

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/151851/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Buck, Andrew D. 2022. Remembering Outremer in the West: The Secunda pars historiae Iherosolimitane and the crisis of crusading in mid-twelfth-century France. *Speculum: A Journal of Medieval Studies* 97 (2) , pp. 377-414. 10.1086/718762

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/718762>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



**Remembering Outremer in the West: The *Secundam Historiae Iherosolimitane Partem*
and the Crisis of Crusading in Mid-Twelfth-Century France**

By Andrew D. Buck

University College Dublin

andrewdbuck1987@googlemail.com

Over the last two decades, the nature of “crusade” studies has been revolutionized by a proliferation of historiography focused on re-examining narratives—most especially those pertaining to the First Crusade (1095–99), which, as Katherine Allen Smith has noted, created a “different way of writing history”—not for their empirical value, but as cultural artefacts: as windows on to the authors, their intended audiences, and the communities (ecclesiastical and secular) to which they belonged.¹ Recent works have thus examined, among other things, the function of the “eyewitness” as a narrative tool, the representation of emotional rhetoric and the miraculous, the uses of the Bible, and the intersection between *chansons de geste* and Latin narrative histories.² In concert with this greater interest in the literary aspects of crusading narratives, moreover, there has emerged a wider focus on the relationship between crusading and memory. As a consequence, in addition to considering how Latin and vernacular texts built communities of crusading remembrance that shaped perceptions of participation, particularly through the formation of “cultural memories” around specific events, individuals, or families, which then intersected with aristocratic and royal identities across the twelfth century and beyond, scholars have come to recognize the wider role played in constructing and transmitting crusading identities by other sources, including liturgical texts, rituals, material cultures, and relics.³

Nevertheless, this upward trend in tracing the reception of crusading has so far focused primarily on individual expeditions, most especially the First Crusade, and as a result there has been much less scholarly discussion regarding the role played by the histories of the four polities

(known collectively as the Crusader States, the Latin East, or Outremer) created in the wake of that initial venture—the kingdom of Jerusalem, the principality of Antioch, and the counties of Edessa and Tripoli.⁴ That is not to say there has been no interest, but that which has moved beyond a focus on empiricism has largely been limited to considering a select few sources created in the Latin East, in particular those by Fulcher of Chartres, Walter the Chancellor, and William of Tyre, with little consideration of their position within wider processes of interpretation and remembrance.⁵ Though it would be misleading to suggest that there is as much potential textual source material for these polities as there is for crusading expeditions, which goes some way to explaining the differing historiographical emphases, there is a need to understand how the stories surrounding the creation and survival of permanent Latin settlements in the Holy Land and Syria were digested by those same European societies who placed such great value in individual crusading campaigns.

This article aims, therefore, to offer a contribution to this historiographical process by examining a lesser-known text relating to the early decades of the Crusader States, the so-called *Secundam historiae Iberosolimitane partem* (hereafter *Secunda historia*), often attributed to Lisiard of Tours. By first tracing the *Secunda historia's* provenance, and then examining the form and function of its content, it will be argued that this text is a vital repository of information regarding both the place of these nascent polities within wider literary discussions on the nature of holy war and the defence of the Holy Land, and also the ecclesiastical and monastic networks that linked medieval Europe and the Latin East. More specifically, it shines a hitherto unrecognized light on the significance of the Crusader States at a particularly difficult moment for the crusading movement in the mid-twelfth century following the failure of the Second Crusade (1146–49)—an expedition which, though launched in emulation of the First Crusade after the loss of Edessa to Muslim forces in 1144, and led by Kings Louis VII of France and Conrad III of Germany, ended in ignominy after disastrous defeats to the Turks in Asia Minor, an abortive siege of Damascus in July 1148, and failed efforts to co-ordinate an assault on Fatimid-held Ascalon.⁶ Indeed, it will be argued here

that contemporary dialogues regarding anger at Byzantine opposition to crusading, the consequences of sin for crusaders, particularly when they are a king, the sanctifying and heroizing of Latin Christian military involvement in the Holy Land, and fears over the kingdom of Jerusalem's borders with Fatimid Egypt, all find voice in this text. As a window on to how events in Outremer were received, perceived, and digested in twelfth-century France, and the potential function such stories could have within a society well-attuned to processes of crusading remembrance, the *Secunda historia* is thus as valuable a cultural artefact as those more popular narratives linked to the crusades.

The Text and its Author

The *Secunda historia* covers the history of the Latin East from late summer 1099—the immediate aftermath of the crusader conquest of Jerusalem on 15 July and the subsequent defeat of a Fatimid relief force at Ascalon in August that year—through to early 1124, just before a joint Jerusalemite and Venetian force besieged and captured the port city of Tyre, albeit without King Baldwin II (r. 1118–31), who was in Muslim captivity.⁷ It is based on the 1124 recension of Fulcher of Chartres's *Historia Hierosolymitana*, although, as will become clear, it is neither an entirely faithful nor complete copy, omitting Fulcher's account of the First Crusade, several intermittent chapters, and an account of Tyre's capture, as well as adding much original material.⁸ It survives in three manuscripts: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 5513, fols. 67v–97r (hereafter BnF lat. 5513); London, British Library, MS Harley 3707, fols. 107r–163v (hereafter BL Harley 3707); and Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España, MS 10225, fols. 78r–109r (hereafter BNE 10225).⁹ BL Harley 3707 and BNE 10225 contain the full text (or at least the most complete to survive), while BnF lat. 5513 ends mid-sentence and is missing one or more of the final folios. The dating, geographical provenance, and proximity to the original author is problematic for both BL Harley 3707 and BnF lat. 5513, as will be discussed below, although it appears they are from twelfth-

century France, while BNE 10225 was copied in Spain during the fourteenth century. Each manuscript contains a version—albeit a notably variant one in the case of BnF lat. 5513—of Baldric of Bourgeuil’s account of the First Crusade, the *Historia Ierosolimitana*, and BL Harley 3707 also includes extracts from Peter Alfonsi’s *Contra Iudaeos dialogi*.¹⁰ The title *Secunda historia* was attributed in 1611 by its first editor, Jacques Bongars, and seemingly relates to a note found in BnF lat. 5513 which describes it as *additio ad librum baldrici. sive secunda historia* (“an addition to the book of Baldric, or a second history”).¹¹ Though this note is not found in either BL Harley 3707 or BNE 10225, it does appear that the *Secunda historia* was viewed as a companion piece to Baldric. For convenience, this naming convention will be followed here.¹²

Rather more problematic is the *Secunda historia*’s attribution to Lisiard of Tours. None of the surviving manuscripts provide an author; indeed, Bongars considered it anonymous. However, the seventeenth-century German philologist, Kaspar von Barth (d. 1658), claimed to have seen a manuscript attributed to *Lisiard d. Traoms*, which he took to mean *Lisiard de Turonensis* (Lisiard of Tours).¹³ Though this cannot have been any of the extant manuscripts—which aligns with another of von Barth’s problematic authorial attributions of a text related to Fulcher’s *Historia*, that is the *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem expugnantium*, which he claimed was composed by one Bartolf of Nangis—other versions of the *Secunda historia* are known to have existed.¹⁴ For example, a further manuscript of Baldric—Chartres, Bibliothèque de Chartres, MS 130 (hereafter Chartres MS 130)—contained a version of the *Secunda historia* used by the editors of the *Recueil des historiens des croisades* but which was destroyed during World War Two; while another may have been lost in a fire that ravaged von Barth’s personal manuscript collection at his house in Sellerhausen, which also included a copy of the 1124 recension of Fulcher’s *Historia*.¹⁵ By the eighteenth century, the German scholar Johann Albert Fabricius (d. 1736) had linked this Lisiard to a cleric who served as deacon of Laon from 1153 to 1168 and authored an Ordinal for that same cathedral.¹⁶ This conclusion undoubtedly stemmed from the foundational work of Luc d’Achery, who included Lisiard in his catalogue of Laon’s deacons, published as an appendix to his edition of Guibert of

Nogent's literary works, although d'Achery attributed him with neither the epithet "of Tours" nor authorship of the *Secunda historia*.¹⁷ Fabricius's attribution has since stuck. When Jacques Paul Migne included the *Secunda historia* in the *Patriologia Latina*, he cited Fabricius's authorial identification, despite following Bongars's edition.¹⁸ The aforementioned editors of the *Recueil des historiens des croisades*, who offered an alternative version of the text to that provided by Bongars, similarly propagated its ties to Lisiard, even though their manuscripts appear not to have done so.¹⁹ Heinrich Hagenmeyer, who briefly discussed the *Secunda historia* in his edition of Fulcher's *Historia*, likewise accepted von Barth and Fabricius's ideas, and accordingly dated the text to the 1150s or 1160s.²⁰ Consequently, some modern scholars have accepted uncritically that the *Secunda historia* was composed by Lisiard of Tours, deacon of Laon cathedral.²¹ There has been some dissent, though. Discussing the career of Lisiard the Deacon in his 1897 edition of the Laon Ordinals, Ulysse Chevalier observed that documents mentioning Lisiard date to no earlier than 1155, meaning d'Achery's career dates must be revised, and also reconfirmed that no Laonese materials carry the epithet "of Tours." Chevalier also questioned whether Lisiard the Deacon should be linked in any way to the *Secunda historia*, suggesting instead that historians should content themselves with Bongars's title and forego any such authorial attribution.²²

Nevertheless, it is in fact possible to say more about the *Secunda historia*'s provenance. First, it should be noted that the text is fairly stable, at least as we have it: while there are some slight variations between the manuscripts, these are rarely (if ever) more than minor scribal alterations, while the evidence of Chartres MS 130, at least as can be surmised from the *Recueil* edition, supports this thesis. There are also several sentence constructions which point to it being the work of a single author. For example, there is a particular fondness throughout for *adeo ... ut* ("to such a degree ... that"), which appears on twenty-two occasions, as well as *non dico* (or *dicam*) ... *sed* ("I shall not say ... but"), which appears five times.²³ Neither are simple echoes of Fulcher's style—though he used *adeo ... ut*, he did not do so with quite the same frequency; nor are they a stylistic borrowing from Baldric. Furthermore, the extent to which the text shows familiarity with Fulcher's

Historia, and is skilfully able to re-order and re-write it into a different, but no less consistent, narrative, lends further support to the belief that there was one author. Whether either of the earlier manuscripts represents the autograph is another matter, as will be considered in due course. One final thing to note is that the Anonymous author was clearly well educated and so belonged to the same intellectual milieu as both Fulcher and Baldric. Not only do they demonstrate a grasp of Scripture beyond Fulcher's—which is perhaps unsurprising given the latter's approach to biblical allusions has been described as “understated”—and thus deserves to be considered as part of wider twelfth-century trends of framing the crusading past in relation to biblical exegesis; but we also find references to classical authors like Juvenal and Virgil, the latter being a particular favourite of Baldric.²⁴ There are also hints that the author was familiar with traditions surrounding crusade narratives other than those of Fulcher and Baldric, as well as *chanson* or epic traditions.

Regarding the text's geographical origins and dating, there is sadly no definitive way to identify where in France BL Harley 3707 comes from, or when exactly it was produced (beyond a likelihood of the second half of the twelfth century), as the earliest marker of its provenance comes from the seventeenth century.²⁵ However, we can at least have some confidence that BnF lat. 5513 is linked to the Touraine region of central France. As Nicholas Paul has demonstrated, the version of Baldric found in this manuscript—known to historians as the G manuscript—contains additions found in no other copy of the *Historia Ierosolimitana*, and which relate to the crusading exploits of Hugh of Chaumont, lord of Amboise, and other local participants. In other words, this version of Baldric was made specifically for an audience from the Touraine. That there are textual crossovers between the G manuscript and two other texts, the *Gesta Ambaziensium dominorum* (“The Deeds of the Lords of Amboise”) and the *Chronica de gestis consulum Andegavorum* (“The Chronicles of the Deeds of the Counts of Anjou”), further demonstrates that this variant of the *Historia Ierosolimitana* formed a part of wider efforts to construct and propagate crusading memories and family identities specific to the Touraine.²⁶ It might be considered, therefore, that the *Secunda historia* served a similar purpose, and that we should look towards the region of Tours for our

author—as Paul himself suggested.²⁷ There are certainly hints at influences local to this area within the text. For example, the *Secunda historia* nearly always utilizes the term *consul* when discussing the counts of Edessa and Tripoli (and also some French lords who participated in the so-called “1101 Crusade”).²⁸ These are not copied from Fulcher, and because it is a quirk that exists in all of the surviving manuscripts, we can safely assume that it replicates the original author’s style. Importantly, this spelling, though drawn from classical influences, was particularly prominent in the area of Anjou (which the Touraine bordered).²⁹ Furthermore, when describing how King Baldwin II absolved sellers of all duties on wheat and vegetables in the ports of the kingdom in 1120, the *Secunda historia* noted how this ensured a remittance of *minagium*, or measurage (not the term used by Fulcher).³⁰ In the twelfth century, *minagium* was a term specific to France and, as noted by Nicholas Vincent in relation to the administration of King Henry II of England, was “found exclusively in the charters of Anjou.”³¹ Though it can also be seen elsewhere, *minagium* was nevertheless not a very common term, and it therefore serves as additional evidence that the author had ties to central-western France.³²

The *Secunda historia*’s author also utilized a quote from Juvenal’s *Satires*—“Humble fortune protects the virtuous Latins, and labours into the nights with Hannibal near to the city”—which is not included in Fulcher, but can be found, verbatim, in the *Deeds of the Lords of Amboise*.³³ While Juvenal’s works were not unknown in this period, to utilize the exact same quote could imply some form of inter-relationship between the two texts, similar to that which Paul has identified between the *Deeds of the Lords of Amboise* and the G manuscript of Baldric.³⁴ Given that all of the extant manuscripts of the *Secunda historia* carry this quote, it could be argued that, if its author lifted it *from* the *Deeds of the Lords of Amboise* (which Paul has posited was composed c. 1153–55), then BnF lat. 5513 is likely the earliest version, from which BL Harley 3707 (and later BNE 10225) would then probably have derived.³⁵ If this were the case, however, we must wonder why the author-scribes (of which there was clearly only one in each instance) of BL Harley 3707 and BNE 10225 did not also replicate the version of Baldric found in BnF lat. 5513. Indeed, despite the stability of the

Secunda historia in the extant manuscripts, the variances between the versions of Baldric, especially in the French manuscripts, suggest instead that neither of these represents the autograph of the former text; nor are they necessarily directly related. What appears more likely is that all three author-scribes used a common exemplar, or very similar manuscripts—perhaps Chartres MS 130 or one textually related to it, or even that known by von Barth—containing both Baldric and the *Secunda historia*.³⁶ Having seen this exemplar, the author-scribe of BnF lat. 5513 then edited the *Historia Ierosolimitana* based on local interests, while the author-scribe of BL Harley 3707 seems to have stuck to it fairly faithfully (as did the author-scribe of BNE 10225 two centuries later).³⁷ In this scenario, the *Secunda historia* would appear to pre-date the completion of the *Deeds of the Lords of Amboise*, which points to a date of composition before 1155 (incidentally the year Lisiard the Deacon first appears in Laon Cathedral), and that the *Deeds's* author took the Juvenal quote either from the same exemplar as the author-scribe of BnF lat. 5513 or used the version found in the latter manuscript. Therefore, while the author of the *Secunda historia* might have had links to the Touraine, we cannot assume that the text itself originated there.

In fact, other internal clues suggest an entirely different geographical focus. Taking inspiration from several studies, including Paul's on the G manuscript of Baldric, which have demonstrated how the geographical location of a text might be traced through emphases placed on specific individuals, there are three figures whose representation in the *Secunda historia* proves important.³⁸ The first is Baldwin of Boulogne, otherwise known as King Baldwin I of Jerusalem (r. 1100–18). Given that Fulcher of Chartres was Baldwin's personal chaplain, it is perhaps unsurprising that a text based upon his *Historia* is pro-Baldwin.³⁹ However, while the depiction of the Jerusalemite king will be discussed in greater depth below, there are a couple of instructive examples which reveal how the *Secunda historia* adds its own twist. We begin with the discussion of Baldwin's reaction, while still count of Edessa, to news of the Danishmend Turks's capture of fellow First Crusade veteran Bohemond of Taranto, prince of Antioch, near Melitene in June 1100.⁴⁰ In Fulcher's version, Baldwin immediately gathered forces from Edessa and Antioch and

“did not delay to seek out [the ‘Turks]” (*quaerere non distulit*).⁴¹ The *Secunda historia* goes further: “having heard of such a miserable misfortune, Baldwin became most vehemently sad. He mourned his friend, bewailed his colleague, and lamented the common crisis. And nor did that most judicious hero (*heros cordatissimus*) delay to rush to the aid of his friend, if possible, with as much of an army as he could, and with the Antiochenes joined to him too.”⁴² This represents a considerable departure from Fulcher’s version, and portrays Baldwin in a particularly positive light. Notwithstanding calling him a hero (a moment of hyperbole rare even for narratives pertaining to crusading, including Baldric’s epic-tinged account of the First Crusade), the use of emotional performance helps to present him as a man—a leader—of loyalty and brotherly devotion.⁴³ As Stephen Spencer has demonstrated, weeping played a key role in texts related to crusading expeditions, with tears acting as “expressions of the fraternal love which supposedly bound [crusaders] together.” Through such acts of lachrymose compassion and affection—deeply imbedded as they were in Scripture—Christian holy warriors were depicted participating in a wider religious (and military-religious) community. The notion of weeping for co-religionists who suffered at enemy hands was also a core component of European crusading calls throughout the twelfth-century, launched as they often were in response to military disasters in Outremer.⁴⁴ Here, therefore, through his grief and weeping, as well as his immediate move to bring aid to those he loved, Baldwin becomes both the idealized Christian king and the idealized holy warrior: a model for western knights and rulers who might hear similar tales of dangers experienced by their co-religionists in the East.⁴⁵

This heroizing trend is taken to even greater heights in our second example, which focuses on the so-called “first battle of Ramlah,” fought between Baldwin’s small Jerusalemite army and the Fatimid forces of Ascalon in late summer 1101.⁴⁶ In Fulcher’s account, Baldwin was in the thick of the fighting, at one stage running through (*percussit*) a Muslim enemy with his lance (which bore a white flag), with the tip still protruding as his foe fell to the ground. Fulcher even noted that “I, standing nearby, witnessed this” (*propius astans cernebam*), with the sudden inclusion of

eyewitness experience no doubt as a means to lend credence to the validity and impressiveness of this feat.⁴⁷ Yet, in the *Secunda historia's* account of Baldwin's martial prowess, it is noted that "some he threw to the ground from their horses with a lance; others he cut in half in their seats with a sword."⁴⁸ Baldwin is thus described killing multiple opponents, and not just with his lance. Such a modification is particularly significant, for, in the wake of the First Crusade, stories quickly circulated in written and oral form regarding the bisection of a Muslim opponent (or opponents) by Godfrey of Bouillon, Baldwin's brother and the first ruler of Jerusalem. This is described most dramatically, perhaps, in Robert the Monk's *Historia Ierosolimitana*, produced in Rheims c. 1110, but is found in roughly only a third of the manuscripts of Baldric, primarily those produced later (including, importantly, BnF lat. 5513 and BL Harley 3707, which offer different versions of this episode, with the *Secunda historia's* use of the verb *dimidiare* mirroring the lexical choice made in only the latter of these manuscripts).⁴⁹ As Simon John has demonstrated, the bisection trope, which drew influences from epic traditions, became something of a standard against which idealized warriors were judged.⁵⁰ The *Secunda historia's* attribution of multiple bisections to Baldwin therefore not only suggests the author's knowledge of a wider corpus of crusading narratives than Baldric or Fulcher (which will become even clearer below), as well as early *chanson* traditions; it also placed Baldwin on a par with Godfrey and amongst the highest echelons of martial prowess.⁵¹

Importantly, though the *Secunda historia* rarely names actors outside of the main rulers and patriarchs, there are two other figures whose appearances suggest an interest in recording and aggrandizing the actions of northern French settlers. The first of these is Hugh, lord of Tiberias, who originated from Fauquembergues in the Pas-de-Calais, which was situated near to Saint-Omer and Boulogne in the diocese of Thérouanne.⁵² Alongside Hugh offering military support to Baldwin I in the wake of a disastrous battle outside Ramlah in 1102, the *Secunda historia* notes that Hugh faced the Damascenes in battle three times in 1106, and in the last of these he "marvellously" (*mirabiliter*) put to flight 4000 enemy soldiers with only 120 knights—although not long after he was reportedly killed in a Turkish ambush.⁵³ Indeed, it is of interest that the author of the *Secunda*

historia chose to include such minor asides as Hugh's battles with the Damascenes and subsequent death—which make up a single, small chapter of Fulcher's *Historia*—when other similar chapters are otherwise excised, while the use of *mirabiliter* is both original and adds a sense of potential divine agency.⁵⁴ The second, and perhaps more overt, example is that of Eustace Grenier, lord of the Jerusalemite cities of Caesarea and Sidon, who acted as temporary regent of the kingdom in 1123 when King Baldwin II—Baldwin of Boulogne's successor and cousin—was taken captive by Balak, the Turkish emir of Kharput.⁵⁵ Upon Eustace's appointment, Fulcher noted he was “a good man and honest by character, who at that time possessed Caesarea and Sidon.”⁵⁶ By contrast, in the *Secunda historia*, Eustace was prince (*principem*) of Caesarea and Sidon, and also “a man altogether strenuous in arms, distinguished in habits, strong in counsel, and of illustrious nobility.”⁵⁷ Moreover, at various points during his regency, Eustace is seen in the *Secunda historia* taking a leading role in events—essentially acting as the ruler of Jerusalem—whereas Fulcher depicted him simply working in conjunction with the other nobles.⁵⁸ Eustace's prominence is particularly significant because he hailed from Beaurain-Château, which was also in the Pas-de-Calais and the diocese of Thérouanne, forming part of the lordship of the counts of Saint-Pol (themselves First Crusaders), whose lands bordered the county of Boulogne.⁵⁹

What emerges from these examples, then, is the suggestion that the author of the *Secunda historia* had a special interest in figures from north-eastern France, from which it can be inferred that the text was originally composed in this same region. As John Ott has shown, the period from the late-eleventh to the early–mid-twelfth century was one of powerful ecclesiastical collegiality and co-operation in north-eastern France, particularly in the archdiocese of Rheims. Included within this were the bishoprics of Arras, Thérouanne, and Laon, but also involved were influential local lords, like the counts of Boulogne and Saint-Pol.⁶⁰ This collegiality would likely have created a greater sense of regional religious—and thus, perhaps, crusading—identity, such that the recording of stories of important local figures who went on to have significant roles in the kingdom of Jerusalem would have appealed to nearby audiences in much the same way as Hugh of

Chaumont's crusading exploits resonated with those in the Touraine.⁶¹ We know for certain that Fulcher's *Historia* was subject to local interest. Guibert, abbot of Nogent-sous-Coucy (d. 1124), who was well known among the intellectual communities of Laon and was a close ally of its bishop, Bartholomew (r. 1113–51), used an earlier recension of the *Historia* in his own account of the First Crusade, the *Dei gesta per Francos*.⁶² Moreover, interest in the exploits of local figures in the crusade and beyond can be identified in other sources. Both Hugh of Tiberias and Eustace Grenier appear alongside Baldwin of Boulogne, Godfrey of Bouillon, and several other figures, in a little discussed verse list produced to commemorate the participants of the First Crusade and early settlers of Outremer who heralded from the diocese of Thérouanne, with Eustace described as *princeps* of Caesarea and a “notable knight” (*notus miles*).⁶³ Further to this is a short narrative which describes events in the kingdom of Jerusalem in 1111 and must date to the first half of the twelfth century, for it is attached to several of the earliest manuscripts of Guibert's *Dei gesta* (most of which emanate from north-eastern France and the archdiocese of Rheims).⁶⁴ In this, Baldwin I achieved an important victory over Ascalonite forces after the latter had attempted to trick the king into a peace treaty and secure armed entrance into Jerusalem through nefarious means. One of the only other Latin Christian figures to be named here is Eustace Grenier, who is credited with a lead role. While there is no indication that the author of this brief account used Fulcher or the *Secunda historia* (for neither have the story), or that it was known by the author of the *Secunda historia* (who may, however, have known—or even produced—the verse list of crusade participants), these texts do at least demonstrate a wider contemporary interest in tales relating to Baldwin I's reign in north-eastern France.

Equally important, though, is the fact that the Premonstratensian monastic order had a significant presence throughout the archdiocese of Rheims, especially in the region of Laon. In fact, the bishop of Laon at the turn of the 1150s, Walter I (r. 1151–53/5), was himself a former abbot of the order's house of Saint-Martin of Laon, while the aforementioned Bishop Bartholomew had been a powerful supporter.⁶⁵ It has long been established that monastic orders

like the Premonstratensians, who were known for their preaching, were vital conduits for promoting and facilitating crusade participation, while they also helped to shape dialogues surrounding holy warfare by serving as hubs for the creation and preservation of crusading memories.⁶⁶ Furthermore, the Premonstratensians held several houses in the Latin East, including at Mountjoy, just outside of Jerusalem, as well as a dual foundation dedicated to Saints Joseph and Habakkuk, which was responsible for a Josephite shrine near Diospolis (Lydda) and an abbey church near Ramlah. So influential was the order, that they were seemingly involved in supporting King Baldwin III during a conflict with his mother, Queen Melisende, in 1152 over his right to rule alone, and soon afterwards in 1153—perhaps as a reward for his loyalty—Abbot Amalric of Saints Joseph and Habakkuk was elected bishop of Sidon and the order granted possessions in newly-conquered Ascalon.⁶⁷ In the context of the *Secunda historia*, then, it is of interest that several of its key original passages relate to events around Ramlah, and to the Ascalonites who threatened it, as well as to a former lord of Sidon. Just as significant is the fact that the author drew on the Old Testament Book of Habakkuk—rarely used in the wider corpus of early crusade texts—to cite the passage “Death shall flow before His face; the Devil shall follow at His feet” (Habakkuk, 3:5).⁶⁸ Indeed, the Premonstratensians were responsible for introducing this saint’s cult to the area of Ramlah, while in a recent study on the use of the Bible in crusade narratives, Katherine Allen Smith has noted only one other reference to Habakkuk, found in the *Dei gesta* of Guibert of Nogent, who incidentally wrote a commentary on this book.⁶⁹ The Premonstratensians were also known cultivators of writing, such as the Premonstratensian Continuation of Sigebert of Gembloux’s chronicle, completed c. 1155 either in Rheims or Laon, but which likely survives only in a later abbreviated format in a manuscript also containing the so-called Laon Continuation.⁷⁰ The author of the Premonstratensian Continuation demonstrates a clear interest in Outremer, particularly events surrounding Ascalon, and was evidently very well (and quickly) informed about the kingdom of Jerusalem in the early 1150s. Meanwhile, the entry for 1124 includes a Venetian attack on Ascalon, which is followed by the capture of Tyre, as well as King Baldwin II’s release

from Muslim captivity.⁷¹ When it is considered that these mark the end of the 1124 recension of Fulcher of Chartres's *Historia*—but not, as noted above, the end of the *Secunda historia*, which includes only preparations for the siege of Tyre—and given the ties between the Premonstratensians and Guibert of Nogent (who wrote a commentary on Hosea and dedicated it to the order's founder, Norbert of Xanten), it is evident that Fulcher's text would have been known to Premonstratensian circles in and around Laon.⁷²

Nevertheless, the potential links with the Touraine should not be overlooked, and it is also worth noting here that Baldric of Bourgeuil spent most of his life in the region just to the west of Tours, which perhaps partly explains why the author of the *Secunda historia* chose to pair the narrative with this account of the First Crusade, rather than Fulcher's own version of that initial venture found in Book One of his *Historia*; although it is also likely that, while Baldric's text did not have a singularly powerful linguistic or thematic influence over the *Secunda historia*, it was still considered preferable on theological and literary grounds.⁷³ Thus, it is distinctly plausible that an author based in north-eastern France—such as at Laon, perhaps having been drawn there by its famous school, known for scholars of the Bible like Anselm of Laon (d. 1117)—who originally hailed from the Touraine and also had links to the Premonstratensian order, might have written the *Secunda historia*.⁷⁴ While this is not enough to confirm the attribution of the text to Lisiard of Tours, nor to link this Lisiard to the deacon of Laon cathedral (although it should be noted that Lisiard is an unusual name), it does make such a reality at least possible.

To better understand the purpose of the *Secunda historia*, though, and to shed further light on the issue of dating, we must explore several key themes in the narrative. First, however, it should be noted that, although the wide gap between the potential *termini post* and *ante quos* of the *Secunda historia*'s composition (1124–55) creates difficulties in offering a secure date, especially given the author's failure to extend beyond Fulcher's timeframe, it is possible to be more precise. Indeed, there is a wealth of internal evidence, to be discussed below, which points to a composition

date linked to events surrounding the aftermath of the Second Crusade's disastrous failures: on the march through Byzantine territory and Turkish Asia Minor, and upon arrival in Outremer. It will be contended here, therefore, that we should view the *Secunda historia* within the context of efforts to summon a follow-up venture—a project known to historians as the “non-Crusade of 1150”—inspired by the defeat and killing of Prince Raymond of Antioch at the Battle of Inab in 1149 and instigated by Abbot Suger of Saint-Denis at a church council summoned for this purpose, and which was attended by Louis VII, at Laon cathedral in March 1150.⁷⁵ The failure of the text to extend beyond 1124 need not threaten this, for doing so would have necessitated detailing the invention of a new dynasty in Jerusalem through the marriage of Count Fulk V of Anjou and Melisende of Jerusalem in 1128, which would perhaps have detracted from the author's motivational purpose given the Capetians's increasingly difficult relations with the Angevins.⁷⁶ It was certainly not unknown for mid-twelfth-century narratives of Outremer to focus on the pre-1124 “golden age” of the Latin East, as shown by the *Historia Nicaena vel Antiochena*, a text covering the years 1099–1123 (which likewise drew on Fulcher's *Historia*) and seemingly produced in Jerusalem to glorify its ruling family in the mid-to-late 1140s.⁷⁷ Importantly, placing the *Secunda historia* in the context of the early 1150s has a profound impact on our understanding of its purpose and content, as well as the role played by memories of the Latin East—not simply the First Crusade—in promoting further crusading in the mid-twelfth century.

Remembering Outremer and Explaining Failure

In the wake of the Second Crusade's failure, many writers sought to explain how an expedition which had begun so auspiciously could have ended so badly. This was especially so because the crusade's ecclesiastical progenitors, Pope Eugenius III and Abbot Bernard of Clairvaux, had couched the venture as a follow up to the First Crusade, and there is every reason to believe that participants—influenced by contemporary processes of local and collective remembrance that had

constructed an image of that initial venture as a key moment of epic Christian heroism—bought into this notion.⁷⁸ These reactions took several forms: some blamed Bernard for offering false promises; some criticized the crusaders themselves, accusations from which the ruling leaders were not immune, suggesting that they had fallen into sinful and prideful behaviours that brought forth God’s wrath, and even that they had proved inept at key moments; others looked to Byzantium, whose emperor, Manuel I Komnenos, had experienced particular difficulties with the crusaders, especially the French, and was also accused of collusion with the Turks; while some—albeit largely in Germany—suggested that the Latins of Jerusalem had betrayed the venture at Damascus by accepting bribes from its Muslim defenders.⁷⁹ As will be argued below, the presence of several of these themes throughout the *Secunda historia* suggests that it should be considered within this same literary climate.

We begin with the issue of anti-Byzantine sentiment. As Marcus Bull and Stephen Spencer have recently argued, accusations of Greek betrayal act as a central narrative drive for one of our only eye-witness accounts of the Second Crusade, that of Odo of Deuil, abbot of Saint-Denis (composed by 1150).⁸⁰ While it would be misleading to say that the Byzantines are an especially prominent aspect of the *Secunda historia*, for they are not so in Fulcher’s *Historia*, even though he is considered to have shown pro-Byzantine sympathies, it is nevertheless significant that its author perpetuates similar anti-Greek attitudes to Odo.⁸¹ Firstly, when detailing the “1101 Crusade,” during which several armies travelled to the Holy Land following the First Crusade’s success, the *Secunda historia* omits Fulcher’s comment that the leaders met Count Raymond of Toulouse at Constantinople, to which he had returned after Jerusalem’s capture.⁸² This effectively erased any hint at the relationship that emerged between Raymond and Emperor Alexios I Komnenos, which even saw joint military action against the Latins of Antioch and during a subsequent siege of Tripoli.⁸³ However, the most obvious example relates to the text’s version of the so-called “1107/1108 Crusade.” This venture, led by Bohemond of Taranto against the Byzantine-held Adriatic coast after an extensive recruitment campaign across France, was launched on the premise

that Alexios represented a threat to the Latin East as a result of apparent attacks on pilgrims; though it ended in failure at Dyrrachium, with Bohemond forced to agree a peace treaty with the emperor.⁸⁴ Of this campaign, Fulcher recorded that it was inspired by fears that Alexios had been thwarting or impeding pilgrims travelling to Jerusalem, and that, as part of the subsequent peace agreement, the emperor had sworn on precious relics that he would ensure the safety of pilgrims as far as it was within his power to do so.⁸⁵ Although the *Secunda historia* does not depart radically from Fulcher, there are subtle variations which intensified the narrative, making it more anti-Greek in tone. For example, Alexios was now “very hostile to Christian pilgrims travelling to Jerusalem and a worse and more cruel enemy than the Saracens themselves.”⁸⁶ Likewise, discussing the peace treaty, the author noted that Alexios “swore over most precious relics that, throughout his entire empire, nothing would be brought to bear against pilgrims by himself or by other nuisances; rather he would protect and aid them faithfully.”⁸⁷ The author even included an original lament for the many who died at Dyrrachium, carried away by a “uniquely excessive ardour” (*nimio solis ardore*) on the path to Jerusalem.⁸⁸ Through these changes, therefore, the *Secunda historia* intimates that not only had Alexios been a greater threat to the Holy Land than Islam, but, at the expense of the lives of many devoted French soldiers, he had sworn without qualification to protect those pilgrims who passed through his lands in future.

Such hostility did not stop with Alexios, however. Indeed, the *Secunda historia* demonstrates a particularly negative attitude towards all schismatic Christians. This can be witnessed in descriptions of inter-Christian religious celebrations, like Baldwin of Boulogne’s arrival at Jerusalem to become king in mid-1100, as although Fulcher has him greeted outside the city, and then led to the Holy Sepulchre, not just by Latins, but also by Greeks and Syrians, the latter two groups are absent from the *Secunda historia*.⁸⁹ The text also omits entirely the famous episode of the Holy Fire, in which Baldwin, having initially refused non-Latins entrance into the Holy Sepulchre, was forced to relent after the failure of the Easter miracle.⁹⁰ Eastern Christians are also removed from an act of communal prayer and fasting carried out by the citizens of Jerusalem while Eustace

Grenier led the Latin armies against the Muslims near Ramlah in 1123.⁹¹ The *Secunda historia* likewise changes Fulcher's text when relating episodes where Eastern Christians were caught up in military or political affairs. Thus, while the *Secunda historia* follows Fulcher's description of local Syrians aiding Baldwin in attacking and killing Muslim brigands near Ascalon in summer 1100, its author, quoting Virgil's *Aeneid*, noted that Baldwin had launched this attack "to show mercy to the conquered, and to subdue the proud" (*Aeneid*, Book 6, line 853), which appears to imply that those Syrians aided by Baldwin's intervention were, despite their Christianity, subjected peoples.⁹² Furthermore, when describing Ramlah as part of an account of an attack made on the city by the Ascalonites in 1102, the *Secunda historia's* author neglects Fulcher's note that the area was also populated by Syrian Christians, who bore the initial brunt of the Muslim assault.⁹³ In a similar vein, there is no hint of Fulcher's story that, following the disastrous subsequent battle at Ramlah in 1102, when Baldwin was feared dead by many, the king had entrusted a local Syrian—whose bravery and faith is praised—with the task of bringing word of his survival to Jerusalem.⁹⁴ Perhaps the most overt example, however, relates to the *Secunda historia's* account of a daring act of espionage, launched by fifty "most strenuous men" (*strenuissimi viri*) from Edessa in the hope of saving Baldwin II, along with Count Joscelin of Edessa and other Latins, from his aforementioned captivity at the hands of Balak. Indeed, the *Secunda historia* omits that Fulcher considered those men to have been Armenian.⁹⁵ Moreover, when Joscelin successfully escaped with a few companions and entered Armenian territory on the way to seek further aid from Antioch and Jerusalem, the *Secunda historia* inserts another anti-Eastern Christian gloss. While Fulcher noted that the small group was worried about being recognized, the *Secunda historia* goes further, suggesting that they "dared not search for nourishment for themselves, having suspected those Christians [i.e. the Armenians] of betrayal; and for that reason they feared to be seen or to be recognized."⁹⁶ Finally, though the *Secunda historia* followed Fulcher in detailing that the Edessan count was eventually helped by an Armenian and his family, the former omits the latter's comment that this had occurred only after Joscelin had sent one of his companions to seek the aid of a native

(*indigam*).⁹⁷ Instead, it is suggested that “in such a position of misfortune, they [Joscelin and his companions] had only one hope, and so they begged for the help of divine pity to come to them.”⁹⁸

When combined, these passages demonstrate an especially strong effort to eradicate moments of inter-Christian unity, particularly given that Fulcher’s text is famed for promoting and extolling such interaction as a core element of the Orientalization of Latin settlers.⁹⁹ It is possible that the author of the *Secunda historia* saw the Byzantines and other Eastern Christians as one and the same, and so we can view this as part of wider efforts to promote fears of betrayal in the wake of the Second Crusade. Equally, we are perhaps witnessing echoes of other French memories of experiences in the East; ones that might relate to the aforementioned anger felt towards the Latin settlers of Outremer, who were seen as overly familiar with native populations. There is certainly a hint at this in the *Secunda historia*’s description of events in northern Syria in 1115, when the Latins of Antioch, Tripoli, and Jerusalem allied with Muslim Damascus against Bursuq of Mosul. In Fulcher, this union came at the request of the Latins; but in the *Secunda historia* their proactivity is removed—instead the ruler of Damascus approached them for fear of his own demise.¹⁰⁰ The negative portrayal of Eastern Christians may also relate to the recollections of those crusaders who had been forced to undertake a dangerous (and often deadly) march towards Antioch through Cilicia—which was home to extensive Eastern Christian communities—in early 1148 after Louis VII, having suffered multiple attacks from the Turks, abandoned them and took ship to Antioch from Adalia.¹⁰¹

Indeed, there are other suggestions that the experiences of French crusaders in Asia Minor left an imprint on the *Secunda historia*. Thus, in the text’s description of how King Baldwin II failed to draw Turkish forces into battle in northern Syria in 1122, we find the following description of the latter’s military tactics: “those Parthians [i.e. the Turks] ... were always on the move, now turning their backs, now their faces, more nimble than you can imagine, so that when you think that they are fleeing it is necessary to beware their unexpected return and sudden charges, and for

this reason, when you believe you have defeated them, you should look out that you do not see yourself defeated.”¹⁰² The *Secunda historia* is partly taking inspiration here from Fulcher, who described how the Parthians never remain in the same place, and that they would turn quickly in feigned flight before returning to the fray.¹⁰³ However, it adds a deftness not found in Fulcher, as well as an original commentary on the pitfalls of confidence that could hint at personal experience. Interestingly, this account of war with the Turks raises distinct parallels with Odo of Deuil’s eyewitness account of the build-up to, and events of, a disastrous defeat for French crusaders against the Seljuk Turks at Mount Cadmus in early January 1148, a little over a week after a more successful skirmish.¹⁰⁴ Regarding that initial conflict, Odo notes that although the crusaders had “joyfully obtained the first fruits of victory by killing some of [the enemy],” the cunning (*astus*) Turks, “skilled and agile in flight and bold in pursuit,” subsequently caused problems for Louis VII, who “could neither have peace nor join battle with them, as they assaulted boldly and retreated skilfully and easily.”¹⁰⁵ The Turks eventually fled after a courageous charge by the French knights, with Odo proudly declaring that the crusaders had sowed the fields with Turkish corpses and claiming the presence of divine intervention.¹⁰⁶ Yet, it is noted that one consequence of this victory was that the Turks summoned allies from all around to seek vengeance, while the unmindful (*immemores*) crusaders cared more for securing supplies and finding a suitable camp than maintaining good order, particularly as the vanguard entered the mountain. It was here that the Turks returned, killing many with arrows and forcing others to plummet to their deaths from the rocky paths; while they thronged (*congregantur*) around those further back, cutting the defenceless crowd to pieces. It was only nightfall that curtailed the slaughter.¹⁰⁷ The following day, Louis regrouped and drove the Turks away, but Odo did not hold back from lamenting at what had occurred: “the flowers of France withered before they could bear fruit in Damascus. In saying this, I am overcome by tears, and I groan from the bottom of my heart.”¹⁰⁸

Though Odo’s profession of grief is highly stylized and consistent with emotional literary conventions, and Bull has also demonstrated that the use of eyewitness was as much a narrative

device as it was a reflection of the author's lived experiences, it seems likely that the deaths of so many soldiers before they reached the Holy Land would have been keenly felt.¹⁰⁹ This is demonstrated not only by letters composed by Eugenius III in the wake of the crusade, such as his missive to Abbot Suger in April 1150, in which he stressed fears that a new campaign would lead to a further "outpouring of blood" (*effusionem sanguinis*) and described the crusade as "the severe disaster of the Christian name which the Church of God has suffered in our time," but also by the words of the Jerusalemite chronicler, William of Tyre (d. c. 1184), who, though writing in Outremer some three decades later, had been a student in Paris at the time of the venture.¹¹⁰ In his version, William notes how the knight leading the vanguard, Geoffrey of Rancogne, had rashly gone ahead, despite orders to the contrary, which allowed the Turks to attack and defeat the divided army.¹¹¹ Lamenting further, William commented that "there died on that day noble and illustrious men, singularly distinguished for military deeds, [and] deserving of pious recollection ... On that inauspicious day for us [i.e. the Christians], and by that very great disaster, the vast glory and strength of the Franks perished."¹¹² The closeness of this to Odo's account would appear to suggest that news of Mount Cadmus was widely-known and sadly received back in France. In this context, the description of Turkish warfare found in the *Secunda historia* takes on a new edge, perhaps suggesting that the author had spoken to an eyewitness (maybe even Odo), for instance during the aforementioned council at Laon, or at the very least that they were aware of these disastrous events.¹¹³

However, another key aspect of the *Secunda historia* which points to the influence of reactions to the Second Crusade's failure is the thematic significance of God punishing sinful Christians—especially those guilty of pride—by inflicting defeat on them in war. While the notion of assigning defeat to pride, and success to trust in God, was a common paradigm of crusade texts, and indeed many other medieval narratives, that the *Secunda historia* emphasizes the idea of a chastized ruler, punished so that he might amend his ways before returning later to achieve victory, has particular resonance with the wake of the Second Crusade. This is so not only in relation to

the criticism faced by Conrad III of Germany and Louis VII of France for their part in the venture's failure, but, more importantly, because the latter was being asked to return to the Holy Land at the Council of Laon in March 1150. Indeed, the theme of divine instruction appears so consistently throughout the *Secunda historia*, and often on occasions (and in formats) not found in Fulcher, that it constitutes a major part of the work, reflects the author's own agenda, and was probably inspired by a major Latin defeat, such as the failure of the Second Crusade and/or the disaster at Inab.

This is seen first with Bohemond of Taranto's aforementioned capture by Turkish forces near Melitene in July 1100. Thinking he was safe, Bohemond had moved forward rashly (*inconsulte*) and altogether incautiously (*omnino incaute*), and so was overthrown by an abominable people (*gens nefaria*) and "made a laughing stock by the enemy" (*ludibrio hostibus facti*)—a gloss not found in Fulcher.¹¹⁴ Likewise, evoking popular themes within texts relating to the First Crusade, victories are often described in ways designed to emphasize how deeply success was entwined with the balance of humility and pride, while Latin holy warriors are presented as the new Israelites and God's chosen people.¹¹⁵ Thus, a surprising victory achieved by a heavily outnumbered Baldwin near Beirut in late summer 1100 as he travelled to become king of Jerusalem, is described as having been granted "so that proofs might become manifestly clear that this was not to be the work of [human] strength," and "so that the Christians, *truly the sons of Israel* [my emphasis], seeing God fighting for his people on land and sea, congratulating together, might proclaim: 'if God is for us, who can be against us?' (Romans, 8:31)."¹¹⁶ In a comment not in Fulcher, but which clearly emphasized the changeability of fortune and the importance of reliance only on Christ, the *Secunda historia* noted further that: "Look, you who have conquered in this manner, who now boast themselves to have won! The victors are conquered by the conquered, the captives are captured by the captured; and they are bound, guarded, and divided by those who had already believed themselves to be held captive."¹¹⁷

The theme of divine instruction is also found in the *Secunda historia's* version of a battlefield speech delivered by Baldwin I on the eve of the first battle of Ramlah in 1101. Having evoked Luke 12:32–34—“Do not be afraid little flock, for your father is pleased to give you the kingdom”—which again raised parallels with ideas of the Latins as God’s chosen people, as well as Augustinian notions of their being heirs to the city of God, Baldwin chided his men that, “if you should think only of the earthly kingdom, or wages, or even gifts, you shall rightly tremble, fearing either to be conquered or even to be killed.”¹¹⁸ Moreover, that each man “should know that he ought to desire to be seen fighting, to die; as, by dying, the eternal kingdom will be prepared [for him] by the eternal king.”¹¹⁹ The thread of divine instruction later re-emerges in relation to a victory achieved by Prince Roger of Antioch over numerically superior Muslim forces at Tell Danith in 1115. Here, the author of the *Secunda historia* asks why such a victory would occur “unless to make clear by the strongest proofs that it is for a man to glory only in God, being worth nothing in himself.”¹²⁰ It is even suggested that “nothing can be more accursed, nothing more detestable with God, than dread of His presumption; just as on the other hand nothing is more pleasing, nothing more acceptable, than to know with a truly humble and devoted heart that He performs all our works for us.”¹²¹ We can even find a moment of spiritual judgement for failed crusaders who proved themselves a poor comparison to settlers. Thus, when the *Secunda historia* describes the 1101 crusaders’s defeat by the Turks in Asia Minor, it is stated that this occurred because, “by one reason or another, having not completed the journey, [and] wishing to return to their lands,” they retreated from Antioch; whereupon, “being opposed by Soliman the Turk ... or rather by the just judge God (2 Maccabees, 12:5), punishing the idleness of they who had not fulfilled the good and holy summons of the holy pilgrimage ... 100,000 of them, both knights and footsoldiers, perished by various deaths.”¹²² By drawing on the Book of Maccabees, as so many narrators of the First Crusade did, this helped to mark a religious contrast between temporary pilgrims who failed to complete their journey and those settlers who devoted their lives to defending the Holy Land.¹²³ While it cannot be said that Louis had failed to complete his pilgrimage during the Second Crusade,

for he discharged his vow by praying at the Holy Sepulchre, the sense here of the need to complete unfinished business could relate to the lack of a successful martial response Edessa's loss.

Another example which could reflect contemporary discussions regarding sinful crusaders relates to the Battle of the Field of Blood in 1119, where Prince Roger of Antioch, along with most of the principality's military strength, was killed fighting Il-Ghazi of Mardin.¹²⁴ At the beginning of his account of this conflict, the author of the *Secunda historia* states that:

The truth commands me to expose, yet the horror and magnitude of the disaster forbids me to report, how many and how great were the evils that overwhelmed the Antiochenes. But I do not know whether it is better for the Christians to take away from them the words for those evils that they endured when they happened, or it is harmful even to the damned to suppress the lessons of their damnation, inasmuch as it may even be useful for the wicked themselves to be deterred from the path to destruction by their example. For if perhaps it confers nothing to the damned themselves to know how and why they perished, nevertheless it can perhaps be very beneficial for those following, having understood the destructions of others, to avoid the roads to ruin.¹²⁵

Importantly, though this draws slight inspiration from Fulcher, much of it is original, including the author directly addressing the audience to signpost this as a key didactic moment. Then, following a severe critique of Roger and the Antiochenes, guilty in particular of adultery, pride, and luxury, the *Secunda historia* draws this together in another original passage, in which it is noted that "it is not remarkable if prisoners of sin, slaves of vice, should be surrendered to their enemies and killed; so that, stirred by the example of destruction, those who refuse to understand by the words of warning, should realize death to be 'the wages of sin' (Romans, 6:23)."¹²⁶ Finally, the author adds that "it should be observed from this that a people without counsel and without prudence (Deuteronomy 32:38), who do not fear to excite the Lord's anger, merited indeed that God should erase their name from human memory (Deuteronomy, 32:26). However, His extermination is to

be delayed because of the anger of enemies (Psalms, 137:7); lest perhaps their enemies be proud and say: ‘Our mighty hand, and not the Lord, has done all these things’ (Deuteronomy, 32:27).”¹²⁷ It is perhaps no coincidence that the *Secunda historia* should make such alterations to Fulcher’s text in the wake of the battle of Inab in 1149, where the Antiochenes—whose prince Louis VII is reported to have fallen out with during the crusade—were again punished by the Lord.¹²⁸ Nevertheless, the extent to which the author dwells on this moment, and glosses it with biblical significance, is instructive. Indeed, not only does the reference to Deuteronomy reinforce earlier notions that the Latin East had been established for the new Israelites by God’s strong hand, but, given that the Antiochene defeat is followed by a victory for Baldwin II, who rode swiftly to aid his brethren alongside the counts of Edessa and Tripoli, it could also represent an underlying message regarding the need for western leaders to aid their co-religionists in Outremer, however morally flawed they may be, particularly in the wake of a chastening military failure.¹²⁹

An underlying desire to promote aid for the East is also suggested in a further passage in which one of Baldwin II’s knights engaged in a conversation with a Muslim enemy while awaiting battle near Antioch in late 1119. Though this dialogue also occurs in Fulcher, the *Secunda historia*’s version is original.¹³⁰ Thus, the Muslim soldier declared the insanity of the Latins for daring to face a larger enemy force, especially given his belief that they had “abandoned the law, preserving, as you have become accustomed, neither faith nor truth amongst yourselves.”¹³¹ “On the other hand,” the Muslim noted, “if you should preserve the law and faith of God, just as you hitherto used to be accustomed to do, you shall be frightful to us by character, and unconquerable”—a sentiment repeated in even stronger terms a few lines later.¹³² On the following day, therefore, the Latins, reinforced by the Cross and trusting in God, achieved victory, with divine anger converted into pity.¹³³ Interestingly, like several inter-faith dialogues found in narratives pertaining to the First Crusade, this takes on something of a *disputatio* format (albeit the Latin is not seen to answer), particularly through its focus on law and the ridiculing of the Christian.¹³⁴ As Katherine Allen Smith has argued, such scenes drew inspiration from anti-Jewish treatises and served in other

crusading narratives to present Muslims in the same light as the enemies of Christ found in Scripture and through this to propagate parallels with the Israelites.¹³⁵ In the context of the Second Crusade, it reinforced the need to combat those who threatened and scorned Christianity, even in the face of embarrassment and ridicule (such as would be felt in defeat) and despite God having punished them for their sins. This is accentuated when the *Secunda historia* describes Baldwin II's decision to again ride north to Antioch in 1120, having heard of another Turkish invasion, as driven by "the compassion of brotherly love" (*fraternae miseratio caritatis*).¹³⁶

Importantly in the context of Louis VII and the crusading proposals of the early 1150s, this theme dovetails neatly with a moment in which the author was perhaps demonstrating a sensitivity towards attitudes to a king who had failed in the course of holy war, one whom some wished would return to Outremer in response to a further disaster. This relates to the second battle of Ramlah in 1102, which coincided with the "1101 Crusade." Here, Baldwin I, having rashly hastened to face a Fatimid force that greatly outnumbered his own, suffered a devastating defeat in which most of his men were killed, including illustrious western noblemen like Stephen of Blois and Stephen of Burgundy. The king himself barely escaped with his life. In the aftermath, however, having regrouped and awaited his allies, Baldwin inflicted a retaliatory defeat on the Muslims.¹³⁷ In describing the initial battle, the *Secunda historia* berated Baldwin for his rashness in a long and original passage, noting that he had "relied too much on his own probity," presuming his strength was owed to himself and not to God alone. As such, "his temerity was severely punished, with God, who opposes arrogance, opposing them, so that he would not emerge victorious in this, as he was accustomed; rather, he would barely escape alive."¹³⁸ Moreover, once the fleeing Baldwin eventually made his way to nearby Arsuf having escaped enemy detection, the *Secunda historia* adds a further explanatory gloss to Fulcher's *Historia*, commenting how "the Just Lord chastized him completely, but he was corrected kindly."¹³⁹ The text then draws on Scripture to note that "He has struck down the proud, but raised up the stricken, as that Prophet was able to sing to Him: 'The Lord chastizing has chastened me, but He has not delivered me over to death' (Psalms, 117:18)."¹⁴⁰

Consequently, the Latins were granted victory in the ensuing follow-up battle as they “were forced to hope in divine force alone” and because Christ would not abandon “those who had called out His name all day.”¹⁴¹ In a revealing and original passage that makes frequent recourse to Scripture, the *Secunda historia* brings this message together: “the Lord clearly granted safety upon them, but fittingly, the people, namely the humble, acquired safety, and the eyes of the arrogant were humbled (Psalms, 17:28), ‘so that no flesh should glory in His presence’ (1 Corinthians, 1:29), taught not to trust in his bow and sword, and to sing with his whole heart to the Saviour: ‘You have saved us from those who afflict us, and have put to shame those who hate us’ (Psalms, 43:8)”.¹⁴²

That Baldwin I suffered no other major losses in the text, with the king trusting in God and Christ each time he went into battle, only served to emphasize the extent to which the *Secunda historia* used this as a didactic moment, one deeply imbedded in exegetical discussions on the right behaviour of a holy warrior and of following the *vita apostolica*.¹⁴³ At the turn of the 1150s, when senior churchmen sought to convince Louis VII, who had only just returned from a disastrous sojourn in the East and who faced criticism for his part in this failure, such a message would have been highly relevant; to the king, but also to those around him who might be expected to participate as well.

Remembering *Outremer* and Promoting the Crusade

While much can be found in the *Secunda historia* that seemingly relates to attempts to comment upon, and explain, the failure of the Second Crusade through the history of the Latin East, there is also, as has been alluded to already but which will be discussed in depth below, a great deal that points to efforts to use this material as a stimulus for further crusading, such as was being proposed at Laon in March 1150. For example, there are several moments when the *Secunda historia* clearly emphasizes the importance of a collective Latin identity, which would have underpinned any effort

to convince western forces to travel east. One such instance is the aforementioned description of Baldwin I's tearful reaction to Bohemond of Taranto's defeat and capture in July 1100—as the emphasis placed on Christian brotherhood, grieving for the losses experienced by co-religionists, and riding to their aid, were important themes of crusade texts and preaching.¹⁴⁴ More interesting, however, are two moments when, during a long and unique passage rationalizing an attack on Ascalon, the *Secunda historia* describes the Latin settlers as *our* Jerusalemites (*nostris Hierosolymitae/nostris Hierosolymitis*), offering an overt sense of common identity that transcended geographical boundaries.¹⁴⁵ In a similar vein, in the *Secunda historia's* version of Baldwin I's battlefield oration at Ramlah in 1101, Fulcher's comment that none should consider flight because “Francia is a long way from you,” becomes instead “because *our* Francia is a very long distance from *us* [my emphasis].”¹⁴⁶

We can also look to references made to themes or literary tropes, beyond biblical allusions, prevalent in narratives pertaining to the First Crusade, such as the description of Baldwin bisecting Muslim soldiers in battle, or the conversation between a Christian and Muslim soldier, both discussed above. Thus, there are battlefield descriptions similar in tone to those found in First Crusade texts, such as this regarding Ramlah in 1101: “All now cried out, and by their confused shouts heaven itself was shaken—whether from the excessive noise or the collision of weapons, or even from the beating of helmets and swords; the shrieks and yells of the dying or the wounded were heard from all sides.”¹⁴⁷ In addition, the soldiers of the kingdom of Jerusalem, like those of the First Crusade, are seen confessing their sins and taking communion on the eve of battle, such as near to Ramlah in 1105.¹⁴⁸ Also of interest is the author's apparent fondness for an analogy likening killing to the scything of crops. In describing a massacre of the Muslim populace at Caesarea in 1101, it is noted that “besides troops overthrowing and piercing the masses who were crowded together, and likewise threshing as if they were wheat on the threshing floor, they massacred everyone by indiscriminate slaughter.”¹⁴⁹ Similarly, when detailing a Venetian battle with a Muslim fleet near Jaffa in 1123, the Italians, having boarded the Muslim vessels, are described as

“beheading everyone on their ships as if they were crops in the fields.”¹⁵⁰ There are likely biblical parallels here, for example Apocalypse 14:15: “Thrust in thy sickle, and reap, because the hour is come to reap: for the harvest of the earth is ripe”—particularly as this relates to those willing to die for the Lord. Yet, there are also potential influences from First Crusade narratives or epic traditions. Indeed, the fact that the second passage is close to one found in Robert the Monk’s *Historia Ierosolimitana*, in which it is described how, during the “Bridge Battle” with Muslim forces outside Antioch in March 1098, crusaders were “systematically cutting off heads like the harvester with his scythe in meadow grass or corn,” makes it likely the *Secunda historia*’s author knew this text.¹⁵¹

This challenges the argument recently advanced by Thomas Asbridge that early accounts of crusading violence, most especially Robert the Monk’s, did not influence later depictions of similar acts in the Latin East: for, although the author of the *Secunda historia* cannot be said to have “luxuriate[d]” in violence to quite the same degree as Robert, it does appear that the employment of such tropes stemmed from a desire to situate the warfare and violence enacted in the Crusader States in the same epic and spiritual literary contexts as that initial expedition.¹⁵² This is most clearly demonstrated in another passage describing the aforementioned naval battle between the Venetians and the Fatimids in 1123. Here, the *Secunda historia* adapted Fulcher’s comment that the formers’s feet were tinged with blood (*sanguine fluido tingerentur*), noting instead that: “it may perhaps seem incredible to say that a miracle is considered to have occurred there, with the blood of the slaughtered flowing all the way to the shinbones of the killers, to the full horror of all who boarded the ships.”¹⁵³ Furthermore, Fulcher’s comment that “you could see the sea to be reddened” for four miles around, becomes “such a great amount of blood was said to have flowed” that for nearly four miles around “the sea was seen to be red.”¹⁵⁴ In this regard, it is almost certain that although the *Secunda historia* drew on Fulcher, and extreme bloodshed and horror can be found in other texts, like Walter the Chancellor’s *Bella Antiochena*, which notably circulated in manuscripts with Fulcher’s text, efforts were being made to evoke the First Crusade through the deployment

of well-known literary allusions.¹⁵⁵ This would have included not only the eschatologically-tinged descriptions of the massacre enacted by the crusaders at Jerusalem on 15 July 1099, but also the aforementioned “Bridge Battle” outside Antioch, where, according to Robert the Monk, who revelled in blood imagery more than nearly any other First Crusade author, “the blood spilled turned the river to crimson, and filled those watching with total horror.”¹⁵⁶ It could be argued, therefore, that the author of the *Secunda historia*, by demonstrating that moments of epic holy war in the East had not ended with the First Crusade, sought to show that emulation of the deeds and heroes of that initial expedition—the memory of which clearly hung heavily over Europe but, in the wake of the Second Crusade’s failure, perhaps also caused some embarrassment for contemporaries who found themselves compared negatively to their crusading forebears—was not the only way to achieve spiritual and martial renown. In other words, such evocations sought to demonstrate that the emulation of settlers, who were presented as more morally flawed than the participants of the First Crusade, could afford western warriors similar opportunities for heroic remembrance.

Other sections also communicate the idea that spiritual glory could be attained not just through a one-off crusading venture, but by maintaining and defending the newly established polities in the East. At the start of the text, for example, having heard of Jerusalem’s capture, Bohemond of Taranto became ashamed (*erubescit*) at having stayed behind at Antioch, and Baldwin of Boulogne bashful (*verecundatur*) at having done so at Edessa. Thus, “both were caused to well up with shame that the titles of their own glory would not be counted among the highest triumph of praise.”¹⁵⁷ Nevertheless, the *Secunda historia* declares, “it was brave and cautious of the same men to stay behind and strengthen and defend the newly captured regions, by which they had surpassed others in conquering.”¹⁵⁸ The author even evokes Scripture to argue that divine providence inspired the actions of both those who remained (at Antioch and Edessa) and those who departed (for Jerusalem), “so that in both instances ‘this glory shall be dedicated not to men, Christ, but to your name’ (Psalms, 113:9).”¹⁵⁹ Importantly, this represents an adaptation of Fulcher’s comment

that it was perhaps (*forsitan*) divine providence that caused these two brave leaders to stay behind; while, by emphasizing how both had surpassed others, the author offered a clearer sense that maintaining and defending other newly conquered sites was worthy of the same heroic renown as taking Jerusalem.¹⁶⁰ In the context of the Second Crusade's success in reaching Jerusalem, but failure to save Edessa, and the subsequent need to now protect the principality of Antioch, this was an apt message.

Perhaps the clearest example, however, relates to the *Secunda historia*'s description of the early problems facing the Latin East, devoid as it was of defenders and inhabitants, and beset on all sides by enemies. Though Fulcher also commented on this, and described it as a divine miracle that the Latins survived, the author of the *Secunda historia* went to much greater lengths to demonstrate the validity of these polities:

I shall speak of these people, so that they who either read or hear this shall turn their attentions to the many and great labours, fears, and anxieties the early possessors of that land and the region of Jerusalem suffered for Christ, so that it shall be understood likewise that it is no less of a miracle to be able to have retained after a while so great a region, so thin with occupiers or defenders, than to have conquered it in the first place. It is apparent, therefore, to regard in all these things the esteemed work of the Lord Christ, to admire His strength, to observe His mercy.¹⁶¹

What is key here is that the *Secunda historia*, far more so than Fulcher, portrays the defence of the Holy Land as no less of a miracle than the success of the First Crusade, and that the work of Christ was being done by settlers just as it had been done in that first expedition—a theme developed across the rest of this passage through frequent Scriptural allusions.¹⁶² In another moment where the author moves into the first person, the link between crusade and settlement is further demonstrated by the remark that “hence, also, along with that same Apostle [a reference to an earlier quote from 1 Peter, 3:14: ‘if you should suffer for justice, you are blessed’], we consistently

venture to bless they who we know to have endured innumerable and immeasurable labours and struggles *on the way to, and in, the Holy Land* [my emphasis].”¹⁶³ Similar themes are found in Baldwin I’s battlefield speech at Ramlah in 1101, where the king reportedly told his forces that although they would become more glorious in death than if they were to survive, “still we will have acquired by the Lord Christ’s gift a great name for ourselves, beyond the name of the greats who are in the earth.”¹⁶⁴ Each of these passages taps into aforementioned parallels made with the Israelites being granted the Holy Land as a reward for their suffering, as well as contemporary concerns about crusading heritage, so that crusaders were being asked to follow in the footsteps of both biblical and crusader-settler ancestors.¹⁶⁵ Therefore, while concerns emerged in the wake of the Second Crusade’s failure regarding the spiritual merits of the Latin East, as well as the value of offering military support to these polities, due to accusations of Jerusalemite collusion with Damascus’s Muslim lords, for the *Secunda historia*’s author, to provide such help—and thus emulate the settlers—was no less meritorious than repeating the deeds of the First Crusaders.

There are even moments when the *Secunda historia* includes vengeance motifs—which Susanna Throop has demonstrated were crucial to justifications of crusading throughout the twelfth century—to rationalize a renewed attack on Muslim enemies.¹⁶⁶ Thus, in describing Baldwin I’s assault on Arsuf in 1101, the text not only incorporates Fulcher’s account of an earlier siege of the city by Godfrey in 1100, in which 100 Latins were captured and brutally executed on the walls in full view of their comrades, it also takes this further, noting how “the Christians, not forgetful of those so cruel crimes which their fellows had caused to be committed to King Godfrey, ardently gathered for the attacking of the impious.”¹⁶⁷ Likewise, when Baldwin besieged Caesarea, which was eventually taken by storm and its citizens massacred, the *Secunda historia* (unlike Fulcher) noted that the Muslim forces had “ridiculed the besiegers; they provoked them with jeers and insults, relying on their walls and very many defenders,” and that, in prosecuting an indiscriminate slaughter, “the anger of God against the blasphemers was satisfied.”¹⁶⁸ This latter theme, of divine anger being mollified and the Latins as the instruments of fulfilling this, is also found in the *Secunda*

historia's aforementioned discussion of Baldwin II's victory in the immediate aftermath of the Field of Blood in 1119, where it is described how "victory and vengeance had been restored over the enemy worshippers."¹⁶⁹ Importantly, the text's attempt to couch the value of vengeance not only in the wider context of answering insults against the Christian faith, but also in relation to responding to the deaths of comrades and the shame of a failed siege, could reflect French memories of crusading losses, particularly at Damascus.

Another theme prominent to rationalizations of crusading is that of devotion to, and imitation of, Christ. As William Purkis has argued, the idea of *imitatio Christi*—through notions of suffering and self-sacrifice—"was central to the spirituality of the First Crusade," both in the case of early written responses (due in part to the influence of contemporary monastic ideals, including later those of the Premonstratensians), but also as regards participants's perceptions of their own spiritual behaviour.¹⁷⁰ However, as the creation of the Latin East caused increased levels of pilgrimage from Europe to the Holy Land and interest in relics of Christ's Passion, the ways in which such spirituality manifested changed. Moreover, when Eugenius III called the Second Crusade with *Quantum Praedecessores* in 1145, and Bernard of Clairvaux spread sermons and letters to promote participation, the notion of *imitatio Christi* was "astonishing[ly]" absent—the result, Purkis argues, of a deliberate Cistercian attempt to redefine crusading. Part of this was that participants were being asked to emulate not the son of God, but their own crusading forefathers; a message that appears to have been remarkably successful, even if popular conceptions of crusading as a form of *imitatio Christi* endured.¹⁷¹

It is perhaps significant, therefore, that we find a clear emphasis on the importance of devotion to Christ, as well as echoes of *imitatio Christi*, throughout the *Secunda historia*—more so than we do in Fulcher's *Historia*. Indeed, while this cannot necessarily be seen to be a targeted message for the French king, as can other aspects of the text, it might nevertheless suggest efforts to push back against Eugenius and Bernard's efforts in response to the crusade's failure and to

evoke an earlier, more successful form of holy warfare as a means of promotion. Beyond the abovementioned allusion to Psalms 113:9 in describing Bohemond and Baldwin not travelling to Jerusalem with the First Crusaders, as well as the description of the early settlers doing the work of Christ, the *Secunda historia* frequently describes the Latins as worshippers of Christ (*cultores Christi*), the people of Christ (*Christi populus*), servants of Christ (*servos Christi*), the knights of Christ (*milites Christi*), and other related terms—frequently doing so in moments when Fulcher, who shows a stronger interest in God than in Christ, does not; while we also see Latins acting for the love of Christ (*pro Christi amore*).¹⁷² An instructive example of the *Secunda historia*'s particular focus on the settlers's devotion to Christ is found in the description of Baldwin's aforementioned march south with a small force to become king following Godfrey's death in August 1100. Having come to a narrow and highly defended pass just north of Beirut, in Fulcher's *Historia* the Latins "devoutly prayed for aid to come from Heaven" and God's bountiful support duly arrived.¹⁷³ In the *Secunda historia*, however, the Latins "most devotedly prayed to the heavens for help in their great necessity. And nor was the loving kindness of the Saviour found wanting." Going further, it notes how the Muslims would have secured victory here "had not the Holy Christ inspired His men, having been enclosed in an extreme crisis, as much by a miracle as by unforeseen judgement, and supplied help."¹⁷⁴ The *Secunda historia* likewise demonstrates a pervading interest in the relic of the True Cross, famously carried into battle by the forces of Jerusalem until it was lost to Saladin at the battle of Hattin in 1187.¹⁷⁵ Although most instances of its presence are also in Fulcher, the *Secunda historia* placed an even greater emphasis on the power and importance of the Cross, or, on a few occasions, "the Cross and the Crucified" (*Cruce ... et Crucifixus*).¹⁷⁶ A useful example relates to the first battle of Ramlah in 1101, in which the *Secunda historia* includes the original remark that "against its [i.e. the Cross's] strength, demons and the followers of demons cannot sustain themselves for long"; while a subsequent victory against Muslim opponents near Jaffa, it was said, "should be seen to be assigned to nothing except to the strength of the Lord's Cross."¹⁷⁷

Of further interest is the *Secunda historia*'s adaptation of Fulcher's apologist commentary on the validity of Baldwin I wearing a crown in the city where Jesus wore the crown of thorns.¹⁷⁸ At this moment the author includes an additional gloss which responds to potential criticisms, noting that: "For, just as Christ's death is the cause of our life, so too the mockery of Christ is the emblem of our honour. Does not every Christian become 'a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood' (1 Peter, 2:9) from that crowning of Christ?"¹⁷⁹ This not only evoked a sense that ruling (and defending) the kingdom of Jerusalem was an act of *imitatio Christi*, it also placed it within the context of vengeance for the Crucifixion, which became crucial to the promotion of crusading across the twelfth century.¹⁸⁰ That warfare prosecuted in defence of the Latin East carried with it the same Christological significance as the First Crusade is repeated in the *Secunda historia*'s account of the first battle of Ramlah in 1101. Having noted how the Jerusalemites were vastly outnumbered, the text asks: "Who hears this and is not terrified? Is courage the same as faith? (2 Kings, 18:19) Is temerity the same as strength? (Isaiah, 36:4) Indeed, if you could see this, you would not wish to fight, but to die. Thus, it is clear: they were ready to die, but to die for Him who suffered death for them is worthy. It is not courage, but faith; not temerity, but love. Indeed, 'Christ' so the Apostle said, 'suffered in flesh' (1 Peter, 4:1), and they were similarly roused by this thinking."¹⁸¹ When, on the eve of battle, Baldwin delivered the aforementioned speech—framed as it now was in the context of the Apostles and of Old Testament kings like Hezekiah, who defended Judah from the Assyrians—his reminder to his men that "you have come freely to offer your souls, for Christ, for distinction, and you have discovered what you came for" took on a deeper, biblically reinforced significance.¹⁸²

For the author of the *Secunda historia*, therefore, the settlement and defence of the Latin East was imbued with distinct Christological meaning, even serving as an act of *imitatio Christi*. This brings the text into line with the early narrative descriptions of the First Crusade, and also suggests that the turn against the efforts of Eugenius and Bernard to strip crusading of its *imitatio Christi* characteristics began quite early—perhaps as a direct response to the Second Crusade and the

participants's apparent failure to act according to divine will. What is interesting, however, is that the *Secunda historia's imitatio Christi* appeared to go hand-in-hand with concerns for emulating the military forebears who had built and defended Outremer. In this way, we may identify a hybrid between the original crusading model, the Cistercians's emphasis on emulating predecessors, and the culmination of efforts to compare the crusaders to the biblical Israelites. In other words, the text promotes not only *imitatio Christi*, but also *imitatio Hierosolimitani*. As with other aspects of the text, such an approach would likely have resonated powerfully in the early 1150s as crusading faced its most significant existential crisis. Indeed, the *Secunda historia* re-emphasized crusading's distinct spiritual power and also tapped into the wider processes of heroic emulation and remembrance that arose so prominently in the wake of the First Crusade, albeit with the crucial adaptation of following in the footsteps of the settlers.

Finally, as has become clear at various points in this article, there is a preoccupation in the *Secunda historia* with the city of Ascalon, which is mentioned thirty-three times. This is unsurprising: the Fatimids of Egypt, who used Ascalon as a base of operations against the nascent kingdom of Jerusalem, were the Latins's foremost threat for much of the period, and are ever-present throughout Fulcher's *Historia*.¹⁸³ Nevertheless, there is an original passage in the *Secunda historia* which suggests that the city had a particular significance for the future of crusading in the early 1150s. Thus, in describing Baldwin I's attack on the Ascalonites in late-summer 1100, the citizens of the latter are first described as ever rebellious (*rebellem semper*), while what follows next is worth citing in full:

I judge that the Lord was unwilling to destroy both the city and people [of Ascalon], or to hand them over to His people, just as was written by the ancients and is therefore to be believed, so that Jerusalem would always endure in them and they would keep on doing battle, that is to say, so that they would not be attacked and overcome by vicious habits through leisure, worse than the worst of enemies, as in that dictum of the satirist, truthfully

but wordily, “Humble fortune protects the virtuous Latins, and labours into the nights with Hannibal near to the city” (Juvenal, *Satire 6*, lines 287–91); and so that our Jerusalemites would be both weighed down in a state of humility from the constant presence of wars and labours, and constrained in chastity. [*In BnF lat. 5513 a manicule points to this part of the text – see below*] Of course, it is less pleasing to be proud when it is hardly possible to live; fornication is less delightful to those who are constantly in fear of dying, too. And so external wars are often destroyers of internal wars. Visible enemies are either the repression or oppression of invisible enemies. Accordingly, unlike spiritual wars of wickedness in the heavens, it is necessary for these things to be believed by our Jerusalemites: the constant wars they are enduring are against flesh and blood, that is, against the Ascalonites.¹⁸⁴

This passage appears to suggest that the Ascalonites are the enemy through which the Jerusalemites—or, more rightly, “*our* Jerusalemites”—were tested: the method by which their faith and dedication was proved. In many ways, it encapsulates the underlying strand in the *Secunda historia* of the battle against sin and the need to show humility in the face of the Lord to achieve victory. Moreover, there is a pervading sense that this drew on Saint Augustine’s concept of the Two Cities, a core focus for a great deal of contemporary exegesis but also a prominent theme of early crusade narratives.¹⁸⁵ Indeed, as Katherine Allen Smith has argued, Augustine’s model for attaining the city of God by eschewing the sinful desires of the earthly city was an attractive one for crusade authors, as the epic struggle between the Israelites and Babylon, a city rebellious against God, could easily be reworked for the crusaders (the new Israelites) and the Fatimids (the new Babylonians).¹⁸⁶ In the *Secunda historia*, however, it is not Babylon specifically, but Ascalon, through which the Two Cities narrative is carried.

Regarding this Ascalonite focus, it is no exaggeration to say that there is no parallel to this in any other crusade narrative, even though many First Crusade texts include the Fatimid defeat at

Ascalon in August 1099. As such, this passage is a crucial window on to not only the text (and its purpose), but also the wider context of crusading ideas in north-eastern France in the early 1150s. Nevertheless, it is perhaps to be expected. In the Bible, Ascalon was associated with unbelief and threatened with divine wrath (Jeremiah, 47:7), and as already noted, it appears in crusade narratives as a site of divine victory.¹⁸⁷ Moreover, in addition to the city's role in threatening the early Crusader States, there are suggestions that during the course of the Second Crusade discussions were held between the settlers and the crusaders over whether to carry out an attack on Ascalon, both before and after their assault on Damascus.¹⁸⁸ Though this did not come to fruition, this period nevertheless marked the re-orientation of Latin expansion towards the south-west, and onwards into Egypt. In 1153, Baldwin III, supported by newly-arrived western forces, besieged and captured Ascalon—the last major conquest by a Jerusalemite king.¹⁸⁹

What this passage potentially reveals, therefore, is that it was an attack on Ascalon that was discussed, and hoped for, at the council of Laon in 1150—and so, as a means to promote the validity of this, the *Secunda historia* author drew on contemporary discussions relating to the crusade's place in sacred time and presented the conflict between Jerusalem and Ascalon as that of the Two Cities: the path to the city of God. That the text offers a sense that this struggle was long-lasting and central to ensuring the Jerusalemites remained on the correct path need not undermine hopes for Ascalon's capture; rather, it was as a warning not to allow a physical victory to mark the end of the spiritual war. Moreover, given the aforementioned influence of the Premonstratensians in north-eastern France, as well as their presence on the Latin borders with Ascalon in the region around Ramlah, it is not difficult to imagine that the order might have used the occasion of the council at Laon to promote such an idea, or that an author with potential links to them might emphasize the importance of capturing this city in a text designed to stimulate further crusading activity. It is certainly of interest that the Premonstratensian Continuation of Sigebert of Gembloux notes in short succession the Second Crusaders's hoped-for campaign against Ascalon; conflict with the Templars around nearby Gaza in the wake of Inab in 1149; and

the city's capture by the king of Jerusalem only a short while afterwards.¹⁹⁰ In other words, Ascalon was evidently on the minds of the Premonstratensians in the early 1150s. It is even possible that Amalric, the order's aforementioned abbot of the double institution of Saints Joseph and Habakkuk, who became bishop of Sidon in 1153, did so within the Latin siege camp, both because it appears his predecessor, Bernard, died there, and due to the order's receipt of possessions inside Ascalon, made to them by King Baldwin III and his brother Amalric at the time of the city's capture (*a Christianis captione*).¹⁹¹ The evidence of BnF lat. 5513 suggests such an interest was not limited to northern France, though. As alluded to above, this part of the manuscript includes a marginal manicule, the only one found in the text.¹⁹² Whether we can date this to the time of copying is unclear—though Nicholas Paul has argued that the marginalia is twelfth-century in date—but it would make sense for the scribe to have pointed to this element of the text if it was done around the time of Ascalon's capture; perhaps because figures local to the Touraine were amongst those pilgrims Baldwin III enlisted to aid in the siege.¹⁹³ It is even possible that the scribe of BnF lat. 5513, unlike those of BL Harley 3707 and later BNE 10225, simply copied this manicule from their original exemplar, which would certainly add to the sense of the author's powerful interest in Ascalon.

Throughout the *Secunda historia*, therefore, we find clues that it sought to promote the spiritual and martial validity of the Latin East by situating it within the literary, spiritual, and exegetical frameworks commonly associated with the First Crusade and the nascent crusading movement.¹⁹⁴ In doing so, there is little doubt that this was as a means to use these processes of remembrance to prompt renewed western interest in Outremer; with a focus on the Latin East, as opposed to the First Crusade itself, perhaps in order to side-step anxieties over how the Second Crusade had failed to live up to the high standards of that initial expedition by demonstrating that biblical and epic parallels—so important to how contemporary elite societies interpreted the crusade and situated themselves within its history—could be found beyond the events of 1095–99. In other words, the Crusader States, flawed but still spiritually meritorious, and a site of martial

heroism, were perhaps considered a more apt potential vehicle for future recruitment in 1150 and beyond.

Conclusion

By way of a conclusion, I shall return to the historiographical issue mentioned at the start. As it was noted, modern scholarly efforts to identify changing medieval attitudes towards, and definitions of, crusading, as well as the reception of the movement within elite European societies, have focused either on accounts of the First Crusade—tracing, in particular, how the writing and re-writing of this venture’s narrative offers insights into the development of the crusading movement across the twelfth century and beyond—or of those which detail other single expeditions. This trend is undoubtedly a product of our sources: the number of texts written to record individual crusading campaigns far outweighs those which trace the history of the Latin East, even when we incorporate those created in Outremer. Yet, it has also led to the privileging of particular canonical texts, authors, and events. In recent years, efforts have been made to incorporate into the historiographical narrative those texts which are lesser known, but this process is still far from complete, and those relating to the Latin East, particularly those, like the *Secunda historia*, which appear to have been written off as largely derivative, continue to be side-lined.¹⁹⁵ This article has sought to demonstrate that an approach that steps away from canonical texts, and also includes the reception of the history of Outremer, has much to offer scholars, and not just those interested in the field of crusade studies.

Thus, when re-situated as a text produced in north-eastern France (albeit with some ties to, and subsequent interest from, the Touraine) at the start of the 1150s, one linked to efforts to launch further military support for the Latin East following the Second Crusade’s failure, the *Secunda historia*, almost entirely ignored by crusade historians, and once described by Harold S. Fink as adding “little of value to knowledge of the period,” can in fact tell us a great deal about mid-

twelfth-century conceptions of holy war, of devotional knighthood, of *imitatio Christi*, and of the importance of local interest to the recording of the crusading past.¹⁹⁶ For those experienced in reading crusade texts, it will appear both highly familiar, but likewise tantalizingly enigmatic—including tropes and themes which punctuate many other such narratives while still offering unique insights relevant to the region, the context of its production, and the crusading movement more generally. It also adds greater texture to recent work that has stressed the ecclesiastical unity of north-eastern France, particularly in the archdiocese of Rheims, for it suggests that these networks could be harnessed for the promotion of crusading and support for the Latin East; while the focus on local figures, such as Baldwin of Boulogne and Eustace Grenier, demonstrates how deeply the memories of crusading settlers could imprint themselves on these networks. Finally, the apparent ties which this text has to the Premonstratensians reveals something of the anxieties which could be felt by a monastic order with landed interests in both Europe and Outremer, particularly given the instability of the latter. To be responsible for shrines in the Holy Land was an important and prestigious duty, but there are suggestions here that, for those brothers who remained in Europe, concern over the military fragility of this region, and thus the safety of their brethren, was keenly felt.

In short, the *Secunda historia* is a crucial—and hitherto unrealized—witness not only to contemporary reactions to the failure of the Second Crusade, and subsequent efforts to promote enthusiasm for the Latin East at a time of growing cynicism and despondency, but also to the ecclesiastical and monastic networks which connected Europe (and beyond) in this period. It is, more specifically, an important cultural artefact that demonstrates the effects that crusading and the Latin settlement of the East had in France, particularly the north-east, in the mid-twelfth century.

For their help in creating this piece, I wish to thank Susan Edgington, who answered many Latin queries with her characteristic patience and wit; Steven Biddlecombe, Bartłomiej Dźwigala, Thomas Lecaque, Katherine Mortimer, Simon Parsons, Nicholas Paul, Jay Rubenstein, Thomas Smith, Beth Spacey, Stephen Spencer, and Michael Staunton for reading drafts and offering advice; and the *Speculum* editors and anonymous reviewers, who

pushed me to make this as good as it can be. Thanks are also due to the Irish Research Council for a Government of Ireland Postdoctoral Fellowship during which this research was undertaken.

¹ Katherine Allen Smith, *The Bible and Crusade Narrative in the Twelfth Century* (Woodbridge, UK, 2020), 46. For a good introduction to the general trend, see Marcus Bull, “Narratological Readings of Crusade Texts,” in *The Crusader World*, ed. Adrian Boas (Abingdon, UK, 2015), 646–60.

² Marcus Bull, *Eyewitness and Crusade Narrative: Perception and Narration in Accounts of the Second, Third and Fourth Crusades* (Woodbridge, UK, 2018); Stephen J. Spencer, *Emotions in a Crusading Context, 1095–1291* (Oxford, UK, 2019); Beth C. Spacey, *The Miraculous and the Writing of Crusade Narrative* (Woodbridge, UK, 2020); Smith, *The Bible and Crusade Narrative*; Carol Sweetenham, “2000 Cows and 4000 Pigs at One Sitting: Was the *Gesta Francorum* Written to be Performed in Latin?” *The Medieval Chronicle* 13 (2020): 266–88; Simon T. Parsons, “The *Gran conquista de Ultramar*, its Precursors, and the Lords of Saint-Pol,” *The Journal of Religious History, Literature and Culture* 5/2 (2019): 101–116. Four recent edited collections are also worthy of note here: Marcus Bull and Damien Kempf, eds., *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory* (Woodbridge, UK, 2014); Elizabeth Lapina and Nicholas Morton, eds., *The Uses of the Bible in Crusader Sources* (Leiden, 2017); Simon T. Parsons and Linda M. Patterson, eds., *Literature of the Crusades* (Woodbridge, UK, 2018); Natasha R. Hodgson, Katherine J. Lewis, and Matthew M. Mesley, eds., *Crusading and Masculinities* (Abingdon, UK, 2019).

³ On this, see Nicholas L. Paul, *To Follow in their Footsteps: The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages* (New York, 2012); James Naus, *Constructing Kingship: The Capetian Monarchs of France and the Early Crusades* (Manchester, UK, 2016); Nicholas Paul and Suzanne Yaeger, eds., *Remembering the Crusades: Myth, Image, and Identity* (Baltimore, 2012); Megan Cassidy-Welch, ed., *Remembering the Crusades and Crusading* (Abingdon, UK, 2017); Megan Cassidy-Welch and Anne Lester, eds., *Crusades and Memory: Rethinking Past and Present* (Abingdon, UK, 2017); M. Cecilia Gaposchkin, *Invisible Weapons: Liturgy and the Making of Crusade Ideology* (Ithaca, NY, 2017); Andrew D. Buck, “‘Weighed by such a great calamity, they were cleansed for their sins’: Remembering the Siege and Capture of Antioch,” *The Journal of Religious History, Literature and Culture* 5/2 (2019): 1–16.

⁴ Though see now Andrew D. Buck, “Settlement, Identity, and Memory in the Latin East: An Examination of the Term ‘Crusader States’,” *English Historical Review* 135/573 (2020): 271–302.

⁵ Verena Epp, *Fulcher von Chartres: Studien zur Geschichtsschreibung des ersten Kreuzzuges* (Düsseldorf, 1990); Thomas Asbridge, “The Portrayal of Violence in Walter the Chancellor’s *Bella Antiochena*,” in *Syria in Crusader Times: Conflict and Co-Existence*, ed. Carole Hillenbrand (Edinburgh, UK, 2019), 163–83; Andrew D. Buck, “William of Tyre, Femininity, and the Problem of the Antiochene Princesses,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 70/4 (2019): 731–49; Beth 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): 51–67.

⁶ Jonathan P. Phillips, *The Second Crusade: Extending the Frontiers of Christendom* (New Haven, CT, 2007); Michael Gervers, ed., *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians* (New York, 1992); Jonathan P. Phillips and Martin Hoch, eds., *The Second Crusade: Scope and Consequences* (Manchester, UK, 2001); Jason Roche and Janus Møller Jensen, eds., *The Second Crusade: Holy War on the Periphery of Latin Christendom* (Turnhout, 2015).

⁷ The preferred edition here is “Secundam Historiae Iherosolimitane Partem,” in *Recueil des historiens des croisades: historiens occidentaux*: (hereafter *Secunda historia*), 5 vols. (Paris, 1844–95), 3:547–86.

⁸ Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolimitana (1095–1127)* (hereafter Fulcher, *Historia*), ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1913), 42–48, 91–99. In relation to Fulcher’s *Historia*, the text of the *Secunda historia* covers Book One, chapters 33–36; Book Two, chapters 1–25, 30–64; and Book Three, chapters 1–28 (missing out Book Three, chapters 29–36).

⁹ For BnF lat. 5513 see: <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b9078409t> [last accessed 27/2/2021]; for BL Harley 3707 see: http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=harley_ms_3707_fs001r [last accessed 27/2/2021]; for BNE 10225 see: <http://bdh-rd.bne.es/viewer.vm?id=0000042287&page=1> [last accessed 27/2/2021].

¹⁰ BnF lat. 5513, fols. 1r–67r; BL Harley 3707, fols. 1r–107v, 163r–166v, BNE 10225, fols. 1r–77r. See also Baldric of Bourgeuil, *The Historia Ierosolimitana*, ed. Steven Biddlecombe (Woodbridge, UK, 2014), esp. lxxxiii–lxxxvi, lxxxviii–xc.

¹¹ Jacques Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos, sive Orientalium Expeditionum et Regni Francorum Hierosolimitani Historia* (Hanover, 1611), 594–621; BnF lat. 5513, fol. 67r.

¹² Bongars (*Gesta Dei per Francos*, 594) seemingly believed *Secunda* referred to a now-lost first part, but it seems more likely that it simply refers to the text’s relationship to Baldric.

¹³ Kaspar von Barth, “Animadversiones et glossaria manuscripta ad Bongarsianos scriptores historiae palestinae,” in *Reliquiae Manuscriptorum omnis aevi Diplomatum ac Monumentorum Ineditorum adhuc*, ed. Johann Peter von Ludewig, 12 vols. (Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1720–41), 3:523.

¹⁴ Susan B. Edgington, “The *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem expugnantium* of ‘Bartolf of Nangis’,” *Crusades* 13 (2004): 21–35, at 23.

¹⁵ Baldric of Bourgeuil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xcvi–xcix; Robert Dale Sweeney, *Prolegomena to an Edition of the Scholia to Status* (Leiden, 1969), 3; *Secunda historia*, 546; Fulcher, *Historia*, 98–99.

¹⁶ Johann Albert Fabricius, *Bibliotheca latina mediae et infimae aetatis*, reprinted in 3 vols. (Florence, 1858–59), 3:559.

¹⁷ Luc d’Achery, *Venerabilis Guiberti abbatis B. Mariae de Novigento opera omnia* (Paris, 1651), 820–21.

- ¹⁸ “Lisiardus Turonensis Clericus, Historia Hierosolymitana incipit pars secunda,” in PL 174:1589–1634.
- ¹⁹ *Secunda historia*, 547.
- ²⁰ Fulcher, *Historia*, 84.
- ²¹ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, lxxxiii–lxxxvi, lxxxviii–xc; David S. Bachrach, “Conforming with the Rhetorical Tradition of Plausibility: Clerical Representation of Battlefield Orations against Muslims, 1080–1170,” *The International History Review* 26/1 (2004): 1–19, at 14–15.
- ²² Ulysse Chevalier, *Ordinaires de l'Église Cathédrale de Laon (XIIe et XIIIe siècles)* (Paris, 1897), viii–xviii.
- ²³ *Secunda historia*, 550, 552, 553, 554, 556, 557, 560, 567, 568, 571, 572, 573, 575, 576, 578, 580, 585.
- ²⁴ Smith, *The Bible*, 71–72. On the classical references, see *Secunda historia*, 555, 564; Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxi–xxii.
- ²⁵ http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Harley_MS_3707 [last accessed 27/2/2021]; Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, lxxxv–lxxxvi.
- ²⁶ Nicholas L. Paul, “Crusade, Memory and Regional Politics in Twelfth-Century Amboise,” *Journal of Medieval History* 31/2 (2005): 127–41.
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*, 140.
- ²⁸ *Secunda historia*, 563, 571, 577, 582–84.
- ²⁹ Nicholas L. Paul, “*Origo Consulum*: Rumours of Murder, a Crisis of Lordship, and the Legendary Origins of the Counts of Anjou,” *French History* 29/2 (2005): 139–60. It is also of interest here that Baldric was prone to classicizing his narrative, which may have partly influenced the approach of the *Secunda historia*'s author. Indeed, though Baldric largely used the more common term *comitem*, he did at times use *consul*, while the G manuscript inserted the latter term on at least one occasion. See Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 12, 37, 45, 76, n. j, 94; Jay Rubenstein, “Poetry and History: Baudry of Bourgueil, the Architecture of Chivalry, and the First Crusade,” *Haskins Society Journal* 23 (2011): 87–102.
- ³⁰ *Secunda historia*, 578. Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 636–37.
- ³¹ Nicholas Vincent, “Regional Variations in the Charters of King Henry II,” in *Charters and Charter Scholarship in Britain and Ireland*, ed. Marie T. Flanagan and Judith A. Green (Basingstoke, UK, 2005), 70–106, at 82.
- ³² See e.g. Jan F. Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus* (Leiden, 1997) and Logeion: <https://logeion.uchicago.edu/minagium> [last accessed 27/2/21].
- ³³ *Secunda historia*, 555: “Servabat castas humilis fortuna Latinas, Et labor in noctes et proximus Hannibal urbi”; “Gesta Ambaziensium Dominorum,” in *Chroniques d'Anjou*, ed. Paul Marchegay and André Salmon, 2 vols. (Paris, 1856), 1:158–226, at 207.
- ³⁴ Paul, “Crusade, Memory and Regional Politics,” 127–41. On Juvenal, see Estrella P. Rodriguez, “Reading Juvenal in the Twelfth Century,” *Journal of Medieval Latin* 17 (2007): 238–52.
- ³⁵ Paul, “Crusade, Memory and Regional Politics,” 136–39.
- ³⁶ Crusade texts often came in sets. For example, most surviving versions of Fulcher's 1124 recension were accompanied by Raymond of Aguilers' First Crusade narrative and Walter the Chancellor's *Bella Antiochena*. See Fulcher, *Historia*, 91–99; Jay Rubenstein, “Putting History to Use: Three Crusade Chronicles in Context,” *Viator* 34 (2004): 131–68.
- ³⁷ A single scribe appears to have produced BnF lat. 5513, albeit there are some slight variances in text size and adherence to borders which could indicate staggered sittings.
- ³⁸ Paul, “Crusade, Memory and Regional Politics,” 127–41; Parsons, “*Gran conquista*,” 101–116.
- ³⁹ Susan B. Edgington, *Baldwin I of Jerusalem, 1100–1118* (Abingdon, UK, 2019), 14–15. Albeit Jay Rubenstein has argued recently that Fulcher's attitude towards his patron shifted somewhat negatively towards the end of his life. See Jay Rubenstein, “Tolerance for the Armies of Antichrist: Life on the Frontiers of Twelfth-Century Outremer,” in *Papacy, Crusade, and Christian-Muslim Relations*, ed. Jessalyn L. Bird (Amsterdam, 2018), 81–96.
- ⁴⁰ Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch, 1098–1130* (Woodbridge, UK, 2000), 104–107; Edgington, *Baldwin*, 59–60.
- ⁴¹ Fulcher, *Historia*, 347.
- ⁴² *Secunda historia*, 552: “Audito Balduinus tam miserabili infortunio, vehementissime tristis efficitur: deflet amicum, collegam plangit, communem casum lamentatur. Nec differt heros cordatissimus ad succursum, si posset, amici cum quanto poterat exercitu, junctis etiam sibi Antiochenis, properare.”
- ⁴³ Steven Biddlecombe, “Baldric of Bourgueil and the Flawed Hero,” *Anglo-Norman Studies* 35 (2012): 79–93.
- ⁴⁴ Spencer, *Emotions*, 149–73, quote at 149. The relationship between crusading and Saint Augustine's ideas of *caritas* was also a core component of contemporary exegetical discussions on penitential warfare. See Jonathan Riley-Smith, “Crusading as an Act of Love,” *History* 65 (1980), 177–92; Smith, *The Bible*, 160–71.
- ⁴⁵ Christian brotherhood and fraternal weeping were also prominent themes of Baldric's *Historia*. See Spencer, *Emotions*, 152; Steven Biddlecombe, “Baldric of Bourgueil and the *Familia Christi*,” in *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory*, ed. Marcus Bull and Damien Kempf (Woodbridge, UK, 2014), 9–23.
- ⁴⁶ Edgington, *Baldwin*, 129–32.
- ⁴⁷ Fulcher, *Historia*, 413–14. On eyewitness testimony, see Bull, *Eyewitness*, 1–71 and *passim*; Simon John, “Historical Truth and the Miraculous Past: The Use of Oral Evidence in Twelfth-Century Latin Historical Writing on the First Crusade,” *English Historical Review* 130/543 (2015): 263–301.

⁴⁸ *Secunda historia*, 560: “alios lancea in terram deturbat de caballis; alios ense dimidiat in sellis.”

⁴⁹ Robert the Monk, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, ed. Damien Kempf and Marcus Bull (Woodbridge, UK, 2013), 45; Baldric of Bourgeuil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 51 (see notes t and z). It should be noted here that the verb similarity between only the *Secunda historia* and the copy of Baldric found in BL Harley 3707, as well as the absence of this story from the version of Baldric in BNE 10225, lends further weight to the belief that none of the extant manuscripts are directly related but rather were informed by a common exemplar.

⁵⁰ Simon John, “‘Claruit Ibi Multum Dux Lotharingiae’: The Development of the Epic Tradition of Godfrey of Bouillon and the Bisected Muslim,” in *Literature of the Crusades*, ed. Simon T. Parsons and Linda M. Paterson (Woodbridge, UK, 2018), 7–24. See also Thomas 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): 719–50, at 738–42.

⁵¹ The *Secunda historia* is not the only text to edit Fulcher’s narrative to aggrandize Baldwin’s career, for the Anglo-Norman chronicler, William of Malmesbury (d. 1143), did so as well. See Stephen J. Spencer, “Fear, Fortitude and Masculinity in William of Malmesbury’s Retelling of the First Crusade and the Establishment of the Latin East,” *The Journal of Religious History, Literature and Culture* 5/2 (2019): 35–50, esp. 42–46.

⁵² Alan V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: A Dynastic History 1099–1125* (Oxford, UK, 2000), 211–212.

⁵³ *Secunda historia*, 563–64, 568.

⁵⁴ Fulcher, *Historia*, 446–55. See also Spacey, *Miraculous*, 16–21.

⁵⁵ Murray, *Crusader Kingdom*, 193–95; Asbridge, *Creation of the Principality*, 84–87.

⁵⁶ Fulcher, *Historia*, 660–61: “hominem probum et moribus honestum, qui tunc Caesaream possidebat et Sidonem.”

⁵⁷ *Secunda historia*, 580: “virum utique strenuum armis, et moribus honestum, pollentem consilio, et nobilitate clarum.”

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 580–81. Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 660–61, 664–67.

⁵⁹ Murray, *Crusader Kingdom*, 193–195; Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders, 1095–1131* (Cambridge, UK, 1998), 202, 212.

⁶⁰ John Ott, *Bishops, Authority and Community in Northwestern Europe, c. 1050–1150* (Cambridge, UK, 2015), esp. 111–53, 257–308.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 154–221, 257–82; Paul, *Follow in their Footsteps*, 43–47.

⁶² Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta per Francos*, ed. Robert B. C. Huygens, CCCM 127A (Turnhout, 1996), 15–16; Jay Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent: Portrait of a Medieval Mind* (New York, 2002), 83–175. See also Ott, *Bishops*, 266–67.

⁶³ “Versus de viris illustribus diocesis Tarvanensis qui in sacra fuere expeditione,” in *Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum moralium historicorum, dogmaticorum, moralium amplissima collectio*, ed. Edmond Martène and Ursin Durand, 8 vols. (Paris, 1724–33), 5:539–40. See also Charles Moeller, “Les flamands du Ternois au royaume latin de Jérusalem,” in *Mélanges Paul Frederyq* (Brussels, 1903), 189–202, at 191, in which it is noted that this verse is included in an abbreviated twelfth-century manuscript of Fulcher of Chartres’ *Historia*; and Paul, *Follow in their Footsteps*, 35–36.

⁶⁴ Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta*, 28–39, 68–69, 355–60. See also Susan B. Edgington, “Espionage and Counter-Espionage: An Episode in the Reign of Baldwin I of Jerusalem,” in *Crusader Landscapes in the Medieval Levant: The Archaeology and History of the Latin East*, ed. Micaela Sinibaldi, Kevin J. Lewis, Balázs Major, Jennifer A. Thompson (Cardiff, UK, 2016), 157–67.

⁶⁵ Ott, *Bishops*, 300–301; Krijnie N. Ciggaar, “The Abbey of Prémontré—Royal Contacts, Royal News: The Context of the So-Called *Continuatio Praemonstratensis*,” in *East and West in the Crusader States: Context—Context—Confrontations III*, ed. Krijnie N. Ciggaar, Adelbert Davids, and Herman G. Teule (Leiden, 2003), 21–33. On the Premonstratensians more generally, see Jan-Baptist Valvèkens and François Petit, “Premonstratensi,” in *Dizionario degli Istituti di Perfezione*, ed. Guerrino Pelliccia and Giancarlo Rocca, 10 vols. (Rome, 1952–2003), 7: 720–45.

⁶⁶ Marcus Bull, *Knightly Piety and the Lay Response to the First Crusade: The Limousin and Gascony, c.970–c.1130* (Oxford, UK, 1993); Katherine Allen Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture* (Woodbridge, UK, 2011); Katherine Allen Smith, “Monastic Memories of the Early Crusading Movement,” in *Remembering the Crusades and Crusading*, ed. Megan Cassidy-Welch (Abingdon, UK, 2017), 131–44.

⁶⁷ Bernard Hamilton and Andrew Jotischky, *Latin and Greek Monasticism in the Crusader States* (Cambridge, UK, 2020), 150–59; Ciggaar, “Abbey of Prémontré,” 30–31; Benjamin Z. Kedar, “Jerusalem’s Two *Montes Gaudii*,” in *Crusader Landscapes in the Medieval Levant: The Archaeology and History of the Latin East*, ed. Micaela Sinibaldi, Kevin J. Lewis, Balázs Major, and Jennifer A. Thompson (Cardiff, UK, 2016), 3–20.

⁶⁸ *Secunda historia*, 579.

⁶⁹ Hamilton and Jotischky, *Latin and Greek Monasticism*, 156; Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta*, 204; Smith, *The Bible*, 238; Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent*, 184.

⁷⁰ “Sigeberti Gemblacensis, Continuatio Praemonstratensis,” in MGH SS 6:447–56; Ciggaar, “Abbey of Prémontré,” 21–33

⁷¹ “Sigeberti Gemblacensis, Continuatio Praemonstratensis,” in MGH SS 6:449: “Venetiani navali exercitu Ascalonem obsidentes, accepta ab Ascalonitis pecuniae taxatione, recedunt, et Tyrum aliquandiu obsessem in deditionem accipiunt. Balduinus rex Ierosolimorum a Saracenis preventus capitur, et post diutinam captivitatem data pecuniae estimatione relaxatur.”

- ⁷² Fulcher, *Historia*, 687–746. Cf. *Secunda historia*, 584–85; Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent*, 189.
- ⁷³ Baldric of Bourgeuil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xi–xxiv.
- ⁷⁴ On Laon, see Marcia L. Colish, “Another Look at the School of Laon,” *Archives d’Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Âge* 53 (1986): 7–22; Michael Clanchy and Lesley Smith, “Abelard’s Description of the School of Laon: What Might it Tell us about Early Scholastic Teaching?,” *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 54 (2010): 1–34.
- ⁷⁵ Giles Constable, “The Crusading Project of 1150,” in *Montjoie: Studies in Crusade History in Honour of Hans Eberhard Mayer*, ed. Benjamin Z. Kedar, Jonathan Riley-Smith, and Rudolf Hiestand (Aldershot, UK, 1997), 67–75; Timothy Reuter, “The ‘non-crusade’ of 1149–50,” in *The Second Crusade: Scope and Consequences*, ed. Jonathan P. Phillips and Martin Hoch (Manchester, UK, 2001), 150–63; Phillips, *The Second Crusade*, 269–77; James Naus, *Constructing Kingship: The Capetian Monarchs of France and the Early Crusades* (Manchester, UK, 2016), 98–102. On Inab, see Andrew D. Buck, *The Principality of Antioch and its Frontiers in the Twelfth Century* (Woodbridge, UK, 2017), 37–41.
- ⁷⁶ Jean Dunbabin, “Henry II and Louis VII,” in *Henry II: New Interpretations*, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill and Nicholas Vincent (Woodbridge, UK, 2007), 47–62.
- ⁷⁷ “Historia Nicaena vel Antiochena,” in *Recueil des historiens des croisades: historiens occidentaux*, 5 vols. (Paris, 1844–1895), 5: 139–85. See also Deborah Gerish, “The *Historia Nicaena vel Antiochena* and Royal Identity,” in *The Second Crusade: Holy War on the Periphery of Latin Christendom*, ed. Jason Roche and Janus Møller Jensen (Turnhout, 2015), 51–90.
- ⁷⁸ Phillips, *Second Crusade*, 17–79; Naus, *Constructing Kingship*, 90–92; Paul, *Follow in their Footsteps*, 90–133.
- ⁷⁹ Giles Constable, “The Second Crusade as Seen by Contemporaries,” *Traditio* 9 (1953): 213–79, especially 266–76; Elizabeth Siberry, *Criticism of Crusading, 1095–1274* (Oxford, UK, 1985), 69–81; Naus, *Constructing Kingship*, 93–98; Bull, *Eyewitness*, 168–78; Stephen J. Spencer, “Feelings of Betrayal and Echoes of the First Crusade in Odo of Deuil’s *De profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem*,” *Historical Research* 92 (2019): 657–79.
- ⁸⁰ Bull, *Eyewitness*, 168–78; Spencer, “Feelings of Betrayal,” 657–79. For contemporary attitudes towards the Greeks in Latin Europe more generally, see Savvas Neocleous, *Heretics, Schismatics, or Catholics? Latin Attitudes to the Greeks in the Long Twelfth Century* (Toronto, 2019), 6–97.
- ⁸¹ Léan Ni Chléireigh, “The Impact of the First Crusade on Western Opinion towards the Byzantine Empire: the *Dei Gesta per Francos* of Guibert of Nogent and the *Historia Hierosolymitana* of Fulcher of Chartres,” *The Crusades and the Near East*, ed. Conor Kostick (London, UK, 2011), 161–188.
- ⁸² Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 430; *Secunda historia*, 561–62. See also Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 2nd ed. (London, UK, 2009), 120–34.
- ⁸³ Isabelle Augé, “Les Comnènes et le comté de Tripoli: une collaboration efficace?,” in *Le comté de Tripoli: état multiculturel et multiconfessionnel (1102–1289)*, ed. Gerard Dédéyan and Karim Rizak (Paris, 2010), 141–55.
- ⁸⁴ Jay Rubenstein, *Nebuchadnezzar’s Dream: The Crusades, Apocalyptic Prophecy, and the End of History* (Oxford, UK, 2019), 7–20; Brett Whalen, “God’s Will or Not? Bohemond’s Campaign Against the Byzantine Empire (1105–1108),” in *Crusades—Medieval Worlds in Conflict*, ed. Thomas Madden, James Naus, and Vincent Ryan (Aldershot, UK, 2010), 111–25.
- ⁸⁵ Fulcher, *Historia*, 518–25: “quanto latius imperium eius extendebatur.”
- ⁸⁶ *Secunda historia*, 568: “Christianis Hierosolymam peregre petentibus infestissimum, et ipsis Sarracenis longe deteriorem crudelioremque inimicum.”
- ⁸⁷ *Ibid.*: “jurante super pretiosissimas reliquias, nullum se per totum imperium suum illaturum peregrinis de cetero nocumentum; sed servaturum fideliter et adjuturum.”
- ⁸⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 554; Fulcher, *Historia*, 368.
- ⁹⁰ Though the Holy Fire episode is heavily downplayed in Fulcher’s 1127 recension, the evidence of witnesses to earlier recensions, like Guibert of Nogent’s *Dei gesta* and the *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem expugnantium* (traditionally attributed to Bartolf of Nangis), suggests it had initially been described in some detail and so the *Secunda historia*’s author was likely aware of it. See Fulcher, *Historia*, 395–96; Edgington, *Baldwin*, 86–88.
- ⁹¹ *Secunda historia*, 581; Fulcher, *Historia*, 664–66.
- ⁹² *Secunda historia*, 555: “parcere subiectis, et debellare superbos.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 370–75.
- ⁹³ *Secunda historia*, 561; Fulcher, *Historia*, 424–27.
- ⁹⁴ Fulcher, *Historia*, 446–50. Cf. *Secunda historia*, 563.
- ⁹⁵ *Secunda historia*, 582–83; Fulcher, *Historia*, 676–80.
- ⁹⁶ *Secunda historia*, 582–83: “victum sibi quaeritare nec sic audent, etiam Christianos illos habentes prodicionis suspectos; ideoque et videri pavitantes et agnosci.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 682–83.
- ⁹⁷ *Secunda historia*, 582–83; Fulcher, *Historia*, 682–86.
- ⁹⁸ *Secunda historia*, 583: “In tantis positi malis, solum sperabant, hocque sibi affore precabantur divinae pietatis auxilium.”
- ⁹⁹ This view relies on an oft-cited passage in which Fulcher describes Westerners becoming Easterners, such that they had acclimatized to eastern lifestyles and even intermarried with Syrians, Armenians, and converted Muslims (*Historia*, 748).
- ¹⁰⁰ *Secunda historia*, 572; Fulcher, *Historia*, 580–84.

¹⁰¹ Phillips, *Second Crusade*, 202–206; Christopher MacEvitt, *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East: Rough Tolerance* (Philadelphia, PA, 2008), 3–13.

¹⁰² *Secunda historia*, 579: “illa Parthica ... more suo semper instabilis ; nunc dorsum, nunc visum agilius quam opinari possis hostibus obvertens, ut quum eam fugere putes, recursum repentinum et impetus subitos necesse sit caveas, et unde te credas vicisse, videre ne vincaris oporteat observare.”

¹⁰³ Fulcher, *Historia*, 649–50: “gens illa Parthica in procinctu vel apparatu bellico moraliter nunquam in eodem statu permanentes (nunc enim vicum, nunc dorsum obsistentibus opinione celerius vertunt et praetor spem simulate fugiunt et recursu repentino impetunt), non se ad bellandum certo statu aptaverunt, sed congressum penitus vitaverunt et taliter ceu victi abcesserunt.”

¹⁰⁴ Phillips, *Second Crusade*, 197–202.

¹⁰⁵ Odo of Deuil, *De projectione Ludovici VII in Orientem*, ed. and tr. Virginia G. Berry (New York, 1948), 108–111: “de capitibus eorum laeti primitias habuerunt,” “ad fugam docti et faciles et ad persequendum protervi,” “illis proterve infestantibus et docti et leviter refugientibus pacem non posset habere nec pungnam.”

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 110–113.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 112–117.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 118–21: “Marescunt flores Franciae antequam fructum faciant in Damasco. Quo relatu suffondor lacrimis, et de visceribus intimis ingemisco.”

¹⁰⁹ Spencer, *Emotions*, 113–76; Bull, *Eyewitness*, 168–78.

¹¹⁰ “Eugenii III papae pontificis Romani: Epistolae et privilegia,” in PL 180:1414–1415: “Gravem namque Christiani nominis jacturam, quam nostris temporibus Ecclesia Dei sustinuit”; William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, ed. Robert B. C. Huygens, 2 vols., CCCM 63/63A (Turnhout, 1986). See also Peter W. Edbury and John G. Rowe, *William of Tyre: Historian of the Latin East* (Cambridge, UK, 1988), 13–22.

¹¹¹ William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, 2:750–52

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 2:751–52: “Occubuerunt illa die viri nobiles et illustres, rebus militaribus singulariter insignes, pie digni recordatione ... Occidit illa nostris infausta die et casu nimis adverso ingens Francorum gloria et virtus.”

¹¹³ By comparison, William of Malmesbury presented the Turks in opposite terms, as cowards who relied on poisoned arrows over martial skill. See James Titterton, “Bloodless Turks and Sanguine Crusaders: William of Malmesbury’s Use of Vegetius in His Account of Urban II’s Sermon at Clermont,” *The Medieval Chronicle* 13 (2020): 289–308.

¹¹⁴ *Secunda historia*, 551–52; Fulcher, *Historia*, 343–47.

¹¹⁵ Smith, *The Bible*, 58–65, 112–28.

¹¹⁶ *Secunda historia*, 553–54: “ut manifestissimo claresceret indicio, istud non nisi opus esse virtutis,” “ut Christiani et vere filii Israel, suum et terra et mari pro se pugnantem videntes Deum, gratulabundo concentu clamarent: Si Deus pro nobis, quis contra nos.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 363–64. See also Dennis H. Green, *The Millstätter Exodus: A Crusading Epic* (Cambridge, UK, 1966), 256–57.

¹¹⁷ *Secunda historia*, 554: “Ecce, quo modo victi sunt, qui jam se vicisse gloriabantur! Vincuntur victores a victis, a captivis captivatores capiuntur ; et ab eis quos jam se vinctos tenere putaverant, vincuntur, asservantur, distribuuntur.”

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 559: “Si sola regis terreni vel stipendia cogitaretis vel donativa, merito trepidaretis, vel vinci vel etiam mori formidantes.” See also Smith, *The Bible*, 164–65.

¹¹⁹ *Secunda historia*, 559: “Optatus debet videri pugnaturus, mori, qui sciat ab aeterno rege regnum paratum esse aeternum morienti.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 411–412. See also Bachrach, “Conforming with the Rhetorical Tradition,” 14–15.

¹²⁰ *Secunda historia*, 572–73: “nisi ut evidentissimis clarescat indicis in nullo nisi in Deo gloriandum homini, qui per se nihil valens.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 589.

¹²¹ *Secunda historia*, 573: “Cujus praesumptionis timore nihil apud Deum abominabilius, nihil esse execrabilius potest; sicut e diverso, nihil gratius, nihil acceptabilius, quam vere humili et devoto corde intelligere quia omnia opera nostra operatur nobis ipse.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 589.

¹²² *Secunda historia*, 562: “sed inde alius alia occasione, via nondum expleta, in terras suas redire volentes,” “Ubi obsistente Solimano Turco ... vel potius justo iudice Deo ignaviam eorum puniente, qui bonum et sanctum non impessent peregrinationis sanctae propositum ... centum millia tam equitum quam peditum ex eis variis mortibus disperissent.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 428–33.

¹²³ On the First Crusade and the Maccabees, see e.g. Elizabeth Lapina, “The Maccabees and the Battle of Antioch,” in *Dying for the Faith, Killing for the Faith: Old-Testament Faith-Warriors (Maccabees 1 and 2) in Cultural Perspective*, ed. Gabriela Signore (Leiden, 2012), 147–59; Nicholas Morton, “The Defence of the Holy Land and the Memory of the Maccabees,” *Journal of Medieval History* 36/3 (2010): 275–93; Smith, *The Bible*, 62–63. Interestingly, this passage is also cited in Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta*, 128.

¹²⁴ Thomas Asbridge, “The Significance and Causes of the Battle of the Field of Blood,” *Journal of Medieval History* 23/4 (1997): 301–316.

¹²⁵ *Secunda historia*, 576: “quae et quanta Antiochenos involverint mala, et veritas historiae jubet evolvere, et horror magnitudoque cladis prohibet referre. Sed nescio quid Christianis praestaret eorum ipsis malorum subtrahere verba, quorum illi pertulerint facta ; quin potius noceret etiam perditis exempla subprimere eorum perditionis ;

quandoquidem etiam ipsis forsitan sit perversis utile, ipsorum exitio ab eorum deterri imitatione. Quod si forte ipsis nihil conferat damnatis quomodo et quare perierint nosse, sequentibus tamen saluberrimum forte potest, cognitis aliorum ruinis, a viis cavere ruinosis.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 620–24.

¹²⁶ *Secunda historia*, 576–77: “non mirum si captivi criminum, et vitiorum servi, traditi sunt hostibus perimendi; ut intelligant exitiorum exemplis concussi, qui verbis admoniti intelligere nolunt, mortem esse stipendia peccati.”

¹²⁷ *Secunda historia*, 577: “Animadvertat hinc gens absque consilio et sine prudentia, quae iram Domini irritare non pertimescit, commeruisse quidem se ut cessare faceret Deus ex hominibus memoriam eorum; sed tamen ejus exterminationem propter iram inimicorum esse dilatam; ne forte superbirent hostes eorum et dicerent: Manus nostra excelsa; et non Dominus fecit haec omnia.” A further, very similar, example is also found in the description of King Baldwin II’s victory over the Turks near Zardana in northern Syria in 1122 (see *Idem*, 579).

¹²⁸ It is also possible that the author had seen Walter the Chancellor’s eyewitness account of the Field of Blood (which circulated alongside Fulcher’s 1124 recension), for there are tonal similarities; though the lack of textual borrowing makes this hard to prove. See Walter the Chancellor, *Bella Antiochena*, ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Innsbruck, 1896); Fulcher, *Historia*, 91–99; Rubenstein, “Putting History to Use,” 131–68. On Louis’s difficult relationship with Raymond of Poitiers (which may have related to the latter’s apparent behaviour towards the French king’s wife, Eleanor of Aquitaine), see Phillips, *Second Crusade*, 207–12.

¹²⁹ *Secunda historia*, 577–78; Fulcher, *Historia*, 624–33. See also Smith, *The Bible*, 121–22.

¹³⁰ Fulcher, *Historia*, 628–29.

¹³¹ *Secunda historia*, 577: “cujus legem reliquistis, nec fidem, nec veritatem inter vos, ut solebatis, conservantes.”

¹³² *Ibid.*: “Nam si Dei vestri legem et fidem servaretis, adhuc, sicut solebatis, et terribiles nobis ex more, et insuperabiles essetis.”

¹³³ *Ibid.*: “ira in misericordiam esset conversa.”

¹³⁴ See e.g. Robert the Monk’s description of ambassadorial discussions between the crusaders and Kerbogha of Mosul outside Antioch in June 1098 (*Historia Ierosolimitana*, 70–72), or the *Chanson d’Antioche*’s coverage of Antiochene Turks laughing at crusader privations (*La Chanson d’Antioche*, ed. Susan Duparc-Quioc, 2 vols. (Paris, 1976–78), 1:171). See also John Tolan, *Saracens: Islam in the Medieval European Imagination* (New York, 2002), 109–123.

¹³⁵ Smith, *The Bible*, 128–51, esp. 139–41. In this context, the inclusion of elements of Peter Alfonsi’s anti-Jewish tract in one of the extant manuscripts (as well as Chartres MS 130) is of interest, albeit its incomplete nature, as well as its absence from the other manuscripts, means we cannot be sure whether Peter’s text was meant to accompany the *Secunda historia*, as it appears to have occasionally done so with Baldric’s *Historia*. See Baldric of Bourgeuil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, lxxxv, xcvi, xcvi.

¹³⁶ *Secunda historia*, 578. Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 638–40.

¹³⁷ *Secunda historia*, 561–64. Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 424–55.

¹³⁸ *Secunda historia*, 562: “Confidebat siquidem nimis de probitate sua,” “Punita est graviter ejus temeritas, Deo qui superbis resistit ei resistente, in eo quod non, ut solebat, exstiterit victor, sed victus vix evaserit.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 438–39.

¹³⁹ *Secunda historia*, 562–63: “Ita plane corripuit eum Dominus juste, sed benigne correxit.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 444–46.

¹⁴⁰ *Secunda historia*, 563: “Elisit elatum, sed elisum erexit, ut possit ei cantare illud prophetae: Castigans castigavit me Dominus, et morti non tradidit me.”

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*: “de solo divino auxilio sperare compellunt’, ‘non diu defuit clamantibus ad se pius exauditor Christus.”

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 564: “tribuit plane Dominus salutem, sed opportune, populum videlicet humilem, salvum faciendo, et humiliando oculos superbiorum, ut non gloriatur omnis caro coram ipso, edocta non sperare in arcu et gladio suo, et cantare toto corde Salvatori suo: Salvasti enim nos de affligentibus nos, et odientes nos confundisti.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 453–55.

¹⁴³ *Secunda historia*, 566–67, 568, 569.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 552. See also Spencer, *Emotions*, 149–73.

¹⁴⁵ *Secunda historia*, 555.

¹⁴⁶ Fulcher, *Historia*, 412: “Francia equidem longe est a vobis”; *Secunda historia*, 559: “quia longe nimis nostra nobis Francia abest.”

¹⁴⁷ *Secunda historia*, 560: “Vociferantur omnes, et confusis clamoribus ipsum pulsatur coelum; fragor nimius vel de collisionibus armorum, vel de illisionibus cassidum resonat et gladiatorum; plangores et ululatus undique vel morientium audiuntur vel vulneratorum.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 416. For comparative examples, see Robert the Monk’s coverage of the battle of Dorylaeum in July 1097 and the Lake Battle outside Antioch on 9 February 1098 (*Historia Ierosolimitana*, 26–27, 42).

¹⁴⁸ *Secunda historia*, 566. Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 495–97. See also Riley-Smith, *Idea of Crusading*, 91–119.

¹⁴⁹ *Secunda historia*, 559: “Conglobantur super corruentium acervos catervae percussorum, simulque tanquam triturantes in area triticum, indiscreta omnes caede trucidant.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 400–404.

¹⁵⁰ *Secunda historia*, 581: “omnes in suis navibus, ac si in agris messem, detruncantes.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 671–72.

¹⁵¹ Robert the Monk, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 44: “quoniam seriatim, ut falcator prata vel messem, detruncabant.” On the issue of authorship and dating, see *Idem*, xvii–xli.

¹⁵² Asbridge, “An Experiment in Extremity,” 735–36, 747–50.

- ¹⁵³ Fulcher, *Historia*, 672; *Secunda historia*, 581–82: “occisorum sanguine usque occidentium tibias exundante navium tabulatus plenos omnes horruisse.”
- ¹⁵⁴ Fulcher, *Historia*, 672: “salum rubescere ... vidertis”; *Secunda historia*, 581–82: “tantus ex eis fertur fluxisse sanguis,” “mare videretur rubuisse.”
- ¹⁵⁵ Asbridge, “The Portrayal of Violence,” 175–79. On the Walter-Fulcher manuscripts, see footnote 36.
- ¹⁵⁶ Benjamin Z. Kedar, “The Jerusalem Massacre of July 1099 in the Western Historiography of the Crusades,” *Crusades* 3 (2004): 15–75, esp. 16–30; Robert the Monk, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 45: “Cruor effusus sanguineum flumini dabat colorem, cunctisque cernentibus magnum incutiebat horrorem”; Asbridge, “An Experiment in Extremity,” 741–44. The recourse to the miraculous is also a key theme of First Crusade narratives. See Spacey, *Miraculous*, passim.
- ¹⁵⁷ *Secunda historia*, 549: “pudore suffunditur uterque, quod gloriarum suarum titulis supremæ laudis victoria non annumeretur.”
- ¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*: “quamvis ejusdem fuerit virtutis et cautelæ ad muniendas defensandasve noviter expugnatas regiones remansisse, cujus et ad expugnandas præcessisse.”
- ¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*: “ut utrobique non homini, sed nomini tuo, Christe, detur hæc gloria.”
- ¹⁶⁰ Fulcher, *Historia*, 322–25.
- ¹⁶¹ *Secunda historia*, 557: “memoraverim ut advertant qui legerint ista vel audierint, quot et quantos labores, timores, angores, sustinuerint pro Christo primitivi illi terræ vel regionis Hierosolymitanæ possessores, simulque ut intelligatur non minus miraculi esse regionem tam amplam a tam raro vel possessore vel defensore retentari potuisse postmodum, quam primitus expugnari. Liquet itaque Christi Domini in omnibus his operatam dignationem intueri, ammirari virtutem, clementiam contemplari.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 387–90.
- ¹⁶² *Secunda historia*, 557.
- ¹⁶³ *Ibid.*: “Proinde et nos cum eodem Apostolo convenienter audemus beatificare eos quos scimus in via et in terra sancta innumeros et immensos labores sudasse et agones.”
- ¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 559: “sed tamen magnum nomen, ultra nomen magnorum qui sunt in terris, nobis, Christo Domino donante, comparabimus.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 411–412.
- ¹⁶⁵ Paul, *Follow in their Footsteps*, passim.
- ¹⁶⁶ Susanna A. Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance, 1095–1216* (Farnham, UK, 2011).
- ¹⁶⁷ *Secunda historia*, 558: “Hujus tam crudelis in collegas patrati piaculi non immemores qui rege Godefredo fuerant christiani, tam ardentem ad expugnationem convenerunt impiorum.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 398–400.
- ¹⁶⁸ *Secunda historia*, 558–59: “obsessores irrident; convitiis lacessunt et maledictis, de muris et propugnaculis suis plurimum confidentes,” “ira Dei in blasphemos compleretur.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 400–404.
- ¹⁶⁹ *Secunda historia*, 577: “cultoribus victoria de hostibus, et vindicta fuisset restituta.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 630–31.
- ¹⁷⁰ William J. Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality in the Holy Land and Iberia, c. 1095–c. 1187* (Woodbridge, UK, 2008), 22–27, 30–47, 57–58.
- ¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 59–82, 86–98, 111–119.
- ¹⁷² *Secunda historia*, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 559, 560, 561, 562, 565, 566, 567, 572, 583, 585.
- ¹⁷³ Fulcher, *Historia*, 359–64: “auxilium de caelo adfore devote precabamur.”
- ¹⁷⁴ *Secunda historia*, 553: “auxilium ibi de coelo præstari in tanta necessitate devotissime precabantur. Nec defuit suis Clemens ubique bonitas Salvatoris,” “nisi pius Christus et suis in extremo conclusis articulo, tanto mirabilius, quanto insperatus consilium inspiraret, et ministraret auxilium; et inimicis suorum utrumque mirabiliter subtraheret.”
- ¹⁷⁵ Alan V. Murray, “Mighty against the Enemies of Christ: The Relic of the True Cross in the Armies of the Kingdom of Jerusalem,” in *The Crusades and their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton*, ed. John France and William Zajac (Aldershot, UK, 1998), 217–38.
- ¹⁷⁶ *Secunda historia*, 559, 560, 561, 563, 564, 566, 567, 577, 578, 579, 581, 583, 584.
- ¹⁷⁷ *Secunda historia*, 560–61: “cuius virtutem, sicut daemones, it et daemonum satellites diutius non sustinentes,” “non nisi Dominicæ Crucis virtuti videretur assignanda.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 414, 417–20.
- ¹⁷⁸ Fulcher, *Historia*, 384–87.
- ¹⁷⁹ *Secunda historia*, 556: “Sicut enim mors Christi vitæ nostræ est causa, sic et irrisio Christi, nostri est insigne honoris. An non omnis Christianus ex illa Christi corona, genus electum, regale sacerdotium est factus.”
- ¹⁸⁰ Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, 59–61; Smith, *The Bible*, 141–43. On wider shifts in this period to promoting the significance of the Cross as underpinning the validity of Latin rule in the East, see Sylvia Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City: Crusader Jerusalem and the Catholic West (1099–1187)* (Aldershot, UK, 2005), 63–90.
- ¹⁸¹ *Secunda historia*, 559: “Quis audiat hoc, et non horrescat? audacia est ista an fiducia? temeritati ascribendum hoc an fortitudini? hoc etenim videri possit, non pugnare velle, sed mori. Ita plane ita est: parati erant mori, sed pro eo qui pro ipsis mortem dignatus est pati. Non ergo audacia erat ista, sed fides, non temeritas, sed charitas; “Christo” etenim, ut Apostolus dicit, ‘passo in carne’, et ipsi simili cogitatione armabantur.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 407–409.
- ¹⁸² *Secunda historia*, 559: “venistis sponte offerre animas vestras, pro Christo, discrimini, invenistis ad quod venistis.” Cf. Fulcher, *Historia*, 411–412.
- ¹⁸³ The frequency of the appearance of Ascalon and the Ascalonites in Fulcher can be traced through the index to the modern edition. See Fulcher, *Historia*, 873.

¹⁸⁴ *Secunda historia*, 554–55: “Quam et urbem et gentem, sicut de antiquis scriptum est, idcirco credendum, arbitror Dominum vel delere vel servis suis tradere noluisse, ut semper in eis experiatur Hierusalem, et habeant consuetudinem praeliandi, ne videlicet per otium peioribus inimicis deterius impugnentur et expugnentur, moribus vitiosis, ut iuxta dictum illud satirici quidem sed garriendo veridici, ‘Servabat castas humilis fortuna Latinas, Et labor in noctes et proximus Hannibal urbi’; et nostri Hierosolymitae ex bellorum et laborum assiduitate, et in humilitate deprimantur, et constringantur in castitate. Minus quippe superbire libet, ubi vix licet vivere; minus delectat fornicari eos qui assidue timent etiam mori. Bella itaque exteriora interiorum sunt saepe peremptoria bellorum. Hostes visibiles invisibilium sunt vel repressio vel oppressio inimicorum. Proinde contra spiritualia nequitiae in coelestibus bella, Hierosolymitis nostris necessaria semper credenda sunt ea quae adversus carnem et sanguinem, hoc est, adversus Ascalonitas, continua sustinent bella.”

¹⁸⁵ Smith, *The Bible*, 155–60.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 160–209.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 178.

¹⁸⁸ Phillips, *Second Crusade*, 215–217, 226; Martin Hoch, “The Crusaders’ Strategy Against Fatimid Ascalon and the ‘Ascalon Project’ of the Second Crusade,” in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*, ed. Michael Gervers (New York, 1992), 119–31.

¹⁸⁹ William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, 2:789–95, 797–805 (for the reference to western arrivals, see *Idem*, 793). See also Malcolm Barber, *The Crusader States* (New Haven, CT, 2012), 200–61.

¹⁹⁰ “Sigeberti Gemblacensis, Continuatio Praemonstratensis,” in MGH SS 6: 454–55.

¹⁹¹ Though Amalric’s election here is not overtly stated, William of Tyre included Bernard’s death during his discussion of the siege and notes the presence of the patriarch and major prelates (*Chronicon*, 2:792, 797). On the gift of possessions in Ascalon, see Hans E. Mayer and Jean Richard, *Diplomata regum latinorum Hierosolimitanorum*, 4 vols. (Hanover, 2010), 2:773–6 (at 775).

¹⁹² BnF lat. 5513, fol. 74v.

¹⁹³ Paul, “Crusade, Memory and Regional Politics,” 139.

¹⁹⁴ This supports Smith’s arguments (*The Bible*, 9–12 and *passim*) on the originality and creativity of crusade texts, as although it draws on common tropes, it does so for unique narrative purposes.

¹⁹⁵ For instance Nicholas Paul’s *To Follow in their Footsteps* examines First Crusade stories in dynastic histories, while he is currently working on a thirteenth-century narrative regarding the translation of a relic of the True Cross from Antioch to Brogne. See *Idem*, “Possession: Sacred Crusading Treasure in the Material Vernacular,” *The Journal of Objects, Art and Belief* 14/4 (2018): 520–32; “Writing the Knight, Staging the Crusader: Manasses of Hierges and the Monks of Brogne,” in *Knighthood and Society in the High Middle Ages*, ed. David Crouch and Jean Deploige (Leuven, 2020), 167–92. Moreover, while Katherine Allen Smith’s *The Bible and Crusade Narrative* incorporates lesser-known texts, it does so only for stories relating to the First Crusade; thus leaving room to consider how narratives might have responded to, and been shaped by, continued military activities in the Latin East.

¹⁹⁶ Frances Rita Ryan and Harold S. Fink, *Fulcher of Chartres: A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem, 1095–1127* (Knoxville, TN, 1973), 48.