



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *The First Crusade Letter Written at Laodicea in 1099: Two Previously Unpublished Versions from Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek CIm 23390 and 28195*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/137341/>

Version: Accepted Version

Book Section:

Smith, TW orcid.org/0000-0001-9329-6880 (2017) The First Crusade Letter Written at Laodicea in 1099: Two Previously Unpublished Versions from Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek CIm 23390 and 28195. In: Kedar, BZ, Phillips, J, Riley-Smith, J and Chrissis, NG, (eds.) *Crusades*. Routledge , Abingdon, Oxon, UK , pp. 1-25. ISBN 978-1-138-21325-8

© 2017 by the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East. This is an Accepted Manuscript of a book chapter published by Routledge in *Crusades* on 14 Feb 2017, available online:

<https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/e/9781315305745/chapters/10.4324%2F9781315305752-4>. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

**The First Crusade Letter written at Laodicea in 1099:
Two Previously Unpublished Versions from Munich,
Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 23390 and 28195**

Thomas W. Smith

Trinity College, Dublin

thsmith@tcd.ie

Abstract

This article analyses the discovery by the author in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 23390 of a fourth recension of the letter written by the leaders of the First Crusade at Laodicea in September 1099 (Hagenmeyer no. XVIII). A different version of the same letter from the second recension, unearthed in Clm 28195 by Benjamin Kedar in the 1980s, is also analysed and both letters are published for the first time. It is argued that these copies of the letter testify to flourishing Germanic interest in the crusading movement in the monastic houses of southern Germany and Austria in the period between the Third Crusade and the Crusade of Frederick II. The letters were probably copied as part of a celebration and commemoration of German participation in the crusades, which culminated in the recovery of Jerusalem by Frederick II in 1229. The present article also contends that greater attention should be given to the regional manuscript traditions of the letters of the First Crusade, so as to reveal more about their popularity and transmission in the Middle Ages.

In his critical edition of the letters from the First Crusade, published in 1901, Heinrich Hagenmeyer identified seventeen different manuscript copies of the letter composed by the leaders of the First Crusade at Laodicea in September 1099 (Hagenmeyer letter no. XVIII).¹

I wish to record my gratitude to the Leverhulme Trust for the award of a Study Abroad Studentship (2013–15), during which this article was researched and written. I am very grateful to Professor Bernard Hamilton, Dr Georg Strack, the two anonymous peer reviewers, and the Associate Editor of the present journal, Dr Nikolaos Chrissis, for their helpful comments on the present article. My thanks also to Dr Juliane Trede of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek for her kind assistance with my researches.

¹ *Epistulae et chartae ad historiam primi belli sacri spectantes quae supersunt aevo aequales ac genuinae / Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088–1100: Eine Quellensammlung zur Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges, ed.*

Working from these seventeen manuscript copies, Hagenmeyer proposed that there were three different recensions of the letter in circulation in the Middle Ages.² The meticulous quality of Hagenmeyer's edition and its rapid and enduring acceptance as authoritative means that, since his pioneering researches, very few scholars have returned to examine the manuscripts in which the letter is preserved. Yet two new versions of the Laodicea letter, of which Hagenmeyer was unaware, have now been unearthed in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich. I have identified a previously unedited version which contains the text of a hitherto unknown fourth recension of the letter from the beginning of the thirteenth century (in Clm 23390), and Benjamin Kedar has discovered a version of the second recension in an early thirteenth-century copy (in Clm 28195).³ The present article analyses and prints both letters for the first time. It assesses why one scribe decided to amend the text in order to create the fourth recension and what the two copies of the letter in Clm 23390 and 28195 reveal about the circulation of, and interest in, the text in southern Germany and Austria a century after the capture of Jerusalem.

The Authorship and Authenticity of the Laodicea Letter

Soon after the stunning and bloody capture of Jerusalem by the forces of the First Crusade on 15 July 1099 and the Battle of Ascalon on 12 August, many of the surviving crusaders began to return to the West. In September 1099, on the return journey from the crusade, Robert of Normandy, Robert of Flanders and Raymond of Toulouse stopped at Laodicea in Syria, where Bohemond of Taranto and Archbishop Daimbert of Pisa were laying siege to the city. After prevailing upon Bohemond and Daimbert to abandon the siege, the leaders of the First Crusade

Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Innsbruck, 1901), no. XVIII. The letter is introduced and the manuscript tradition assessed at 103–14. The letter is edited at 167–74. Hagenmeyer provides an extremely detailed commentary on the content of the letter at 371–403. Different recensions of the letter have been translated into English, although these are of later versions rather than the first recension (which was the original version of the letter sent to the pope), and the complexity of the manuscript tradition is not acknowledged. A version from the second recension is translated in *Letters of the Crusaders*, ed. Dana C. Munro, rev. edn (Philadelphia, PA, 1902), 8–12, and reprinted in *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and Other Source Materials*, ed. Edward Peters, 2nd edn (Philadelphia, PA, 1998), 292–96. The translations in August C. Krey, *The First Crusade: The Accounts of Eye-Witnesses and Participants* (Princeton, 1921), 275–79 and *Letters from the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12th–13th Centuries*, trans. by Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate (Farnham, 2010), 33–37 were made directly from Hagenmeyer's critical edition, which means that they also have the extra sections from the second and third recensions which were added only after the letter began circulating in the West (Krey cites Hagenmeyer as his source at 282). On the recensions, see the main text directly below.

² *Epistulae*, ed. Hagenmeyer, 111.

³ Benjamin Z. Kedar, "Ein Hilferuf aus Jerusalem vom September 1187," *Deutsches Archiv* 38 (1982): 112–22, at 113; reprinted with original pagination in *idem, The Franks in the Levant, 11th to 14th Centuries* (Aldershot, 1993), no. X.

all wrote a report to the pope (in effect Paschal II, although his identity was unknown to the crusaders at this point) and the faithful of Christendom, recounting the miraculous events of the First Crusade from the capture of Nicea in summer 1097 up to the sojourn of the returning crusaders at Laodicea.⁴ The authors of the letter are named as Daimbert, archbishop of Pisa (soon to become patriarch of Jerusalem), Godfrey of Bouillon (who, though not present at Laodicea, had presumably authorised the use of his name), Raymond of Toulouse, and all the bishops and crusaders “in terra Israel.”⁵

Speculative doubts about the authenticity of the letter, which focussed predominantly on Godfrey’s absence from Laodicea in September 1099, were dismissed convincingly by Hagenmeyer in 1873.⁶ He argued that the use of Godfrey’s name in absentia tallies with the other “authors” who were named despite not being present, such as the “alii episcopi” and the “universus Dei exercitus qui est in terra Israel,” and that Godfrey had probably given permission for his name to be used in such encyclical documents from the crusader army.⁷ Indeed, it is remarked in the letter itself that Godfrey remained in Jerusalem, rather than travelling to Laodicea with the other leaders.⁸ This would be a peculiar thing for a forger to include. The immediate inclusion of the letter by contemporary chroniclers, such as Frutolf of Michelsberg (d. 1103), and his continuator, Ekkehard of Aura (a participant in the crusade of 1101), attest to its authenticity.⁹ Along with the accurate and detailed content of the letter, the

⁴ John 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 *Crusade Sources*, 39–69, at 42–43; Heinrich Hagenmeyer, “Der Brief der Kreuzfahrer an den Pabst und die abendländische Kirche v. J. 1099 nach der Schlacht bei Ascalon,” *Forschungen zur Deutschen Geschichte* 13 (1873): 400–12, at 401. The most detailed studies of the letter remain Hagenmeyer’s analysis in this article and in his later edition (cited above). Another important study of the letter, superseded and corrected by the researches of Hagenmeyer, is Paul Riant “Inventaire critique des lettres historiques des croisades,” *AOL* 1 (1880): 1–235, at 201–04. More recently, in addition to France’s chapter cited above, see: Jonathan Riley-Smith, “The Title of Godfrey of Bouillon,” *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 52 (1979): 83–86, at 84; Alan V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: A Dynastic History 1099–1125* (Oxford, 2000), 71.

⁵ *Epistulae*, ed. Hagenmeyer, 168. For the text of the salutatio, see the edition at the end of the present article.

⁶ For the doubts about the authenticity of the letter, see Hagenmeyer, “Der Brief der Kreuzfahrer an den Pabst,” 401, who quotes these views at length.

⁷ Hagenmeyer, “Der Brief der Kreuzfahrer an den Pabst,” 402. On the complexities of the title accorded to Godfrey in the document, see Riley-Smith, “The Title of Godfrey of Bouillon.”

⁸ *Epistulae*, ed. Hagenmeyer, 173.

⁹ Hagenmeyer, “Der Brief der Kreuzfahrer an den Pabst,” 402; Benjamin Z. Kedar, *Crusade and Mission: European Approaches toward the Muslims* (Princeton, 1984), 65 n. 67; Frutolfi et Ekkehardi *chronica necnon anonymi chronica imperatorum*, ed. Franz-Josef Schmale and Irene Schmale-Ott (Darmstadt, 1972), 112–17. Dr Christian Lohmer of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* is currently working on the universal chronicle of Frutolf. He presented some of his findings at Leeds International Medieval Congress 2013, which included the

fact that it was immediately accepted as genuine by contemporaries is strong evidence that the letter is authentic, and the speculative doubts about whether it is a forgery should be dismissed as baseless.

Hagenmeyer attributed the authorship of the letter to Raymond of Aguilers, a chaplain in Raymond of Toulouse's contingent, based on internal evidence.¹⁰ First, the written style of the letter is very similar to that of Raymond of Aguilers' *Historia Francorum*, and Hagenmeyer argued that Raymond was most likely the author of both, and that he later used the letter whilst compiling his narrative account.¹¹ For example, the author of the letter used the same obscure term *Hispania* (denoting Isfahan, rather than Spain) to refer to Syria as Raymond of Aguilers in his *Historia*.¹² Second, the author of the letter seems to have taken special care to promote the interests of Raymond of Toulouse. The latter was given the honour of being the only other leader mentioned alongside Godfrey of Bouillon and Daimbert as an author of this letter, thus earning Raymond of Toulouse great prestige, when, as has been noted above, he was far from the only secular leader present at Laodicea.¹³ This desire for recognition in the letter fits with the obsession of Raymond of Toulouse with the leadership of the expedition.¹⁴ As John France has pointed out, the author of the letter also expounds "a very pro-Provençal view, even asserting the genuineness of the Holy Lance," and the author's plural "we" clearly refers to the Provençal contingent.¹⁵ While it will never be possible to establish the authorship of the letter with unequivocal certainty, Hagenmeyer's argument that Raymond of Aguilers was its author is both plausible and attractive; if not Raymond of Aguilers, then it was certainly someone else in the Provençal contingent.

alterations that Ekkehard made to Frutolf's copy of this letter. His paper can be accessed online at: <<http://mittelalter.hypotheses.org/2294>> [accessed 29 July 2015].

¹⁰ Hagenmeyer, "Der Brief der Kreuzfahrer an den Pabst," 405, 412.

¹¹ See the comparisons in Hagenmeyer, "Der Brief der Kreuzfahrer an den Pabst," 405–10. Although France has criticised the weak nature of the similarities that Hagenmeyer drew in his close textual comparison between the wording of Raymond of Aguilers' *Historia Francorum* and the anonymous *Gesta Francorum* (France, "The Anonymous *Gesta Francorum*," 43–51), Hagenmeyer's close textual comparison of the letter of September 1099 with Raymond's *Historia Francorum* is persuasive. On Raymond's reuse of the letter whilst composing the *Historia Francorum*, see: Hagenmeyer, "Der Brief der Kreuzfahrer an den Pabst," 412; *Epistulae*, ed. idem, 109.

¹² Hagenmeyer, "Der Brief der Kreuzfahrer an den Pabst," 407.

¹³ Hagenmeyer, "Der Brief der Kreuzfahrer an den Pabst," 412.

¹⁴ Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History* (London, 2004), 46.

¹⁵ France, "The Anonymous *Gesta Francorum*," 42, 42–43.

Recensions and Content

Hagenmeyer identified three different recensions of the Laodicea letter, which he stated could be discerned most easily from their concluding sections. Since the identification of the new, fourth recension presented below rests on these concluding sections, it is necessary to pause to examine their content before moving on. In his edition, Hagenmeyer numbered the different passages of the letter, and, according to him, the first recension of the letter contained 17 sections.¹⁶ This original, first recension of the letter relates the events of the First Crusade after the siege of Nicaea, taking in the tribulations of the army at Antioch, the capture of the cities of “Barra” and “Marra,” as well as the bloody conquest of Jerusalem, and culminates in the Battle of Ascalon and its immediate aftermath. Hagenmeyer counted six manuscript versions of the first recension.¹⁷ The final passage (no. 17) of the first recension calls upon:

[A]ll the bishops, devout clerics, monks and all the laity, to glory in the marvellous bravery and devotion of our brothers, in the glorious and very desirable reward of the Almighty, in the remission of all our sins which we hope for through the grace of God, and in the exultation of the Catholic Church of Christ and the whole Latin race, so that God who lives and reigns for ever and ever will sit down at His right hand. Amen.¹⁸

On its arrival in the West, the letter began to circulate rapidly, and it was during this period that the text picked up two auxiliary concluding sections (nos. 18 and 19), which were intended to function as an excitatorium to stir the people of Christendom to support the crusading movement.¹⁹ These additional sections delineate the different recensions. Hagenmeyer identified eight manuscript versions of the second recension.²⁰ All letters of the second recension bear the extra exhortatory section 18, which runs thus:

Through the Lord Jesus who accompanied us at all times, strove with us and saved us in all our tribulations we pray and beseech you not to forget your brothers who are returning home to you; by being generous to them and settling their debts God will be

¹⁶ *Epistulae*, ed. Hagenmeyer, 111.

¹⁷ *Epistulae*, ed. Hagenmeyer, 111.

¹⁸ *Letters from the East*, ed. Barber and Bate, 36; *Epistulae*, ed. Hagenmeyer, 173. The Latin text of sections 17–19 of the letter is given in the edition.

¹⁹ *Epistulae*, ed. Hagenmeyer, 111.

²⁰ *Epistulae*, ed. Hagenmeyer, 111.

generous to you, absolving you of all your sins and granting you a share in all the blessings we or they have earned in His sight. Amen.²¹

The letters of the third recension contain all 18 preceding sections and add yet another passage (no. 19) summarising the key dates of the First Crusade. At some point when the second recension was already circulating, one scribe, who considered the dates of the important battles lacking in the previous recensions, appended the new final section which brought all these together, thus creating the third recension.²² The motivation of the scribe in compiling this new section was almost certainly liturgical – his new passage facilitated the celebration of the great victories of the expedition in the monastic houses in which these texts were being copied:

Jerusalem was captured by the Christians in the year of the Lord 1099, on the Ides of July, 6th feria in the seventh indiction, in the third year of their expedition. Their first battle, in which many Turks were killed, was at the bridge on the River Farfar on the ninth day before the kalends of March. The second battle, a Christian victory over the pagans, was at Nicaea three days before the nones of March. Their third battle was on the fourth day before the kalends of July at Antioch, where they followed the newly-discovered Lance of the Lord. Their fourth battle was on the kalends of July in Romania where they defeated the Turks. Their fifth battle was on the ides of July when Jerusalem was captured after thirty-nine days of siege. Their sixth battle was four days before the kalends of August at Ascalon against the king of the Babylonians; there a small army of Christians inflicted a crushing defeat on one hundred thousand horsemen and forty thousand footsoldiers. Thanks be to God. End of letter.²³

The third recension is the rarest of the three – Hagenmeyer only found three manuscript versions.²⁴ As we will now see, the content of these auxiliary segments is crucial to the analysis

²¹ Letters from the East, ed. Barber and Bate, 36; Epistulae, ed. Hagenmeyer, 173–74.

²² Epistulae, ed. Hagenmeyer, 111.

²³ Letters from the East, ed. Barber and Bate, 36–37; Epistulae, ed. Hagenmeyer, 174. Hagenmeyer notes that the scribe who created section 19 wanted to collect all the key dates together: “Die dritte Version ist diejenige mit den 2 Zusätzen 18 und 19; diese hat ein Kopist gefertigt, welcher es als Mangel empfand, dass im Briefe selbst die einzelnen Geschehnisse ohne Angabe des Datums angeführt sind; um diesem Mangel abzuhelpfen, hat er Abs. 19 beigefügt.”: Epistulae, ed. Hagenmeyer, 111. Implicit in Hagenmeyer’s statement is that the motivation was to facilitate liturgical celebration of the First Crusade. On the liturgy of the crusades at the time Clm 23390 and 28195 were created (still an under-explored topic in crusades scholarship) see the groundbreaking study by Amnon Linder, *Raising Arms: Liturgy in the Struggle to Liberate Jerusalem in the Late Middle Ages* (Turnhout, 2003).

²⁴ Epistulae, ed. Hagenmeyer, 111.

of the newly discovered fourth recension in Clm 23390, which takes as its base text a letter of the third recension.

The Version in Clm 23390

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 23390 is a small parchment codex composed of 74 folios measuring 13.5 x 9.5 cm.²⁵ The manuscript is a miscellany whose various different parts date to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and were probably not always bound together in the same codex. The provenance of the manuscript is completely unknown, but, as will be demonstrated below, the part containing the Laodicea letter is probably of southern German or Austrian origin. The librarian Johann Andreas Schmeller (1785–1852), who, between 1829 and 1852, organised the manuscript collections which now belong to the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, first included Clm 23390 in a series of manuscripts of uncertain origins – catalogued as “ZZ” manuscripts.²⁶ Schmeller gave the codex the shelfmark ZZ 390.²⁷

N.B. Plate not licensed for electronic reproduction

– see printed version.

Plate 1. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 23390, fol. 57r. This image shows most of the unique final sections of the fourth recension of the Laodicea letter (and also the incipit of the following text). Parts of the manuscript have been badly affected by water damage. © 2015 Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich. Reproduced by permission.

²⁵ Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 23390. The Laodicea letter is found on fols 60r–62v, 57r. *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum bibliothecae regiae Monacensis, Tomi II, Pars IV: Codices num. 21406–27268 complectens*, ed. Carolus Halm and Gulielmus Meyer (Munich, 1881), 67. Norbert Höing pointed out that the codex actually contains 74 folios, rather than the 73 given in the catalogue, since there are two folios in the manuscript numbered “fol. 1”: Norbert Höing, “Die ‘Trierer Stilübungen’: Ein Denkmal der Frühzeit Kaiser Friedrich Barbarossas,” *Archiv für Diplomatik* 1 (1955): 257–329, at 271, n. 76.

²⁶ “Codices diversae originis, quibus Schmellerus signum ZZ dedit.”: *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum ... Codices num. 21406–27268*, ed. Halm and Meyer, 50. On Schmeller’s organisation of the manuscript collections of what is now the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, see the Staatsbibliothek web page “Ordnung der Handschriften” at <https://www.bsb-muenchen.de/die-bayerische-staatsbibliothek/abteilungen/handschriften-und-alte-drucke/abendlaendische-handschriften/ordnung-der-handschriften> [accessed 29 July 2015].

²⁷ *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum ... Codices num. 21406–27268*, ed. Halm and Meyer, 67.

The Laodicea letter in Clm 23390, which is currently the only known exemplar of a fourth recension, was hitherto unknown to scholars of the crusades. There are a number of reasons why it has been overlooked until now. There is Hagenmeyer's reputation for thoroughness and the rapidity with which his edition of the First Crusade letters was accepted as authoritative, which probably discouraged other scholars from conducting their own manuscript searches. Anyone only casually examining the manuscript would probably have been further dissuaded by the misleading and incorrect pencil note on fol. 60r which refers the reader to *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum* of Pistorius and Struve (1726).²⁸ The catalogue similarly notes that the letter has been published in this edition, but crucially "in fine maxime differens."²⁹ A cursory examination of the manuscript alongside the edition of Pistorius and Struve was enough to reveal that this edition was not made from Clm 23390 and that the version in this codex was worth pursuing. The unanswered question that remains, however, is why did Hagenmeyer miss this manuscript in the first place? The Staatsbibliothek manuscript catalogue, which was published in 1881, twenty years before Hagenmeyer's work was printed, clearly states that this is a letter of the First Crusade, albeit incorrectly dated to 1098.³⁰ Two possibilities present themselves. The first is the most simple and most plausible: Hagenmeyer missed the manuscript. This is entirely possible, given the great extent of his work and the nature of human fallibility. The second, less likely, prospect is that, given the somewhat uncertain status of the ZZ manuscripts, Hagenmeyer did not deem it worth looking for a First Crusade letter in this mixed lot.

What little is known about the provenance of ZZ manuscripts has to be deduced from internal evidence. Aside from the letter of the First Crusade written at Laodicea, Clm 23390 contains, among other items, the "Translatio Eusebii de destructione Jerusalem," various sermons,³¹ a letter of Frederick I from the Third Crusade, and epitaphs of Pope Alexander III

²⁸ "Script. rer. Germ. Pist. Struve I, 664": Clm 23390, fol. 60r; *Rerum Germanicarum Scriptores aliquot insignes...*, ed. J. Pistorius and B.G. Struve, vol. 1 (Regensburg, 1726), 664–66.

²⁹ *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum ... Codices num. 21406–27268*, ed. Halm and Meyer, 67.

³⁰ "Epistola de bello in terra Sancta a. 1098": *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum ... Codices num. 21406–27268*, ed. Halm and Meyer, 67.

³¹ The sermons, many of which are recorded in a twelfth-century hand, appear to celebrate feast days. It also seems that, since the sections of the manuscript containing the sermons have not suffered the same water damage as the section containing the Laodicea letter and the letter of Frederick I, that they were originally bound in separate codices. The manuscript is not listed in the index of the *Repertorium der lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters für die Zeit von 1150–1350*, ed. Johannes Baptist Schneyer, 11 vols (Münster, 1969–90). The other parts of Clm 23390, including the sermons, would undoubtedly repay further research.

and Petrus Comestor.³² It is unclear when this small manuscript, which is preserved in a modern binding, reached its current form, but it seems probable that the contents did not always travel together in the same codex. There is apparent water damage to leaves containing the Laodicea letter of September 1099, Frederick I's letter, and subsequent folios, which roughly correspond to the last third of the manuscript. This apparent water damage has not affected quires in the previous two thirds, which contain texts such as the sermons and the "Translatio Eusebii de destructione Jerusalem". This allows us to surmise that the contents of the manuscript were probably bound in separate codices before being compiled into the present codex some time after the water damage occurred. The ordering of the Laodicea letter in the manuscript also reveals that it has been rebound in this collection incorrectly. The letter begins on fol. 60r and runs to fol. 62v, where it breaks off. The letter then continues, and finishes, on fol. 57r.³³

The hand in which the Laodicea letter is written appears to match that of the Third Crusade letter of Frederick I.³⁴ It is probably significant that they are bound together and that folios from both letters were rebound in the wrong order, and I would suggest that they originated from the same codex. The letter of Frederick I to his son, Henry VI, written at Philoppopolis on 26 November 1189, relates the events of the imperial crusade up to that point. Assuming that, since both texts share the same scribal hand, the Laodicea letter and the letter of Frederick I were copied into the manuscript contemporaneously to celebrate the crusading movement, the letter from Philoppopolis provides us with a terminus a quo of 1190. The terminus ad quem is supplied by the scribal hand, which is definitely not later than the thirteenth century and Hans-Hugo Steinhoff has dated this part of the manuscript to the beginning of the thirteenth century.³⁵ This means that our new copy of the First Crusade letter was produced in a period when German participation in crusading was at its peak. In addition to Frederick I Barbarossa's leadership of a contingent on the Third Crusade and the later Crusade of Frederick II (1228–29), the German and Austrian contribution to the Fifth Crusade was extremely

³² *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum ... Codices num. 21406–27268*, ed. Halm and Meyer, 67.

³³ The text which immediately follows the Laodicea letter on fol. 57r and finishes on fol. 57v describes the lineage of Mary. The incipit runs thus: "Anna et Esmeris due sorores fuerunt...": Clm 23390, fol. 57r.

³⁴ Clm 23390, fols. 52v, 63r–64v; *Regesta chronologico-diplomatica regum atque imperatorum Romanorum inde a Conrado I. usque ad Henricum VII.: Die Urkunden der Römischen Könige und Kaiser von Conrad I. bis Heinrich VII.*, 911–1313, ed. Johann Friedrich Böhmner (Frankfurt am Main, 1831), (no. 2719) 145.

³⁵ Hans-Hugo Steinhoff, "Münchner Halssegen Swemo diu kela virswillit," in *Verfasser-Datenbank* (Berlin, 1987). Online version consulted at: <<http://www.degruyter.com.vdbo.emedia1.bsb-muenchen.de/view/VDBO/vdbo.vlma.3031>> [accessed 7 September 2015].

significant, and it was during this period that the Teutonic Order was flourishing.³⁶ It is plausible to suggest that the copy of the letter in Clm 23390 was created as a response to the Third Crusade and the foundation of the Teutonic Order.

Indeed, the letter of Frederick I is pivotal in attempting to determine why Clm 23390 was compiled. Since it remains unclear when Clm 23390 reached its present form, it is very difficult to discern a clear purpose for the compilation of the miscellany as a whole. A case can be made, however, for at least a part of the manuscript having a crusading theme. The imperial letter from the Third Crusade indicates a probable German interest on the part of the manuscript's compiler. Furthermore, the overwhelming majority of medieval Latin manuscripts preserved in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek came from Bavarian religious houses.³⁷ Although Clm 23390 is a "ZZ" manuscript of unknown provenance, it seems very likely that it originated in a religious house in southern Germany (or possibly Austria). Like the version in Clm 28195, which was produced in Bavaria in the second quarter of the thirteenth century, the First Crusade letter in Clm 23390 was most probably copied as part of a celebration of the crusading movement and the role of the Germans in its furtherance. As is revealed below, the text of the letter also follows other manuscripts of German provenance.

So what of the text of the letter? Most of the copy in Clm 23390 is a decent witness to the text of the letter as established by Hagenmeyer, albeit with a few mistakes and minor changes in style that are unique to this version (such as the omission of *milia* when describing the number of footsoldiers in the crusader host in section 13, and the use of *scilicet die* instead of *videlicet die* in section 10 – see edition below). Although sections 1–14 follow closely the letter that the leaders of the First Crusade composed at Laodicea in September 1099, the final sections of the version in Clm 23390 are clearly not faithful to that original text. This is important because the very existence of the letter in Clm 23390 changes our understanding of the recensions of the letter and it also sheds more light on the purposes of those scribes who copied the letter.

³⁶ On the foundation of the Teutonic Order, see Nicholas E. Morton, *The Teutonic Knights in the Holy Land, 1190–1291* (Woodbridge, 2009), 9–30.

³⁷ For an overview of the provenance of the Clm manuscripts in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, see the Bestandsübersicht on their website. This document is compiled using provenance information from the catalogues and was last updated on 15 December 2014: <https://www.bsb-muenchen.de/fileadmin/images/www/pdf-dateien/abteilungen/Handschriften/Bestand_lateinische_HssClm.pdf> [accessed 21 July 2015]. See also Günter Glauche, "Wege zur Provenienzbestimmung versprengter bayerischer Handschriften," *Bibliotheksforum Bayern* 6 (1978): 188–208, at esp. 188 and 207–08.

Not only is it incredibly rare to find new sources for the First Crusade, but this new version of the Laodicea letter in Clm 23390 proves that there was at least one other recension in circulation in the Middle Ages. Unless other versions are unearthed, Clm 23390 contains the only witness to this new, fourth recension. Most unfortunately, as noted above, the text of the Laodicea letter is water-damaged in several places, rendering many parts of the letter illegible. There is no evidence of deliberate scraping of the parchment, nor of wear from use. Quill strokes are often faintly visible under ultraviolet light, and the use of such a lamp made it possible to recover some fragments of the text that would otherwise have remained lost. Even more unfortunately, these important final sections of the letter, which diverge the most from the other recensions, are badly affected.

Until the middle of section 15 there are no major deviations from the other recensions, but from this point onwards, the letter in Clm 23390 breaks away drastically. The fourth recension alters the letter's account of the Battle of Ascalon and the extant text contains a snippet of new information on the encounter and then simply states that "we" returned to Jerusalem.³⁸ What is particularly significant about the fourth recension is that it omits section 16 (present in all other recensions) which relates the subsequent movements of the crusade leaders thus:

After the victory celebrations the army returned to Jerusalem where Duke Godfrey remained. Raymond, Count of St Gilles, Robert, Count of Normandy and Robert, Count of Flanders, returned to Latakia where they found the Pisan fleet and Bohemond. After the archbishop of Pisa had established peace between Bohemond and our leaders Count Raymond made preparations to return to Jerusalem for the sake of God and our brothers.³⁹

In place of sections 16–18, the version in Clm 23390 ends with a modified version of section 19 from the third recension, which collates all the key dates from the First Crusade (see the edition below). This means that the fourth recension is much shorter than all other versions.

Despite the damage to the manuscript, and the unique final sections in particular, one can make some observations on the significance of these variations for the manuscript tradition.

³⁸ "Hostes autem multas et multiplices turmas fecerunt, et ut nostros in perdita allicerent et sic eos deciperent, et boves, et oves, camelos et dra[-] [...] parire fecerunt. Hostibus devictis [...] spoliis acceptis a[-] Deo revers[i] [sumus] IERUSALEM, cum [...]": Clm 23390, fols 56v–57r.

³⁹ Letters from the East, ed. Barber and Bate, 36; Epistulae, ed. Hagenmeyer, 173.

The omission of the section regarding the leaders of the crusade may support the identification of the origin of this manuscript as southern German or Austrian. It is possible that the scribe who created this new recension of the letter (either in this manuscript or in an earlier exemplar, now lost) had less interest in commemorating the French and Norman crusade leaders than in celebrating the crusading movement in general, in which German participants played a much greater role. Such a hypothesis is supported by the inclusion of Frederick I's letter from the Third Crusade. Furthermore, the variant readings found in the Laodicea letter in Clm 23390 follow most closely a number of manuscripts produced and in circulation in southern Germany and Austria.⁴⁰ This would match the origins of the vast majority of the manuscripts preserved in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, which, as mentioned above, came mostly from Bavarian monastic houses.

One can be much more certain that the Laodicea letter was copied so as to commemorate the capture of the Holy City in liturgical celebrations. The final section of the letter in Clm 23390, which compiles all the significant dates of the First Crusade, varies greatly from all the versions of this section known from the third recension, and it is clear that the scribe who created this variant concentrated his creative efforts on rewriting the final sections of the letter. While the final section in Clm 23390 gives only the years – and not the precise dates – of the capture of Nicea and Antioch, the exact date is given for the capture of Jerusalem (“Anno autem millesimo LXXXX VIII in i[dib]us Iulii Ierosolima.”),⁴¹ which is highly suggestive of a singular intent to celebrate this event alone.

⁴⁰ Manuscript designations are those used in *Epistulae*, ed. Hagenmeyer, 111–12: F¹ = Frankfurt am Main, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. Barth. 104 was produced in Disibodenberg (south-west of Mainz) in the mid fourteenth century <<http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:hebis:30:2-13150>>; V¹ = Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 427 Han was made in Austria in the twelfth century (before 1152) <<http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/AL00174001>>; V² = Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 701 Han also dates to the twelfth century, and, although it is not known where it was produced, its earliest provenance is the Benedictine monastery of St Alban in Mainz <<http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/AL00175073>>; V³ = Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 2373 Han was produced in the second quarter of the fourteenth century (after 1328) in the Upper Rhine region, either in southern Germany or Austria <<http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/AL00173770>>; V⁴ = Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 9779 Han, however, is problematic, since it is a very late copy from the seventeenth century of unknown provenance <<http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/AL00175222>>. [All links accessed 23 July 2015.] Clm 23390 also follows B¹ = Brussels, Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, Ms. 3156 (note the newer manuscript reference, which differs from that given by Hagenmeyer) although this is a later copy from the fourteenth century (finished in 1388) whose earliest provenance is Stavelot abbey in Belgium – see *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque royale de Belgique*, ed. J. van den Gheyn, vol. 5 (Brussels, 1905), 111–12.

⁴¹ Clm 23390, fol. 57r. See illustration above and also the edition in the appendix.

That Clm 23390 contains a highly modified version of section 19 also means that the scribe who created the fourth recension copied his text from the third recension. It is unclear whether the version in Clm 23390 is a unique creation or whether it was copied from a lost exemplar. It could be significant, however, that the letter of Frederick I from the Third Crusade copied into the same codex also appears to be a variant version.⁴²

The Version in Clm 28195

The version of the Laodicea letter in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 28195 requires much less detective work. In an important article published in *Deutsches Archiv* in 1982, Benjamin Kedar drew attention to this previously neglected manuscript, which features an unpublished version of the Laodicea letter from September 1099, along with a number of other texts relevant to the study of the crusades.⁴³ Clm 28195 is a parchment codex composed of 119 folios, measuring 33 x 23 cm.⁴⁴ While the *Katalog der lateinischen Handschriften* dates this manuscript to the beginning of the thirteenth century, Elisabeth Klemm has since dated it more accurately, on art historical grounds, to the second quarter of the thirteenth century.⁴⁵ The manuscript originated from Kaisheim Abbey, a Cistercian institution in Bavaria, before it passed into the collection of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in 1909.⁴⁶ As Kedar notes, this relatively late accession, coming just after the completion of the supposedly definitive collections of crusade sources by scholars such as Hagenmeyer, explains why the manuscript was overlooked.⁴⁷ The codex predominantly comprises works of that most famous Cisterian, Bernard of Clairvaux, but it also contains an urgent appeal to Pope Urban III, sent by Patriarch Eraclius of Jerusalem just prior to the fall of the Holy City in 1187 (which Kedar edited in his

⁴² The nineteenth-century catalogue notes that this letter “differt ab editis”: *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum ... Codices num. 21406–27268*, ed. Halm and Meyer, 67.

⁴³ Kedar, “Ein Hilferuf”.

⁴⁴ Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 28195. The Laodicea letter is found on fols 114ra–115ra. Note that the folio numbers given in the catalogue are incorrect: *Katalog der lateinischen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München: Clm 28111–28254*, ed. Hermann Hauke, *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum Bibliothecae Monacensis, Tomus IV, Pars 7: Codices latinos 28111–28254 continens* (Wiesbaden, 1986), 135, 139.

⁴⁵ Elisabeth Klemm, *Die illuminierten Handschriften des 13. Jahrhunderts deutscher Herkunft in der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek* (Wiesbaden, 1998), 151. My thanks to Dr Juliane Trede for this reference.

⁴⁶ *Katalog der lateinischen Handschriften ... Clm 28111–28254*, ed. Hauke, 135; *Handschriftenerbe des deutschen Mittelalters*, ed. Sigrid Krämer and Michael Bernhard, 3 vols (Munich, 1989–90), vol. 1, 383–84; Kedar, “Ein Hilferuf,” 112.

⁴⁷ Kedar, “Ein Hilferuf,” 112. Heinrich Hagenmeyer published his collection of First Crusade letters in 1901, and it has remained a cornerstone of crusade scholarship ever since: *Epistulae*, ed. Hagenmeyer.

article), and two letters concerning the First Crusade: the one being the letter of September 1099 discussed here, while the other is the missive that Daimbert of Pisa sent to all the faithful of Germany in April 1100.⁴⁸ The Laodicea letter is therefore nestled in a collection that bears an undeniable crusading theme, and it was almost certainly copied to commemorate and further the crusading movement in southern Germany.⁴⁹ Such a suggestion is supported not only by the inclusion of the letter of Heraclius immediately prior to the fall of Jerusalem, but also by the insertion of the letter of Daimbert to Germany, which calls upon the Germans to take the cross and defend the city.⁵⁰ Indeed, the dating of this manuscript means that it can be placed firmly in the context of the Crusade of Frederick II (1228–29), during which the emperor recovered the city of Jerusalem through diplomacy and secured a decade-long truce.⁵¹ These texts were probably copied in response to, and as a celebration of, this momentous event, which would explain the inclusion of the Laodicea letter and the letter of Daimbert to the Germans: just as she had in 1099, Jerusalem required new defenders in 1229, and the creator of this manuscript clearly hoped that those defenders would be found in Bavaria.

As Kedar has noticed, the text of the Laodicea letter in Clm 28195 follows the first recension closely, but it also has section 18 which denotes it as belonging to the second recension, at least according to Hagenmeyer's system.⁵² A hybrid of both the first and second recensions, Kedar points out that this text therefore does not fit with Hagenmeyer's analysis. Clm 28195 certainly complicates Hagenmeyer's assessment of the recensions, yet I would caution against jettisoning his system entirely. It is clear that the circulation of the letter in the Middle Ages was more complex than scholars had assumed. We should undoubtedly pay more attention to the regional groups of manuscripts which contain the letter.⁵³ As the foregoing

⁴⁸ For the full contents of the manuscript, see *Katalog der lateinischen Handschriften ... Clm 28111–28254*, ed. Hauke, 135–39. The letter of Eraclius forms the bulk of Kedar's article. It is discussed and edited in Kedar, "Ein Hilferuf," 114–22. The variant version of the Laodicea letter is noted in *ibid.*, 113. The letter from Daimbert to the faithful of Germany from 1100 is discussed, and a new passage is edited, in *ibid.*, 113–14.

⁴⁹ The Cistercians took part in preaching the Second, Third, and Fourth Crusades, as well as the Albigensian Crusade: Beverly Mayne Kienzle, "Preaching," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, ed. Mette Birkedal Bruun (Cambridge, 2013), 245–57, at 251.

⁵⁰ The letter is edited in *Epistulae*, ed. Hagenmeyer, 176–77, and is supplemented by the superior fragment edited in Kedar, "Ein Hilferuf," 113–14. The improved letter is translated in *Letters from the East*, ed. Barber and Bate, 37–38.

⁵¹ Jonathan Phillips, "The Latin East, 1098–1291," in *The Oxford Illustrated History of the Crusades*, ed. Jonathan Riley-Smith (Oxford, 1995), 112–40, at 136.

⁵² Kedar, "Ein Hilferuf," 113 n. 4.

⁵³ Damien Kempf and Marcus Bull have demonstrated the value of discerning regional groups of manuscripts in the introduction to *The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk*, ed. Damien Kempf and Marcus G. Bull (Woodbridge, 2013), xlii–xlvii.

discussion has demonstrated, the new version of the letter in Clm 23390 shares variant readings with manuscripts of all three previous recensions and most probably stems from a southern German or Austrian textual tradition. The letters in Clm 23390 and 28195 also share a small number of variant readings, meaning that the new texts are distantly related to each other.⁵⁴ Since little research has been done on the Laodicea letter in Clm 28195, it is certainly underappreciated that the manuscripts which it follows most closely also have southern German or Austrian provenances.⁵⁵

Nevertheless, despite the importance of regional groups of manuscripts, Hagenmeyer's delineation of recensions according to sections 18 and 19 is still useful since it best reflects the different stages of the transmission of the letter in the West and the reworking of the text by scribes eager to further the crusading movement – first through the addition of an excitatorium in section 18 and then by facilitating liturgical commemoration of the First Crusade in section 19. Of course there was borrowing between the texts of the different recensions, something perhaps best illustrated by the text in Clm 28195, which was probably created (either in this manuscript or in a lost exemplar) by taking the text of the letter from the first recension and updating it by adding section 18 from a copy belonging to the second recension. Such copying complicates the manuscript tradition, but it must be remembered that all versions of the second recension are of course based on the text of the first, and the very fact that Clm 28195 follows the text of the first recension so closely is surely the strongest evidence that Hagenmeyer's delineation of the recensions according to the concluding sections has merit.

⁵⁴ They both share the reading *aliqui continerent* at the end of section 5, they both add *contra hostes* to section 6, and in section 13 both share the wording *mirabilis Deus in servis suis*, they replace *vertit* with *convertit*, and both replace *nec haberent* with *non haberent*. See the edition below.

⁵⁵ Manuscript designations are those used in *Epistulae*, ed. Hagenmeyer, 111–12: G = Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 1024 Helmst. is a twelfth-century manuscript which came from Erfurt – see Martina Hartmann, *Humanismus und Kirchenkritik: Matthias Flacius Illyricus als Erforscher des Mittelalters* (Stuttgart, 2001), 243; M¹ = München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 4594 dates to the second half of the twelfth century and came from the the Benedictine monastery of Benediktbeuern in Bavaria – see Günter Glauche, *Katalog der lateinischen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München: Die Pergamenthandschriften aus Benediktbeuern: Clm 4501–4663, Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum Bibliothecae Monacensis, Tomus III, Series nova, Pars 1, Codices Latinos 4501–4663 bibliothecae Benedictoburanae continens* (Wiesbaden 1994), 154; V = Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 398 Han dates to the second half of the twelfth century probably originated from the Cistercian monastery of Heiligenkreuz near Vienna, Austria <<http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/AL00168018>> [accessed 29 July 2015]; V¹ and V⁴ = see above, n. 40; Z = Zwettl, Zisterzienserstift, Cod. 283 dates to the second half of the twelfth century and was produced in Zwettl, Austria <<http://manuscripta.at/?ID=31894>> [accessed 29 July 2015].

Conclusions

The discovery of a fourth recension of the Laodicea letter of September 1099 changes our understanding of the missive and its transmission in the Middle Ages. In its final sections, the fourth recension differs greatly from the other versions. It is clear that the scribe who created this recension concentrated on supplying an accurate copy of the events up to the Battle of Ascalon, before writing the French and Norman crusade leaders out of the history and compiling a new version of section 19 to facilitate liturgical celebration of the capture of Jerusalem. This internal evidence, combined with the relationship of this new version to other manuscripts, and the Bavarian origins of most of the Clm manuscripts in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, means that the provenance of the letter in Clm 23390 can probably be attributed to southern Germany or Austria. Further internal evidence from the manuscript reveals that this copy was made at the beginning of the thirteenth century.

The new versions of the letter in Clm 23390 and 28195 are witnesses to a flourishing interest in German participation in the crusading movement in the monastic houses of southern Germany and Austria in the early thirteenth century. The memory of the First Crusade was recalled to celebrate and commemorate the capture of Jerusalem, as a means of monastic participation in the crusading movement, and as a response to the contemporary state of the Holy Land.⁵⁶ The period from the Third Crusade (1189–92) to the Crusade of Frederick II (1228–29) – which included, of course, the foundation of the Teutonic Order and also the Fifth Crusade (1217–21) – was an era of crusading characterised by high levels of German participation. The version in Clm 23390, which aimed at celebrating German involvement in the crusading movement, was copied at the beginning of the thirteenth century in the aftermath of the Frederick Barbarossa's death on the Third Crusade. The version of the letter in Clm 28195 was created in the context of Frederick II's crusade and his recovery of Jerusalem – a momentous occasion not only to be recorded and feted, but also to be supported by the recruitment of new German defenders of the Holy Land.

One underlying aim of the present article has been to demonstrate that there is still much to learn about the First Crusade and its later reception from archival research.⁵⁷ Hagenmeyer's

⁵⁶ The text of Robert the Monk's *Historia Iherosolomitana*, for instance, was enthusiastically copied in German monasteries after the German contribution to the Second Crusade (1145–49): Robert the Monk, ed. Kempf and Bull, xliv.

⁵⁷ This has also been demonstrated recently in the introduction to Robert the Monk, ed. Kempf and Bull, which focuses on the reception of Robert's history of the First Crusade. Of particular relevance to the present article, the editors have also noted that "perhaps contrary to what one might expect of reader responses sensitive to questions

edition remains the most valuable study on the letters of the First Crusade, but research remains to be done on the manuscript traditions of the letters. Although, with nineteen different manuscript versions of the Laodicea letter now identified, we have a good source base to work from, there were surely many more copies of the letter, now lost, which would help illustrate the transmission of the letter, something the discovery of the fourth recension has complicated. There may well be other copies of letters from the First Crusade still awaiting discovery in the archives of Europe. Yet it is certain that new discoveries will be made by those who investigate in more depth the manuscript tradition of these letters, which can tell us much about interest in, and active support for, the crusading movement in the centuries after the First Crusade.

of political and national identity, Robert's Francocentric history of the crusade would seem to have enjoyed notable success in the German empire from the mid-twelfth century onwards, in particular within circles close to the emperors themselves.": Robert the Monk, ed. Kempf and Bull, xlii. The fourth recension of the Laodicea letter in Clm 23390, however, which excises section 16 praising the French and Normans, is evidence of just such sensitivity and its effect on the shaping of history.

Edition of the First Crusade Letter written at Laodicea (September 1099) in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 23390 and 28195

Note on the edition

I have included Hagenmeyer’s section numbers in square brackets. The only alterations I have made to his edition are to transpose his consonant letter “u” with the letter “v”, and to capitalise all words which follow full stops. In my editions of the manuscript letters, I have followed spelling, punctuation and capitalisation as they appear in each manuscript. Significant parts of the letter in Clm 23390 have suffered from water damage and a UV light was required in order to read these. Ellipses in square brackets indicate illegible parts of the manuscript. Words given in square brackets are readings of which I am fairly confident, but are not clearly visible to the naked eye in the manuscript – these have been identified through a combination of a UV light and comparison with Hagenmeyer’s edition; readings with question marks, however, are less certain. Future examination using the developing art of multispectral imaging would surely reveal more of the lost text.

Epistulae, ed. Hagenmeyer, no. XVIII, 167–74	Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 23390, fols. 60r–62v, 57r	Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 28195, fols. 114ra–115ra
[1] Domino papae Romanae ecclesiae et omnibus episcopis et universis Christianae fidei cultoribus ego Pisanus archiepiscopus et alii episcopi et Godefridus dux, gratia Dei ecclesiae S. Sepulcri nunc advocatus, et Raimundus comes S. Aegidii et universus Dei exercitus, qui est in terra Israel, salutem et orationem.	[Fol. 60r] Domino suo pape Romane ecclesie et omnibus [Episcopis?] universis Christiane fide cultoribus, P[isanus] archiepiscopus et alii episcopi et [G.?] gratia Dei ecclesie [S.?] sepulcri nunc advocatus et R. comes sancti [...] et universus Dei exercitus qui est in terra [...] salutem et oratione[m?].	[Fol. 114ra] Domino pape Romane ecclesie et omnibus episcopis universisque fidei Christiane cultoribus, Pisanus archiepiscopus et alii episcopi et Gotefridus Dei gratia ecclesie Sancti Sepulcri nunc advocatus et Reginmunt comes Sancti Egidii cum universo Dei exercitu qui est in terra Israel, salutem et orationem.

<p>[2] Multiplicate preces et orationes cum iocunditate et exultatione in conspectu Domini, quoniam Deus magnificavit misericordiam suam complendo in nobis ea, quae antiquis temporibus promiserat.</p>	<p>Multiplicate preces et orationes cum iocunditate [et?] [exultati]one in conspectu Domini quoniam Deus [magnificavit] suam misericordiam complendo in nobis, et quae antiquis temporibus promiserat;</p>	<p>Multiplicate preces cum iocunditate et exultatione in conspectu Domini, quoniam magnificavit misericordiam suam complendo in nobis ea que promisit in temporibus antiquis.</p>
<p>[3] Etenim cum capta Nicaea cunctus exercitus inde discederet, plus quam CCC milia armatorum ibi fuerunt, et licet haec tanta multitudo, quae universam Romaniam occupare poterat, atque epotare flumina omnia et pascere omnes segetes una die posset, tamen cum plenitudine tanta conduxit eos Dominus, ut de ariete nummus, de bove vix XII acciperentur. Praeterea etsi principes et reges Saracenorum contra nos surrexerunt, Deo tamen volente facile victi et conculcati sunt.</p>	<p>Etenim cum capta Nicea, cunctus exercitus [...] discederet, plus quam [C?]CC milia armatorum ibi fuerunt, et licet hec tanta multitudo que universam Romoniam occupare poterat, atque epotare flumina omnia, et pascere una die posset omnes segetes, tamen cum plenitudine tanta conduxit eos Dominus, ut de ariete nummus, de bove vix duodecim acciperentur. Preterea etsi principes et reges Sarracenorum contra nos surrexerunt, Deo tamen volente facile victi, et conculcati sunt.</p>	<p>Etenim cum capta Nicea cunctus exercitus discederet plus quam trecenta milia armatorum illic fuerunt et licet [fol. 114rb] hec tanta multitudo universam Romaniam occupare, flumina epotare, segetes omnes una die et pascere posset tanta tamen plenitudine conduxit vite necessaria Deus ut de ariete nummus, de bove vix duodecim acciperentur. Preterea etsi principes et reges Sarracenorum contra nos surrexerint Deo tamen volente facile victi et conculcati sunt.</p>
<p>[4] Ob haec itaque feliciter acta, quia quidam intumuerant, opposuit nobis Deus Antiochiam, urbem humanis viribus inexpugnabilem, ibique per</p>	<p>Ob hec itaque feliciter acta, quia quidam intumerant, opposuit nobis Deus Antiochiam urbem humanis viribus [fol. 60v] inexpugnabilem, ibique per</p>	<p>Ob hec itaque feliciter acta quia quidam intumerant opposuit nobis Deus Antiochiam urbem humanis viribus inexpugnabilem ubi per novem menses detentos</p>

<p>IX menses nos detinuit atque in obsidione extra ita humiliavit, donec omnis superbiae nostrae tumor in humilitatem recurrit. Igitur nobis sic humiliatis, ut in toto exercitu vix C boni equi reperirentur, aperuit nobis Deus copiam suae benedictionis et misericordiae et induxit nos in civitatem atque Turcos et omnia eorum potestati nostrae tribuit.</p> <p>[5] Cum haec quasi viribus nostris adquisita obtineremus nec Deum, qui haec contulerat, digne magnificaremus, a tanta multitudine Saracenorum obsessi sumus, ut de tanta civitate nullus egredi auderet. Praeterea fames in civitate convaluerat, ut vix ab humanis dapibus se continerent aliqui. Longum est enarrare miseras, quae in civitate fuere.</p> <p>[6] Respiciens autem Dominus populum, quem tam diu flagellaverat, benigne consolatus est eos. Itaque primo quasi pro</p>	<p>VIII menses detinuit, atque in obsidione extra ita humiliavit, donec omnis superbiae [nostre in humilitatem] tumor recurrit. I[gitur] [...] [humiliatis?] [...] [exercitu] [...] bo[ni equi] reperirentur aperuit nobis Deus copiam suae benedictionis et misericordie et induxit nos in civitatem atque Turcos, et omnia eorum potestati nostre tribuit.</p> <p>Cumque hec quasi viribus nostris adquisita obtineremus, nec Deum, qui hec contulerat digne magnificeremus, e tanta multitudine Sarracenorum obsessi sumus, ut de tanta civitate nullus egredi auderet. Praeterea fames in civitate ita convaluerat, ut vix ab humanis dapibus se aliqui continerent. Longum est enarrare miseras que in civitate fuerit.</p> <p>Respiciens autem Dominus populum quem ita diu flagellaverat benigne consolatus. Itaque primo quasi pro satisfactione</p>	<p>in obsidione eisdem ita humiliavit ut omnis superbiae nostre tumor desideret. Igitur nobis sic humiliatis ut in toto exercitu vix centum boni equi reperirentur aperuit Deus copiam suae benedictionis et misericordie nosque in civitatem induxit atque Turchos et eorum omnia potestati nostre tribuit.</p> <p>Cum hec quasi viribus nostris aquisita obtineremus nec Deum qui contulerat digne magnificaremus tanta Sarracenorum multitudine obsessi sumus ut de civitate nullus egredi auderet. Praeterea fames ita in civitate convaluerat ut vix ab humanis dapibus se aliqui continerent. Longum est enarrare miseras qui in civitate fuere.</p> <p>Respiciens autem Dominus populum quem tam diu flagellaverat benigne consolatur ac primo quasi pro satisfactione</p>
--	--	---

<p>satisfactione tribulationis lanceam suam, munus non visum a tempore apostolorum, pignus victoriae nobis obtulit.</p> <p>Deinde corda hominum adeo animavit, ut illis, quibus aegritudo vel fames ambulandi vires negaverat, arma sumendi et viriliter dimicandi virtutem infunderet.</p> <p>[7] Deinde cum triumphatis hostibus fame et taedio exercitus deficeret Antiochiae et maxime propter discordias principum in Syriam profecti, Barram et Marram, urbes Saracenorum, expugnativimus et castella regionis obtinuimus, cumque ibidem moram disposuissemus, tanta fames in exercitu fuit, ut corpora Saracenorum iam fetentium a populo Christiano comesta sint.</p> <p>[8] Deinde cum divino monitu in interiora Hispaniae progredieremur, largissimam atque misericordem et victoriosissimam manum</p>	<p>tribulationis, lanceam suam munus non visum a tempore apostolorum, pignus victoriae nobis obtulit.</p> <p>Deinde corda hominum animavit, ut illis quibus aegritudo vel fames ambulandi vires negaverant [fol. 61r] arma sumendi et viriliter contra hostes diminican[-] [...]</p> <p>[...] cum triumphatis [...]</p> <p>discor[dias]</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>[-]ma</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>castella regionis ob[tinuimus?] [...]</p> <p>[-]o[-]</p> <p>[...] disposuissemus tanta [...]</p> <p>[...] corpora Sarracenorum [...]</p> <p>[...] a populo Christiano comesta [sint].</p> <p>[Deinde?] cum divino monitu in interiora Hispanie progredieremur largissimam [...]</p>	<p>tribulationis lanceam suam munus non visum a tempore apostolorum pignus victoriae nobis obtulit [con[tulit] corrected] deinde corda hominum adeo animavit ut illi quibus aegritudo vel fames vires ambulandi negaverat arma sumendi et viriliter contra hostes dimicandi virtutem infunderet.</p> <p>Inde cum triumphatis hostibus fame et taedio exercitus deficeret Antiochie, maxime propter discordias principum in Syriam profecti, Barram et Marram urbes Sarracenorum expugnativimus, et castella regionis obtinuimus. Cumque ibi moram disposuissemus, tanta fames in exercitu fuit ut corpora Sarracenorum iam fetentium a populo Christiano comesta sint.</p> <p>Deinde cum divino monitu in interiora Hispanie progredieremur largissimam atque misericordem et victoriosissimam manum omnipotentis patris</p>
---	---	--

<p>omnipotentis patris nobiscum habuimus. Etenim cives et castellani regionis, per quam procedebamus, ad nos cum multis donariis legatos praemittebant, parati servire et oppida sua reddere.</p>	<p>victorissimam manum omnipotentis patris nobiscum habuimus. Etenim civitates et castella[-] regionii per quam procedebamus, ad nos cum multis donariis legatos premittebant, parati servire et oppida sue reddere.</p>	<p>nobiscum habuimus. Etenim cives et castelliani regionis illius per quam procedebamus ad nos cum multis donariis legatos premittebant parati servire et opida sua reddere. [Fol. 114va]</p>
<p>Sed quia exercitus noster non multus erat, et in Hierusalem unanimiter venire festinabant, acceptis securitatibus tributarios eos fecimus, quippe cum de multis una civitatibus, quae in maritimis illis sunt, plures homines haberet quam in exercitu nostro fuissent.</p>	<p>Sed quia exercitus noster non multus erat, et in Ierusalem unanimiter venire festinabant, acceptis securitatibus tributarias esse fecimus eas. Quippe cum de multis una civitatibus que in maritimis illis sunt, plures [homi]nes haberet quam in exercitu nostro [fui]ssent.</p>	<p>Sed quia exercitus noster non multus erat, et Iherusalem unanimiter festinebat acceptis securitatibus tributarios eos fecimus quippe cum de multis una civitatibus que in maritimis illis sunt, plures homines haberet quam in exercitu nostro fuissent.</p>
<p>[9] Cumque auditum esset Antiochiae atque Laodiciae et Rohas, quia manus Domini nobiscum esset, plures de exercitu, qui ibi remanserant, consecuti sunt nos apud Tyrum. Sic itaque Deo conviatore et cooperatore nobiscum usque ad Hierusalem pervenimus.</p>	<p>Cumque auditum esset Antyoche, [fol. 61v] atque Laodicie, et Rohas quia manus Domini nobiscum esset, plures de exer[citu] [qui?] ibi remanserant consecuti sunt [...]</p> <p>Deo conviatore et [cooperatore nobiscum?] usque ad Ierusalem pervenimus.</p>	<p>Cumque auditum esset Antiochie et Laodicie et Rohas quia manus Domini nobiscum esset plures de exercitu qui ibi remansit consecuti sunt nos apud Tyrum. Sic itaque Deo conviatore et cooperante nobiscum usque ad Iherusalem pervenimus.</p>
<p>[10] Cumque in obsidione illius multum exercitus laboraret, maxime propter</p>	<p>Cumq[ue] [...] illius multum exercitus labor[aret] maxime propter</p>	<p>Cumque in obsidione illius multum exercitus laboraret maxime propter aque</p>

<p>aquae inopiam, habito consilio, episcopi et principes circinandam esse civitatem nudis pedibus praedicaverunt, ut ille, qui pro nobis in humilitate eam ingressus est, per humilitatem nostram pro se ad iudicium de suis hostibus faciendum nobis eam aperiret.</p> <p>Placatus itaque hac humilitate Dominus, VIII die post humiliationem nostram civitatem cum suis hostibus nobis tribuit, eo videlicet die, quo primitiva ecclesia inde abiecta fuit, cum festum de Dispersione Apostolorum a multis fidelibus celebratur. Et si scire desideratis, quid de hostibus ibi repertis factum fuerit, scitote: quia in porticu Salomonis et in templo eius nostri equitabant in sanguine Saracenorum usque ad genua equorum.</p> <p>[11] Deinde cum ordinatum esset, qui civitatem retinere deberent et alii amore patriae et pietate parentum suorum redire voluissent,</p>	<p>aque inopiam habito consilio episcopi [et] principes, circinandam esse civitatem nudis pedibus predicaverunt, ut ille qui pro nobis in humilitate eam ingressus est, per humilitatem nostram pro se ad iudicium de suis hostibus faciendum nobis eam aperiret.</p> <p>Placatus itaque Dominus hac humilitate, octavo die post humiliatione civitatem cum suis hostibus nobis tribuit, eo scilicet die quo primitiva ecclesia inde abiecta [est?] cum festum de dispersione apostolorum a multis fidelibus celebratur.</p> <p>Et si scire desideratis quid de hostibus ibi repertis factum fuerit, scitote quod in porticu Salomonis, et in templo eius nostri equitabant in sanguine Sarracenorum usque ad genua equorum.</p> <p>Deinde cum ordinatum esset, qui civitatem retinere deberent, et alii amore patriae, alii pietate parentum suorum redi[fol. 62r]re</p>	<p>inopiam habito consilio episcopi et principes circinandam esse civitatem nudis pedibus predicaverunt, ut ille qui pro nobis in humilitate eam ingressus est per humilitatem nostram pro se ad iudicium de suis hostibus faciendum nobis eam aperiret.</p> <p>Placatus itaque hac humilitate Dominus octavo post humiliationem nostram die civitatem nobis tradidit eo videlicet die, quo primitiva ecclesia inde abiecta fuit, cum festum de dispersione apostolorum a multis fidelibus celebratur.</p> <p>Et si scire desideratis quid de hostibus ibi repertis factum fuerit scitote quia in porticu Salomonis et in templo eius nostri equitabant in sanguine Sarracenorum usque ad genua equorum.</p> <p>Deinde cum ordinatum esset qui civitatem retinere deberent et alii amore patrie et pietate parentum suorum redire voluissent, nunciatum</p>
---	---	---

<p>nuntiatum nobis est, quod rex Babyloniorum Ascalonam venisset cum innumerabili multitudine paganorum, ducturus Francos, qui Hierosolymis erant, in captivitatem et expugnaturus Antiochiam: sic ipse dixerat, aliter autem Dominus statuerat de nobis.</p>	<p>voluisse[nt] [nuntiatum] nobis est, quod rex [...] [veni]sse[t] cum innum[erabili] [...] ductur[us] [...] [captivita]tem, [et expugnaturus Antiochiam] s[ic/sicut] [...] pre[-] [...]. Aliter autem [...] nobis.</p>	<p>est nobis quod rex Babyloniorum Ascalonam venisset cum innumerabili multitudine paganorum ducturus [ducturos corrected] Francos qui Iherosolimis erant in captivitatem et expugnaturus Antiochiam sicut ipse dixerat, aliter autem Dominus statuerat de nobis.</p>
<p>[12] Itaque cum in veritate conperissemus, exercitum Babyloniorum Ascalonae esse, contendimus obviam illis, relictis sarcinis et infirmis nostris in Hierusalem cum praesidio. Cumque exercitus noster et hostium se conspexissent, genibus flexis adiutorem Deum invocavimus, ut, qui in aliis nostris necessitatibus legem Christianorum confirmaverat, in praesenti bello, confractis viribus Saracenorum et diaboli, regnum Christi et ecclesiae a mari usque ad mare usquequaque dilataret.</p>	<p>[Ita]que cum in veritate [conperissemus] exercitum [Babylon]iorum Ascalon[e] esse [...] obviam illis relictis sarcinis et [infirmis] nostris in Ierusalem cum presidio. Cumque [...] noster et hostiu[m?] se conspexissent genibus flexis adiutorem Deum invocavimus, ut qui in aliis necessitatibus nostris legem confirmaverat Christianorum in presenti bello confractis viribus Sarracenorum et diaboli, regnum Christi et ecclesiae a mari usque ad mare usquequaque dilataret.</p>	<p>Itaque cum in veritate conperissemus exercitum Babyloniorum Ascalone esse contendimus obviam illis relictis sarcinis et infirmis nostris in Iherusalem cum presidio. Cumque exercitus noster et hostium se conspexissent, genibus flexis adiutorem Deum invocavimus ut qui in aliis nostris necessitatibus legem Christianorum confirmaverat, in presenti bello confractis viribus Sarracenorum et diaboli, regnum Christi et ecclesiae a mari usque ad mare usquequaque dilataret.</p>
<p>[13] Nec mora: clamantibus ad se Deus affuit atque tantas audaciae vires</p>	<p>Nec mora, clamantibus ad se Deus affuit, atque tantas vires audaciae ministravit, ut</p>	<p>Nec mora, clamantibus ad se Deus affuit atque tantas audaciae vires ministravit ut</p>

<p>ministravit, ut, qui nos in hostem currere videret, fontem aquae vivae sitientem cervum segnem adiudicaret: miro videlicet modo, cum in exercitu nostro non plus quam V milia militum et XV milia peditum fuissent et in exercitu hostium C milia equitum et CCCC milia peditum esse potuissent. Tunc mirabilis in servis suis Dominus apparuit, cum, antequam confligeremus, pro solo impetu nostro hanc in fugam multitudinem vertit et omnia arma eorum diripuit, ut, si deinceps nobis repugnare vellent, nec haberent arma, in quibus sperarent.</p> <p>[14] De spoliis vero non est quaerendum, quantum captum sit, ubi thesauri regis Babyloniae occupati sunt. Ceciderunt ibi plus quam C milia Maurorum gladio. Timor autem eorum tantus erat, ut in porta civitatis ad II milia suffocati sint. De his vero, qui in mari interierunt,</p>	<p>qui nos in hostem currere videret, fontem aque vive sicientem cervum, segnem adiudicaret. Miro videlicet modo cum in exercitu nostro non plus quam quinque milia hominum militum, et quindecim milia peditum fuissent, et in [fol. 62v] exercitu [nostro expunged] hostium C milia equitum, et CCCC peditum esse potuissent. Tunc mirabilis Deus in servis suis apparuit cum antequam confligeremus pro solo impetu nostro hanc in fugam multitudinem convertit et omnia arma eorum diripuit ut si deinceps nobis repugnare velle[nt], non haberent arma in quibus sperarent.</p> <p>De spoliis vero non est querendum, quantum captum sit, ubi thesauri regis Babilonie occupati sunt, ceciderunt ibi plus quam C milia Maurorum gladio. Timor autem eorum tantus erat, quod in porta civitatis ad duo milia suffocati sunt. De his vero qui in mari</p>	<p>qui nos in hostes currere videret, fontem aque vive sicientem, certum segnem adiudicaret, miro videlicet modo cum in exercitu nostro non plus quam V milia militum et quindecim milia pe[fol. 114vb]ditum fuissent et in exercitum hostium centum milia equitum et quadringenta milia peditum esse potuissent. Tunc mirabilis Deus in servis suis apparuit, cum antequam confligeremus pro solo impetu nostro hanc in fugam multitudinem convertit, et omnia arma eorum diripuit ut si deinceps nobis repugnare vellent, non haberent arma in quibus sperarent.</p> <p>De spoliis vero non est querendum quantum captum sit, ubi thesauri regis Babylonie occupati sunt. Ceciderunt ibi plus quam centum milia Marorum [sic] gladio. Timor autem eorum tantus erat ut in porta civitatis ad duo milia suffocati sint. De hiis vero</p>
--	--	---

<p>non est numerus. Spineta etiam ex ipsis multos obtinuerunt. Pugnabat certe orbis terrarum pro nobis, et nisi spolia castrorum de nostris multos detinuissent, pauci essent de tanta multitudine hostium, qui renuntiare potuissent de bello.</p> <p>[15] Et licet longum sit, tamen praetereundum non est: pridie quam bellum fieret, multa milia camelorum et boum et ovium cepit exercitus.</p> <p>Cumque iussu principum populus haec dimisisset, ad pugnam progrediens, mirabile dictu, multas et multiplices turmas cameli fecerunt, similiter et boves et oves. Haec autem animalia nobiscum comitabantur, ut cum stantibus starent, cum procedentibus procederent, cum currentibus current. Nubes etiam ab aestu solis nos defenderunt et refrigerabant.</p> <p>[16] Celebrata itaque victoria, reversus est</p>	<p>interierunt, non est numerus. Spineta eciam ex ipsis multos obtinuerunt. Pugnabat certe orbis terrarum pro nobis, et quod nisi spolia castrorum de nostris multos detinuissent.</p> <p>Et licet longum sit, tamen pretereundum non est. Pridie quam bellum fieret, multa milia camelorum, et bovom, et ovium cepit exercitus.</p> <p>Cumque iussu principum populus hec dimisisset ad pugnam progressus est. Hostes autem multas et multiplices turmas fecerunt, et ut nostros in perdita allicerent et sic eos de[fol. 57r]ciperent, et boves, et oves, camelos et dra[-] [...] parere fecerunt. Hostibus devictis [...] spoliis acceptis a[-] Deo revers[i] [sumus] IERUSALEM, cum [...]</p> <p>A[nno] Dominice incarnationis millesimo LXXXX VI [...] q[uam?]</p>	<p>qui in mari interierunt non est numerus, spineta etiam ex ipsis multos obtinuerunt. Pugnabat certe orbis terrarum pro nobis, et non spolia castrorum de nostris multos detinuissent pauci essent de tanta multitudine hostium qui renuntiare potuissent de bello.</p> <p>Et licet longum sit tamen preterendum non est. Pridie quam bellum fieret multa milia camelorum et bovom et ovium cepit exercitus.</p> <p>Cumque iussu principum populus hec dimisisset, ad pugnam progrediens, mirabile dictu multas et multiplices turmas fecerunt, similiter autem et boves et oves. Hec autem animalia comitabantur nobiscum, ut cum stantibus starent cum procedentibus procederent cum currentibus current. Nubes etiam ab estu solis nos defendebant et refrigerabant.</p> <p>Celebrata itaque victoria reversus exercitus</p>
--	---	--

<p>exercitus Hierusalem, et relicto ibi duce Godefrido, Regimunt comes S. Aegidii et Robertus comes Normanniae et Robertus comes Flandrensis Laodiciam reversi sunt, ibi classem Pisanorum et Boemundum invenerunt. Cumque archiepiscopus Pisanus Boemundum et dominos nostros concordare fecisset, regredi Hierosolymam pro Deo et pro fratribus comes Regimunt disposuit.</p> <p>[17] Igitur ad tam mirabilem fratrum nostrorum fortitudinis devotionem, ad tam gloriosam et concupiscibilem omnipotentis retributionem, ad tam exoptandam omnium peccatorum nostrorum per Dei gratiam remissionem et Christi catholicae ecclesiae et totius gentis Latinae invitamus vos exultationem et omnes episcopos et bonae vitae clericos monachosque et omnes laicos, ut ille vos ad dexteram Dei considerare faciat, qui vivit et regnat</p>	<p>[die?] [ter?]cio [...] crucis celebratur [gratias?] [...] [-]spire postea in octa[vo?] [die?][...] est facta ab his [...] [Ierosolima ire] p[reparav?]erant. In [anno] vero millesimo [LX?]XXXVII [...] innumerabil[-] exercitu [...] tot[o?] fere ex divina dispositione sine capite conf[id?]ente capta est Nicea. Anno vero millesimo LXXXX VIII Anthiochia. Anno autem millesimo LXXXX VIII in i[dib]us Iulii Ierosolima.</p>	<p>Iherusalem et relicto ibi duce Gotefrido. Reinmunt comes Sancti Egidii, et Ruobpertus comes Nordmannie, et Rubpertus comes Flandrie, Laodiciam reversi sunt ibi classem Pisanorum et Boemundum invenerunt. Cumque archiepiscopus Pisanorum, Boemundum et dominos nostros concordare fecisset, regredi Iherusalem pro Deo et pro fratribus comes Reginmunt disposuit.</p> <p>Igitur ad tam mirabilem fratrum nostrorum fortitudinis devocionem, et tam gloriosam et concupiscibilem omnipotentis Dei retributionem, et tam exoptandam omnium peccatorum nostrorum per Dei gratiam remissionem, et Christi et ecclesie et tocius gentis Latine, invitamus vos exultatione et omnes episcopos et bone vite clericos monachosque et omnes laicos, ut ille vos ad dexteram Dei consedere</p>
--	--	--

<p>Deus per omnia saecula saeculorum. Amen.</p> <p>[18] Rogamus et obsecramus vos per Dominum Iesum, qui nobiscum semper fuit et conlaboravit et ex omnibus tribulationibus nos eripuit, ut sitis fratrum memores vestrorum, qui ad vos revertuntur, benefaciendo eis et solvendo debita eorum, ut vobis Deus beneficiat et ab omnibus vos peccatis absolvat, ut in omnibus bonis, quae vel nos vel illi apud Deum meruimus, partem vobis Deus concedat. Amen.</p> <p>[19] Capta est autem Hierusalem a Christianis anno Domini MXCIX, Idus Iulii, feriae VI, indictione VII, anno III profectionis eorum. Primum eorum bellum fuit apud pontem Farfar fluminis, in quo multi Turcorum interfecti sunt IX Kalendis Martii. Secundum bellum fuit apud Nicaeam III Nonis Martii, in quo pagani a Christianis victi</p>		<p>faciat. Qui vivit et regnat per omnia secula seculorem. AMEN.</p> <p>Rogamus et obsecramus vos per Dominum Iesum qui nobiscum [fol. 115ra] semper fuit et conlaboravit et ex omnibus tribulationibus nos eripuit, ut sitis fratrum memores qui revertuntur ad vos, benefaciendo illis et solvendo debita eorum ut vobis beneficiat Deus, et ab omnibus peccatis absolvat, ut in omnibus bonis que vel nos vel illi apud Deum meruimus partem vobis Deus concedat. AMEN.</p>
--	--	--

sunt. Tertium eorum bellum fuit IV Kalendis Iulii Antiochiae, lancea Domini noviter inventa eos praecedente. Quartum fuit Kalendis Iulii. In Romania vero etiam Turci devicti sunt. Quintum eorum bellum fuit Idibus Iulii, quando post tricesimum nonum obsidionis diem capta est Hierusalem. Sextum eorum bellum fuit IV Kalendis Augusti apud Ascalonam contra regem Babyloniorum, in quo C milia equitum et XL milia peditum a parvo Christianorum exercitu victi et constricti sunt. Deo gratias. Finit epistula.