The *Chanson d'Antioche*

An Old French Account of the First Crusade

Translated by
Susan B. Edgington and
Carol Sweetenham

Crusade Texts in Translation 22

CRUSADE TEXTS IN TRANSLATION

Volume 22

About the volume

The Old-French *Chanson d'Antioche* has long intrigued historians and literary scholars. Unusually among epic poems, it follows closely a well documented historical event - the First Crusade - and appears to include substantial and genuine historical content. At one time it was believed to be based on an account by an eye-witness, 'Richard the Pilgrim'. Carol Sweetenham and Susan Edgington have combined forces to investigate such claims, and their findings are set out in a comprehensive introduction which, firstly, examines the textual history of the poem from its possible oral beginnings through several re-workings to its present form, achieved early in the thirteenth century. A second chapter assesses the *Chanson's* value as a source for the crusade, and a third considers its status as a literary text.

A complete prose translation follows, the first in English and based on the definitive edition. The *Chanson* is revealed as a lively narrative, with tales of chivalry, villainy, and even episodes of humour. There are extensive footnotes to the translation, and an appendix provides supplementary material from a different manuscript tradition. There is also a cast list of heroes and villains with biographical information for the 'real' ones and literary analogues for the fictional characters. The *Chanson d'Antioche* can now be read for enjoyment, and for a whole new perspective on crusading in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

About the translators

Susan B. Edgington is an Honorary Research Fellow at Queen Mary, University of London, UK.

Carol Sweetenham is an Associate Research Fellow at the University of Warwick, UK

This book is dedicated to the memories of Elspeth Kennedy and Julian Chrysostomides

THE *CHANSON D'ANTIOCHE*

Crusade Texts in Translation

Editorial Board

Titles in the series include

Mary Fischer
The Chronicle of Prussia by Nicolaus von Jeroschin
A History of the Teutonic Knights in Prussia, 1190–1331

Peter Jackson
The Seventh Crusade, 1244–1254
Sources and Documents

Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate
Letters from the East
Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12th–13th Centuries

G. A. Loud
The Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa
The History of the Expedition of the Emperor Frederick and Related Texts

Thomas S. Asbridge and Susan B. Edgington
Walter the Chancellor's *The Antiochene Wars*
A Translation and Commentary

Carol Sweetenham
Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade
Historia Iherosolimitana

Damian J. Smith and Helena Buffery
The Book of Deeds of James I of Aragon
A Translation of the Medieval Catalan *Llibre dels Fets*

The *Chanson d'Antioche*
An Old French Account of the First Crusade

Translated by

SUSAN B. EDGINGTON
Queen Mary, University of London, UK

CAROL SWEETENHAM
University of Warwick, UK

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2011 by Ashgate Publishing

Published 2016 by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Edgington, Susan.
The Chanson d'Antioche: An Old-French Account of the First Crusade. –
(Crusade Texts in Translation)
1. Chanson d'Antioche. 2. Crusades in literature. I. Title II. Series III. Sweetenham, Carol.
841.1–dc22

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Chanson d'Antioche. English
The Chanson d'Antioche: An Old-French Account of the First Crusade / [introduced and translated by] Susan B. Edgington and Carol Sweetenham.
p. cm. – (Crusade Texts in Translation)
First English translation of the Old French Chanson d'Antioche.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
1. Crusades – First, 1096-1099 – Poetry. 2. Epic poetry, French – Translations into English.
3. Chansons de geste – Translations into English. 4. Chanson d'Antioche. 5. Epic poetry, French – History and criticism. 6. Chansons de geste – History and criticism. 7. Crusades in literature.
I. Edgington, Susan. II. Sweetenham, Carol. III. Title.
PQ1425.A48E5 2011
841'.1–dc22 2011015236

ISBN 9780754654896 (hbk)
ISBN 9781315614526 (ebk)

Contents

This page has been left blank intentionally

Abbreviations

A	*Aevum*
AB	*Analecta Bollandiana*
AC	*L'Antiquité Classique*
B	*Byzantion*
BH	*Bullétin Hispanique*
DR	*Dublin Review*
FHS	*French Historical Studies*
FMLS	*Forum for Modern Language Studies*
GRLMA	*Grundriss der romanischen Literaturen des Mittelalters*
H	*History*
HR	*Historical Review*
HT	*History and Theory*
JHR	*Journal of Hispanic Research*
JMH	*Journal of Medieval History*
JOAS	*Journal of Oriental and African Studies*
JWCI	*Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute*
MA	*Le Moyen Age*
MGHS	*Monumenta Germaniae Historiae Scriptores*
MS	*Medieval Studies*
MW	*Moslem World*
NM	*Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*
O	*Olifant*
OFCC	The Old French Crusade Cycle
P	*Parergon*
PM	*Perspectives Médiévales*
PMLA	*Proceedings of the Modern Language Association*
R	*Romania*
RG	*Romanica Gandensia*
RHC Occ	*Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux (5 vols, Paris: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1844-96).*
RHC Or	*Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Orientaux (5 vols, Paris: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1872-1906).*
RLR	*Revue de langues romanes*
RMS	*Reading Medieval Studies*
RN	*Romance Notes*
RR	*Romanic Review*

SCH	*Studies in Church History*
T	*Traditio*
T-L	*A. Tobler, Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch : bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Erhard Lommatzsch (11 vols, Berlin: Weidmann, 1925-2002) [Tobler-Lommatzsch]*
ZFSL	*Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur*
ZRP	*Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*

Preface

We owe Professor Linda Paterson a big debt of gratitude for her thorough reading of a first draft and her perceptive comments: this book is the better for it, and indeed would not have been undertaken without her. Our work has also benefited from insights given by Marianne Ailes, Malcolm Barber, Matthew Bennett, Chris Foot, Sarah Kay, Gordon Knott, Conor Kostick, Jonathan Phillips, and John Tolan at various points and in various contexts. Parts of it were tested on colleagues in the Société Rencesvals and at the Institute of Historical Research in London; their comments were invaluable. It goes without saying that we are entirely responsible for any failings in the work.

We have used Mme. Suzanne Duparc-Quioc's excellent edition of the *Chanson d'Antioche* as the basis for our translation, and acknowledge the assistance of the publishers, Paul Geuthner, in trying to trace copyright for this. We thank the University of Alabama Press for permission to translate extracts from the late Jan Nelson's edition of the *Chanson* in our Appendix 1.

We should like to thank the Taylorian Institute, the Bodleian Library, the Sackler Institute, and the History Faculty Library in Oxford for their unfailing helpfulness, and in particular Janet Foot at the Taylorian for help navigating databases. We thank our editor at Ashgate, Dr John Smedley, for his patience and help. We are grateful to our families for support and occasional distraction: on the one hand computer tamer *extraordinaire* Philip Sweetenham, and Oliver and William Sweetenham for sharing their mother's attention with Graindor de Douai and Richard le Pèlerin; on the other Ben and Penny Edgington, Rebecca and Mike Richardson, and four granddaughters who have all this fun ahead of them.

Finally, both of us lost a revered mentor during the preparation of this volume, and we have dedicated it to them: Elspeth Kennedy, Professor of Medieval French in the University of Oxford, and Julian Chrysostomides, Reader in Byzantine History and Director of the Hellenic Institute at Royal Holloway, University of London.

SUSAN B. EDGINGTON and CAROL SWEETENHAM
August 2011

This page has been left blank intentionally

PART I
Introduction

This page has been left blank intentionally

Chapter 1
The Textual History of the *Chanson d'Antioche*

In this chapter we examine the textual history of the *Chanson d'Antioche*. The chapter starts with the vexed questions of authorship and dating. It traces the development of the text during the twelfth century and examines its metamorphosis into the wider Old French Crusade Cycle (hereafter OFCC or Cycle), cross-referring as necessary to the parallel Occitan textual tradition. There is a brief description of the manuscripts containing the text and their evolution throughout the thirteenth century, a witness to the continuing interest in the text. We finish with a summary of the subsequent literature based on the legends in the Cycle.

Authorship and dating

Received wisdom on the authorship and dating of the *Antioche* goes something like this. The text is a quasi-diary of the First Crusade by a poor crusader known as Richard le Pèlerin, written at the time of or just after the Crusade in the form of the vernacular *chanson de geste*. Richard's work was used by the Lotharingian chronicler Albert of Aachen and referred to by other authors. Richard was thus both an eyewitness to events and a pioneer: the first author by nearly a century to use vernacular poetry – and specifically the *chanson de geste* – to describe current events. Towards the end of the twelfth century Richard's text was substantially reworked by another author, Graindor de Douai. Graindor kept enough of the original for it to be discernible beneath his reworking, and for the last third he relied heavily on the work of Robert the Monk. He also edited the text to turn it into a trilogy with the *Chanson des Chétifs* and the *Chanson de Jérusalem*. During the thirteenth century other texts were added to this nucleus to form the OFCC, which was substantially complete by the middle of the thirteenth century.[1]

[1] This summarises the views of P. Paris, G. Paris, Pigeonneau, Sumberg and Duparc-Quioc. See also A. Hatem, *Les poèmes épiques des croisades: génèse – historicité – localisation* (Paris, 1932); C. Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des croisades* (Paris, 1940). The arguments are set out in more detail in C. E. Sweetenham, 'Antioch and Flanders: some reflections on the writing of the Chanson d'Antioche', in P. E. Bennett, A. E. Cobby and J. E. Everson (eds), *Epic and Crusade: proceedings of the colloquium of the Société Rencesvals British Branch held at Lucy Cavendish College, Cambridge, 27–28 March 2004* (Edinburgh, 2006), pp. 131–51.

The evidence - or not - for Richard

The problem with the Richard-as-pioneer theory is that there is no solid evidence for it. There is no external corroboration for his existence, although in fairness as a supposed 'homme du peuple' it would be surprising if there were.[2] So our only piece of evidence is internal to the *Antioche*. In the account of the battle of Antioch is a list of 38 Saracen kings forming a counterpart to the list of Christian barons just given. The names are the usual mix of fantasy, history and abuse.[3] At the end of the list comes the comment:

> Cil ki le cançon fist sot bien dire les nons
> Ricars li pelerins de qui nos le tenons.[4]

If we take this at face value it says simply that Richard knew a list of standard-issue Saracen names and produced the 'cançon'; it is implied that the names formed part of this song. We might reasonably assume from context that it was about the First Crusade, or at least the battle of Antioch. But we have no way of knowing what kind of song it was: a full-blown *chanson de geste*, a much shorter composition like those of William IX of Poitiers, or something else.[5] We do not know whether it was in Latin or in the vernacular. Neither do we know whether it covered the entire First Crusade, events at Antioch or just the culminating battle of Antioch. And there is no hint in the reference as to whether Richard was a contemporary eyewitness or produced a later account: there is a reference at v.8377 to 'cil qui la fu' though Richard is not named. The present tense 'tenons' might imply that Richard is in fact still alive.[6]

The question of Richard's existence or non-existence has become inextricably linked with the debate about the source material of the *Antioche*. We discuss below

---

[2] S. Duparc-Quioc, *La Chanson d'Antioche* (2 vols, Paris, 1976–78), vol. 2, *Étude critique*, p. 217: 'il vivait le plus souvent avec les gens de pied.'

[3] vv. 9015–26: the list includes David and Solomon, the descriptively named Tenebrois and Claras de Sarmazane.

[4] vv. 9013–14: 'the author of the song – Richard the Pilgrim, from whom we have it – knew the names very well'.

[5] William IX of Poitiers wrote songs about his experiences in the Holy Land according to Orderic Vitalis [OV], 'miserias captivatis suae ut erat iocundus et Lepidus … multotiens retulit rithmicis versibus cum facetis modulationibus' ('being a gay and light-hearted man, he often recited the trials of his captivity … using rhythmic verses and skilful modulations'): *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. and trans. M. Chibnall (6 vols, Oxford, 1969–75), vol. 5, pp. 342–3. None survives, and possibly Orderic is extrapolating back from William's later fame as the 'first troubadour'. But if William's extant lyrics are any guide, they might have been short vernacular songs of a few stanzas: *Guglielmo d'Aquitania: poesie*, ed. N. Pasero (Modena, 1973).

[6] R. F. Cook, *Chanson d'Antioche, chanson de geste: le cycle de la croisade est-il épique?* (Amsterdam, 1980), p. 27.

the evidence for some kind of earlier version, and it seems beyond doubt that some such version of the material in the text did exist. But there is no evidence that it was written by Richard le Pèlerin, and much less that it was a *chanson de geste* written as a diary of the crusade.

So why the reference to Richard? It was standard practice in the *chanson de geste* to assert authenticity by claiming that the text came from an eyewitness or other impeccable source. The *Chanson de Roland*, famously, ascribes itself to Turold; *Girart de Roussillon* claims to be by a monk named Sestu.[7] What better, then, than to claim a source who had been a crusader – 'pèlerin' – himself? Kleber argued that the name of Richard became a badge of authenticity attached to successive versions of the text.[8] That said, it is strange to drop the reference casually into the middle of an account of battle. Such references could be expected to come at the start or end of the text.[9] Graindor gives a long and elaborate prologue but does not mention Richard once in it. We might have expected more detail and prominence if Richard was indeed cited as a guarantee of eyewitness authenticity.

The most we can take from the reference is that Richard was a pilgrim or crusader at some point – by no means necessarily the First Crusade – and that he produced some kind of preceding poetic text that contained this list of Saracen names. We do not know what form this work had, when it was written, or what it contained.[10]

The 'reworking' of 'Graindor de Douai'

Graindor de Douai, the supposed *remanieur* of Richard's supposed ur-text, has had a bad press. He has been accused of acting as some kind of literary vandal, spoiling the primitive beauty of Richard's *Antioche* with later material in his attempt to knit together the *Antioche*, the *Chétifs* and the *Jérusalem* into a coherent trilogy.[11]

---

[7] *La Chanson de Roland*, ed. I. Short (Paris, 1990), v. 4002; *Girart de Roussillon*, ed. W. M. Hackett (3 vols, Paris, 1953–55), vv. 24–6. H. Pigeonneau, *Le cycle de la croisade et la famille de Bouillon* (Paris, 1877), p. 146 has a nice turn of phrase: 'ces manuscrits découverts un beau jour au fond de quelque abbaye, recopiés par l'ordre d'un pieux abbé et dont ils ne sont que les modestes et fidèles éditeurs.'

[8] H. Kleber, 'Wer ist der Verfasser der Chanson d'Antioche? Revision einer Streitfrage', *ZFSL*, 94 (1984), p. 142.

[9] The reference to Turold is the last line of the Oxford *Roland*; *Girart*'s reference to Sestu is at the start.

[10] Even his name varies. He is 'Guicars li pelerin' in mss F and G, and omitted in E.

[11] H. Kleber, 'Graindor de Douai: remanieur-auteur-mécène?', in K.-H. Bender (ed.), *Les épopées de la croisade* (Stuttgart, 1987), pp. 66–75; Duparc-Quioc, *Étude*, p. 217: 'c'est donc le côté pittoresque, épique de la croisade que nous a montré Richard et on le verrait bien davantage si la dernière partie de la chanson … n'avait pas été si modifiée par Graindor.'

As with Richard we have only one reference to Graindor de Douai in the text of the *Antioche*. In the prologue come the following lines:

> Cist novel jougleor qui en suelent canter
> Le vrai commencement en ont laisié ester,
> Mais Grainsdor de Douai nel velt mie oblier
> Ki nos en a les vers tous fais renoveler.[12]

What this actually says is that new (fashionable?) *jongleurs* have ceased to give the text its proper beginning. Graindor does not think it should be forgotten and has rewritten the text or had it rewritten accordingly. It is not clear from this reference whether the rewriting is of the whole poem or only the start, or indeed the prologue. Nor is it clear whether the anonymous narrator – 'nos' – is the author of the new version or the recipient of Graindor's new version.

There are two other references to an earlier version. The prologue adds further details:

> Oï l'avés chanter en une autre chancon,
> Mais n'estoit pas rimee ensi com nos l'avon,
> Rimee est de novel et mise en quarregnon.
> Mais cil qui le rima n'i vaut metre son non,
> Por cou que tels l'oist quin froncast le grenon.[13]

Peter the Hermit's vision of the Holy Sepulchre and subsequent departure on crusade was the true start of the poem. It was described in another poem written in a different rhyme (perhaps assonanced?) and/or metre; it is not clear whether this poem covered only the true start of the crusade or more material. An anonymous author restyled it and wrote it down; he preferred to remain anonymous because the listeners disliked either him or his poetry. So if we take the text at face value there were two anonymous versions of this earlier poem, one apparently oral and in an undetermined metre, the later one written down and in rhyme.

The final reference is at the closing lines of the poem.

---

[12] Laisse 1, vv. 12–15: 'these upstart *jongleurs* who go around singing it have left out the proper beginning, but Graindor de Douai – who has had all the lines brought up to date for us – has no intention of forgetting it.'

[13] Laisse 3, vv. 78–82: 'you have heard this recounted in another song, but not in rhyme like the version we have: it has acquired a new rhyme scheme and been written down. However the author who turned it into rhyme did not dare put his name to it in case his audience turned up their noses at it.'

> Segnor, or voel que soit ceste raisons finee
> Cil qui ces vers a fais et la rime trovee
> Dusqu'à une autre fois qu'ele ert renovelee.[14]

This tells us merely that the author of this version wrote and rhymed the text. It is unclear whether this author is to be identified with the anonymous but unpopular author above. It is not clear whether the last line envisages an overhaul of the text at some point in future. There are a further two references to a previous source: judging by the context this is Robert the Monk.[15]

All this is very confusing. Graindor may be the author or may be the commissioner of this version. Either way he is responsible for giving the work a new beginning describing the crusade of Peter the Hermit. This at least, and perhaps more, comes from a previous work by an anonymous author who wrote down and put into rhyme a previous anonymous version that was not written down and not in rhyme. The relationship between the earlier written text and this one is not clear. We can say with certainty only that there was at least one previous version of the first part of the text and Graindor either commissioned someone to restore the proper beginning to the text or rewrote it himself.

Furthermore, not all versions of the text refer to Graindor. He is mentioned by name in the oldest version of the *Antioche*, mss. A, B and C: in manuscript E he is Hervix de Douai, and he is not mentioned at all in mss. F, G and L.[16]

So the internal evidence for Graindor's work is not clear-cut. There is some – slender – external evidence for an author with a similar name working at a similar time. There are parallels of names, language and incident between the Crusade trilogy texts, and the *Fierabras* and the *Destruction de Rome* that precedes it.[17]

---

[14] Laisse 374, vv. 9580–82: 'My lords, now the author who wrote these lines and crafted the rhymes wants to bring this account to an end until the next time it is reworked.'

[15] Laisse 292, v. 7244, 'se l'estoire ne ment' ('if the story is to be believed'); laisse 366, v. 9339, 'Li escris le tesmoigne et si est verités' ('this is not a tall tale and you deny it at your peril'). Both come in passages translated from Robert and refer to his material.

[16] See Duparc-Quioc's note to v. 14 (*Édition*, p. 19). For other similar references see M. Delbouille, 'Les chansons de geste et le livre', in *La technique littéraire des chansons de geste: actes du colloque de Liège*, *septembre 1957* (Paris, 1959), pp. 333–4, where he lists a variously named Graindor de Brie, Jendeus de Brie and Gautier de Douai.

[17] *La destruction de Rome*, ed. L. Formisano (Florence, 1981); also *La destruction de Rome: d'après le manuscrit de Hanovre IV, 578*, ed. J. H. Speich (Berne, 1988), vv. 1–21; also '*La destruction de Rome* et *Fierabras*: ms Egerton 3028, Musée Brittanique, Londres', Louis Brandin, *R*, 64 (1938), pp. 18–100. Gordon Knott has drawn attention to the resemblances between some of the Saracen names in the *Jérusalem* and *Fierabras*, and suggested that the Bishop of Forez from the *Chétifs* may also be referred to in *Fierabras* (ed. Marc Le Person (Paris, 2003)). The King of Nubia from the Cycle is killed in the *Destruction* vv. 853–8. Some of the language used – 'si orrés bone chanchon de bien enluminee:/ N'i avera fable dite ne mensonge provee'; 'le chanchon ert perdue et le rime faussee' (vv. 3–4, 7) – is close to that of the *Antioche*. Shadowy reminiscences of the

The prologue of the *Destruction* attributes it to a reworking of an older text found at St-Denis by King Louis and a Gautier de Douai.[18] The castellans of Douai did indeed bear the name Walter (Gautier) from the eleventh into the fourteenth centuries, starting with Walter I 1051–1111; Walter III bore the title between 1199 and 1207/8; and Walter IV from 1217 to no later than 1252.[19] Mandach suggests that Walter I wrote *Fierabras* in conjunction with Louis VI and acquired the soubriquet 'Grain d'Or' at some point in the process; he would also have been responsible for the *Antioche* drawing on the military expertise he had acquired at the battle of Hastings.[20] This is difficult to evidence, and does not fit with what the *Antioche* tells us about Graindor. But arguably the text preserves a memory of some link to the castellans of Douai.

In sum, the evidence for Graindor's existence is not much stronger than that for Richard's. His name varies between versions; it is unclear whether he was author or commissioner; and he disappears in later redactions of the text. So it is hard to assert definitively that Graindor was the author of the text as it now stands. But he may well have commissioned it, and some link with the castellans of Douai – real or perceived – may lurk in the background.

So who did write the Antioche?

The conclusions we can draw from this evidence are limited. We discuss below the evidence for some form of ur-*Antioche*: it is clear that some such text existed and a text needs an author. But there is no convincing evidence either that Richard was that author or that he existed at all. Graindor's existence has a shade more conviction, but we do not know whether he was author or commissioner. The allusions in the text point to a complex history of *remaniement*. All this suggests a much more complex textual history than a simple reworking of Richard's original text by Graindor.

Antioche do seem in places to lurk behind the text of the *Destruction*: the beheading of the Pope recalls that of the priest at Mass (vv. 1263–5), Rome is like Antioch handed over by a traitor (vv. 1187–236) and there is a whirling image of Apollon on top of a mast (vv. 227–30, 330–32).

[18] *Destruction*, vv. 10–19.

[19] E. Warlop, *The Flemish Nobility before 1300* (4 vols, Courtrai, 1976), vol. 3, pp. 765–73.

[20] A. de Mandach, *Naissance et développement de la chanson de geste en Europe. V: 'La Geste de Fierabras'* (Geneva, 1987), pp. 109–28. See the refutation by Gordon Knott, 'Notes on Reality and Improbability in Fierabras,' *O*, 20 (1995–96), pp. 145–70, esp. 161–5.

Potential predecessors? The evolution of the text during the twelfth century

No manuscript preserves any form of the *Antioche* pre-dating the version in the Old French Crusade Cycle. But the creation of the Cycle and external evidence suggest that an earlier version or versions of the text of some kind evolved during the twelfth century.

Early *chanson de geste* material contemporary (more or less) with the Crusade

There is no extant Old French *chanson de geste* describing and contemporary with the Crusade. But the Latin chronicles written in the years immediately following the Crusade contain material that reflects closely the conventions of the *chanson de geste*. The most striking is the run of episodes about Corbaran and his mother, in which he mocks the Christian weapons, sends a letter to the Caliph, and has a long dialogue with his mother as she attempts to persuade him not to fight because her prophecies suggest he will lose. These appear not only in the early *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum* but in the four texts which are based on it, though not in other sources for the crusade: all these are likely to pre-date 1110.[21] The list of Saracen kings at the battle of Antioch appears in closely similar form in Peter Tudebode, who was an eyewitness at least to events at Jerusalem.[22] Both Raymond of Aguilers and Fulcher of Chartres preserve material about Amedelis as Corbaran's confidant and his game of chess before the battle of Antioch. Ralph of Caen refers to the game of chess in terms that suggest it was widely known; interestingly most of the verse in his account is centred on events

[21] Latin texts are footnoted in translations (where these exist). For editions of the texts see the bibliography. Here *GF*: *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, ed. and trans. R. Hill (London, 1962); PT: *Peter Tudebode: Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, trans. J. H. and L. L. Hill (Philadelphia, 1974). For a recent discussion see J. Rubinstein, 'What is the *Gesta Francorum* and who was Peter Tudebode?', *RM*, 77 (2005), pp. 179–204. *GF* was reworked by three Benedictine clerics in the first decade of the century: Baudri of Bourgueil, bishop of Dol; Guibert of Nogent, abbot of St-Germer de Fly; and Robert the Monk [BB; GN; RM]. BB added elegance but relatively little new material (*Historia Jerosolymitana*, *RHC Occ* 4, pp. 1–111). GN added historical context alongside new and sometimes lurid material: *The Deeds of God through the Franks: A translation of Guibert de Nogent's Gesta Dei per Francos*, trans. R. Levine (Woodbridge, 1997). RM included additional material from an unidentified source: *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, trans. C. E. Sweetenham (Aldershot, 2005). The passage in question describes Corbaran's mocking of some elderly Christian weapons, his summoning of other Saracen help, and a long burlesque discussion with his mother who foretells doom and suggests he should flee: *GF*, pp. 51–6, followed by PT 93-96, BB, pp. 60–64; GN, pp. 96–8; RM, pp. 154–7. The *Antioche*'s version is translated from RM and holds no clues to an earlier rendering.

[22] PT, pp. 97–8 for the list of kings; p. 116 for his presence at Jerusalem.

at Antioch and his translators suggest this may come from a fictional epic source.[23] Guibert of Nogent is the only chronicler to refer to the Tafurs, and to link them with cannibalism.[24] Such legendary material is found in particular in the chronicle of Albert of Aachen: his description of Soliman, the embassy to the Sultan by Sansadoine and references to Rosseleon (the Rouge Lion of the *Antioche*) are all closely paralleled in the extant *Antioche*.[25]

Insofar as we can draw any conclusions about this material, it all relates to the depiction of Saracen opponents and to events at Antioch. It is also striking that different elements of similar material appear across such a wide range of chronicles: this suggests both that chroniclers drew separately on the material and that it was well known.

It is hard to gauge how much, if any, of this material is reflected in the extant text. The *Antioche* incorporates Saracen-related material found in Albert and Robert, and when this is the case the text prefers the version mediated by them; we cannot assume it preserves material from any earlier tradition unchanged. The scenes of Corbaran in the run-up to the battle and the cannibalism of the Tafurs both show close similarities to what is preserved in other texts, although this might reflect acquaintance with legend and tradition around the Crusade rather than any specific text. Perhaps the most likely survival is the list of Saracen kings also quoted in Tudebode. More speculatively, the runs of formulaic *laisses* that describe the disposition of forces around Antioch, Adhemar's attempts to persuade other leaders to carry the Lance out to battle in Antioch and the marching out of the squadrons for the battle itself may also reflect the incorporation of pre-existing *chanson de geste* style material.[26]

Other episodes in the *Antioche* are similar in nature but not corroborated in any other account. Much of this material recounts individual exploits: the capture of a warhorse by Gontier of Aire; the heroism of Raimbaut Creton; the episode of

---

[23] Raymond of Aguilers [RA] was another eyewitness and chaplain to Raymond of St-Gilles: *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Jerusalem*, trans. J. H. and L. L. Hill (Philadelphia, PA, 1968). Fulcher of Chartres [FC] was chaplain to Baldwin of Boulogne, later Baldwin I of Jerusalem: after Baldwin took Edessa he was not present on the Crusade and drew on *GF* and RA: *Fulcher of Chartres: a history of the expedition to Jerusalem*, trans. H. S. Fink and Sister F. R. Ryan (Knoxville, TN, 1969). For Amedelis and chess see RA, p. 62; FC, pp. 104–5. Ralph of Caen [RC] comments, 'Persarum satrapam scaccis operam dare fama est' ('it is well known that the satrap of the Persians was playing chess'): *The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen: a history of the Normans on the First Crusade* (Aldershot, 2005), p. 106.

[24] GN, p. 146.

[25] Albert of Aachen [AA], *Historia Ierosolimitana: History of the Journey to Jerusalem*, ed. and trans. S. B. Edgington (Oxford, 2007). For details see discussion below.

[26] Laisses 127–39; 307–14; 315–28. On resemblances between *GF* and the *Antioche* see J. Beer, 'Heroic language and the eyewitness: the *Gesta Francorum* and the *Chanson d'Antioche*', in D. P. and M. J. Schenck (eds), *Echoes of the Epic: Studies in Honor of Gerard J. Brault* (Birmingham, AL, 1998), pp. 1–16 and below, chapter 3.

Eurvin of Creel, Pierre Postel and a donkey; the death of Rainald of Toul at the battle of Antioch; and Wicher's heroism in capturing the standard afterwards.[27] All these are ascribed to soldiers from the area of NE France and Lotharingia in which the *Antioche* originates: arguably these represent authentic traditions handed down in families and incorporated at some point in the *Antioche*. Some are clearly signposted as discrete episodes with a formula such as 'or oiés' or 'or escoutés'.[28] There are a few further elements not found elsewhere: the positive role played by Taticius; a raid on a baggage train during the siege of Antioch; Adhemar's suggestion of an embassy to Corbaran; Bohemond's canvassing of opinion in the army; and the heroism of Godfrey pursuing Corbaran after the battle of Antioch.[29] How far these represent embellishment at a late stage and how far original material we cannot determine. The most we can say is that some of the material preserved in the extant *Antioche* would not look out of place in a more conventional *chanson de geste*.

None of this is sufficient evidence to say that there was an early *chanson de geste* about the Crusade. There was certainly nothing out of the ordinary in literary accounts being generated virtually in parallel with events. In Latin Bishop Guy of Amiens produced a verse account of the Norman Conquest within ten years.[30] William IX, as explained above, allegedly produced entertaining poems about his own experiences on the disastrous follow-up to the Crusade in 1101. We know too that the conventions for depicting Saracens were well established by 1100: the Oxford version of the *Chanson de Roland* already contains orchards and luxury, the unholy trinity of Apollon, Mohammed and Tervagant overthrown in defeat, and lists of fantasy names and people.[31] So there is nothing surprising in the concept of some kind of early fantasy material depicting Saracens in line with the conventions of the *chanson de geste*: it is, interestingly, in the context of this material that the reference to Richard is found.[32]

However, this does not mean that such a text existed. It has been generally assumed that it did, largely on the basis that the extant *Antioche* is a *chanson de geste*, and on the characteristics of the preserved material. Equally it could

---

[27] Gontier, laisses 142–3; Raimbaut Creton, laisses 167–9; Eurvin and Pierre, laisse 303; Rainald, laisse 334; Wicher, laisse 358.

[28] Laisse 167, v. 3815; laisse 358, v. 9080.

[29] The raid at laisses 144–5; Adhemar's suggestion, laisse 294; Bohemond's foreshadowing of Henry V, laisse 302; Godfrey's pursuit of Corbaran, laisses 362–5.

[30] *The Carmen de Hastingae Proelio of Guy, Bishop of Amiens*, ed. C. Morton and H. Muntz (Oxford, 1972).

[31] For dating see C. Samaran, 'Sur la date approximative du *Roland* d'Oxford', *R*, 94 (1973), pp. 523–7; G. J. Brault, *The Song of Roland: An Analytical Edition* (2 vols, London, 1978), vol. 1, p. 4. For Saracen luxury in the *Roland* see vv.11–13; for Saracen gods dethroned vv.2580–91; for names vv. 3220–61.

[32] In the list of Saracen kings of Antioch shared with Tudebode: laisse 356; PT, pp. 97–8.

have represented gossip and popular material that used the conventions of the *chanson de geste* to depict the Saracen opponent because that was the obvious frame of reference. Either way it was sufficiently well known for some elements to make their way into contemporary Latin chronicles. There is, however, not enough evidence to assert that a full Old French *chanson de geste* describing the Crusade existed at or shortly after it.

An early Occitan poem about the Crusade

What we do have evidence for is an Occitan poem describing the Crusade and virtually contemporary with it, although again we do not know whether it was a *chanson de geste* or some other type of poem. The chronicler Geoffrey of Vigeois, writing towards the end of the twelfth century, describes how an otherwise unknown Gregory Bechada wrote an 'ingens volumen', 'materna … lingua, ritmo vulgari' describing the events of the Crusade at the request of Bishop Eustorge of Limoges; this was a major work taking, according to Vigeois, twelve years to write. The description implies that he drew on eyewitness accounts, notably seeking advice from an otherwise unknown 'Gaubertus … Normannus'.[33] It dates from the first half of the twelfth century, probably earlier rather than later.[34] We do not know what metre or form the poem used, or how far it might have reflected early *chanson de geste* conventions. We can, though, surmise that it was an unusual work given the amount of space Vigeois devotes to describing it: it is unique in his chronicle. More generally, we know that the early twelfth century was a time of literary experiment in Occitania: Bechada's text would be near contemporary, for example, with the lyrics of William IX of Aquitaine, Cercamon and Marcabru.[35]

This work does not survive: the extant *Canso* is much later and closely related to the Old French version.[36] So we cannot speculate about how it might have related to the possible *chanson de geste* lurking behind the early twelfth-century Latin chronicles of the Crusade. But it strengthens the case that such material might have existed.

---

[33] Geoffrey of Vigeois, *Chronica Gaufredi coenobitae*, in *Novae Bibliothecae Manuscript librorum: Rerum Aquitanicarum praesertim Bituricensium uberrima collectio*, ed. Philippe Labbé (2 vols, Paris, 1657), vol. 2, pp. 279–342; vol. 1, p. 30.

[34] For discussion see *The Canso d'Antioca: An Occitan Epic of the First Crusade*, ed. C. Sweetenham and L. M. Paterson (Aldershot, 2003), pp. 8–9 [*Canso*].

[35] For an overview see S. G. Nichols, 'The early troubadours', in S. Gaunt and S. Kay (eds), *The Troubadours: An Introduction* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 66–82.

[36] *Canso*, pp. 26–7.

References during the twelfth century

By the end of the twelfth century some form of this material had clearly metamorphosed into a recognisable *chanson de geste*. However, the two key references are both in Occitan, and therefore we do not know whether they relate to an Old French version or to an Occitan version.

The first comes in an Occitan *ensenhamen* by the Catalan troubadour Guiraut de Cabrera addressed to his *jongleur* Cabra.[37] The premise is that the unfortunate Cabra is so poor at his job that he does not know any of the texts he should, and to prove the point the poem helpfully lists what these are. Most of the 142 names in the poem refer to *chansons de geste*. One of these is a 'canso d'Antioca'. The date of the *ensenhamen* has been variously set between 1150 and 1198.[38] This suggests strongly that by the end of the twelfth century at the latest there was a poem about the crusade that was well known and likely to have been a *chanson de geste*. The reference also suggests that its focus was events at Antioch, not the crusade more generally.

What we do not know is whether this refers to an Occitan or a French version. Cabrera's poem is of no help since it refers indiscriminately to French and Occitan texts. We know that there was substantial cross-over between Occitan and French epic: *Daurel et Beton* for example is closely related to the Anglo-Norman *Beuve de Hantone*.[39] So it would have been quite possible for an Occitan audience to know a French epic, and indeed for it to have been adapted into Occitan. Equally it could have been an independent Occitan work which might either be or have links back to Bechada's earlier work.

The second reference lies in the Occitan *Canso de la Crozada*, a chronicle of the Albigensian Crusade written in the metre and style of a *chanson de geste*. The first author was Guilhem of Tudela, a cleric from Navarre; the second part is by an anonymous author probably from Toulouse. Tudela's work dates from no later than 1212–13.[40]

Tudela states at the start of his poem that he is modelling his work on the *Canso d'Antioca*:

---

[37] Giraut in F. Pirot (ed.), *Recherches sur les connaissances littéraires des troubadours occitans et Catalans des XIIe et XIIIe siècles* (Barcelona, 1972), pp. 546–62; for Vigeois see P. Botineau, *La Chronique de Geoffroi de Breuil, Prieur de Vigeois*, doctoral thesis (Paris, 1964).

[38] Views on the dating have varied from 1150 to near the end of the twelfth century: for a recent dating of 1196–98 see S. M. Cingolani, 'The *sirventes-ensenhamen* of Guerau de Cabrera: A Proposal for a New Interpretation', *JHR*, 1 (1992–93), pp. 191–201.

[39] *Daurel et Beton*, ed. A. S. Kimmel (Chapel Hill, 1971), pp. 43–6.

[40] J.-M. d'Heur, 'Sur la date, la composition et la destination de la *Chanson de la Croisade Albigeoise* de Guilhem de Tudèle', in *Mélanges d'histoire littéraire, de linguistique et de philologie romane offerts à Charles Rostaing par ses collègues, ses élèves et ses amis* (Liège, 1974), pp. 231–66.

> Senhor, esta canso es faita d'aital guia
> Com sela d'Antiocha et ayssi.s versifia
> E s'a tot aital so, qui diire lo sabia[41]

He takes the style, rhyme scheme and tune of the earlier work about the First Crusade for his own account of the Albigensian Crusade. His work and the extant fragment of the *Canso* do indeed share a rhyme scheme, the distinctive six-syllable *vers orphelin* at the end of each laisse. His work also contains some verbal reminiscences of the Madrid fragment, although it is dangerous to read too much into these in a formulaic genre like the *chanson de geste*.[42] What this tells us is that by 1212 there was a distinctive Occitan *chanson de geste* about the First Crusade, identified with/focusing on events at Antioch in particular; it was written in alexandrines with a *vers orphelin*. It does not tell us anything about the content or relationship to any Old French text.

What both these references tell us is that some version of a *chanson de geste* about Antioch was well known in Occitania by the start of the thirteenth century. Tudela's use of it as a model strongly suggests it was Occitan, although Cabrera's reference leaves open the possibility that an Old French version was also known.

References in the *Antioche* itself also point to the last quarter of the twelfth century. Duparc-Quioc locates it precisely in 1177 on a number of grounds: allusions to the *Proverbes au Vilain* composed at that time; two allusions to the shield of Flanders bearing a lion, attested c.1170; repeated criticism of the house of Blois, reflecting enmity between the houses of Blois and Flanders and the less than impressive behaviour of Stephen of Blois' grandson, another Stephen, in Outremer in 1170; a reference to Prester John, a figure of interest in the 1170s; and two references to the Seven Sleepers, of whom an arm was translated to St-Vaast of Arras in 1173. She argues that it should be seen as an excitatorium to crusade in the context of the pilgrimage of Philippe d'Alsace in 1177.[43] Cook and Sumberg both place the text in 1180–90.[44] If we accept these references as pointing to a date

---

[41] 'My lords, this song is crafted in the same form as the one about Antioch, and has the same verse form, and the same tune for anyone who knows how to sing it' (our translation): *Chanson de la Croisade contre les Albigeois*, ed. E. Martin-Chabot (3 vols, Paris, 1931–60); reprinted with translation by H. Gougaud, *Chanson de la Croisade Albigeoise* (Paris, 1989); see also J. Shirley (trans.), *The Song of the Cathar Wars* (Aldershot, 2000) [*Crozada*].

[42] Compare *Crozada* laisse 93 and *Canso* v. 577, where there is a near-identical reference to Roncevaux; *Crozada* laisse 122 and *Canso* vv. 552–3.

[43] Duparc-Quioc, *Etude*, pp. 132–9.

[44] L. Sumberg suggests 1192 as the latest possible date, linking the poem to the Third Crusade: *La Chanson d'Antioche: étude historique et littéraire, une chronique en vers français de la première croisade par le Pèlerin Richard* (Paris, 1968), pp. 357–64; Hatem also suggests 1190 (p. 344). Cook dates the central trilogy of the Cycle between 1150 and 1190: 'Les épopées de la croisade', in H. van Dijk and W. Noonen (eds), *Aspects de l'épopée romane: mentalités, idéalogies, intertextualités* (Groningen, 1995), pp. 93–110.

in the 1170s, they might be seen as evidence of a version produced at this time fossilised in the current text.

Summary

We have no extant crusade *chanson de geste* in French or Occitan that can be dated to the twelfth century. However, references in Latin chronicles suggest that by the early twelfth century there was some kind of recognised body of material that centred around Antioch and used the conventions of the *chanson de geste* to describe Saracen activities. There is evidence that such a *chanson de geste* existed in Occitania by the start of the thirteenth century, was sufficiently well recognised to serve as a model for the *Crozada* and might in some form date back to the early twelfth century; in parallel Bechada produced a poem in the early twelfth century although there is no evidence this was a *chanson de geste*. Although a number of references in the extant *Antioche* also seem to point towards a late twelfth-century dating, it is unclear whether an Old French equivalent existed. Some form of *chanson de geste* about the Crusade clearly did exist by the end of the twelfth century, and elements of it may be near contemporary with the First Crusade. Interestingly this is not too different from what the *Antioche* itself tells us, namely that an older oral (assonanced?) version was subsequently put into rhyme and written down by an anonymous author.

Sources for the extant *Antioche*: a summarised version of Albert of Aachen, Robert the Monk and a 'St-Pol text'?

The extant text of the *Antioche* is unusual in that it is a *chanson de geste* that shows close parallels with Latin chronicles.[45] The first two-thirds of the text show numerous parallels with the *Historia Ierosolymitana* of the Rhineland chronicler Albert of Aachen, the last third with the *Historia Iherosolymitana* of the French chronicler Robert the Monk. In addition there is abundant material on the exploits of the St-Pol family, little of which is preserved elsewhere.

Parallels with Albert of Aachen

Albert's chronicle is both the fullest account of the Crusade and independent from other accounts: it presents a Lotharingian version of the Crusade with heavy

[45] Unusual but not unique: *Raoul de Cambrai* shows close similarities to the *Chronique de Waulsort*. See introduction to *Raoul de Cambrai*, ed. and trans. S. Kay (Oxford, 1992); D. Misonne, *Eilbert de Florennes: histoire et légende, la geste de Raoul de Cambrai* (Louvain, 1967).

emphasis on events in Germany and eastern France, and with Godfrey playing a leading role. It is likely to have been completed no later than 1119.[46] We do not know what Albert's sources were: he says himself that he relied on contemporary and eyewitness testimony and there is little reason to doubt him.[47]

The first two-thirds of the *Antioche* show strong resemblances with Albert of Aachen. Peter's vision and the start of the Crusade are similar in both, although the *Antioche* omits much of Albert's detail and whole sections including, for example the persecution of the Jews in the Rhineland.[48]

Events at Nicaea also show strong parallels with Albert. Both share, for example, the initial assault before camp was established, the sending of Soliman as an envoy to seek help, and the deaths of Baldwin of Ghent, Baldwin Cauderon and Guy of Porsese. A similar list of names is given in both, and the reference to Bernard of Domedart as 'li delitous' is close to Albert's description of Bernard as 'dilectissimus in omni facto et forma delectabilis' ('very pleasing in every deed and delightful to look at').[49]

At Dorylaeum both place the battle in the valley of 'Gorgonie'. Both describe Bohemond splitting off to go foraging, and the concerns of Robert of Normandy and Stephen of Blois about dispersing forces too far. In both a messenger was sent to Godfrey. Soliman fled to the mountains and the description of booty is similar.[50]

Both texts devote attention to the complicated series of events in which Baldwin and Tancred fought over the possession of various Cilician cities and in which Baldwin eventually became count of Edessa in murky circumstances. The *GF* compresses these events, saying only that Tancred gave Tarsus to Baldwin and retained Adana and Mamistra himself. Fulcher of Chartres, who as Baldwin's chaplain could have been expected to have a close knowledge of events, compresses events into one short chapter. By contrast, Albert and the *Antioche* give a detailed account of both episodes, something found elsewhere only in RC, albeit there from a different point of view.[51]

The parallels continue in events leading up to the taking of Antioch. At Artah both texts refer to Gosson, son of Conon of Montaigu: however in the *Antioche*

---

[46] AA, pp. xxiv–v.

[47] 'ex his aliqua memorie commendare que auditu et relatione nota fierent ab his qui presentes affuissent' (I decided to commend to posterity at least some of the things that were made known to me by listening to those who had been there and to their reports'): pp. 2–3.

[48] Laisses 15–18, 35–7; AA, pp. 2–9.

[49] Laisses 48–88. For the initial assault see AA, pp. 92–5; for the three deaths compare laisse 75 and AA, pp. 110–13; for the list of names see laisse 50 and AA, pp. 96–101; for Bernard v. 8129 and AA, pp. 98–9.

[50] Laisses 89–105. For Gorgonie vv. 1759, 1944, 2003, 2024, 2172 and AA, pp. 128–9; for splitting forces AA, pp. 128–9; for the messenger laisse 98 and AA, pp. 132–3; for Soliman and booty AA, pp. 136–7.

[51] Laisses 106–13; GF, pp. 24–5, FC, pp. 88–92; RC, pp. 57–73; AA, pp. 144–81.

he died in battle, in Albert of illness.[52] Both have Adhemar's instructions about keeping the forces together.[53] The description of the Iron Bridge is the same, as is the release of the prisoners from Civetot; the Turkish survivors alerted Garsion, who prepared for siege.[54] Both have Taticius at the siege and the burning of a siege engine on the bridge.[55] They share a long account of the embassy to the sultan of Persia but many of the details are different. Albert refers to another son, Buldagis, being sent before Sansadoine. In Albert Soliman participated in Garsion's council of war; in the *Antioche* he arrived dramatically part way through. The *Antioche* is alone in having the gruesome use of Garsion's beard as a token.[56] Albert has a long account of a Turkish child taken hostage and released alongside a reference to the son of Antioch's betrayer: the *Antioche* compresses the two into one.[57]

From this point the *Antioche* abandons Albert as its main source. There is only one further parallel: the solo flight of Garsion after the fall of Antioch and the grisly details of his severed head.[58]

The pattern of events and construction of the storyline in the *Antioche* and Albert is the same. There are shared episodes found nowhere else, such as the deaths of the two Baldwins and Guy of Porsese. The same lists of names occur. There is the same emphasis on the heroism of Godfrey. The achievements of the St-Pols and others from north-eastern France are highlighted. The attitude to the Byzantines is positive. Albert refers to Rosseleon as one of the four deputy rulers of Antioch, a clear precursor of the Rouge Lion of the *Antioche*.[59]

However, while the two texts run in parallel, they are not identical. The *Antioche* omits large tracts of material: while this might be explained as reflecting the need to summarise Albert's copious detail, some of the episodes excluded would have sat well in the *Antioche*: for example Godfrey's fight with a bear or the St-Pols protecting Christians foraging.[60] Even where episodes are shared the details are often different: the *Antioche* telescopes into one the two Turkish child hostages at Antioch, and Gosson of Montaigu dies of illness in Albert but (more heroically) in battle in the *Antioche*.

One explanation for this hit and miss pattern of resemblances is that the two texts share a common lost source. Knoch has argued that such a source lies behind Albert's work.[61] While not impossible, there is no corroborative evidence.

---

52 Laisses 114–15; AA, pp. 186–7.

53 Laisse 124; AA, pp. 190–91.

54 Laisse 146 for the bridge; AA, pp. 192–5.

55 Laisse 149–50; AA, pp. 200–201 and 202–5.

56 Laisses 189–224 for the embassy and its consequences; laisses 191–3 for increasingly gory description of the beard; compare AA, pp. 248–51 and 254–61.

57 Laisses 229–32; AA, pp. 224–9 and 272–5.

58 Laisses 370–71; AA, pp. 286–7.

59 AA, pp. 196–7; 326–7.

60 AA, pp. 142–5; 212–15.

61 P. Knoch, *Studien zu Albert von Aachen* (Stuttgart, 1966).

In our view the resemblance has two sources. Up to a point it can be explained by the fact that Albert and the *Antioche* both draw on earlier *chanson de geste* style material: the ghosts of now lost campfire songs, tales of individual heroism and wild speculation about the Saracen enemy fuelled by popular stereotypes.

But this does not explain the close resemblance of storyline, episode and approach in the two texts. They share a clear and consistent account of events from a north-eastern and Lotharingian perspective. This is marked by an emphasis on the role of Peter the Hermit at the expense of the pope, the leadership of Godfrey and focus on deeds by Godfrey's followers. There is no reason to deny Albert the credit for producing this version of events, based as he says on the accounts of participants. However, it is not the version used by the *Antioche*. Instead it appears to be using a summarised or abstracted version of Albert as the framework of the first two-thirds of the text. Here we are firmly in the realm of surmise. But we know from the growth of legends about the Swan Knight and Godfrey that interest in the Crusade remained strong in the north-east of France and Lotharingia: there would at the least have been a context for the production of such a version.

Parallels with Robert the Monk

Borrowings from Robert begin abruptly at laisse 238 with the arrival of Corbaran to besiege Antioch. The arrival of Corbaran, the episode with Calabra, the finding of the Lance and Bohemond's anger over the warriors trapped in the tower are all from Robert in a borrowing stretching over 30 laisses, with some material added about Sansadoine. The account of the embassy to Corbaran is Robert's, but with some additions such as Adhemar's suggestion of the embassy and Bohemond's sounding out of morale in the army. Material about the game of chess and the role of Amedelis common with Raymond of Aguilers and Fulcher of Chartres is also added in, as is the episode of Pierre Postel and Eurvin of Creel.[62]

The account of the battle itself is shaped around three formulaic sets of laisses: Adhemar's attempts to persuade each leader in turn to carry the Lance into battle; the marching out of the squadrons; and a set of single combats.[63] There is also some unique material, notably the death of Rainald of Toul and the capturing of the standard by Wicher.[64] Rather than forming the basis for the account, sections of material from Robert are inserted into it: Adhemar's sermon, the Occitan spy, the grass fire, Odo of Beauvais, the intervention of the white forces, and the

62 RM, pp. 150–67.

63 Laisses 307–14; 315–28; 339–44.

64 Rainald laisses 333–4; Wicher laisse 358.

death of Gerard of Melun.[65] The final *laisses* of the text describing Bohemond's manoeuvring to consolidate control of Antioch are likewise from Robert.[66]

As with the sections reflecting Albert, the material is close but not identical. The storyline is Robert's, but heavily interspersed with other material. Some passages are the same almost word for word.[67] Indeed as Duparc-Quioc has pointed out, the *Antioche* even faithfully reproduces mistakes by Robert.[68] Other passages change details or introduce different details: for example, the *Antioche* inserts an offer of champions' combat into Robert's account of the embassy to Corbaran.[69] The two sources are therefore used rather differently: the compiler seems to have been working from a source close to rather than identical with Albert's text, whereas his use of Robert is based on the extant text.

It is not surprising that an author needing a source for the Crusade should use Robert. Robert's version of the Crusade, produced in 1106–1107 and closely following the account of the *GF*, was the most popular account by a factor of ten. His work survives in around 100 manuscripts: these are widely spread geographically but show some concentration in Germany and north-eastern France.[70] So his was the obvious account to choose: a text was likely to be readily available, and his popularity guaranteed *auctoritas*.

What is unclear is why the author should suddenly start to use Robert for the final third of the text and why he should continue to insert other material. One possibility is that Robert's account was seen as more appropriate for the climactic battle than Albert's, emphasising the divine intervention of the white forces: however the patchy use of it suggests otherwise. It is possible that the Albert-based source material simply stopped after the taking of the city: although the final episode of Garsion's flight suggests otherwise, this could have been moved back from its original position.

---

65 Laisse 329 and RM, p. 169; laisse 329 and RM, pp. 168–9; vv.8392–5 and RM, p. 172; laisses 339–40 and RM, p. 171; laisse 358 and RM, pp. 171–2; laisse 360 and RM, pp. 172–3.

66 Laisses 371–74; RM, pp. 174–5, much expanded.

67 Compare e.g. RM, p. 150 and *Antioche* vv. 6676–81, which is a faithful translation; RM, p. 171 and *Antioche* v. 9064, which both include St Maurice in the holy forces. Duparc-Quioc, *Etude*, pp. 108–10.

68 The Agulani were ferocious Saracen fighters. *GF* says they did not carry swords (p. 49); RM rather puzzlingly renders this as suggesting their horses disapproved of armed riders (p. 150), and *Antioche* v. 6570 follows RM's misapprehension. Similarly *GF* says the emperor retreated to Bulgaria and ordered a scorched earth policy (p. 65); RM skips to the emperor ordering a scorched earth policy in Bulgaria, which makes no sense (pp. 159–60); *Antioche* laisse 287 follows suit. See Duparc-Quioc's comments: *Etude*, p. 108.

69 RM, pp. 165–7; *Antioche* laisse 294.

70 For dating see RM, pp. 4–7; for ms numbers and dissemination, RM pp. 8–9.

Additional material on the St-Pols: the 'St-Pol text'

The exploits of the St-Pols, overlords of St-Pol-en-Ternois in Picardy, feature largely in the poem. They receive 68 mentions in 9,500 or so lines compared to 42 for Robert of Flanders and 47 for Robert of Normandy; only Bohemond, Tancred and Godfrey are mentioned more. Their heroism is consistently highlighted. Thus on arrival at Antioch Enguerrand finds the crucial ford across the Orontes, and urges the Christians to attack. Hugh is given an exploit during the siege, and plays a leading role in the episode of the child hostage. Enguerrand leads the way to the palace when Antioch falls and raises Bohemond's banner to symbolise the taking of the city. They are given their own column in the battle and their heroism picked out.[71]

However, this prominence is not reflected in contemporary accounts of the Crusade. The St-Pols are given one major exploit by Albert.[72] Otherwise Hugh is mentioned once in RC (as 'count of St-Pol'); Enguerrand is mentioned in addition in RA as the subject of a posthumous vision: he never reached Jerusalem, dying of illness at Ma'arrat.[73] It is of course possible that they played a larger role than preserved in any account, and that their exploits could have been remembered a century later even though not recorded.[74] But it is hard to believe they could have had anything like the prominence they are given in the *Antioche* and yet be virtually ignored by the contemporary chroniclers.

We cannot say for certain how much is poetic embellishment and how much a genuine family memory of achievements. We know that such memories could be preserved for generations and might for example be used as sermon illustrations.[75] So it is quite possible that a kernel of truth about Hugh and Enguerrand lies beneath the poetic exaggeration. It is also quite possible that some of this goes back to the early traditions of the Crusade preserved in Albert: the extant *Antioche* may have been continuing and embroidering a legend which already existed.[76]

However, the sheer amount of material suggests that some kind of text was commissioned at some point by the St-Pol family as a means of reflecting glory on

---

71 Laisses 119; 158; 230; 259; 321–2; 352.

72 AA, pp. 212–15.

73 RC, p. 74; RA, p. 89 and AA, pp. 374–7 for Enguerrand.

74 See E. van Houts, *Memory and Gender in Medieval Europe 900–1200* (Toronto, 1999), for discussion of how memory would preserve family traditions and exploits for a century and more.

75 Compare a late fifteenth-/early sixteenth-century document drawn up to remind preachers of facts relevant to the Las Tours family to use in sermons: A. Thomas, 'Le roman de Goufier de Lastours', *R*, 34 (1905), pp. 55–65.

76 See William of Tyre [WT], vol. 1, p. 272 for comments on the survival of collective memory: *A History of Deeds Done Beyond The Sea*, trans. E. A. Babcock and A. C. Krey (2 vols, New York, 1943).

the family.[77] We suggest it was based on a summary of Albert of Aachen and on the chronicle of Robert the Monk, with additional material from family reminiscences and legends. Conjecturally this text was used as a basis for the extant *Antioche*. We do not know at what point this text – the 'St-Pol text' – might have been written. We suggest, though, that the events of a century ago took on a new interest and urgency c.1200 that led to the commissioning of a new version of the *Chanson d'Antioche*.

Picardy in 1200, where the St-Pol lands lay, was a society in transition. Politically it was sandwiched between France and England. Socially this created a sense of insecurity as past certainties changed. The natural reaction was to look back to the glories of the past as a comfort and a means of self-affirmation.[78] One of the manifestations of this was a strengthened interest in genealogy, the family as tangible link between the past and the present. The region produced 'a surprising number of genealogies and genealogical histories of lay figures'.[79] Baldwin of Flanders, for example, dispatched clerks throughout Europe to discover the truth about the links between Charlemagne and his own ancestors.[80] Another and linked effect was that the deeds of ancestors assumed disproportionate importance. Lambert of Ardres, for example, fulminated about the supposed omission of Arnold of Guines from an account of the First Crusade and invented a highly unlikely excuse: that Arnold had failed to give the jongleur recording the events a pair of scarlet shoes, and been left out as a punishment.[81]

These trends came together in a new interest in history which was to lead to the creation of a new form: history written not in Latin or in French verse, but in French prose. Rather like Anglo-Norman England a century before, a need to affirm position in the face of uncertainty created a surge of interest in genealogy 'to revive lost dreams of glory, to vindicate motives and to mantle the discomfort

---

[77] See S. Duparc-Quioc, 'Recherches sur l'origine des poèmes épiques de Croisade et sur leur utilisation éventuelle par les grandes familles féodales', *Atti del convegno internazionale sul tema: la poesia epica e la sua formazione* (Rome: Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, 1970), pp. 771–92, for the connection between the *Antioche* and the St-Pols.

[78] G. Duby, *Le dimanche de Bouvines: 27 juillet 1214* (Paris, 1973); G. Spiegel, *Romancing the Past: The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-century France* (Berkeley, CA, 1993).

[79] *The History of the Counts of Guines and Lords of Ardres: Lambert of Ardres*, trans. L. Shopkow (Philadelphia, 2001), p. 22.

[80] Spiegel, pp. 70–73.

[81] Lambert of Ardres, *Chronique de Guines et d'Ardres*, ed. G. Ménilglaise (Paris, 1855), pp. 311–13; trans. Shopkow, pp. 164–6. Duparc-Quioc takes this as evidence of Richard's existence (*Etude*, p. 145). It is more likely to reflect the criticism *jongleurs* attracted as unreliable sources: see P. Damian-Grint, *The New Historians of the Twelfth-century Renaissance: Inventing Vernacular Authority* (Woodbridge, 1999), pp. 101–2.

that the contemplation of unwanted and adverse historical change germinated.'[82] This in turn generated a need for texts seen as accessible and reliable in 'un bouillonnement creative où s'essayent diverses formes.'[83] The starting point was six translations of the Pseudo-Turpin in the first decade or so of the century, the first commissioned by none other than Yolande of St-Pol.[84] It was not long before the new medium was also being used to portray contemporary events in the form of the accounts of the Fourth Crusade by Clari and Villehardouin, both of whom came from the same area of north-eastern France as the St-Pols.[85] These texts still bore the marks of their *chanson de geste* predecessors in language and formula. But they came with the added *auctoritas* of prose and of eyewitness testimony.[86]

The theme of crusade runs through all these developments. The First Crusade was used as an *exemplum*: Lambert of Ardres describes how Arnaut II de Guines whiled away a wet Picard day listening to stories about Arthur, Charlemagne, Tristan and Isolde, his own genealogy and the First Crusade. Bodel's *Jeu de St Nicolas* portrays the themes of the Crusade.[87]

Arguably the stimulus for this interest was the Fourth Crusade: 'there can be little serious doubt … of the topicality of the imminent Fourth Crusade in Arras at the turn of the century.'[88] The Crusade was a major enterprise for Picardy. Baldwin of Flanders led one of the main contingents and was later to become emperor of Constantinople. Many of the crusaders were from Flanders and Artois.[89] Robert de Clari produced a unique personal account of his experiences. The glorious example of the First Crusade acquired a new relevance both as an inspiration

---

[82] Spiegel, p. 1. Cf. J. Blacker: 'the Norman Conquest … precipitated among the native English the need to document property rights and among the new rulers the desire to explain their new blended heritage to themselves and to justify their supremacy to those they had conquered': *The Faces of Time: Portrayal of the Past in Old French and Latin Historical Narrative of the Anglo-Norman Regnum* (Austin, TX, 1994), p. xii.

[83] For Arras in the thirteenth century see M. Gally, 'Poésie en jeu: des jeux-partis aux fatrasies', in M-M. Castellani and J-P. Martin (eds), *Arras au Moyen Age: histoire et littérature* (Arras, 1994), pp. 71–80.

[84] Spiegel: pp. 70–73 for Baldwin; p. 70 for Yolande.

[85] Robert de Clari, *La Conquête de Constantinople*, ed. and trans. P. Noble (Edinburgh, 2005); Geoffroi de Villehardouin, *La Conquête de Constantinople*, ed. E. Faral (2 vols, Paris, 1961).

[86] P. F. Dembowski, *La Chronique de Robert de Clari: étude de la langue et du style* (Toronto, 1963); J. Dufournet, *Les écrivains de la IVe croisade* (2 vols, Paris, 1973).

[87] Lambert of Ardres, p. 217 and trans. Shopkow, p. 130; Jehan Bodel, *Le Jeu de St Nicolas*, ed. A. Henry (Geneva, 1981).

[88] D. Trotter, *Medieval French Literature and the Crusades* (Geneva, 1988), p. 234.

[89] For the Fourth Crusade see D. E. Queller and T. F. Madden, *The Fourth Crusade: The Conquest of Constantinople*, 2nd edn (Philadelphia, 1997), and J. Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade and the Sack of Constantinople* (London, 2005). On participants see J. Longnon, *Les Compagnons de Villehardouin: recherches sur les croisés de la quatrième croisade* (Geneva, 1978).

to set out on a new crusade and as a comforting memory to set against later disillusionment following events in Constantinople. The prologue to the *Antioche* certainly suggests an exhortatory function.[90]

The St-Pol family, in particular, was central to the Fourth Crusade. Hugh IV was one of the main leaders: 'il fut considéré comme un des chefs de la croisade, au meme titre que les comtes de Flandre et de Blois.'[91] For example he took a leading role in negotiations, accompanying Villehardouin on his mission to ensure that the count of Blois remained committed to the Crusade. He led in battle after battle, commanding the third battalion in the attack on the Golden Horn and the second battalion in fighting off the emperor's counter-attack at Constantinople. He carried Baldwin's sword at the coronation in Hagia Sophia. His reward was to become lord of Demotica until his death in 1205.[92]

What more natural, then, than for the St-Pol family of c.1200, already commissioning a translation of pseudo-Turpin and playing a leading role in the Fourth Crusade, to want to emphasise the heroism of their ancestors on the First Crusade?

We do not know what form this St-Pol text might have taken. It could have been either in Latin or the vernacular, although we suggest the latter given the commissioning of other vernacular works at the same time. It could, like the translations of the pseudo-Turpin, have been in prose. Or it could have been in verse. We do not know whether it was a *chanson de geste*. Its existence, however, might owe much to the preceding epic tradition.

It could be argued that there is no evidence such a text ever existed independently of the Cycle: in other words, why postulate a separate St-Pol predecessor version rather than accept the extant *Antioche* as the St-Pol commission? Two factors point to the existence of a separate and earlier text. The first is that borrowings from Albert and Robert are confined to the *Antioche*: there is no evidence of similar borrowing in the *Jérusalem* and *Chétifs* even though both chroniclers would have provided abundant material. This suggests that the *Antioche* has a different authorial history. The second is that the St-Pols are far less prominent in the *Jérusalem* and (unsurprisingly since they were not taken captive at Civetot) the *Chétifs*.[93] Enguerrand de St-Pol died of illness at Ma'arrat in 1098: he never made it to Jerusalem.[94]

---

[90] See e.g. laisse 6.

[91] Longnon, p. 195.

[92] Longnon, pp. 195–7; Queller and Madden, pp. 47, 52, 115, 123, 126–8, 175, 202. For his elevation to lord of Demotica see K.M. Setton et al. (eds), *A History of the Crusades*, 2nd edn (6 vols, Madison, WI, 1969–89), vol. 2, *The Later Crusades, 1189–1311*, ed. R. Wolff and H. W. Hazard, p. 192.

[93] Their only significant role in the *Jérusalem* is Enguerrand's death at the battle of Ascalon and his subsequent avenging by his father: laisses 242–5, 273. They appear in passing in one manuscript of the *Chétifs* at B73 and 3673.

[94] RA, p. 89; AA, p. 377.

We therefore conclude that the St-Pol family commissioned some kind of text, probably vernacular, at the start of the thirteenth century. It used a version of Albert's chronicle, which originated in Lotharingia, and completed the story using the well-known account by Robert. It added in abundant material on the exploits of the St-Pol family, which is likely to have come from family tradition and memory. We suggest that this text provides the substructure on which the *Antioche* was built.

How 'Graindor' turned this material into the nucleus of the Old French Crusade Cycle

We have argued above that material preceding the *Antioche* existed throughout the twelfth century. However, the *Antioche* is not found apart from the Cycle in any of the extant manuscripts, and none of the manuscripts pre-dates the thirteenth century. In this section we argue that the extant version was created at some point in the first half of the thirteenth century drawing heavily on the 'St-Pol text' by a compiler or compilers – 'Graindor' – who made two major innovations. He or they adopted and recast *chanson de geste* elements of the text: we examine this in detail in chapter 3. And he or they incorporated it into a whole cycle of chansons de geste, perhaps drawing on the memory of shadowy earlier texts. The *Antioche* became the basis for a trilogy with the *Chétifs* and the *Jérusalem* that would in turn develop into a whole cycle recounting the prehistory and post-history of the crusade: the Old French Crusade Cycle. Around a third of the material in the extant *Antioche* reflects this recasting.

The Old French Crusade Cycle

The OFCC comprises a series of texts that in its fullest form takes the story of the Crusade from the ancestry of Godfrey to the time of Saladin.[95] The texts fall broadly into three groups: the central Crusade trilogy of *Antioche-Chétifs-Jérusalem*; the Godfrey texts; and the continuations after the capture of Jerusalem in 1099 that are preserved in various combinations in four manuscripts.

The nucleus of the Cycle is generally considered to be the Crusade trilogy comprising the *Antioche*, the *Chanson des Chétifs* and the *Chanson de Jérusalem*.[96] The three texts together narrate the events of the First Crusade from its beginnings with Peter the Hermit to the battle of Ascalon, with a flashback to Civetot and the

[95] The entire Cycle has been edited in the monumental Alabama edition overseen by Nelson and Mickel. For an overview see E. J. Mickel, 'Writing the record: the OFCC', in Bennett et al (eds), *Epic and Crusade*, pp. 39–64.

[96] *Les Chétifs*, ed. G. Myers, Crusade Cycle V (1981); *La Chanson de Jérusalem*, ed. N. R. Thorp, Crusade Cycle VI (1992).

fate of Peter's followers in the middle. They are linked by a storyline centred on Corbaran's fall from favour with the sultan of Persia and the subsequent help he receives from the crusaders.

Godfrey does not play a dominant role in the Crusade trilogy. However he was soon to be transformed into the protagonist of the entire Cycle through the addition of a number of texts setting out his ancestry and childhood: the *Naissance* (in two versions known as the *Elioxe* and the *Béatrice*), the *Chevalier au Cygne*, the *Fin d'Elias*, the *Enfances Godefroi*, and the *Retour de Cornumarant*.[97] The source material, like the predecessors of the *Antioche* itself, was known in the last decade or so of the twelfth century: it is referred to by William of Tyre in the 1170s, by Geoffrey of Auxerre in 1187–88 and by Ambroise in his *Estoire de la Guerre Sainte*.[98] However, we cannot date the composition of the texts based on it more accurately than the first half of the thirteenth century.[99] There are two references to an otherwise shadowy author Renaus, who may have been the mastermind behind this section of the Cycle.[100] While the Godfrey texts have their own internal logic, they are only loosely connected to the central Crusade trilogy: Mickel suggests that the *Enfances* acts as a bridge to the crusade from the folkloric and romance themes reflected in the *Chevalier au Cygne*, with Calabra's prophecies forming the link.[101] The central trilogy itself was not retrospectively edited to give Godfrey greater prominence.[102]

Four manuscripts of the Cycle also preserve a set of texts known as the continuations: these comprise the *Chrétienté Corbaran*, *Prise d'Acre*, the *Mort Godefroi* and the *Chanson des Rois Baudouin* plus continuations taking the story

---

[97] *La Naissance du Chevalier au Cygne*: *Elioxe*, ed. E. J. Mickel and *Béatrice*, ed. J. A. Nelson, Crusade Cycle I (1977); *Le Chevalier au Cygne* and *La Fin d'Elias*, ed. J. A. Nelson, Crusade Cycle II (1985); *Les Enfances Godefroi* and *Le Retour de Cornumarant*, ed. E. J. Mickel, Crusade Cycle III (1999).

[98] WT IX.6: 'I purposely omit the story of the swan whence legend declares these brothers derived their origin, because, although many writers give that as true, it seems to be without foundation', trans. p. 388. For Geoffrey of Auxerre see F. Gastaldelli, 'Una sconosciuta redazione latina della Chanson du Chevalier au Cygne nel commento all'Apocalisse di Goffredo d'Auxerre, *A*, 42 (1968), pp. 491–501; Ambroise, *The History of the Holy War: Ambroise's Estoire de la Guerre Sainte*, trans. M. J. Ailes and M. Barber (Woodbridge, 2003), vv. 8497–9.

[99] All manuscripts except H date from between the mid-thirteenth and the first quarter of the fourteenth century: *Naissance*, Introduction, p. xxiii.

[100] *Enfances* v. 2412, and *Retour de Cornumarant* v. 1487.

[101] See E. J. Mickel, 'The *Enfances Godefroi*: An Epic in Formation', *R*, 117 (1999), pp. 98–114; 'Cyclical Formation: BNF fr.786 of the *Enfances Godefroi*', *R*, 118 (2000), pp. 529–41; 'The *Enfances Godefroi*: the making of popular history', *R*, 116 (1998), pp. 148–69.

[102] Nelson, *Le Chevalier au Cygne*, p. xxvi: 'The Swan Knight cycle remains relatively disjointed and ununified in the OFCC.'

of the crusades as far as Saladin.[103] They survive in two versions: the earlier is tentatively dated to the second half of the thirteenth century by its editor, the later to around 1300.[104] Insofar as any source can be identified, they are based on the chronicle of Ernoul.[105] Grillo suggests that by this stage verse chronicle had become 'an essentially unattractive generic backwater'.[106] Again the texts are at best loosely connected to the rest of the Cycle: the *Chrétienté* picks up the theme of Corbaran's conversion from the *Chétifs* and Godfrey is prominent until his death, but in general this part of the Cycle 'appears to have evolved rapidly … and never came under the control of a single superviser with talents matching those of Graindor de Douai.'[107]

The narrative of the central Crusade trilogy

It is hard to dispute Duparc-Quioc's view that the extant *Antioche* forms part of a trilogy at the heart of the Cycle along with the *Chétifs* and the *Jérusalem*.[108] A coherent storyline runs through all three centred around the relationship between Corbaran and the sultan of Persia and culminating in the Christians' triumphant capture and defence of Jerusalem: 'la pierre sur laquelle les trois chansons fondent leur unité, nous autorisant ainsi à definer un "cycle de Jérusalem"'.[109]

The *Antioche* begins with a very detailed account of Christian defeat at the battle of Civetot. Several of the Christians were taken captive: Richard of Caumont, Baldwin of Beauvais and Harpin of Bourges chief among them. These formed the band known as the 'chétifs'. The *Antioche* is at some pains to stress that it has the 'vrai commencement' to its story in the form of Peter the Hermit's vision and the defeat of the 'chétifs'.[110] After recounting events at Nicaea and Dorylaeum, the remaining two-thirds of the text focus on the siege and battle of Antioch and the need to defeat the Turkish general Corbaran. The sultan of Persia entrusts his son

---

[103] *The Jérusalem Continuations: Part I, La Chrétienté Corbaran*, ed. P. R. Grillo (1984); *Part II: La Prise d'Acre, La Mort Godefroi and La Chanson des Rois Baudouin*, ed. P. R. Grillo (1987); Crusade Cycle VII; *The Jérusalem Continuations: the London–Turin version*, ed. P. R. Grillo (1994), Crusade Cycle VIII. Each of the manuscripts in which these are preserved has a different selection of texts; the fullest set is in B.N. 12569.

[104] Grillo, *Continuations* II, p. xxxv; *London/Turin*, p. 32.

[105] Grillo, *Continuations* II, p. xxx.

[106] Ibid., p. xxii

[107] Ibid., p. xv.

[108] S. Duparc-Quioc, *Le Cycle de la Croisade* (Paris, 1955), pp. 69–74.

[109] P. Péron, *Les croisés en orient: la représentation de l'espace dans le cycle de la croisade* (Paris, 2008), p. 553.

[110] At v.13. It is not entirely clear whether the 'vrai commencement' refers to the theme of the vengeance of Christ set out in detail in the prologue, to Peter's Crusade and the subsequent captivity of the 'chétifs', or both.

Brohadas to Corbaran, to be guarded on pain of death. However, Brohadas is killed at the battle of Antioch, his death receiving considerable attention in the text. This leaves Corbaran in severe trouble with the sultan at the end of the *Antioche*: not only had he been defeated, but he was responsible for the death of the sultan's heir.

The three episodes of the *Chanson des Chétifs* that follow describe how the 'chétifs' restored Corbaran's position. Richard of Caumont fought a judicial duel on his behalf; Baldwin of Beauvais freed his land from a three-headed serpent; and Harpin of Bourges saved his nephew from being kidnapped by a monkey. Corbaran ended the *Chétifs* the best of friends with his captives, and released them to go to Jerusalem for the climax of the Crusade.

The start of the *Chanson de Jérusalem* shows their return to the Crusade, where their first activity is to win a skirmish. The *Jérusalem* then goes on to portray events at Jerusalem as a rerun of events at Antioch: the siege of Jerusalem corresponds to the siege of Antioch and the battle of Ascalon to the battle of Antioch. The 'chétifs' drop out of sight for the body of the poem, reappearing only as part of the forces in the battle of Ascalon. Their participation in the Crusade redeems not only their own honour, but that of the Crusade more generally: the one defeat suffered at Civetot is comprehensively reversed.

The *Antioche* and the *Jérusalem* are similar lengths and relate to historical events, albeit in highly fictionalised form (particularly the latter): the *Chétifs* is much shorter, forming a bridge between the two and, we may speculate, providing some light relief.[111] The three texts clearly function as a unity. They share characters: the soldiers of the *Antioche* reappear in the *Chétifs*, the Tafur King from the *Antioche* plays a major role in the *Jérusalem* and Eurvin de Creel and Raimbaut Creton are given vignettes in both the *Antioche* and the *Jérusalem*.[112] The storylines mirror each other: in the *Jérusalem* the bishop of Mautran plays a similar role to the bishop of Le Puy in the *Antioche*, and Cornumarant seeks help from the sultan in the same way as Sansadoine. They cross-refer: the *Chétifs* contains a reprise of the action in the *Antioche*, and Godfrey's 'coup épique' in the *Antioche* is referred to in the *Jérusalem*.[113] Themes recur consistently, for example (with wearisome regularity) women bringing water for soldiers to drink in battle,

[111] Duparc-Quioc's edition of the *Antioche* has 9582 lines; the *Jérusalem* ed. Thorp has 9891. The *Chétifs* has 4101.

[112] *Chétifs* vv. 475–80, 3864–72 for combatants familiar from the *Antioche*; *Jérusalem* vv. 3010–39 for the Tafur king leading a squadron and vv. 4792–8 for his opening the gates of Jerusalem; *Antioche* laisse 303 for Eurvin and laisses 167–9 for Raimbaut, *Jérusalem* vv. 3561–774 for the reappearance of Eurvin and Raimbaut.

[113] *Chétifs* vv. 211–20 and vv. 735–49 for events at Antioch; *Jérusalem* vv. 7145–7 for reference to the 'coup épique' described at *Antioche* laisse 161.

the placing on battle of a Friday, and the fabulous Saracen tent.[114] All three texts are underpinned by the vengeance theme.[115]

Joins and inconsistencies are, however, more evident in the trilogy than the above description might suggest. The St-Pols are far less dominant after Antioch, their only substantive appearance in the *Jérusalem* being at the battle of Ascalon. The 'chétifs' largely disappear once they reach Jerusalem despite their heroic feats in converting Corbaran. The northern French baron Thomas of Marle is a key character in the *Jérusalem* despite featuring only in passing in the *Antioche*.[116]

How the central Crusade trilogy might have been compiled

We have argued above that the compiler – 'Graindor' – had two kinds of material at his disposal to create the *Antioche*: some kind of murkily attested preceding epic tradition, and an account of the Crusade based on Albert and Robert commissioned by the St-Pol family, the 'St-Pol text'. We suggest that he recast the latter drawing on the former to create the extant *Antioche*, which became the nucleus of the OFCC.

There is little evidence to suggest an equivalent ur-*Jérusalem*, and no external references to such a text.[117] For the *Jérusalem* the compiler(s) therefore created a close copy of the *Antioche*. The *Jérusalem* is almost exactly the same length as the *Antioche* and follows the same structure, with the siege of Jerusalem paralleling the siege of Antioch and the battle of Ascalon the battle of Antioch; it has with some justice been described as 'une copie … parfois servile' of the *Antioche*.[118] It is in places wildly unhistorical: Baldwin and Bohemond are both shown at the siege of Jerusalem although they were not there in reality, and Enguerrand of St-Pol is shown dying in battle at Ascalon when he had already in fact died

---

[114] *Antioche* laisses 99, 353 and *Jérusalem* vv. 260–66, 301, 586, 3310–12, 3486–8, 4570–78 for water carrying; *Chétifs* vv. 719 for Richard of Caumont's battle on Friday; *Antioche* laisse 201 and *Jérusalem* vv. 6088–172 for tents, *Antioche* laisse 201 and *Jérusalem* vv. 6158–9 for airborne image of Mohammed.

[115] *Antioche* laisses 8–14; *Chétifs* vv. 700–713; *Jérusalem* vv. 1383–9, 1652–3.

[116] He is mentioned 10 times in the *Antioche*: during the sieges of Nicaea and Antioch, climbing into Antioch and in the final battle. See Duparc-Quioc, *Edition*, p. 569.

[117] For discussion of whether the thirteenth-century Spanish compilation the *Gran Conquista de Ultramar* contains vestiges of an earlier *Jérusalem* see Duparc-Quioc, 'La *Chanson de Jérusalem* et la *Gran Conquista de Ultramar*', *R*, 66 (1940), pp. 32–48; N. R. Thorp, '*La Gran Conquista de Ultramar* et les origines de la *Chanson de Jérusalem*', in K.-H. Bender (ed.), *Les épopées de la croisade: Premier colloque international (Trèves, 6–11 août 1984)*, *ZFSL* – Beiheft 11 (Stuttgart, 1987), pp. 76–85. There is no doubt that the *Gran Conquista* preserves material not in our *Jérusalem*: the problem is the lack of evidence to ascribe it to an earlier – as opposed to different – version.

[118] Hatem, *Les poèmes*, p. 269.

of illness at Ma'arrat.[119] As in the *Antioche*, fact takes second place to literary construction. However, there is a recognisable factual sub-structure, for example in the disposition of the forces at Jerusalem.[120] The emphasis on Thomas of Marle may reflect now lost family stories.[121] There are a few shreds of unique material such as the names of the engineers who built the siege engines at Jerusalem.[122] This suggests that the compiler combined a general memory of events with the structure of the *Antioche*, adding references on occasion from unwritten or now lost popular tradition. It is interesting that there appears to have been no epic tradition on Jerusalem compared to the abundant material on Antioch.

Perhaps obviously, the compiler had little choice but to complete his story of the First Crusade with the conquest of Jerusalem. He did, however, have more latitude for the episodic series of skirmishes and sieges between Antioch and Jerusalem. This was an awkward time for the Crusade: there were serious differences of view, particularly between Raymond IV and Bohemond, and the leaders split off to undertake individual sieges. The clear sense of purpose that had brought the Crusade as far as Antioch was dissipated amidst some less than heroic behaviour.[123] It was not promising material for a crusade epic and there is no convincing evidence of any poetic predecessor. The author was therefore faced with an awkward hiatus in his narrative.

The manuscripts containing the *version ancienne* of the *Antioche* contain one solution to this in the form of the twelve laisses (fourteen in some manuscripts) known as the 'douze couplets' or twelve strophes.[124] These are a baldly told version of events between Antioch and Jerusalem covering some 200 lines. It has been argued that they represent an earlier poetic version on the grounds that they are assonanced rather than rhymed.[125] However, the fact that they are alexandrines

---

119 *Jérusalem* vv. 9688–730, 9778–9.

120 N. Thorp, 'La *Chanson de Jérusalem* and the Latin Chronicles', in Bennett et al (eds), *Epic and Crusade*, pp. 153–71; see 159–61 for comments on accuracy of siege disposition.

121 Duparc-Quioc, *Cycle*, pp. 18–30.

122 *Jérusalem* vv. 1895–7, 2194–5, 3375–92, 4422–3: they are called Nicolas and Grégoire and, interestingly, are from Arras. 'Unique' does not, however, mean accurate or authentic.

123 T. Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History* (London, 2004), p. 241: 'the entire expedition stalled, fragmented and was almost dissolved.' See also J. France, 'The Crisis of the First Crusade: from the defeat of Kerbogha to the departure from Arqa', *B*, 40 (1970), pp. 276–308.

124 The laisses appear in full in mss A, B and C and in part in mss. D and E. We translate them at the end of the main poem. See below for discussion of the different versions categorised by Duparc-Quioc. The twelve strophes have long been known as the 'douze couplets', and for consistency we have called them the twelve couplets even though they are not actual couplets.

125 *La Chanson d'Antioche*, ed. Paulin Paris (Paris, 1848), pp. lii–iii.

rather than decasyllabics argues against them being an early link passage, much less the 'brouillon' of Richard le Pèlerin.[126] It is hard to see them as anything but a link passage of indeterminate date by an author trying to fill an awkward gap.[127]

The compiler could have used Robert and Albert for source material as he had for the *Antioche*. Instead he came up with an original solution to this narrative hiatus: to insert the *Chanson des Chétifs* as a way of bridging the gap. The narrative is rewound to 1096–97 with the captivity of the 'chétifs'; the geographical focus is shifted hundreds of miles east to Sarmazane and Oliferne; and the principal characters of the Crusade are replaced by Corbaran and the 'chétifs'. The guiding theme of the three loosely linked episodes is the increasing dependence of Corbaran on the Christians as they win victories for him in three contexts: legal, spiritual and familial. By the end of the text Corbaran is on the brink of conversion to Christianity.[128] This has a dual purpose in the mythology of the Cycle. Corbaran, the arch-opponent, is not only defeated but converted. And the shame of Christian captivity is resoundingly wiped out as the Christians come to dominate their captor. The way is clear to ultimate victory in Jerusalem. In Péron's phrase, the *Chétifs* is a 'mise en oeuvre symbolique de la Croisade'.[129]

It is not clear where the source material of the *Chétifs* came from. There is no evidence to link the text to the experiences of William IX of Aquitaine in 1101 and he is strangely absent if he did indeed write the text.[130] The source of the first episode on Richard of Caumont is unknown, although some memory of Stephen of Caumont (who accompanied William IX in 1101) may lie behind it.[131] The second episode may have originated in Syria and more precisely Antioch. It contains a detailed reference suggesting that the text was written by a canon of St Peter's in Antioch for Raymond of Poitiers, and subsequently passed on to the Patriarch of Antioch.[132] This would date it no later than 1149 and give it an eastern origin, the assumption being that it would then have made its way to the west and eventually been incorporated in the Cycle. This theory is supported by alleged parallels to the

---

126 Sumberg, *Chanson d'Antioche*, p. 327. On the date of the emergence of the alexandrine see K. Togeby, 'Histoire de l'alexandrin francais', in P. Nyberg and H. Sorenson (eds), *Etudes romanes dédiées à Andreas Blinkenberg à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire* (Copenhagen, 1963), pp. 240–66.

127 Duparc-Quioc, *Etude*, pp. 235–42.

128 *Jérusalem* vv. 2764–9, 2933–41: his main concern is what his mother will say.

129 Péron, pp. 401–76, esp. 476.

130 P. Paris, *Nouvelles Etudes sur La Chanson d'Antioche* (Paris, 1878), pp. 18–20.

131 Riley-Smith tentatively identifies him as Richard of Chaumont-en-Vexin, brother of Hugh's brother-in-law Walo who died during the Crusade: *The First Crusaders, 1095–1131* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 231, 240. See also G. M. Myers, '*Les Chétifs*: étude sur le development de la chanson', *R*, 105 (1984), pp. 79–83.

132 *Chétifs* vv. 1663–78, 1773–80.

Byzantine epic text *Digenis Akritas*, which was fashionable in 1140s Byzantium.[133] There is no particular reason to disbelieve all this, but neither is there any reason to think it applies to more than the central Baldwin text; vv.1676–82 suggest as much. The third episode concerns Harpin of Bourges, a well-known figure of the crusade whose history is recounted at some length by Orderic Vitalis: possibly his name was annexed to a folkloric theme.[134] Myers suggests that the figures of Jean d'Alie and the abbé de Fécamp may refer to an eleventh-century abbot of Fécamp.[135]

Overall the *Chétifs* makes little sense as a free-standing text but entire sense in the context of the Cycle. This suggests that the three episodes might have been brought together specifically by the compiler to bridge a difficult part of his narrative.[136] Captivity was an ever-present preoccupation, and it is not surprising that it should form a key theme in the Cycle.[137]

---

[133] Hatem, *Les poèmes*, pp. 375–94; R. Goossens, 'Les recherches récentes sur l'épopée Byzantine', *AC*, 2 (1933), pp. 449–72; U. T. Holmes and W. M. McLeod, 'Source problems of the *Chétifs*: a Crusade chanson de geste', *RR*, 28 (1937), pp. 99–108; P. Bancourt, 'Etude de quelques motifs communs à l'épopée Byzantine de *Digenis Akritas* et à la *Chanson d'Aiol*', *R*, 92 (1974), pp. 508–32; *Digenis Akritis: the Grottaferrata and Escorial versions*, ed. and trans. E. Jeffreys (Cambridge, 1998), pp. lvi–lvii.

[134] According to OV, Harpin was taken captive in the Holy Land whilst helping fight off the emir of Egypt and held in Cairo. He was released after the personal intervention of the Byzantine emperor. He returned to Europe via Rome, where his meeting with Pope Paschal persuaded him to become a monk at Cluny (pp. 350–53). For folklore on abduction by monkeys see S. Thompson, *Motif-Index of Folk Literature* (6 vols, Bloomington, IN, 1955–58): Index R13.1.7.

[135] Myers, '*Les Chétifs*: étude', pp. 63–87, 76–87 for this and other identifications of the heroes of the *Chétifs*.

[136] Cahen also argues a combination of sources: '*Le Premier Cycle de la Croisade*: notes brèves à propos d'un livre (récent?)', *MA*, 63 (1957), pp. 311–28. Myers suggests that the Baudouin episode was added later to the original two: 'Le développement des *Chétifs*: la version fécampoise?' in Karl-Heinz Bender (ed.), *Les épopées de la croisade*, pp. 84–90. It has been argued by Duparc-Quioc (*Cycle*, p. 84) that the *Chrétienté Corbaran* represents a second half of the *Chétifs* by the same author: Corbaran's conversion, strongly hinted at in the *Chétifs*, becomes reality. However the *Chrétienté* is found only in the three manuscripts that preserve the continuations and never alongside the *Chétifs* itself. The main characters Baldwin of Beauvais and Richard of Caumont are absent. And it would not have been hard for a later editor to pick up the central theme as argued by Myers ('*Les Chétifs*: étude', pp. 74–5). So there is no obvious reason to see the *Chrétienté* as originating separately from the continuation texts which it accompanies. See P. R. Grillo, 'Les redactions de la *Chrétienté Corbaran*, première branche des continuations du Cycle de la Croisade', *Au Carrefour des routes d'Europe: la chanson de geste. Xe congrès international de la Société Rencesvals, Strasbourg 1985* (Aix-en-Provence, 1987), pp. 585–600.

[137] 'It is no coincidence that captivity forms one of the principal literary themes in the epic poetry inspired by the First Crusade': A.V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: a dynastic history 1099–1115* (Oxford, 2000), p. 109. On captivity in

The 'twelve couplets' and the *Chétifs* thus form two very different linkages between the *Antioche* and the *Jérusalem*. In the absence of firm evidence, one might surmise that the 'twelve couplets' were supplied at some point by a different author who was dissatisfied with the fictional linkage and sought something more factual to fill the gap.

In sum, we suggest the central Crusade trilogy was produced as follows. The compiler(s) started with a text produced for the St-Pols. This was rewritten extensively to transform it into a cyclic *chanson de geste*, reflecting the existence of an older *chanson de geste* tradition. The compiler(s) either did not have or did not like a similar version of events at Jerusalem, producing instead a version heavily based on events at Antioch. The events between Antioch and Jerusalem presented a problem: they were something of an anticlimax and lacked a clear narrative line. The compiler(s) filled this gap with a compilation of existing fantasy material that together formed the *Chétifs*. The three texts were thus welded into an ambitious narrative conception with a coherent storyline and shared characters and themes, bringing together disparate source material.

Material in the *Antioche* reflecting the compilation

Around a third of the material in the *Antioche* reflects the additions and changes needed to turn the source material into a coherent *chanson de geste* forming part of the central trilogy. There are three main additions: the vengeance theme and 'vrai commencement' at the start of the text; the narrative links forward to the *Chétifs* and *Jérusalem*; and internal links and repetitions.

The first 14 laisses act as introduction, constituting the 'vrai commencement' of the text with the theme of the vengeance of Christ which drives the whole Crusade and Peter the Hermit's vision of the Holy Sepulchre. The poem is insistent both that this is the true beginning and that it has been derived from not one but two earlier works. There are a number of possible reasons for this emphasis. The theme of the Crusade as vengeance for the sufferings of Christ was central to crusade propaganda, particularly by the end of the twelfth century: the prologue is clear that the text is an exhortation to crusade.[138] Peter the Hermit was from Amiens in

---

the *chanson de geste* see N. L. Bard, '"C'est bien costume que soit pris chevaliers": A Consideration of Captivity in the Guillaume Cycle', in A. Berthelot and L. Zarker Morgan (eds), *Acts of the Seventeenth International Congress of the Société Rencesvals for the Study of Romance Epic, Storrs, Connecticut, July 22–28, 2006* (2008), pp. 111–22.

[138] S. Throop traces the development of the concept and argues that it was widespread by the end of the twelfth century: 'Vengeance and the Crusades', *Crusades*, 5 (2006), pp. 21–38. See U. Schönung, 'Die Juden in der *Chanson d'Antioche*', *ZRP*, 102 (1986), pp. 40–52 for links between the vengeance theme and anti-Semitism. For the development of the theme, links to the Gospel of Nicodemus and diffusion see A. Micha, 'La légende de l'empereur malade et de la Vengeance du Sauveur dans les récits en prose française',