

From Battlefield to Memory

The Battle of Hattin and the Fall of Jerusalem in
Letters and Chronicles, 1187-1210



Master's Thesis by Katrine Funding Højgaard

The History Department, Aalborg University, Fall 2016

Supervisor: Torben Kjersgaard Nielsen

**STANDARDFORSIDE
TIL
EKSAMENSOPGAVER PÅ HISTORIE**

Udfyldes af den/de studerende

Prøvens form (sæt kryds):	Projekt	Speciale X	Skriftlig hjemmeopgave
---------------------------	---------	---------------	---------------------------

Uddannelsens navn	Cand.mag. i Historie	
Semester	10.	
Prøvens navn (i studieordningen)	Kandidatspeciale	
Navn(e) og Studienummer	Navn(e)	Studienummer
	Katrine Funding Højgaard	20113695
Afleveringsdato	30. september 2016	
Projekttitel /Specialetitel på dansk	Fra slagmark til erindring: Slaget ved Hattin og Jerusalems fald i breve og krøniker, 1187-1210.	
Bachelorprojekttitel /Specialetitel på engelsk	From Battlefield to Memory: The Battle of Hattin and the Fall of Jerusalem in Letters and Chronicles, 1187-1210.	
I henhold til studieordningen må opgaven i alt maks. fylde antal sider à 2400 tegn – jf. studieordningen gældende	80	
Den afleverede opgave fylder antal tegn (indholdfortegnelse, titelblad, resumé og bilag medregnes ikke)*	191.957	
Vejleder	Torben Kjersgaard Nielsen	

Hvilket modul har du fulgt: Modul L

Kronologisk spredning:

Før-moderne perioder (før 1700)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x
Perioden ca. 1700-1914	<input type="checkbox"/>
Perioden efter 1914	<input type="checkbox"/>

Geografisk spredning:

Dansk/Nordisk	<input type="checkbox"/>
Europæisk/Global	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x

Jeg/vi bekræfter hermed, at dette er mit/vores originale arbejde, og at jeg/vi alene er ansvarlig(e) for indholdet. Alle anvendte referencer er tydeligt anført. Jeg/vi er informeret om, at plagiering ikke er lovlig og medfører sanktioner.

Regler om disciplinære foranstaltninger over for studerende ved Aalborg Universitet (plagiatregler):

<http://plagiat.aau.dk/GetAsset.action?contentId=4117331&assetId=4117338>

Dato og underskrift

29. september 2016

Katrine Funding Højgaard

- Vær opmærksom på, at opgaven ikke er afleveringsberettiget, hvis den overskrider det maksimale antal sider, som er angivet i studieordningens prøvebeskrivelse. Du/I har dermed brugt et eksamensforsøg.

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Part 1. Background.....	5
I. A Looming Catastrophe: The Prelude to the Battle of Hattin	5
II. The Battle of Hattin and the Fall of Jerusalem, 1187	9
III. Communicating the News to the West	12
The Chronicles of Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien.....	18
Part 2. Analysis: Narrating the Defeat.....	22
IV. Loss and Sorrow: Speechlessness, Performance, Commemoration	22
“What More Can We Say?”: Speechlessness.....	22
“With Tears and Sobs”: The Sorrow as Performance	25
Sorrow from a Distance: Commemoration	27
Causa Scribendi: Cries for Help, Crusade Propaganda, Trauma Therapy	32
V. The Status of Jerusalem: Slave and Mother.....	36
Domina Gentium: Jerusalem Feminized	38
Slave on Earth, Mother in Heaven	41
Causa Scribendi: Safe Jerusalem, Reunite Mother and Children.....	43
VI. The Concept of the Enemy	44
Bloodthirsty Brute or Rational Debater: The Nature of the Enemy	45
Conquest and Abuse: The Actions of the Enemy.....	48
A Wider Perspective.....	51
Past and Present.....	52
Concluding Thoughts: From a Present Terror to a Memory of the Past	53
VII. Causal Explanations for the Defeat.....	55
Sinful Christians, Angry God.....	55
An External Factor: Saladin the Opportunist	58
The Wider Perspective: Disputes Among Rulers of the Crusader States.....	59
Causa Scribendi: Do Penance, Appease the Angry God.....	61
Causa Scribendi: Context and Story-telling	63
The Spread of Information from the Latin East: A Conclusion.....	65
Bibliography	71
Resumé.....	74

Introduction¹

On 4 July 1187, the Christian army of the Latin Kingdom in the Levant suffered a devastating defeat in the Horns of Hattin. Three months later, on 2 October 1187, the city of Jerusalem fell to the army of Saladin, Sultan of Egypt and Syria (1174-93). The fateful year of 1187 marks the nadir of the history of the Crusader States when after eighty-eight years in Christian custody, the Holy City was seized by the Muslims. Christianity had now lost Jerusalem, the ultimate goal of the First Crusade, and the loss unleashed a massive literary activity, spreading the news of the defeat throughout Europe. Over time, the events of 1187 took root in the minds of Western Europeans, who commemorated the loss by retelling the story of the defeat in letters, chronicles, poems, and treatises.²

The great defeat at the Battle of Hattin and the subsequent fall of Jerusalem was a turning point in the history of the Crusader States that caused strong and immediate reactions in the West. Pope Urban III (p. 1185-87) reportedly died of shock and grief upon hearing about the defeat at Hattin,³ leaving it to his successor Pope Gregory VIII (p. Oct.-Dec. 1187) to react to the news. On 29 October 1187, Gregory VIII issued the bull *Audita Tremendi*, calling for a new crusade. By November 1187, the news of the fall of Jerusalem reached the Papal Court as well, and the major European leaders soon took the cross. There is a general unanimity

¹ I owe a debt of gratitude to Nicholas Paul, Fordham University, for introducing me to the chronicles of Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien. To Erik Petersen, The Royal Library, for showing an interest in my work and discussing the manuscript tradition of Arnold of Lübeck with me. To Graham Loud, University of Leeds, for sharing with me his not yet published translation of the chronicle of Arnold of Lübeck. To Aalborg University Library for processing my vast number of interlibrary loan requests. To Jens Peter Højgaard and Mette Pedersen for giving me a place to live for the past nine months. To all the unnamed friends and family members who have supported me and kept me company whenever I needed a break from my studies. Last but not least to Torben K. Nielsen for his excellent supervision and valuable feedback and criticism both before and throughout my thesis writing process.

² Sylvia Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City: Crusader Jerusalem and the Catholic West (1099-1187)*. Ashgate, 2005. Pp. 160-61.

³ For instance, an account built on the eyewitness account by the squire Ernoul, who took part in the battle of Hattin (see → footnote 9), reports that the shock and grief upon hearing the news of the Christian defeat at Hattin killed the pope. "The news of it [the defeat] struck the hearts of those faithful to Jesus Christ. Pope Urban who was at Ferrara died of grief when he heard the news." (Lyon *Eracles*, in: *The Conquest of Jerusalem and the Third Crusade: Sources in Translation*, tr. Peter W. Edbury, Brookfield: Ashgate, 1998, p. 47). It might be an exaggeration, but nevertheless, the Pope died around the time that the news of the defeat reached the Papal Court, whether directly upon hearing the news or shortly afterwards.

among historians that the catastrophic events of 1187 were a direct cause of the Third Crusade, which became the largest crusading expedition with the participation of the most prominent leaders, and Gregory VIII's *Audita Tremendi* occurs frequently in the research on the prelude to the Third Crusade.⁴

One can hardly dispute the effect of the papal initiatives, but whereas there is an abundance of research on the actual events of 1187 and the subsequent Third Crusade in 1189-92, detailed research of the transmission of information in the wake of the defeat in 1187 is notably absent.⁵ This thesis will examine how the news of the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem was first communicated to the West, and how the first accounts of the events over time crystallized into an extensive and persistent commemoration.

To examine the full scope of how the narrative of the defeat developed and spread throughout Europe is way too vast a study for me to unfold in the present thesis. Therefore, my focus will be the development of the description of the defeat from the Latin East to the Holy Roman Empire three decades later, when the two monks Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien, residents of Nordalbingia and the Black Forest respectively, both wrote a chronicle, in which they incorporated substantive accounts of the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem. The chronicles of Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien provide interesting case studies. Even though they lived in two different areas of Germany, they shared the broader context of being residents in the Holy Roman Empire and they both finished their chronicles at approximately the same time, around 1209/10. Moreover, their chronicles resemble each other in being accounts of the recent history of the Empire, treating domestic events as well as the imperial matters as far away as the Latin East, including accounts of the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem, which makes them especially relevant in the context of studying the commemoration of the defeat in 1187.

⁴ For instance: Malcolm Barber, *The Crusader States*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012, pp. 324-25. Andrew Jotischky, *Crusading and the Crusader States*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2004, pp. 155-56. Jonathan Phillips, *The Crusades, 1095-1197*. Harlow: Pearson Education, 2002, pp. 138-39.

⁵ Apart from a chapter in Schein's *Gateway to the Heavenly City* (Chapter 9: "'The Terrible News': The Reaction of Christendom to the Fall of Jerusalem (1187)", pp. 159-87), there is no coherent study of the reaction to the defeat in 1187.

While no research of significance on Arnold of Lübeck is available for non-German audiences, German historians have studied Arnold of Lübeck in detail since the 1980's, producing a number of studies on his chronicle and its context.⁶ However, these studies tend to focus more on Arnold's relation to the Baltic area and less on his descriptions of the Eastern Crusades. As regards Otto of St. Blasien, his chronicle has more or less escaped the attention of historians.⁷

This thesis, therefore, aims to break new ground on two fronts. First, it will provide a detailed analysis of how the descriptions of the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem developed from the earliest eyewitnesses to later chronicles. Second, it will examine the chronicles of Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien in the context of the commemoration of the catastrophic events in 1187.

I have divided my thesis into two parts. Part one will explain the background needed to understand the context of part two, the analysis of the sources. In part one, chapters one and two will explain the historical background – the prelude the Battle of Hattin and the actual events of 1187 – based on recent research as well as eyewitness accounts.

Chapter three will provide a survey of the communication and spread of information from the Latin East to the Western Europe. Based on recent research, I will outline current knowledge on how the information travelled from East to West as well as introduce the sources that spread the news of the defeat.

In the second part of this thesis, I will provide a close reading of the source material in order to study how the narrative of the defeat in 1187 was established and developed over time and space. Chapters four to seven will be a comparative analysis of the sources divided into

⁶ Especially Bernd Ulrich Hucker ("Die Chronik Arnolds von Lübeck als *Historia Regum*," in *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 44, 1988 and *Kaiser Otto IV*, Hannover, 1990), Helmut G. Walther ("Zur Verschriftlichung nordelbischen Selbstbewusstseins um 1200 in der Chronik abt Arnolds von Lübeck", in: Matthias Thumser (ed.): *Schriftkultur und Landesgeschichte. Studien zum südlichen Ostseeraum vom 12. bis zum 16. Jahrhundert*. Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 1997. Pp. 1-21), Volker Scior (*Das Eigene und das Fremde: Identität und Fremdheit in den Chroniken Adams von Bremen, Helmolds von Bosau und Arnolds von Lubeck*. Akademie Verlag, 2002), and a recently published anthology by Stephan Freund and Bernd Schütte (ed.) (*Die "Chronik" Arnolds Von Lübeck: Neue Wege Zu Ihrem Verstandnis*, Peter Lang Pub Inc, 2008).

⁷ That is, no independent study on Otto of St. Blasien exist. However, some historians have used his chronicle as source material in studies on Otto IV (Bernd Ulrich Hucker, *Kaiser Otto IV*) and Frederick Barbarossa (Heinz Krieg: *Herrscherdarstellung in der Stauferzeit. Friedrich Barbarossa im Spiegel seiner Urkunden und der staufischen Geschichtsschreibung*, in *Vorträge und Forschungen*, Sonderband 50, Ostfildern, 2003, and Graham Loud: *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*. Farnham, GB: Ashgate, 2013.)

four themes, each illustrating different aspects of the description of the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem.

At the Battle of Hattin, the Christians lost the Cross on which Christ supposedly was crucified, as the Saracens snatched it during the battle, and two months later, Saladin's army conquered the Holy City of Jerusalem. These were severe losses and created a distinct contrast to the victory of the First Crusade in 1099. What had been the primary goal of the First Crusade – Jerusalem – had now been lost, and in chapter four I will examine how the sources described this sense of loss and sorrow.

The City of Jerusalem itself will be the subject of chapter five. The centre of Christianity, the goal of the First Crusade and the cause for a long tradition of mourning and commemorating the loss of the Holy City, Jerusalem plays a leading role in the sources to the events of 1187. Many approaches could be used to study the role of Jerusalem. I have chosen to focus primarily on a common theme in medieval writing: Jerusalem as female in the role as a Mother of Crusaders and Christians.

During the events of 1187, the Christians faced a dangerous enemy: A giant army under Saladin's leadership. The Saracens were foreign and alien to the Christians,⁸ and their meeting in 1187 ended catastrophically for the Christians, and in chapter six I will analyse how the sources conceived of the enemy.

Finally, a catastrophe needs an explanation, whether there is no other obvious reason than a strong enemy and the wrath of God, or a wider historical context might explain another chain of action. Chapter seven will show how the sources explain the causes for the defeat.

In order to compare the sources, it is necessary to consider the writers' contexts and reasons for writing – the so-called *causa scribendi*. Therefore, I will conclude each of the chapters four to seven with a discussion on the *causae scribendi* behind the sources. In some cases, it is fairly easy to figure out why the writers wrote as they did – especially if they tell us their reasons for writing themselves. In other cases, especially Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien, their incentives are somewhat blurred, and we have to resort to theoretical approaches and hypothetical thinking in order to consider their possible *causae scribendi*.

⁸ For surveys on the perceptions of the Islamic world in Latin Christendom, see John Tolan (ed.). *Medieval Christian perceptions of Islam: a book of essays*. New York: Garland Pub., 1996, and *ibid.*, *Sons of Ishmael: Muslims through European eyes in the Middle Ages*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2008.

Part 1. Background

I. A Looming Catastrophe: The Prelude to the Battle of Hattin

Something went terribly wrong for the Christians in the Latin East in the summer and fall of 1187, and when something goes wrong, human beings tend to seek an explanation. Just as the eyewitnesses and contemporaries to the events sought to evaluate the catastrophe and explain the causes for the defeat – something I will treat in greater detail in chapter seven – so have modern historians discussed the causes.⁹ What seems to be an unfortunate combination of a strong enemy personified by Saladin, leader of the united Islamic forces, a pronounced lack of interest from the West, and a weak leadership internally in the Crusader States eventually culminated in the great defeat.

There is a general unanimity among historians that disputes among the leaders in the Crusader States were contributory to the defeat at Hattin, maybe even the decisive factor. Even with a strong enemy and without the desirable support from the West, the Christians might have had a better change of holding the Muslims off, had the leaders worked together as a united group instead of working counter to one another. From the middle of the twentieth century, crusade historians such as Steven Runciman and Marshall Baldwin have explained the division between the ruling classes in the Crusader States as two opposed groups, the well-established so-called “native barons” on the one side and the “newcomers” from the West on

⁹ The most important primary source to the defeat in 1187 and the preceding decade is the eyewitness account by a squire called Ernoul, who had a close relationship to the Ibelin family. It seems very likely that Ernoul followed Balian of Ibelin during the time of the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem, which makes him an important eyewitness. The chronicle by Ernoul has been edited as *La Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard Le Trésorier* (ed. L. M. de Mas Latrie. Paris: Mme Ve Jules Renouard, 1871), but it also occurs in the so-called continuations of William of Tyre. In the early thirteenth century, William of Tyre's account of the events from the First Crusade until 1184 was translated into French and many manuscripts of the French translation have continuations tacked to the end. One of these continuations is the so-called Lyon *Eracles* manuscript, containing a unique and extremely detailed account of the years 1184-97. For major parts of the account the author remains anonymous, but the first part until the end of 1187 most likely builds on Ernoul's eyewitness account. The benefit of referring the Lyon *Eracles* instead of the Ernoul-Bernard edition is that the latter was copied in the West and copies may have been influenced by Western scribes, while the former exists in its original version, written in Acre in the 1240's, and therefore represents the point of view of Eastern Christians without Western European influence (Edbury, *Conquest*, pp. 1-7). Since I only refer to the part of the Lyon *Eracles*, which most likely is copied from Ernoul's chronicle, I will still refer to the Lyon *Eracles* as an account by Ernoul.

the other side.¹⁰ The most prominent members of the baronial side were Raymond III of Tripoli, Baldwin of Ramla and his brother Balian of Ibelin, Reynald Lord of Sidon and the historian William of Tyre. The other group, the “court party”, counted as members Agnes of Courtenay (Baldwin IV’s mother), her brother Joscelin, Reynald of Châtillon, Guy of Lusignan and his brother Aimery, Patriarch Eraclius and Gerard of Ridefort. Marshall Baldwin characterized the baronial side as people who cared about their fiefs and pursued a mainly defensive politics in order to preserve the status quo between the Muslim and Christian sides, whereas the newcomers on the court side were more adventurous and eager to seek renown and fortune through battle, and the existence of these two factions “prevented unified action and in 1187 directly caused military disaster.”¹¹

Peter Edbury has later questioned this strict division between the two sides, pointing out that the categorization is untenable. Not all members of the court side, for instance, were newcomers. Agnes and Joscelin of Courtenay were direct descendants of participants in the First Crusade and had grown up in the East, and Reynald of Châtillon had been in the East since the Second Crusade and ought to know a lot about the military realities after enduring a long period of Muslim captivity. Moreover, there are several examples of relations and intermarriages between the two sides, so it is wrong and misleading to divide the leaders of the Crusader States into “newcomers” versus “natives”.¹² Nevertheless, even if the ruling segment is not dividable into two coherent groups, division among the leaders certainly existed, and the controversies became evident already during the reign of Baldwin IV (r. 1174-85).

Suffering badly from leprosy, the young king Baldwin IV knew his reign would be short-lived, and he was anxious to settle the succession before his death. Therefore, in 1183, he crowned his nephew, Baldwin V (r. 1185-86), as co-ruler and appointed Raymond III of Tripoli¹³ as temporary regent until the boy came of age and his great-uncle Joscelin III of Courtenay as a personal guardian for the boy. If the boy died prematurely, it would be up to

¹⁰ Steven Runciman. *A History of the Crusades vol 2*. Cambridge University Press, 1951. Kenneth M. Setton, et al. *A history of the Crusades*. Vol. I: “The First Hundred Years” (ed. Marshall W. Baldwin). Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969, pp. 590-93.

¹¹ Marshall Baldwin, in: Setton (ed.), *A history of the Crusades*. Vol. I, p. 592.

¹² Peter W. Edbury, “Propaganda and Faction in the Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Background to Hattin”, in: *Crusaders and Muslims in Twelfth-Century Syria*, ed. M. Shatzmiller. Leiden, 1993, pp. 174-75.

¹³ Baldwin IV was crowned King of Jerusalem on 15 July 1174, aged thirteen, and since he was a minor, Raymond of Tripoli, his closest male relative in the East, had been temporary regent until he came of age in July 1176, after which Raymond returned to Tripoli. (Phillips, *The Crusades*, pp. 122-23).

the Pope, the Western emperor, and the Kings of England and France to decide who should succeed him on the throne.¹⁴

The boy King did indeed die prematurely, just a year after the death of his uncle, initiating the succession race. As temporary regent, Raymond of Tripoli was a candidate for the throne. He was not the only candidate, though. Baldwin IV's sister and mother of Baldwin V, Sibylla, had married Guy of Lusignan in 1180. Raymond of Tripoli had attempted to arrange for Sibylla to marry Balian of Ibelin, a supporter of his. The rejection of his candidate might have sparked the division among the ruling families, and, moreover, Guy of Lusignan was a relative newcomer to the Latin East, a so-called *Poitevin*, the kind of people looked down on by the native barons in the Holy Land.¹⁵

Among Guy of Lusignan's supporters were Reynald of Châtillon and Joscelin of Courtenay, Sibylla's uncle, who advised Raymond to go to Tiberias instead of attending the funeral of Baldwin V,¹⁶ and they were also backed by Eraclius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, and Gerard of Ridefort, Master of the Templars.¹⁷ With Raymond in Tiberias, Sibylla was crowned Queen, after which she appointed her husband, Guy of Lusignan, as King by placing the crown on his head. Depending on the point of view, Guy of Lusignan's coronation almost resembles a coup d'état.¹⁸ At least Raymond of Tripoli seems to have taken it hard and, apparently sparked by his animosity towards Guy of Lusignan, he formed a secret alliance with Saladin.¹⁹ Ernoul tells us that Raymond "sent to Saladin who was lord of Damascus telling him that King Guy was gathering his troops to make war on him, and Saladin replied that if he should need help he would come to his aid."²⁰ Then, while the leadership in the Kingdom of Jerusalem was very

¹⁴ Jotischky, *Crusading and the Crusader States*, pp. 99-100.

¹⁵ Phillips, *The Crusades*, pp. 126-28. In the Lyon Eracles, we see the earliest written evidence that the natives and the newcomers to the Latin East received proper nouns that divided the two groups from each other. The natives were called the "polains", the newcomers the "poitevins". The etymology is unclear, but the naming of different ethnic groups shows the growing barrier between natives and newcomers (Edbury, *Conquest*, p. 45-46. See also footnote 74 on p. 46).

¹⁶ Barber, *The Crusader States*, p. 293.

¹⁷ Phillips, *The Crusades*, p. 132.

¹⁸ Writing with the benefit of hindsight, Ernoul stated that Guy of Lusignan was resented by a significant proportion of the baronage, who considered his coronation to foreshadow the end of the Kingdom of Jerusalem (Edbury, *Conquest*, pp. 26-27). Being closely related to the Ibelin family – members of the so-called baronial side, Ernoul was clearly biased in his description of the events, but the disputes among the ruling families nevertheless seem to have exacerbated the already unstable political situation in the Crusader States.

¹⁹ Barber, *The Crusader States*, p. 296.

²⁰ Edbury, *Conquest*, p. 29.

fragile and the division between the leaders resulted in downright treason, a united Islamic political community was gaining in strength under the leadership of Saladin.

II. The Battle of Hattin and the Fall of Jerusalem, 1187

A particular event in the spring of 1187 seems to have triggered the renewed hostilities between Christians and Muslims. In 1185, Raymond of Tripoli had negotiated a four-year truce with Saladin,²¹ but this truce was broken when Reynald of Châtillon seized a Saracen caravan on its way from Cairo to Damascus and refused to deliver back the people and the spoils, which provided Saladin with a pretext for attacking.²² Shortly before Easter 1187, he gathered his forces for a full-scale invasion. The first major clash between Saladin and the army of the Crusader States happened near the springs of Cresson on 1 May 1187, where a huge Saracen army overwhelmed the Christians and executed a large part of the Templars.²³ According to Ernoul, only 140 Christian knights faced an enemy of at least 7,000 armed Saracen knights, and only four knights escaped, among them the master of the Temple Gerard of Ridefort, while all the rest were either beheaded or taken captive.²⁴

The threat of Saladin's army forced Guy of Lusignan and Raymond of Tripoli to settle their quarrels, and unite their forces. As Malcolm Barber writes, "shock must have hastened the reconciliation between the count and the king that was then agreed. They met at the Hospitalier castle of St Job outside Jerusalem, where both dismounted and Raymond fell on his knees before the king, who lifted him up and embraced him."²⁵

Meanwhile, Saladin had assembled a gigantic army with troops from Egypt, Aleppo, the Jazira and Syria, a total of around 20,000 soldiers, while the Christian army numbered around 1,300 knights and 15,000 foot soldiers.²⁶ So although Guy of Lusignan had been able to collect a considerable army by emptying every part of the Crusader States of fighting men, his army was still not as big as Saladin's. On 27 June, Saladin's army reached the Jordan River

²¹ Barber, *The Crusader States*, p. 290.

²² Phillips, *The Crusades*, p. 133.

²³ Barber, *The Crusader States*, pp. 297-99.

²⁴ Edbury, *Conquest*, pp. 32. The huge imbalance between the two opposing armies is supported by other sources as well, e.g. in a letter from Pope Urban III to the Archbishop of Canterbury, where the Pope reports that 110 knights were defeated by 6,000 enemy soldiers. Pope Urban III's letter built on a now lost letter from Gerard of Ridefort to the Pope immediately after the Battle of Cresson (Rudolf Hiestand, *Papsturkunden für Kirchen im heiligen Lande* (Vorarbeiten zum Oriens Pontificius III), Abhandl. Göttingen. Dritte Folge Nr. 136. Göttingen, 1985, pp. 322-24. Trans. Edbury, *Conquest*, pp. 156-57.)

²⁵ Barber, *The Crusader States*, p. 299.

²⁶ Phillips, *The Crusades*, pp. 133-34.

near as-Senebra, approaching Christian territory, while the Christian army gathered at the springs of Saffaryia.²⁷

While at Saffaryia, the King had conflicting advice. Should he wait for Saladin to make the first move or should the Christian forces attack right away? At first, Guy took Raymond's advice to stay and wait. However, being convinced that Raymond was a traitor, the King decided to move the army in the early hours of the morning of 3 July, thus moving the army away from water supplies. The march was arduous, and the men, as well as horses, suffered from thirst and exhaustion in the heat. At midday, the army stopped at Maskana, which turned out to be a bad choice. There was not nearly enough water for an army of this size and, furthermore, Saladin sent forces to surround the Christians, cutting them totally off from water supplies.²⁸

On the morning of 4 July, the Christian army attempted to continue towards Tiberias, but was hindered by Muslim forces, and in the Horns of Hattin Guy of Lusignan's and Saladin's armies met in a direct confrontation. Saladin was the victor, and the Christian defeat was immense. The True Cross was seized by the Saracens and the major Frankish leaders were captured, including the King himself.²⁹

Very soon after the Battle of Hattin, letters started circulating in the West, describing the events in a desperate and lamenting tone, and asking the secular as well as ecclesiastical leaders for immediate assistance. Throughout the period of the Western Christians' presence in the Holy Land, letters were sent back and forth between the East and the West. Letters from the East came in many different variations, from descriptions of the new environment, requests for aid and extra manpower to attempts at exciting Westerners' enthusiasm for new crusading expeditions.³⁰ Now, the letters were calling for help. Through Genoa, the news of the Battle of Hattin reached the Papal Court by October 1187.³¹ In reaction to this, the newly elected

²⁷ Barber, *The Crusader States*, p. 299.

²⁸ Barber, *The Crusader States*, pp. 299-303. The lack of sufficient water supplies seems to have been an important factor, weakening the Christian army considerably. Joshua Prawer pioneered in studying the topography of the Holy Land along with the primary sources (*Crusader Institutions*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980. Pp. 484-500), an approach that was continued by Benjamin Z. Kedar, who, in his article "The Battle of Hattin Revisited," (in: B. Z. Kedar (ed.): *The Horns of Hattin*, Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992. Pp. 190-207), among other things referred to modern studies of how much water the different springs around Hattin contains at different times of the year.

²⁹ Barber, *The Crusader States*, pp. 303-04.

³⁰ Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate (ed.), *Letters from the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12th-13th Centuries*, Ashgate, 2010, p. 1.

³¹ Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City*, p. 160.

Pope Gregory VIII issued the encyclical *Audita Tremendi* on 29 October 1187, calling for a new crusade.³² The letters informing the Papal Court about the defeat at Hattin were written in the direct aftermath of the battle, among them the letter from the Genoese consuls to Pope Urban III,³³ written in late September 1187, which reportedly first brought the news to the attention of the Pope.³⁴ The letter was not sent directly from the East, however, but was based on a report from a Genoese merchant who had been in Acre during the Battle of Hattin.³⁵

While the Papal Court was struck by horror upon hearing about the catastrophe at Hattin, they were unaware of Saladin's march on Jerusalem. On 9 July, Saladin seized Acre and between 10 July and 6 August, the major coastal cities, except Tyre, surrendered one after another. The people of Ascalon tried to resist, but had to give up the defence after two weeks of siege by Saladin's forces. Most of the people formerly living in the lands now conquered by Saladin had fled to Jerusalem, significantly increasing the population. The chief men of authority in Jerusalem were Balian, Lord of Ibelin, and Eraclius, the Patriarch of Jerusalem. Saladin's forces continuously bombarded the city walls without meeting opposition. Guy of Lusignan had assembled most of the fighting men for the Battle of Hattin, leaving mostly civilians to defend Jerusalem. Facing a disaster, Balian of Ibelin negotiated a deal with Saladin to ransom as many people of Jerusalem as possible and on 2 October 1187, the keys to Jerusalem were handed over to Saladin.³⁶

³² Gregory VIII, *Audita tremendi*. *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 202, col. 1539-1542.

³³ *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis*, (ed.) W. Stubbs, vol. 2, RS 49 (London, 1867), pp. 11-13. Tr. Barber and Bate in *Letters from the East*, p. 82-83.

³⁴ Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City*, p. 160, footnote 4.

³⁵ *Letters from the East*, p. 82.

³⁶ Barber, *The Crusader States*, pp. 310-11.

III. Communicating the News to the West

When Pope Gregory VIII issued his *Audita Tremendi*, the news of the fall of Jerusalem had not yet reached the West. It reached the West by the end of November 1187 at the earliest. It is unclear how the Papal Court first heard about the fall of Jerusalem, whether by letter or by embassy. Sylvia Schein refers to a letter from the Hospitaller Hermenger to Leopold V of Austria as one of the first reports to the West describing the fall of Jerusalem. However, this letter was not sent until the fall of 1188, so it can hardly be counted among the earliest news from the East.³⁷

We know from sources such as Ernoul that Joscius, Archbishop of Tyre (c. 1186-1202), led an embassy to the West immediately after the fall of Jerusalem. In Ferrara, he met Pope Gregory VIII.³⁸ Since the Pope died shortly afterwards, it was left to his successor, Pope Clement III (p. 1187-91), to carry out his plans. He sent embassies throughout Europe. Most importantly, he sent Henry, cardinal-bishop of Albano, as an embassy to the German Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa (r. 1152-90), who, on 27 March, 1188, took the cross at Mainz.³⁹ Meanwhile, Joscius' embassy had continued through Europe and met with Henry II of England (r. 1154-89) and Philip II of France (r. 1180-1223), who both took the cross on 21 January 1188. Henry II's son and future King, Richard I (r. 1189-99), had spontaneously taken the cross in November 1187, immediately upon hearing the news of the fall of Jerusalem.⁴⁰

The many letters still extant today bear witnesses to the great amount of accounts streaming out of the Holy Land in the wake of the catastrophic events of 1187.⁴¹ The letters were addressed to recipients all over Europe, and we only need to look at a small selection of letters in order to see a large area of dissemination. Shortly after the Battle of Hattin, a group

³⁷ Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City*, p. 160, footnote 5. The letter from Hermenger to Leopold V is extant in: 'Ansbert', *Historia de Expeditione Friderici Imperatoris*. Ed. A. Chroust, MGH SS, n.s., vol. 5, Berlin, 1928, pp. 4-5. The date October 1187 is stated in the margin, pointing to the contents of the letter. Schein may have confused this date with the composition date of the letter. The letter, however, reports on Saladin's progress during the following year after the conquest of Jerusalem and cannot have been composed until the fall of 1188.

³⁸ For this, see Barber, *The Crusader States*, pp. 325. The Lyon *Eracles* version of Ernoul states that Joscius met with Pope Urban III, but it seems very unlikely that he reached the West in Urban's lifetime.

³⁹ Barber, *The Crusader States*, p. 325.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 325.

⁴¹ Conveniently, a number of letters have been edited, translated and published by Barber and Bate in *Letters from the East*, and a few letters have been published in Edbury's *Conquest*, as well.

of princes and ecclesiastics of the Latin East sent a letter to Emperor Frederick Barbarossa.⁴² Terricus, Grand Preceptor of the Temple, sent a letter addressed to all preceptors and brethren of the Temple in the West.⁴³ Another letter was addressed to Archumbald, master of the Hospitallers of Italy,⁴⁴ while Eraclius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, addressed letters to all the secular leaders of the West as well as to Pope Urban III.⁴⁵ Even more letters were addressed to Henry II of England and Leopold V of Austria (r. 1177-94). Just by looking at the individual recipients, it becomes clear that letters were sent to Italy, Germany, Austria, England and France. Letters dedicated to large groups of people, such as the letter from Terricus to all preceptors and brethren of the Temple in the West, indicate that letters were sent in many copies to different parts of Western Europe. At the very least, we can be certain that Terricus' letter reached England, since it was copied by Roger of Howden, the reason why we know the letter today.

In most cases, the contents of the letters are still available today because they were copied by contemporary chroniclers in the first decades after 1187, which is a solid proof that the letters in question reached their intended Western European audiences. We must assume that this type of letter – the call for help – was aimed at wider dissemination. Even though most of them are addressed to individuals, the contents unveil the intention of reaching larger audiences. In two letters to Pope Urban III, we see requests for spreading the information. A letter sent in late September, 1187, by Genoese consuls, clearly concerned to secure the trade routes between East and West, asks the Pope to “convene the nations, unite the peoples, put heart into the effort to recover the Holy of Holies.”⁴⁶ At the same time, Patriarch Eraclius, residing in the besieged Jerusalem, asks the Pope to stir “all the princes of the West to bring aid speedily to the Holy Land.”⁴⁷ Aimery of Limoges, Patriarch of Antioch, writing to King Henry II of England the following year, also seems to ask Henry to spread the information of the dreadful

⁴² E continuatione Hugonis a Sancto Victore, (ed.) L. Weiland, MGH SS, vol. 21 (Hannover, 1869), pp. 475-6.

⁴³ Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, vol. 2, (ed.) W. Stubbs, RS 51 (London, 1869), pp. 324-5.

⁴⁴ *Historia de Expeditione*, pp. 2-4.

⁴⁵ Jaspert, N., ‘Zwei unbekannte Hilfersuchen des Patriarchen Eraclius vor dem Fall Jerusalems (1187)’, nr. 2, pp. 511-16, in: *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 60 (2004). Hiestand, *Papsturkunden*, pp. 324-7.

⁴⁶ *Letters from the East*, p. 83. Orig.: “Convenite gentes et adunate populos, et ad recuperanda sancta sanctorum [...] cor in humerum date.” (*Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis*, (ed.) W. Stubbs, vol. 2, RS 49 (London, 1867), p. 12.)

⁴⁷ Edbury, *Conquest*, p. 163. Orig.: “nisi [...] occidentalis terre principes ad succurrendum Sancte Terre uelocius animauerit [...]” (Hiestand, *Papsturkunden*, p. 327.)

events in the Holy Land: "The whole world will hear of our grief *with you*, so that it will know the origin and the goal of our tearful lamentations,"⁴⁸ (emphasis mine).

In the case of the letter from princes and ecclesiastics of the Latin East to Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, written in July 1187, we can be fairly certain that it reached a wider audience than Frederick Barbarossa alone. The letter was copied by an anonymous continuator of Hugh of St. Victor (c. 1096-1141), who writes that the letter was read aloud in public around the feast of St. Clement (23 November 1187),⁴⁹ probably somewhere in the proximity of Weingarten in Bavaria, where the chronicle was composed.⁵⁰

Since contemporary chroniclers copied letters from the East in the decades after 1187, they are useful as indicators of the transmission history of the letters. Among the best known British chroniclers, Roger of Howden copied letters received by Henry II, among them the letter from Terricus, Grand Preceptor of the Temple, to all preceptors and brethren of the Temple in the West. The *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi* included a copy of the letter from the Genoese consuls to Pope Urban III, written in late September 1187,⁵¹ probably the very same letter that first brought the news of the Battle of Hattin to the Papal Court.⁵² Apparently, this letter spread furthermore after its arrival at the Papal Court, ending up in an English chronicle. Another letter addressed to Pope Urban III is extant in a thirteenth century manuscript from the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich,⁵³ indicating that this letter also travelled further than to the Papal Court. In fact, quite a few letters can be traced to Southern Germany. The letter from princes and ecclesiastics beyond the sea to Emperor Frederick Barbarossa was copied by the continuator of Hugh of St. Victor, resident of the Weingarten in Bavaria.⁵⁴ The *Historia de Expeditione Friderici Imperatoris* by the so-called Ansbert, the most comprehensive and detailed source to the crusade of Frederick Barbarossa, probably compiled in Passau on the

⁴⁸ *Letters from the East*, p. 85.

⁴⁹ "Verum continentia literarum tam inopinabile malum explicans circa festum beati Clementis in haec verba cepit publice recitari." (*E continuatione*, p. 475, ll. 27-28).

⁵⁰ *E continuatione*, p. 473-74.

⁵¹ *Gesta Regis Henrici*, pp. 11-13.

⁵² Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City*, p. 160, footnote 4.

⁵³ Hiestand, *Papsturkunden*, p. 324.

⁵⁴ *E continuatione*, p. 473-74.

Austro-Bavarian border,⁵⁵ provides copies of a letter to Archumbald, master of the Hospitallers of Italy, written before the surrender of Ascalon, 4 September, and a letter from Hermenger, Provisor of the Hospital, to Leopold V, Duke of Austria, written in November, 1188.⁵⁶

When it comes to the value of the letters from the East as source material, there is a discrepancy between descriptions of the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem. The Battle of Hattin prompted an immediate reaction of letters to the West asking for assistance against the Saracens, while it is hard to find detailed descriptions of the fall of Jerusalem in the form of letters. An explanation might be that the Battle of Hattin presented the so far biggest threat to the Kingdom of Jerusalem and the letters were sent as cries for help to the West, requesting immediate aid to save Jerusalem. We know for a fact that the West indeed reacted quickly. News of Pope Gregory VIII's *Audita Tremendi* and the subsequent preparations for a new crusade expedition may have reached the East soon thereafter and provided assurance that help was on the way, and therefore letters calling for help were not as necessary as it had been directly after the Battle of Hattin. Letters were still sent from the East, though, but there is a lack of detailed descriptions of the siege and fall of Jerusalem. If mentioned at all, it is often

⁵⁵ The standard critical edition of the *Historia de Expeditione Friderici Imperatoris* is the edition by A. Chroust (MGH SS, n.s., vol. 5, Berlin, 1928). Graham Loud has translated the account into English (*Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, pp. 33-134). As a preface to the Crusade, the account starts off with a description of the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem (pp. 1-10). Completed in 1200 at the latest, the *Historia de Expeditione* is a contemporary source. Two early, but fragmented, manuscripts with parts of the account have been handed down to present day, one written c. 1200 at the Benedictine monastery of St. Lamprecht in Styria, the other written probably before 1221 at the Premonstratensian abbey of Mühlhausen in Bohemia. Two copies were made in Moravia in the mid-eighteenth century, probably from a different archetype, and these copies have helped fill the gaps in the fragmented early manuscripts. The authorship is usually ascribed to a so-called Ansbert. However, the authorship is problematic, since the name was only added to the Mühlhausen manuscript sometime during the thirteenth century. An earlier hand described the author as an Austrian cleric who was present at the time of Frederick Barbarossa's crusade (Loud, *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, pp. 1-2.) In reality, the account resembles most of all a composite text, a work by more than one author. The preface to Frederick Barbarossa's crusade alone contains reproductions of three letters (pp. 2-4: the letter to Archumbald, master of the Hospitallers of Italy, pp. 4-5: the letter from Hermenger, Provisor of the Hospital, to Leopold V, Duke of Austria, and pp. 6-10: Pope Gregory VIII's *Audita Tremendi*.), the contents of which take up the major part of the description of the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem. Even if the appellation 'Ansbert' is in any way correct, he was more likely a later compiler than the author of the entire account (Loud, *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 7.) However, at least parts of the accounts are probably written by an Austrian clergyman who participated in Frederick Barbarossa's expedition and provided an eyewitness account of some of the events described (Marie Bláhová, "Ansbert", *EMC*, p. 104.) The early hand describing the author as an Austrian cleric points to a place of origin. The production area could possibly be further confined, since the account seems to emphasize particularly the role of men from Passau, so the compiler possibly came from the Passau region on the border between Bavaria and Austria (Loud, *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 7.)

⁵⁶ *Historia de Expeditione*, pp. 2-5.

described as information already known by sender as well as receiver. Therefore, albeit a rich source for the Battle of Hattin, the letters from the East do not inform us much about the fall of Jerusalem. For that, we must turn to other sources.

I have already mentioned Gregory VIII's *Audita Tremendi* a few times, and it is indeed a source hard to ignore when studying the Third Crusade. It is probably the single most important piece of source material when it comes to the study of the reaction to the Battle of Hattin. Using his papal authority, Gregory VIII wrote the encyclical *Audita Tremendi* to call for a new crusade. When he issued the encyclical on 29 October 1187, he had been Pope for only about a week. The news of the Battle of Hattin reached the Papal Court during the papacy of his predecessor Pope Urban III, but the death of Urban III on 20 October left it to Gregory VIII to react to the news. The *Audita Tremendi* describes the great defeat of the Christians in the Latin East only succinctly and gives more attention to the sins of the Christians as a cause for the defeat and the opportunity of repentance for those undertaking the journey eastwards to aid Jerusalem.⁵⁷ The *Audita Tremendi* is not a particularly rich source for the actual events of 1187, but a key source of the immediate Western reaction to the Battle of Hattin and of the further spread of the information throughout Europe.

Gregory VIII's *Audita Tremendi* survives in only three versions, one of which were sent to Germany around late October 1187.⁵⁸ Apart from originals, we see traces of the encyclical in contemporary chronicles, for instance in the *Historia de Expeditione*, where it was copied in full length, and Arnold of Lübeck summarizes the papal letter in his chronicle, although nothing indicates that he actually read the encyclical himself.⁵⁹ Given the status of the Pope,

⁵⁷ Gregory VIII. *Audita Tremendi*. PL, vol. 202, col. 1539-1542. For an English translation, see: L. and J.S.C. Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: Idea and Reality 1095-1274*. London: Edward Arnold, 1981, pp. 63-67.

⁵⁸ Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, pp. 63-64.

⁵⁹ Arnold summarizes *Audita Tremendi* in his sixth chapter of book four. This could prove the line of transmission, the desirable link from the Latin East to the Pope and from the Pope to Arnold. Paradoxically, however, I will argue that this specific summary proves that Arnold did not read the said encyclical. He knows what the message is: The promise of remission of all sins for those who help liberate the True Cross and the Holy City. He does not know who wrote the letter, though. According to Arnold, Pope Gregory died after only a few days on the Papal Throne, and it was Clement III who wrote the *Audita Tremendi*. This is just a minor detail, but would he not have known which Pope wrote the letter if he had read it himself? Moreover, he does not repeat the wording and phrases of the *Audita Tremendi*, only the overall message, indicating that the Pope's message reached Arnold, if not the actual letter itself.

the importance of the message in *Audita Tremendi*, and the nature of the ecclesiastical communication system,⁶⁰ we must assume that the *Audita Tremendi* was very widespread. The letter was probably sent to at least every Christian province, where the individual archbishops may have informed the bishops of their province. Apart from the encyclical, the Pope also sent embassies to the European Courts. Likewise, churchmen staying at the Curia at the time carried the news to other parts of Europe, like Peter of Blois,⁶¹ for instance, who brought the news to Henry II of England.⁶²

Among the embassies sent by the Papal Court, Henry, Cardinal-bishop of Albano, is especially noteworthy. He was sent by Pope Clement III as an embassy to Frederick Barbarossa upon receiving the news of the fall of Jerusalem,⁶³ and he later wrote about the defeat of 1187 in his *De Peregrinante Civitate Dei*.⁶⁴ Out of eighteen chapters in total about the city of Jerusalem, the thirteenth chapter is a digression where Henry laments the loss of Jerusalem.⁶⁵ In connection with his embassy to Germany, Henry of Albano also wrote a letter to the German ecclesiastical and secular rulers, a letter meant to disseminate the call for crusade. While Peter of Blois set the tone for the English accounts of the fall of Jerusalem, Henry of Albano's writings particularly influenced German and French chroniclers and poets,⁶⁶ making him an important link in the tradition for writing about the catastrophic events of 1187.

It is fairly easy to see the line of transmission of information from the Latin East to Western Europe, even if only looking at a few sources. A multitude of letters disseminated from the East after the Battle of Hattin and recipients in the West copied them into chronicles in the following decades. In the preceding, I have only tracked the transmission of information from the Latin East through European courts to secondary accounts that for certain had some

⁶⁰ According to Sophia Menache, an institutionalization of the ecclesiastical communication developed between the eleventh and fourteenth centuries, and in this period we see attempts at monopolizing the communications channels to Christendom. Papal legates served the important function as "the prolonged arms of the papacy." The institutionalization of the communication showed in the Church's organization into provinces, dioceses and parishes lead by archbishops, bishops and priests, respectively. This way, information from the Pope went through the archbishops to the bishops and further from bishops to priests. (*The Vox Dei: Communication in the Middle Ages*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990, pp. 51-77).

⁶¹ In 1187-89, Peter of Blois wrote the encyclical *De Hierosolymitana Peregrinatione Acceleranda*, and he preached the Third Crusade in England. (Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City*, p. 78).

⁶² Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City*, p. 160.

⁶³ Barber, *The Crusader States*, p. 325.

⁶⁴ Henry of Albano. *De Peregrinante Civitate Dei*, PL, vol. 204, col. 251-402.

⁶⁵ Ibid., col. 351-361: "Tractatus XIII. Digressio, qua lamentatur auctor Jerusalem ab infidelibus captam."

⁶⁶ Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City*, pp. 161-62.

direct knowledge of the primary accounts. As an embassy sent by Pope Clement III, Henry of Albano was in close contact with the Papal Court and must have been well aware of the letters received by the popes. The *Historia de Expeditione* reproduces letters from the East as well as Pope Gregory VIII's *Audita Tremendi*, which shows the compiler's access to sources sent from the Latin East as well as the Papal Court. These sources, however, only account for a small fraction of the total number of written sources about the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem. The events of 1187 caused a tremendous literary activity, and it would be more noteworthy to find contemporary annals and chronicles not mentioning the events in some way or another. It is a well-established fact that the fall of Jerusalem took root in Western European literature, so much indeed that writing about the loss of Jerusalem almost could be seen as an independent literary genre.⁶⁷

One thing is to establish the presence of descriptions of the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem in contemporary writings from all over Europe. Another is to trace exactly how the information about the events of 1187 came from the scene of action to the later European sources. In some cases, as mentioned above, chroniclers copied letters, which prove the connection between the primary and secondary sources, but in most cases, we have accounts – in some cases very detailed accounts – which offer no clue as to where the authors had their information from. We have to keep in mind that the written sources we have access to today only allow us to study the part of the written source material that was stored and saved for posterity, and besides of that, even written sources were probably only a small part of the communication system.

The Chronicles of Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien

As illustrated above, it is possible to trace the line of transmission from the Holy Land to Germany. *The Historia de Expeditione Friderici Imperatoris* was probably composed near the Austro-Bavarian border, and Henry of Albano travelled as a Papal embassy to the German people. In Germany, two chronicles came into existence three decades after the Battle of Hattin

⁶⁷ Ibid., pp. 160-63. The news of the fall of Jerusalem even reached Denmark. The *Historia de profectioe Danorum in Hierosolymam* (c. 1200) describes a Danish-Norwegian expedition to the Holy Land as a reaction to the news of the fall of Jerusalem in 1187 (Karen Skovgaard-Petersen, *A Journey to the Promised Land. Crusading Theology in the Historia de profectioe Danorum in Hierosolymam* (c. 1200). Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2001).

and the fall of Jerusalem, two chronicles that included detailed descriptions of these events. The authors – Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien – are both somewhat mysterious. We do not know very much about their lives or how they received their knowledge about the events of 1187.

We know that Arnold of Lübeck was born sometime in the middle of the twelfth century and was probably raised in Hildesheim or Braunschweig. In Braunschweig, he was a monk at the Benedictine St. Ägidien monastery until 1177 when he was appointed the first Abbot of the newly founded Benedictine monastery of St. John's in Lübeck,⁶⁸ an office he held for more than thirty years until his death sometime between 1211 and 1214. During his abbacy in Lübeck, Arnold composed his prose chronicle,⁶⁹ the so-called *Chronica Slavorum*,⁷⁰ which he finished in 1210.⁷¹

⁶⁸ Laila Werthschulte: "Arnold of Lübeck", *EMC*, pp. 110-11.

⁶⁹ Arnold of Lübeck's chronicle was published in 1868 by Georg Heinrich Pertz in the MGH *scriptores* series as *usum scholarum*, i.e. without a critical apparatus ("Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum". *MGH SS rer. Germ. 14*. Hannover: Hahn, 1868). The same edition was published a year later with a critical introduction by Johann Martin Lappenberg in the MGH *scriptores* series ("Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum". *MGH SS 21*. Hannover: Hahn, 1869, pp. 100-250.) and Lappenberg's introduction to the 1869 critical edition is still the standard source to Arnold's work and his critical edition of the chronicle remains the authoritative edition to this day. In his introduction, Lappenberg divides the manuscripts into two groups. The first group consists of the so-called Prague fragment and the Brno fragment, both belonging to what Lappenberg calls manuscript 1, which he estimated to be closest to the archetype. A later manuscript, Copenhagen GKS 2288 is most likely a copy of the same archetype, and Lappenberg's edition relies heavily on this manuscript and the two fragments. The second group of manuscripts consists of eleven manuscripts that Lappenberg deemed to be farther away from the archetype (Lappenberg, "Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum", pp. 106-112). Lappenberg's edition was translated into Danish by P. Kierkegaard in 1885 (*Arnold af Lybeks Slavekrønike*. Copenhagen: Karl Schønbergs Forlag, 1885), but no modern translations exist in either German or English. However, a new critical edition with a translation into modern German is on its way (Oliver Auge: "Probleme der Übersetzung von Arnolds Chronik: Ein Werkstattbericht." In: Stephan Freund & Bernd Schütte (ed.). *Die "Chronik" Arnolds Von Lubeck: Neue Wege Zu Ihrem Verstandnis*, Peter Lang Pub Inc, 2008, pp. 25-43.) An English translation by Graham Loud will be published c. 2019.

⁷⁰ Not the original title. According to Hucker, the title *Chronica Slavorum* was applied by later editors because of the chronicle's relationship to Helmold of Bosau's chronicle, which was called *Chronica Slavorum*, and Arnold's chronicle was a continuation of Helmold's chronicle. This title, however, is neither adequate nor original, since Arnold's scope is far wider than Helmold's and his chronicle is as much about imperial history including expeditions eastwards as it is about regional Nordalbingian history. The title was firmly cemented by Georg Heinrich Pertz, who used this title for his 1868 edition (Hucker, "Die Chronik Arnolds von Lübeck als *Historia Regum*," pp. 98-99).

⁷¹ The precise date of completion is unknown, but the chronicle was most likely finished sometime between March and August 1210. For a discussion of dating the chronicle, see Hucker, "Die Chronik Arnolds von Lübeck als *Historia Regum*," pp. 111-15.

Arnold of Lübeck's chronicle is about regional as well as imperial events from 1172/73 to 1210, divided into seven books.⁷² The events of the chronicle come in somewhat chronological order, although the course is not entirely linear, as Arnold deviates from the chronology once in a while to tell a story or anecdote from past times. Of particular interest for this thesis is book four, especially chapters one, four, five, and seven which are about the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem as well as lamentations over the loss of Jerusalem.

While only a little is known about Arnold of Lübeck, virtually nothing is known about the author of the so-called *Ottonis de S. Blasio Chronica*.⁷³ The chronicle has received its name after Otto, Abbot of St. Blasien in the Black Forest who died in 1223.⁷⁴ According to Franz-Joseph Schmale,⁷⁵ there is a good probability that this Otto actually wrote the chronicle.⁷⁶ However, the connection between the Abbot and the chronicle was not made until the fifteenth century, and the authorship cannot be proven. It remains uncertain whether this Otto wrote the chronicle or not. For convenience, I will use the name Otto when referring to the chronicle,

⁷² Not necessarily the original division, but for the sake of this thesis, I will follow the book and chapter division from Lappenberg's edition.

⁷³ Otto's chronicle is extant in only four manuscripts. When Adolfus Hofmeister made the first critical edition of Otto's chronicle in 1912, he stemmatized the manuscripts, which he called 1, 1a, 1b and 2. Manuscript 1, Zürich, C. 33,2°, was copied between 1254 and 1273, probably before 1261. It contains the chronicle of Otto of Freising followed by the chronicle of Otto of St. Blasien. Two copies were made from this manuscript, named 1a and 1b. Manuscript 2, Vienna, National Library, No. 3334,2°, is a paper manuscript, copied in 1482 independently from manuscript 1, maybe even copied directly from the archetype. Hoffmeister recognized that the 1a and 1b manuscripts were copies of manuscript 1, and therefore he ignored them in his edition, relying solely on manuscripts 1 and 2. Even though manuscript 1 was written much earlier than manuscript 2, and thereby closer to the completion date of the archetype, it is tainted by errors and written in a volatile language. Meanwhile, manuscript 2 follows the wording of the time period of the archetype, even though it was copied much later, thus indicating that it might have been copied from the archetype. Hoffmeister relied mostly on manuscript 1 for his 1912 edition (Adolfus Hofmeister: "Ottonis de Sancto Blasio Chronica". *MGH SS rer. Germ.* 47. Hannover; Leipzig: Hahn, 1912. Pp. XVII-XXII).

⁷⁴ Mathias Herweg, "Otto of St. Blasien", *EMC*, pp. 1175-76.

⁷⁵ Franz-Josef Schmale is the editor of a modern edition and translation of Otto of St. Blasien's chronicle (*Die Chronik Ottos von St. Blasien und die Marbacher Annalen*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998), which is now considered the standard edition. Before Schmale's edition, the latest translation into German was done by Horst Kohl in 1881 (*Die Chronik des Otto von St. Blasien*. Transl. Horst Ernst Arminius Kohl. Leipzig: Verlag von Franz Dunder, 1881) and the former standard critical edition of the chronicle was edited by Adolfus Hofmeister and published in the *MGH scriptores* series in 1912. Schmale's 1998 edition is more or less a reproduction of Hofmeister's edition. However, he has added some notes and retranslated the text into German and made his edition as a parallel-text edition with the Latin text facing the German translation. An excerpt of Otto's chronicle was translated into English by Graham Loud in 2013, namely the chapters concerned with the Third Crusade (Ch. 29-42) (*Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, pp. 173-191).

⁷⁶ Schmale, *Die Chronik Ottos von St. Blasien*, pp. 1-4.

keeping in mind that the author remains essentially anonymous. The author wrote the chronicle in 1209/10 at the earliest, and no evidence indicates a later completion date.

Otto's chronicle is a history of the Holy Roman Empire between 1146 to 1209, ending with Otto IV's imperial coronation and the peace between Welfs and Hohenstaufens. Otto's loyalty seems to belong transdynastically to the imperial crown and the Empire, and the focus of the chronicle rests more broadly on the Empire.⁷⁷ As part of the imperial history, Otto shows a great interest in the Third Crusade and events related to the Crusades in general. Chapters thirty-one to forty-two are almost entirely dedicated to events related to the Third Crusade.⁷⁸ Of particular relevance to this thesis, chapter thirty deals with the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem.

So the chronicles of Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien are the kind of chroniclers that spend a significant amount of their writings to describe events related to the Crusades, and they both provide rather detailed accounts of the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem. They seem to fit perfectly in the line of transmission of letters from the East reaching the European courts, after which the information seeped into contemporary chronicles. However, the difference between these chronicles and the chronicles by, for instance, Roger of Howden and the *Historia de Expeditione*, is that we have no solid proof of how the information reached Arnold and Otto. Nevertheless, somehow they knew about the events of 1187, and this knowledge makes them part of the literary tradition of commemorating the loss of Jerusalem. In the next part of my thesis, I will analyse the contents of the sources to the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem from the earliest letters from the East to the chronicles of Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien in order to analyse how the narrative developed and changed over time.

⁷⁷ Mathias Herweg: "Otto of St. Blasien", *EMC*, pp. 1175-76.

⁷⁸ Schmale, *Die Chronik Ottos von St. Blasien*, pp. 1-4.

Part 2. Analysis: Narrating the Defeat

The Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem gave rise to a wave of information from the Latin East to the West, eventually causing the Third Crusade. From the Papal Court, letters and embassies brought the news throughout Europe, while further letters from the East were addressed to the Papal Court as well as the major European leaders. From the recipients of these reports, the information filtered out into the surrounding societies and found its way into contemporary chronicles, treatises, poems and sermons, establishing the commemoration of the catastrophe as a literary tradition.⁷⁹ In this part, I will take a detailed look at the catastrophe of 1187, how it was described and how the narrative developed through the three centuries from the letters from the East to the chronicles of Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien.

IV. Loss and Sorrow: Speechlessness, Performance, Commemoration

“What More Can We Say?”: Speechlessness

Much as we try to describe to you all the huge burden of sadness, anguish, incomparable pain and keen affliction that weigh upon us, the sheer size of our discomfiture and misfortunes prevents us from saying anything other than ‘alas, alas!’⁸⁰

Thus writes Eraclius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, in a letter addressed to all the secular leaders of the West in September 1187. Eraclius here seems to lack the ability to fully describe the horrors he has witnessed and must resort to a cry of “alas!” The inability to verbalize the feelings of sorrow and loss is a common theme in the primary sources to the Battle of Hattin and the loss of Jerusalem. In their letter to Frederick Barbarossa, the princes and ecclesiastics beyond the sea even seem to be somewhat paralysed by fright, writing “what more can we say?”⁸¹

⁷⁹ Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City*, pp. 160-62.

⁸⁰ *Letters from the East*, p. 79. Orig.: “Meroris et angustie incomparabilis circumventi doloris immanitatem et afflictionis acerrime molem universitati vestre scriber conamur, sed pre contentionis magnitudine doloris et angustie nil aliud quam lamentationes et ‘ve!’ pronunciare valemus.” (Jaspert, p. 512).

⁸¹ *Letters from the East*, pp. 76-77. Orig.: “Quid plura? [...] Quid amplius loquamur?” (*E continuatione*, p. 476, l. 9 & 18).

several times, as though the horrors of the Saracens' attacks cannot be fully expressed in writing. Likewise, in his letter to all preceptors and brethren of the Temple in the West, Terricus, Grand Preceptor of the Temple, points out the difficulties in describing the horrors with words: "Alas, it is impossible in a letter or by lamentation to recount the numerous huge calamities that the wrath of God has allowed us to suffer because of our sins."⁸²

The letter writers give the impression that the framework of common language collapses concurrently with the collapse of Christianity in the Levant. The enormity of the catastrophe exceeds what is linguistically possible to describe. Exclamations like "proh dolor!",⁸³ "ve!",⁸⁴ and "heu, heu"⁸⁵ – all being nuances of the English word "alas" – are common in the letters from the East, all being exclamations that express feelings of shock and horror, emphasizing the insufficiency of language. The horrors cannot be confined within language, and the descriptions of the events are therefore accompanied by such interjections. However, it is somewhat oxymoronic to describe the limitations of language in letter form. By rejecting the usability of language, the letter writers are using language itself as a rhetorical means to intensify their message. By adopting a despondent attitude, stating that the calamities cannot even be described in words, the senders leave it to the receivers to imagine which unmentionable horrors might have been going on. We cannot dismiss the possibility that the letter writers were genuinely unable to put their experiences into words, but we must assume that the speechlessness most of all was a way to convince the receivers of the severity of the Saracens' attacks.

The rhetorical irresoluteness is not exclusive to the eyewitness accounts. By late October 1187, a letter written by a group of Genoese consuls reached the Papal Court. The main purpose of the letter was to report to Pope Urban III what news they had received from the Latin East; that Saladin had defeated the Christian army and captured the King as well as the Cross. This letter was very likely the first to inform the Papal Court of the Battle of Hattin, the news that accordingly killed Pope Urban III, as the grief and horror proved to be too much for his weak heart. The Genoese refer to an account of a grief-stricken (*lugubri*) fellow citizen,⁸⁶ but otherwise, the letter is matter-of-factly recounting the events in the Holy Land. The news

⁸² *Letters from the East*, p. 78. Orig.: "Quot quantisque calamitatibus ira Dei, nostris peccatis exigentibus, nos in praesenti flagellari permiserit, nec litteris nec flebili voce, proh dolor! explicare valemus." (Roger of Howden, p. 324).

⁸³ *E continuatione*, p. 476, l. 19.

⁸⁴ Jaspert, p. 512.

⁸⁵ Hiestand, *Papsturkunden*, p. 327.

⁸⁶ *Letters from the East*, p. 82. *Gesta Regis Henrici*, p. 11.

of the Battle of Hattin prompted Pope Urban's successor Gregory VIII to immediate action. During his first week as Pope, he wrote the encyclical *Audita Tremendi* as a first reaction to the terrible news. Like some of the letters from the East, he initiates his letter with stating that it is hard to know how to react to such horrible news:

On hearing with what severe and terrible judgement the land of Jerusalem has been smitten by the divine hand, we and our brothers have been confounded by such great horror and affected by such great sorrow that we could not easily decide what to do or say.⁸⁷

The Pope, however, knows exactly what the next step ought to be. First, he emphasizes that the sorrow for the defeat is not a personal sorrow, but something every single Christian should feel:

For anyone of sane mind who does not weep at such a cause for weeping, if not in body at least in his heart, would seem to have forgotten not only his Christian faith, which teaches that one ought to mourn with all those who mourn, but even his very humanity.⁸⁸

Second, the primary message of the *Audita Tremendi* is that the Christians should hasten to the Holy Land and help protect the Eastern Church. His letter is a call for crusade. Whereas some of the letters from the East mention the possibility of remission of sins for those who take the cross, possibly in order to entice Westerners to initiate a new crusading enterprise, the Pope spends a significant part of his letter writing about the sins of Christians and how they need to do penance by travelling eastwards and help protect the City of Jerusalem against the Saracens' attacks. In return, the Pope promises full indulgence (*plena indulgentia*) for their sins.

⁸⁷ Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, p. 64. Orig.: "Audita tremendi severitate iudicii, quod super terram Jerusalem divina manus exercuit, tanto sumus nos et fratres nostri horrore confusi, tantisque afflicti doloribus, ut non facile nobis occurreret, quid agere aut quid facere deberemus." (*Audita tremendi*, col. 1539D).

⁸⁸ Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, p. 65. Orig.: "Quisquis sane in tanta lugendi materia, si non corpore, saltem corde non luget, non tantum fidei Christianae, quae cum omnibus dolentibus docet esse dolendum, sed ipsius est humanitatis nostrae oblitus." (*Audita Tremendi*, col. 1540C).

“With Tears and Sobs”: The Sorrow as Performance

The Pope presents a way to cope with the sorrow: To fight back and protect the Holy Land against the enemy. When he wrote this, the Pope was still unaware of the fact that Jerusalem had fallen into the hands of Saladin. When this news reached the Papal Court, Pope Gregory VIII's successor, Clement III, sent Henry, Cardinal Bishop of Albano, as an embassy to Frederick Barbarossa and on that occasion Henry of Albano himself wrote a letter to be sent to all the leading men of Germany. Working as an auxiliary arm to the Pope, Henry of Albano's letter was intended to summon the German people and urge them to take the cross. It is no wonder, then, that his sorrow is vividly described:

Because ‘the voice of the turtle’, a voice of groaning, a voice of sadness, has recently spread news of lamentable sorrow, who among Christian people has not groaned at such a disaster? Who does not mourn that the Holy Land, which the feet of the Lord dedicated for our redemption, is exposed to the filthiness of pagans? Who does not deplore the capture and trampling underfoot of the life-giving Cross, and the profanation of the sanctuaries of the Lord by the unbelievers? Alas, alas, when something similar was heard, when that Cross received the fixing of the nails, ‘the earth did quake, the sun was terrified, and the rocks rent; and the graves were opened.’⁸⁹

Using acoustic images, Henry describes the news of the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem as a voice of groaning (*vox gemitus*) and a voice of sadness (*vox doloris*). He reuses the *gemitus* in verbal form (*ingemisco*): “who has not groaned (*ingemiscat*) at such disaster?” Moreover, he uses the verb *deploro*: “who has not deplored (*deploret*) the capture of the Cross?” Henry's phraseology creates an almost audible description of the mourning. The sorrow is loud and his interjections “alas, alas!” (*heu, heu!*) reinforces the message. He is yelling his message out to the receivers. The letter was probably meant to be read aloud, thereby making such rhetorical means as yelling possible. The sorrow over the loss of the Cross is not a

⁸⁹ Loud, *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, pp. 41-42. Orig.: “Ex quo vox illa turturis, vox gemitus, vox doloris fines nostros lamentabili nuper novitate doloris aspersit, quis ad tantam stragem non ingemiscat populi christiani? quis terram illam sanctam, quam redemption nostre ipsi dedicarunt pedes domini, spurcitiis paganorum non doleat exponi? quis crucem salvificam captam non deploret et conculcatam ab ethnicis et sanctuarium domini profanatum? Heu, heu! ad auditum quondam similem, cum fixuras clavorum crux ipsa susciperet, *terra tremuit, sol expavit, petre scisse sunt et aperta credimus monumenta.*” (*Historia de Expeditione*, p. 11).

personal, introspective feeling, but a collective feeling that must be shared and performed among the Christian community. The performative aspect of the mourning is present in the primary sources as well. The limitations of language that I initially pointed out – the letter writers' apparent difficulties with describing the events with words – was a rhetorical tool, and the speechlessness is only a part of the letters from the East. No letter writer wrote a letter only to state that they were unable to write about the events. Some letters were quite straightforward, recounting which cities had fallen to the Saracens and how many Christians had been killed. Other letters were more elaborate in describing the sense of loss and sorrow. Overall, the state of mourning is a common characteristic of eyewitnesses to the catastrophic events in the Holy Land as well as later accounts.

The multitude of letters streaming from the East to the West were generally written in tone of desperation and lamentation, urging the Western leaders, ecclesiastical as well as secular, to send aid immediately. Written during Saladin's invasion into Christian territories, the letter writers were at or near the scene of action and must have been very concerned and even frightened, and at the same time distressed about the losses they witnessed first-hand. Several letters express feelings of "tearful lamentation" (*lacrimabilis conquestio*)⁹⁰ and "the enormity of [their] lamentation and sorrow."⁹¹ The sorrow almost takes on a physical form, like an object that can be handled in certain ways. It is measurable; the *enormity* (*magnitudo*) of their lamentation, like Patriarch Eraclius' "huge burden of sadness" (*doloris immanitas*).⁹² And yet, in another letter, the grief is described as immeasurable (*inaestimabilis dolor*).⁹³ Whether it is measurable or not, the letter writers turn the sorrow into an objectified, tangible entity.

Aimery of Limoges, Patriarch of Antioch (c. 1140-96), delivered the news to King Henry II of England "with tears and sobs" (*cum lacrymis et singultibus*)⁹⁴ and he tells that they are beating their breasts (*pectora percutientes*)⁹⁵ to show God their sorrow. The breast-beating in this last case is extremely performative, but all the descriptions of the sorrow in the letters from the East, as well as Henry of Albano's letter to the German people, are somewhat performative. We see no signs of personal, contemplative sorrow. When writing about sadness, it

⁹⁰ *Letters from the East*, p. 76. *E continuatione*, p. 475, l. 25.

⁹¹ Edbury, *Conquest*, p. 162. Orig.: "Meroris et doloris nostri magnitudinem" (Hiestand, *Papsturkunden*, p. 326).

⁹² *Letters from the East*, p. 79. Jaspert, p. 512.

⁹³ *Letters from the East*, p. 85. Roger of Howden, p. 340.

⁹⁴ *Letters from the East*, p. 85. Roger of Howden, p. 340.

⁹⁵ *Letters from the East*, p. 85. Roger of Howden, pp. 341-42.

is a sadness expressed with tears and sobs. The lamentations are tearful. The sorrow is something to deplore and groan about. The sorrow here assumes an almost corporeal form, letting the news drown in symbolic tears. Even Pope Gregory VIII writes in his *Audita Tremendi* that the defeat at Hattin is something that ought to cause every Christian to weep. In a way, the Pope is instructing the Christian people how to act – how to perform their collective sorrow.

The letters from the East as well as Pope Gregory VIII's and Henry of Albano's letters must be considered among the immediate reactions to the Battle of Hattin and – in the case of Henry of Albano – the fall of Jerusalem. The shock and grief are very visible – or even audible – and we see an uncertainty as to what is actually happening. In most of the letters, the writers are terrified by the great defeat at Hattin, but they do not yet know that Saladin is about to conquer Jerusalem as well. The main purpose of the letter writers is to call attention at what is going on and urge people from all over Europe to take the cross and travel across the sea to the defence of the Christian provinces in the East. We have to keep this purpose in mind when reading their sorrow as a performative act. The Eastern letter writers were calling for help, and Pope Gregory and Henry of Albano were reverberating the message throughout Europe. In order to urge people to aid the Holy Land, the letters had to show the severity of the current disasters and the sorrow had to be carried on to the receivers. If the receivers were to share the sorrow, it would be a sorrow shared among a wider Christian community.

Sorrow from a Distance: Commemoration

The lamenting exclamations are not unique to the early reactions, but the descriptions of the sorrow seem to change as we move on to accounts written a little later than in the direct aftermath of the events in 1187. The sense of loss and grief is still very present, though, and maybe there is a good reason to keep mourning the loss: When the *Historia de Expeditione Friderici Imperatoris* was written in the late twelfth century, for instance, and when Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien finished their chronicles around 1210, the Christians had not reconquered Jerusalem. The loss was real and permanent.

In the *Historia de Expeditione*, the events of 1187 are described at the very beginning of the chronicle and works as an introduction to the history of Frederick Barbarossa's Crusade, and the sense of loss is spelled out in detail from the very first line, as the chronicle begins in this way:

When I consider the desolation and the miserable captivity through which the land of the Lord and the city of the King of all kings, which was once the Lady of [all] peoples and the ruler of every province, is now made subject to the slavery of barbarian foulness, I judge it worthy of lamentation by every Christian.⁹⁶

Moreover, while most descriptions of the events of 1187 use Scripture in one way or another to describe the loss and sorrow, the author of the *Historia de Expeditione* is of the opinion that reality is even worse than the examples found in Scripture:

I am compelled to weep with the prophet and with Him in whom the truth of all prophecy is explained. For indeed this truth, and the prophet of the truth, challenges us to sorrow as we weep over the various ruins of that same city, and especially since the reason for the lamentation in our time is much more serious than the previous evil that gave rise to lamentation.⁹⁷

We are left with no doubt that the loss of Jerusalem is something to be mourned, but the grief is not as immediate and intense as in the earliest sources to the events in 1187. In the *Historia de Expeditione*, the sorrow works more as an introductory passage. The chronicle is about Frederick Barbarossa's Crusade, and the fall of Jerusalem works as the reason for Frederick to travel eastwards. There is an awareness of then and now. The city of Jerusalem "was *once* [...] the ruler of every province [and] *now* made subject to slavery" (emphasis mine). The author *judges* this change of status worthy of lamentation and the lamentation is more linked to the current state of Jerusalem than the loss itself. The feeling of sorrow seems to be more deliberate and less immediate. We still see the performative elements in the rhetoric, but in a way it is more forced. The author is *compelled* to weep (*flere compellor*). The verb *compellor* (*con + pello*) is leading the thoughts towards a forced act. The author is *driven* to or *forced* to

⁹⁶ Loud, *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 33. Orig.: "Recogitanti mihi desolationem et miserandam captivitatem, qua terra domini et civitas regis regum omnium que prius domna gentium et princeps provinciarum exstitit, nunc in servitutem barbarice feditatis redacta est, omni christiano lugendum dignum iudico." (*Historia de Expeditione*, p. 1).

⁹⁷ Loud, *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 33. Orig.: "Cum propheta et cum eo, in quo totius prophetie veritas explicita est, flere compellor. Ipsa etenim veritas et propheta veritatis varias deplangentes eiusdem civitatis ruinas ac luctum nos provocant, cum utique huius nostril temporis planctus causa omnem priorem superet planctus molestiam." (*Historia de Expeditione*, p. 1).

weep. Even though the author is writing about the state of Jerusalem as lamentable, the sorrow is not as corporeal and performative as the earliest accounts. The description is less sobbing and groaning and more matter-of-factly. Maybe the difference is that the sorrow by now has turned into a standardized element of the commemoration of the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem, no longer the immediate sorrow of a frightened writer in the midst of the events, but a sorrow that has existed for a long time.

Lamentation and sorrow take up a lot of space in the chronicle by Arnold of Lübeck, as well. In fact, the entire first chapter of book four is titled *Lamentations about the downfall of the Church and especially of Jerusalem*,⁹⁸ where he draws heavily on Scripture in order to explain and meditate over the loss of Jerusalem and the True Cross. The opening line of this chapter is as follows: “While among these [events], tears flow, sighs are dragged, and a voice of crying and shrieking is raised up high.”⁹⁹ It is a description of an almost violent and very performative sorrow, but it is not Arnold’s own personal sorrow. The fact that he uses an entire chapter, a total of sixty-four lines (Lappenberg edition), to meditate over the loss of Jerusalem shows us that the loss is indeed important and lamentable, but looking at the chapter in the context of the rest of book four, it becomes clear that the chapters are organized in a deliberate way. The lamentation is almost exclusively confined to the first chapter and reappears in chapter seven, while the descriptions of the actual events of 1187 and the preceding years are more or less uninterrupted by any kinds of feelings. Arnold finishes his first chapter by stylistically leading the reader away from lamentation towards the story of the events leading up to the fall of Jerusalem: “However, now let us make an end to these things, and turn our pen to the destruction of the holy city.”¹⁰⁰

In chapter seven, Arnold returns to the lamentation, describing the sorrow felt by the Christian community upon receiving the terrible news from the East. “There was communal

⁹⁸ Loud, *Arnold of Lübeck*, p. 88. Orig.: “Querimonia de excidio ecclesie et maxime Ierusalimitane.” (Lappenberg, *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*, p. 162, l. 42). Since Arnold’s original manuscript no longer exist, we cannot be entirely sure that he titled his chapters himself, but all three manuscripts in the Royal Library in Copenhagen (Add. 50 fol, GKS 2288,4⁰, GKS 646,2⁰) have headlines and in all three, the titles in the manuscripts are almost identical with the titles in Lappenberg’s edition. There is a good probability that GKS 2288,4⁰ is a copy of the same archetype, and even if the original did not have chapter headings, at least some of the early copies had.

⁹⁹ My translation. Orig.: “Inter hec autem fluunt lacrimae, trahuntur suspiria, et vox ploratus et ululatus in excelso levatur.” (Lappenberg, *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*, p. 162, l. 42 – p. 63, l. 1).

¹⁰⁰ Loud, *Arnold of Lübeck*, p. 90. Orig.: “Nunc autem his finem faciamus et ad destructionem civitatis sancte stilum vertamus.” (Lappenberg, *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*, p. 164, l. 21-21).

mourning, with everyone lamenting with a single voice,”¹⁰¹ writes Arnold. This communal mourning, a performative and collective lamentation, supports the impression given by the earliest sources. Arnold, however, is not necessarily taking part in this performance, but only witnessing it. By returning to the theme of mourning the loss in his seventh chapter, the two chapters – one and seven – work as a frame around Arnold’s description of the prelude to the Battle of Hattin and the actual events of 1187, events that he describes straightforwardly and without “alas!”-interjections. In chapter four, he writes about the defeat at Hattin this way:

The king was captured; the bishops were killed and the Cross of the Lord seized by the enemy, and almost all the others were either slain by the sword or fell into the hands of the enemy, so that only a few are believed to have escaped by flight.¹⁰²

Chapter five initiates with this description about Saladin’s conquests into Christian territories:

After killing the people of God, Saladin thus conquered the whole land, and driving out the inhabitants, he smote every fortified city with the edge of the sword. All the holy places were destroyed; the religious, both men and women, were either slaughtered or taken away into captivity. Even virgins dedicated to God suffered violence.¹⁰³

Arnold surely describes the horrors, but in a very straightforward way. His detailed descriptions inform the reader about the events, but the more sentient parts are left to the framing chapters. He finishes his fourth chapter with what resembles a personal sorrow: “May my soul die by the death of these just men, and may my last hours be similar to theirs!”¹⁰⁴ However, this seems to be yet another stylistic element, linking the fourth chapter to the fifth. The actual

¹⁰¹ Loud, *Arnold of Lübeck*, p. 100. Orig.: “Communis fuit meror omnium una voce plangentium.” (Lappenberg, *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*, p. 170, l. 13).

¹⁰² Loud, *Arnold of Lübeck*, p. 96. Orig.: “Captivatus est rex, trucidati episcopi et crux Domini a suis hostibus capta est, omnesque fere aut occisi sunt gladio aut hostilibus manibus comprehensi, ita ut pauci per fugam elapse noscantur.” (Lappenberg, *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*, p. 167, l. 33-35).

¹⁰³ Loud, *Arnold of Lübeck*, p. 97. Orig.: “Igitur occiso populo Dei, Salladinus totam obtinuit terram, depopulatisque omnibus, omnem civitatem munitam percussit in ore gladii. Omnia loca sancta destructa sunt, religiose persone tam virorum quam mulierum aut trucidati aut in captivitatem abducte sunt. Sed et virgines Deo dicte vim pertulerunt.” (Lappenberg, *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*, p. 168, l. 30-33).

¹⁰⁴ Loud, *Arnold of Lübeck*, p. 97. Orig.: “Moriatur anima mea morte iustorum, et fiant novissima mea horum similia!” (Lappenberg, *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*, p. 168, l. 24).

descriptions of the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem are told with no lamenting interruptions.

When looking at the course of events alone, Arnold's narrative differs considerably from the earlier accounts in not showing any signs of significant sorrow and grief. His narrative is a story written from afar, temporally as well as geographically. The shock and grief are not immediate feelings interrupting Arnold's flow of events, but nevertheless, they are very present in the framing chapters one and seven, demonstrating that the loss of Jerusalem is something that should still be mourned three decades later.

In the chronicle by Otto of St. Blasien, on the other hand, sorrow is virtually non-existent. There is a casual "proh dolor"¹⁰⁵ when the Cross is captured, but apart from that, it is hard to find traces of shock and grief. Like Arnold of Lübeck, Otto of St. Blasien is writing long after and far away from the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem, and the knowledge of the catastrophic events of 1187 can hardly have caused any surprise three decades later. By then, it was firm knowledge that the Christians had had control of Jerusalem and lost it again. Otto does indeed show his historical awareness:

This lamentable desolation of the Holy Land took place in the year from the Lord's Incarnation 1187, in the eighty-eighth year from the coming of the Franks, when that same land was liberated from the pagans by Duke Godfrey. And so Saladin overcame Palestine and wretchedly undermined the Church beyond the sea, and that region has now for many years been groaning under its subjection by the pagans.¹⁰⁶

Otto knows about the past. In just a few lines he tells us that Jerusalem was conquered by the Christians and lost again eighty-eight years later, and he also informs the reader that the Holy Land is still subject to Muslim control, which in a way is a confirmation of the loss. The earliest accounts of the events of 1187 were struck by horror and immediate grief, but hoped to avoid further disaster by summoning the strength of the united Christianity. In 1210, the loss of Jerusalem was a long established fact.

¹⁰⁵ Schmale, *Die Chronik Ottos von St. Blasien*, p. 84.

¹⁰⁶ Loud, *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 175. Orig.: "Facta est hec terre sancte lamentabilis desolatio anno ab incarnatione Domini M^oCLXXXVII, ab adventu vero Francorum, quando eadem terra a paganis per Gotfridum ducem liberata est, anno LXXX^oVIII^o. Sicque Saladinus Palestina subacta ecclesiam transmarinam miserabiliter attrivit, ipsaque region iam per multos annos paganis subdita gemit." (Schmale, *Die Chronik Ottos von St. Blasien*, p. 86).

Causa Scribendi: Cries for Help, Crusade Propaganda, Trauma Therapy

The earliest sources, letters sent from the East in the immediate aftermath of the Battle of Hattin, display an instant speechlessness, an inability to express the catastrophe with words. A speechlessness that develops into a performative sorrow, a sorrow expressed by tears, moans and sobs, a tangible sorrow. As I have already implied a few times, the writers of the letters from the East had a clear purpose: They needed assistance from the West and they needed it fast. The cry for help should be considered the main purpose of the letters from the East. Another purpose would be to provide the West with information of the recent events in the Holy Land: Many letters described which cities Saladin's army had conquered and the course of events in the battles where the Christians faced the Saracens, but the general tone in the letters from the East is one of lamentation, desperation and despondency. The extreme sorrow that resulted in speechlessness, tears and moans increased the message. The letter writers probably were in a state of real sorrow, anxiety and shock, but it was a deliberate choice to include these feelings in their letters.

The sorrow – especially the performative kind – is present in Pope Gregory VIII's *Audita Tremendi* as well, and in this case, we are left with no doubt that, when the Pope urges Christians to mourn, he has an agenda. The Pope's *causa scribendi* is unmistakable. His *Audita Tremendi* is a call for crusade, which is clear throughout his encyclical, for instance in this passage:

We should first amend in ourselves what we have done wrong and then turn our attention to the treachery and malice of the enemy. And let us in no way hesitate to do for God what the infidels do not fear to attempt against the Lord.¹⁰⁷

The Christians, Eastern as well as Western, have sinned, and in order to do penance, they must rush to the aid of Jerusalem. In the quotation above, we also see the Pope's approval of making war, to do against the enemy what the enemy is doing against Christians.

¹⁰⁷ Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, p. 66. Orig.: "In nobis primo quod male gessimus emendemus; deinde feritatem et malitiam hostium attendamus; et quod illi contra Deum tentare non timent, nos pro Deo, agere nullatenus haesitemus." (*Audita Tremendi*, col. 1541C).

Henry of Albano's *causa scribendi* is the same the Pope Gregory VIII's. As Pope Clement III's embassy, Henry of Albano is preaching the crusade to the Germans, so his *causa scribendi* is clearly to promote the crusade idea and stir people to take the cross.

The *causae scribendi* of Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien are not as obvious as they are in the earlier sources. Neither tells what his reason for writing is. There is little research on Arnold and Otto, but when it comes to Arnold, German scholars have been discussing the nature of his chronicle. Helmuth Walther argued that Arnold was mostly concerned about regional Nordalbingian history and the history of Henry the Lion,¹⁰⁸ whose Crusade initiates the chronicle and, according to Volker Scior, Arnold's emphasis lies above all on the local and regional identities, while events farther away from home are of lesser importance.¹⁰⁹ Bernd Ulrich Hucker saw Arnold's chronicle as a *Historia Regum* about Emperor Otto IV and argued that Arnold probably wrote in an atmosphere of expectation of a forthcoming crusade after Otto IV had taken the cross in May 1209, and Arnold's chronicle could even be seen as a piece of crusade propaganda.¹¹⁰ There is virtually no research on Otto of St. Blasien, but he wrote his chronicle at roughly the same time as Arnold and in both chronicles, the events of 1187 are framed by longer accounts of German events, but still tied strongly to the realities across the sea. According to Hucker, Otto should be seen in the same context as Arnold, promoting the crusade of Otto IV.¹¹¹

To view Arnold and Otto's *causae scribendi* as crusade propaganda is to view them as continuators of the *causae scribendi* of Pope Gregory VIII and Henry of Albano. The Pope called for crusade, Henry of Albano spread the message, and now, three decades later, Arnold

¹⁰⁸ Walther, "Zur Verschriftlichung", pp. 1-21.

¹⁰⁹ Scior, *Das Eigene und das Fremde*, pp. 229-30.

¹¹⁰ Hucker, "Die Chronik Arnolds von Lübeck als *Historia Regum*," pp. 98-119. Hucker, *Kaiser Otto IV*, pp. 127-48.

¹¹¹ Hucker, *Kaiser Otto IV*, pp. 127-137.

and Otto are propagating the crusade idea yet again. In the meantime, neither the Third Crusade (1189-92)¹¹² nor the German Crusade (1197-98)¹¹³ had been able to reconquer Jerusalem, and the Fourth Crusade (1202-04) never even reached the Holy Land, but ended up sacking Constantinople instead.¹¹⁴ So when Arnold and Otto wrote their chronicles, Jerusalem was still under Muslim control, and the wish to retake the Holy City still prevailed.

¹¹² On 27 March, 1188, Frederick I Barbarossa took the cross at Mainz, and headed eastwards in the spring of 1189 (Barber, *The Crusader States*, p. 325). On 10 June 1190, however, the Emperor drowned while taking a swim in a cold river in Southern Cilicia, and with their leader gone, the imperial army broke apart. Only a minor contingent continued to the Holy Land under the leadership of Frederick of Swabia (1167-91), son of Frederick Barbarossa (Phillips, *The Crusades*, p. 139-40). The Kings of England and France, Richard I and Phillip II, both set out from Vézelay in Burgundy on 4 July 1190. Phillip arrived in the Holy Land on 20 April 1191, and Richard arrived on 8 June (Barber, *The Crusader States*, p. 341). Once arrived, Phillip and Richard laid siege to Acre, which surrendered on 12 July (Phillips, *The Crusades*, pp. 144-45). Phillip left the Holy Land on 31 July 1191, leaving Richard as the undisputed leader of the Crusade. The central goal of the Crusade was still Jerusalem, and after having ordered the murder of the 2,700 prisoners captured at Acre, Richard continued southwards (Barber, *The Crusader States*, pp. 346-47). With a composite army of Richard's own forces, the French forces left by Phillip, and the Hospitallers, the Crusaders won a victory against Saladin's forces on the plains of Arsuf on 7 September 1191. Afterwards, they refortified Ascalon, which had been razed to the ground by Saladin's forces (Phillips, *The Crusades*, pp. 146-48). Richard's army marched on Jerusalem twice, but did not succeed in capturing the city. Because of political turmoil at home, a result of Phillip returning to France and threatening Richard's properties, Richard had to head homewards in 1192. On 2 September 1192, Richard and Saladin signed a three-year truce, leaving the coastline from Jaffa to Tyre in Christian custody, while the Muslims got Ascalon, and Christian pilgrims were allowed to enter Jerusalem (Phillips, *The Crusades*, pp. 148-50).

¹¹³ In the summer of 1197, a German army organized by Emperor Henry VI set off from Southern Italy with a considerable army of 4,000 knights and 12,000 other soldiers. Upon reaching the Holy Land in the autumn of 1197, the German army captured Beirut, strengthening the Frankish control of the sea. In Italy, Emperor Henry VI died on 28 September, and the news brought the German Crusade to a sudden end, and the army went back to the West. The Crusade was short, but succeeded in strengthening the Frankish position in the Holy Land, and marked the beginning of a greater imperial involvement in the Levant, whereas the French had dominated the crusades during the twelfth century (Phillips, *The Crusades*, pp. 151-52).

¹¹⁴ Upon his election in 1198, perhaps in part to follow up on the recent German crusade, Pope Innocent III (p. 1198-1216) announced a new crusade. The purpose of the Fourth Crusade was to go and get control of Jerusalem again, but the Crusaders never made it past Constantinople. Instead, they sacked the city and brought a vast number of relics and valuables back to Western Europe. The Venetians agreed to provide transportation across the Mediterranean, but the Crusaders could not pay the price. The Venetian doge, Enrico Dandolo (c. 1195-1205) then suggested to give up the Crusaders' debt and provide further military aid, if only they would help the Venetians reconquering the city Zara, which the Hungarian king had recently seized from the Venetians. The Crusaders captured Zara on 24 November 1202. Back in Constantinople, Alexios IV (r. 1203-04), pretender to the Byzantine throne, promised to provide the crusading army with sufficient equipment and troops to complete the Crusade in return for them helping him to the throne. However, he could not keep his promise, and after he had been dethroned, his successor, Alexios V (r. Jan.-Apr. 1204), refused to fulfill the promises of Alexios IV, and tried to defend the city against the vengeful crusaders. His attempts were in vain, and 13 April 1204, Constantinople fell to the Crusaders. (For an in-depth survey of the Fourth Crusade, see Donald E. Queller and Thomas F. Madden, *The Fourth Crusade: the conquest of Constantinople*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997).

Crusade propaganda is one way to explain the *causae scribendi* of Arnold and Otto, a motive that relates to their chronicles in general. If we return to the specific topic of this chapter – the loss and sorrow – we might view Arnold and Otto's writings as a development of the sorrow expressed in the letters from the East. Even though the sorrow changed from the early letters to the later chronicles, it remained present, and not only in letters and chronicles. The loss of Jerusalem was a matter that concerned all of Christendom, and Pope Gregory VIII even prescribed special liturgical observances. A new festival day had been added to the ecclesiastical calendar after the conquest of Jerusalem in 1099 and in 1149 a new commemoration was added. The defeat in 1187 required new commemorations, and the Pope ordained a Lenten fast for Fridays in Advent for five years. Moreover, prayers were to be said for the liberation of the Holy Land and for Christian prisoners in Muslim captivity, and a special mass was to be sung.¹¹⁵ The new liturgy emphasizes the importance of mourning the loss of Jerusalem and shows the mourning as a collective commitment for all of Christianity.

When considering the loss as a collective sorrow, we might also see the loss as a trauma for Christianity. In a pathological sense, trauma (Greek, *τραῦμα*) signifies “a wound or an external bodily injury in general”, while in psychoanalysis and psychiatry, trauma is a “psychic injury, especially one caused by emotional shock the memory of which is repressed and remains unhealed.”¹¹⁶ In its original Greek, there is also a sense of a body part being ripped off the rest of the body, and if we consider the Christian community in bodily terms, the loss of Jerusalem could be seen as a traumatic experience as part of Christianity got severed from the rest of the Christian body. If we treat the loss as a trauma, we might see the letters from the East as the first screams of pain as the amputation of Jerusalem from the rest of Christendom happens, and the later accounts are then a way to come to terms with the traumatic loss, and, by propagating for new crusades, pursuing a way to reconnect the lost Holy Land with the Christian West. After all, new crusades were still launched, and the Crusader States still existed in amputated form until 1291. Consecutive crusade expeditions could be seen as attempts at winning back this lost (body)part, making the Christian world whole again.

¹¹⁵ Jaroslav Folda. “Commemorating the Fall of Jerusalem: Remembering the First Crusade in Text, Liturgy, and Image.” In: Paul, Nicholas and Suzanne Yeager (ed.). *Remembering the Crusades: Myth, Image, and Identity*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012, pp. 125-28.

¹¹⁶ OED → *Trauma*.

V. The Status of Jerusalem: Slave and Mother

In the letters from the East, in particular, we see references to Jerusalem's historical significance as the central place of Christianity. Especially the princes and ecclesiastics beyond the sea refer in their letter to Emperor Frederick Barbarossa (July, 1187) to "Christ's own city of Jerusalem,"¹¹⁷ "[...] that holy city in which the Angel Gabriel appeared to the Blessed Virgin."¹¹⁸ Furthermore, they urge Frederick Barbarossa to send help by referring to the death of Christ:

These facts we bring to your attention, entreating you with tears to see fit to bring your advice and your help to the land that Christ consecrated with his blood so that it is no longer soiled by the enemies of Christ. Do this for the redemption of your souls.¹¹⁹

Thereby, in one letter the senders refer to two central events in Christ's life: The Annunciation and the Passion, both taking place in Jerusalem that is now in danger of being conquered by the Muslims. Likewise, Patriarch Eraclius refers to the Crucifixion in his letter to all the secular leaders of the West (September, 1187): "May God prevent the holy city of Jerusalem, in which the Lord earned our salvation, from falling into their hands."¹²⁰ In this case, the city's Biblical status is mentioned in a parenthetical sentence, like a casual remark.

Jerusalem was the centre of medieval Christianity and the Holy City was usually placed in the centre of medieval maps, even though it was placed on the fringe of the Christian world geographically. We must assume that Jerusalem's geographical and Biblical status as the centre of Christianity was common knowledge and well-known to the receivers of the letters from the East. The reason for including references to these things might have been to remind the Western Christians of the city's status, emphasizing the importance of the city and the importance of getting help as soon as possible.

¹¹⁷ *Letters from the East*, p. 76. Orig.: "Christi urbem Hierusalem" (*E continuatione*, p. 475, l. 22-23).

¹¹⁸ *Letters from the East*, p. 76. Orig.: "[...] vastantes et depredantes eam ab ipsa civitate sancta, in qua angelus Gabriel beatissimae Virgini apparuit." (*E continuatione*, p. 475, l. 34-35).

¹¹⁹ *Letters from the East*, p. 77. Orig.: "Haec igitur vobis notificamus lacrimabiliter deprecantes, quatinus pro redemptione animarum vestrarum terrae, quam Christus suo sanguine consecravit, consilio et auxilio vestro succurrere dignemini, nec eam ab inimicis Christi diutius coinquinari patiamini." (*E continuatione*, p. 476, l. 29-32).

¹²⁰ *Letters from the East*, p. 79. Orig.: "Ne Iherusalem itaque civitas sancta, in qua salute nostrum operates est dominus, inimicis fidei Christiane, quod deus avertat, in preda efficiatur!" (Jaspert, p. 515).

In his chronicle, Arnold of Lübeck uses his peculiar narrative technique¹²¹ to let Jerusalem's Biblical status appear in a monologue presented by the soldiers defending Jerusalem against Saladin's army:

'Let us fight bravely, and let us die with our brothers. For is this not the place of the Lord's Passion, in which Christ died for us? Now therefore let us remain, and we shall die joyfully with Him, so that together we shall rise up again with Him.'¹²²

This way, the soldiers are almost performing some kind of *Imitatio Christi* by wanting to die as martyrs in the very same spot that Christ himself died for the salvation of mankind. In this passage, Arnold is depicting the defenders of Jerusalem as valiant Christians, willing to die for the safety of Jerusalem. This picture soon shatters, though, as Arnold continues this way:

There were, however, others who did not 'desire to depart and be with Christ', and did not agree with these sentiments, and they sent an embassy to Saladin to secure their freedom.¹²³

There is an almost comic irony in this sentence; the valiant Christians being more brave rhetorically than in reality. However, we should probably not read Arnold's chronicle as a comedy, but read this episode as an ill-concealed critique of the inhabitants of the Holy Land at the time of the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem. The defenders of Jerusalem ought to have fought until death, but, apparently, they treasured their earthly life too much to enter the heavenly life already. Apart from this critique, the passage above shows that the Biblical and

¹²¹ Arnold's writing style presents an interesting narrative technique, as he lets the characters express themselves in long monologues. We must ascribe this feature to Arnold's own imagination, since he cannot have known anything about the actual conversations in the past. It is a way to make the narrative more vibrant, turning his own prejudices into words said by actual persons. Grammatically, he switches between past and present tense. He seems to prefer the present tense when describing dramatic scenes, such as at the Battle of Hattin, which is another way to dramatize past events, just like the monologues.

¹²² Loud, *Arnold of Lübeck*, p. 98. Orig.: "Pugnemus viriliter et moriamur cum fratribus nostris. Nonne iste est locus dominice passionis, in quo Christus pro nobis mortuus est? Nunc ergo eamus et nos, et leti moriamur cum illo, ut simul conresurgamus cum ipso." (Lappenberg, *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*, p. 169, ll. 11-14).

¹²³ Loud, *Arnold of Lübeck*, p. 98. Orig.: "Alii autem qui nondum cupiebant dissolvi et esse cum Christo, non acquieverunt sermonibus istis, sed pro sui liberatione legationem miserunt Salladino." (Lappenberg, *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*, p. 169, ll. 14-15).

historical significance of Jerusalem is present in the early eyewitnesses as well as Arnold's later chronicle.

Domina Gentium: Jerusalem Feminized

The references to Jerusalem as the scene of Christ's Passion are not the only descriptions of Jerusalem we see in the sources. In the early letters as well as later chronicles, we see Jerusalem anthropomorphized into human form as woman, as mother *and* as child. We see an example of Jerusalem personified, but not necessarily gendered, in Patriarch Eraclius' letter to Pope Urban III (September, 1187):

For the holy city of Jerusalem, which formerly was wont to have dominion far and wide over the neighboring lands, now allows unrestricted exit beyond the walls to none of its inhabitants, as it and Tyre alone remain.¹²⁴

Eraclius' description above is not directly gendered, although, according to Latin grammar, a city (*civitas*) is always feminine. This gendering resembles a common theme of describing Jerusalem's central role and power over neighbouring lands, usually as a feminized entity. Ancient Middle Eastern tradition for identifying cities as female deities apparently affected Old Testament prophets to incorporate female metaphors for cities, thereby consolidating the mentality of conceiving cities as women.¹²⁵ Looking at other sources to the fall of Jerusalem, the theme of the powerful Jerusalem having lost its power is present in a feminized version, for instance in the *Historia de Expeditione*:

¹²⁴ Edbury, *Conquest*, p. 163. Orig.: "Nam ciuitas sancta Ierusalem, que quondam per finitimas terras longe lateque dominari consueuerat, ut nulli de habitatoribus suis extra muros liber exitus pateat, ipsa et Tyro utcumque superstitibus." (Hiestand, *Papsturkunden*, p. 327).

¹²⁵ David Morris, "The Servile Mother: Jerusalem as Woman in the Era of the Crusades." In: Paul, Nicholas and Suzanne Yeager (ed.). *Remembering the Crusades: Myth, Image, and Identity*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012, p. 175.

The land of the Lord and the city of the King of all kings, which was once the Lady of [all] peoples and the ruler of every province, is now made subject to the slavery of barbarian foulness, I judge it worthy of lamentation by every Christian.¹²⁶

Very similar is a passage in Arnold of Lübeck's chronicle, where he cites Lamentations:

How doth the city sit solitary that was full of people! How has she become as a widow! She that was great among the nations, and a princess among the provinces, how is she become tributary!¹²⁷

In both passages, Jerusalem is described as a woman who used to be strong. The modern translations above differ from each other, but the same phrase exists in the original Latin texts: *Domna/domina gentium* – the Lady or the master of the peoples. The domination belongs to the past, though, and the once so strong *domina* is now made subject to slavery or made tributary.

In his article, "The Servile Mother: Jerusalem as Woman in the Era of the Crusades", David Morris has studied the concept of the feminized city in sources to the Crusades, and in some cases he has found a "conceptual link between the purported rape of women and the violation of a fully feminized Jerusalem," the sources conferring "upon Jerusalem the powerful image of an abused and oppressed woman."¹²⁸ I have not seen any directly sexualized descriptions of Jerusalem in my source material, but the gendered city is indeed described as a former master who is now a slave, and the term slavery could as well indicate abuse and oppression in a city just recently lost to the Muslims.

Gendering the city of Jerusalem is not limited to its role as *domina*. Motherhood and also childhood are central themes in the sources. Jerusalem had an important place in medieval mentality qua its status and significance in Biblical history, being the cradle of Christianity.

¹²⁶ Loud, *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 33. Orig.: "... qua terra domini et civitas regis regum onmium que prius domna gentium et princeps provinciarum exstitit, nunc in servitutem barbarice fedtatis redacta est, omni christiano lugendum dignum iudico." (*Historia de Expeditione*, p. 1).

¹²⁷ Loud, *Arnold of Lübeck*, p. 99. Orig.: "Sicque humiliata civitate sancta, renovatum est illud lamentationis carmen Ieremie: Quomodo sedet sola civitas, plena populo? facta est quasi vidua, domina gentium, princeps provintiarum, facta est sub tributo." (Lappenberg, *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*, p. 169, ll. 29-31).

¹²⁸ Morris, "The Servile Mother", p. 174.

“In many cultures,” writes Morris, “places of origin such as a city or a country generate powerful feelings of attachment that result in the use of the language of parenthood to describe the foci of collective loyalty.”¹²⁹ This language of parenthood is present in many sources to the fall of Jerusalem. Parental metaphors are used for the City of Jerusalem as well as the Pope, giving Jerusalem the role as mother and child alternately. In his letter to Pope Urban III, Patriarch Eraclius addresses the Pope as “your fatherhood” (“*vestra paternitas*”),¹³⁰ a common way to address the Pope. After this, Eraclius asks for help on behalf of the inhabitants of Jerusalem by using a paternal metaphor:

Therefore, although there remains no other refuge for us apart from God, we have recourse to bring our afflictions and intolerable miseries tearfully to the feet of your holiness, like sons to their father, like the shipwrecked to a haven, that out of your paternal affection your heart may be roused on our behalf and on behalf of the holy city of Jerusalem.¹³¹

In this passage, the inhabitants of Jerusalem are the children and the Pope their father, but it is strongly implied that the City itself is a child as well, a child that needs protection against the current dangers. The language of parenthood works with Jerusalem as a child, as well. That is, a child in relation to God. As God’s representative on earth, it makes perfect sense to describe the Pope as a father to the child Jerusalem. In most cases, however, Jerusalem’s role as mother is emphasized, as we see in the chronicle of Otto of St. Blasien:

¹²⁹ Morris, “The Servile Mother”, pp. 174-75. The image of motherhood was also used elsewhere, for instance in the 13th century chronicle by Henry of Livonia, who described the Livonian Church as a mother of the Estonian Church. The Livonian Church was reproductive, capable of creating new Christians, as opposed to the Russian Orthodox Church which was sterile and barren (Torben K. Nielsen, “Sterile Monsters? Russians and the Orthodox Church in the Chronicle of Henry of Livonia,” in: Alan V. Murray (ed.), *The Clash of Cultures on the Medieval Baltic Frontier*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2009, pp. 250-52).

¹³⁰ Edbury, *Conquest*, p. 163. Hiestand, *Papsturkunden*, p. 327.

¹³¹ Edbury, *Conquest*, p. 163. Orig.: “Igitur quoniam nullum nobis post Deum aliud restat refugium, ad pedes sanctitatis uestre afflictiones nostras et miseras intolerabiles lacrimabiliter exponendo recurrimus, tanquam filii ad patrem, naufragi ad portum, ut paterna affectione uiscera uestra super nos et super ciuitatem sanctam Ierusalem commoucantur.” (Hiestand, *Papsturkunden*, p. 327).

When [the pope] received the awful news of the destruction of the land beyond the seas, he imposed penance on the whole Church to placate God, and he sent out cardinal bishops and priests as legates to all the lands subject to the Church on this side of the sea, lamenting the disaster with paternal affection, and informing the sons of Mother Church that, 'mindful of the breasts' through whose milk the ancient church in Jerusalem was nourished, they should bring help to their suffering mother.¹³²

In this passage, we see a very bodily image of Jerusalem as a mother with lactating breasts. Here, the parental image is clear and obvious, and the sons of the West are urged to help their mother. However, the image is double since we see "paternal affection" on the Western side as well, indicating that Jerusalem has a double role as mother *and* child. Mother of the Western Christians and daughter of God.

Slave on Earth, Mother in Heaven

We have now seen descriptions of Jerusalem as an enslaved *domina* and as a mother. The distinction between Jerusalem as a slave and as a mother has its origin in St. Paul's letter to the Galatians where he distinguished between the earthly and the heavenly Jerusalem.¹³³

For Sina is a mountain in Arabia, which hath affinity to that Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But that Jerusalem, which is above, is free: which is our mother.¹³⁴

¹³² Loud, *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, pp. 175-76. Orig.: "Qui lamentabili de subversione transmarine terre accepto nuncio, omni ecclesie ad placandum Deum indicta penitencia, legatos suos cardinales episcopos et presbyteros in omnes cismarine ecclesie fines direxit, filiis ecclesie matris confusionem paterno conquerens affectu et, ut matri vim patienti memores uberum, quorum lacte primitiva ecclesia in Ierusalem nutrita in eis virili robore convaluit, subveniant, obtestatur, cruceque accepta in remissionem peccatorum, crucis servos se gloriantes, crucis ignominiam, que a paganis capta tenebatur, in laudem et gloriam vindicent crucifixi, verbo predicationis magnanimiter hortatur." (Schmale, *Die Chronik Ottos von St. Blasien*, p. 88).

¹³³ Morris, "The Servile Mother", pp. 176-77.

¹³⁴ Galatians 4:25-26 (Douay-Rheims 1899 American Edition (DRA). Orig.: "Sina enim mons est in Arabia qui coniunctus est ei quae nunc est Hierusalem et servit cum filiis eius. Illa autem quae sursum est Hierusalem libera est quae est mater nostra." (Biblia Sacra Vulgata).

In Augustine's *City of God*, we see the same concepts of servitude and motherhood, but the distinction is not as pronounced as St. Paul's. In Augustine, the earthly Jerusalem works more as a symbol or prefiguration of the heavenly Jerusalem:

Moreover, we are to understand Jerusalem not as the one who is in servitude with her children, but the one who is our free mother, who according to the Apostle is everlasting in heaven. There, after the labors belonging to life's anxieties and worries, we will be comforted like her small children, borne upon her shoulders and on her lap.¹³⁵

Whether there is a sharp distinction or not, the two possible statuses of Jerusalem – as slave or as mother – are useful to keep in mind when reading the sources to the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem. When this Holy City was indeed lost to Saladin's army, the status as slave seems to be an appropriate way to describe Jerusalem. The knowledge of what is above – the free mother, according to St. Paul – gives the Christians a reason to fight for the earthly city. Especially if the two of them – the earthly Slave-Jerusalem and the heavenly Mother-Jerusalem – are intertwined as Augustine has it, it is possible that the terrestrial city must be kept safe in order to secure access to the celestial version of the same city.

The feminized Mother-Jerusalem seems to have been a common way to understand the status of Jerusalem, an important part of medieval mentality, as Morris writes:

Thus even before subsequent crusades were undertaken, Jerusalem was perceived in the collective memory of the Latin West as a woman living within a whole range of what one may call "kinship" structures. She was a mother to several daughter-cities within the ecclesial hierarchy of the church; she was the mother of the Christian Church as a whole; she was also a mother to the crusaders. [...] Thus the medieval imagination had constructed a complex world of personal relationships for Mother Jerusalem to inhabit.¹³⁶

If the Crusaders really regarded the celestial Jerusalem as a mother in the middle of a larger kinship structure, then the enslavement of the terrestrial Jerusalem must have provided a strong

¹³⁵ Cited from Morris, "The Servile Mother", pp. 177-78.

¹³⁶ Morris, "The Servile Mother", p. 183.

reason to take the cross and fight for the safety of this gateway to heaven. The paternal metaphors are present in the early letters as well as later chronicles, but the passages seem to be more elaborate in the chronicles, written long after the actual events when Mother Jerusalem was still enslaved, when the wish to free Jerusalem from the enemy was still on the agenda.

Causa Scribendi: Safe Jerusalem, Reunite Mother and Children

Compared to the descriptions of loss and sorrow described in the previous chapter, the differences between the early and later sources are not as pronounced when it comes to the description of Jerusalem. The gendered descriptions of the city are present in letters from the East as well as later chronicles, showing us that the gendered metaphors were a well-established way to describe cities in general, Jerusalem in particular.

The early letter writers focus more on Jerusalem's biblical status than later sources, reminding the recipients of the importance of the Holy City as the geographical location of important events in the life of Christ. This may be explained by their primary *causa scribendi* – the cry for help. By reminding the readers of the importance of the Holy City's history and geography, they are emphasising the need to receive aid from the West as soon as possible. Otherwise, this centre of Christianity will be lost to the Muslims.

When it comes to the image of Mother Jerusalem, the metaphor seems to develop and become more elaborate over time, and this might have something to do with the fact that the lost Jerusalem kept being lost. No crusade expeditions between 1187 and 1210 succeeded in recapturing the city, and when Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien wrote their chronicles, Jerusalem was still lost. If we continue the line of thought from the previous chapter, and consider the loss of Jerusalem as a traumatic experience, Jerusalem ripped off the rest of Christendom like an amputated body part, the continued focus on Jerusalem could be seen as a wish to reunite this part with the rest of the Christian body. Also, to see Jerusalem as a mother of Crusaders and Christians in general, the loss of Jerusalem signifies that the Mother has been separated from her children, and the goal of future crusade expeditions might be to reunite Mother Jerusalem with her children in the West.

VI. The Concept of the Enemy

In the wake of the Battle of Hattin, Archumbald, master of the Hospitallers of Italy, received a letter from the Latin East that ended with a frightening description of the Saracens:

But so great is the multitude of Saracens that from Tyre which they are besieging as far as Jerusalem they cover the face of the earth like innumerable ants. Unless these remaining cities and the very small remnant of eastern Christians are aided quickly, they too will succumb to the pillaging of the raging gentiles who are thirsting for Christian blood.¹³⁷

This passage illustrates the general tendency in the early accounts of the events of 1187 to describe Saladin and the Saracens as badly as possible. With the intention of causing an immediate reaction in the West, it is not surprising that the letters are rather one-sided, establishing a clear division between “us and them”, describing the Saracens as “a huge horde of Turkish barbarians”¹³⁸ and Saladin, for instance, is called “the pagan king”¹³⁹ and the evil worshiper of Muhammad.¹⁴⁰ The enemy has many names, repeated in letters as well as later chronicles, such as *pagani*, *infideles*, *inimici Christi*, and *ethnici*.

The “us and them” discourse is present in all the sources to the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem, from the first letters to the later chronicles, as Arnold of Lübeck, for instance, describes the Battle of Hattin as a collision between the faithful and the infidels¹⁴¹ and Otto of St. Blasien describes Saladin’s men primarily as *paganes*, expressing the “us and them” dichotomy that seemingly was the common Western way to describe relations in the East. This is not surprising, though. On the contrary, it would be strange not to see expressions like that in the sources, and instead of elaborating further on the obvious “us and them” descriptions in

¹³⁷ Edbury, *Conquest*, p. 162. Orig.: “Tanta autem est multitudo Sarracenorum et Turcorum, quod a Tyro quam obsident usque Iherusalem cooperuerunt superficiem terre quasi formice innumerabiles. Et nisi cito residuis et iam dictis civitatibus et reliquis paucissimis christianorum orientalium subveniatur auxilio, simili casu ibunt in direptionem gentilium sevientium et sanguinem christianum sitientium.” (*Historia de Expeditione*, p. 4).

¹³⁸ *Letters from the East*, p. 76. Orig.: “Turchi [...] maximo exercitu barbarorum congregato.” (*E continuatione*, p. 475, ll. 33-34).

¹³⁹ Edbury, *Conquest*, p. 160. Orig.: “Saladinus rex paganus.” (*Historia de Expeditione*, p. 2, l. 18).

¹⁴⁰ *Letters from the East*, p. 79.

¹⁴¹ “Sicque desiderata congressione facta confligunt fideles cum infidelibus” (Lappenberg, *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*, p. 167, l. 29-30).

the sources, I will look for certain nuances in the descriptions of the enemy that will tell us more about the concept of the enemy than the “us and them” dichotomy alone. First, I will take a more detailed look at the nature of the enemy. Apart from being evil (which, of course, they are, according to the sources), what are the Saracens? Second, I will look at the enemy's actions. What do they do that makes them so evil? Third, even though all the sources agree on the evilness of the enemy, the time difference between the early sources and the chronicles of Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien allows the latter to view the enemy in a broader perspective, and therefore the last part of this chapter will look at the concept of the enemy written from a distance, setting the enemy in a wider context.

Bloodthirsty Brute or Rational Debater: The Nature of the Enemy

Apart from numerous descriptions of the Saracens' progress into Christian territory, conquests, beheadings of Christians, and other evil deeds, we see in several sources the Saracens described as bloodthirsty inhuman creatures. For instance, in Terricus' letter to all preceptors and brethren of the Temple in the West (between 10 July and 6 August, 1187):

Intoxicated by the blood of our Christians the whole horde of pagans immediately set out for the city of Acre. They took it by force and then laid waste to the whole land.¹⁴²

Similarly, in his *Audita Tremendi*, Pope Gregory VIII refers to the Saracens as “those savage barbarians thirsting after Christian blood,”¹⁴³ and the letter to Archumbald referred to “the raging gentiles who are thirsting for Christian blood.”¹⁴⁴

Patriarch Eraclius writes to Pope Urban III that “nor are these things enough to satiate the barbarity of the enemies of the cross of Christ.”¹⁴⁵ In this case, Eraclius is not directly

¹⁴² *Letters from the East*, p. 78. Orig.: “Deinde pagani Christianorum nostrorum sanguine debacchati, versus civitatem Accon, cum omni sua multitudine venire non distulerunt; quam violenter capientes, totam terram fere invaserunt.” (Roger of Howden, p. 325).

¹⁴³ Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, p. 65. Orig.: “feritate barbarica Christianorum sanguinem sitiente.” (*Audita tremendi*, col. 1540C).

¹⁴⁴ Edbury, *Conquest*, p. 162. Orig.: “gentilium sevientium et sanguinem christianum sitientium.” (*Historia de Expeditione*, p. 4).

¹⁴⁵ Edbury, *Conquest*, p. 162. Orig.: “Nec ista inimicis crucis Christi ad crudelitatis sue sacietatem suffecerunt.” (Hiestand, *Papsturkunden*, p. 326).

describing the Saracens as bloodthirsty, but mentioning their lack of satiety (*satietas*) indicates that the Saracens want to eat or drink more than they already have.

These descriptions show the enemy acting by their senses instead of their sanity. The Saracens' behaviour almost resembles that of animals. Not that the sources directly equate the enemy with beasts, but just like animals navigate by senses, so are the Saracens described as driven by their senses. Like predators, the Saracens are savage (*feritate*). They are also described as "intoxicated" or raving (*debacchati*), like insane or drunk people. When the sources describe the Saracens as acting more sensuously and corporeally than rationally, they oppose the behaviour of the Saracens with that of the Christians, and it is a way to make the horrors even more horrible. The Saracens are irrational creatures, only following the scent of Christian blood. Acting by their senses instead of their sanity, they are seemingly unstoppable until they get what they want – dominion over the Holy Land. Therefore, they can only be held back by force, and the West needs to aid the Christians in the Levant against this ferocious army.

Apart from the ferocity of the enemy, many sources are concerned about the enemy's quantity. The first reactions to the defeat were obviously influenced by shock and surprise, and especially the sheer size of Saladin's army seems to concern the writers of letters from the East, like Patriarch Eraclius who writes that "the enemy have covered the face of the earth and with their numbers have deleted the Christian name."¹⁴⁶ The noun *multitudo* – a multitude – is often used for describing Saladin's huge army, and likewise, some of the letters from the East uses *formicae* – a swarm of ants – as a metaphor for the Saracens, almost resembling one of the biblical plagues, as we see it in Terricus' letter:

At the present moment they are actively besieging Tyre, attacking day and night, and their numbers are so great that they are like a swarm of ants covering the whole face of the earth from Tyre to Jerusalem, even as far as Gaza.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁶ *Letters from the East*, p. 79. Orig.: "Operuerunt hostes faciem terre et in fortitudine sua deleto nomine christiano." (Jaspert, p. 512).

¹⁴⁷ *Letters from the East*, p. 78. Orig.: "Civitatem etiam Tyrum in praesentiarum acriter obsidentes, violenter die noctuque expugnare non cessant, et tanta est eorum copia, quod totam terrae faciem, a Tyro usque ad Jerusalem, et usque ad Gazam, velut formicae cooperuerunt." (Roger of Howden, p. 325).

Patriarch Eraclius writes that “The enemy have covered the face of the earth and with their numbers have deleted the Christian name.”¹⁴⁸ He is not using the ant metaphor, but otherwise the description is similar to Terricus’ and the description seen in the letter to Archumbald,¹⁴⁹ giving the impression that the uncountable multitude of Saracens are everywhere. The princes and ecclesiastics beyond the sea write about “a huge horde of Turkish barbarians”¹⁵⁰ and “an army whose numbers could not be counted,”¹⁵¹ clearly emphasizing the huge size of Saladin’s army. Similarly, the Genoese consuls describe the Saracens as an infinite multitude of soldiers.¹⁵²

It makes perfect sense that the first accounts of the Battle of Hattin are preoccupied with the size of Saladin’s army. It did outnumber the Christian army at Hattin, and describing the enemy as an army of innumerable size may also have been a way to express the need for help from the West. This way of describing the enemy is almost unique to the first letters from the East. Arnold of Lübeck later mentions “Saladin and all his multitude,”¹⁵³ but he does not describe the Saracens as covering the earth, or the Saracens as an uncountable swarm of ants. Just a multitude, a big army, which it was. In this case, the remark is mostly factual.

Likewise, the descriptions of the Saracens as having a craving for Christian blood are only found in letters from the East and Pope Gregory’s *Audita Tremendi*, both being sources that were meant to entice Westerners to take the cross and rush to the aid of Jerusalem. Therefore, it is not surprising that these letters are describing the enemy in the most blood-dripping and frightening way. They had to emphasize the greatness of the threat against Jerusalem, stressing the need for immediate assistance.

Instead, moving on to later chronicles, Saladin is described more as a human being than a frightening inhuman. Especially Arnold of Lübeck gives Saladin a role just like every other actor in his narrative. Saladin is evil, yes, but he is able to act rationally, think and discuss. For instance, Arnold lets Saladin speak in long monologues which tell the reader more about his

¹⁴⁸ *Letters from the East*, p. 79. Orig.: “Operuerunt hostes faciem terre et in fortitudine sua deleto nomine christiano.” (Jaspert, p. 512).

¹⁴⁹ See above, p. 44, footnote 137.

¹⁵⁰ *Letters from the East*, p. 76. Orig.: “Turchi [...] maximo exercito barbarorum congregato.” (*E continuatione*, p. 475, ll. 33-34).

¹⁵¹ *Letters from the East*, pp. 76-77. Orig.: “exercitu multiplicato cuius numerus numerum excedebat.” (*E continuatione*, p. 476, ll. 10-12).

¹⁵² “multitudine bellatorum infinita.” (*Gesta Regis Henrici*, p. 12).

¹⁵³ Loud, *Arnold of Lübeck*, p. 95. Orig.: Salladinus cum omni multitudine.” (Lappenberg, *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*, p. 167, ll. 14-15).

character. A long and elaborate episode in Arnold's chronicle shows us Arnold's way to elevate the Christians above the Saracens. After the Battle of Hattin, he lets Saladin speak to the captive Christians. During a nine-line long monologue (Lappenberg edition), Arnold has Saladin mocking the Christian religion and the Eucharist and urging the defeated Christians to pray to Muhammad instead, which the Christians, of course, deny, remaining steadfast in their belief. The Christians' answer is exactly the same length as Saladin's speech. While Saladin critiques the worship of Jesus instead of God, the Christians answer that Christ is both God and son of God. Saladin points out the uselessness of the Christian God and tries to convince the Christians that his God Mohammad is a better choice. The Christians answer by laughing at Mohammad, denying him, cursing him.¹⁵⁴ It resembles a theological debate, and this way, Arnold lets the Christians defend the Christian belief and thereby elevates them above the pagan Saladin who does not understand the Eucharist or the nature of the Holy Trinity. The Christians are wiser and more faithful. That way, the dialogue between Saladin and the Christian soldiers serves two functions: First, it shows the Christians as faithful to Christianity even when facing capital punishment for not submitting to Islam. Second, it describes Saladin as a rational human being, although not a very clever one. He has poor knowledge of Christianity, and he deifies Muhammad, making him – in the eyes of Christians – an unwise unbeliever.

Conquest and Abuse: The Actions of the Enemy

As already mentioned, Saladin's monologues in Arnold of Lübeck's chronicle show his ability to speak and discuss. Putting words in the mouth of Saladin is unique to Arnold's chronicle, but we see other descriptions of what the enemy does – and also what the enemy is unable to do. As an example of the latter, we read about a miraculous episode in the letter from the princes and ecclesiastics beyond the sea to Emperor Frederick Barbarossa:

The tyrant Saladin wanted to test the power of Christ's Cross, so he had it thrown into the fire in the presence of the leaders of his army, but as it came back out immediately, the astounded man ordered it to be guarded strongly and reverently in his treasury.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵⁴ Lappenberg, *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*, p. 168, ll. 1-23.

¹⁵⁵ *Letters from the East*, p. 77. Orig.: "Volens itaque predictus tyrannus virtutem dominicae crucis experiri, in presentia principum exercitus sui fecit eam in ignem vehementem prosterni, sed cum ilico

Despite Saladin's progress and tremendous strength, he is not able to destroy the Cross. The writers of this letter obviously want to show the receiver that the power of the Christian faith is strong enough to resist the enemy. It is a rhetorical means to make clear that the senders kept their faith despite the horrors they witnessed, and they wanted their receivers to know that even though the enemy made progress and defeated the Christians, the faith and the power of the relic remained, giving the Westerners a reason to fight for Jerusalem and win back what was lost. This way, the enemy is described as not strong enough to break the Cross or the Christian faith, thus depicting the Christians as stronger than the Saracens, if not physically, then at least in spirit.

The sources relate many examples of the enemy's actions in general. The enemy attacked, conquered and progressed through the Christian territories in the Levant, and this progress is described in most letters from the East. Apart from the emotional descriptions of sorrow and frightening descriptions of bloodthirsty Saracens, the letters had an obvious function: to inform the receivers of what was going on. Therefore, most letters include a list of which cities have fallen to Saladin's army and which battles have been fought. This information is mostly factual, just relating Saladin's progress. This factual description is repeated in the chronicle by Otto of St. Blasien, who writes:

Made bold by this victory, the pagans ravaged the whole region, and captured or destroyed all the towns of the Christians apart from Tyre, Sidon, Tripoli and Antioch, and a few other towns and very strong and impregnable castles.¹⁵⁶

However, we do see more figurative descriptions of the enemy, and I want to point out two similar examples of describing the enemy's use of the Christian churches as stables for horses (*stabula equorum*). In his letter to all the secular leaders of the West, Patriarch Eraclius writes:

egrederetur, stupefactus iussit eam in suo thesauro vehementer et reverenter custodiri." (*E continuatione*, p. 476, ll. 26-29).

¹⁵⁶ Loud, *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 175. Orig.: "Hac Victoria insolescentibus paganis, omni provincia devastata cunctisque civitatibus Christianorum sive possessis sive dirutis, exepta Tiro et Sydona, Tripoli et Antiochia ac paucis aliis civitatibus et castellis munitissimis et inexpugnabilibus." (Schmale, *Die Chronik Ottos von St. Blasien*, p. 84).

Indeed, the perfidious enemies of the Cross of Christ have turned our churches into stables for the horses and they copulate with Christian women in front of the altars.¹⁵⁷

Similarly, Arnold of Lübeck writes:

After the enemies of Christ had obtained the Holy City, their eye did not spare the sanctuary of God, but making this temple a stable for their horses they destroyed all the decoration to bring contumely to the Christian religion, and committed many other wicked deeds.¹⁵⁸

These passages are not identical, but they are clearly the same expressions. It is a description of the ignominious act of using God's house as a habitat for beasts. It is a description of abuse and assault on Christian property. Here, we might recall St. Paul's distinction between the terrestrial and the celestial Jerusalem. The passages above clearly witness the abuse of the terrestrial Jerusalem, an assault on Mother Jerusalem. We might also notice that whereas the early letters seem to be the most expressive when it comes to describing the evilness and inhumanity of the enemy, this time Arnold of Lübeck participates in the descriptions of the Saracens' evil behaviours. We might assume that the assault on the physical locations of Jerusalem is a more serious matter in the mind of Arnold than the spilling of Christian blood, since the actual battles happened more than three decades before Arnold finished his chronicle. The battles and the killings belong to the past, but the physical Jerusalem is still there, still in Muslim hands, and still something the Christians want to get back. Therefore, assaults on Mother Jerusalem might have been of more interest to Arnold than the deaths of Christians and the bloodthirstiness of Saracens in the past.

¹⁵⁷ *Letters from the East*, p. 79. Orig.: "Perfidi quidem inimici Crucis Christi coram altaribus iacent cum feminis christianis, in ecclesiis equorum stabula facientes." (Jaspert, p. 515).

¹⁵⁸ Loud, *Arnold of Lübeck*, p. 99. Orig.: "Cum autem obtinuissent civitatem sanctam inimici Christi, non pepercit oculus eorum sanctuario Dei, sed ipsum templum stabulum equorum facientes, destructo omni ornatu ad contumeliam christiane religionis, scelera multa ibidem perpetraverunt." (Lappenberg, *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*, p. 169, ll. 21-24).

A Wider Perspective

We know from later Eastern eyewitness accounts of the events of 1187, for instance Ernoul, that Saladin engaged in a diplomatic negotiation while Jerusalem was under siege, and that he ultimately let many Christians escape Jerusalem by paying little or no ransom.¹⁵⁹ Arnold of Lübeck also describes the ransom; men were allowed to leave the city for the price of ten gold coins, women for the price of five. However, due to the cruel nature of the Saracens, “those who did not have the aforesaid money would redeem their lives by being slaves and bonds-women.”¹⁶⁰

Otto of St. Blasien also mentions this, but not without indicating that Saladin only made the deal in order to secure future sources of income by keeping the Holy Sepulchre intact as a goal for Christian pilgrimages: “After the city was surrendered on terms, as was mentioned, the pagans did respect the Sepulchre of the Lord, though [only] ‘for the sake of profit’.”¹⁶¹

The fact that Arnold and Otto include descriptions of the ransom, shows us that they knew more about the context than earlier sources. Of course, most letters from the East were written before the fall of Jerusalem, before the ransom. Still, the chronicles by Arnold and Otto are more detailed and contain far more context than the earlier sources. Written more than three decades later, they had the benefit of hindsight and were able to view the fall of Jerusalem in relation to events both before and after Saladin’s conquest. Also, both Arnold and Otto are able to be a little more nuanced than the eyewitnesses. Not that they are nuanced at all – they are just as preoccupied with the “us and them” dichotomy as the earlier sources – but they do describe Saladin a little more humanlike than, for instance, the letters depicting the Saracens as insane, bloodthirsty creatures.

In general, when it comes to the concept of the enemy, we see a pronounced difference between the early sources and the chronicles written long after the events. For instance, the preoccupation with the size of Saladin’s army that we see in the letters from the East is not a

¹⁵⁹ Edbury, *Conquest*, pp. 59-61.

¹⁶⁰ Loud, *Arnold of Lübeck*, p. 99. Orig.: “Qui vero predictam pecuniam non haberent, pro redemptione vite servi essent et ancille.” (Lappenberg, *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*, p. 169, ll. 22-21).

¹⁶¹ Loud, *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 175. Orig.: “Postque civitate per condicionem, ut dictum est, tradita sepulchrum Domini a paganis questus gratia in veneratione habetur.” (Schmale, *Die Chronik Ottos von St. Blasien*, p. 86).

matter that seems to interest Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien. Apparently, the uncountable number of Saracens was more urgent to the letter writers who were the ones to face the frightening enemy than it was to Arnold and Otto, writing three decades after the events.

Past and Present

Another way we can see the sources' temporal proximity to the events is in the grammar. It comes as no surprise that eyewitnesses use the present tense and later accounts use the past tense, but looking at the grammar of the original texts enable us to see some nuances that tend to disappear in modern translations.

If we take another look at Terricus' description of the Saracens and compare the translation with the original Latin.¹⁶² Whereas the translator sticks to the present tense, the Latin switches between the present and past tense. In the present, the Saracens are besieging Tyre and do *not cease* from attacking (*non cessant*), an activity happening right now. The enemy is covering the face of the earth in the past tense (*cooperuerunt*), which tells the reader that it has already happened. The enemy is there, and they are everywhere. In the letter to Archumbald, we even see the use of the future tense, pointing to events yet to come: The Christians "will succumb to the pillaging of the gentiles" (*ibunt in direptionem gentilium*).¹⁶³

In the case of the similar passages of the enemy using the churches as stables,¹⁶⁴ the biggest difference between the two descriptions is that Patriarch Eraclius uses the present tense (*iacent*), while Arnold of Lübeck uses the pluperfect and past tense (*obtinuissent, pepercit, perpetraverunt*). For Eraclius, the abuse of the Holy places is happening here and now, for Arnold it is a story belonging to the past.

Grammatically, Otto of St. Blasien is the one most remote from the events he is describing. He has a preference for past participles and omits the conjugations, removing every kind of action from the verbs. However, we do see some conjugated verbs that are, interestingly, in the present tense. The present has consistently been translated as the past tense, though. For

¹⁶² See above, p. 46 and footnote 147.

¹⁶³ Edbury, *Conquest*, p. 162. *Historia de Expeditione*, p. 4.

¹⁶⁴ Cited above p. 49-50, footnotes 157 and 158.

instance, Otto writes in Latin: “Sanctaque redemptionis nostre loca profanata a paganis incoluntur.”¹⁶⁵ This sentence has been translated as: “The holy places of our redemption were profaned by the pagans who now lived there.”¹⁶⁶ What has been changed into past tense in the translation, is present tense in the Latin. The verb *incoluntur* is in the present tense, telling us that the condition is still the same. The pagans now – that is, Otto’s now – live in the area formerly controlled by Christians.

Concluding Thoughts: From a Present Terror to a Memory of the Past

When describing the enemy, the sources’ *causae scribendi* influence their writings. Just like we saw a more immediate and violent sorrow in the first letters from the East, so is the enemy more frightening in the early sources to the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem. The letters written in the wake of the Battle of Hattin share an uncertainty regarding the near future, an extreme fear of the progressing enemy and a desperate wish for help from the West. We need to consider this context in order to understand why the letter writers wrote as they did. With the main purpose – to stir the West to react and send aid – in mind, we must assume that, although veiled by immediate panic, the letter writers used rhetorical means to advance their message. They kept focus on the one-sided description of the enemy as a ferocious multitude that would soon conquer the Holy City of Jerusalem itself if more assistance from the West were not to arrive soon.

We see the same blood-dripping descriptions in Pope Gregory VIII’s *Audita Tremendi*, which should also be seen as a deliberate way to present the enemy. The narrow focus on the enemy as a bloodthirsty and ferocious multitude is a way to establish a clear division between the attackers and the attacked. The enemy is dangerous and not quite human, and a new crusade is necessary in order to beat the enemy and retake Jerusalem.

The inhumanity of the Saracens belongs to the early sources. When we move on to the later chronicles, the descriptions of the enemy change markedly, as Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien do not seem too preoccupied with the evilness the enemy. They do mention the evil deeds of the Saracens, but neither is concerned about the multitude or the bloodthirstiness of the enemy. On the contrary, Arnold as well as Otto describe Saladin as a rational human

¹⁶⁵ Schmale, *Die Chronik Ottos von St. Blasien*, p. 86.

¹⁶⁶ Loud, *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 175.

being. Both mention that Saladin negotiated a ransom in order to let Jerusalem's citizens escape the city, and Arnold furthermore describes Saladin as being able to engage in a theological debate. The debate presents him as an unwise unbeliever, though, but nevertheless, Arnold's description is far removed from the early letter writers' horrifying accounts of inhuman creatures thirsting for Christian blood. We cannot be sure what Arnold and Otto's *causae scribendi* were, and maybe the enemy did not have a function as a real living enemy in their chronicles. Only when it comes to assaults on Christian property, Arnold is concerned about the wicked deeds of the Saracens. Maybe Arnold cared more about what happened to the City of Jerusalem than what happened between Christians and Muslims long time ago. When Arnold and Otto wrote their chronicles, more than three decades had passed, and Saladin was long in his grave. The figure of Saladin belonged to the past, and instead of presenting him as inhuman, his person served another function. In Arnold's chronicle, Saladin is the unwise, pagan counterpart to the faithful Christians. It might have been a deliberate intention to use the figure of Saladin as a contrast to the Christians in order to elevate Christianity above Islam.

Otto does show concern that the pagans still live in the Holy Land, though, and maybe this is a reason to write: He does indicate more than once that the events from the past are still relevant in the present, since Jerusalem is still controlled by Muslims. So even though Saladin's army belong to the past, the situation has not really changed when it comes to the occupation of the Holy City, and Otto's *causa scribendi* could very well be to commemorate the loss and remind readers that the tragedy of 1187 should not be forgotten.

VII. Causal Explanations for the Defeat

As we just saw, the Saracens were evil barbarians thirsting for Christian blood, and the pure evilness of Saladin and his army may be an explanation for the defeat. However, the fact that the Christians, God's chosen people, could be defeated, required other explanations than the strength of Saladin's army alone. A key figure in the letters from the East is God himself, who allows the catastrophe to happen because of the sins of Christians, and Saladin's army might have functioned merely as tool in the hand of the revengeful God.

Sinful Christians, Angry God

Especially in the letters from the East, the sinfulness of Christians is a strong factor and at the same time, we see God as an active subject, allowing the catastrophic events to happen. "Because of the sins of the Christians God delivered them into the hands of their enemies,"¹⁶⁷ write the princes and ecclesiastics beyond the sea to Emperor Frederick Barbarossa in their letter from July, 1187. Here we see God's active role in the events and, furthermore, "[...] the Lord put His people to the sword."¹⁶⁸ In two different letters to the West, Patriarch Eraclius points to God's anger as a reason for the defeat:

Alas, alas, Lord God, because of our sins You have done this to us, and in Your anger Your eye has shown no pity, since You have allowed the loss of the sacrosanct life-giving Cross to the Saracens.¹⁶⁹ [...] Truly, Holy Father, the anger of the Lord has come upon us and His terrors have put us to confusion. His displeasure drains my spirit, while He has added sorrow to our sorrow. He has allowed the most holy and life-giving cross, once and only given for our salvation, to be captured by the Turks.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁷ *Letters from the East*, p. 76. Orig.: "propter peccata christianorum dedit eos Dominus in manus inimicorum suorum." (*E continuatione*, p. 476, ll. 5-6).

¹⁶⁸ *Letters from the East*, p. 77. Orig.: "et conclusit Dominus in gladio populum suum." (*E continuatione*, p. 476, l. 18).

¹⁶⁹ *Letters from the East*, p. 79. Orig.: "Heu! heu!, domine deus, propter peccata nostra fecisti nobis rem hanc, nec pepercit oculus tuus in indignatione tua, dum sacrosanctam et vivificam crucem in manus Sarracenorum permisisti devenire." (Jaspert, p. 512).

¹⁷⁰ Edbury, *Conquest*, p. 162. Orig.: "Vere, pater sancte, ire domini transierunt in nos, terrores eius nos conturbauerunt, cuius etiam indignatio ebibit spiritum meum, dum dolorem dolori nostro super addidit. Qui sacrosanctam et uiuificam crucem, unicum et peculiar salutis nostre subsidium a Tracis capi permisit." (Hiestand, *Papsturkunden*, p. 326).

A number of sources mention God's justice. He is merciless, but just. The Genoese consuls write to Pope Urban III that God acted "fairly but without mercy"¹⁷¹ and label the catastrophe as "the just judgement of God."¹⁷² In a letter from Hermenger, Provisor of the Hospital, to Leopold V, Duke of Austria, written in November, 1188, more than a year after the events we still see the themes of Christian sinfulness and God's anger, which is still described as just and reasonable:

Because our sins merited it, the Lord came to hate His land and brought His hand down heavily on it. Exercising His just and reasonable anger and rage against our boundless excesses He allows the situation of the Christians on this side of the sea to worsen from day to day.¹⁷³

That God's anger is just and reasonable is a general theme in the early accounts of the Battle of Hattin. The Christians had it coming, having sinned for a long time. Pope Gregory VIII's *Audita Tremendi*, in particular, explains God's patience, giving the Christians time to change their sinful behaviour, but in the end, He had enough:

We ought not to believe, however, that these things have happened through the injustice of a violent judge, but rather through the iniquity of a delinquent people. [...] His anger does not come suddenly, but he puts off revenge and gives men time to do penance; in the end truly he, who does not fail to give to give judgement in his mercy, exacts his punishment to penalize transgressors and to warn those who are to be saved.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷¹ *Letters from the East*, p. 82. Orig.: "in æquitate, sed misericordiæ Suæ oblitus." (*Gesta Regis Henrici*, p. 11).

¹⁷² *Letters from the East*, p. 83. Orig.: "justo Dei iudicio" (*Gesta Regis Henrici*, p. 12).

¹⁷³ *Letters from the East*, p. 86. Orig.: "Peccatis namque promerentibus dominus terram suam abhominatus manum suam super suum adgravans patrimonium iram et furorem in nostros inmoderatos excessus iuste et rationaliter exercens christianorum cismarinorum causam cottidie deteriorem fieri permittit." (*Historia de Expeditione*, p. 4, ll. 16-20).

¹⁷⁴ Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, p. 65. Orig.: "Nos autem credere non debemus quod ex injustitia Iudicis ferientis, sed ex iniquitate potius populi delinquentis. [...] Nec enim subito venit ira ejus, sed et ultionem differ, et tempus tribuit poenitenti. Tandem vero, qui in misericordia iudicium non amittit, vindictam suam ad poenam transgredientium et cautelam salvandorum exercet." (*Audita tremendi*, col. 1540D-1541B).

According to Gregory, not only the Eastern Christians are to blame, but entire Christendom, and a major part of his *Audita Tremendi* is preoccupied with describing the sins of Christians and the need to do penance by taking the cross. The sinfulness of Christians plays an important part in the writings of Henry of Albano and the *Historia de Expeditione Friderici Imperatoris* as well. Henry of Albano writes:

He who has punished the Christian people in judgement for their sins, and who has averted His eyes from their land as a result of their lusts, has [also] decreed redemption for us through His mercy.¹⁷⁵

In the *Historia de Expeditione* we read:

“According to the dispensation of human destiny, when we read that Jesus wept over the ruin of this same city and had mercy upon it, we hope and trust that we shall appease this manifestation of His wrath and anger, which we have undoubtedly deserved and it is certain that we have provoked against us, and we shall receive assistance through His pious compassion.”¹⁷⁶

Here we see the Christian behaviour prior to the defeat characterized as a provocation against God, provoking God to punish them. At the same time, we see a hope that God's anger can be relieved, most likely by winning Jerusalem back. The *Historia de Expeditione* is the story of Frederick Barbarossa's Crusade, and a crusade might very well be a way to appease the angry God.

¹⁷⁵ Loud, *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 42. Orig.: “Qui peccatis exigentibus populum christianorum, qui iam post concupiscentias suas oculos suos statuerat declinare in terram, de iudicio flagellavit, redemptionem nobis de misericordia sua reservavit.” (*Historia de Expeditione*, p. 11, ll. 25-28).

¹⁷⁶ Loud, *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 33. Orig.: “Secundum humane siquidem exinanitionis dispensationem, cum legimus flevisse Iesum eiusdem iam sepedicte civitatis ruinas et sibi compassum esse, speramus quod et in huius sue indignationis ira, quam nostris meritis indubitanter nos et contra nos provocasse certum est, propitiaturum nobis et pia compassione subventurum confidimus.” (*Historia de Expeditione*, p. 1, ll. 18-24).

An External Factor: Saladin the Opportunist

In some sources, Saladin is described as a sly opportunist, taking advantage of the dissention among the rulers of the Crusader States. This does not occur in the letters from the East, but only in Pope Gregory VIII's *Audita Tremendi* and the chronicles of Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien. In the *Audita Tremendi*, it says:

Taking advantage of the dissension which the malice of men at the suggestion of the devil has recently roused in the land of the Lord, Saladin came upon those regions with a host of armed men.¹⁷⁷

Likewise, Arnold of Lübeck writes:

On discovering that the king and the count were at loggerheads, Saladin, the king of Damascus, was overjoyed, and since the Holy Land was always under threat, he decided that he would be able to use this as an excuse to invade it.¹⁷⁸

This passage from Arnold's chronicle follows the third chapter of his fourth book, a chapter that describes the animosity between King Guy and Raymond of Tripoli, while Otto of St. Blasien initiates his thirtieth chapter this way:

In the year from the Lord's Incarnation 1187, Saladin, the King of the Saracens, who was living at Damascus, took notice of the most wicked conduct of the Christians, and considering them to be riddled with discord, envy and avarice decided that this was a suitable moment to set about gaining all of Syria and Palestine.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁷ Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, p. 64. Orig.: "Ex occasione quippe dissensionis quae malitia hominum ex suggestione diaboli facta est nuper in terra, accessit Saladinus cum multitudine armatorum ad partes illas." (*Audita Tremendi*, col. 1540B).

¹⁷⁸ Loud, *Arnold of Lübeck*, p. 93. Orig.: "Salladinus autem rex Damasci, cognita controversia que inter regem et comitem erat, letatus est valde, et quia terre sancte semper insidiabatur, tali occasione introitum se habere potuisse arbitratus est." (Lappenberg, *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*, p. 166, ll. 4-6).

¹⁷⁹ Loud, *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 174. Orig.: "Anno dominice incarnationis M^oCLXXXVII. Saladinus rex Sarracenorum apud Damascum habitans, nequissimum Christianorum animadvertens commercium eosque discordia, invidia, avaricia infectos considerans, tempus opportunum ratus ad optinendam totam Syriam cum Palestina intendit animum." (Schmale, *Die Chronik Ottos von St. Blasien*, p. 84).

In Otto's version, Saladin is reacting more generally to the succession crisis and Sibylla and Guy's ascent to the throne, which Otto described in chapter twenty-nine. In all three passages above, Saladin is calculating, taking advantage of the unstable political situation in the Crusader States. Especially Arnold and Otto give very graphic descriptions of Saladin's cunning. We almost get the impression that Saladin has not been planning to invade the Holy Land, but when he suddenly got the chance, he decided to make a move. Or, at least, that he has been waiting for favourable opportunity to invade. Saladin is an external factor, a consequence of the disputes among the rulers of the Crusader States. Hence, Saladin himself is not really a cause for the defeat, but a result of longstanding instability in the Crusader States.

The Wider Perspective: Disputes Among Rulers of the Crusader States

In the letter that presumably first informed the Papal Court of the Battle of Hattin, the letter from The Genoese consuls to Pope Urban III (late September, 1187), we see two other possible causes for the Christian defeat: They write that,

[...] other troops failed to obey the king's orders. They did not advance to provide back-up and, as a result, the knights of the Temple were hemmed and slaughtered. Next the Parthians lit fires all around the Christian army, an army worn out from the long march, affected by the intense heat and with no water to drink.¹⁸⁰

Here, we hear that King Guy could not control his army and that the army suffered from thirst. This letter belongs to the earliest sources recounting the Battle of Hattin, but unlike the other letters treated here, the letter from the Genoese is not a letter directly from the East, but a letter from Genoa that is built on an eyewitness account, a Genoese who travelled from the Latin East to Genoa shortly after the battle. The geographical distance might explain why this letter is able to widen the perspective and consider factors such as military disorganization and lack of water, whereas the letters sent directly from the East seem to be mainly preoccupied with

¹⁸⁰ *Letters from the East*, p. 82. Orig.: "Cæteri vero, regio spreto mandato, nec processerunt ad pugnam nec ullum eis præstare succursum, unde milites Templi retenti et trucidati sunt. Postmodum Christianorum exercitum laborioso itinere confectum, et nimio calore prægravatum, aqua omnino deficiente, Parthi igne circumdederunt." (*Gesta Regis Henrici*, p. 11).

the angry God punishing the sinful Christians. Apart from the letter from the Genoese, there is a significant difference between how the early letters as well as the Pope's *Audita Tremendi*, Henry of Albano's letter to the Germans and even the later *Historia de Expeditione* explain the causes for the defeat and how Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien describe them.

Looking at these two later chronicles, the sinfulness of Christians is no longer an important factor, whereas the disputes among the rulers of the Crusader States and the prelude to the Battle of Hattin take up much more space. There is a difference between them, though. Arnold does mention the sins of Christians as a cause, Otto does not. For instance, Arnold writes:

But 'there is no counsel against the Lord', who because of the evil behaviour of men wished to impose an awful judgement upon that land.¹⁸¹

Arnold's first chapter of book four, as previously described, is a lamentation about the downfall of Jerusalem, and among the lamentations, we see hints of accusations against the people of the time of the events, in particular the clergy. The end of the first chapter is directed against the clergy:

By not respecting that life-giving sacrament, and by failing properly to honour the holy places, this has led to the utmost confusion, so that one may say with Jeremiah: 'We lie down in our confusion, and our shame covers us, for we have sinned against the Lord our God, we and our fathers, from our youth even unto this day, and have not obeyed the voice of the Lord our God'.¹⁸²

Moreover, Arnold's sixth chapter of book four is a summary of the *Audita Tremendi*, which, as already mentioned, is mainly concerned with the sinfulness of Christians. There is no doubt

¹⁸¹ Loud, *Arnold of Lübeck*, p. 96. Orig.: "Set non est consilium contra Dominum, qui propter malitiam hominum terribile super terram illam exercere volebat iudicium." (Lappenberg, *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*, p. 167, ll. 21-22).

¹⁸² Loud, *Arnold of Lübeck*, p. 90. Orig.: "Ipsa vivifica sacramenta minus reverendo, et loca sancta negligentius honorando confusionem maximam excepit, ita ut dicat cum Ieremia: Dormiemus in confusione nostra, et operiet nos ignominia nostra, quoniam peccavimus Domino Deo nostro et nos et patres nostri ab adolescentia nostra usque ad hanc diem et non audivimus vocem Domini Dei nostri." (Lappenberg, *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*, p. 164, ll. 16-20).

that in Arnold's opinion the sinfulness of Christians is among the causes for the defeat in 1187, but the disputes among the rulers of the Crusader States during the preceding years are just as guilty.

Chapter two of Arnold's book four is about the death of Baldwin IV and Baldwin V and the subsequent succession crisis, while chapter three is about the discord between King Guy and Raymond of Tripoli. Both chapters are surprisingly detailed, and Arnold makes clear that the disputes among the rulers opened the way for Saladin's progress.

Likewise, more or less the entire twenty-ninth chapter of Otto's chronicle is about the disputes among the leaders in the Kingdom of Jerusalem before the events of 1187. Soon after Sibylla inherited the Kingdom, "it was trampled underfoot by the pagans, since no good had come from rule being in the hands of a woman." Every great man of the kingdom wanted to marry her in order to obtain the right to inherit the Kingdom and "for this reason great hatred arose among them, which brought the kingdom to disaster." She chose to marry Guy, a foreigner. This annoyed the rest of the magnates, especially the Count of Tripoli, "who thought it unworthy to recognise him as king, since he was a stranger. After receiving a bribe, he invited the Saracens into the kingdom, and he betrayed various castles and towns to them as he strove to obtain Jerusalem."¹⁸³

Causa Scribendi: Do Penance, Appease the Angry God

The sinfulness of Christians is a theme common to the first letters from the East and the Pope's *Audita Tremendi* as well as later chronicles like Arnold of Lübeck. Although we see other possible causes for the defeat, the sinfulness is predominant. In the early letters, the revengeful God plays a leading role. For the letters writers, writing from the scenes of action, God's wrath was possibly a way to explain the arrival of the numerous enemy and come to terms with the frightening experience of facing the Saracens. The sinfulness of the Christians and the need to do penance play a major role in the *Audita Tremendi* as well as in Henry of Albano's writings.

¹⁸³ Loud, *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 174. Orig.: "A paganis conculcandum erat, quia in manus puelle non bono omine regendum devenerat. [...] "hacque de causa maxima inter eos conflata invidia regnum dedit exicio. [...] Unde reliqui principes valde permoti sunt, maximeque comes Tripolitanus eum regum habere, quia peregrinus erat, indigne ferens Sarracenos accepto precio regno induxit traditisque eis castellis quibusdam et civitatibus ad optinendam Ierosolimam accendit." (Schmale, *Die Chronik Ottos von St. Blasien*, p. 82-84).

The letters first mentioned the sinfulness of Christians as a cause of the defeat, but Pope Gregory VIII was the one to reinforce the message and provide a solution: a new crusade was needed in order to appease the angry God. The Pope had a clear intention when he wrote about the sins as a cause for the defeat, and Henry of Albano spread the message to Germany: Christians all over Europe were encouraged to take the cross as a way to do penance.

In the short contextual preface to the history of Frederick Barbarossa's crusade in the *Historia de Expeditione*, we see the same causal explanation: That the Christians have sinned against God, and they have to do penance by travelling eastwards and win Jerusalem back. The author of the *Historia de Expeditione* clearly wants to place the history of Frederick Barbarossa's Crusade in a context and justify his journey. We see a clear series of events: The Christians sinned, then God allowed the Saracens to conquer the Holy Land as a punishment, the Pope called for a crusade to do penance and retake Jerusalem, Henry of Albano spread the message to Germany, and finally Frederick Barbarossa took the cross and travelled eastwards. Clearly, the *Historia de Expeditione* emphasises the sinfulness of Christians as a cause for the defeat in order to explain Frederick Barbarossa's Crusade.

The sinfulness is an important element in the chronicle of Arnold of Lübeck as well. He writes about the sins of Christians in his first chapter of book four, and his sixth chapter is a summary of the *Audita Tremendi*, clearly repeating the Pope's message about the need to do penance. If Arnold's *causa scribendi* was to support a new crusade in his own time, as Hucker argues, the idea of sinfulness as a cause for the defeat works the same way as in the *Audita Tremendi*. There is a problem – the Christians have sinned and God allows the catastrophe to happen – and a solution – the Christians need to do penance by taking the cross and liberating Jerusalem. Otto of St. Blasien, on the other hand, do not show interest in the sinfulness of Christians. Instead, his focus lies on the dissention between the rulers of the Crusader States, placing the events in a wider historical context. Arnold is interested in the context as well, and Arnold and Otto's wider perspectives can be explained by their temporal distance from the events. Writing more than three decades after the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem, Arnold and Otto are able to view the events in a wider context.

Causa Scribendi: Context and Story-telling

I have argued above that the primary reason for including the events of 1187 in the *Historia de Expeditione Friderici Imperatoris* is to create a context for the main story of Frederick Barbarossa's Crusade. Given the location and length of the description of the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem – as a short introduction to Frederick Barbarossa's Crusade, which is the main topic of the chronicle – it seems fair to assume that the author's reason for writing about the events of 1187 is to create a contextualizing introduction to the Crusade to come.

The Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem could function as context in the chronicles of Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien as well, although the events of 1187 seem to form a more integrated part of the narratives in these chronicles and not just an introductory passage. After all, the events are not at the beginning of either chronicle, but in the middle of longer histories.

Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien wrote their chronicles more than three decades after the events of 1187, and events that happened between the fall of Jerusalem and their writing time have most likely affected their way of writing. Whereas the first sources to the events of 1187 focused narrowly on the specific events, later chroniclers were able to view the events in a context. This explains why both Arnold and Otto include descriptions of what happened in the Crusader States prior to the Battle of Hattin.

Otto's account is not very detailed, and it is worth mentioning that among the participants of the battle, only two are mentioned by name: Saladin and Reynald of Châtillon. The King of Jerusalem is just a "rex" with no name, while Reynald, on the other hand, is an "illustrissimus princeps".¹⁸⁴ Along with many other Christians, both Reynald and the King are beheaded after the Battle of Hattin; clearly, the story of King Guy's captivity and further existence had not reached Otto's writing desk. Apart from the most illustrious Reynald, one other person is highlighted, namely a Teutonic knight, who apparently fought very bravely against the Saracens during the siege of Jerusalem, possibly being given special attention by Otto because of the German origin of the Teutonic Order, thus showing a hint of national pride:¹⁸⁵

¹⁸⁴ Schmale, *Die Chronik Ottos von St. Blasien*, p. 84.

¹⁸⁵ In fact, the Teutonic order was not founded until 1197/98. Otto, then, uses his knowledge from his own time to apply on the events of 1187.

I consider that one ought not to pass over in silence an incident that occurred while Jerusalem was under siege. The pagans attacked and captured one of the towers, killing many Christians, and Saladin's banner was raised there. As a result the citizens grew desperate and ceased to defend the rest of the walls, and that very same day the city was about to fall, with its people facing extermination 'with the edge of the sword'. Seeing this, a certain German knight, 'summoning audacity from desperation', encouraged those around him and making a valiant attack on the enemy stormed the tower. The pagans within it were slain, and he cut down the staff of Saladin's banner and threw the standard into the mud. By doing this he restored the confidence of the citizens, and he brought them back to defend the walls as quickly as possible.¹⁸⁶

The fact that Otto does not know about the events following the Battle of Hattin: that King Guy lived through captivity, was released and later ruled Cyprus, indicates a less detailed knowledge.

Finally, we must keep in mind that the fall of Jerusalem gave rise to a wave of descriptions of the defeat, and Arnold and Otto's chronicles could be seen as part of a literary trend. Both of them wrote chronicles with a wider scope than merely local or regional accounts, so it would be more noteworthy if they did not write about the contemporary events in the Holy Land, since these events formed part of the history of the Empire. When writing about the history of the Empire, it would be a natural thing to incorporate accounts of imperial activities in the Holy Land.

¹⁸⁶ Loud, *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 175. Orig.: "Nec silendum arbitror, quod obsessa Ierusalem paganis irruentibus una turrium occisis plerisque Christianis imposito Saladini vexillo capta est, unde civibus orta desperatio relictā murorum defensione eadem die civitatem in ore gladii exterminandam pene dederat exicio. Quod videns quidam miles Teutonicus ex desperatione sumens audaciam quosdamque circa se hortatus impetu magnanimitē in hostes facto turrē vi obtinuit, occisisque in ea paganis vexillum Saladini truncata hasta deiciens de eminencia turris in lutum proiecit civibusque fiduciam resistendi hoc facto conferens ad defensionem murorum eos quantocius reduxit." (Schmale, *Die Chronik Ottos von St. Blasien*, p. 86).

The Spread of Information from the Latin East: A Conclusion

The ill-fated events of 1187 mark the nadir in the history of the Crusader States. The Christians suffered a crucial defeat at the Battle of Hattin and, two months later, Saladin's conquest of Jerusalem sealed the catastrophe. The information about the events soon spread from the scenes of action to Western European audiences and spread further throughout Europe, creating a new literary tradition of commemorating the defeat in writing. During this thesis, I have demonstrated how the accounts changed from the early letters from the East to the later chronicles of Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien.

As illustrated in the analysis, the description of the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem changed strikingly as the narrative moved through time and space. The first letters from the East were desperate and lamenting, obviously affected by shock and surprise as the huge Saracen army entered Christian territories. There is a marked contrast between the early letters and the later chronicles of Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien, a contrast that may be explained by the different contexts and *causae scribendi* of the sources. The early letters are mostly cries for help, expressing a performative sorrow and describing the enemy in inhuman terms, whereas later chronicles such as the *Historia de Expeditione Friderici Imperatoris* and the chronicles of Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien do lament the loss of Jerusalem, but in a less performative and immediate way. The later chronicles contextualize the events and consider the dissention between the rulers of the Crusader States as a possible cause for the defeat, while the early sources only consider an uncountable enemy and the wrath of God as causes for the defeat.

Between the letters from the East and the later chronicles, we find Pope Gregory VIII's *Audita Tremendi* and the writings of Henry of Albano, and they form a link between the eyewitness and the later chronicles. These sources have a clear purpose: To promote a new crusade. Thereby, they focus narrowly on the evilness and inhumanity of the enemy, the magnitude of the sorrow and the sinfulness of the Christians as the ultimate cause for the defeat. It is a deliberate choice to communicate one version of the defeat, the version that supports a call for crusade. Pope Gregory himself stated in his *Audita Tremendi* that his encyclical was not a detailed description of the events: "We do not think that we ought to describe the events in letters until somebody comes to us from those parts who can explain more fully what really

happened,”¹⁸⁷ wrote Gregory. Thereby, he admits his lack of knowledge concerning the events, and he chooses to describe the Battle of Hattin only perfunctory, because, firstly, he did not know very much about the actual battle and, secondly, he only needed a limited version of the events in order to justify a call for crusade. The widespread *Audita Tremendi* reinforced and spread the idea that God allowed the Saracens to defeat the Christians because the Christians had sinned, and a new crusade expedition was needed in order to win back what was lost.

It is important to keep in mind that the Pope thereby established a limited version of the Battle of Hattin. The message about the sinfulness of Christians disseminated from the Papal Court, but the detailed descriptions of the events, as we see them described in the chronicles of Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien, must have originated from other sources. Letters from the East were sent not only to the Pope but to secular rulers as well. Still, we must assume that written sources were only part of the transmission of information. Oral transmission must have formed another part. Finally, even the earliest written sources were not necessarily built on eyewitnesses alone.

One thing is a deliberate choice to leave out details unknown to the author; another is to rely on oral transmission and rumours. The letter from the Genoese consuls to Pope Urban III - probably the first letter to bring the news of the Battle of Hattin to the Papal Court - had part of their information from a citizen returning from the Latin East. However, they also write that they heard about the events across the sea “from frequent rumour” (*ex celebris famæ relatu*),¹⁸⁸ which is an interesting fact. It tells us that already shortly after the Battle of Hattin, an oral tradition about the battle existed outside of the Latin East. Moreover, it tells us that the first source to reach the Papal Court was not solely based on eyewitness accounts. Already in this part of the transmission, the narrative may have been distorted by incorrect accounts, which is a possibility when it comes to oral transmissions. Think, for instance, of the common parlour game where a story passes through a circle of persons. One person whispers a story to another who in turn passes the story on to the next in line. When the last person finally tells their version of the story to the group, it most often differs significantly from the story whispered by the first person. Due to misunderstandings in the transmission of the story, the forgetfulness of human mind, or even a deliberate decision to alter the story in order to make it

¹⁸⁷ Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, p. 64. Orig.: “[...] quae in eorum non devenerint potestatem, non credimus nostris litteris explicandum.” (*Audita Tremendi*, col. 1540B).

¹⁸⁸ *Letters from the East*, p. 82. *Gesta Regis Henrici*, p. 11.

more exciting, are among the factors changing the story as it passes from person to person. Factors that may also have altered the narrative of the events of 1187 as it became part of an oral tradition.

Another thing that may have changed the narrative is an author's deliberate choice to tell his own version of the story. For instance, the author of the *Historia de Expeditione* writes:

I propose to describe what took place in the year of our Lord 1187 [...] insofar as I can reveal it from the truthful account of those who were present at this capture, desiring to recount this not as a history but as a lamentable tragedy.¹⁸⁹

Here, we see a wish to tell the truth and the ambition to rely on eyewitnesses. We also see considerations about the choice of genre, which is a peculiar element. Does this mayhap mean that the author intends to emphasize the sorrow at the expense of historical facts? Or is it just rhetoric, stressing that the history he is about to tell is a story of loss and sorrow? Nevertheless, the *Historia de Expeditione* uses written sources. In fact, the part of the chronicle about the events of 1187 is almost nothing but a compilation of letters, a collection of sources.

It has not been the aim of this thesis to track the line of transmission from the Latin East to the chronicles of Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien, since we do not have sufficient source material to do so. Still, we might think about how they received their information, since there are obvious missing links in the transmission of information described in this thesis. Since we are able to follow the information from the Holy Land to Europe and further to Germany, one might hope to find the link between the sources written in Germany and the chronicles of Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien. For instance, when it comes to the *Historia de Expeditione*, written either in Bavaria or Austria, it would not be unlikely for Otto of St. Blasien to have known about this chronicle given the geographical proximity, but I have seen no signs that Otto would have read the *Historia de Expeditione*.

The only actual link in the transmission is Arnold of Lübeck's summary of the *Audita Tremendi*, but Arnold to not repeat the exact wording of the encyclical, and he thinks it was written by Clement III instead of Gregory VIII, which indicates that Arnold knew about the

¹⁸⁹ Loud, *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 33. Orig.: "[...] quantum ex veridica relatione eorum qui huic captivitati interfuerunt, [...] narrare proposui, non historiam sed lacrimabilem traiediam prosequi cupientes." (*Historia de expeditione*, p. 2, ll. 5-8).

Pope's message, but it was not a detailed knowledge, and he had not read the letter himself. Nevertheless, the message of the *Audita Tremendi* was widespread, and the sinfulness of Christians is elaborated in Arnold's chronicle, so he was clearly influenced by that part of the description of the defeat. This indicates that even if Arnold did not read the exact letter, he was still aware of the essence of the letter.

Since we have no knowledge about Arnold and Otto's sources of information, we can only speculate about what kind of informants they used, and we might consider different possible kinds of oral transmission.

One possibility is that they encountered papal embassies. We know, for instance, that Henry of Albano preached the crusade in Germany, and among his writings, we have his letter to the Germans. Even if Arnold and Otto did not know about his letter, they might have heard about his preaching. Little that we know about Arnold and Otto, they must both have been young men in the 1180's, and if they heard about the preaching of the crusade, some information could have been stored in their memories. We know from Henry of Albano himself as well as the *Historia de Expeditione* that his preaching was widespread and that it worked. For instance, the author of the *Historia de Expeditione* writes that Henry of Albano convinced many Germans to take the cross despite language barriers:

Even though he was French, and ignorant of the German language, he explained his sweet doctrine through an interpreter, and prepared the minds of many valiant knights in Germany for that journey.¹⁹⁰

Also, Henry of Albano instructed the receivers of his letter to distribute the information further:

The imperial majesty summons you by his authority, [while] we summon your whole community to that same court on behalf of God and through that authority we exercise as legate, and we strictly enjoin and instruct you the venerable bishop to take care to summon the abbots and those other prelates subject to you, [working] together with the bearer of this present missive, who will perhaps be unable to reach everyone.¹⁹¹

¹⁹⁰ Loud, *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 41.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., p. 43.

Of course, we cannot conclude that Henry of Albano's intention to spread the information widely actually resulted in a wide dissemination, but as described in chapters two and three, the Pope's embassies succeeded in calling the major European leaders to take the cross, and Henry of Albano convinced Frederick Barbarossa to take the cross. The Third Crusade became the largest crusade expedition with the participation of the most prominent leaders. Thus, later events show that the Pope's call for crusade and his embassies had a clear effect. It seems fair to assume that Henry of Albano's letter was in fact very widespread, and, if nothing else, the crusade atmosphere must have been felt all over Europe as the information disseminated.

Another possible source of information is pilgrims returning from the Holy Land. We know that pilgrims kept visiting Jerusalem after 1187, although on a smaller scale.¹⁹² What is especially interesting is that Arnold, as well as Otto, mention pilgrims, although Otto does not do so directly, but he does indicate that Saladin sees a way to make a profit,¹⁹³ though, and Otto probably means the possibility to earn money from pilgrims paying entrance fees. In Arnold's chronicle, there is no doubt about Saladin's pilgrimage business:

However, the Lord's Sepulchre was entrusted to men of religion, on condition that they paid tribute to Saladin from the gifts of the pilgrims who visited this same Sepulchre in time of peace. Indeed, to satisfy his greed, Saladin decreed that if any Christian wished to visit the Lord's Sepulchre, he should give a gold *bizanteus* for his safe-conduct, and he might [then] go and return in peace, although he might carry weapons with him.¹⁹⁴

Since they mention pilgrims, and we know that pilgrimage continued after the fall of Jerusalem, it is very likely that German pilgrims went to Jerusalem, heard stories about the recent past and spread the story on their way home to Germany, stories that might have reached Arnold and Otto.

¹⁹² Denys Pringle, *Crusade Texts in Translation: Pilgrimage to Jerusalem and the Holy Land, 1187–1291* (23). Farnham, GB: Routledge, 2012, pp. 5d-5e.

¹⁹³ Loud, *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 175. Orig.: "Postque civitate per condicionem, ut dictum est, tradita sepulchrum Domini a paganis questus gratia in veneratione habetur." (Schmale, *Die Chronik Ottos von St. Blasien*, p. 86).

¹⁹⁴ Loud, *Arnold of Lübeck*, p. 99. Orig.: "Sepulchrum tamen Domini religiosi viris tali conditione deputatum est, ut tributum Salladino de oblationibus peregrinorum, qui ipsum sepulchrum sub conditione pacis visitabant, ministrarent. Siquidem Salladinus consulens questui avaritie sue, hoc statuerat, ut si quis christianorum sepulchrum Domini visitare vellet, byzantium auri pro suo conductu daret et liber iret et rediret, dummodo nulla secum arma deferret." (Lappenberg, *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*, p. 169, ll. 24-29).

The chronicles of Arnold of Lübeck and Otto of St. Blasien are much more detailed than the other sources analysed in this thesis, and they must have received their information from other sources. I have not been able to find the missing link in the transmission of information, but future research might compare other chronicle narratives and find similarities between them and the chronicles of Arnold and Otto. In the middle of the thirteenth century, the continuations of William of Tyre started circulating in Europe, providing very detailed descriptions of the events of 1187,¹⁹⁵ but before then, we have no knowledge of detailed eyewitness accounts in Europe. However, given the wealth of detail in the chronicles of Arnold and Otto, it seems probable that other accounts – whether written or oral – must have been circulating in Germany, because the letters from the East and the writings of Pope Gregory VIII and Henry of Albano alone are not nearly sufficient to explain how Arnold and Otto knew so much about the historical contexts of the events, details not described by any of the other sources treated in this thesis.

This thesis has illustrated how the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem were first described in letters from the East and subsequently spread to the Holy Roman Empire. We know, however, that the information of the events of 1187 spread throughout Europe, and it would be interesting to study the development of this literary tradition in other geographical areas. According to Sylvia Schein, the writings of Henry of Albano, in particular, influenced German and French chroniclers and poets, while Peter of Blois set the tone for the English accounts of the fall of Jerusalem,¹⁹⁶ and quantitative comparative studies across geographical areas might result in a more detailed picture of the transmission of information. Moreover, it would be interesting to see if the descriptions of the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem developed differently in other areas, or if all Western Europeans shared the same commemoration of the defeat. As illustrated in this thesis, there is a wealth of exciting approaches to the sources of the defeat of 1187, and a broader study with inclusion of more sources might add even more nuances to the description of the Battle of Hattin and the fall of Jerusalem.

¹⁹⁵ Edbury, *Conquest*, pp. 3-7.

¹⁹⁶ Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City*, pp. 161-62.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

EMC: *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, ed. Graeme Dunphy. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
MGH SS: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores*, ed. G.H. Pertz *et al.*, 32 vols. Hannover, Weimar, Stuttgart, Cologne and Munich, 1826-1934. Website: www.dmgh.de.
OED: Oxford English Dictionary. Website: www.oed.com.
PL: *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J.P. Migne, 217 vols plus 4 vols indexes. Paris, 1857-1912.

Primary Sources

‘Ansbert’. *Historia de Expeditione Friderici Imperatoris*. Ed. A. Chroust, MGH SS, n.s., vol. 5. Berlin, 1928.
Arnold of Lübeck. *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*. Ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz. MGH SS, rer. Germ. 14. Hannover: Hahn, 1868.
Arnold of Lübeck. *Arnoldi Chronica Slavorum*. Ed. Johann Martin Lappenberg. MGH SS 21. Hannover: Hahn, 1869. Pp. 100-250.
Arnold of Lübeck. *Arnold af Lybeks Slavekrønike*. Translated by P. Kierkegaard. Copenhagen: Karl Schønbergs Forlag, 1885.
E continuatione Hugonis a Sancto Victore. Ed. L. Weiland, MGH SS, vol. 21 (Hannover, 1869), pp. 475-6.
Ernoul. *La Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le Trésorier*. Ed. L. M. de Mas Latrie. Paris: Mme Ve Jules Renouard, 1871.
Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis. Ed. W. Stubbs, vol. 2, RS 49 (London, 1867), pp. 11-13.
Gregory VIII. *Audita tremendi*. PL, vol. 202, col. 1539-1542.
Henry of Albano. *De Peregrinante Civitate Dei*. PL, vol. 204, col. 251-402.
Hiestand, Rudolf. *Papsturkunden für Kirchen im heiligen Lande*. Vorarbeiten zum Oriens Pontificius III, Abhandl. Göttingen. Dritte Folge Nr. 136. Göttingen, 1985.
Jaspert, Nikolas. “Zwei unbekannte Hilfsersuchen des Patriarchen Eraclius vor dem Fall Jerusalems (1187).” In: *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 60 (2004), vol. 2, pp. 483-516.
Letters from the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12th-13th Centuries. Tr. Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate, Ashgate, 2010.
Lyon Eracles. In: *The Conquest of Jerusalem and the Third Crusade: Sources in Translation*. Tr. Peter W. Edbury, Brookfield: Ashgate, 1998.
Otto of St. Blasien. *Die Chronik des Otto von St. Blasien*. Transl. Horst Ernst Arminius Kohl. Leipzig: Verlag von Franz Dunder, 1881.
Otto of St. Blasien. *Ottonis de Sancto Blasio Chronica*. Ed. Adolfus Hofmeister. MGH SS rer. Germ. 47. Hannover; Leipzig: Hahn, 1912.

Otto of St. Blasien. *Die Chronik Ottos von St. Blasien und die Marbacher Annalen*. Ed. & transl. Franz-Josef Schmale. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998.
Roger of Howden. *Chronica*. Vol. 2, (ed.) W. Stubbs, RS 51 (London, 1869).

Secondary Works

- Auge, Oliver. "Probleme der Übersetzung von Arnolds Chronik: Ein Werkstattbericht." In: Stephan Freund & Bernd Schütte (ed.). *Die "Chronik" Arnolds Von Lubeck: Neue Wege Zu Ihrem Verstandnis*, Peter Lang Pub Inc, 2008, pp. 25-43.)
- Barber, Malcolm. *The Crusader States*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.
- Edbury, Peter W. "Propaganda and Faction in the Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Background to Hattin." In: *Crusaders and Muslims in Twelfth-Century Syria*, ed. M. Shatzmiller. Leiden, 1993. Pp. 173-189.
- Folda, Jaroslav. "Commemorating the Fall of Jerusalem: Remembering the First Crusade in Text, Liturgy, and Image." In: Paul, Nicholas and Suzanne Yeager (ed.). *Remembering the Crusades: Myth, Image, and Identity*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012, pp. 125-45.
- Freund, Stephan & Bernd Schütte (ed.). *Die "Chronik" Arnolds Von Lübeck: Neue Wege Zu Ihrem Verstandnis*. Peter Lang Pub Inc, 2008.
- Hucker, Bernd Ulrich. "Die Chronik Arnolds von Lübeck als *Historia Regum*." In *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 44, 1988.
- Hucker, Bernd Ulrich. *Kaiser Otto IV*. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1990.
- Jotischky, Andrew. *Crusading and the Crusader States*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2004.
- Kedar, Benjamin Z. "The Battle of Hattin Revisited." In: B. Z. Kedar (ed.): *The Horns of Hattin*, Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992. Pp. 190-207.
- Krieg, Heinz. *Herrscherdarstellung in der Stauferzeit. Friedrich Barbarossa im Spiegel seiner Urkunden und der staufischen Geschichtsschreibung*. Vorträge und Forschungen, Sonderband 50, Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2003.
- Loud, Graham. *Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*. Farnham, GB: Ashgate, 2013.
- Menache, Sophia. *The Vox Dei: Communication in the Middle Ages*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Morris, David. "The Servile Mother: Jerusalem as Woman in the Era of the Crusades." In: Paul, Nicholas and Suzanne Yeager (ed.). *Remembering the Crusades: Myth, Image, and Identity*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012, pp. 174-94.
- Nielsen, Torben K. "Sterile Monsters? Russians and the Orthodox Church in the Chronicle of Henry of Livonia." In: Alan V. Murray (ed.), *The Clash of Cultures on the Medieval Baltic Frontier*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2009, pp. 227-52.
- Phillips, Jonathan. *The Crusades, 1095-1197*. Harlow: Pearson Education, 2002.
- Prawer, Joshua. *Crusader Institutions*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980. Pp. 484-500.

- Pringle, Denys. *Crusade Texts in Translation: Pilgrimage to Jerusalem and the Holy Land, 1187–1291* (23). Farnham, GB: Routledge, 2012.
- Queller, Donald E., and Thomas F. Madden. *The Fourth Crusade: the conquest of Constantinople*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997.
- Riley-Smith, L. and J.S.C. *The Crusades: Idea and Reality 1095-1274*. London: Edward Arnold, 1981.
- Runciman, Steven. *A History of the Crusades* vol. 2. Cambridge University Press, 1951.
- Schein, Sylvia. *Gateway to the Heavenly City: Crusader Jerusalem and the Catholic West (1099-1187)*. Ashgate, 2005.
- Scior, Volker. *Das Eigene und das Fremde: Identität und Fremdheit in den Chroniken Adams von Bremen, Helmolds von Bosau und Arnolds von Lubeck*. Akademie Verlag, 2002.
- Setton, Kenneth M., et al. *A history of the Crusades*. Vol. I: "The First Hundred Years" (ed. Marshall W. Baldwin). Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.
- Skovgaard-Petersen, Karen. *A Journey to the Promised Land. Crusading Theology in the Historia de profectione Danorum in Hierosolymam (c. 1200)*. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2001.
- Tolan, John Victor (ed.). *Medieval Christian perceptions of Islam: a book of essays*. New York: Garland Pub., 1996.
- Tolan, John Victor. *Sons of Ishmael: Muslims through European eyes in the Middle Ages*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2008.
- Walther, Helmut G. "Zur Verschriftlichung nordelbischen Selbstbewusstseins um 1200 in der Chronik abt Arnolds von Lübeck." In: Matthias Thumser (ed.): *Schriftkultur und Landesgeschichte. Studien zum südlichen Ostseeraum vom 12. bis zum 16. Jahrhundert*. Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 1997. Pp. 1-21.

Unpublished Material

Loud, Graham. *English Translation of the Chronicle of Arnold of Lübeck*.

Front Page Illustrations

- "L'armée de Saladin", Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Fr 22495, fol. 229v. 14th century.
- "Mort de Renaud de Châtillon", Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS 68, fol. 399. 15th century.
- "Siège de Jérusalem", Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS 68, fol. 404. 15th century.

Resumé

Fra slagmark til erindring: Slaget ved Hattin og Jerusalems fald i breve og krøniker, 1187-1210.

Den 4. juli 1187 mødtes to enorme hære ved Hattin i det Hellige Land. Den store kristne korsfarerhær under ledelse af Guy af Lusignan, konge af Jerusalem, mod en endnu større muslimsk hær under ledelse af Saladin, sultan af Egypten og Syrien. Den kristne hær led et massivt nederlag, der resulterede i tilfangetagelsen af de fleste kristne ledere og saracenernes erobring af det Hellige Kors. Tre måneder senere, den 2. oktober 1187, faldt Jerusalem til den muslimske hær. Slaget ved Hattin og Jerusalems fald markerer et lavpunkt i historien om de kristne Korsfarerstater. Jerusalem, der havde været målet for det Første Korstog i 1099, var nu tabt efter 88 år under kristent herredømme, og nyheden om tabet nåede hurtigt til Vesteuropa, hvor informationen spredtes og med tiden udviklede sig til en litterær tradition.

Dette speciale undersøger hvordan denne litterære tradition blev grundlagt og udviklede sig efterhånden som beretningen om slaget ved Hattin og Jerusalems fald blev spredt fra de første breve sendt fra det Hellige Land til krøniker skrevet mere end tre årtier senere. I det Tysk-Romerske Rige blev to krøniker skrevet omkring 1210, den ene af den nordtyske Arnold af Lybæk, den anden af Otto af Skt. Blasien fra Schwarzwald i det sydlige Tyskland. Begge krøniker omhandler kejserrigets historie fra midten af 1100-tallet til omkring 1210 og begge inkluderer detaljerede beskrivelser af slaget ved Hattin og Jerusalems fald. Fælles for disse to krøniker er også at de ikke har været skænket megen opmærksomhed i forskningslitteraturen. Arnold af Lybæk er ganske vist de seneste årtier blevet studeret grundigt af tyske forskere, men mest med fokus på hans beskrivelser af lokale forhold og kristen ekspansion i de baltiske områder, mens Otto af Skt. Blasien stort set har undgået historikeres opmærksomhed.

Mens selve begivenhederne i 1187 er grundigt beskrevet i forskningslitteraturen, er informationsspredningen i kølvandet på nederlaget underbelyst. Dette speciale kaster derfor nyt lys på både informationsspredningen efter slaget ved Hattin og Jerusalems fald og på Arnold af Lybæk og Otto af Skt. Blasiens beskrivelser af disse begivenheder.

Dette undersøges ved dels at afdække hvilke kilder der spredte nyhederne om nederlaget, dels at nærlæse og sammenligne disse kilder for at spore udviklingen i beskrivelsen af nederlaget.

Det er muligt at spore informationen fra det Hellige Land til forskellige modtagergrupper i Vesten. I oktober 1187 nåede nyheden Pave Urban III, der angiveligt døde af chok. Hans efterfølger, Gregor VIII, skrev sin berømte *Audita Tremendi*, hvori han udråbte et nyt korstog. Paven sendte også udsendinge rundt i Europa for at udbrede sit budskab. En af disse var Henry af Albano, der rejste i Tyskland og blandt andet skrev et brev til de tyske gejstlige og verdslige ledere. En krønike skrevet hen mod slutningen af det 12. århundrede i grænseområdet mellem Bayern og Østrig, den såkaldte *Historia de Expeditione Friderici Imperatoris*, kopierer både *Audita Tremendi*, Henry af Albanos brev og breve fra Hellige Land, hvilket viser at beskrivelsen af nederlaget var nået til Sydtyskland. Informationsspredningen kan dog ikke spores hele vejen til Arnold og Ottos krøniker, da vi ikke kender deres kildemateriale, og de er også væsentligt mere detaljerede end de hidtil nævnte kilder, hvilket indikerer at de må have haft andre kilder til rådighed, det være sig skriftlige eller mundtlige.

Der sker en tydelig udvikling i kildernes beskrivelse af nederlaget, fra de tidlige forskrækkede og jamrende beskrivelser af utællelige, blodtørstige umennesker, til senere nuancerede beretninger, der også tager stilling til begivenhedernes historiske kontekst; fra en opfattelse af begivenhederne som Guds straf over de syndige kristne, til senere overvejelser om de politiske forhold i Korsfarerstaterne kan have spillet en rolle i begivenhedernes gang. Disse ændringer må til dels forklares med kildernes *causa scribendi*. Mens de tidligste breve fra det Hellige Land skrev med det formål for øje at bede Vesten om assistance hurtigst muligt, var det Gregor VIII og Henry af Albano's intention at samle Kristenheden om et nyt korstog. Den anonyme *Historia de Expeditione* skrev sandsynligvis om begivenhederne i 1187 for at skabe en kontekst til og legitimering af Frederik Barbarossas korstog. Arnold og Ottos *causae scribendi* er sværere at udpege. Det er en mulighed at de skrev for at støtte Kejser Otto IV's planlagte korstog. Måske skrev de også for at bearbejde den kollektive kristne sorg over tabet af Jerusalem. Måske skrev de om nederlaget fordi de var påvirkede af tidens litterære tendenser, eller blot fordi deres krøniker om kejserriget inkluderede de Tysk-Romerske kejsers ekspeditioner østpå.