

Retelling the Crusaders' Defeat in Hungary: Cultural Contact between Jewish and Christian
Chroniclers – Tzafrir Barzilay

One of the most well-known episodes of persecution perpetrated against Jews in the Middle Ages occurred in summer 1096, when groups of Crusaders who were traveling to the East to take part in the First Crusade viciously attacked Jews in several Rhineland towns.¹ After the attacks, most of the Crusaders continued to move southeastward, through Hungary to Byzantine Bulgaria and further toward Constantinople. The journey was an uphill battle: the Crusaders found it hard to obtain supplies and control their own men, and thus repeatedly came in conflict with local Christian inhabitants. One crusader army, led by Peter the Hermit, suffered a great defeat at the hands of the Bulgarians near Belgrade. Another group of Crusaders, led by Count Emicho of Flonheim, was almost completely wiped out by the Hungarians near Mosonmagyaróvár.² Only a few sources documenting these events have survived, and most of these include very few details.³ Much of the information available comes from a single source, the *Historia Ierosolimitana*, composed by Albert of Aachen in the northern Rhineland during the first quarter of the twelfth century. This account is the longest and most detailed of the First Crusade chronicles, and includes a lengthy

* This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement No. 681507). I thank Elisheva Baumgarten and Adam Kosto for reading drafts of this paper and offering valuable feedback.

¹ For some of the relevant historiography, see notes 8,9 and 10 below.

² Jay Rubenstein, *Armies of Heaven: The First Crusade and the Quest for Apocalypse* (New York: Basic Books, 2011), 55-79.

³ The short accounts: Guibert of Nogent, *Dei Gesta per Francos*, in *Guibert de Nogent, Dei gesta per Francos et cing autres textes*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens (Turnhout: Brepols, 1996), 121-122; Cosmas of Prague, *Chronica Boemorum*, MGH SS rer. Germ. N.S. 2:164; Ekkehard of Aura, *Ekkehardi Chronicon Universale*, MGH SS 6:208, 215; Ekkehard of Aura, *Hierosolymita: De oppresione, liberatione ac restauratione Hierosolymitanae ecclesiae*, in *Recueil des historiens des croisades: historiens occidentaux*, vol. 5 (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1895), 20-21; *Annalista Saxo*, MGH SS 6:730; Heinrich Hagenmeyer, *Anonymi gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1890), 106-109; Robert the Monk, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, in *Recueil des historiens des croisades: historiens occidentaux*, vol. 3 (Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1866), 731-733.

narrative of the journey of different Crusaders' groups through Hungary.⁴ However, it is interesting to note that the second longest account of these events comes from a Hebrew chronicle, in which Shlomo bar Shimshon describes how the Crusaders massacred the Jews.⁵ What is particularly intriguing is that there are several clear similarities between the Hebrew account and the Latin one. For example, both sources use a similar image to describe how Emicho's men were killed. Shlomo writes that "More than thousands – tens of thousands – drowned in the Danube River, until they walked on the backs of the drowned as if on dry land."⁶ Albert states that: "It is amazing to relate: so many of the fugitives were drowned that the waters of that very wide river could not be seen for a considerable time because there were so many thousands of bodies."⁷ As this article will show, there are several more examples of such similarities among the sources (see appendix), though there are also differences between them. Did Shlomo read Albert's chronicle? Did both writers use a common source? How was the information translated from the Latin into the Hebrew, if this happened at all? What can one learn from this about the way that Shlomo composed his account, and about how Jews and Christians shared information in twelfth-century Rhineland in general? This article aims to answer these questions.

Shlomo bar Shimshon's chronicle is one of the most famous Hebrew texts of the Middle Ages. It is one of three surviving Hebrew chronicles narrating the attacks against the Jews in 1096,

⁴ Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, ed. and trans. Susan Edgington (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007), xxiii-xxv, 12-29, 52-71.

⁵ Eva A. Haverkamp, ed., *Hebräische Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen während des Ersten Kreuzzugs* (Hannover: Monumenta Germaniae Historica and Israel Academy of Sciences, 2005), 484-489.

⁶ "וטבעו בנהר הדונאי יותר מאלף אלפים וריבי רבבות, עד שדרכו על גבם כמו שידרכו על היבשה." - Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 489. English translation in: Shlomo Eidelberg, ed., *The Jews and the Crusaders: The Hebrew Chronicles of the First and Second Crusades* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1977), 70.

⁷ "Mirabile dictu! Tanta fugitiuorum submersio facta est, ut tam spaciosi fluminis aque pre tot milium corporibus per aliquantum temporis videri non possent." - Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 56-57.

which were also described in several Latin sources.⁸ Due to the dramatic nature of these events, and the lack of other primary narrative sources documenting Jewish life in eleventh and twelfth century Europe, the Hebrew chronicles have received much historiographical attention.⁹ Historians have noted that these chronicles contain many stories or literary elements that correspond to contemporary Christian sources. Particular events are often described in similar terms in Jewish and Christians narratives, and both reflect similar cultural perceptions of martyrdom, sainthood, violence, and religious rituals.¹⁰

⁸ For a review of the Latin sources: Eva A. Haverkamp, "What Did the Christians Know? Latin Reports on the Persecutions of Jews in 1096," *Crusades* 7 (2008), 59-86. For the Hebrew sources: Avraham David, "Historical Records of the Persecutions during the first Crusade in Hebrew Printed Works and Hebrew Manuscripts," in *Facing the Cross: The Persecutions of 1096 in History and Historiography*, ed. Yom Tov Assis et al. (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2001), 193-205. New editions of the Hebrew Sources: Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 246-493; Avraham Fraenkel, Abraham Gross, and Peter Sh. Lehnardt, eds., *Hebräische liturgische Poesien zu den Judenverfolgungen während des Ersten Kreuzzugs* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2016).

⁹ For historiographical reviews: Jeremy Cohen, "A 1096 Complex? Constructing the First Crusade," in *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. Michael A. Signer and John Van Engen (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 9-26; idem, *Sanctifying the Name of God: Jewish Martyrs and Jewish Memories of the First Crusade* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 31-54; Eva Haverkamp, "Martyrs in Rivalry: The 1096 Jewish Martyrs and the Thebean Legion," *Jewish History* 23 (2009), 320-322, esp. n. 5; Avraham Grossman, "The Cultural and Social Background of Jewish Martyrdom in 1096," in *Facing the Cross*, 55-56, n. 1; Judith Bronstein, "The Crusades and the Jews: Some Reflections on the 1096 Massacre," *History Compass* 5 (2007), 1268-1279.

¹⁰ Yitzhak (Fritz) Bear, "The Persecution of 1096," in *Sefer Assaf*, ed. M.D. Cassuto et al. (Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1953), 126-139; idem, "The Religious-Social Tendency of 'Sepher Hassidim'," *Zion* 3 (1937), 3-5; Robert Chazan, *European Jewry and the First Crusade* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 38-40, 59-70, 89-90, 94; idem, *God, Humanity, and History: The Hebrew First Crusade Narratives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 190-191, 200-210; idem, "The Story of the Jewish Community of Cologne - 1096," *Alei Sefer* 11 (1984), 66-67; Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 16-18; Shmuel Shepkaru, *Jewish Martyrs in the Pagan and Christian Worlds* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 185-210; idem, "Death Twice Over: Dualism of Metaphor and Realia in Twelfth Century Hebrew Crusading Accounts," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 93 (2002), 229-238, 247-248; idem, "From After Death to Afterlife: Martyrdom and Its Recompense," *AJS Review* 24 (1999), 37-42; idem, "To Die for God: Martyrs' Heaven in Hebrew and Latin Crusade Narratives," *Speculum* 77 (2002), 311-341; Jeremy Cohen, "The 'Persecutions of 1096' – From Martyrdom to Martyrology: The Sociocultural Context of the Hebrew Crusade Chronicles," *Zion* 59 (1994), 181-185, 191-195, 199-206; idem, *Sanctifying the Name of God*, 62-64, 87-90, 120-129, 154-157; Ivan G. Marcus, "A Jewish-Christian Symbiosis: The Culture of Early Ashkenaz," in *Cultures of the Jews: A New History*, ed. David Biale (New York: Schocken, 2002), 467-472; idem, "From 'Deus Vult' to the 'Will of the Creator': Extremist Religious Ideologies and Historical Reality in 1096 and Hasidei Ashkenaz," in *Facing the Cross*, 92-100; Abraham Gross, "Historical and Halakhic Aspects of the Mass Martyrdom in Mainz: An Integrative Approach," in *Facing the Cross*, 175-176; Lucia Raspe, "The Black Death in Jewish Sources: A Second Look at 'Mayse Nissim'," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 94 (2004), 475-479; Israel Jacob Yuval, *Two Nations in Your Womb: Perceptions of Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Tel-Aviv: 'Alma/' Am 'Oved, 2000), 166-167, 176-177, 189-191, 217-218; idem, "The Language and Symbols of the Hebrew Chronicles of the Crusades," in *Facing the Cross*, 116-117; Lena Roos, "God Wants It!": *The Ideology of Martyrdom in the Hebrew Crusade*

Scholars have explained these similarities in two major ways, which are not mutually exclusive. The first suggests that the similarities stem mainly from the fact that these sources often record similar events. If Jewish and Christian sources generally agree about the “facts”, it is because they are all based, sometimes indirectly, on the reports of eyewitnesses who were present during the events. Similarities in modes of thought and language can be attributed to the fact that Jews and Christians exchanged claims about conversion, faith and devotion, even if this communication was meant as a hostile act. Thus, it is reasonable that Jews and Christians used similar terms, with some variations, to discuss issues of conversion and martyrdom.¹¹

The second historiographical approach focuses on the literary nature of the Hebrew chronicles, and suggests that as they were created, their Jewish authors were influenced by Christian ideas and perceptions, which made their way into their work. Thus, the similarities between Jewish and Christian narratives should be attributed mostly to a cultural influence of the majority over the minority (or to their shared culture), rather than to a resemblance in eyewitness accounts.¹² This article claims that at least in some cases, the writers of the Hebrew narratives of the First Crusade used Latin or vernacular Christian sources. In particular, it shows that Shlomo bar Shimshon became familiar with a version the chronicle of Albert of Aachen through oral or written vernacular channels, and used it as one of his major sources.

Chronicles and its Jewish and Christian Background (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), 87-271; Haverkamp, “Martyrs in Rivalry,” 319-335.

¹¹ Chazan, *God, Humanity, and History*, 190-191, 200-210; idem, “The Facticity of Medieval Narrative: A Case Study of the Hebrew First Crusade Narratives,” *AJS Review* 16 (1991), 31-56; idem, *European Jewry*, 38-40, 59-70, 89-90, 94; Gross, “Historical and Halakhic Aspects,” 171-172.

¹² Ivan G. Marcus, “The Representation of Reality in the Narratives of 1096,” *Jewish History* 13 (1999), 37-48; idem, “A Jewish-Christian Symbiosis,” 467-472; Cohen, “The ‘Persecutions of 1096,’” 205-208; Roos, *‘God Wants It!’*, 26-27, 270-271; Shepkaru, “To Die for God,” 334-335; Haverkamp, “Martyrs in Rivalry,” 319-335; Bear, “The Persecution of 1096,” 127-130.

Scholars who discuss the chronicle called after Shlomo bar Shimshon generally agree that it is actually a compilation of earlier sources, put together sometime between 1140 and 1146, in or around the city of Mainz. The editor of the chronicle relied on two older Hebrew chronicles (only one of which has survived) as well as on oral accounts of eyewitnesses who were still alive almost half a century after the persecution.¹³ Shlomo definitely compiled in 1140 a section of the chronicle discussing the events around Cologne in 1096, or at least the last part of it.¹⁴ Shlomo Eidelberg argue that Shlomo bar Shimshon wrote only this section, and a different editor added the other sections sometimes before 1146. He claims that the last parts of the chronicle contain stronger German influences, and thus were probably composed later.¹⁵ However, Shlomo Noble points out that influences of the Middle High German language are common throughout the text, including in the section clearly composed by Shlomo bar Shimshon. Eva Haverkamp notes that the editor of the chronicle (who also wrote parts of it) referred throughout the text to information he presented in earlier sections. She thus concludes that a single editor, probably Shlomo himself, edited the entire text, and wrote the parts that are not based on earlier sources. She adds that some parts of the text were indeed compiled around 1140 and the others shortly after, probably before 1146.¹⁶

¹³ Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 49-63, 70-136; Chazan, *God, Humanity, and History*, 52-56; Anna Sapir Abulafia, "The Interrelationship between the Hebrew Chronicles on the First Crusade," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 27 (1982), 221-239; Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 15-19; Roos, "God Wants It!", 11-16. The last possible date for the composition of the chronicle is based on the fact that the Second Crusade is not mentioned in the text. Older editions of the chronicle: Adolf Neubauer and Moritz Stern, eds., *Hebräische Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen während der Kreuzzüge* (Berlin: Simion, 1892), 1-31; Abraham M. Habermann, *Sefer Gzeirot Ashkenaz ve-Tsarfat* (Jerusalem: Tarshish, 1946), 24-6

¹⁴ "[...] עד הנה שנת תת"ק לפרט, ואני, שלמה בר שמשון, העתקתי זה המאורע במעגנצא" - Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 433; Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 55.

¹⁵ Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 15. For additional options see: Chazan, "The Story of the Jewish Community of Cologne," 63-65; Chazan, *God, Humanity, and History*, 52-54; Abulafia, "The Interrelationship between the Hebrew Chronicles," 227-231.

¹⁶ Shlomo Noble, "Yiddish Calques in Rabbinic Hebrew," *Leshonenu* 23 (1959), 174-177; Haverkamp, *Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen*, 59-63.

There is another reason to believe that Shlomo bar Shimshon was the said editor of the chronicle, based his affinity to the community of Mainz. Shlomo states at the end of the section about the events around Cologne that he composed his account in Mainz, as we have seen. Yet other sections of the chronicle, which Eidelberg suggests were edited by others, also show sympathy towards the Mainz community. Such sympathy is clearly evident in the sections describing the events in Worms and Mainz.¹⁷ Also in the last paragraphs of the chronicle, which describe the establishment of the Speyer community by Jewish refugees from Mainz in 1104, the author refers to Mainz as “our hometown, the place of our forefathers”¹⁸. The fact that two other separate sections, at the beginning and at the end of the text, show such a strong affinity to Mainz, suggest that Shlomo bar Shimson of Mainz was the one who edited them. Indeed, it is not impossible that an unknown editor, with some affiliation to the community of Mainz, compiled together Shlomo’s work with other material and edited the entire corpus sometime between 1140 and 1146. Yet, I argue, based also on the work of Noble and Haverkamp, that the most likely scenario is that Shlomo himself added the other parts to his description of the events around Cologne. I will continue to analyze the chronicle based on this premise; still most of the conclusion below are valid even if the editor was a different Jewish scholar who lived in Mainz during the fifth decade of the twelfth century.

While it is clear what sources Shlomo used to write some parts of his chronicle, the origins of other parts remain a mystery.¹⁹ Haverkamp claims that one of these parts, a description of the last supper of Jewish martyrs in the town of Xanten, represents ideas originating in a Christian cult

¹⁷ קהל מגנצא, חסידי “;”אנשי קודש חסידי עליון, קהילה הקדושה אשר במעגנצא, מגן וצינה לכל הקהילות, אשר שמם הולך בכל המדינות”¹⁷ Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 291, 313-315, 433. Some of this language originates from the Mainz Anonymous chronicle, but the later editor certainly expended on it.

¹⁸ “עיר מולדתינו, מקום אבותינו” - Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 491.

¹⁹ See parallels and differences within the Hebrew chronicles: Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 246-493; Roos, “*God Wants It!*”, 111-112, 149-151, 195-196, 221-222, 262-265, appendix.

established around the Thebean legion martyrs. She does more than just point out the similarities, and carefully discusses the ways in which Shlomo bar Shimshon could have learned about this cult and its characteristics. She even suggests that a particular Christian text, the *Passio Sanctorum Thebeorum* of Sigebert of Gembloux, could have inspired Shlomo to write his narrative of the events in Xanten. Indeed, there is a clear resemblance in some of the literary elements, as well as in the structure, between the two narratives. Still, it remains fairly plausible that Shlomo could have incorporated such elements into his text without knowing Sigebert's work, since these were well known in the shared culture of Jews and Christians. There are no particular phrases or details in Shlomo's story that are so unique that they could not have been found anywhere else other than in the *Passio*. Haverkamp thus concludes that Shlomo bar Shimshon drew upon the contemporary shared culture of Jews and Christians, but did not necessarily know and used particular Christian sources.²⁰

Still, it is possible to demonstrate that Shlomo relied on another Christian source, i.e. on a version of the *Historia Ierosolimitana* by Albert of Aachen, as a basis for some parts of his narrative. Albert probably wrote this chronicle in the northern Rhineland town of Aachen early in the twelfth century, possibly in two redactions.²¹ He used eyewitness testimonies, as well as poetic sources such as an early version of the *Chanson d'Antioche*, to present a detailed description of the crusade, including an account of the attacks against the Jews.²² This work has survived in fourteen

²⁰ Haverkamp, "Martyrs in Rivalry," 319-335.

²¹ Albert of Aachen, xxiii-xxv. For an older edition of the text, based on a different manuscript: *Recueil des historiens des croisades: historiens occidentaux*, vol. 4 (Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1879), 270-711.

²² Jay Rubenstein, "Guibert of Nogent, Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres: Three Crusade Chronicles," in *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory*, ed. Marcus Bull and Damien Kempf (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2014), 24-37; Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxvi-xxviii, 50-53; Susan Edgington, "The *Historia Iherosolimitana* of Albert of Aachen: A Critical Edition" (PhD Dissertation: University of London, 1991), 11-30; idem, "Albert of Aachen and the Chansons de Geste," in *The Crusades and Their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), 23-37. Harari shows that in addition to these sources, Albert simply invented details to complete his narrative: Yuval Noah Harari, "Eyewitnessing in Accounts of the First Crusade: The *Gesta Francorum* and other Contemporary Narratives," *Crusades* 3 (2004), 95-98.

manuscripts, seven of which were copied during the twelfth century. One of them was copied in the town of Eberbach, not far from Mainz, where Shlomo compiled his chronicle.²³ Other copies of the *Historia* circulated in the northern Rhineland at the time, and at least two of them, Albert's original manuscript and a manuscript copied around Cologne, are now lost.²⁴ Therefore, it is impossible to determine which manuscript Shlomo could have used, even if he had direct access to one. Still, it is probable Albert's chronicle was known in the area of Mainz during the 1140s.

Several historians have noted that some information in Shlomo bar Shimshon's chronicle do not appear in the earlier Hebrew chronicles or in other medieval Hebrew sources, but is mentioned in the *Historia*. Most notably, in 1953 Yitzhak Baer compared and contrasted parts of the Hebrew and the Latin texts, and concluded that Shlomo used some Christian material to write his chronicle.²⁵ However, Baer presents only a short analysis of the similarities between the chronicles, and later historians did not fully acknowledge the implications of his argument. Robert Chazan notes the similarities on several occasions, but simply states that Albert's account "corroborates" Shlomo's, thus suggesting that both chroniclers documented similar information independently.²⁶ Eidelberg takes the same position, and discusses Albert's account as an independent source to the Hebrew chronicle.²⁷ Kenneth Stow also points out one particular case

²³ Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 561 and 562. Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxxvii-xxlvii; Edgington, "The Historia Iherosolimitana," 42-57.

²⁴ Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxxvii-xlix; Edgington, "The Historia Iherosolimitana," 42-57, 63-70-72. Manuscript H originates from the monastery of Gladbach, and E from Liège. The provenance of the two contemporary manuscripts J and K is unknown. Three more manuscripts, originating in the Low Countries, were lost.

²⁵ Baer, "The Persecution of 1096," 128-130. Baer explicitly states that he does not present a full analysis of the connections between the sources. Later research has undermined many of his conclusions regarding the circumstances and the time of composition of Shlomo's chronicle: Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 49-63, 70-136; Chazan, *God, Humanity, and History*, 52-56; Abulafia, "The Interrelationship between the Hebrew Chronicles," 221-239; Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 15-19; Roos, "God Wants It!," 11-16.

²⁶ Chazan, *European Jewry*, 59-70, 89-90, 94, especially: 59, 94. Also see: Chazan, *God, Humanity, and History*, 65-67.

²⁷ Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 17-18. Also Haverkamp points out some of the similarities, but does not explain how they came to be: Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 97, 487-489, ns. 19, 23.

of similarity, and even suggests that “the Jewish report may be a copy of the Christian one,” but does not investigate this option any further.²⁸ Indeed, a close reading of these two texts side by side reveals significant correlations, as we will see. Still, the question remains: was Bear (and Stow) right to claim that the Hebrew account is based on Christian material, or are the two chronicles simply describing similar events independently?

As a first step towards answering this question, the next paragraphs will present a systematic review of the correlations between the chronicles of Shlomo bar Shimshon and Albert of Aachen, according to the order in which they appear in Shlomo’s text. There are couple such correlations in the descriptions of the events of 1096 in Mainz.²⁹ First, the local bishop promises to protect the Jews against the Crusaders, in exchange for a large amount of money and property. According to Shlomo’s text, the bishop “took the entire community into his inner chamber”,³⁰ which is similar to what is written in the *Historia*: “he settled the Jews in the very large hall of his house.”³¹ In this case, Shlomo’s wording is closer to Albert’s than to other Hebrew accounts.³² Moreover, the name of the bishop of Mainz, Ruthard, appears in these two chronicles but not in other Hebrew sources.³³ In general, Shlomo’s chronicle contains much more information about the development of the crusade than the other two Hebrew accounts. It discusses the actions that Pope Urban II took to launch the crusade, and the motivations of major European nobles, such as

²⁸ Stow, “Conversion, Apostasy, and Apprehensiveness: Emicho of Floheim and the Fear of Jews in the Twelfth Century,” *Speculum* 76 (2001), 916.

²⁹ As Chazan notes: Chazan, *European Jewry*, 61-63, 89-90, 94.

³⁰ “והכניס כל הקהל בחדר הפנימי שלי” - Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 309. Translation in: Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 28.

³¹ “Iudeos in spaciosissimo domus sue solio [...] constituit” - Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 52-53.

³² Compare: Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 293. Heinrich Graetz noted the similarity of this Latin phrase to another Hebrew account, but the wording in Shlomo’s text seems closer: Heinrich Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart: aus den Quellen neu bearbeitet* (Leipzig: Leiner, 1894), 6:360.

³³ “רוטהרט” - Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 309; “episcopum Ruothardum” - Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 50.

Godfrey of Bouillion. Most notably, it mentions Peter the Hermit and the journey of his group through the Rhineland eastwards. Peter extorted some money or provisions from the Jews of Trier, and his preaching stirred popular unrest, yet he was not involved in the persecution of Jews, which began only after his departure. Thus, earlier Hebrew chroniclers ignored him completely, yet Shlomo chose to report about his journey in detail.³⁴ The *Historia* describes Peter as the one who initiated the crusade, and acted as one of its major leaders.³⁵ The fact that Shlomo adopted this point of view supports the idea that he knew Albert's account, as do the other examples above.

Still, these examples do not prove that Shlomo knew the *Historia*. He could have learned about the events in Mainz or the development of the crusade from other sources. Indeed, Shlomo mentions that he "asked the elders concerning the entire matter", in other words, he gathered the testimonies of eyewitnesses to the events of 1096.³⁶ Such witnesses could have easily remembered the name of the local bishop at the time, or the place where the Jews found refuge. Shlomo could have learned from similar sources about the development of the crusade, including details about the actions of the pope, Godfrey of Bouillion or Peter the Hermit.³⁷ A closer look at the peculiar story of the Crusaders' goose can make this point clear. Shlomo describes how one Christian woman claimed that she was being led to the Holy Land by her goose, and that this was a miracle proving the righteousness of the Crusaders. He presents this event from the perspective of local

³⁴ Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 471, 485-489. Also see: Chazan, *European Jewry*, 53-56.

³⁵ Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 2-45. This description was probably inspired by the *Chanson d'Antioche*, or a source related to it: Suzanne Duparc-Quioç, ed., *Chanson d'Antioche* (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste P. Guethner, 1976), 20-21, 30-36.

³⁶ "עד הנה שנת תת"ק לפרט, ואני, שלמה בר שמשון, העתקתי זה המאורע במגנצא. משם שאלתי את פי הזקנים כל המעשה, ומפיהם סידרתי." - Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 433; Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 55. Chazan suggests that Shlomo used this practice to write only some of his text: "The Story of the Jewish Community of Cologne," 63-65.

³⁷ Albert of Aachen clearly used such sources, and some of these may have still circulated a few decades later: Rubenstein, "Guibert of Nogent, Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres," 36; Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxvi-xxviii; Edgington, "The *Historia Iherosolimitana*," 11-17; Harari, "Eyewitnessing in Accounts of the First Crusade," 95-96.

Jews, who were told by their Christian neighbors that this miracle was indisputable evidence that the Lord had chosen Christianity over Judaism.³⁸ Albert of Aachen presents a similar story, including the same hint of ridicule over the gullibility of lower-class Crusaders.³⁹ However, one cannot definitively conclude based on this story that Shlomo knew Albert's chronicle, since he could have learned the tale from other sources. As some historians have noted, another Hebrew chronicle, written shortly after the crusade, presents a similar story. Indeed, Shlomo's wording in this case is closer this Hebrew chronicle than to the *Historia*. Moreover, other Latin accounts, those of Guibert of Nogent and Ekkehard of Aura, report about the Crusaders' goose.⁴⁰ It is plausible that even if this story sounds like a colorful tale conceived by a creative chronicler, it reflects a historical event. Thus, the correlation between the *Historia* and Shlomo's chronicle could be best explained by both writers documenting a similar event, and not by one text influencing the other. Thus, it is not enough to point to the similarities between the texts in order to show that Shlomo indeed knew Albert's account, or that both of them had a common source.

To demonstrate a historical connection between Shlomo bar Shimshon's chronicle and the *Historia*, the next passages will focus on the last part of the Hebrew account, in which Shlomo writes about the journeys of the Crusaders through Hungary. This section has received much less attention, since it portrays events that happened after the attacks against the Jews.⁴¹ Other medieval Hebrew sources do not contain parallel sections, as their writers probably only considered relevant events that involved Jews.⁴² As noted above, most of the Christian sources also ignore these events

³⁸ Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 300-301.

³⁹ Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 58-59.

⁴⁰ Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 300-301; Guibert of Nogent, *Dei Gesta per Francos*, 331; Ekkehard of Aura, *Hierosolymita*, 19; Raspe, "The Black Death in Jewish Sources," 475-477, esp. n. 17; Rubenstein, "Guibert of Nogent, Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres," 31.

⁴¹ Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 17-18; Stow, "Conversion, Apostasy, and Apprehensiveness," 916; Chazan, *God, Humanity, and History*, 65-67; idem, *European Jewry*, 63-64; Bear, "The Persecution of 1096," 128-130.

⁴² Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 484-489.

or describe them briefly.⁴³ Thus, even the fact that the chronicles of Albert and Shlomo are the two main sources that discuss this issue in detail suggest a connection between them. Yet there are much stronger reasons to believe that such a connection existed.

The chronicles of Shlomo and Albert offer several examples of similar descriptions of the events in Hungary (see appendix). Both accounts provide a detailed depiction of the journey taken by Peter the Hermit and his men. Shlomo writes about the first contact between Peter and King Coloman I:

He [Peter] sent messengers to the king of Hungary, declaring: 'Let us pass through your land; we will go by the king's highway and we will neither eat nor drink without money.'

The king granted the Crusaders permission to pass through the entire land, but they were to proceed in a peaceful manner and not harm his subjects in any city.⁴⁴

This account relay on a Biblical passage,⁴⁵ but also presents a clear the similarity to the *Historia*:

He [Peter] sent messages right away to the ruler of Hungary, asking him to open the way into and through the middle of his kingdom to Peter and his comrades. This was granted to him, but on the condition that he would not seize and plunder in the king's lands but would keep peaceful on his journey while, indeed, all the things the army needed might be procured at a price, without brawling and dispute.⁴⁶

⁴³ See n. 3 above.

⁴⁴ Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 68. לא. דרך המלך נלך, נעברה נא בארצך, דרך המלך נלך, לא. "וישלח אליו מלאכים אל מלך הונגרייא לאמר: נעברה נא בארצך, דרך המלך נלך, נעברה נא בארצך, דרך המלך נלך, לא. " - נאכל ולא נשתה כי אם בכסף. ויתן המלך רשות לעבור בכל גבולו, הוא וכל חילו, רק שילכו בשלום ואל יזיקו לעמו בכל עיר ועיר." Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 485.

⁴⁵ Numbers 21:21-22. As other scholars have pointed out: Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 68, 159 n. 220; Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 485, n. 3.

⁴⁶ "Hiis locatis, protinus regnatori Vngrie nuncia direxit, quatenus sibi suisque consociis pateret aditus et transitus per medium regni eius. Quod illi concessum est, ea conditione interposita, ne in terra regis predam contingeret, sed pacifice uiam teneret, omnia uero quibus indigeret exercitus sine iurgio et lite precio mutarent." - Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 12-13.

Indeed, despite the differences in style and language (which can be expected), the content of these two passages is almost identical, as Bear notes.⁴⁷ Shlomo tells another story about Peter's group that resembles the *Historia*:

The enemies of the Lord [the Crusaders] departed from there and arrived at the River Danube; the river was overflowing its banks and no boats were available. Near the river was a small village. The Crusaders came and destroyed the village, and took the wood of the houses to use as logs, from which they built a bridge and crossed the river.⁴⁸

Albert described a somewhat similar situation when he discussed the hasty crossing of the river⁴⁹ between the cities of Zemun and Belgrade:

Peter [...] left Zemun with all of his companions [...] and set out to cross the Sava. But he found few ships – only a hundred and fifty in number on the whole riverbank [...]. Because of this, as many as possible of those for whom there were no ships tried their best to cross using timbers joined together and fastened with osiers.⁵⁰

In this case, there are some differences between the accounts, as one claims that the Crusaders dismantled wooden houses to build a bridge, while the other states that they constructed rafts from

⁴⁷ Bear, "The Persecution of 1096," 128.

⁴⁸ "ויסעו משם אויבי יי ויבאו עד נהר אחד ושמו דונאי, והנהר היה מלא על כל גדותיו ולא היו ספינות לעבור את הנהר. והיה שם אצל הנהר – כפר אחד, ויבאו וישחיתו הכפר ויקחו את עצי הבתים ויעשו העצים ויתקינו בהם גשר ויעברו את הנהר." – Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 485; Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 70. Also see: Bear, "The Persecution of 1096," 129. This is an unlikely story, as both the Danube and the Sava (where the said event probably happened, see below) are far too wide to be bridged using the technology available for the Crusaders: Alan V. Murray, "Roads, Bridges and Shipping in the Passage of Crusade Armies by Overland Routes to the Bosphorus 1096-1190," in *Die Vielschichtigkeit der Strasse: Kontinuität und Wandel im Mittelalter und der frühen Neuzeit; internationales Round-Table-Gespräch, Krems an der Donau, 29. November bis 1. Dezember 2007*, ed. Kornelia Holzner-Tobisch et al. (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2012), 199-201. Shlomo may have confused the crossing of the Sava by Peter's army and the crossing of the Leitha by Emicho's group: Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 22-25, 54-57; and below.

⁴⁹ Albert refers to the river "Maroam", that is the Morava. Yet, the river flowing between Zemun and Belgrade is the Sava, a tributary of the Danube. Shlomo refers only to the Danube in his account, and thus both chronicles had different kinds of incorrect information.

⁵⁰ "Petrus [...] cum uniuersis sociis Maleuillam deserens, [...] Maroam transire disposuit. Sed paucas naues, numero tantum centum quinquaginta, in toto litore reperit [...]. Vnde quamplurimi quibus naues defecerant, iunctura lignorum et copulatione uiminum transire certabant [...]" - Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 18.

available timber. Still, the problem that the Crusaders faced and the solution that they found for it are described in similar terms. In addition, both accounts characterizes Peter's group as a "great army, as innumerable as the sand of the sea".⁵¹ They also depict the attack against this group in the same manner, as Shlomo writes that "[the Hungarians] began to slay those who lagged behind,"⁵² and Albert that "they beheaded and stabbed those who were slow and at the tail end of the army."⁵³ While Shlomo insists that the attackers killed every last one of the Crusaders, Albert clarifies that they were able to regroup and many of them arrived at Constantinople.⁵⁴ Still, the parallels between these stories are clear.

After he describes the fate of Peter's group, Shlomo bar Shimshon turns to the journey of another Crusaders' group, led by Count Emicho of Flonheim, through Hungary.⁵⁵ Again, his account echoes that of Albert of Aachen. Shlomo, for example, states that: "The kingdom of Hungary was completely closed because of the enemies [the Crusaders]. [...] And they [the Crusaders] came to the edge of the kingdom of Hungary, to the city of Miesenburch, and around the walls were clay pits."⁵⁶ Albert refers to the same event:

⁵¹ "exercitus illius copiosus, ut harena maris innumerabilis" - Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 12-13. "כבד הוא מאוד ועם כחול אשר על שפת הים" - Haverkamp, *Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen*, 487. "They were very great in number, an assemblage as multitudinous as the grains of sand upon the seashore." - Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 69. Samuel 1, 13:5.

⁵² "כבר התחילו לזנוב כל הנחשלים" - Haverkamp, *Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen*, 487. Deuteronomy, 25:18.

⁵³ "ac tardos et extremos exercitus detruncare et transfigere non parcentes" - Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 20-21.

⁵⁴ Haverkamp, *Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen*, 487; Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 24-29; Chazan, *God, Humanity, and History*, 66-67.

⁵⁵ Some historians mistakenly refer to Emicho of Flonheim as "Emicho of Leiningen": Ingo Toussaint, *Die Grafen von Leiningen: Studien zur leiningischen Genealogie und Territorialgeschichte bis zur Teilung von 1317/18* (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke., 1982), 25-28; Hannes Möhring, "Graf Emicho und die Judenverfolgungen von 1096," *Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter* 56 (1992), 102-104; Stow, "Conversion, Apostasy, and Apprehensiveness," 915.

⁵⁶ "ומלכות הונגרייא סוגרת ומסוגרת מפני האויבים. [...] ויבאו עד קצה מלכות הונגרייא עד עיר מיזנבורק, וסביב לחומה בארות חימר" - Haverkamp, *Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen*, 487. Also see: Genesis, 14:10. Eidelberg's translation does not reflect well the original Hebrew.

But when they [the Crusaders] came to the king's fortress at Meseburch, which is defended by the river Danube and the Leitha with its marshes, they found the bridge and gate of the fortress closed on the orders of the king of Hungary.⁵⁷

Here, Shlomo and Albert agree not only on the general occurrences, but also on the name of the particular city where they happened, and its description as surrounded by marshes.⁵⁸ As shown above, both chroniclers also depict the killing of the Crusaders by the Hungarians in similar terms, portraying the Danube River completely filled with their bodies.⁵⁹ Thus, the story of Emicho's group provides further evidence for the correlation between the two chronicles.

Interestingly, Shlomo seems to have mixed the stories of the two Crusaders' groups, the one led by Peter and the one led by Emicho, that appear in separate sections of the *Historia*. He describes the army of Emicho as composed of people of the Rhineland, Franks, Swabians, and Austrians, which, according to Albert, makes more sense as a description of Peter's group.⁶⁰ He also states that when Emicho's men were defeated, "The Greeks pursued them from all sides till the Danube River. They fled across the bridge which Peter the Priest had made, and the bridges broke."⁶¹ The only way to make sense of this sentence is to assume that Shlomo (or his source)

⁵⁷ "Sed hiis ad presidium regis Meseburch uenientibus quod fluius Danubii et Lintax plaudibus firmat, pons et porta presidii clausa reperitur ex preceptor egis Vngarie" - Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 52-53. I have kept the name of the city as it appears in the original text.

⁵⁸ Both Albert and Shlomo use versions of the name Miesenburch, yet the city is also known as Miesenburg, Moson, Mosony, Wieselburg or Mieselburg. See: Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 52-53; Haverkamp, *Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen*, 487, n. 19; Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 70, 159, n. 226.

⁵⁹ Haverkamp, *Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen*, 489; Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 70; Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 56-57; ns. 6-7 above.

⁶⁰ "ואז באו לו הריינש, יושבי ריינוס, חיל כבד מאוד, וחיל שוואב, וחיל צרפת וחיל אושטרייך [...] וראש כולם היה אימכו הרשע, הפיחה" - Haverkamp, *Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen*, 487. Compare: "Petrus predictus et exercitus illius copiosus, ut harena maris innumerabilis qui a diuersis coniunctus conuenerat, scilicet Francigene, Sueui, Bawarii, Lotharingii" - Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 12. This description can also match the army of Gottschalk: Ibid. 44-45.

⁶¹ "וירדפו אחריהם יוונים מכל צד עד הנהר דונאי ויברחו על הגשר אשר עשה פידרון כומר וישברו הגשרים" - Haverkamp, *Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen*, 489; Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 70. Eidelberg's translation does not reflect well the original Hebrew.

mixed together two descriptions of battles fought between the Crusaders and local inhabitants, both of which took place around bridges over the Danube. The first is the battle of Peter's group against the Bulgarians near Belgrade, and the second is the battle of Emicho's group against the Hungarians near Mosonmagyaróvár (that is, Miesenburch or Mosony). The Bulgarians ("the Greeks") certainly did not attack Emicho's men, who never advanced further than the northern border of Hungary. It was not Peter, but the Crusaders who came after him, who constructed a bridge over the Leitha River (a tributary of the Danube).⁶² This is further evidence that Shlomo was familiar with some of the information presented in the *Historia*, but also an indication that this information was somehow distorted.

Even though Shlomo mixed up different parts of the narrative, it is evident that he constructed his story in a similar manner to the *Historia*. As we can see in the table below, almost all of the components of Shlomo's story appear in the first book of Albert's work, and in a similar order. Not all of the details match, but the structure of the narrative is clearly identical. One might argue that this is coincidental, and that both Albert and Shlomo simply chose to present the events in a chronological order. However, Shlomo also mentions Peter and Emicho earlier in his text, and in this case, Emicho appears before Peter, in contrast to the actual chronological order of events. When it comes to the narrative describing the occurrences Hungary, Shlomo flipped the order, probably since he organized this section of his account according to the structure presented in the *Historia*.

⁶² Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 22-25, 54-57; Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 17. Although Shlomo claims that Peter built a bridge over the Danube, there is no mention of this unlikely story in other sources: Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 485. In fact, Peter's army probably took a different route to the one used by Emicho, and never crossed the Leitha: Murray, "Roads, Bridges and Shipping," 198-202. It is also possible that Shlomo confused bridges built by the Hungarians with those built by the Crusaders, which may explain the unclear phrase "וישברו הגשרים": "pontes enim longa uetustate dirutos reparauerunt" - Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 56; n. 61 above; appendix.

Elements of Shlomo's narrative in their original order	Location in the modern edition of the <i>Historia</i>
Peter's army and his agreement with King Coloman	¶ 7, pp. 12-13
The first disagreement of Peter's men with the Hungarians	¶ 7, pp. 12-17
The crossing of the Danube / Sava / Morava	¶ 8, pp. 16-19
Conflict with the Hungarians / Bulgarians	¶ 9-10, pp. 19-21
Emicho's army besieges Miesenburch	¶ 28, pp. 52-55
Emicho gives hostages to the Hungarians	??
The slaughter of Emicho's men	¶ 29, pp. 56-57
Conclusion	¶ 29, pp. 56-59

In short, there are significant similarities between the two descriptions of the journey of the Crusaders through Hungary (see appendix). Thus, it is evident that Shlomo used the *Historia*, or a source related to it, as the basis for this section, and possibly for other parts of his account. This conclusion marks a significant contribution to the historiography presented above, as it indicates a connection between particular Jewish and Christian narratives. It differs from other attempts to show connections between the Hebrew crusade chronicles and contemporary Christian literature (with the articles by Bear and Haverkamp excluded), as these only pointed out parallel ideas, beliefs or cultural elements. However, some sections in Shlomo's chronicle and in the *Historia* share particular narrative structure, phrases, and even words. Thus, in this case it is possible to consider historical scenarios that can explain the textual similarities, and conclude which of these scenarios is the most probable.

Despite the similarities, I assert that Albert's chronicle in its original Latin form probably did not influence Shlomo's writing directly. As noted above, several manuscripts of the *Historia* circulated in the northern Rhineland during the mid-twelfth century, around the same time that

Shlomo composed his chronicle.⁶³ Still, most Jews, particularly in central Europe, had no knowledge of Latin,⁶⁴ and probably no access to the relevant manuscripts, which were usually kept in monastic libraries.⁶⁵ Therefore, it is unlikely that Shlomo (or one of his acquaintances) would have been able to copy and translate passages of the *Histora* directly from the Latin manuscript. Moreover, there are also clear differences between the accounts, as Shlomo's description of the events in Hungary contains parts that do not appear in the *Historia*.⁶⁶ Thus, the Hebrew account should be considered as a partial variant, not a copy, of the Latin one.

In his chronicle, Shlomo seems to claim that he had eyewitness accounts of the events in Hungary: "And the remnant [of the massacre against the Crusaders] came and our hearts heard and rejoiced, for the Lord showed us vengeance against our enemies."⁶⁷ A closer reading of this passage, however, suggests that Shlomo did not receive the information directly. The words referring to the audience of the news in this phrase are in the plural, and its structure gives the impression that the information about the massacre in Hungary reached the Rhineland quite quickly. Therefore, this sentence seems to indicate that the ones who received the information from the survivors were the local Jews (thus, in plural) who endured the Crusaders' attacks in 1096, and not Shlomo himself. Moreover, Shlomo declared elsewhere that he wrote his account around the year 1140, and had to rely on information related by the elders of Mainz.⁶⁸ So, how did the

⁶³ Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxxvii-xxlvii; Edgington, "The Historia Iherosolimitana," 42-57.

⁶⁴ Kirsten A. Fudeman, *Vernacular Voices: Language and Identity in Medieval French Jewish Communities* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), 1-2, 14-18; Raspe, "The Black Death in Jewish Sources," 477; Roos, "God Wants It!," 42-46.

⁶⁵ Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxxvii-xxlvii; Edgington, "The Historia Iherosolimitana," 42-57.

⁶⁶ For example, the description of the conflict between the Hungarians and the Crusaders over the selling of food, and of the hostages who turned against Emicho: Haverkamp, *Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen*, 484-489. There are some vague parallels in the *Historia*, but Shlomo may have simply invented these details or found them elsewhere: Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 18-21, 66-71. Bear and Eidelberg note these "mistakes" in Shlomo's account: Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 17-18; Bear, "The Persecution of 1096," 129.

⁶⁷ "והפליטה באה ושמעה ושימח לבנו, כי הראנו יי נקמה באויבינו." - Haverkamp, *Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen*, 489.

⁶⁸ Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 433.

information conveyed by the survivors of the massacre in Hungary reach Shlomo decades later? One possible explanation may be that Jewish elders conveyed the testimonies they heard in 1096 to Shlomo later on, or that he himself met old Christian survivors. However, we have noted that Shlomo's text is very similar to the *Historia* in some particular details and phrases. It is unlikely that though Shlomo worked around forty years after Albert, they both heard such similar testimonies. Another explanation suggests that a different Hebrew writer, working closer to the time of the battles in Hungary, composed this description, and Shlomo later added it to his account of the events around Mainz and Cologne. Yet the different sections seem similar in language and style, and combine logically into a complete narrative.⁶⁹ It is more likely that the way Albert describes hearing of the story inspired Shlomo's claims that he based his account on survivors' testimonies. In reference to the great massacre of the Crusaders, Albert declares: "those who were present and escaped with difficulty swear this is true."⁷⁰ It seems that Shlomo adopted this statement, maybe in an attempt to hide the fact that he was using a Christian source to write his text.

If this is the case, it is even more difficult to explain how Shlomo learned the information documented in Albert's chronicle, considering he probably had no direct access to the Latin text. There are two plausible scenarios; both assume that Shlomo used some vernacular version of a First-Crusade account. The first scenario suggests that a German version of the *Historia* circulated around the Rhineland during the first half of the twelfth century, but has not survived in any

⁶⁹ See discussion of the reasons to believe that Shlomo bar Shimshon was the single editor of the chronicle above, and also: Haverkamp, *Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen*, 59-63.

⁷⁰ "sicut hii pro uero affirmant qui presentes uix euaserunt" - Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 48-49. This kind of statement appears occasionally throughout Albert's text: Harari, "Eyewitnessing in Accounts of the First Crusade," 95-96.

manuscripts.⁷¹ Alternatively, several oral or written accounts of the crusade could have been circulating in the area at the time, and if so, Albert and Shlomo could have come across similar such accounts a few decades apart. Indeed, several historians suggested that Albert used an older source known as the Lotharingian Chronicle, which did not survive.⁷² Most notably, in 1966 Peter Knoch compared the *Historia* to the chronicle of William of Tyre and found significant similarities between them, but also some variations. Thus, he suggested that the two texts had a common source, i.e. the Lotharingian Chronicle.⁷³ However, Susan Edgington claims that it is possible that William simply used a partial copy of Albert's chronicle, and that the differences between the two sources result from William's editing work. Still, she agrees that Albert used some written or oral vernacular sources that did not survive, even if he did not use a whole unknown chronicle.⁷⁴ The same sources could have also been available to Shlomo. Both scenarios maintain that Shlomo heard or read the story of the Crusaders in Hungary, and maybe other details later incorporated into his narrative, in Middle High German and translated them into Hebrew.

It is difficult to determine which of these scenarios (which are not mutually exclusive) is more likely, but there are reasons to believe that Shlomo indeed used a vernacular account of the crusade. It is quite clear that Shlomo knew Middle High German well, possibly as his native

⁷¹ A few old-French poems inspired by the First Crusade circulated during the twelfth century, namely the *Chanson d'Antioche*, the *Chanson de Jérusalem* and the *Chanson des chétifs*: Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxvii. Clearly, there was an interest in vernacular descriptions of the crusade, yet no German equivalent has survived. The first full vernacular translation of a crusade chronicle, that of William of Tyre, was made sometime in the early thirteenth century: Philip David Handyside, "The Old French Translation of William of Tyre" (PhD dissertation, Cardiff University, 2012), 119-127. Still, it is possible that parts of Albert's chronicle were transmitted orally in the vernacular, even if there was no official translation.

⁷² For the relevant historiography, see: Edgington, "The *Historia Iherosolimitana*," 17-23.

⁷³ Peter Knoch, *Studien zu Albert von Aachen: Der erste Kreuzzug in der deutschen Chronistik* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1966), 29-63, 152-206.

⁷⁴ Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxvi-xxviii; Edgington, "The *Historia Iherosolimitana*," 11-30; Edgington, "Albert of Aachen and the *Chansons de Geste*," 23-37. And also: Rubenstein, "Guibert of Nogent, Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres," 36. Moreover, the idea that lost unedited sources formed the basis for the complete and fairly coherent chronicles of the crusade is plausible: Jay Rubenstein, "What is the *Gesta Francorum*, and who was Peter Tudebode?," *Revue Mabillon* 16 (2005), 179-204.

language. Noble has shown that the language of Shlomo bar Shimshon, like that of the other Hebrew chroniclers of the First Crusade, was heavily influenced by the vernacular German. This is evident not only in particular terms and phrases, but also in certain grammatical structures.⁷⁵ This is true for the entire chronicle, including the parts that were apparently influenced by the *Historia*. If these parts were a direct translation of the Latin text, one would expect to see more Latin influences on Shlomo's language and fewer German ones, but this is not the case. For example, Shlomo refers to the Danube River by the name "Donai", which is closer to German (*Donau*) or Slavic (*Dunaj*) dialects than to the Latin (*Danubium*).⁷⁶ In addition, when the chronicle refers to Emicho in the context of his journey into Hungary, it mentions the name of his hometown, Flonheim or Vlanheim.⁷⁷ Though Emicho was a prominent figure in the crusade, and in the massacre of Jews, no other contemporary chronicle, Hebrew or Latin, mentions his hometown by name.⁷⁸ Thus, Shlomo probably learned of this (German) name from an unknown vernacular source, and not from the Latin version of the *Historia*. Another example that indicates a vernacular source for the text is the references to Peter the Hermit. We have noted that Shlomo is the only

⁷⁵ Noble, "Yiddish Calques in Rabbinic Hebrew," 174-177; Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 15. Also see: Erika Timm, *Graphische und phonische Struktur des Westjiddischen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Zeit um 1600* (Tübingen: Niemeyer 1987), 357-386. For different opinions regarding the language spoken by Jews in the medieval German Empire: Alexander Beider, *Origins of Yiddish Dialects* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 1-10.

⁷⁶ "דונאי" - Haverkamp, *Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen*, 487-489. The Latin form is "Danubius," e.g. Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 14, 16, 52, 56. The Middle High German term is "Tuonowe" (but later Donaw or Donau): Jacob Grimm, *Deutsche Grammatik, Vierter Theil* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1898), 1:479. Shlomo, like Jews in later generations, used a form closer to the Slavic "Dunaj": Beider, *Origins of Yiddish Dialects*, 428. For the Slavic influence on early Judeo-German: Timm, *Graphische und phonische Struktur des Westjiddischen*, 360-361.

⁷⁷ "וראש כולם היה אימכו הרשע, הפיחה מולגהים" - Haverkamp, *Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen*, 487.

⁷⁸ Haverkamp, *Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen*, 267, 307-315; Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 50-57; Ekkehard of Aura, *Ekkehardi Chronicon Universale*, 6:208, 215; Ekkehard of Aura, *Hierosolymita*, 5:20; *Annalista Saxo*, MGH SS 6:729-730; Otto of Freising, *Chronica sive Historia de duabus civitatibus*, MGH SS rer. Germ. 45:311; Toussaint, *Die Grafen von Leiningen*, 26-28; Möhring, "Graf Emicho," 102-103. Only a document composed in 1098 mentions a "comes emicho de Vlanheim." It is unlikely that an "Emicho comes de Flanheim," mentioned in a document from 1139, is the same person: Heinrich Beyer, ed., *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der jetzt die Preussischen Regierungsbezirke Coblenz und Trier bildenden mittelrheinischen Territorien*, vol. 1 (Coblenz: Hölsher, 1860), 451, no. 395; 568, no. 512.

Hebrew writer to mention Peter, and this suggests that Christian traditions led him to do so. Still, he does not refer to Peter by his Latin name, that is Petrus, but by vernacular versions of this name. When Shlomo first mentions Peter, he calls him “Piderbalrat”, probably a mispronunciation of “Peter Prälat”, that is Peter the Prelate in Middle High German.⁷⁹ Later, he refers to him as “Pidron the priest”, a unique form of this name, which does not appear in the *Historia*, nor in other Latin sources.⁸⁰ Only the vernacular French *Chansons* preserve a similar version of this name, “Pieron” or “Pierron”.⁸¹ While it is impossible to determine whether Shlomo had a direct access to the *Chansons* (i.e., to early versions of them), other vernacular traditions may have preserved a similar form of the name. Moreover, since Albert of Aachen probably relied on an early version of the *Chanson d'Antioche*, and maybe on other related poems, a vernacular version of the *Historia* could have also referred to Peter by this unique name.⁸² Thus, these examples suggest that Shlomo used a vernacular version of the *Historia*, or other vernacular sources related to it, and not the Latin text itself as his source.

To conclude, the evidence suggests that in order to write his account Shlomo used a Christian source (or sources) related to the chronicle of Albert of Aachen, which he probably accessed in a Middle High German version. The part describing the defeat of the Crusaders in Hungary is almost certainly based on such a source, and other passages discussing the development

⁷⁹ “והוא הנקרא פידרבלרט” - Haverkamp, *Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen*, 470-471, esp. n. 3.

⁸⁰ “פידרון הכומר” - Haverkamp, *Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen*, 471, 485-487. “Sacerdos quidam Petrus nomine, quondam heremita” - Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 2. Guibert of Nogent, *Dei Gesta per Francos*, 121.

⁸¹ *Chanson d'Antioche*, 30, 40, 317, 364; Nigel R. Thorp, ed., *The Old French Crusade Cycle: La Chanson de Jérusalem* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1992), 162, 165, 174, 185, 191-192, 194, 212-214; Geoffrey M. Myers, ed., *The Old French Crusade Cycle: Les chétifs* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1981), 11, 40, 42, 56, 84.

⁸² Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxvi-xxviii; Edgington, “The *Historia Iherosolimitana*,” 11-17, Edgington, “Albert of Aachen and the *Chansons de Geste*,” 23-37. The language of Rhineland Jews was influenced by medieval French, and it is possible that Shlomo could have known the *Chansons*, which were indeed circulated in the Rhineland, in their original language, but the evidence is slim: Timm, *Graphische und phonische Struktur des Westjiddischen*, 361-365; Beider, *Origins of Yiddish Dialects*, 375-411.

of the crusade may also be influenced by it. This is an important conclusion for the study of the First-Crusade chronicles. While it is evident that some of these chronicles influenced each other, historians often assume that such influence was direct — that one writer simply read the works of one or more of his predecessors.⁸³ However, in our case it is probable that Shlomo was influenced by the *Historia*, or a source related to it, through a Middle High German version. Such a version has not survived in any manuscript, and may have been transmitted exclusively in oral form. Still, the Middle High German version maintained so many linguistic and structural elements from the original Latin text, that, despite the translation, one can still find similarities between Albert's and Shlomo's descriptions of the events. This is an indication that versions of crusade chronicles circulated far beyond people who were well versed in Latin.

But even if Shlomo could have easily accessed Christian sources describing the crusade, this still does not explain why he would bother incorporating them into his chronicle. As shown above, older Hebrew accounts, as well as eyewitnesses' testimonies, supplied him with plenty of details regarding the attacks against the Jews in 1096.⁸⁴ And yet, he chose to include information not directly relevant to these events, in particular the description of the Crusaders' journey through Hungary. The end of the account provides an explanation for why he made this choice. Shlomo finishes his description of the massacre of the Crusaders with the statement: "the Lord shattered the pride of our enemies, and their name was uprooted."⁸⁵ He adds a series of biblical verses describing the vengeance of God against the enemies of the Jews, and the future salvation of Israel.

⁸³ In the context of this study: Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxvi-xxviii; Edgington, "The Historia Iherosolimitana," 11-30; idem, "Albert of Aachen and the Chansons de Geste," 23-37; Rubenstein, "Guibert of Nogent, Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres," 24-37; idem, "What is the Gesta Francorum?," 179-204; Harari, "Eyewitnessing in Accounts of the First Crusade," 77-99.

⁸⁴ Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 49-63, 70-136, 433; Chazan, *God, Humanity, and History*, 52-56, 63-65; Abulafia, "The Interrelationship between the Hebrew Chronicles," 221-239; Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 15-19; Roos, "God Wants It!," 11-16.

⁸⁵ "שיבר יי גאון אויבינו ונעקרו שמם" - Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 489; Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 71.

Finally, he dedicates a short passage to the building of a new synagogue in Speyer and the rehabilitation of the Jewish community there.⁸⁶ In this manner, Shlomo alters the overall message of his narrative, focusing it on the vengeance of God, the salvation of the Jews and the reestablishment of the communities rather than on the destruction of 1096.⁸⁷ Shlomo may have chosen to present his narrative in this manner since he was writing more than forty years after the events, when the Jewish communities in the Rhineland were already flourishing. Other Hebrew chroniclers, who wrote shortly after the massacre of the Jews, chose less optimistic endings for their narratives. The Mainz Anonymous chronicle does not end with a clear conclusion, and Eliezer bar Nathan focuses on the reward that the martyrs could expect in the afterlife. Shlomo could not have found an example of actual events representing divine retribution against the Crusaders in these narratives (or similar ones).⁸⁸ Yet, this element was crucial for his message, because it showed that the divine order, as he saw it, was maintained. God punished the Crusaders, who deserved their defeat, and allowed the Jews to prosper again. Shlomo had to turn to Christian sources to find a text presenting such a message.

Moreover, Shlomo found in Albert's chronicle (or in a vernacular source related to it) criticism against the Crusaders, and in particular against Emicho and his men. After describing the massacre that the Hungarians committed against Emicho's army, Albert states:

In this the hand of God is believed to have been against the pilgrims, who had sinned in his eyes by excessive impurities and fornications unions, and had punished the exiled Jews (who are admittedly hostile to Christ) with a great massacre, rather from greed for their

⁸⁶ Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 490-493.

⁸⁷ As other scholars note: Bear, "The Persecution of 1096," 129-130; Chazan, *God, Humanity, and History*, 66-67; Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 19.

⁸⁸ Haverkamp, *Hebräische Berichte*, 373-375, 469. That being said, the other Hebrew chronicles present ideas of divine retribution against the Christians, yet this retribution is expected at the End of Days, not as a historical event: Yuval, *Two Nations in Your Womb*, 108-114, 119-123, 151, 156-159; Shepkaru, *Jewish Martyrs*, 192-205.

money than for divine justice, since God is a just judge and commands no one to come to the yoke of the Catholic faith against his will or under compulsion.⁸⁹

Clearly, Albert wished the conversion of the Jews and the conquest of Jerusalem, but he doubted the motives of some of the Crusaders and criticized their actions. He presented the massacre of the Jews as proof that they disregarded divine will, and acted out of avarice. This attitude may have convinced Shlomo that he could use the story of the Crusaders in Hungary to convey a similar message in his own chronicle.

The analysis presented here is an important step toward a better understanding of the editing and composition process performed by Shlomo bar Shimshon. It can also serve to draw broader conclusions regarding the cultural connections between Jews and Christians during the first half of the twelfth century. First, we have seen that Shlomo was willing to use Christian sources as part of his text, even though his narrative focuses on themes of Jewish seclusion and martyrdom. While Shlomo abbreviated the story depicting the journey of the Crusaders through Hungary and concentrated on their defeats, he apparently kept many of the unique literary, linguistic and structural elements of the original account (as one can reconstruct based on the *Historia*). Even if Christians told and wrote this story as part of their crusading narrative, Shlomo did not see it as an inherently Christian story, and used it for his own purposes. This conclusion suggests that Shlomo could have used other Christian sources to fill in gaps in his account, or shed light on issues he considered meaningful. However, the authors or editors of the other Hebrew crusade chronicles, who composed their accounts closer to the massacre of the Jews, may have been reluctant to do so. In order to say more regarding these issues, historians should study the

⁸⁹ “Hic manus Domini contra peregrinos esse creditur, qui nimiis inmundiciis et fornicario concubitu in conspectu eius peccauerunt, et exules Iudeos licet Christo contrarios, pecunie auaricia magis quam pro iusticia Dei graui cede mactauerant, cum iustis iudex Deus sit, et neminem inuitum coactum ad iugum fidei Catholice iubet uenire.” - Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 58-59.

Hebrew crusade chronicles as part of the general literature produced following the First Crusade, while carefully considering the possibility that detailed narratives crossed lingual and geographical boundaries.⁹⁰

Secondly, if indeed the story of the Crusaders' journey through Hungary reached Shlomo through vernacular sources, it is an intriguing example of the exchange of narratives between Christians and Jews. Only rarely is it possible to determine what kind of information was transferred via such oral vernacular channels, yet in our case, it is clear that the two groups shared some fundamental stories. This supports the arguments presented by Bear, Haverkamp and other historians who claim that the writers of the Hebrew chronicles used information available in their environment, including Christian ideas, narratives, and sources.⁹¹ At the same time, it is clear that tracking such intercultural connections can be methodologically challenging, and often lead to speculative arguments. To deal with this challenge, this article relied mostly on a close parallel reading of the Hebrew and Latin sources, as well as on linguistic tools that shed light on the vernacular origin of particular names or phrases. Using a similar approach to study more of the early texts of European Jewry can contribute much to a field constricted by limited historical sources.

⁹⁰ As was the case with Latin and vernacular sources: Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxvi-xxviii; Edgington, "The Historia Iherosolimitana," 11-30; idem, "Albert of Aachen and the Chansons de Geste," 23-37; Rubenstein, "Guibert of Nogent, Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres," 24-37; idem, "What is the Gesta Francorum?," 179-204; Harari, "Eyewitnessing in Accounts of the First Crusade," 77-99.

⁹¹ See note 12 and related discussion above.

Appendix – The *Historia Ierosolimitana* and Shlomo's chronicle: A side-by-side comparison

The <i>Historia Ierosolimitana</i>	Shlomo bar Shimshon's chronicle
<p>“exercitus illius copiosus, ut harena maris innumerabilis qui a diuersis coniunctus conuenerat, scilicet Francigene, Sueui, Bawarii, Lotharingii” - Albert of Aachen, 12.</p>	<p>”כבד הוא מאוד ועם כחול אשר על שפת הים [...] ואז באו לו הריינש, יושבי ריינוס, חיל כבד מאוד, וחיל שווא, וחיל צרפת וחיל אושטרייך” - Haverkamp, 487</p>
<p>“Hiis locatis, protinus regnatori Vngrie nuncia direxit, quatenus sibi suisque consociis pateret aditus et transitus per medium regni eius. Quod illi concessum est, ea conditione interposita, ne in terra regis predam contingeret, sed pacifice uiam teneret, omnia uero quibus indigeret exercitus sine iurgio et lite precio mutuarent.” - Albert of Aachen, 12.</p>	<p>”וישלח אליו מלאכים אל מלך הונגרייא לאמר: נעברה נא בארצך, דרך המלך נלך, לא נאכל ולא נשתה כי אם בכסף. ויתן המלך רשות לעבור בכל גבולו, הוא וכל חילו, רק שילכו בשלום ואל יזיקו לעמו בכל עיר ועיר.” - Haverkamp, 485</p>
<p>“Petrus [...] cum uniuersis sociis Maleuillam deserens, [...] Maroam transire disposuit. Sed paucas naues, numero tantum centum quinquaginta, in toto litore repert [...]. Vnde quamplurimi quibus naues defecerant, iunctura lignorum et copulatione uiminum transire certabant [...]” - Albert of Aachen, 18.</p>	<p>”ויסעו משם אויבי יי ויבאו עד נהר אחד ושמו דונאי, והנהר היה מלא על כל גדותיו ולא היו ספינות לעבור את הנהר. והיה שם אצל הנהר כפר אחד, ויבאו וישחיתו הכפר ויקחו את עצי הבתים ויעשו העצים ויתקינו בהם גשר ויעברו את הנהר.” - Haverkamp, 485</p>
<p>“ac tardos et extremos exercitus detruncare et transfigere non parcentes” - Albert of Aachen, 20.</p>	<p>”כבר התחילו לזנוב כל הנחשלים” - Haverkamp, 487</p>
<p>“sicut hii pro uero affirmant qui presentes uix euaserunt” - Albert of Aachen, 48</p>	<p>”והפליטה באה ושמעה” - Haverkamp, 489</p>
<p>“episcopum Ruothardum” - Albert of Aachen, 50.</p>	<p>”ההגמון שלהם רוטהרט” - Haverkamp, 309</p>
<p>“Iudeos in spaciosissimo domus sue solio [...] constituit” - Albert of Aachen, 52.</p>	<p>”והכניס כל הקהל בחדר הפנימי שלו” - Haverkamp, 309</p>

<p>“Sed hiis ad presidium regis Meseburch uenientibus quod fluuius Danubii et Lintax plaudibus firmat, pons et porta presidii clausa reperitur ex preceptor egis Vngarie” - Albert of Aachen, 52.</p>	<p>"ומלכות הונגרייא סוגרת ומסוגרת מפני האויבים. [...] ויבאו עד קצה מלכות הונגרייא עד עיר מיזנבורק, וסביב לחומה בארות חימר" - Haverkamp, 487.</p>
<p>“Bulgari [...] e duabus eruperunt portis, in sagittis et lanceis, et graui uulnere, et sic in uirtute magna repressos, uniuersos in fugam uerterunt. Quorum quingenti a ponte corruentes, undis inmersi ac suffocati sunt.” - Albert of Aachen, 22. “Pontes enim longa uetustate dirutos reparauerunt” [...] “Vngari [...] sine tardatione fugientes persequantur” - Albert of Aachen, 56.</p>	<p>"וירדפו אחריהם יוונים מכל צד עד הנהר דונאי ויברחו על הגשר אשר עשה פיזרון כומר וישברו הגשרים" - Haverkamp, 489 (Note that elements from both Latin stories are incorporated into the short Hebrew phrase)</p>
<p>“Mirabile dictu! Tanta fugitiuorum submersio facta est, ut tam spaciosi fluminis aque pre tot milium corporibus per aliquantum temporis videri non possent.” - Albert of Aachen, 56.</p>	<p>"וטבעו בנהר הדונאי יותר מאלף אלפים וריבי רבבות, עד שדרכו על גבם כמו שידרכו על היבשה." - Haverkamp, 489</p>
<p>“Anserem quandam diuino asserebant spiritu afflatam, et capellam non minus eodem repletam, et has sibi duces huius uie sancta fecerant in Ierusalem, quas nimium uenerabantur, ac bestiali more hiis intendentes plurime copie ex tota animi intentione uerum id esse credebant affirmantes.” - Albert of Aachen, 58.</p>	<p>"ויהי היום, ותבא גויה אחת ותביא עמה אווזה אשר היתה מגדלת משהית אפרוח. והיה האווזה הולך בכל מקום שהגויה הולכת, והיתה צווחת ואומרת לכל עובר ושב: ראו, שזה האווזה מבין בעצמו מה שאמרתי, לילך לתעות, ורוצה גם היא לילך עמי. אז נתקבצו התועים והעירונים ועמי הארץ עלינו, ויאמרו אלינו: איה ההבטחה שלכם? איך תוכלו להנצל? עתה תיראו, כי אילו האותות עשה להם הצלוב לעיניהם, כדי לעשות נקמה באויביהם." - Haverkamp, 300.</p>