

The Uses of the Bible in Crusader Sources

Edited by

Elizabeth Lapina
Nicholas Morton



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Contents

List of Illustrations VIII
List of Abbreviations IX
Notes on Contributors XI

Introduction 1

PART 1

Exercise of Violence

- 1 The Crusader Conquest of Jerusalem and Christ's Cleansing of the Temple 19
Katherine Allen Smith
- 2 Violent Hermeneutics of Sacred Space in Jewish and Christian Crusade Literature 42
Uri Shachar
- 3 The Sack of Jerusalem in 1099 and Crusader Violence Viewed by Contemporary Chroniclers 63
Luigi Russo
- 4 The Slaughter of the Innocents and the Depiction of Children in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Sources of the Crusades 74
Sini Kangas

PART 2

The Chronicles of the First Crusade

- 5 Reading Raymond: The Bible of Le Puy, the Cathedral Library and the Literary Background of the *Liber* of Raymond of Aguilers 105
Thomas Lecaque
- 6 '*Hoc enim non fuit humanum opus, sed divinum*': Robert the Monk's Use of the Bible in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* 133
Carol Sweetenham

- 7 **Scriptural Allusion in the Crusading Accounts of Frutolf of Michelsberg and his Continuator** 152
T. J. H. McCarthy

PART 3

Papal Correspondence and Crusade Propaganda

- 8 **The Use of the Bible in Twelfth-Century Papal Letters to Outremer** 179
Miriam Rita Tessera
- 9 **The Use of the Bible in the *Arengae* of Pope Gregory IX's Crusade Calls** 206
Thomas W. Smith
- 10 **'Until the Full Number of Gentiles Has Come In': Exegesis and Prophecy in St Bernard's Crusade-Related Writings** 236
Kristin Skottki
- 11 **The Exegesis of Violence in the Crusade Writings of Ralph Niger and Peter of Blois** 273
John D. Cotts

PART 4

James of Vitry

- 12 **Living in the Penultimate Age: Apocalyptic Thought in James of Vitry's *ad status* Sermons** 297
Lydia M. Walker
- 13 **Preaching and Narrating the Fifth Crusade: Bible, Sermons and the History of a Campaign** 316
Jessalynn Bird
- 14 **'*Consenescentis mundi die vergente ad vesperam*': James of Vitry's *Historia Orientalis* and Eschatological Rhetoric after the Fourth Lateran Council** 341
Jan Vandeburie

PART 5

The Crusading Movement and the Crusader States

- 15 **Providential History in the Chronicles of the Baltic Crusades** 361
Torben Kjersgaard Nielsen
- 16 **Walls of Defence for the House of Israel: Ezekiel 13:5 and the Crusading Movement** 403
Nicholas Morton
- 17 **The Maccabees in the Lord's Temple: Biblical Imagery and Latin Poetry in Frankish Jerusalem** 421
Julian Yolles
- 18 **'As it is Said in Scripture and in Law': The Bible in the Crusader Legal System** 440
Adam M. Bishop
- 19 **The 'Holy Women' in the Liturgy and Art of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Twelfth-Century Jerusalem** 455
Iris Shagrir
- Select Bibliography** 477
- Index of Biblical Citations and References to Biblical Books** 481
- General Index** 488

The Maccabees in the Lord's Temple: Biblical Imagery and Latin Poetry in Frankish Jerusalem

Julian Yolles

Introduction

As part of a broader effort to identify the use of biblical imagery in sources on the crusades, a flurry of recent scholarship has centred on the Maccabees and their representation as exemplary figures or, in some cases, as counter examples.¹ These studies have drawn the contours of an extensive tradition preceding the First Crusade in which the Jewish Maccabees were considered to be virtuous warriors worthy of emulation by Christians, while also identifying relevant parallel traditions in Armenian sources. In recent years especially, the work of Elizabeth Lapina, Nicholas Morton and Luigi Russo has done much to trace a development of Maccabean imagery across the sources written in the context of the crusades, from broader figures of martyrdom and bravery in lit-

1 Christoph Auffarth, *Irdische Wege und himmlischer Lohn: Kreuzzug, Jerusalem und Fegefeuer in religionswissenschaftlicher Perspektive*, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte 144 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002); Mary Fischer, "The Books of the Maccabees and the Teutonic Order", *Crusades* 4 (2005): 59–71; René Richtscheid, "Die Kreuzfahrer als 'Novi Machabei': zur Verwendungsweise der Makkabämetaphorik in chronikalischen Quellen der Rhein- und Masslande zur Zeit der Kreuzzüge", in *Campana pulsante convocati: Festschrift anlässlich der Emeritierung von Prof. Dr. Alfred Haverkamp*, ed. Frank G. Hirschmann and Gerd Mentgen (Trier: Kilomedia, 2005), 473–86; Elizabeth Lapina, "Things Done in a Foreign Land': Representations of the First Crusade in the Twelfth Century" (PhD diss., Johns Hopkins University, 2007); Daniel Joslyn-Siemiatkoski, *Christian Memories of the Maccabean Martyrs* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); Nicholas Morton, "The Defence of the Holy Land and the Memory of the Maccabees", *Journal of Medieval History* 36 (2010): 275–93; Sylvain Gouguenheim, "Les Maccabées, modèles des guerriers chrétiens des origines au XIIe siècle", *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale Xe–XIIe siècles* 54 (2011): 3–20; Elizabeth Lapina, "The Maccabees and the Battle of Antioch", in *Dying for the Faith, Killing for the Faith: Old-Testament Faith-Warriors (1 and 2 Maccabees) in Historical Perspective*, ed. Gabriela Signori (Leiden: Brill, 2012); Luigi Russo, "Continuité et transformations de la typologie des Maccabées jusqu'aux origines du mouvement des croisades", in *La typologie biblique comme forme de pensée dans l'historiographie médiévale*, ed. Marek Thue Kretschmer (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 53–76. See also the contribution in this volume of Thomas Lecaue.

erature dealing with the First Crusade, to paragons of military prowess and saintly virtue specifically associated with the military orders.

Not one study, however, has traced this development within a single geographic area. Given the wealth of information that has been drawn together by scholars, it is now possible to perform much more specialized case studies. I propose to discuss here a set of sources with connections to a single monastic institution, with the intention at the same time to draw more attention to texts that are frequently neglected in crusades scholarship.

Indeed, arguably the fullest treatment of the Maccabees occurs in a versification edited only as recently as 2010. The poem was composed by one Geoffrey, the first abbot of the monastic community established at the Dome of the Rock, which the Franks called the *Templum Domini* ("Lord's Temple"), between late 1135 and late 1137.² Geoffrey's predecessor at the *Templum Domini*, Achard of Arrouaise, also composed a poem in which the Maccabees make an appearance, which has been ignored altogether. The following discussion will therefore place these two poets within some of the larger discourses that have emerged, and consider why the figures of the Maccabees were particularly relevant to an author writing in Frankish Jerusalem during the first half of the twelfth century.

Achard of Arrouaise

When the crusaders finally captured Jerusalem on July 15, 1099, they did so by breaching the northern wall, to the northeast of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. A group of crusaders led by the Norman Tancred of Hauteville then made its way to the Sacred Esplanade (known to Jews and Christians as the Temple Mount), where they committed an infamous massacre.³ Tancred and his men proceeded to strip the Dome of the Rock of its treasures, an episode most vividly recounted by Ralph of Caen in a dramatized debate on the legality of this action between Tancred and Arnulf of Chocques, who enjoyed a brief

2 Eyal Poleg, "On the Books of Maccabees: An Unpublished Poem by Geoffrey, Prior of the 'Templum Domini'", *Crusades* 9 (2010): 13–56. This edition will henceforth be abbreviated as GA, Macc. Recently I edited Geoffrey's versification of Josephus's *Jewish War*: Julian Yolles, "Geoffrey, Prior of the *Templum Domini*, *On the Seven Books of Josephus*", *Crusades* 13 (2014): 77–118.

3 For a survey of the sources, see Benjamin Z. Kedar, "The Jerusalem Massacre of July 1099 in the Western Historiography of the Crusades", *Crusades* 3 (2004): 15–75.

stint as Latin patriarch of Jerusalem in the aftermath of the crusade before being replaced by the papally-approved Daibert of Pisa.⁴

When Godfrey of Bouillon transformed the Dome of the Rock into a church called the *Templum Domini* and installed a community of canons to oversee it, Achard of Arrouaise, its first prior, decided that restoring the stolen treasures should be his first priority. He had travelled to the Holy Land from St. Nicolaus d'Arrouaise in Artois (mod. *département* Pas-de-Calais) with Cono, cardinal legate and bishop of Praeneste,⁵ probably sometime in the year 1110,⁶ whereupon he became the first prior of the community of secular canons established at the *Templum Domini*, being first mentioned in this capacity in charters dating to the year 1112.⁷ He died sometime between late 1135 and late 1137, when his successor Geoffrey appears in two charters.⁸

Achard decided to appeal to the crown of Jerusalem for the return of the treasures, doing so in the form of a lengthy rhythmical poem comprising 817 lines of rhythmic or accentual poetry in lines of 15 syllables with end-rhyming

-
- 4 Ralph of Caen, *Radulphi Cadomensis Tancredus*, ed. Edoardo D'Angelo, Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis 231 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), ll. 3790–3892.
- 5 For Cono of Praeneste, sometimes referred to as Cuno or Kuno, see Charles Dereine, “Conon de Préneste”, *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1956); Rudolf Hiestand, “Legat, Kaiser und Basileus. Cuno von Praeneste und die Krise des Papsttums von 1111–1112”, in *Aus Reichsgeschichte und Nordischer Geschichte. Festschrift Karl Jordan*, ed. Horst Fuhrmann, Klaus Wriedt, and Hans Eberhard Mayer (Stuttgart: E. Klett, 1972), 141–52; Attilio Cadderi, *Conone di Preneste: cardinale legato di Pasquale II, Gelasio II, Callisto II (?–1122)* (Centro studi francescani del Lazio, 1974).
- 6 It is unclear when exactly Cono travelled to Jerusalem, but certainly after 1107 and before 1111; see the discussion in Cadderi, *Conone di Preneste*, 52–3. Paul Lehmann suggested the year 1108 without any evidence; see the introduction preceding his edition of the poem: Paul Lehmann, “Die mittellateinischen Dichtungen der Prioren des Tempels von Jerusalem Acardus und Gaufridus”, in *Corona quærnea, Festgabe Karl Strecker zum 80. Geburtstage dargebracht*, Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica 6 (Leipzig: K. W. Hiersemann, 1941), 299–330, at 300. This edition will henceforth be abbreviated as AP (=Acardus Prior).
- 7 H. E. Mayer and Jean Richard, *Die Urkunden der lateinischen Könige von Jerusalem*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Diplomata Regum Latinorum Hierosolymitanorum. (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2010), i, no. 52 (RRH no. 68). Pace Giovanni Loche, who claimed that Achard is listed here without specification of his capacity, apparently misreading the charter: Giovanni Loche, “Il Templum Domini e le sue tradizioni secondo le fonti scritte in epoca crociata”, *Liber Annuus* 59 (2009): 281–300, at 290.
- 8 The final charter signed by Achard dates to Christmas 1135 and September 1, 1136: RRH, no. 167; edited in G. Geneviève Bresc-Bautier, ed., *Le cartulaire du chapitre du Saint-Sépulcre de Jérusalem*, Documents relatifs à l'histoire des Croisades 15 (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1984), no. 61. Geoffrey appears in two charters that date between September 24 and December 24 of 1137: RRH, nos. 172 and 173.

couplets, known as *versus caudati* in medieval classifications.⁹ Each line has a caesura after the eighth syllable, resulting in discrete units of 8p+7pp. In the earlier Middle Ages, such a pattern was used in hymns in what amounted to a rhythmical imitation of the quantitative trochaic septenarius, but these rigid constraints are not followed by Achard in any consistent manner.¹⁰ Nevertheless, the choice of this particular form, along with the frequent references by the poet to his activity in terms of orality, may point to a possible oral performance of the work.¹¹

The first 30 lines of the poem form an acrostic identifying the addressee and the poet: *BALDVINO REGI PRIOR TEMPLI ACARDVS* (“Achard, prior of the Temple, to King Baldwin”).¹² It is unclear, however, whether King Baldwin I (1100–1118) or Baldwin II (1118–1131) is meant here, but an earlier rather than a later dating seems preferable, given that the poet indicates his awareness of the identity of the looters of the *Templum Domini* but chooses not to divulge it, presumably out of political tactfulness. Such a stance would have been most pressing while the principal culprits were alive, and since Tancred died on December 12, 1112, a dating to the reign of Baldwin I would make sense.¹³ Furthermore, we know from other sources that restorations to the *Templum Domini* began as early as

9 See Wilhelm Meyer, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur mittellateinischen Rythmik* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1905), i, p. 79; Carl Erdmann, “Leonitas”, in *Corona quereana, Festgabe Karl Strecker zum 80. Geburtstage dargebracht* (Leipzig: K. W. Hiersemann, 1941), 15–28, at 18–19; Dag Ludvig Norberg, *An Introduction to the Study of Medieval Latin Versification* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2004), 62 n. 20.

10 See for a discussion, Norberg, *Medieval Latin Versification*, 107–108.

11 For example, AP, ll. 43 and 44. This was first pointed out by Eyal Poleg: GA, Macc, 14.

12 Baldwin is also addressed at the very end of the poem: see AP, l. 843.

13 See AP, ll. 21–23. This observation was first made by Sylvia Schein: Sylvia Schein, “Between Mount Moriah and the Holy Sepulchre: The Changing Tradition of the Temple Mount in the Central Middle Ages”, *Traditio. Studies in Ancient and Medieval History, Thought and Religion* 40 (1984): 175–95, at 181 n. 21; see also Joshua Prawer, *The History of the Jews in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 47. Lehmann, however, was a proponent of a later dating, given the references to a future dedication of the *Templum Domini*, which did not occur until 1141 (which, however, Achard did not live to see): see AP, ll. 809–815. Arguing for the earlier dating, Hans Eberhard Meyer called attention to a charter dating from 1109 in which King Baldwin I granted the *Templum Domini* to Tancred, suggesting that Achard’s poem was written to protest this affront to the community of canons that had taken up residence in the *Templum*, and pointed out that there is evidence that Achard’s petition had concrete results: a charter issued by King Amaury in 1166 confirms a monetary grant of Baldwin I to the *Templum*, which would have been issued in the period between the winter of 1109/1110 and the spring of 1112. See Hans Eberhard Mayer, “Zur Frühgeschichte des Templum Domini in Jerusalem”, in *Bistümer, Klöster und*

1114–1115, which could have been the result of Achard's solicitation for royal patronage.¹⁴

The opening of the poem leaves little doubt about its purpose and intended audience: the poet writes to the court of the Jerusalemite king in order to have returned to the *Templum Domini* those treasures that were taken from it during the capture of Jerusalem on July 15, 1099. The crown was not an impartial party in Achard's suit, for as Albert of Aachen reports, Tancred shared the spoils of the *Templum Domini* with Godfrey of Bouillon.¹⁵ To lend the work a bit of added cachet, and to build his case for the return of what rightfully belonged to the Temple, Achard proposes to write a poem dealing at length with the history of the Temple to convince the king and his court of the dignity of the site and the respect due to it and its current monastic community. In fact, Achard goes much further: he states quite plainly that the king's own salvation depends on the rightful return of the stolen treasure.¹⁶

No small task lay before Achard, since the site of the *Templum Domini* did not have any pre-existing traditions as a place of Christian worship or as a pilgrim destination. On the contrary, Jerome (writing after the Roman sack of the Temple and before the rise of Islam) had described the rubble on the Temple Mount as a "dung heap", and Christians saw the destruction of the Jewish Temple by Titus and Vespasian in 70 AD as a righteous vindication of what they considered Jewish betrayal.¹⁷ Nor could Achard claim the current structures atop the Temple Mount, which had been built by Muslims, as sites of Christian worship. A major overhaul was in order, the key to which was the Bible: with his poem, Achard retraces the biblical past of the site, reading the Bible in light of the importance of the Temple Mount.

Achard's poem should be considered part of the larger movement in the first half of the twelfth century to introduce Christian traditions to the Ḥaram area, as pilgrim reports began to circulate accounts that associated a whole range of biblical events with the buildings they visited there, and as chroniclers began to include the *Templum Domini* alongside the Holy Sepulchre as

Stifte im Königreich Jerusalem, Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica 26 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1977), 222–29, at 225–28.

14 See FC, 1.26.7–9 and WT, 8.3.94–98.

15 AA, 6.23. For a discussion, see William G. Zajac, "Captured Property on the First Crusade", in *The First Crusade. Origins and Impact*, ed. Jonathan Phillips (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 153–86, at 161–2.

16 AP, ll. 26–32.

17 Jerome, *Commentarii in Esaiam*, ed. Marc Adriaen, CCSL 73A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1963), 240.

the goal of the First Crusaders.¹⁸ Achard's poem is the most overt and systematic of these efforts, and offers valuable evidence of how a head of an institution directly contributed to the creation of a new narrative.

Achard provides a summary of the history of Jerusalem and its place within the various empires of the eastern Mediterranean, progressing through a kind of *translatio imperii*,¹⁹ or the succession of empires across the ages, and ends on a studied debate about who built the current *Templum Domini*, with Justinian, Helena (in that order) and Heraclius all offered as equally plausible candidates.²⁰ The possibility of a Muslim founder – an uncomfortable fact that would have been counterproductive to Achard's rhetorical strategy – is glossed over entirely.²¹ The poet then gives thanks to God for delivering the *Templum*, along with the other holy sites of Jerusalem, into the hands of the crusaders, before lodging one final complaint concerning the fact that some of

18 For a more detailed discussion of the changing attitudes toward the Temple Mount in Christian discourse, see Schein, "Between Mount Moriah and the Holy Sepulchre"; Heribert Busse, "Vom Felsendom zum Templum Domini", in *Das Heilige Land im Mittelalter. Referate des 5. interdisziplinären Colloquiums des Zentralinstituts für fränkische Landeskunde*, ed. Wolfdietrich Fischer and Jürgen Schneider, Schriften des Zentralinstituts für Fränkische Landeskunde und Allgemeine Regionalforschung an der Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg 22 (Neustadt an der Aisch: Verlag Degener & Co., 1982), 19–32; Sylvia Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City: Crusader Jerusalem and the Catholic West (1099–1187)* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005), 91–108; Benjamin Z. Kedar and Denys Pringle, "1099–1187: The Lord's Temple (Templum Domini) and Solomon's Palace (Palatium Salomonis)", in *Where Heaven and Earth Meet: Jerusalem's Sacred Esplanade*, ed. B. Z. Kedar and Oleg Grabar (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2009), 133–49.

19 See especially AP, ll. 491–574.

20 As pointed out by Lehmann (AP, 302–3), this bears much similarity to a passage in the pilgrim guide of Rorgo Fretellus: *Rorgo Fretellus de Nazareth et sa Description de la Terre Sainte: histoire et édition du texte*, ed. Petrus Cornelis Boeren (Amsterdam: North-Holland Pub. Co, 1980), c. 53. The question of who founded the *Templum Domini* was thus both a learned literary debate as well as a pressing matter of institutional history and cultural identity. A similar passage can also be found in John of Würzburg, see *Peregrinationes tres: Saewulf, John of Würzburg, Theodericus*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, CCCM 139 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1994), ll. 218–31. Important in this regard is the study of the development of literary traditions surrounding the founding of the *Templum Domini* in Aryeh Graboïs, "La fondation de l'abbaye du Templum Domini et la légende du Temple de Jérusalem au XII^e siècle", in *Autour de la Première Croisade: Actes du Colloque de la Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East (Clermont-Ferrand, 22–25 juin 1995)*, ed. Michel Balard, Byzantina Sorbonensia 14 (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1996), 231–37.

21 Contrast John of Würzburg, who adds to the names mentioned by Achard a rumour that it was built by an "emperor of Memphis in Egypt in honor of *Allāh kabūr*": *Peregrinationes tres*, 87–88.

these crusaders plundered the *Templum*. Achard points out that the Muslims not only preserved the treasures in the *Templum* for centuries but even added to them, while the Christian army – which should most of all have been respectful – looted them at the first opportunity.²²

Achard bases his account largely on biblical source materials, especially Kings and Chronicles, as he himself indicates.²³ In narrating the expulsion of the money changers from the Temple,²⁴ Achard invokes the authority of *orthodoxo patres* (“orthodox church fathers”), probably obliquely referring to Jerome’s commentary on the Gospel of St Matthew.²⁵ Other sources utilized by Achard (but not explicitly acknowledged) include Josephus’s *Jewish War* in the Latin translation by Pseudo-Rufinus and Eusebius’s *Ecclesiastical History* in the Latin translation by Rufinus.²⁶

A key element of Achard’s poem is the application of typological exegesis to form links that bespeak continuity with his own time. For instance, Achard explains that the first Temple was originally built by Solomon to house the Ark of the Covenant, and points out that the Ark prefigured the sacraments of his own time. Achard makes the church of the *Templum Domini* relevant by forging a connection between the Ark of the Covenant, Solomon’s Temple and the Eucharist – or, in other words, between the biblical past and the Frankish present.²⁷

In his effort to chronicle in verse the entire biblical history of the site of the *Templum Domini*, Achard also covers the period of the Maccabees:

The famous Antiochus descended from this stock [the Greeks]; he had been a hostage at Rome and, being most wicked, frequently interrupted

22 AP, ll. 794–808. A nearly identical sentiment can be found in a text connected with another community of canons in the Latin East, the *Inventio Patriarcharum* commissioned by the community of Hebron possibly in the late 1130s, as well as in Rorgo Fretellus, who complains that the Franks and Venetians plundered Tyre: see R. B. C. Huygens, “*Inventio Patriarcharum*”, *Crusades* 4 (2005): 131–55, at ll. 258–268 and Rorgo Fretellus, *Description de la Terre Sainte*, c. 25.

23 AP, l. 36.

24 AP, ll. 648–53.

25 Jerome, *Commentarii in Evangelium Matthaei*, ed. David Hurst and Marc Adriaen, CCL 77 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969).

26 Josephus is used as the source for a story of cannibalism occurring during the siege of Jerusalem in 70 AD by the Roman forces of Vespasian and Titus (AP, ll. 715–40), while Eusebius is used as a source for the story of the martyrdom of St James the Less (AP, ll. 759–78).

27 AP, ll. 237–61.

the sacrifices of the Jews and desecrated the House of God. For that wicked one often sent armies to compel the Jews to sacrifice to demons; some of them agreed to sacrifice to idols, while others preferred to die for their ancestral laws. Antiochus also burned the Torah and robbed the Temple of its many ornaments; he arrogantly entered the holy of holies and stole the gold along with the altar, as well as chandeliers, the table of proposition, and golden drinking vessels that were highly sought after, and the veil, the crowns, and small vessels; and with all of this he returned to his own lands. After this he sent two generals to compel the people to sacrifice to idols, following the rites of the gentiles; Judas Maccabeus valiantly opposed them, and his brothers fought bravely with him, killing many generals sent by Antiochus, and vanquished others in battle and put them to flight. After this they purified the sanctuary from all impurities caused by the veneration of idols; then they built an altar which they dedicated to the Lord, and a great rejoicing took place among the people.²⁸

The poet refers here to the biblical Books of the Maccabees, of which only the first two are accepted within the (deuterocanonical) canon of the Catholic Church (the third being also accepted in the Orthodox canon). They represent historical books that relate the events under Seleucid rule in the period 175–134 BC, with 2 Maccabees presenting an alternate account corresponding to the first seven chapters of 1 Maccabees (as far as 161 BC).²⁹

28 AP, ll. 544–69: *Quorum de stirpe processit illustris Antiochus; / fuerat hic Rome obses, qui et ipse pessimus / multum gentis Iudeorum atque sacrificium / dissipando prophanavit dei sanctuarium. / Crebro namque nequam ille missis exercitibus / Iudeos sacrificare compulit demonibus. / Quorum quidam immolare consenserunt ydolis, / quidam mori decreverunt legibus pro patriis. / Legem quoque Iudeorum combussit Antiochus, / sed et templum spoliavit ornamentis pluribus, / in sanctificationem intrans cum superbia / aureum tulit altare, luminis candelabra / mensam propositionis atque libatoria / aureaque vasa valde concupiscibilia / velum simul et coronas atque mortariola, / sublatisque universis rediit ad propria. / Post hec misit duces suos ad cogendum populum / ydolis sacrificare iuxta ritus gentium. / Quibus Iudas Machabeus restitit viriliter / et cum eo fratres eius repugnantes fortiter, / occiderunt duces multos, missos ab Antiocho / et superaverunt quosdam fugatos de prelio. / Post hec sancta mundaverunt abominationibus / universis et immundis ydolorum cultibus, / tunc altare construxerunt dedicantes domino, / et leticia pergrandis facta est in populo. All translations are my own.*

29 1 and 2 Maccabees were officially accepted into the canon by the Roman Catholic Church at the Council of Trent (1545–1563); see *Enchiridion symbolorum, definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, ed. H. Denzinger, 34th ed. (Barcelona: Herder, 1965), no. 1502. They are considered apocryphal by Protestants.

The main theme of the first narrative is the Jewish revolt led by the founders of the Hasmonean dynasty as a result of Antiochus IV Epiphanes's attempts to force the Jews to abandon their religious customs (including circumcision and dietary laws), with particular emphasis on the heroic actions of the five sons of the priest Mattathias, especially those of Judas Maccabeus. The second account focuses on the martyrdom suffered by the priest Eleazar and an unnamed mother and her seven sons at the hands of Antiochus IV, which is elaborated upon in the fourth apocryphal book of the Maccabees (the third book relating instead an earlier episode of Jewish persecution in Egypt that has little to do with the Maccabees). Although the four books of the Maccabees found in the Septuagint did not become part of the Hebrew Bible, the stories they tell of Jewish resistance to gentile oppression turned them into important cultural documents for communities living in the Hellenistic diaspora (and hence their inclusion in the Septuagint).

In his poem, Achard briefly appears to refer to the Maccabean martyrs of 2 Maccabees, who preferred to die rather than forsake the Mosaic Law; but since he is chiefly concerned with the despoiling of the Temple, he focuses on the Maccabean warriors led by Judas, as described in 1 Maccabees, and on their restoration of the Temple. Extensive attention is paid to the restoration, with an elaborate enumeration of all the items that were taken from the Temple by Antiochus. Achard then develops the popular conception of the Maccabees as exemplary warriors (*repugnantes fortiter*) into custodians of the Temple, who restore it to its former glory and in so doing appease both God and the populace of Jerusalem. The implications for the king of Jerusalem would have been fairly obvious, particularly given that King Baldwin I, the most likely addressee of Achard's poem, may have closely associated himself with the figure of Judas Maccabeus. In fact, on the basis of several witnesses, we know that the epitaph on Baldwin's tombstone read as follows:

KING BALDWIN, A SECOND JUDAS MACCABEUS,
HOPE OF THE NATION, STRENGTH OF THE CHURCH, VIRTUE OF BOTH,
WHOM LEBANON AND EGYPT, DAN AND MURDEROUS
DAMASCUS FEAR AND BRING TRIBUTE TO,
ALAS IS ENCLOSED IN THIS HUMBLE TOMB.³⁰

30 I have followed here the transcription of Elzear Horn, who visited Jerusalem in the years 1724–44. See Elzear Horn, *Ichnographiae Monumentorum Terrae Sanctae, 1724–1744*, ed. Eugene Hoade and Bellarmino Bagatti, 2nd ed., Publications of the Studium Biblicum Franciscanum 15 (Jerusalem: Franciscan Press, 1962), 71: *REX BALDEWINVS, IVDAS ALTER MACHABEVS, / SPES PATRIE, VIGOR ECCLESIE, VIRT<VS> VTRIVSQ<VE>, / QVEM*

If Baldwin was to be considered a new Judas Maccabeus, it follows that he ought to emulate his deeds – not the least of which being, Achard appears to suggest, safeguarding the Temple and its treasures. The commemoration of the Maccabees is absorbed into contemporary politics, as Achard urges Baldwin to return the treasures stolen by Tancred from the *Templum Domini*. Whereas earlier the Maccabees had served as exemplary figures for crusaders fighting against pagans, here they appear to be used in the context of internal politics within the crusader states. Of course, there had been precedent for the use of the figures of the Maccabees by Christians in religious-political discourse, most notably during the Investiture Contest, in which the pope painted the Holy Roman Emperor as a tyrannical Antiochus – the same implication made by Achard with respect to Tancred.³¹

Achard's poem is important for being one of the few extant works of the Latin East so explicitly connected with the royal court of Jerusalem.³² In essence, the poem functions as a mirror for princes by setting up biblical examples to be followed by King Baldwin – most notably the example of King David. When Achard relates how David built an altar at the current site of the *Templum Domini* to atone for his sin of pride and to escape the wrath of the avenging angel, there is no question about the lesson to be drawn from this cautionary tale.³³ Likewise, the figures of Judas Maccabeus and his brothers, as restorers of the Temple and vanquishers of its despoilers, were to be construed as meaningful examples to the Frankish king of Jerusalem. If Achard's representation of Judas Maccabeus (and others) in his poem is meant to imply a religious and political imperative to the king, what does this tell us about the role of the Bible in Frankish society in the East? Clearly, the Franks who had settled in Jerusalem perceived themselves to be a *populus Dei*, a chosen people of God, and that within the Bible lay buried the typological seeds to which their own lives and actions ought to conform if they were to bring forth the fruits of virtue.

FORMIDABANT, CVI DONA TRIBVTA FEREBANT / CEDAR & EGYPT<VS>, DAN AC HOMICIDA DAMASCVS / PROH DOLOR IN MODICO CLAVDITVR HOC TVMVLO. The epitaph also occurs, with a few variations, in the earlier account of Theoderich: *Peregrinationes tres*, c. 360.

31 For examples, see Morton, "The Defence of the Holy Land and the Memory of the Maccabees", 279–80.

32 Other examples include the abbreviated history commissioned by Baldwin III (*Historia Nicaena vel Antiochena necnon Ierosolymitana*) and William of Tyre's history of the Holy Land, as well as his non-extant history of Eastern rulers, both originally commissioned by Amaury I.

33 AP, ll. 110–27. The warning would have been all the more evident given that Achard addresses Baldwin early on as "successor of renowned King David" (AP, l. 24).

Geoffrey the Abbot

Achard's successor as prior of the *Templum Domini* was Geoffrey, who followed Achard's poem with two books, the first of which is a versification of 1 and 2 Maccabees and focuses on issues of simony, while the second book versifies Josephus's *Jewish War*, providing an abbreviated account of the *Jewish War* in verse while relating the events to biblical history.³⁴ Nothing is known about Geoffrey's life before he arrived in the Holy Land.³⁵ His name first appears in a charter dating to the autumn of 1137, where he is listed as prior of the *Templum Domini*,³⁶ while another charter lists Geoffrey as abbot of the same institution,³⁷ meaning that at some point in the autumn of 1137 the priory must have changed into an abbey. Since the incipit of one manuscript attributes all three poems (that is, Achard's poem and Geoffrey's two poems) to "prior Geoffrey",³⁸ it seems likely that Geoffrey wrote his two poems in the brief period when he was still a prior, between December 25, 1135 and December 24, 1137. Geoffrey appears for the last time in a charter from 1160,³⁹ and he must have died at some point before April 1166, when his nephew Hugh appears as his successor.⁴⁰

-
- 34 Poleg, "On the Books of Maccabees: An Unpublished Poem by Geoffrey, Prior of the 'Templum Domini'"; for Geoffrey's second poem, see Yolles, "Geoffrey, Prior of the *Templum Domini*, *On the Seven Books of Josephus*".
- 35 On the life of Geoffrey, see Amnon Linder, "An Unpublished Charter of Geoffrey, Abbot of the Temple in Jerusalem", in *Outremer: Studies in the History of the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem Presented to Joshua Prawer*, ed. Benjamin Z. Kedar, Hans Eberhard Mayer and R. C. Smail (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1982), 119–29; Rudolf Hiestand, "Gaufridus Abbas Templi Domini: An Underestimated Figure in the Early History of the Kingdom of Jerusalem", in *The Experience of Crusading, 2: Defining the Crusader Kingdom*, ed. Peter W. Edbury and Jonathan Phillips (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 48–59; Malcolm Barber, *The Crusader States* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 177–78.
- 36 *RRH*, no. 173. Edited in Guigues Albon, ed., *Cartulaire général de l'Ordre du Temple*, 119?–1150; *recueil des chartes et des bulles relatives à l'Ordre du Temple formé par le marquis d'Albon* (Paris: H. Champion, 1913), no. 141; for the date of this charter, see Mayer and Richard, *Die Urkunden*, ii, 857.
- 37 *RRH*, no. 172; edited in Bresc-Bautier, *Le cartulaire*, no. 23, but see Mayer for the correct dating of the charter, which should be September 24–December 24 of 1137 rather than between January 1 and February 5 of 1138: Hans Eberhard Mayer, *Die Kanzlei der lateinischen Könige von Jerusalem*, *Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica* 40 (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1996), ii, 856–57.
- 38 This is Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud. misc. 406 (late 12th, early 13th c.).
- 39 Mayer and Richard, *Die Urkunden*, i, no. 260.
- 40 *Ibid.*, ii, no. 316.

Geoffrey was a figure of considerable prominence in the kingdom of Jerusalem during the middle of the twelfth century.⁴¹ He was sent on two different embassies to the Byzantine courts of John II Komnenos and Manuel Komnenos (in 1142/1143 and in 1158/1159, respectively), apparently on account of his fluency in Greek.⁴² His prominence is further attested by his frequent appearance as a witness to charters, as well as the existence of a charter which he issued himself. Dating to the period 1146–1166, it concerns the confirmation of Ernardus Ruffus II of the donation of Woodbridge Priory to the abbey of the *Templum Domini*, while Geoffrey in turn confirmed that Ernardus and his heirs would maintain the privilege of electing its prior.⁴³ The charter, bearing Geoffrey's personal seal showing a figure seated on a throne holding a *baculum*, with the dome of the *Templum Domini* on the reverse, provides valuable evidence that Geoffrey's sphere of influence extended well beyond the Latin East.⁴⁴

Geoffrey's first poem, composed in sixteen-syllable lines with internal or leonine rhyme, generally follows the structure of 1 Maccabees, presenting a versification of 1 Macc. 1–16 with episodes of 2 Maccabees inserted at appropriate moments, most notably the corruption of the priesthood in 2 Macc. 3–5 and the persecutions instituted by Antiochus in 2 Macc. 6–7.⁴⁵ Apart from the books of the Maccabees, the poem contains echoes of liturgical phrases that would have been sung frequently at the *Templum Domini*, while the poet also relates the biblical material to the *Templum Domini* more directly through phrases commonly used in Marian worship.⁴⁶ Most striking in this regard is

41 See Linder, "An Unpublished Charter", and Hiestand, "Gaufridus Abbas".

42 See the comments in WT, 15.21.11–12, 18.24.6–7.

43 The charter is edited in Linder, "An Unpublished Charter", 121.

44 The seal can be found in Hans Eberhard Mayer, *Das Siegelwesen in den Kreuzfahrerstaaten*, Abhandlungen (Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse) 83 (Munich: Verlag der Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978), 32 and plate 1.5. This seal is from a different charter, confirming the purchase of a house within the *septa Templi* by one otherwise unknown Arnaldus the Baker (Fornerius). See for this charter *RRH*, no. 173b, and the discussion and edition in Hiestand, "Gaufridus Abbas", 58–9.

45 GA, Macc, ll. 31–213 and 269–353. Geoffrey writes verses of 8+8 syllables, either to be construed as 16-syllable verses with internal or leonine rhyme, or as rhyming couplets of 8 syllables each. The placement of the accent is not fixed, although the rhymed syllables tend to correspond. This metrical scheme, which allowed Geoffrey a great amount of flexibility in versifying the narratives of the Maccabees and the *Jewish War*, corresponds to a few hymns attributed to Matthew of Vendôme: see the discussion in Norberg, *Medieval Latin Versification*, 120–121.

46 GA, Macc, 18–19.

the description of the mother of the seven brothers standing still (*stabat mater immobilis*) in the face of Antiochus's persecution. Her lack of grief, as she rejoices that her martyred sons persevered in their faith, contrasts with the Virgin Mary weeping outside Christ's tomb, which later became the subject of a celebrated hymn.⁴⁷ Considering that the *Templum Domini* was dedicated to the Virgin Mary a few years later in 1141, Geoffrey's poem reflects the ongoing efforts to associate the *Templum* with the Virgin Mary.

Unlike Achard's poem, Geoffrey does not open with a prologue or introduction, beginning instead with a versification of the opening of 1 Maccabees. After the stage for the story of the Maccabean revolt is set by the narration of Alexander's conquest of the Levant, the poet states his intentions:

I have decided to abbreviate in a short book the many battles of the Maccabees that they fought, but first it is useful to relate how the land came to be abandoned and the Temple deserted. As long as the Law was dutifully observed by the people, no enemy invaded or attacked them. Instead God's Temple and his people, whom the Lord protected, were venerated by all other peoples.⁴⁸

The poem is expressly intended as an abbreviation of 1 and 2 Maccabees, beginning with explaining the causes that led to the dire situation of the people of Israel under Antiochus IV. Geoffrey, prior and soon abbot of the *Templum Domini*, took his predecessor's use of the Maccabees a step further, going so far as to versify both 1 and 2 Maccabees in a single, lengthy poem. Yet Geoffrey's poem represents much more than a mere versification of the books of the Maccabees: in the first place, it combines the two books and rearranges the order of the events to form a coherent and linear narrative that brings together the stories of the Maccabean warriors led by Judas Maccabeus (1 Maccabees) and of the mother and her seven sons who suffered martyrdom (2 Maccabees).⁴⁹

47 GA, Macc, l. 348; John 20:11.

48 GA, Macc, ll. 27–30: *Brevi quidem volumine decrevimus perstringere / Machabeorum prelia que commiserunt plurima. / Sed prius causas expedit narrare, cur contigerit / Terre depopulatio templique desolatio. / Quamdiu lex a populo conservabatur sedulo, / Hostilis hunc incursio non conterebat prelio. / Sed potius ab omnibus venerabatur gentibus / Templum dei vel populus quem protegebat dominus.*

49 See Geoffrey's own words at the end of the poem, GA, Macc, ll. 1153–1158: *Est et in hoc opusculo quod attendendum estimo: / In illis voluminibus de quibus hec excerptimus / Que primo quidem facta sunt posterius conscripta sunt, / Unde lectoris animus conturbatur frequentius. / Nos autem rem ex ordine aggressi sumus scribere / Ut quod illic implicitum hic cunctis sit perspicuum.*

Secondly, three authorial digressions within the poem offer exegetical interpretations of the biblical text. The first digression relates two exempla, supposedly taken from a work of Augustine against heresy (but probably from the eleventh-century Alger of Lyon).⁵⁰ The first exemplum deals with the sacred flame of the Jewish Temple, which was miraculously preserved under water during the Babylonian Captivity and was extinguished only after Jason purchased the priesthood.⁵¹ The second exemplum provides a tropological or moral interpretation of the story of Potiphar, who is said to have become a eunuch upon purchasing Joseph.⁵² Geoffrey then relates in a second digression the events described in his poem to modern times:

With this poem I urge the readers to consider carefully how unlawful it is, and in opposition to the Holy Spirit, at this moment in time to attempt to acquire the priesthood through purchase. For now we do not sacrifice the fat of bulls or rams to the Lord, nay, instead the flesh and blood assumed by the Son of God from the Virgin Mary for us sinners. If the fire was extinguished then, when Jason acquired the priestly glory by bribing the king, what do we believe will happen now with the fire of the Holy Spirit? It is extinguished both for the buyers and the sellers.⁵³

The poet concerns himself chiefly with combating the practice of simony – that is to say, the buying and selling of spiritual goods and ecclesiastical offices, usually referring specifically to the office of bishop. At the very end of the poem, Geoffrey once again makes explicit the dual purpose of abbreviation and providing a warning against simony:

The history has been treated with the utmost brevity, for I have omitted much and spoken but little about many things. My intention is to show

50 So suggests Poleg in GA, Macc, 21.

51 GA, Macc, ll. 111–31.

52 GA, Macc, ll. 132–42.

53 GA, Macc, ll. 214–24: *Ammonemus hoc carmine lectores ut sollicite / Perpendant, quam nefarium sit contra sanctum spiritum / Nunc temporis per pretium ambire sacerdotium. / Non enim adeps pinguium, taurorum vel arietum / Nunc immolatur domino in nostro sacrificio, / Immo caro cum sanguine quam de Maria virgine / Assumpsit dei filius pro nobis peccatoribus. / Si ignis tunc extinctus est, quando Iason potitus est / Pontificali gloria data regi pecunia, / Quid fieri nunc, credimus, de igne sancti spiritus? / Extinguitur emptoribus simul ac venditoribus.*

through these books that the vice of simony arose in ancient times, from Simon and afterward from a certain Jason.⁵⁴

Geoffrey draws on the earlier poem of Achard, who had made the case that the Ark of the Covenant, kept within the Temple, prefigured the Eucharist. Here, the typology is much more obvious and direct: the sacrifices made in the Jewish Temple prefigured Christ's sacrifice on behalf of mankind. Salient for Geoffrey is the relation between *tunc* ("then") and *nunc* ("now"): for him, the time of the Maccabees has a bearing on his own time, and reading the books of the Maccabees may help his contemporaries in understanding the present and perhaps to avoid another destruction of the Temple. Then there was a *sacerdotium* ("priesthood") in Jerusalem which could be purchased, while in Geoffrey's own day, too, there were accusations that ecclesiastical offices could be "bought" by the highest bidder. For example, Ralph of Domfront, archbishop of Antioch, was accused of simoniacal practices by two clergymen in 1138, a year after Geoffrey composed his poem.⁵⁵

Underlying Geoffrey's poetic endeavour is the assumption that sinful behaviour among the Franks jeopardized their position in the Levant. The clearest expression of this idea is found in the Canons of the Council of Nablus, convened in 1120 and attended by, among others, Geoffrey's predecessor Achard of Arrouaise.⁵⁶ The preamble to the canons reflects on the disastrous rout of Roger of Antioch's army at the Battle of the Field of Blood a year earlier (1119), which is deemed to have been the result of sinful behaviour among the Franks. The council aimed, therefore, to reduce the sins committed by setting down a number of stringent laws, so that, instead of chastising them, the Lord will save them from their enemies, just as they read happened in the case of the Israelites (*ut in populo Israelitico contigisse legimus*).⁵⁷ What is new in Geoffrey's formu-

54 GA, Macc, ll. 1148–1152: *Digesta est hystoria sub brevitare maxima / Nam plura pretermisimus de multis pauca diximus. / Et nostra est intentio de symonie vitio / Ex his libris ostendere quod ab antiquo tempore / Exortum est a Symone et post a quodam Iasone*. The Simon mentioned here refers to Simon the Benjamite, an overseer of the Temple who attempted to induce Apollonius to rob the Temple's treasury (2 Macc. 3), and to the high priest Jason, who promoted a policy of Hellenization (2 Macc. 4).

55 WT, 15.16.33, and see the discussion in Bernard Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States: The Secular Church* (London: Variorum Publications, 1980), 34–35.

56 Benjamin Z. Kedar, "On the Origins of the Earliest Laws of Frankish Jerusalem: The Canons of Nablus, 1120", *Speculum*, no. 74 (1999): 310–35 (repr. in Benjamin Z. Kedar, *Franks, Muslims and Oriental Christians in the Latin Levant: Studies in Frontier Acculturation* (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 2006), no. 1).

57 Kedar, "The Canons of Nablus", 331.

lation of this concept is the idea that the preservation of God's people goes hand-in-hand with that of the Temple.

Geoffrey also emphasizes the importance of the site of the *Templum Domini* in salvation history more generally: by framing history as the difference between sacrificing bulls and rams in the Jewish Temple and partaking of the Eucharist – the flesh and blood of Christ, born of the Virgin Mary – in the *Templum Domini*, Geoffrey completely passes over Christ's Resurrection and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre that commemorated it. As the chief rival of the *Templum Domini* within the religious landscape of Frankish Jerusalem, Geoffrey may have been motivated to reframe salvation history in a way that placed his own institution at the centre of events. Geoffrey's poem, therefore, opens a new window on the competition between the various religious institutions of Frankish Jerusalem.⁵⁸

In the third and final digression of the poem, Geoffrey invokes the authority of Gregory the Great.⁵⁹ The poet claims to paraphrase from Gregory's *Moralia in Iob* ("Moral interpretations of Job") an interpretation of the stories of both Joseph and Judas Maccabeus: as soon as they rely on human rather than divine aid, they are deprived of all divine assistance. In the case of Judas Maccabeus, his attempts to cultivate a peaceful alliance with the Romans backfired, for he was killed shortly afterward. The moral of the story, as Geoffrey pithily puts it, is as follows:

It is good, therefore, for us to place our hope in God the just judge, but not in man or the gold of Arabia.⁶⁰

Geoffrey invokes the authority of the celebrated pope, liturgist and exegete Gregory the Great, although the passage in question cannot be found anywhere in the *Moralia in Iob*, or any other of his works – and here, as in the case of Pseudo-Augustine, we may be dealing with an as yet unidentified spurious

58 For the architectural dimensions of the rivalry between the Holy Sepulchre and the *Templum Domini*, see Nurith Kenaan-Kedar, "Symbolic Meaning in Crusader Architecture: The Twelfth-Century Dome of the Holy Sepulcher Church in Jerusalem", *Cahiers Archéologiques* 34 (1986): 109–17.

59 GA, Macc, ll. 798–812.

60 GA, Macc, ll. 811–12: *Est ergo bonum ponere in deo iusto iudice / Spem nostram non in homine vel in auro Arabiae*. The phrasing recalls Psalm 71:15: *dabitur ei de auro Arabiae*. Compare also the opening of Walter the Chancellor's *Bella Antiochena*, who says that "gold from Arabia" (*auro Arabico*) and precious gems were highly sought after: Walter the Chancellor, *Galterii cancellarii Bella Antiochena: Mit Erläuterungen und einem Anhang*, ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Innsbruck: Wagner'schen Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1896), 1 prol. 4.

work of Gregory the Great. Although Geoffrey's precise reference here is uncertain, he appears to allude to ongoing arrangements for a political alliance, possibly with the Turks in Damascus or Aleppo. Such alliances were not unheard of during this time: for example, in 1115 Prince Roger of Antioch had forged an alliance with Damascus, as described by Walter the Chancellor,⁶¹ while in 1140, King Fulk struck a brief alliance with the Damascenes against Zengi, atabeg of Mosul. According to William of Tyre, the Franks were offered a sizeable sum of gold to protect the city.⁶²

At the very end of the poem, Geoffrey again steps in to relate the Maccabees to his own time:

But now many, ignorant of the past, say that never was there a time like that of our own; but if they knew the past, they would call these happy times.⁶³

Geoffrey berates those who are ignorant of history, and argues that there is value to be had in studying previous events that took place in Jerusalem – a pursuit that may aid the present and prevent future calamities. As Eyal Poleg argued, this comment may reflect a criticism of those who were reluctant to recognize the Maccabean martyrs, who died for outdated Jewish dietary laws and circumcision, in the same way that Christian martyrs were honoured.⁶⁴ For Geoffrey, this kind of presentist thinking was a dangerous affair, because it disregards the valuable lessons that the past may have to offer. More importantly for the canons of the *Templum Domini*, such attitudes diminish the importance of their institution, which had no established status as a Christian sanctuary to draw on. The key point, therefore, of these last verses of Geoffrey's poem seems to be that there is a similarity between the time of the Maccabees and that of the Franks. It lies in Geoffrey's view that both the people of Israel at the time of the Maccabees and the Franks of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem are a chosen people of God, but also that similar acts of impiety can bring similar destruction upon them – a topic treated at length in Geoffrey's poem on the Roman destruction of the Temple. Just as greed and simoniacal actions led to

61 WC, 1.2.6.

62 WT, 15.7.

63 GA, Macc, ll. 1168–70: *Nunc autem dicunt plurimi preteritorum nescii / Huic nostro similia nunquam fuisse tempora, / Qui si nossent preterita hec dicerent felicia*. For a brief discussion of this passage, which has otherwise been ignored by scholars, see Russo, "Continuité et transformations", 75–76.

64 GA, Macc, 19–20. For a discussion of twelfth-century Latin sources that problematize the Maccabees, see Lapina, "The Maccabees and the Battle of Antioch".

the subjugation of the Jews, while adherence to the Law safeguarded them from enemy attacks, so did the Franks' greed place them in peril from their neighbouring enemies. Yet, as Geoffrey's earlier statements show, the essential comparability of the Maccabean past and Frankish present does not take away from the fact that current stakes are higher: while previously, one risked extinguishing the sacrificial fire in the Temple, now the fire of the Holy Spirit hangs in the balance.

Conclusion

The poems of Achard of Arrouaise and Geoffrey are unique witnesses to poetic treatments of the various Maccabean stories in the Frankish kingdom of Jerusalem. Achard paved the way by composing an innovative poem that combined a formal entreaty with biblical versification. As the head of a brand-new monastic institution that could not count on an established religious tradition and political clout, Achard faced a daunting task: to establish the significance of the site of the *Templum Domini* by bringing the church into connection with the Jewish Temples that had stood there before, as well as with the various biblical narratives associated with the location, while at the same time making his case for the return of the stolen treasure. Achard's poem is thus a literary production, a foundational document of the institution of the *Templum Domini* and a plea to the king, all at once.

Achard's poem, which had made the initial connection between the Maccabees and the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem in a panoramic view of the biblical history of the Temple, allowed Geoffrey to take for granted the connection between the Maccabees and the *Templum Domini* to provide a lengthy poem combining the canonical books of the Maccabees, interspersed with authorial digressions and exempla that lend a moral point to the biblical narrative: a warning to the secular and ecclesiastical powers-that-be – and especially those of the kingdom of Jerusalem – not to engage in simony. Geoffrey zeroed in on Achard's treatment of the Maccabees as a topic worthy of a full-scale poem, for as established exemplary figures of holy warriors they were popular with the institutions of Frankish Jerusalem of the twelfth century, including the Knights Templar and the Hospitallers.⁶⁵ By closely associating the Maccabees with the

65 See the preface of Rorgo Fretellus's pilgrim guide (*Comte-R.* version), which describes the Knights Templar as *novi Machabei*: Rorgo Fretellus, *Description de la Terre Sainte*, c. 2. For the Hospitallers, see the fourteenth-century account of the foundation of the Order of the Knights Hospitaller (which may have been originally composed as early as the late twelfth

Templum Domini, its abbot was in a position to claim moral authority, as on the matter of simony. Ultimately, Geoffrey's poem fits into a much longer tradition linking the Maccabees to simony: for instance, the late eleventh and early twelfth-century abbot Rupert of Deutz employed the figures of the Maccabean martyrs in the context of promoting Church reform, particularly with regard to simony,⁶⁶ while Dante would go on to compare Pope Clement V to Jason, who became high priest after bribing Antiochus.⁶⁷

To conclude, Achard and Geoffrey played crucial roles in the early history of the *Templum Domini* and in its establishment as one of the principal institutions in the kingdom. The connection they made between their church and the popular figures of the Maccabees was a key element in this process that stood the test of time: in his account of the Council of Clermont, William of Tyre portrays Pope Urban II as chiefly concerned with the defilement of the Temple, calling upon his listeners to follow the example of Mattathias and his sons to cleanse it.⁶⁸

century), which gives a fanciful narrative involving Judas Maccabeus: Antoine Calvet, *Les Légendes de l'Hôpital de Saint-Jean de Jérusalem*, Centre d'enseignement et de recherche d'Oc II (Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 2000).

66 See for a discussion, see Joslyn-Siemiatkoski, *Christian Memories*, 88–89.

67 Dante, *Inferno*, 19.85.

68 WT, 1.15.48–49.