<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Copyists and redactors : Towards a prolegomenon to the editio princeps of Peregrinatio Antiochie per Vrbanum papam facta

Niskanen, Samu Kristian

Brepols
2019

Niskanen , S K 2019 , Copyists and redactors : Towards a prolegomenon to the editio princeps of Peregrinatio Antiochie per Vrbanum papam facta . in O Merisalo , S Niiranen & M Kuha (eds) , Transmission of Knowledge in the Late Middle Ages and the Renaissance . Brepols , Turnhout , pp. 103-114 . <https://doi.org/10.1484/M.BIB-EB.5.117235>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/304830>

<https://doi.org/10.1484/M.BIB-EB.5.117235>

publishedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

IV.

Historiography

Copyists and redactors

Towards a prolegomenon to the editio princeps of Peregrinatio Antiochie per Vrbanum papam facta

▼ **ABSTRACT** This is a textual and literary discussion on the four surviving versions of a history of the First Crusade, composed within a few years of the Christian capture of Jerusalem in 1099. The best-known of those four texts is *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, today one of the most widely read medieval histories. In contrast, one of the versions, *Peregrinatio Antiochie per Vrbanum papam facta*, has never been published in print. This paper attends to the question of priority in transmission, a challenging conundrum as none of our four texts is identifiable as patently authorial. Rather than seeking to propose precisely how the four texts are related to one another, I attempt to identify editorial strategies that may account for divergence between them. What follows is, then, a methodological essay on textual criticism and a case study of how medieval readerships engaged with historical writings.

This paper concerns an eyewitness history of the First Crusade, composed within a few years of the Christian capture of Jerusalem in 1099.¹ The work has come down to us in four versions. The best known is *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum* (The Deeds of the Franks and the Other Pilgrims to Jerusalem, henceforth *GF*), which is today one of the most widely read medieval histories. Its success is mostly due to the subject matter, the confrontation between Christian and Muslim, reported at first hand. The work also possesses literary qualities which appeal to modern taste. Its account of the realities of crusading is unusually frank, even brutal. The account encompasses not only the dealings of the high command but also the experiences and opinions of the rank and file. Immediacy and frankness characterize the narration. The other three extant versions of this anonymous history are *De Hierosolymitano itinere* (On the Journey to Jerusalem, henceforth *PT*) by Peter Tudebode, *Hystoria de uia et recuperatione Antiochie atque Ierusalem* (A History of the Journey to and Recovery of Antioch and Jerusalem, henceforth *HAI*), and *Peregrinatio Antiochie per Vrbanum papam facta* (The Pilgrimage to Antioch Instigated by Pope Urban, henceforth *PA*). The least known and least studied is the one mentioned last. *PA* survives in a single manuscript from the thirteenth century, which was introduced to Crusade scholarship only in 2012.² Save for tiny

fragments in an early-modern edition, this version has never been published in print. I am currently preparing the *editio princeps*. What follows is an attempt to understand *PA*'s composition and status in the context of the three related texts.

Our four versions seem to descend ultimately from a common source (henceforth *CS*), now lost. I, then, regard the four texts as redactions. It should be emphasized that in this paper, *CS* represents the *latest* stemmatical step from which the four extant versions may have sprung. In other words, *CS* was not necessarily the authorial urtext. It will be argued, indeed, that the authorial text, devoid of editorial touches, cannot be restored with recourse to the extant manuscripts.³ Furthermore, this paper will not presume to propose stemmata representing precisely how the four texts are related to each other. Much laborious spadework needs to be done before conclusive stemmata can be established, due to several factors. Modern scholarship, in spite of brave efforts, has so far failed to clarify the internal transmission of the *GF* and *PT* branches. To make things worse, confusion is rife in *PT*'s most recent edition and not unknown in *GF*'s modern critical editions. New manuscripts have also emerged. The present paper introduces one, a *PT* manuscript which has gone unnoticed by previous Crusade scholarship. The gravest single hindrance to the stemmatical resolution is probably the fact that *PA* remains unpublished in print, save for short excerpts from a very similar text incorporated in the *editio princeps* of *GF*. In spite of these provisos, useful observations can already be made. This essay

-
- 1 I thank Lauri Leinonen, Outi Merisalo, John Pryor, and James Willoughby for their assistance and comments. This paper was written under the auspices of the projects *Transmission of Knowledge in the Late Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (Tralmar, Academy of Finland and University of Jyväskylä, no. 267518) and *Medieval Publishing from c. 1000 to 1500* (MedPub). The MedPub project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 716538. All translations are my own.
 - 2 Samu Niskanen, 'The Origins of *Gesta Francorum* and Two Related Texts: Their Textual and Literary Character', *Sacris Erudiri*, 51 (2012), pp. 287–316,

and Marcus Bull, 'The Relationship between the *Gesta Francorum* and Peter Tudebode's *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere*: the Evidence of a Hitherto Unexamined Manuscript', *Crusades*, 11 (2012), pp. 1–17.

- 3 For the previous (and slightly different) use of the term *common source* (and *Ur-Gesta*), see *Hystoria de uia et recuperatione Antiochie atque Ierusalem* [...], ed. by Edoardo D'Angelo, Edizione nazionale dei testi mediolatini, 23 (Firenze: SISMEL, 2009), pp. xxviii–xxix and liii.

benefits for the first time in modern scholarship from recourse to a full transcript of *PA*. The evidence it brings allows us to read the existing pool of textual data in new ways. The case is a healthy reminder of the maxim *recentiores, non deteriores* (later, not inferior) and that students of earlier periods should not neglect the evidence of later manuscripts and printed editions.

GF survives in ten manuscripts.⁴ More may still emerge. *GF* was first published in print by Jacques Bongars in 1611.⁵ Importantly, Bongars used a lost *PA* manuscript as his secondary source. More recently *GF* has been published several times in critical editions.⁶ In a paper presented at Oxford in May 2012, John Pryor demonstrated that the main editions of *GF* – by Hagenmeyer, Bréhier, and the duo of Hill and Mynors respectively – are characterized by inaccuracies and some outright

errors.⁷ The introduction to the edition of Hill and Mynors had already observed that Hagenmeyer and Bréhier confused two important manuscripts, leading to an incorrect understanding of the manuscript tradition.⁸ Likewise, insufficiencies in Mynors' editorial text and apparatus undermine his own stemmatic conclusions. Some of the extant manuscripts remain uncollated.

PT was worked up by Peter Tudebode, a Poitevin priest and participant in the Crusade, as is known from a colophon to his first-hand account of a procession around Jerusalem before the conquest of the city, which seems to be a discrete episode inserted into the history.⁹ Since its first appearance in print in 1641, his version has been called *De Hierosolymitano itinere*.¹⁰ The decision here to derive the acronym for this rendition from his initials rather than from the title is due to the fact that it is unclear whether the currently favoured title is in any way authentic. PT survives in five manuscripts,¹¹ of which the Vatican manuscript,

4 Madrid, BE, D III 11, fols 1^v–18^v; Madrid, BNE, 9783 (E e 103), fols 149^r–176^r; Cambridge, GCC, 162/83, fols 111^r–140^r; Vatican City, BAV, Reg. lat. 641, fols 1^r–46^v; Reg. lat. 572, fols 1^v–64^v; Cambridge, CCC, 281, fols 134^r–155^v; Berlin, SBB-PK, lat. quarto 503, fols 1^r–36^v; Paris, BNF, lat. 5511A, fols 84^r–86^v (lacking much of the text); Florence, BML, Ashburnham 1054, fols 96^r–101^v; and Copenhagen, KB, Acc. 2011/5, pp. 319–54, 135–38.

5 *Gesta Dei per Francos* [...], I, ed. by Jacques Bongars (Hanoviae: Typis Wecheliani, apud heredes Aubrii, 1611), pp. 1–29.

6 The main editions are *Recueil des historiens des croisades*, 5 vols (Paris: Imprimerie impériale; 1844–95), III: *Historiens occidentaux*, ed. by Philippe Le Bas, Henri Wallon and Adolphe Régnier (1866), pp. 121–63; *Anonymi Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum*, ed. by Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1890); *Histoire anonyme de la première croisade*, ed. by Louis Bréhier, *Classiques de l'histoire du Moyen Âge* (Paris: H. Champion, 1924); *Anonymi Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum*, ed. by Beatrice A. Lees (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924); *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum*, ed. by Rosalind Hill and Roger A. B. Mynors, *Nelson's Medieval Texts* (London: T. Nelson, 1962). I have not seen the edition of Luigi Russo, published in 2003. Unless otherwise indicated, the references to *GF* are to Hill and Mynors' edition. Roman numerals included in references agree also with the editions of Hagenmeyer and Bréhier.

7 John Pryor, 'Jacques Bongars, the *Belli Sacri Historia* and the Early Medieval Historiography of the First Crusade'. I am very grateful to Prof. Pryor for providing me with a copy of the paper.

8 *GF* (Mynors), p. xlii.

9 PT, p. 138. The references to PT will be to the edition by the Hills, for which see the next footnote.

10 The main editions, which all agree on the title *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere*, are *Petri Tudebodi sacerdotis Sivracensis historia de Hierosolymitano itinere* [...], ed. by Jean Besly (Lutetiae: Sebastianus Cramoisy, 1641); *Recueil*, III, pp. 3–117; and *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere*, ed. by John H. Hill and Laurita L. Hill (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1977).

11 Paris, BNF, lat. 5135A, fols 1^r–37^v; lat. 4892, fols 212^r–236^r; London, BL, Harley 3904, fols 1^r–63^v; Montpellier, BFM, H 142, fols 33^r–68^r; Vatican City, BAV, Reg. lat. 554, fols 196^r–221^r. The new manuscript has previously been noted at least twice in modern scholarship: *Documents historiques inédits tirés des collections manuscrites de la Bibliothèque Royale et des archives ou des bibliothèques des départements* [...], ed. by Jacques J. Champollion Figeac, 5 vols (Paris: Didot Frères and Imprimerie Nationale, 1841–74), III (1847), pp. 266–67. The manuscript's transmission (it was copied either from Paris, BNF, lat. 4892 or shares the source with it) is commented on in

Reg. lat. 554, datable to the fifteenth century and coming from France, is hitherto unknown to Crusade scholarship. Precisely how the manuscripts are related to each other remains unresolved. As regards PT's contents, there are events reported by Peter Tudebode that are not found in our other versions – there are more absences in *GF* and *PA* than in *HAI* – while PT is silent on other events that are present in the others. The material exclusive to PT often pertains to Raymond, Count of Toulouse (+ 1105) and the crusaders subject to him, which is a hint that Peter Tudebode might have been associated with Count Raymond's contingent.

HAI was composed sometime between 1130 and 1153.¹² This work is often known as *Historia belli sacri* (A History of the Holy War), a title coined from a short introductory note by Jean Mabillon, the work's first modern editor.¹³ The title used here, *Hystoria de uia et recuperatione Antiochiaae atque Ierusalymarum*, derives from the recent critical edition of *HAI*, which supersedes previous work.¹⁴ The work has two manuscript witnesses, one of which is only a partial copy.¹⁵ *HAI* is itself an amalgamation of materials also from two other sources, the *Gesta Tancredi* (The Deeds of Tancred) of Ralph of Caen and the *Liber* (The Book) of Raymond of Aguilers.¹⁶ Alert to imperfections in his sources, *HAI*'s anonymous compiler made structural changes to the narration, modifying the sequence of some of the action. Although, as such, *HAI* represents a step further

away from *CS*, the common source, it yields textual evidence of great consequence. Evidence from *HAI* may now be compared with that from *PA* in a far greater quantity than was available to the first two commentators on the subject, of whom the present author was one. What follows seems to undermine their preliminary propositions.¹⁷

PA, the main focus of this paper, was unknown to modern Crusade scholarship before it was introduced in two articles published in 2012.¹⁸ The text survives in a single manuscript, Cambridge, SCC, 3, which provides the title *Peregrinatio Antiochie per Vrbanum papam facta*.¹⁹ Judging from its script, the manuscript had its origin in England in the thirteenth century. Its earliest known provenance was Ramsey Abbey in Cambridgeshire, where the same title, *Peregrinatio Antiochie*, was recorded in a booklist datable to the mid-fourteenth century. The book was part of a donation from Adam de Sulegrau, whose identity remains unknown.²⁰ All references to *PA* will be to this manuscript. As noted above, traces of a very similar text, which represented the same redaction, survive in the *editio princeps* of *GF* from 1611 by Bongars. His use of it as a secondary source in his edition has proved too limited to provide reliable evidence of the redaction's character and role in transmission. Bongars had recourse to manuscript Vitellius D. III of Sir Robert Cotton's library. Save for a few folios not relevant to us, that manuscript was destroyed in the fire at Ashburnham House – the so-called Cotton Fire – on 23 October 1731.²¹

Georges Pon and Soline Kumaoka, 'L'historiographie poitevine au XI^e siècle et au début du XII^e siècle', *Quaestiones Medii Aevi Novae*, 12 (2007), pp. 1–57 (p. 48).

12 For the date-frame, see *HAI*, p. xvi. The *HAI* references are to D'Angelo's edition.

13 Jean Mabillon and Michel Germain, *Museum Italicum* [...], 2 vols (Luteciae Parisiorum: Apud viduam Edmundi Martin, Johannem Boudot et Stephanum Martin, 1687), 1, pp. 130–236. This was then reprinted in *Recueil*, III, pp. 169–229.

14 See *HAI*, ed. by D'Angelo.

15 Montecassino, ABA, 300, pp. 1–166 and Paris, BNF, lat. 6041A, fols 105^r–124^v, which is the partial copy.

16 *HAI*, pp. xxviii–xl.

17 See the so-called preliminary solutions A and B, Niskanen, 'Origins', pp. 296 and 315. Preliminary solution A is identical to Bull's conclusion.

18 Niskanen, 'Origins' and Bull, 'Relationship'.

19 The manuscript is described in Montague R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of St Catharine's College, Cambridge* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1925), pp. 10–12.

20 *English Benedictine Libraries*, ed. by Richard Sharpe and others, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues, 16 vols (London: The British Library, 1990–), IV (1996), B68.414, p. 395.

21 For a fuller discussion, see Niskanen, 'Origins', pp. 288–90.

To assess *PA*'s status in transmission, I shall scrutinize the relationship between it and *GF* in particular. Such an approach is more or less a necessity in the present state of research. The sum of the reported events in *PA* and *GF* is virtually identical. *PT* and *HAI*, in contrast, are more individualistic. They bear accounts not found in *GF* and *PA*, and are also silent on some events reported in them. Focusing on *PA*, the present paper does not discuss materials distinctive to *HAI* and *PT*.

Because *HAI* and, to a lesser extent, *PT*, comprise several idiosyncrasies, their classification as redactions in contrast to original works requires comment. Literally taken, the term redaction applies here to the material *HAI* and *PT* share with *GF* and *PA*. What is more, no paratextual element in *HAI* and *PT* implies authorial ownership for their makers. Their titles, as preserved in our manuscripts, do not furnish the writer's name; Peter Tudebode is identified solely on account of his colophon *within* the narration.²² *HAI* is our only redaction to include a prologue, a device which medieval authors often used to assert their authorship over the work to follow. *HAI*'s prologue makes no comment to that effect. The next-wave histories of the first crusade, written by Baldric of Bourgueil († 1130), Guibert of Nogent († 1124), and Robert the Monk († 1122), serve to clarify our distinction between a redaction and an original work. Baldric, Guibert, and Robert relied – in the structural aspect often heavily – on versions of our anonymous history, but their own authorial voices, in the form of their distinctive styles of literary expression and design, characterize their compositions. The prefatory devices of their works make this point clear. Remarks therein on the authorial process and publication demonstrate that each of the three authors regarded his work as an original piece.²³

Before embarking on a textual inquiry, it is important to introduce three methodological observations. First, we must bear in mind that *CS* may well have been unsatisfactory as literature. A corollary is that imperfections – be they structural, stylistic, syntactic, or lexical – do not necessarily represent corruption by manuscript transmission, but may derive from *CS*. This paper's underlying claim is that *CS*'s lack of refinement was conducive to scribal individuality at subsequent stages of transmission. Copyists became redactors. Naturally, their approaches to stylistic emendation were not alike. I shall propose that one redactor made the text more concise; one was keen to elaborate; and one frequently rearranged the material.

Secondly, an oft-deployed method to distinguish between the authorial voice and later editorial touches is to assess the status of passages found in some manuscripts but absent from others, whether they were inserted into the former or omitted from the latter. This approach should be employed with care. An instant of this method's employment by a previous Crusade scholar demonstrates a potential peril. *GF* reports how crusaders were encouraged by their clergy in a moment of despair as follows: *Episcopi uero et presbyteri confortabant nostros et commonebant ne deficerent* ('The bishops and priests reassured our men and encouraged them not to falter').²⁴ The corresponding passage in *PT*, *HAI*, and *PA*, in addition, provides the gist of the priestly words of comfort. The extract below is from *PT*, as given in its most recent edition.

Episcopus namque et presbyteri qui illic aderant confortabant et submonebant nostros dicentes: "Estote ubique fortes in Christi fide,

²² *PT*, p. 138.

²³ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, Prologus and *Epistola ad Petrum*, ed. by Steven Biddlecombe (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2014), pp. 3–4 and 122; Guibert of Nogent, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, *Epistola ad*

Lysiardum and Prologus, in *Recueil*. IV (1889), pp. 117–21; Robert the Monk, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, *Apologeticus sermo*, ed. by Damien Kempf and Marcus G. Bull (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013), p. 3.

²⁴ *GF*, ii, p. 4.

et nolite timere illos qui uos persecuntur. Sicuti Dominus dicit: Nolite timere eos qui occidunt corpus; animam uero non possunt occidere”.²⁵

(The bishop and priests who were there reassured and encouraged our men, saying: “Be always brave in the faith of Christ, and do not fear those who persecute you. Just as the Lord says: Fear not them that kill the body, for they cannot kill the soul”.)

According to Louis Bréhier, one of *GF*’s modern editors, the direct speech in the longer report *est manifestement une addition postérieure*. Yet brevity does not necessarily guarantee authenticity.²⁶ One may as well presume that the copyist responsible for *GF* shortened the account in question by omitting the passage in direct speech from his redaction. I shall argue below that abridgement was a key aspect of the editorial policy governing *GF*.

Thirdly, the question of priority in transmission can be a complicated one in cases where a work survives in several versions, of which none is manifestly identifiable as authorial. In such a case, the textual critic must distinguish between various layers of text, ranging from what is the authorial voice to what is deliberate revision and what is inadvertent noise by manuscript transmission. Comparison of snippets of text that represent scribal errors and other minor infelicities or variations in order to identify the authorial as opposed to the scribal, as seen in the critical apparatus of modern editions, will not do in most cases. Such evidence predominantly concerns the transmission of a single version and, if relevant to relationships between various versions, tends to emit signals that are hard to interpret without serious caveats. This is not to say

that the traditional methods of textual comparison cannot have application here; on the contrary, final conclusions – should they ever be reached – will need to be supported by minute textual evidence. At this stage, however, conclusions about priority must be substantiated by evidence the implications of which are more explicit: the emphasis must be on subject matter and literary aspects, such as structure and mannerisms of expression. In what follows, I shall introduce cases of textual comparison along these lines.

In *GF* and *HAI*, we are informed that upon his arrival at Nicaea Duke Robert of Normandy was accompanied by *Count Stephen and many others*.²⁷ Previous scholarship, without recourse to *PA*, has identified Stephen as Count of Blois and Chartres.²⁸ The corresponding passage in *PA* happens to designate Stephen also with a toponym, *Alba Maris*, which is a corruption of *Albamarla* or similar, and denotes Aumale (also known as Albemarle) in Normandy.²⁹ The historical context and other chroniclers testify to the accuracy of *PA*’s identification. The liege lord of the Count of Aumale was the Duke of Normandy, suggesting that if Count Stephen of Aumale took part in the Crusade, he would have done so in the contingent of which Robert of Normandy was the commander. Ralph of Caen in his *Gesta Tancredi* recorded the Count of Aumale among those present at the battle of Antioch in the army of Robert of Normandy.³⁰ Albert of Aachen reported Stephen of Aumale’s

²⁵ PT, p. 35. The quotation is from Matt. 10. 28.

²⁶ *GF*, ed. by Bréhier, p. 8, n. h. It is unclear whether Bréhier was aware that the passage he rejected also appears in PT and *HAI*, which he frequently consulted. In referring the passage solely to Bongars’ edition, he implied that it is not found in any surviving manuscript.

²⁷ *GF*, viii, p. 15; *HAI*, 6. 28, p. 28. PT omits the passage in question.

²⁸ *GF*, viii, ed. by Hagenmeyer, p. 185, n. 30; ed. by Bréhier, p. 39, n. 4; ed. by Mynors, p. 15, n. 1; *HAI*, p. 148.

²⁹ *PA*, fol. 54^v.

³⁰ Ralph of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi*, xlix, *Recueil*, III, p. 642. See also William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, ed. by Robert B. C. Huygens, CCCM, 73 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1986), i. 17. 16–17, ii. 23. 7, and vi. 17. 13.

presence at Nicaea.³¹ It is of course possible that a well-informed copyist (or a reader) inserted the toponym of Aumale in a text from which our *PA* manuscript descends. Yet the odds must favour instead the toponym's having been lost in the course of transmission. *Alba Maris* in *PA* is, therefore, likely to represent an earlier stratum of transmission than is witnessed by its absence from *GF* and *HAI*.

There are other instances of the inaccuracy or inauthenticity of *GF*'s testimony to proper names compared to that of *PA* and other redactions. On one occasion *GF* designates Richard of the Principate, a crusader in Bohemond's contingent, who appears several times in our anonymous history, as *princeps* rather than *de Principatu*.³² The error does not occur in *PA*, *HAI*, or *PT*. Furthermore, *GF* presents the nickname of a certain Hugh in Latin, calling him *insanus* ('mad').³³ *PA*, *PT*, and *HAI* use the vernacular for the nickname, calling the man (with spelling variants) *Hugo li forsenez* (Hugh the Mad).³⁴ *GF*'s reading represents a step further away from the crusaders' own linguistic realities, which were vernacular rather than Latin. The same linguistic step can also be observed in how the four recensions record the crusaders' well-known battle-cry of *God wants it*. *PA*, *HAI*, and *PT* use the vernacular, reading *Deus le uolt* (God wants it) with spelling variants.³⁵ *GF* presents the words in Latin: *Deus uult* (God wants).³⁶ The battle-cry is quoted twice and on both occasions the pattern of linguistic choice is the same. The impression is that *GF* set out to Latinize vernacular expression.

On occasion, *GF* is also lacking in topographical accuracy. All four renditions include the well-known story of how Stephen of Blois deserted the Crusade at Antioch. Standing on a mountain top, he saw an army of Muslims so massive that he despaired and fled. According to *PA*, *PT*, and *HAI*, the mountain was the highest of those around Antioch,³⁷ whereas *GF* makes no reference to its height.³⁸ Obviously, this disagreement has but little persuasive evidential weight for textual criticism. The reason for referring to this instance is that it demonstrates a frequent pattern of divergence. *GF* is usually the shortest of the four redactions at the level of the individual sentence. I would argue that this quality belongs to acts of deliberate editorial policy.

A somewhat more striking example is found in the report of Bohemond's visit to Constantinople at the invitation of Emperor Alexius. The emperor requested that Bohemond lodge outside the city. *HAI* and *PA* specify that his lodging was *Sanctus Argenteus*,³⁹ a detail missing in *GF* and *PT*.⁴⁰ *Sanctus Argenteus* is a corruption of *Ἀνάργυροι* ('the Silverless') denoting Saints Cosmas and Damian, medical doctors who had ministered to the ill for free before their martyrdom.⁴¹ Bohemond having lodged in a monastery dedicated to Saints Cosmas and Damian (or somewhere in the locality taking its name from that house) is corroborated by the independent testimony of Anna Komnene.⁴² Even though *PA* and *HAI* report the monastery's patron saints less than perfectly, the detail does throw a small light on the logistics of crusading.

31 Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, ed. by Susan B. Edgington, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007), ii, 23, p. 98.

32 *GF*, iv, p. 7.

33 *GF*, xxvi, p. 61.

34 *PA*, fol. 74^v; *HAI*, 12. 4, p. 80; *PT*, p. 102.

35 *PA*, fols 51^r and 68^v; *HAI*, 5. 25, pp. 19 and 9, 311, p. 65. *PT*, p. 40 *Deus lo uult* MSS CD; *Deus hoc uult* MSS AB; and p. 85 *Deus lo uult* MSS ACD, *Deus hoc uult* MS B. The sigla are those of the edition by the Hills.

36 *GF*, iv, p. 7 and xx, p. 47.

37 *PA*, fol. 75^v; *HAI*, 12. 25, p. 82; *PT*, p. 105, the remark in question is missing from manuscript A.

38 *GF*, xxvii, p. 63.

39 *PA*, fol. 52^v; *HAI*, 5. 71, p. 23.

40 *GF*, vi, p. 11; *PT*, p. 43.

41 Alexander van Millingen, *Byzantine Constantinople: the Walls of the City and Adjoining Historical Sites* (London: J. Murray, 1899), p. 127.

42 Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, *Recueil*, ed. by E. Miller, I. 2: *Historiens Grecs* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1875), p. 31.

None of the evidence presented above amounts to an entirely convincing case. One could posit that the reported readings in *PA* did not derive from *CS* but were brought in by well-informed copyists. The apparent Latinization of vernacular words in *GF* is an exception. However, since the instances of those linguistic choices are so few, their power to persuade is insufficient. In that respect, the following two examples are stronger. The first indicates a greater degree of authenticity

in *PA*, *HAI*, and *PT* than in *GF*. The second demonstrates that at times our most reliable guide to *CS* is arguably *PA*. Taken together, these examples can suggest that *CS* was, in terms of its literary qualities, a very rough piece of work.

The following excerpts, quoted from *PA* and *GF*, offer an explanation as to why our anonymous author was silent on some events related to the conquest of Antioch while he reported others.

Omnia que fecimus antequam Antiochia capta fuisset, nequeo enarrare; que facta sunt et quomodo fiunt, tamen aliquantulum uolo explicare. Ideo aliquantulum dico, quia nemo est in hiis partibus qui omnimodo – siue clericus siue laicus – dicendo siue scribendo possit narrare sicut est res acta.	Omnia quae egimus antequam urbs esset capta nequeo enarrare, quia nemo est in his partibus – siue clericus siue laicus – qui omnino possit scribere uel narrare sicut res gesta est. Tamen aliquantulum dicam.
<i>PA</i> , fol. 67 ^r .	<i>GF</i> , xix, p. 44.
(I cannot tell of all the things we did before Antioch was taken; but I do want to explain a little of what we did and how this happened. So I say a little of it, for there is no one in these parts – clerk or layman – who could in every respect relate in speaking or writing how the deed came to pass.)	(I cannot tell of all the things we did before the city was taken, for there is no one in these parts – clerk or layman – who could in every respect write down or tell how the deed was accomplished. But I will say a little of it.)

PA's text, with which *HAI* and *PT* comply with minor variations, is repetitive and proceeds in a wandering manner.⁴³ Its essence can be summarized as follows: since no one else in this region can do so, I will now report events from the time before Antioch was taken. *GF*'s rendition of the passage is less clumsy and more concise than *PA*'s and that of the other two redactions. *GF* is also unique in that it implies that in this case the narrator – a persona constructed by, but not necessarily equivalent to, the author – relied on reports by others. That derivative status stands against the fact that elsewhere the narrator tends to feature as an eyewitness. The impression is that *GF*'s reading of the passage is a paraphrase and a slightly inaccurate one at that. If this reading

is correct, the example demonstrates how the redactor responsible for *GF* employed his favourite editorial tools, rewording and abridgement, and that slight narrative discrepancies emerged in the process.

My final example is the longest and most complex to be presented in this essay, and makes the strongest case. The excerpt will be quoted first in full from *PA*. Some interpretation with comparisons to other redactions will then follow. *PA*'s version consists of three distinct components, distinguished by subject matter and indicated below by use of boldface numerals. The first component explains how crusaders arranged the defences of Antioch; the second component is a topographical description of Antioch; the third component fails to make sense in the position it has in *PA*.

⁴³ *HAI*, 9, 266–68, p. 60; *PT*, p. 82.

[1] Modo accepit Boamundus consilium cum suis hominibus quomodo muniret castrum de alta montanea de hominibus et de uictu. Et comes sancti Egidii similiter accepit consilium cum suis hominibus quomodo muniret palatium Cassiani amiralii et turrin que est super pontem, que est ex parte portus sancti Symeonis, de hominibus et de uictu, qui non deficient longo tempore. [2] Hec namque ciuitas ualde est pulchra et honorabilis, quia infra muros eius sunt .iiii. maxime montanee et nimis alte. In altiore quoque est castellum edificatum mirabile et nimis forte. De deorsum est ciuitas honorabilis atque conueniens, omnibusque ornata honoribus. Quoniam multe ecclesie in ea sunt edificate. Tres centa .lx. monasteria in se continet. Sub suo iugo continet patriarcha centum quinquaginta tres episcopos. Clauditur ciuitas a duobus muris. Maior quoque ualde est altus et mirabiliter latus magnisque lapidibus compositus, in quo sunt ordinate .iiii. centum et quinquaginta turres, modisque omnibus est ciuitas formosa. Ab oriente clauditur .iiii. magnis montaneis. Ab occidente secus ciuitatis muros fluit quoddam flumen cui nomen Farfar [3] *et ita noluerunt stulte neque uane dimittere regalem ciuitatem Antiochiam*. Que tante auctoritatis fuit caput et ductor Antiochus rex, et ab eo dicitur Antiochia.

PA, fols 81^{r-v}.

([1] Now Bohemond took counsel with his men as to how to fortify the citadel on top of the mountain with men and victuals. And the Count of St Giles likewise took counsel with his men as to how to fortify the palace of Cassianus the emir and the tower standing on the bridge, which is on the side of the Port of St Simeon, with men and victuals, so that they would not fail for a long time. [2] This city is indeed very beautiful and glorious, for there are

within its walls four huge and very high mountains. On the highest one stands the citadel, built wondrously well and strong. Down below lies the city, glorious and well situated and adorned with all kinds of glorious things. For there are numerous churches erected within it. It embraces 360 churches. 153 bishops are under the authority of its patriarch. The city is enclosed by two walls. The greater one is very high and incredibly thick and built of great stones, and is furnished with 450 towers, and the city is beautiful in every respect. On the east it is enclosed by four great mountains. On the west a river called Farfar [Orontes] runs by the city-walls [3] *and in that manner they did not wish to lose the royal city of Antioch foolishly and in vain*. King Antiochus was a leader and commander of great authority and it is after him that the city is called Antioch [for which sentence see n. 48].)

The italicized clause (my italics) in component three is an obvious *non sequitur* in terms of the narration. It dangles in limbo without obvious reference to the immediately preceding topographical sketch. However, the quoted extracts run fluently if components two and three are transposed as demonstrated below. (I have slightly abbreviated component two for the sake of clarity.)

[1] Modo accepit Boamundus consilium cum suis hominibus quomodo muniret castrum de alta montanea de hominibus et de uictu. Et comes sancti Egidii similiter accepit consilium cum suis hominibus quomodo muniret palatium Cassiani amiralii et turrin que est super pontem, que est ex parte portus Sancti Symeonis, de hominibus et de uictu, qui non deficient longo tempore [3] *et ita noluerunt stulte neque uane dimittere regalem ciuitatem Antiochiam*. Que tante auctoritatis

fuit caput et ductor Antiochus rex, et ab eo dicitur Antiochia. [2] Hec namque ciuitas ualde est pulchra et honorabilis, quia infra muros eius sunt .iiii. maxime montanee et nimis alte. [...] Ab oriente clauditur .iiii. magnis montaneis. Ab occidente secus ciuitatis muros fluit quoddam flumen cui nomen Farfar.

([1] Now Bohemond took counsel with his men as to how to fortify the citadel on top of the mountain with men and victuals. And the count of St Gilles likewise took counsel with his men as to how to fortify the palace of Cassianus the emir and the tower standing on the bridge, which is on the side of the Port of St Simeon, with men and victuals, so that they would not fail for a long time, [3] *and in that manner they did not wish to lose the royal city of Antioch foolishly and in vain.* King Antiochus was a leader and commander of great authority and it is after him that the city is called Antioch [for which sentence see n. 48]. [2] This city is indeed very beautiful and glorious, for there are within its walls four huge and very high mountains. [...] In the east it is enclosed by four great mountains. In the west a river called Farfar [Orontes] runs by the city-walls.)

The first half of component three, the clause *et ita – ciuitatem Antiochiam*, reads in English *in that manner they did not wish to lose the royal city of Antioch foolishly and in vain*. The clause plainly complements component one; it states the motive for why Bohemond and Raymond made arrangements to defend Antioch. Component two, the topographical sketch, likewise runs fluently if positioned as proposed. The brief eulogy and etymology of Antioch in component three (*Que*

tante auctoritatis – ab eo dicitur Antiochia) serve as an introduction to the topography of that city.⁴⁴

The topographical sketch, component two, was an interpolation.⁴⁵ It was imperfectly implemented between components one and three.⁴⁶ Such an error would be easily explained if the party who composed the topographical sketch entered it in the margin of his manuscript of our anonymous crusade history. Medieval interpolations that were not made *in rasura* were made like that. A subsequent copyist would then have incorporated the brief description of Antioch, slightly mistaking its position, into the text proper. Analogous cases from the period of the manuscript book are legion. The topographical sketch must have been found, thus ill-positioned, already in CS, for GF, HAI, and PT also include it. As such, CS cannot have been the urtext but an edited one, subject to interpolation and perhaps other editorial interventions.⁴⁷

The topographical sketch has one more lesson. I propose that GF, HAI, and PT betray editorial reactions to the confusion caused by the sketch's mistaken position in CS.⁴⁸ Each

44 For the apparently incomplete character of the sentence under discussion, see n. 48.

45 Even though operating without recourse to PA, Bréhier was able to identify the topography as an interpolation. He removed it from the text proper and published it as an appendix; GF, ed. by Bréhier, pp. vii and 220–23.

46 Should the proposition be rejected that the topographical sketch was an interpolation, the corollary would have to be that at some stage of transmission a copyist had lifted this passage from the text and placed it in the wrong position. This is implausible, since no mechanical errors support it.

47 This conclusion is consistent with the paradigm, standard particularly in continental scholarship, that there was a primitive text, now lost; GF, ed. by Bréhier, p. xxii; Jean Flori, *Chroniqueurs et propagandistes: introduction critique aux sources de la Première croisade*, Hautes Études médiévales et modernes, 98 (Genève: Librairie Droz, 2010), pp. 167–68; HAI, p. liii.

48 Whether this applies to PA is less certain. On the basis of GF (xxxii, p. 77) and PT (p. 120), it can be postulated that CS, in the latter half of component three, included

of them, I argue, amended the passage in their own way and in line with their respective editorial policies. The case of *GF* is the most straightforward.⁴⁹ The redactor responsible for *GF* was prone to abbreviate. Likewise, having copied the topographical sketch, he simply omitted the incompatible clause following it, that is, the first half of our component three. There was nothing wrong with his solution; it is perfectly fluent.

PT, which is often the most elaborate of the four redactions, ironed out the confusion by expanding the first half of component three, the clause that breaks the logic of narration. He made it compatible with the passage on Antiochene topography. To demonstrate this solution, the relevant passage must be quoted. The italics (by me) in the final sentence indicate PT's insertion, which harmonizes the immediately following clause with the preceding topographical sketch.⁵⁰ I have again abridged the text for the sake of clarity.

a clause mentioning that there had been seventy-five Antiochene kings. This statement is absent from *PA*. The absence may have been a reaction to the apparent confusion in *CS* or an inadvertent case of eye-slip by a copyist. Because the discussed sentence in *PA* is deficient, the latter explanation is the more probable one. Amended on the basis of PT's evidence (given in brackets), *PA* reads: *Que tante auctoritatis [fuit quod eam prius LXX et V reges constituerunt, quorum] fuit caput et dux Antiochus rex, et ab eo dicitur Antiochia.*

⁴⁹ *GF*, xxxi–xxxii, pp. 76–77.

⁵⁰ It should be noted that the word *Thema* (albeit only found in a single manuscript) at the opening of component two, ushering in a new section, is in line with another editorial inclination apparent in PT. Peter Tudebode relished *exotica*, Greek and oriental. PT uses three times the word *drogomandus* (interpreter), derived from Arabic (PT, pp. 80, 108, and 139). In other redactions, the Latin word *interpres* is used. PT's account of a procession around Jerusalem, in which he himself participated according to his own testimony, reports the cry of the Saracens *Frangi agip salip*, in his Latin translation: *Franci, est bona crux?* (Franks, is the cross good?; PT, p. 137). For another such instance, see p. 139; for a Greek quotation, see p. 108. Finally, as argued in n. 48,

[1] Deinde accepit Boamundus consilium cum suis hominibus, quomodo muniret castrum de alta montanea de bonis armis et de uictu qui non deficeret longo tempore. Et Raimundus sancti Egidii comes similiter muniuit palatium Cassiani [...] [2] XIII Thema. Haec quoque ciuitas ualde est magna et pulchra [...] Ab occidente secus ciuitatis muros fluit quoddam flumen magnum cui nomen est Pharphar. [3] *Et ideo quod est tam bona et tam pulchra*, noluerunt stulte dimittere regalem ciuitatem Antiochiam [...].

PT, pp. 119–20.

([1] Then Bohemond took counsel with his men as to how to fortify the citadel on top of the mountain with good arms and victuals, so that they would not fail for a long time. And Raymond of St Giles likewise fortified the palace of Cassianus. [2] Chapter 13. This city is also very big and beautiful [...] In the west a great river which is called Farfar [Orontes] runs by the city-walls. [3] *And for the reason that it is so fine and beautiful*, they did not wish to lose the royal city of Antioch foolishly. [...])

HAI, our last redaction, rearranged various sections. Its tendency to do so derived partly from the recourse its redactor had to several sources from which he extracted his materials.⁵¹ He positioned the selected material as he saw fit. The sketch of Antiochene topography, our component two, is a case in point. The redactor lifted it from where, as unanimously certified by *PA*, *GF*, and PT, he found it in his source (*CS* or a derivative text). Having cleansed the passage of

CS almost certainly included a mention of seventy-five kings of Antioch. PT (p. 120) alone names them. The list, which is bogus, was probably his invention.

⁵¹ *HAI*, pp. xxviii–xl.

the incompatible component three, he advanced it to a position he considered the soundest. In *HAI* the topographical sketch is positioned close to the beginning of the whole section pertaining to events at Antioch.⁵²

In conclusion, the evidence presented here suggests that *PA* descended from *CS* independently of the other three versions. Furthermore, *GF*'s brevity is not necessarily a sign of authenticity, but rather seems to belong to the editorial policy of its redactor. On account of frequent agreement between *GF* and *PA*, we may assume that the source on which *GF* relied resembled *PA*. Unfortunately, *PA*'s transmission status with reference to *HAI* and *PT* is a more complex affair. *HAI* and *PT* include materials not found in *PA* and the three disagree on the sequence of narration. Comparisons between them are, therefore, more difficult to conduct and only very preliminary remarks can be put forward.⁵³ *HAI*'s

most recent editor established lists of passages that he regarded as the most instructive towards establishing the relationship between *GF*, *PT*, and *HAI*. It should be noted that these extracts represent a mere fraction of his total pool of data. I have compared *PA*'s text with each extract, and while the results rely on an admittedly thin evidence base, the fact that they are consistent with my conclusion on the relationship between *GF* and *PA* adds to their merit. The version of the anonymous history on which *HAI* drew seems to have been closer to *PA* than to *GF*. Yet *PA* and *GF* are frequently identical with each other against agreement between *HAI* and *PT*.⁵⁴ The situation is more complicated than that: *PA* and *HAI* also group together against agreement between *GF* and *PT*.⁵⁵ Since it is unclear whether there are significant cases in which *GF* and *HAI* disagree in concert with concord between *PA* and *PT*, it is impossible to propose a precise stemma.

⁵² *HAI*, 9.7–10, pp. 38–39.

⁵³ The situation is set to improve on publication of John Pryor's analyses of his massive list of major variants, collected from all the manuscripts.

⁵⁴ D'Angelo divided his evidence as to the relationship between *HAI*, *GF*, and *PT* into four categories. The following account complies with that scheme when relevant. His category two (p. xxxvi) comprises sixteen passages present in *PT* and *HAI* but absent from *GF*; of these *PA* includes four and misses twelve. An analogous result emerges from D'Angelo's fourth category, in which *HAI* seems to oscillate between *GF* and *PT*; p. xxxix. He presented an extract comprising four sentences in *HAI*. Of the twelve individual words that serve as indicators, *HAI* shares six with *GF* and the remaining six with *PT*. *HAI* and *PA* share ten words. As regards the two words on which *HAI* and *PA* disagree, *PA* agrees with *GF*.

⁵⁵ An instance of this phenomenon occurs in the account, discussed above, of Bohemond lodging in *Sanctus Argenteus* according to *PA* and *HAI*. A further case is found in the sentence immediately following, in which *PA* (fol. 52^r) and *HAI* (s. 72, p. 23) designate Emperor Alexius as *malignus* ('wicked') as opposed to *GF* (vi, p. 11) and *PT* (p. 43).