

[This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Stephen J. Spencer, ‘Feelings of Betrayal and Echoes of the First Crusade in Odo of Deuil’s *De Profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem*’, *Historical Research*, vol. 92, issue 258 (November 2019), pp. 657–79, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2281.12287>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.]

Feelings of betrayal and echoes of the First Crusade in Odo of Deuil’s *De profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem**

What did Odo of Deuil, a monk (and later abbot) of Saint-Denis, hope to achieve when writing the *De profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem*? This is an important question because the *De profectione*, composed in the spring or summer of 1148 (or alternatively in 1150), represents the fullest extant eyewitness testimony for the Levantine branch of the ill-fated Second Crusade—an expedition launched by Pope Eugenius III on 1 December 1145 and led by Louis VII of France and Conrad III of Germany.¹

Most historians agree that Odo of Deuil’s literary aims were threefold: to aggrandise Louis VII, whom he served as chaplain during the journey; to provide a guide for future pilgrims; and to blame the Byzantine empire for the expedition’s failure.² In addition, because Odo clearly intended to furnish his abbot, Suger of Saint-Denis, with information about the journey, to be incorporated into the latter’s unrealised *Vita* or *Gesta Ludovici VII*, some scholars have also argued that the text should be read with that objective in mind.³ Of course, these literary goals were by no means mutually exclusive, and there remains significant debate over the relative importance of each, especially Odo’s vilification of the Greeks. The *De profectione* was long considered ‘hysterically anti-Greek’ and ‘notable for its strong and explicit anti-Greek stance’, as Steven Runciman and Timothy Reuter characterised the text respectively.⁴ This view dominated historiographical opinion, reaching its apogee in 1993 with Henry Mayr-Harting’s ground-breaking analysis, which concluded that the work

was produced in 1150 to augment support for a planned campaign against Byzantium and to impress Odo's stringent anti-Byzantine views upon his *confrères* at Saint-Denis.⁵ Albeit an attractive proposition, and somewhat in line with other sources which pointed to Byzantine treachery, Odo's virulent anti-Greek stance appears out of tune with broader contemporary opinion towards Byzantium in western Europe; and it is now generally believed that the planned 1150 expedition aimed to alleviate the Muslim threat to the crusader states, rather than to exact revenge on the Greeks.⁶ Nonetheless, Mayr-Harting's study represents the last major attempt to explain, rather than simply describe, the pervasiveness of anti-Byzantine rhetoric in the *De profectione*, in part due to a growing trend (initiated by Giles Constable) of demoting this feature of the text as a 'secondary theme' and of emphasising the complexity of Odo's attitude towards the Greeks.⁷ Thus, Jonathan Phillips has argued that Odo's perception of the Byzantines was neither monochromatic nor consistent, noting that his 'prejudice against the Greeks failed to prevent him from making positive comments about them and did not entirely blind him to the rationale behind their actions'.⁸

Two relatively recent areas of scholarship—the memorialisation of the crusades and the history of emotions—can shed valuable light on Odo's literary agenda, and thus significantly reframe the aforementioned discussions. This article draws attention to the overarching dominance and consistency of Odo's defamation of the Byzantines, despite his very occasional positive comments, and proposes a new explanation for his vehemently anti-Greek tone by placing the *De profectione* in the broader contextual framework of the memorialisation of crusading in the twelfth century.⁹ Both of these considerations lead to the conclusion that Odo's denigration of the Greeks was a literary goal of primary, rather than secondary, importance. The first part considers Odo's engagement with the literary tradition of the First Crusade, which was both more important and complex than previously assumed. It will be argued that Odo consulted at least two histories of the First Crusade, from which he borrowed imagery and motifs; however, he was keen to justify the Second Crusaders'

inability to emulate the accomplishments of their predecessors, a core theme of papal preaching, and therefore accused the treacherous Greeks of having prevented them from doing so—of heralding a break from the past. The second part furthers this line of argument, highlighting the pervasiveness of anti-Greek sentiment in the *De profectioe* by exploring a hitherto unappreciated element in Odo's presentation of the Byzantines and the crusaders' interactions with them: his use of emotional rhetoric. In recent years, the burgeoning field of the history of emotions has witnessed the rejection of traditionalist characterisations of the Middle Ages as a period of emotional turmoil and, in turn, the publication of more rigorous investigations into the emotional standards of medieval societies. This has simultaneously manifested a deeper appreciation of the role of emotions in expressing religious, social, political and gender discourses in medieval texts.¹⁰ An analysis of the *De profectioe*'s emotional registers points to another, somewhat neglected textual function: vilification.¹¹ As we shall see, emotions were a valuable literary weapon in the substantial arsenal Odo mobilised against the Greeks, with several facets of the *De profectioe*'s emotional content reflecting the influence of the histories of the First Crusade.

Echoes of the First Crusade

The potential impact of the memory and historiographical tradition of the First Crusade in shaping Odo's account of the Second Crusade remains a point of contention among historians. The famous crusading window of Saint-Denis, several roundels of which depicted events of the First Crusade, was installed during the abbacy of either Suger or Odo, and the latter almost certainly had access to histories of the First Crusade.¹² A codex containing two accounts of that expedition (by Raymond of Aguilers and Fulcher of Chartres) and a copy of Walter the Chancellor's *Bella Antiochena* was presented to Louis VII early in his reign by a veteran of the First Crusade and may well have been available to the monks of Saint-Denis.¹³ As Jay Rubenstein has hypothesised, it is possible that Odo had read this collection.¹⁴

Moreover, according to the *Dialogus apologeticus*, composed c.1153 by William of Saint-Denis, Suger's biographer and a former librarian of the abbey, Odo familiarised himself with histories of the First Crusade before departure and even took an account with him on crusade:

I handed over to him as a pledge a fair-sized codex assembled from my library, and I collected as a gift to him for precaution another book of the journey, that is an itinerary [or the *Itinerary*] of that former pilgrimage, which captured [and] expelled the enemies of Christianity from both Antioch and the sepulchre of the saviour.¹⁵

For Henri Waquet, it was therefore 'quite possible' that Odo left western Europe with the intention of becoming the Second Crusade's historiographer.¹⁶ More recently, Phillips has gone further, suggesting that such reading 'must have had some impact upon his understanding of the crusade' and 'may have helped to shape his attitudes'.¹⁷ In contrast, James Naus has rejected the idea that accounts of the First Crusade were a formative influence, contending that 'there is little evidence that Odo followed them as a model for his text'.¹⁸

It is true that the contrasting fortunes of the two expeditions likely curtailed overt comparisons, and very little of the *De profectione*'s plot architecture can be said to have derived directly from narratives of the First Crusade. Nevertheless, given the level of Odo's exposure to the memory of the events of 1095–1099, we should not so readily discount the possibility that the chronicle tradition of the First Crusade left its mark on him and impacted upon his presentation of the Second Crusade. The problem, of course, is that only a handful of parallels between the *De profectione* and First Crusade histories have hitherto been identified. As others have noted, Odo made at least two direct allusions to the earlier expedition, both of which appear in connection to Louis VII's apparent desire to follow in the

footsteps of his predecessors.¹⁹ Beyond this, Phillips has drawn attention to two further moments when the First Crusade ‘was clearly in his thoughts’: a passing comment that the Greeks ‘were accustomed to press people to cross [the Bosphorus]’ (‘solebant urgere transitum’); and Odo’s emphasis on the theme of vengeance, which likewise punctuated accounts of the First Crusade.²⁰ Another parallel was recently highlighted by Beth Spacey, who suggested that Odo’s use of the celestial knight motif ‘should be understood within the context of his desire to present Louis’s expedition to the East in the same tradition as the First Crusade’.²¹

In fact, there are several further features of the text which strongly suggest that Odo was familiar with at least two First Crusade chronicles, and that these works influenced his approach to the Second Crusade, albeit not always in the way we might expect. Raymond of Aguilers’ *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem* was almost certainly available at Saint-Denis. As early as 1890, F. de Mély demonstrated that the inscriptions on six roundels of the crusading window at Saint-Denis were probably based on Raymond’s *Historia*, and this was confirmed by Elizabeth Brown and Michael Cothren’s 1986 study, which highlighted that the window bore the same spelling of Kerbogha (‘Corboras’) as Raymond’s text.²² An illustrative example of the nexus between Raymond’s *Historia* and Odo’s *De profectioe* is the latter’s inclusion of the celestial knight motif. Describing a skirmish between Louis’ army and the Turks on the banks of the Meander River in 1147, Odo wrote that: ‘Actually, there were people who said that they had seen in front of our men at the river’s crossing a certain white-clad knight, whom they had not seen before or since, and that he had struck the first blows in the battle.’²³ While Spacey has shown that the saintly warrior trope marked an array of First Crusade narratives, primarily the *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum* (a version of which, it will be suggested below, Odo also used) and its derivatives, I would argue that Odo’s account of this scene was probably inspired by Raymond’s *Historia*. Both Raymond and Odo specified that the heavenly knight(s) rode in

front of the crusader army (Raymond: ‘exercitum nostrum precedentes’; Odo: ‘militem ante nostros’) and actively fought against the Turks.²⁴ Neither of these details featured in the *Gesta*, which recorded that from the mountains there appeared a countless army of men on white horses and bearing white banners. No mention is made of their actual intervention in the conflict.²⁵ Furthermore, both Raymond and Odo ascribed this report to others: Raymond explicitly acknowledged that ‘we did not see it’ (‘nos non vidimus’) and that the information derived from individuals in their ranks, while Odo claimed to have heard the story second-hand and stated that he desired not to deceive or to be deceived.²⁶ No such cautionary remark is found in the *Gesta*, although the author was clearly keen to convince his audience: ‘Trust these words, because it was seen by many of our men.’²⁷ Finally, while Raymond and Odo differ in terms of the number of anonymous knights—two in Raymond, a single rider in Odo—the *Gesta* diverges substantially by suggesting an entire army, led by Saints George, Mercurius and Demetrius.²⁸ The source which inspired Odo’s allusion to the celestial knight cannot be determined with certainty, but the most likely candidate is Raymond of Aguilers’ *Historia*.

Nevertheless, it is highly likely that the *Gesta Francorum*, one of the earliest narratives of the First Crusade, or a very similar text was also among the histories consulted by Odo, perhaps even being the account he took on crusade.²⁹ This was suspected by Brown and Cothren, as well as by Phillips and Marc Carrier, but as yet remains unproven.³⁰ Brown and Cothren’s hypothesis was based on the fact that the *Gesta* was alternatively titled *Itinerarium Ierosolymorum* or *Itinerarium Hierosolimitano* in two codices, which tallied with William of Saint-Denis’ claim to have given Odo ‘itinerarium ... pristina illius peregrinationis’.³¹ The notion that William was referring to a specific work, ‘the *Itinerary* of that former pilgrimage’, now seems more credible: in a recent study of a newly-discovered manuscript related to the *Gesta Francorum*, Samu Niskanen has persuasively argued that the work was originally

known as *Itinerarium Hierosolimitanorum*, and that its title evolved into *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum* at an early stage of the text's transmission.³²

Several correlations between the *De profectione* and *Gesta Francorum* suggest that Odo was working in an intellectual climate which had been influenced by the *Gesta* tradition. For instance, Odo's suggestion that Bernard of Clairvaux roused such enthusiasm for the expedition at Vézelay in 1146 that the abbot was forced to tear his own garments into crosses closely resembles the *Gesta*'s account of Bohemond of Taranto manufacturing crosses out of his most precious cloak at Amalfi in 1096, although we cannot rule out the possibility that Bernard deliberately re-enacted Bohemond's famous gesture to aid recruitment.³³ Both texts presented crusading as a form of *imitatio Christi* and insisted that deceased crusaders received the reward of martyrdom.³⁴ Unfortunately, the field still lacks a systematic analysis, akin to Ane Bysted's study on the development of the crusade indulgence, of whether and how the concept of martyrdom evolved in a crusade setting during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.³⁵ Nonetheless, it is clear that the First Crusade popularised the idea that those who died in battle warranted the martyr's crown.³⁶ If created during Suger's abbacy, a roundel of the crusading window at Saint-Denis, which depicted nine figures receiving the martyr's crown, may have convinced Odo that deceased crusaders attained that heavenly reward, yet his presentation of martyrdom also echoes the inchoate ideas found in early narratives of the First Crusade, like the *Gesta*.³⁷

Two aspects of Odo's attitude towards martyrdom deserve comment here. Firstly, despite his emphasis on the crusaders' trials and tribulations, martyrdom was not a prominent theme of the *De profectione*: the crusaders' dead were only twice described as martyrs.³⁸ Secondly, Odo's conception of martyrdom was conservative and theologically imprecise. He appears to have conflated the *remissio peccatorum* and martyrdom: 'their death, whereby their errors were swept away through fervent faith, has won the martyr's crown'.³⁹ This conceptual confusion is also evident in accounts of the First Crusade, which repeatedly allude

to martyrdom but rarely to the remission of sins offered by Urban II.⁴⁰ Moreover, in the *De profectione*, the agonies the crusaders endured and their steadfast faith warranted a fitting spiritual reward, with Louis reminding his troops that those who were penitent and devout deserved ‘to be crowned as martyrs whose souls God takes from such toil’.⁴¹ This could reflect a lack of clarity in *Quantum praedecessores*—Eugenius III’s call to arms—or Bernard of Clairvaux’s preaching, or perhaps the latter’s concept of the ‘year of jubilee’, which stressed the centrality of God’s grace to the indulgence.⁴² Yet it might also be indicative of the ideas expressed in early crusade histories. In a similar fashion to Odo, the *Gesta Francorum*, Raymond of Aguilers and Fulcher of Chartres all presented martyrdom as an apt reward for the crusaders’ suffering.⁴³ In fact, Odo made a vague allusion to the First Crusaders’ status as martyrs, although neither *martyr* nor *martyrium* was used, when Louis supposedly assured his men that their fathers had attained ‘heaven’s glory’ (‘caeli gloriam’).⁴⁴ Certainly, Odo’s attitude towards martyrdom differs markedly from the more theologically refined accounts composed within the first decade of the twelfth century by the Benedictine monks Baldric of Bourgueil, Robert the Monk and Guibert of Nogent. In the *De profectione*, martyrdom was represented as a gift *from* God, who saved the crusaders from earthly tribulations by conferring upon them the martyr’s crown, rather than a gift *to* God; and there is no suggestion that the crusaders sacrificed their lives as an act of love, or that in so doing they were imitating Christ’s example—two prominent themes in the Benedictine accounts.⁴⁵

The parallels between the *De profectione* and *Gesta Francorum* tradition do not end there. In his prefatory letter, Odo twice described the expedition as ‘via sancti Sepulcri’ and once as ‘itinere Ierosolymitano’; *via* and *iter* were used to designate the enterprise throughout the remainder of his account.⁴⁶ Albeit typical pilgrimage terminology, these are the same terms found in accounts of the First Crusade, with the *Gesta* repeatedly referring to the expedition as *via* or *iter Sancti Sepulchri*.⁴⁷ Furthermore, the Second Crusaders were

frequently described as *peregrini* and their Muslim opponents as *pagani*, the same terms employed by contemporary chroniclers of the First Crusade, including the *Gesta*'s anonymous author.⁴⁸ On one occasion, Odo called the Turks 'inimicos Dei et nostros' ('God's enemies and ours')—a phrase also found in the *Gesta*.⁴⁹ Knightly distress at the loss of their mounts is another recurring trope in both the *Gesta* and *De profectione*.⁵⁰ None of these correlations is conclusive, but collectively they are suggestive of an author who had come into contact with First Crusade histories. Odo himself seemingly acknowledged the importance of literature in shaping one's opinions, and specifically one's opinions of the Byzantines, when he recorded that, at the council of Étampes in 1147, there were men who declared that the Greeks were deceitful, 'as they had learned from reading and from experience'.⁵¹ Indeed, in 2005, Luigi Russo tentatively suggested that Odo of Deuil's anti-Byzantine stance was based on 'a pre-existing tradition', possibly connected to Bohemond of Taranto's preaching tour of France in 1106.⁵²

Many of the abovementioned characteristics are ubiquitous in crusade texts and do not necessarily point to the influence of the *Gesta Francorum* specifically. Yet there is another, more compelling reason to suspect that Odo had access to a version of the latter. Suger of Saint-Denis' *Vita Ludovici Grossi*, written in the 1130s and 1140s, testifies to a contemporary interest in, and engagement with, the memory of the First Crusade at Saint-Denis.⁵³ The abbot repeatedly referred to the expedition and at times demonstrated his knowledge of events, noting, for instance, that Guy Trousseau had deserted Antioch 'in fear of Kerbogha' ('timore Corbarani'), leaving his comrades abandoned within the city.⁵⁴ He also recorded that Antioch's garrison surrendered to Bohemond alone ('specialiter') on account of his valour ('strenuitatem').⁵⁵ These are two of the most detailed and specific references to the First Crusade in Suger's text; usually the abbot simply alluded to individuals returning from the 'via Sancti Sepulchri' and 'itinere Jherosolimitano'—the same phrases used in the *Gesta* and *De profectione*.⁵⁶ Bohemond himself could have been the source of these details, for Suger

purports to have witnessed the prince of Antioch's preaching, alongside Bishop Bruno of Segni, at Poitiers in 1106.⁵⁷ Given that Bohemond was recruiting for an expedition against the Byzantine emperor, Alexios I Komnenos, it makes sense that he would have emphasised his own contribution to Antioch's capture, and thus the legitimacy of his possession of the city, which contravened the oath agreed at Constantinople in 1096.⁵⁸ Yet most accounts, including a letter Bohemond sent to Pope Paschal II in 1106 (or 1108), suggest that Alexios' injustices, especially his oppression of pilgrims to Jerusalem, were the focal point of Bohemond's appeal.⁵⁹

Intriguingly, it is not inconceivable that the aforementioned details in Suger's *Vita Ludovici Grossi* derived from, or were perhaps inspired by, the *Gesta Francorum* or a very similar text. It has long been suspected that the *Gesta*, which tended to cast the southern Italian Norman leader in a favourable light, was disseminated as 'propaganda' during Bohemond's 1106 preaching tour of France, although scholars have not yet reached a consensus on this point.⁶⁰ However, the presence of the *Gesta Francorum* in France in the twelfth century is irrefutable: it was consulted by the aforementioned trio of northern French Benedictine monks (Baldric, Robert and Guibert), as well as by Gilo of Paris; and there was probably a copy at Fleury too.⁶¹ In the *Gesta Francorum*, Bohemond was presented as single-handedly engineering Antioch's fall through his negotiations with a member of the city's garrison, the Turkish betrayer Firuz, who outwardly praised Bohemond's worth, referring to him as 'most vigorous' ('acerrimus') and 'unconquered' ('inuictus').⁶² While Bohemond undoubtedly did play an instrumental role in these events, and his negotiations with Firuz have, quite rightly, become a mainstay of modern reconstructions, this was not necessarily an established 'fact' soon after the city's capture on 3 June 1098. Rather, it only seems to have become an accepted part of the expedition's memory during the twelfth century, in large part due to the *Gesta's* influence.

Indeed, it is a sign of the extraordinary impact the *Gesta Francorum* has exerted on modern scholarship that historians have invariably glossed over the confusion evident in several of the earliest accounts of Antioch's fall.⁶³ Importantly, these early reflections diverge substantially from the version of events presented in both the *Gesta* tradition and Suger's work, implying that the latter was influenced by the former. Of the letters written by or for the crusaders in the aftermath of the city's conquest, just one attributed the success to Bohemond alone. Writing to Urban II on 11 September 1098, the First Crusade's princes addressed the pontiff collectively in the first person plural, but when describing Antioch's capture, the letter suddenly moved into the singular: 'I, Bohemond, having made an agreement with a certain Turk, who handed over that city to me, placed ladders against the wall'.⁶⁴ This clause has led to speculation that Bohemond, or a member of his entourage, was responsible for its inclusion, although the document has several curious and problematic features, which have been discussed elsewhere by Nicholas Paul.⁶⁵ By contrast, in July 1098, Anselm of Ribemont believed that the city was betrayed by three of its citizens, and failed to associate this with a specific crusade leader.⁶⁶ The negotiations that led to the city's capture were presented as a joint effort in a circular sent by the clergy and people of Lucca in October 1098, which purports to report the experiences of a participant in the siege called Bruno. According to this missive, on 2 June four brothers, noblemen of Antioch, promised to surrender the city to Bohemond, Robert Curthose and Robert II of Flanders, but when the gates were opened to accept the three princes, the entire Christian army unexpectedly entered.⁶⁷ Again, this account differs markedly from the *Vita Ludovici Grossi* and texts connected to the *Gesta Francorum*, with Bohemond merely one of three princes responsible for securing the city. Likewise, for Raymond of Aguilers, writing c.1101, the entire affair was a collective effort by the enterprise's leaders. He wrote that one of Antioch's Turks sent word to 'our princes' ('principibus ... nostris') that he would deliver the city, after which the 'principes' (again plural) decided through a common council to send Bohemond, Godfrey of

Bouillon and Robert of Flanders to test the offer.⁶⁸ This downplaying of Bohemond's role was probably a by-product of Raymond of Aguilers' Provençal leanings: Raymond is known to have used the *Gesta*, so he may well have purposefully suppressed Bohemond's name, no doubt aware of Raymond of Toulouse's desire to return Antioch to Emperor Alexios.⁶⁹ Interestingly, the scribe of one of the *Historia*'s manuscripts felt the need to insert 'per Boimundum' into the sentence describing the traitor's initial contact with the princes; and no mention of Bohemond's contribution to these events was made in a letter sent in September 1099 by the papal legate Daibert of Pisa, but almost certainly written by Raymond of Aguilers.⁷⁰

These early accounts thus reveal a degree of ambiguity over the process by which Antioch fell into Latin hands. During the twelfth century, such ambiguity was eliminated by the far-reaching historiographical tradition emanating from the *Gesta Francorum*: time and again, western commentators who consulted the *Gesta*, or related texts, ascribed this victory to Bohemond specifically.⁷¹ Notably, Baldric of Bourgueil elaborated on the *Gesta*, his foundation text, by suggesting that Firuz struck a friendship with Bohemond because he had heard 'much good' ('multa bona') about him, which tallies with Suger's belief that the garrison appreciated Bohemond's qualities.⁷² Regardless of whether one accepts that the *Gesta Francorum* was circulated to augment recruitment for Bohemond's planned attack on Byzantium, the *Gesta* (and related texts) played a key role in promoting the idea that Bohemond was the sole architect of Antioch's capture, and this tradition was reflected in Suger's *Vita Ludovici Grossi*.

Taken in isolation, however, the accord between Suger and the *Gesta* regarding Bohemond's centrality to the fall of Antioch could be discounted on the basis of oral traditions. Albert of Aachen, who probably wrote independently of the textual tradition surrounding the *Gesta Francorum* and relied on the oral testimonies of returning crusaders, afforded Bohemond a prominent role in these events, crediting him with striking an

agreement with a Turkish traitor which eventually led to the city's capture. The numerous parallels here between the *Gesta* and Albert are suggestive of a common tradition; if not textual, then oral.⁷³ Nonetheless, like Suger, the *Gesta Francorum* also named Guy Trousseau as one of those who deserted Antioch in 1098, terrified ('timore perterriti') by the first engagement with Kerbogha of Mosul's army.⁷⁴ The *Gesta* and Suger not only agree on the timing (during the second siege of Antioch) and motivation (fear) behind Guy's desertion, but also on the method of his escape: he descended 'per murum'.⁷⁵ Crucially, all other texts that reported Guy's flight were connected to the *Gesta Francorum* tradition.⁷⁶ The most likely explanation for these points of accord is that Suger came into contact with the *Gesta Francorum* or a work within that historiographical tradition, and it is thus highly likely that the same text, perhaps a copy of the *Gesta Francorum* itself, was available at the library of Saint-Denis.

All this suggests that Odo of Deuil was conscious of the crusading past and familiar with at least two of its histories. However, that does not mean that Odo deliberately set his account of the Second Crusade in line with the tradition established by the First Crusade; that he sought to present the expedition as the First Crusade 'mark II'. In fact, the opposite seems to be the case. Surprisingly, the clearest and fullest allusion to the First Crusade, which appears in Book VII of the *De profectione*, has largely escaped historiographical comment. While scholars have focused on an oration imputed to King Louis at Antalya in 1148, in which he urged his troops to follow the route of their forbearers, the alleged response of his barons is even more revealing:

We do not want to, and cannot, depreciate the renown of our fathers, but events went smoother for them than they have thus far for us. For when they had passed through Constantinople and crossed the Arm, they immediately encountered the Turks and entered their lands, as they had wished, and they maintained their

alacrity through the practice of warfare and preserved their wealth through the capture of cities and castles. However, we have met in those places the deceitful Greeks, whom we spared, to our bad luck, as if they were Christians; and sluggish with idleness and afflicted by weariness and annoyances, we have spent nearly all our wealth.⁷⁷

This represents a reasonably accurate account of the First Crusade's progress in 1096–1097, adding to the impression of an author familiar with the enterprise's history: the First Crusaders did indeed achieve a string of notable victories over the Turks soon after crossing the Arm of St George, including the capture of Nicaea on 19 June 1097 and victory in the battle of Dorylaeum on 1 July.⁷⁸ More importantly, Odo here used the earlier expedition as a direct point of reference. While King Louis himself acknowledged in a letter to Abbot Suger that, having arrived at Antalya, 'we had long and many consultations' ('diu multumque deliberassemus') over the best route, in all likelihood the words imputed to Louis' barons are Odo's own.⁷⁹ The use of direct speech was a common literary technique for communicating an author's own understanding of crusading, and here the barons were made to express sentiments with which Odo almost certainly agreed. In Book IV, Odo had complained that, after crossing the Bosphorus, Louis' progress was impeded by 'the cunning of the Greeks' ('Graecorum versutias').⁸⁰ Moreover, the notion that the Greeks were false Christians featured elsewhere in his narrative, and the suggestion that they should have been slain, rather than spared, is to be expected in light of the author's tacit approval of the bishop of Langres' proposed attack on Constantinople.⁸¹ The opponents of the two expeditions served as the key differentiator and accounted for their contrasting levels of success: the First Crusade triumphed over the Turks, whereas the Second Crusade was hamstrung by the treacherous Greeks.

Viewed in this context, Odo's sustained literary assault on the Greeks can be interpreted not simply as an attempt to exculpate Louis or to explain the enterprise's failure, but rather to explain why the expedition failed to continue the crusading tradition established by the First Crusade—a tradition of celebrated success. Two considerations make this all the more likely. Firstly, the emulation of predecessors was a core theme of *Quantum praedecessores*, in which Eugenius III not only pitched his message as a continuation of Pope Urban II's 1095 appeal and acknowledged the First Crusaders' accomplishments, but also challenged western Europe's arms-bearers, the 'sons', to imitate the example set by their 'fathers'.⁸² Bernard of Clairvaux stressed the same theme in his recruitment letters, which were intended to complement *Quantum praedecessores*, and it resurfaced in a number of sources pertaining to the Second Crusade.⁸³ The imitation of predecessors theme appears in three of the four allusions to the First Crusade in the *De profectioe*, suggesting that Odo knew that the Second Crusaders *should* have emulated their forbearers, but that they had failed to live up to their example.⁸⁴ Secondly, other western commentators interpreted the shortcomings of Louis' and Conrad's contingents in relation to the First Crusade's success. For example, Henry of Huntingdon, writing before 1155, remarked: 'For the armies of the French king and the emperor had been more splendid and larger than that which earlier had conquered Jerusalem, and yet they were crushed by very much smaller forces and were destroyed like a spider's web.'⁸⁵

If this analysis is correct, and Odo did indeed perceive Greek perfidy as the primary difference between the First and Second Crusades, it offers another explanation for his near-constant vilification of the Byzantines, albeit one that is not necessarily incompatible with the idea that he wrote in 1150 with the intention of drumming up support for an expedition against Byzantium.⁸⁶ It also explains several of the *De profectioe*'s features and silences, including why Odo was keen to point out that, on Christmas eve 1147, the knights attained the '*first* fruits of joy' ('laeti primitias') against the Turks, and why he was at pains to justify

the crusaders' inability to capitalise on other opportunities to score notable victories, as if anticipating the criticism of contemporaries.⁸⁷ The notion that the Greeks were responsible for preventing the crusaders from following in the footsteps of their predecessors also accounts for Odo's explicit warnings to future pilgrims *vis-à-vis* Byzantine treachery and his frequent accusations of Greco-Muslim collusion, which become more sustained as the story nears the Mount Cadmus fiasco and Louis' departure from the Holy Land.⁸⁸ Furthermore, it probably explains why, despite his liberal use of anti-Greek polemic, his insistence that he was not fabricating their character and his use of two texts rife with anti-Alexian vitriol, Odo not once compared Manuel's perfidy to that of Alexios. There are numerous moments when we might expect a flash of anti-Alexian sentiment, or at least a nod towards the emperor's supposed 'betrayal' of the First Crusade. For instance, in another allusion to the First Crusade which tends to be overlooked, Odo acknowledged that the Greeks 'retain that which the power of the Franks liberated, because they sought out Jerusalem'.⁸⁹ This was an opportunity to set the Second Crusaders' experiences within a tradition of Byzantine obstruction of crusading ventures, potentially by alluding to the 'unjust' nature of the oaths agreed between Alexios and the First Crusade's princes, the emperor's refusal to lead the expedition to Jerusalem or his failure to relieve the crusaders trapped inside Antioch in June 1098, all of which was detailed in the *Gesta Francorum* and Raymond of Aguilers' *Historia*.⁹⁰ Odo remained silent. While it is dangerous to argue *ex nihilo*, the complete absence of the First Crusaders' troubled relationship with Alexios and the Byzantines, as set out in the *Gesta Francorum*, Raymond of Aguilers and other histories, seems a glaring omission for an author who was so concerned with criticising the Greeks. Instead, using Bishop Godfrey of Langres as a mouthpiece, Odo turned to a more recent event in the Latin East for a comparator. In a bid to convince the French army of the legitimacy of an attack on Constantinople, the bishop, a man of 'wise intellect' ('prudens animo'), apparently drew attention to Emperor John II Komnenos' expedition against Raymond of Antioch in 1142–1143, with Manuel identified as

‘the heir of that complaint and crime’ (‘heres questus et criminis’).⁹¹ The overriding impression is that this ‘crime’ better suited Odo’s narrative purposes than the First Crusade—an expedition which triumphed in spite of Alexios’ alleged duplicity. Hence, in the *De profectione*, the First Crusaders simply ‘passed through Constantinople and crossed the Arm’.⁹²

Feelings of Betrayal

Thus far it has been argued that Odo’s engagement with the memory and historiographical tradition of the First Crusade was more complex than previously believed. He almost certainly used the *Gesta Francorum* (or a variant of that work) and Raymond of Aguilers’ *Historia*. Though neither text can be said to have directed his account, they probably shaped some of his interpretations of events and peoples, and the ways in which he wrote about them. However, the notion that Odo deliberately sought to present the Second Crusade as a continuation of the 1095–1099 expedition through his use of motifs and *topoi* found in First Crusade histories is an oversimplification of the memorialisation process. While Odo was willing to borrow ideas, tropes and (as we shall see) character-sketches, he was seemingly at pains to emphasise the distinctiveness of the Second Crusaders’ experiences and to avoid direct comparisons with the First Crusade, in all likelihood because he sought to portray Byzantine treachery as the primary reason for the Second Crusaders’ failure to continue the tradition established by their forefathers.

This interpretation of the *De profectione* encourages us to reconsider Odo’s demonization of the Byzantines as a major narrative aim, rather than a ‘secondary theme’ (as Constable suggested). Accordingly, the remainder of this article draws attention to a new layer in Odo’s vilification of the Byzantines—his use of emotional language—and, in so doing, it further demonstrates the probable influence of the *Gesta Francorum* and Raymond of Aguilers’ *Historia*. Following the methodological approach outlined by Barbara

Rosenwein in 2010, a lexical analysis of the *De profectione* has been conducted in order to gauge the frequency of emotion words, before considering the contexts in which such terms appear and their textual functions.⁹³ Such an analysis reveals that the imputation of various passions to both Greek and Latin protagonists represents a cornerstone of Odo's denigration of the Byzantines' character, often serving to communicate and amplify the recurring theme of betrayal.

Fear is both the dominant emotion in the *De profectione*, with Odo's preferred fear word, *timor*, appearing on nearly forty occasions, and the one most frequently attributed to the Byzantines. In his seminal study of the *De profectione*, Phillips argued that Odo showed some appreciation of the motives underpinning Greek treatment of the crusaders. 'Notwithstanding his heavy criticisms of the Greeks', Phillips wrote, 'Odo did discern the essential reason why they followed certain courses of action'—the essential reason being fear.⁹⁴ The question, however, needs to be asked: when Odo of Deuil imputed fear to the Byzantines, and Manuel specifically, was he truly attempting to explain their actions? Phillips' argument has as its starting-point the assumption that Odo possessed a genuine interest in Greek motivation. This is, in part, a legacy of the long historiographical tradition of treating Odo as a 'reporter', even if 'a very intelligent reporter', who paid attention to the countries and peoples he observed.⁹⁵ It is probably also symptomatic of the tendency of crusade historians to treat the emotional content of their sources as accurate reflections of the crusading experience and protagonists' lived feelings.⁹⁶ However, both of these premises have come under scrutiny in recent years: owing to the work of Marcus Bull, Elizabeth Lapina and others, we now possess a more nuanced understanding of twelfth-century attitudes towards eyewitness testimony, which do not necessarily mirror our own modern conceptions; and historians are becoming increasingly aware of the pitfalls of attempting to cultivate 'real' feelings from medieval narratives.⁹⁷ Furthermore, the superficial accord between the *De profectione* and non-western evidence has likely increased scholarly

confidence in the accuracy of Odo's emotional characterisation of Manuel. After all, the Byzantine chronicler Niketas Choniates described how, with the arrival of the Germans, Manuel was 'naturally thrown into a state of confusion' and, 'distrustful and suspicious lest they be wolves coming in sheep's clothing', he assembled the Byzantine forces.⁹⁸

Despite this apparent correlation and Odo's proximity to events in Constantinople, it will be contended here that, far from displaying an interest in Greek inspiration, he inextricably linked Byzantine fear to their treacherous behaviour, and that the impetus for this probably lies in the rhetorical tradition established by the First Crusade narratives, especially the *Gesta Francorum*. In Odo's account of the arguments purportedly advanced by a cluster of Frankish barons regarding the legitimacy of paying homage to Manuel, the latter's fear was mentioned four times.⁹⁹ The repetition of fear words ('timens', 'timeri', 'metus', 'formidini') is typical of Odo's literary style: 'By reiterating the same word, different forms of the same word, and words which derive from the same root he achieved vivid effects marked by strong emphasis.'¹⁰⁰ Through his repeated use of fear terms, Odo was probably projecting Manuel as a weak ruler. This is consistent with the suggestion that Louis VII twice alleviated the Byzantine emperor's fear, and on another occasion Odo went a step further, using fear language to question Manuel's Christian credentials.¹⁰¹ In fact, I would argue that passages pertaining to Manuel's timidity should be interpreted in light of a particularly revealing earlier comment, in which the Byzantines' fear was represented as a stimulus for deceitful actions: 'Whoever has known the Greeks will, if asked, say that when they are frightened they become despicable in their excessive debasement'.¹⁰² That fear was the root of Greek treachery was reiterated on several further occasions, such as when *timor* led Byzantine officials to confer with the Turks—a decision which endangered a host of infirm crusaders.¹⁰³

Gendered stereotypes may have encouraged Odo to make a conceptual link between Byzantine fearfulness and perfidy, for he rehearsed the Roman idea that the Greeks were

effeminate, and thus liable to degenerate entirely into women ('Graeci penitus frangebantur in feminas') and lay aside all manly vigour ('omne virile robur ... deponentes').¹⁰⁴ Furthermore, fear was considered an integral characteristic of feminine nature in western Europe, and its emasculating effect was widely attested in crusade chronicles.¹⁰⁵ While the crusaders feature as militarily adept and virile warriors in the *De profectione*, the Greeks appear unwarlike, unmanly and fearful—flaws which necessitated resorting to underhand tactics.

A likely entry-point for this emotional characterisation of the Byzantines was the *Gesta Francorum*. Not only did the *Gesta* portray the Greeks as effeminate, but it also represented fear as the driving force behind the Byzantines' treacherous policy towards the crusaders.¹⁰⁶ Learning of Bohemond of Taranto's proximity to Constantinople, Alexios I reportedly became 'anxious and inflamed with anger, [and] was planning how to entrap these soldiers of Christ by fraud and cunning'.¹⁰⁷ It was from such fear that the idea of binding the expedition's leaders to 'unjust' oaths had apparently originated, with the elders of Constantinople, who feared losing their country, devising the 'clever plan' ('ingeniosis scematibus') of demanding that the crusaders swear oaths of fealty to the emperor.¹⁰⁸ In addition, Alexios' immense fear of Bohemond allegedly prompted him to offer the leader a unique deal consisting of lands around Antioch, and he later failed to relieve the crusaders besieged within Antioch by Kerbogha's forces because he had retreated 'petrified with fear' ('timore perterritus').¹⁰⁹

Therefore, in terms of the emphasis on Byzantine trepidation and the nexus established between fear and deceitful wiles, the *De profectione* mirrors the *Gesta Francorum*. Other early chroniclers of the First Crusade placed comparatively little emphasis on Byzantine fear. Fulcher of Chartres, known for his more amenable attitude towards the Greeks, only attributed fear to Alexios on a single occasion, as did Raymond of Aguilers, despite his more damning appraisal of the emperor.¹¹⁰ It is, of course, possible that Odo had consulted one of

the so-called ‘*Gesta*-derivatives’, for both Guibert of Nogent and Robert the Monk developed this theme, albeit in slightly different ways. Guibert magnified Alexios’ timidity, twice denouncing him as ‘timidus princeps’, and represented Byzantine fear as a marker of their effeminate nature, whereas Robert amplified the connection between Alexios’ fear and his manifest treachery.¹¹¹ In Robert’s account, the emperor’s fear and deceitful impulses formed a sort of symbiotic relationship, whereby his treacherous mind was both inspired by fear and a source of fear itself.¹¹² Yet it is unlikely that Odo used the accounts by either Guibert or Robert, as both authors substantially developed the emotional personification of Alexios found in the *Gesta*.¹¹³ In an isolated instance, the *Gesta* recorded that Alexios was overjoyed (‘gausisus est ualde’) when he received news of the destruction of the first wave of crusaders, known to posterity as the ‘People’s Crusade’.¹¹⁴ Guibert of Nogent not only magnified this trait by including two further occasions when Alexios reportedly felt elation at crusader setbacks, but also introduced emotional descriptors not found in his base text, most notably casting the emperor as envying the crusaders’ martial capabilities, wisdom and accomplishments.¹¹⁵ Robert the Monk placed greater emphasis on his anger, portraying Alexios as raging uncontrollably; in fact, unrestrained fury and fear of treachery, originating from a ruler’s own duplicity, were common hallmarks of a tyrant.¹¹⁶ If Odo had used either text, we might expect to find traces of these more developed emotional characterisations, designed to cast the emperor as an ineffectual and tyrannical ruler, in the *De profectioe*. However, neither anger nor envy was a component part of the emotional make-up of Manuel or the Byzantines in Odo’s text, and he rarely envisaged the Greeks rejoicing at crusader setbacks.¹¹⁷ The *Gesta Francorum* thus remains the most likely inspiration behind Odo’s emphasis on Byzantine fear.

Nonetheless, to ascribe Odo’s emotional characterisation of the Byzantines solely to his knowledge of First Crusade histories would be to grossly underestimate the author’s literary achievement and originality, for he also incorporated themes that are absent from accounts of

that expedition. If fear drove Manuel's deceit, then it was achieved through the pretence of love—a passion which medieval authors, including Odo, frequently used to connote affection between co-religionists, united in a Christian brotherhood.¹¹⁸ In his descriptions of the Second Crusaders' interactions with the Byzantines, the latter—epitomised by their emperor—were regularly presented as repressing their true feelings and generating false impressions of love. The flattering letters Louis received from Manuel at Ratisbon in 1146 were derided as 'exceedingly affectionate because they were not from affection'.¹¹⁹ Odo made the same accusation on two further occasions. Having recorded the emperor's promise to adequately provision Louis' army, Odo wrote that if Manuel's 'bodily gestures, if his alacrity of appearance, if his words had revealed the innermost [feelings] of the heart', then bystanders would have attested that he 'loved the king with exceeding affection'.¹²⁰ For Odo, these signs were inconclusive, and he later appended his praise for Manuel, who had heightened the glory of the celebration for the feast of Saint Denis on 9 October 1147, with the comment: 'We report the compliances of the emperor so that the treachery of him who simulated the affection which we are accustomed to show our most intimate friends might lie open, for he harboured a feeling which we could not have appeased, except by our deaths.'¹²¹ Therefore, Manuel only pretended to love the crusaders, and his ability to camouflage his inner feelings through false emotional displays typified his untrustworthiness and deceitful nature.

Odo's use of emotions to vilify not only encompassed the passions he attributed to the Byzantines, but also those imputed to the crusaders. Fear intersected with the theme of deception in another significant way in the *De profectioe*: the crusaders were regularly represented as fearing Greek wiles. The Frankish army twice feared for Louis VII's safety when he was in the presence of Manuel; and, in a scathing denunciation of the Byzantine capital, Odo explicitly stated that Constantinople 'is to be feared by all on account of her treachery and faithlessness'.¹²² Thus, Odo was clearly of the opinion that Greek treachery

should be feared. There is no clearer indication of this than his portrayal of Louis VII. A range of emotions were used to cast the king in the best possible light, with emphasis placed on his zeal of faith ('*zelus fidei*') and joy in extending Christianity and serving Saint Denis, but for our purposes it is important to recognise that Louis was depicted as a powerful monarch, who was capable of inspiring terror in others and who displayed no trepidation in confronting his opponents.¹²³ The only things Louis feared in the *De profectioe* were God, natural phenomena and Greek cunning.¹²⁴ During the council at Étampes, men acquainted with the Byzantines allegedly warned of their treachery, prompting the author to remark: 'Would that the king and his men, who rightly feared the strength of no nation, feared deceitful wiles!'¹²⁵ Likewise, one of Louis' final actions in the East—his command that the count of Flanders and Archibald of Bourbon should stay behind to guard weak participants at Antalya—materialised because 'he feared deceit where he had so often found it'.¹²⁶ In other words, even Louis, that undaunted warrior-king who feared engaging 'no nation' in combat, felt some trepidation over Greek deceitfulness. The fact that Odo was willing to represent his 'chief subject matter' ('*principalis materia*') in such a way is an indication of the importance he attached to vilifying the deceitful Greeks, while the positioning of these two passages—the first prior to Louis' departure from the West and the second shortly before his return—illustrates the consistency with which Odo pursued that literary aim.¹²⁷

The historiographical tradition of the First Crusade was not responsible for this strong emphasis on fearing Greek wiles, since few accounts composed before 1148 stressed that theme.¹²⁸ Rather, it more likely reflects Odo's knowledge of classical literature, specifically a passage from Virgil's *Aeneid*, which he quoted directly: 'I fear the Greeks, even when they bear gifts.'¹²⁹ Several late twelfth- and early thirteenth-century crusade commentators also utilised this 'proverb', as Odo called it, yet remarkably few, if any, early chroniclers of the First Crusade did so, despite their frequent complaints of Byzantine treachery.¹³⁰ However, that should not overshadow a potential point of correlation between the *De profectioe* and

Raymond of Aguilers' *Historia*—a work which, as we have seen, was probably available at Saint-Denis. A significant shift in the representation of the crusaders' passions is discernible at the beginning of Book III of the *De profectione*. In the two previous books, Odo had concentrated on the joy which marked the expedition's early phases, but when the Franks entered Byzantine territory, their feelings changed dramatically:

Thus far we were engaged in play, because we neither suffered injuries from the malice of men nor feared dangers from the cunning of deceitful men. However, from [the moment] when we entered Bulgaria, the land of the Greeks, our valour endured hardship and our senses were on the alert.¹³¹

Raymond of Aguilers included a similar passage—albeit an emotional transformation from joy to sorrow—in his account of Raymond of Toulouse's arrival at Constantinople in 1097: 'While things carried out thus far have easily accompanied me, the writer, with certain steps of good fortune and joy, they now follow with so great a burden of bitterness and grief that it wearies me to have begun that which I have vowed to complete.'¹³²

Whereas Raymond of Aguilers only contemplated leaving 'a monument of perpetual grief' ('perpetui meroris monumenta') by enumerating the deaths which resulted from Byzantine deceit, Odo undoubtedly succeeded in executing that narrative strategy.¹³³ Throughout the *De profectione*, Latin protagonists were represented as experiencing strong emotional responses—especially sorrow—to Byzantine policy and treachery, thereby signalling the illegitimacy of Greek actions. Indeed, like fear, sorrow is a prominent emotion of the *De profectione*, with Odo using a range of grief terms, including *dolor/dolere* (16 occurrences), *tristitia* (2), *luctus/lugere* (7), *planctus/plangere* (6), *lacrimae* (5) and *fletus/flere* (9). Even before the Frankish army had set out, Roger of Sicily's envoys reportedly departed from the council at Étampes 'in a state of grief' ('dolentium habitu')

because the Franks had chosen the route through Greece and they knew well of Byzantine deceit.¹³⁴ Thereafter, the *De profectione* is replete with references to participants enduring Greek attacks ‘not without sorrow’ (‘non sine dolore’), and to the lamentable (‘dolendum’) and tearful (‘flebiles’) demise of the French and German armies that stemmed from Byzantine treachery.¹³⁵ It is little surprise, then, that after narrating the decimation of the French army on Mount Cadmus, Odo purported to describe his own emotional response to that disaster: ‘In relating this, I am covered with tears and groan from the innermost parts of my body.’¹³⁶ Such first-person interjections, declaring the author’s own emotional reactions to events, are rare in the *De profectione*; and while we cannot discount the possibility that this passage reflects Odo’s actual feelings, it is equally plausible that it was designed to dramatise—to heighten the atmosphere of grief and betrayal.

Less frequently, anger terminology was used to describe the crusaders’ reactions to Greek ‘crimes’. Learning that a group of Franks who preceded the French army had been attacked by the emperor’s troops, Louis’ envoys in Constantinople went to Manuel ‘raging with exceeding agitation’ (‘nimia commotione furentes’) and complained about that ‘cunning crime’ (‘doloso scelere’).¹³⁷ The Latin term *furor* possessed strong overtones of irrationality and madness, although, in this instance, it was probably deployed to stress the extent of the royal messengers’ wrath and thus the injustice of Manuel’s conduct.¹³⁸ Similarly, having been abandoned by their Byzantine guide in Asia Minor, members of the German army were reportedly angry (‘irati’) and especially grieved (‘dolentes maxime’) because they were unable to pay him a fitting reward for his crime.¹³⁹

At times, a more developed emotional script is discernible, whereby the crusaders’ anger and grief were inextricably tied to a desire for revenge.¹⁴⁰ Odo’s account of the defeat of Conrad III’s army, and the emotional response of Louis’ men to news of that event, serves as an illustrative case-study. With the arrival of German nobles who tearfully (‘flebiliter’) reported that Conrad’s army had retreated to Nicaea, the French were ‘grieved with

stupefaction and stupefied with grief’, and Manuel was identified as the chief perpetrator for having given them an unreliable guide.¹⁴¹ Odo also recorded an emotionally-charged scene in which Louis—who grieved (‘doluit’) his ally’s injury as if it were his own—and Conrad met, embraced and exchanged kisses amid tears of pity.¹⁴² At another meeting, Conrad was apparently ‘anxious with fresh grief’ (‘recenti dolore anxius’) and, through his account of the German tragedy, he moved all present to tears, thus creating a community of mourners.¹⁴³ This emphasis on grief and tears was not only a sign of the affection that existed between the two rulers, but also a method of criticising the Byzantines, for in an earlier passage Odo summarised the German and French defeats by stressing the crusaders’ ‘twofold grief’ (‘geminus luctus’) and by demanding vengeance.¹⁴⁴ That the Greeks deserved vengeance, either human or divine, for their deception was a prominent overarching theme of the *De profectione*, and this explains Odo’s willingness to justify—again, as if anticipating criticism—the French crusaders’ failure to exact revenge on Antalya’s Greek inhabitants for betraying them to the Turks, and his reluctance to represent the Byzantines as pursuing vengeance.¹⁴⁵ Thus, on one occasion, he countered individuals who believed that the Greeks’ actions towards the crusaders should be characterised as vengeance (‘vindictam’), rather than malice (‘malitiam’), by insisting that those who did not know the case fully were incapable of making a just judgement.¹⁴⁶

There are strong indications that Odo’s deployment of emotional language to denounce the Byzantines represents a *conscious* narrative strategy. This is suggested, above all, by the fact that emotions were even used to criticise fellow crusaders, especially the Germans, who were consistently depicted as succumbing to bouts of mad, unrelenting rage. Richard Barton has demonstrated that twelfth-century Latin chroniclers often distinguished between appropriate, righteous *ira* and illegitimate, bestial *furor*.¹⁴⁷ Notwithstanding a few important anomalies, this semantic distinction is reflected in the *De profectione*. Whereas the anger of Louis and the French was usually related using *ira*—the king was ‘inflamed with anger’

(‘succensusque ira’) at an unruly Fleming and his men later exacted revenge on the Turks through an angry attack (‘irae impetus’)—when remarking upon the disorderly behaviour of the Germans, who were partly blamed for the problems the Franks encountered, Odo preferred *furor*.¹⁴⁸ Reporting a juggler’s pranks on some Germans in a settlement near Philippopolis, Odo described how the latter, ‘as if they had seen a portent, immediately rose up with fury, seized the juggler and tore him to bits’.¹⁴⁹ With the arrival of Philippopolis’ governor and army, unarmed to diffuse the violence, the outnumbered Germans were ‘agitated by wine and rage’ (‘Turbatus ... a vino et furore’) and consequently misinterpreted the situation, wrongly believing that they were seeking retribution.¹⁵⁰ This account of German *furor* may reflect the influence of Lucan’s *Pharsalia*, from which the *furor Teutonicus* stereotype originated, although at no point did Odo directly use that phrase; his preferred term for Germans was *Alemanni*.¹⁵¹ Another scenario is that Odo encountered this ethnic stereotype, which gained new currency in the twelfth century, indirectly through Suger’s *Vita Ludovici Grossi*, for the abbot included a very similar description of German fury:

the mad Germans invented a pretext for a quarrel, gnashed their teeth in fury, and began to rage out of control. Their treachery caught everyone by surprise. With drawn swords they rushed about like men who were out of their minds and attacked the Romans who, properly in such a place, were not armed.¹⁵²

While this account of *furor Teutonicus* pertains to a markedly different context—the Germans unleashed their fury against the citizens of Rome in 1111, following the imperial coronation of Henry V—there are several notable parallels with the aforementioned scene from the *De profectioe*, suggesting that Suger’s text may have served as a model. In both passages, the Germans’ *furor* was represented as uncontrollable, blinding them to reason (in Odo they misinterpreted the situation, whereas in Suger they invented a pretext for the

dispute), and as resulting in illegitimate violence against unarmed victims. Elsewhere in his narrative, Odo included a similar scene, in which the Germans furiously attacked ('furiose invadunt') the French and were only calmed following the intervention of wise men—a common *topos* for signalling disproportionate rage.¹⁵³ Odo's portrayal of German fury was conventional, but he clearly understood the value of emotions as mechanisms for vilification.

Conclusion

Odo of Deuil's engagement with the memory and historiographical tradition of the First Crusade was more complex than has yet been appreciated and had a significant bearing on his presentation of the Second Crusade. On the one hand, he was willing to borrow tropes and themes from First Crusade histories, especially the *Gesta Francorum* and Raymond of Aguilers' *Historia*—both of which, it has been contended, were available at Saint-Denis. On the other hand, Odo was seemingly at pains to justify the crusaders' failure to fulfil the papal mandate of emulating their predecessors—of continuing the successful tradition established by the First Crusade—and therefore made few direct allusions to, and even fewer comparisons with, the events of 1095–1099. To explain this failure, and to exculpate Louis, Odo represented Byzantine opposition as the key differentiator between the experiences of the Second Crusaders and the First Crusaders before them: the 'fathers' had passed swiftly through Constantinople and scored a string of victories against the Turks, whereas the 'sons' were confronted with the wily Greeks, whose treacherous practices inhibited their progress. Odo's use of the Greeks as a scapegoat—to explain the expedition's failure and the break from tradition—not only accounts for several curious omissions in the text, most notably the author's reluctance to present Manuel's policy as a continuation of Alexios' during the First Crusade, but also offers an additional—or perhaps alternative—explanation for Odo's strong anti-Greek tone than Mayr-Harting's idea that he was writing in 1150 in connection to a planned retaliatory expedition against Byzantium.

On this basis, Odo's vilification of the Byzantines should be reinstated as a primary, rather than secondary, literary objective, as Runciman and others once believed. An examination of the emotional rhetoric of the *De profectione* reveals that Odo's defamation of the Greeks was both deeper and more consistent than recent analyses have allowed. Emotional language represents a fundamental thread in the text's narrative assault on the Byzantines, with this process of vilification encompassing the passions imputed to both the Greeks and crusaders. The Greeks and their emperor appear fearful, effeminate and reliant on underhand tactics—an emotional characterisation which closely resembles the portrayal of Alexios I in the *Gesta Francorum* and probably reflects the influence of that text. Manuel's simulated affection, in the manner of a false Christian, enabled him to entrap the Second Crusaders, who were represented as justifiably fearing Byzantine treachery and as being overcome by strong feelings of sorrow and anger in response to injuries, which in turn motivated acts of vengeance. The fact that Odo also utilised emotions, like *furor*, to criticise German crusaders implies that this was a conscious ploy; that he purposefully deployed emotion words to vilify. In addition to the *Gesta Francorum*, the emotional content of the *De profectione* appears to have been shaped, in one way or another, by Raymond of Aguilers' *Historia*, Suger of Saint-Denis' *Vita Ludovici Grossi* and Virgil's *Aeneid*. Thus, the value of the history of emotions for the medievalist lies not only, or necessarily primarily, in reconstructing the emotional standards of the period; emotional language can also serve as a diagnostic tool for enriching our understanding of enigmatic texts, like the *De profectione*, by casting light on their authors' literary agendas, how they set about achieving those objectives and the factors and influences which conditioned the writing of history.

* This study was supported by the Charles University project Progres Q07, Centre for the Study of the Middle Ages. I am also grateful to the Past & Present Society and the Institute of Historical Research, University of London, for the award of a fellowship, which enabled me to complete this research. Dr Andrew Buck kindly read several drafts of this article; his suggestions, as well as those of Professor Jonathan Phillips and the other (anonymous) reader, have greatly improved it.

¹ On the expedition, which suffered heavy losses in Asia Minor and came to an end with a fruitless siege of Damascus in July 1148, see J. Phillips, *The Second Crusade: Extending the Frontiers of Christendom* (New Haven, 2007); A. J. Forey, 'The failure of the siege of Damascus in 1148', *Journal of Medieval History*, x (1984), 13–23; G. A. Loud, 'Some reflections on the failure of the Second Crusade', *Crusades*, iv (2005), 1–14. For the text's disputed dating, see Odo of Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem*, ed. and trans. V. G. Berry (New York, 1948) [henceforth OD], p. xxiii; Henry Mayr-Harting, 'Odo of Deuil, the Second Crusade and the monastery of Saint-Denis', in *The Culture of Christendom: Essays in Medieval History in Commemoration of Denis L. T. Bethell*, ed. M. A. Meyer (London, 1993), pp. 225–41. Only one manuscript of the *De profectione* survives: Montpellier, Bibliothèque de l'École de Médecine, MS H 39, fos. 15v–41, discussed in OD, pp. xxxii–xl.

² G. Constable, 'The Second Crusade as seen by contemporaries', *Traditio*, ix (1953), 213–79, at p. 217; G. M. Spiegel, *The Chronicle Tradition of Saint-Denis: A Survey* (Brookline, 1978), p. 54.

³ OD, p. 4; C. A. Cioffi, 'The epistolary style of Odo of Deuil in his "De profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem"', *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch*, xxiii (1988), 76–81; J. Naus, *Constructing Kingship: The Capetian Monarchs of France and the Early Crusades* (Manchester, 2016), pp. 94–6; L. Grant, *Abbot Suger of St-Denis: Church and State in Early Twelfth-Century France* (Harlow, 1998), pp. 36–7. A fragment of Suger's biography of Louis VII has survived: Suger of Saint-Denis, *De glorioso rege Ludovico, Ludovici filio*, ed. F. Gasparri, *Suger Oeuvres* (2 vols., Paris, 1996), i. 156–76.

⁴ S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades* (3 vols., Cambridge, 1951–4), ii. 274 n. 2; T. Reuter, 'The "non-crusade" of 1149–50', in *The Second Crusade: Scope and Consequences*, ed. J. Phillips and M. Hoch (Manchester, 2001), pp. 150–63, at p. 151. See also R.-J. Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States, 1096–1204*, trans. J. C. Morris and J. E. Ridings (Oxford, 1993), pp. 149–50, 158; J. Harris, *Byzantium and the Crusades* (London, 2003), pp. 98–100.

⁵ Mayr-Harting, pp. 231–40.

⁶ *The Letters of Peter the Venerable*, ed. G. Constable (2 vols., Cambridge, 1967), i. 394–5; John of Salisbury, *Historia pontificalis*, ed. and trans. M. Chibnall (London, 1956), p. 54; Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia*

Anglorum, ed. and trans. D. Greenway (Oxford, 1996), pp. 750, 752; Constable, 'Second Crusade', pp. 272–3; J. Phillips, *Defenders of the Holy Land: Relations between the Latin East and the West, 1119–1187* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 112–18; G. Constable, 'The crusading project of 1150', in *Montjoie: Studies in Crusade History in Honour of Hans Eberhard Mayer*, ed. B. Z. Kedar, J. Riley-Smith and R. Hiestand (Aldershot, 1997), pp. 67–75; Phillips, *Second Crusade*, pp. 274–6.

⁷ Constable, 'Second Crusade', p. 217. See also B. Schuster, 'The strange pilgrimage of Odo of Deuil', in *Medieval Concepts of the Past: Ritual, Memory, Historiography*, ed. G. Althoff, J. Fried and P. J. Geary (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 253–78, at p. 262, where a transition in the author's attitude, from suspicion to open hatred, is suggested. M. Bull, *Eyewitness and Crusade Narrative: Perception and Narration in Accounts of the Second, Third and Fourth Crusades* (Woodbridge, 2018) was published too late to be incorporated fully. Bull stresses 'the central importance of anti-Greek sentiment as a structuring device', whereby the Greeks' true nature gradually unfolds in the text and is grounded 'in observation, experience and reflection'. The emotional language considered in the second part of the present article, particularly that imputed to the crusaders, supports Bull's argument regarding the significance of 'the motif of journey-as-experience' in the *De profectioe*. See Bull, *Eyewitness and Crusade Narrative*, pp. 168–78, at pp. 170, 178.

⁸ J. Phillips, 'Odo of Deuil's *De profectioe Ludovici VII in Orientem* as a source for the Second Crusade', in *The Experience of Crusading, Volume One: Western Approaches*, ed. M. Bull and N. Housley (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 80–95, at p. 90.

⁹ For passages which are sometimes interpreted as positive, see OD, pp. 44, 68; Phillips, 'Odo of Deuil's *De profectioe*', pp. 85–7. One of these, regarding the celebration of the feast of Saint Denis, is reconsidered below. On the memorialisation of the crusades, see Phillips, *Second Crusade*, pp. 17–36; C. Tyerman, *The Debate on the Crusades* (Manchester, 2011), pp. 7–36; N. L. Paul, *To Follow in their Footsteps: The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY, 2012); *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory*, ed. M. Bull and D. Kempf (Woodbridge, 2014); *Remembering the Crusades and Crusading*, ed. M. Cassidy-Welch (Abingdon, 2017).

¹⁰ See, for example, G. Althoff, 'Empörung, Tränen, Zerknirschung: "Emotionen" in der öffentlichen Kommunikation des Mittelalters', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, xxx (1996), 60–79; R. E. Barton, 'Emotions and power in Orderic Vitalis', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, xxxiii (2011), 41–59; D. Boquet and P. Nagy, *Sensible Moyen Âge: une histoire des émotions dans l'Occident médiéval* (Paris, 2015); *Gender and Emotions in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Destroying Order, Structuring Disorder*, ed. S. Broomhall (Farnham, 2015); *Understanding Emotions in Early Europe*, ed. M. Champion and A. Lynch (Turnhout, 2015); S. McNamer, 'The

literariness of literature and the history of emotion', *PMLA*, cxxx (2015), 1433–42; B. H. Rosenwein, *Generations of Feeling: A History of Emotions, 600–1700* (Cambridge, 2016).

¹¹ Most discussions of this theme have focused on anger; for example, K. McGrath, 'The politics of chivalry: the function of anger and shame in eleventh- and twelfth-century Anglo-Norman historical narratives', in *Feud, Violence and Practice: Essays in Medieval Studies in Honor of Stephen D. White*, ed. B. S. Tuten and T. L. Billado (Farnham, 2010), pp. 55–69. However, see S. J. Spencer, 'Emotions and the "other": emotional characterizations of Muslim protagonists in narratives of the crusades (1095–1192)', in *Literature of the Crusades*, ed. S. T. Parsons and L. M. Paterson (Cambridge, 2018), pp. 41–54.

¹² E. A. R. Brown and M. W. Cothren, 'The twelfth-century crusading window of the abbey of Saint-Denis: *praeteritorum enim recordatio futurorum est exhibitio*', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, xlix (1986), 1–40; Phillips, *Defenders*, p. 107; Phillips, *Second Crusade*, pp. 122–4; Naus, *Constructing Kingship*, pp. 77–8.

¹³ J. Rubenstein, 'Putting history to use: three crusade chronicles in context', *Viator*, xxxv (2004), 131–68; Phillips, 'Odo of Deuil's *De profectioe*', p. 84.

¹⁴ Rubenstein, 'Putting history to use', p. 150.

¹⁵ D. A. Wilmart, 'Le dialogue apologétique de moine Guillaume, biographe de Suger', *Revue Mabillon*, xxxii (1942), 80–118, at p. 103: 'ego ex commissa michi bibliotheca codicem illi grandiusculum pro pignore tradidi ... et ... alium ei libellum pro itineris cautela ... dono contuli, itinerarium scilicet pristinae illius peregrinationis, qua uel Antiochia uel sepulcro saluatoris Christiani exterminati hostibus potiti sunt'.

¹⁶ Eudes de Deuil, *La croisade de Louis VII, roi de France*, ed. H. Waquet (Paris, 1949), p. 10.

¹⁷ Phillips, *Second Crusade*, p. 185.

¹⁸ Naus, *Constructing Kingship*, p. 94.

¹⁹ OD, pp. 58, 130; M. Bull, 'The Capetian monarchy and the early crusade movement: Hugh of Vermandois and Louis VII', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, xl (1996), 25–46, at pp. 44–5; Phillips, 'Odo of Deuil's *De profectioe*', p. 84.

²⁰ OD, p. 78; Phillips, 'Odo of Deuil's *De profectioe*', p. 84; S. A. Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance, 1095–1216* (Farnham, 2011), pp. 43–71.

²¹ B. C. Spacey, 'The celestial knight: evoking the First Crusade in Odo of Deuil's *De profectioe Ludovici VII in Orientem* and in the anonymous *Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris*', *Essays in Medieval Studies*, xxxi (2016), 65–82, at p. 72.

-
- ²² F. de Mély, ‘La croix des premiers croisés’, *Revue de l’art chrétien*, n.s. i (1890), 297–306, at pp. 298–9; Brown and Cothren, p. 18.
- ²³ OD, p. 112: ‘Certe fuerunt qui dicerent album quendam militem ante nostros ad transitum fluminis, quem non viderunt prius vel postea, se vidisse et primos ictus in proelio percussisse.’
- ²⁴ Raymond of Aguilers, *Le Liber de Raymond d’Aguilers*, ed. J. H. Hill and L. L. Hill (Paris, 1969) [henceforth RA], pp. 45–6; OD, p. 112.
- ²⁵ *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, ed. and trans. R. Hill (London, 1962) [henceforth GF], p. 69.
- ²⁶ RA, p. 45; OD, p. 112.
- ²⁷ GF, p. 69: ‘Hec uerba credenda sunt, quia plures ex nostris uiderunt.’
- ²⁸ GF, p. 69.
- ²⁹ Given the current state of scholarship on the early transmission of the *Gesta Francorum*, which is divided between those who see the *Gesta* as the earliest text and those who theorise a lost parent text, we cannot be certain that the work consulted by Odo exactly mirrored the *Gesta Francorum*. Rather, I suggest that he had access to a very similar text, possibly the *Gesta*, within that textual tradition. See M. Bull, ‘The relationship between the *Gesta Francorum* and Peter Tudebode’s *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere*: the evidence of a hitherto unexamined manuscript (St Catherine’s College, Cambridge, 3)’, *Crusades*, xi (2012), 1–17; S. Niskanen, ‘The origins of the *Gesta Francorum* and two related texts: their textual and literary character’, *Sacris Erudiri*, li (2012), 287–316, at pp. 287–96; J. Rubenstein, ‘What is the *Gesta Francorum*, and who was Peter Tudebode?’, *Revue Mabillon*, xvi (2005), 179–204.
- ³⁰ Brown and Cothren, p. 18; Phillips, ‘Odo of Deuil’s *De profectioe*’, pp. 83–4; Phillips, *Second Crusade*, p. 124; M. Carrier, ‘L’Image des Byzantins et les systèmes de représentation selon les chroniqueurs occidentaux des croisades 1096–1291’ (PhD diss., Université Paris I, Panthéon-Sorbonne, 2006), pp. 295–6.
- ³¹ Brown and Cothren, p. 18 n. 80; *Anonymi Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum, mit Erläuterungen herausgegeben*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1890), p. 10.
- ³² Niskanen, pp. 297–302.
- ³³ OD, p. 8; GF, p. 7.
- ³⁴ OD, pp. 6, 118, 130; GF, pp. 1, 4, 17, 65, 85.
- ³⁵ A. L. Bysted, *The Crusade Indulgence: Spiritual Reward and the Theology of the Crusades, c.1095–1216* (Leiden, 2015).

³⁶ C. Morris, 'Martyrs on the field of battle before and during the First Crusade', *Studies in Church History*, xxx (1993), 93–104, at p. 103.

³⁷ Brown and Cothren, pp. 11–13; Phillips, *Second Crusade*, p. 123.

³⁸ OD, pp. 118, 130. See also OD, p. 92, where the Germans were depicted as preferring 'a glorious death' ('mortem gloriosam') to a base life.

³⁹ OD, p. 118: 'finis, correptis erratibus fide fervida, martyrio meruit coronari'. On the distinction between the indulgence and martyrdom, see J. Riley-Smith, 'Death on the First Crusade', in *The End of Strife*, ed. D. Loades (Edinburgh, 1984), pp. 14–31, at pp. 18–19.

⁴⁰ Morris, 'Martyrs on the field', p. 98.

⁴¹ OD, p. 130: 'coronari ut martyres quorum Deus animas de tali sumit labore'.

⁴² A. L. Bysted, 'The true year of jubilee: Bernard of Clairvaux on crusade and indulgences', in *The Second Crusade: Holy War on the Periphery of Latin Christendom*, ed. J. T. Roche and J. M. Jensen (Turnhout, 2015), pp. 35–49. For Odo's engagement with Eugenius' crusading message, see OD, pp. 8, 14, 70, 94. Bernard of Clairvaux seemingly hinted at the prospect of martyrdom in a letter to the faithful of eastern France and Bavaria in 1146: Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistolae*, in *Sancti Bernardi Opera*, ed. J. Leclercq, H.-M. Rochais and C. H. Talbot (8 vols., Rome, 1957–77), viii. 315.

⁴³ *GF*, p. 17; RA, pp. 113–14; Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1913), pp. 117, 226–7; J. Flori, 'Mort et martyre des guerriers vers 1100: l'exemple de la première croisade', *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, xxxiv (1991), 121–39; P. Buc, *Holy War, Martyrdom, and Terror: Christianity, Violence, and the West, ca. 70 C.E. to the Iraq War* (Philadelphia, 2015), pp. 168–70.

⁴⁴ OD, p. 130.

⁴⁵ J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (London, 1986), pp. 151–2; W. J. Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality in the Holy Land and Iberia, c.1095–c.1187* (Woodbridge, 2008), pp. 43–5.

⁴⁶ OD, pp. 2, 4, 28, 130.

⁴⁷ *GF*, pp. 1, 12, 40, 62, 72, 75, 76, 80; C. Morris, 'The *Gesta Francorum* as narrative history', *Reading Medieval Studies*, xix (1993), 55–71, at p. 65; Purkis, p. 17.

⁴⁸ For the crusaders as pilgrims, see OD, pp. 22, 38, 40, 44, 76, 94; *GF*, pp. 8, 11, 12, 14, 29, 51, 59, 65, 72, 73, 81, 82, 86; L. Ní Chléirigh, 'Nova peregrinatio: the First Crusade as a pilgrimage in contemporary Latin narratives', in *Writing the Early Crusades*, ed. Bull and Kempf, pp. 63–74; A. Grabois, 'The crusade of King Louis VII: a reconsideration', in *Crusade and Settlement*, ed. P. W. Edbury (Cardiff, 1985), pp. 94–104, at pp. 98–9; Bull, 'Capetian monarchy', pp. 45–6. For the crusaders' opponents as pagans, see OD, pp. 80, 90, 106,

112; *GF*, pp. 20, 26, 49, 51, 53, 55, 58, 71, 72, 77, 78, 79, 82, 83, 84, 85, 87, 89, 91, 92, 93, 95, 97; J. V. Tolan, *Saracens: Islam in the Medieval European Imagination* (New York, 2002), pp. 105–34, 194–213.

⁴⁹ OD, p. 90; *GF*, p. 40.

⁵⁰ OD, pp. 118, 130, 132, 134; *GF*, pp. 23, 34, 41, 70, 88, 89.

⁵¹ OD, p. 13: ‘sicut lectione et experientia noverant’.

⁵² L. Russo, ‘Il viaggio di Boemondo d’Altavilla in Francia (1106): un riesame’, *Archivio storico italiano*, dciii (2005), 3–42, at pp. 37–8.

⁵³ J. Naus, ‘Negotiating kingship in France at the time of the early crusades: Suger and the *Gesta Ludovici Grossi*’, *French Historical Studies*, xxxvi (2013), 525–41; Naus, *Constructing Kingship*, pp. 64–74.

⁵⁴ Suger of Saint-Denis, *Vie de Louis VI le Gros*, ed. and trans. H. Waquet (Paris, 1929) [henceforth Suger, *Vie*], p. 36; *The Deeds of Louis the Fat*, trans. R. Cusimano and J. Moorhead (Washington, DC, 1992) [henceforth Suger, *Deeds*], p. 40.

⁵⁵ Suger, *Vie*, p. 44; Suger, *Deeds*, p. 43.

⁵⁶ Suger, *Vie*, pp. 37, 38, 130, 142; Suger, *Deeds*, pp. 40, 84, 90.

⁵⁷ Suger, *Vie*, p. 48; Suger, *Deeds*, p. 45.

⁵⁸ Ralph of Caen, who served as Bohemond’s chaplain during the preaching tour and claimed to have known Bohemond and his nephew Tancred well, recorded that each spoke daily (‘sermo quotidianus’) about their experiences on the First Crusade, including the capture of cities like ‘Antioch [that was captured] at night through treachery’ (‘Antiochiam noctu dolis’): Ralph of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi in expeditione Hierosolymitana*, in *Recueil des historiens des croisades: historiens occidentaux*, ed. Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres (5 vols., Paris, 1844–95), iii. 603.

⁵⁹ W. Holtzmann, ‘Zur Geschichte des Investiturstreites’, *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, I (1935), 280–2, at p. 281; Russo, pp. 26–34.

⁶⁰ A. C. Krey, ‘A neglected passage in the *Gesta* and its bearing on the literature of the First Crusade’, in *The Crusades and Other Historical Essays Presented to Dana C. Munro by His Former Students*, ed. L. J. Paetow (New York, 1928), pp. 57–78; Russo, p. 33; J. Flori, *Chroniqueurs et propagandistes: introduction critique aux sources de la première croisade* (Geneva, 2010), pp. 78–82, 167–9; Niskanen, pp. 309–12; J. Rubenstein, ‘The *Deeds* of Bohemond: reform, propaganda, and the history of the First Crusade’, *Viator*, xlvi (2016), 113–35. But see the reservations in N. L. Paul, ‘A warlord’s wisdom: literacy and propaganda at the time of the First Crusade’, *Speculum*, lxxxv (2010), 534–66.

-
- ⁶¹ Gilo of Paris, *Historia vie Hierosolimitane*, ed. and trans. C. W. Grocock and J. E. Siberry (Oxford, 1997); *Recueil des historiens des croisades: historiens occidentaux*, v. xcii–xciii; Paul, ‘A warlord’s wisdom’, p. 562.
- ⁶² *GF*, pp. 44–7, at p. 46.
- ⁶³ J. France, *Victory in the East: A Military History of the First Crusade* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 257–68; T. S. Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History* (London, 2004), pp. 200–11; C. Tyerman, *God’s War: A New History of the Crusades* (London, 2008), pp. 141–2. However, John France has pointed to a temporary truce the crusaders negotiated with Antioch’s garrison: J. France, ‘The fall of Antioch during the First Crusade’, in *Dei Gesta per Francos: Crusade Studies in Honour of Jean Richard*, ed. M. Balard, B. Z. Kedar and J. Riley-Smith (Aldershot, 2001), pp. 13–20.
- ⁶⁴ *Epistulae et chartae ad historiam primi belli sacri spectantes: Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088–1100*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Innsbruck, 1901), p. 162: ‘ego Boemundus, conuentione facta cum quodam Turco, qui ipsam mihi tradidit ciuitatem, scalas ... muro applicui’.
- ⁶⁵ Paul, ‘A warlord’s wisdom’, pp. 555–6. Some of the issues raised by Paul are addressed in L. García-Guijarro, ‘Some considerations on the crusaders’ letter to Urban II (September 1098)’, in *Jerusalem the Golden: The Origins and Impact of the First Crusade*, ed. S. B. Edgington and L. García-Guijarro (Turnhout, 2014), pp. 151–71.
- ⁶⁶ Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, p. 159.
- ⁶⁷ Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, p. 166.
- ⁶⁸ *RA*, p. 64.
- ⁶⁹ J. France, ‘The anonymous *Gesta Francorum* and the *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem* of Raymond of Aguilers and the *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere* of Peter Tudebode: an analysis of the textual relationship between primary sources for the First Crusade’, in *The Crusades and their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton*, ed. J. France and W. G. Zajac (Aldershot, 1998), pp. 39–69.
- ⁷⁰ *RA*, p. 64; Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, p. 169. The addition appears in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS latin 5511, listed as B by the Hills.
- ⁷¹ See R. Levine, ‘The pious traitor: rhetorical reinventions of the fall of Antioch’, *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch*, xxxiii (1998), 59–80; R. L. Slitt, ‘Justifying cross-cultural friendship: Bohemond, Firuz, and the fall of Antioch’, *Viator*, xxxviii (2007), 339–49.
- ⁷² Baldric of Bourgueil, *The Historia Ierosolimitana of Baldric of Bourgueil*, ed. S. J. Biddlecombe (Woodbridge, 2014), p. 53.

⁷³ These include that: the betrayer was a Turk; Bohemond offered him immense riches; Bohemond told Godfrey of Bouillon, Robert of Flanders and Raymond of Toulouse (and Adhémar of Le Puy in the *Gesta*) of his plan; Bohemond had been earlier promised lands around Antioch; the leaders granted Bohemond the city if he could take it; the traitor's son was in Bohemond's hands; the crusaders' plan, which derived from Bohemond in Albert and directly from Firuz in the *Gesta*, involved a feigned attack on Kerbogha's army; the traitor conversed with the crusaders in Greek and asked of Bohemond's whereabouts; a ladder either fell (Albert) or broke (*Gesta*) during the attempt to infiltrate the city; at dawn, the sight of Bohemond's banner inspired the remainder of the army to rush to the city's gates; 3 June was a Thursday; and Antioch's commander, Yaghi Siyan, fled in fear, only to encounter a group of eastern Christians (Syrians in Albert, Syrians and Armenians in the *Gesta*) in the mountains, who decapitated him. *GF*, pp. 12, 44–8; Albert of Aachen, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, ed. and trans. S. B. Edgington (Oxford, 2007), pp. 270–87. See also the observations on shared information in the histories by Albert and Guibert of Nogent in J. Rubenstein, 'Guibert of Nogent, Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres: three crusade chronicles intersect', in *Writing the Early Crusades*, ed. Bull and Kempf, pp. 24–37, at pp. 30–6.

⁷⁴ *GF*, p. 56.

⁷⁵ *GF*, p. 56; Suger, *Vie*, p. 36.

⁷⁶ J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders, 1095–1131* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 210.

⁷⁷ OD, p. 132: “Non”, inquit, “Volumus deprimere, nec possumus, laudem parentum, sed levius cum eis hucusque actum est quam nobiscum. Cum enim illi Constantinopolim et Brachium pertransissent, voti compotes Turcos et eorum terras ilico reppererunt, et de exercitio militiae alacres, et de captione urbium et castrorum sese divites servaverunt. Nos autem Graecos fraudulentos in locis illorum invenimus, quibus (malo nostro) velut Christianis pepercimus; otioque torpentes taedio et molestiis aegrotantes, fere omnia nostra expendimus.”

⁷⁸ See Asbridge, pp. 117–39.

⁷⁹ Suger of Saint-Denis, *Epistolae*, in *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, ed. M. Bouquet *et al.* (24 vols., Paris, 1738–1904), xv. 496.

⁸⁰ OD, p. 72.

⁸¹ OD, pp. 80, 56, 58, 68–72.

⁸² Eugenius III, *Quantum praedecessores*, ed. R. Grosse, ‘Überlegungen zum Kreuzzugsaufruf Eugens III. von 1145/46. Mit einer Neuedition von JL8876’, *Francia*, xviii (1991), 85–92; Phillips, *Second Crusade*, pp. 51–2, 54.

⁸³ Phillips, *Second Crusade*, p. 72; Purkis, pp. 90–1.

⁸⁴ This was not simply a literary device: many of those who took the cross in 1146/7 did intend to emulate their predecessors. See J. Riley-Smith, 'Family traditions and participation in the Second Crusade', in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*, ed. M. Gervers (New York, 1992), pp. 101–8; and, more broadly, Paul, *To Follow in their Footsteps*.

⁸⁵ Henry of Huntingdon, pp. 752–3: 'Exercitus namque regis Francorum et imperatoris et splendidior et maior fuerat quam ille qui prius Ierusalem conquisierat, et a paucissimis contriti sunt, et quasi tele aranearum disternati sunt, et demoliti.'

⁸⁶ Mayr-Harting, pp. 231–40.

⁸⁷ OD, p. 108.

⁸⁸ OD, pp. 98, 54, 88, 90–2, 108, 110–12, 114, 116, 126, 128, 134, 136, 138, 140. Greco-Turkish collusion was not a complete fabrication on Odo's part: in the summer of 1147, Manuel had agreed a truce with the sultan of Iconium. See Suger of Saint-Denis, *Epistolae*, p. 496; Niketas Choniates, *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, trans. H. J. Magoulias (Detroit, 1984), p. 39; S. Neocleous, 'Byzantine-Muslim conspiracies against the crusades: history and myth', *Journal of Medieval History*, xxxvi (2010), 253–74, at pp. 259–65.

⁸⁹ OD, p. 88: 'retinent quod Francorum virtus, quia Ierosolymam conquisierunt, liberavit'.

⁹⁰ *GF*, pp. 11–12, 17, 63–5; *RA*, p. 41.

⁹¹ OD, pp. 68–70. Phillips, 'Odo of Deuil's *De profectioe*', pp. 85–6, has suggested that Queen Eleanor of France's status as the niece of Raymond of Antioch and the presence of Antiochene envoys in France in 1145–1146 may explain Odo's knowledge of this event. However, it is also possible that reports had circulated earlier, for an encyclical issued by Pope Innocent II, which prohibited the involvement of Latin mercenaries in the Byzantine army in response to the emperor's attack on Antioch, could date to either March 1138 or March 1143. See *Papsturkunden für Kirchen im Heiligen Lande*, ed. R. Hiestand (Göttingen, 1985), pp. 168–9.

⁹² OD, p. 132.

⁹³ B. H. Rosenwein, 'Problems and methods in the history of emotions', *Passions in Context*, i (2010), 1–32. For broader critiques of the methodologies available to emotions historians, see *Doing Emotions History*, ed. S. J. Matt and P. N. Stearns (Chicago, 2014); J. Plamper, *The History of Emotions: An Introduction*, trans. K. Tribe (Oxford, 2015); R. Boddice, *The History of Emotions* (Manchester, 2018).

⁹⁴ Phillips, 'Odo of Deuil's *De profectioe*', pp. 86, 88–9, at p. 89.

⁹⁵ Eudes de Deuil, *La croisade de Louis VII*, ed. Waquet, p. 12. Berry likewise believed that Odo 'analyzed men psychologically', citing his descriptions of the Greeks and Manuel as evidence: OD, p. xxix n. 109. Odo himself occasionally appears in the narrative and there are hints that he was working from memory, yet unambiguous

instances of eyewitness recall are extremely difficult to identify: Bull, *Eyewitness and Crusade Narrative*, pp. 178–85.

⁹⁶ See, for example, S. Menache, ‘Emotions in the service of politics: another perspective on the experience of crusading (1095–1187)’, in *Jerusalem the Golden*, ed. Edgington and García-Guijarro, pp. 235–54.

⁹⁷ Bull, *Eyewitness and Crusade Narrative*, esp. pp. 1–71; M. Bull, ‘The eyewitness accounts of the First Crusade as political scripts’, *Reading Medieval Studies*, xxxvi (2010), 23–37; E. Lapina, “‘Nec signis nec testis creditur...’: the problem of eyewitnesses in the chronicles of the First Crusade”, *Viator*, xxxviii (2007), 117–39; Y. N. Harari, ‘Eyewitnessing in accounts of the First Crusade: the *Gesta Francorum* and other contemporary narratives’, *Crusades*, iii (2004), 77–99; S. D. White, ‘The politics of anger’, in *Anger’s Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, ed. B. H. Rosenwein (Ithaca, NY, 1998), pp. 127–52, at p. 137; J. H. Arnold, ‘Inside and outside the medieval laity: some reflections on the history of emotions’, in *European Religious Cultures: Essays Offered to Christopher Brooke on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*, ed. M. Rubin (London, 2008), pp. 107–29.

⁹⁸ Niketas Choniates, p. 36. See also W. R. Taylor, ‘A new Syriac fragment dealing with incidents in the Second Crusade’, *The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, xi (1929–30), 120–30, at p. 123.

⁹⁹ OD, pp. 78–80: ‘Si iudicamus hoc esse turpitudinem, delemus consuetudinem. Nunc autem imperator, sibi timens, nostrum requirit hominum. Si ergo turpe est nos ab eo timeri, si est inhonestum quod minoribus facimus nos facere imperatori, dimittamus. Si vero metus imperatoris vel mos nostrae consuetudinis nec regi facit iniuriam nec nobis verecundiam, acquiescamus nostrae consuetudini. Pro nostro commodo illius parcamus formidini.’

¹⁰⁰ OD, p. xxvii.

¹⁰¹ OD, pp. 58, 82, 80.

¹⁰² OD, pp. 56–8: ‘Requisitus enim quicumque Graecos noverit fatebitur quia quando timent nimia sua deiectione vilescunt’.

¹⁰³ OD, p. 136.

¹⁰⁴ OD, p. 56; Carrier, pp. 77–93, 164–74; M. Bennett, ‘Virile Latins, effeminate Greeks and strong women: gender definitions on crusade?’, in *Gendering the Crusades*, ed. S. B. Edgington and S. Lambert (Cardiff, 2001), pp. 16–30.

¹⁰⁵ See the introduction to *Fear and its Representations in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, ed. A. Scott and C. Kosso (Turnhout, 2002), p. xxv; Baldric of Bourgueil, pp. 31, 66; Ralph of Caen, p. 698.

¹⁰⁶ *GF*, p. 67.

-
- ¹⁰⁷ *GF*, p. 11: ‘anxians et bulliens ira, cogitabat quemadmodum callide fraudulenterque comprehenderet hos Christi milites’.
- ¹⁰⁸ *GF*, p. 11.
- ¹⁰⁹ *GF*, pp. 12, 63.
- ¹¹⁰ Fulcher of Chartres, pp. 175–6; *RA*, p. 41.
- ¹¹¹ Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta per Francos*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens (Turnhout, 1996) [henceforth *GN*], pp. 130, 135, 142, 235; Robert the Monk, *The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk*, ed. D. Kempf and M. Bull (Woodbridge, 2013) [henceforth *RM*], pp. 18, 19.
- ¹¹² *RM*, p. 19.
- ¹¹³ D. Kempf, ‘Towards a textual archaeology of the First Crusade’, in *Writing the Early Crusades*, ed. Bull and Kempf, pp. 116–26, at p. 122.
- ¹¹⁴ *GF*, p. 5.
- ¹¹⁵ *GN*, pp. 128, 230, 314, 105.
- ¹¹⁶ *GF*, pp. 3, 6, 11; *RM*, pp. 9, 16, 18, 19; R. Morse, *Truth and Convention in the Middle Ages: Rhetoric, Representation, and Reality* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 165–6.
- ¹¹⁷ *OD*, pp. 116, 122.
- ¹¹⁸ *OD*, pp. 14, 34, 36, 102; C. S. Jaeger, *Ennobling Love: In Search of a Lost Sensibility* (Philadelphia, 1999), pp. 11–26; R. L. Slitt, ‘Acting out friendship: signs and gestures of aristocratic male friendship in the twelfth century’, *Haskins Society Journal*, xxi (2010), 147–64.
- ¹¹⁹ *OD*, p. 26: ‘nimis affectuosa, quia non erant ex affectu’.
- ¹²⁰ *OD*, p. 60: ‘Si gestus corporis, si alacritas faciei, si verba cordis intima demonstrarent, circumstantes illum nimio affectu regem diligere comprobarent’.
- ¹²¹ *OD*, p. 68: ‘Referimus imperatoris obsequia ut pateat dolus ipsius qui praetendebat affectum quem solemus amicis praecordialibus demonstrare et gerebat animum quem non possemus nisi mortibus nostris placare.’
- ¹²² *OD*, pp. 66, 82, 86: ‘est dolis et infidelitate omnibus metuenda’.
- ¹²³ *OD*, pp. 6, 10, 102, 34, 44, 74, 112, 104, 108.
- ¹²⁴ *OD*, pp. 14, 108.
- ¹²⁵ *OD*, p. 12: ‘Rex autem et sui qui merito nullarum gentium vires timebant fraudes utinam timuissent!’
- ¹²⁶ *OD*, p. 138: ‘fraudemque timens ubi saepius illam invenerat’.
- ¹²⁷ *OD*, p. 32.
- ¹²⁸ An exception is Albert of Aachen, pp. 78, 88.

¹²⁹ Virgil, *Aeneid*, The Loeb Classical Library (2 vols., London, 1916–18), i. 296: ‘timeo Danaos et dona ferentes’; OD, p. 26.

¹³⁰ In the prologue to his *Gesta Tancredi*, Ralph of Caen (p. 606) seems to capture the meaning of Virgil’s proverb: ‘metuebantur enim Graecorum insidiae, qui familiare habent, quod etiam bene meritos invitaverunt ad munera, retrudere ad flagra’. See also William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens (Turnhout, 1986), pp. 503, 914; John of Salisbury, p. 60; *Historia peregrinorum*, ed. A. Chroust, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Frederichs I*, MGH SRG, n.s. v (Berlin, 1928), p. 132.

¹³¹ OD, p. 40: ‘Hucusque lusimus, quia nec damna pertulimus ex malitia hominum nec pericula timuimus de astutia subdolorum. Ex quo autem intravimus Bulgariam terram Graecorum, et virtus laborem pertulit et sensus exercitium.’

¹³² RA, pp. 40–1: ‘Facile autem res gesta hactenus me scriptorem quibusdam leticie et prosperitatis gressibus comitabatur, que tanto acerbitatis et meroris honore nunc premit, ut incepisse me tedeat, cum perficere votum sit.’

¹³³ RA, p. 41.

¹³⁴ OD, p. 14.

¹³⁵ OD, pp. 48, 82, 50, 54, 132.

¹³⁶ OD, p. 118: ‘Quo relatu suffundor lacrimis, et de visceribus intimis ingemisco.’ For a similar interjection, see OD, p. 80.

¹³⁷ OD, p. 52.

¹³⁸ R. E. Barton, ‘Gendering anger: *ira*, *furor*, and discourses of power and masculinity in the eleventh and twelfth centuries’, in *In the Garden of Evil: The Vices and Culture in the Middle Ages*, ed. R. Newhauser (Toronto, 2005), pp. 371–92, at pp. 383–7.

¹³⁹ OD, pp. 90–2.

¹⁴⁰ This emotional script was common both inside and outside a crusading context: White, pp. 142–5; Throop, pp. 21–2, 158–71.

¹⁴¹ OD, p. 90: ‘cum stupore dolent et cum dolore stupent’.

¹⁴² OD, p. 96.

¹⁴³ OD, p. 100.

¹⁴⁴ OD, p. 98.

¹⁴⁵ OD, pp. 42, 70, 134, 140–2; Phillips, ‘Odo of Deuil’s *De profectioe*’, p. 84; Throop, pp. 14–15, 75–6. Odo only once used *vindicta* to describe Greek actions: OD, p. 108.

¹⁴⁶ OD, p. 72.

¹⁴⁷ Barton, 'Gendering anger', pp. 387, 389.

¹⁴⁸ OD, pp. 74, 126.

¹⁴⁹ OD, p. 42: 'Alemanni, quasi viso prodigio, ilico cum furore consurgunt, mimum rapiunt, et in frusta discerpunt'.

¹⁵⁰ OD, p. 42.

¹⁵¹ L. E. Scales, 'Germen militiae: war and German identity in the later Middle Ages', *Past & Present*, clxxx (2003), 41–82, at pp. 68–71.

¹⁵² Suger, *Vie*, p. 64: 'cum inopinata nequitia, ficta litis occasione, furor Theutonicus frendens debachatur; exertis gladiis velut pleni mania discurrentes, Romanos tali in loco jure inermes aggrediuntur'; Suger, *Deeds*, p. 52; F. Curta, 'Furor Teutonicus: a note on ethnic stereotypes in Suger's *Deeds of Louis the Fat*', *Haskins Society Journal*, xvi (2005), 62–76.

¹⁵³ OD, p. 44; F. L. Cheyette, 'Suum cuique tribuere', *French Historical Studies*, vi (1970), 287–99, at p. 295; R. E. Barton, "'Zealous anger" and the renegotiation of aristocratic relationships in eleventh- and twelfth-century France', in *Anger's Past*, ed. Rosenwein, pp. 153–70, at pp. 162–3.