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Abstract This essay examines similarities between the Hebrew chronicle of Shlomo bar Shimshon and the Latin chronicle of Albert of Aachen. Both sources describe the massacre of Rhineland Jews during the First Crusade and the subsequent defeat of the Crusaders by the Hungarians and the Bulgarians. On the basis of similarities in structure, content, and language between these two accounts, I argue that Shlomo chose to integrate at least one Christian source into his narrative. At the same time, I assert that it is unlikely that Shlomo’s Hebrew account was translated directly from Albert’s Latin chronicle. I present evidence indicating that the information conveyed in the Latin text reached the Jewish chronicler via vernacular channels, either oral or written.
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One of the best-known episodes of persecution perpetrated against Jews in the Middle Ages occurred in the summer of 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. Following 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 difficult 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. Only a few sources documenting these events have survived, and most of these include very few details. Much of the available

1For some of the relevant historiography, see nn. 8–10 below.
2Jay Rubenstein, Armies of Heaven: The First Crusade and the Quest for Apocalypse (New York, 2011), 55–79.
3See Guibert of Nogent, Dei gesta per Francos, in Guibert de Nogent, Dei gesta per Francos et cinq autres textes, ed. R. B. C. Huygens (Turnhout, 1996), 121–22; Cosmas of Prague, Chronica Boemorum, Monumenta Germaniae Historica (MGH), Scriptores rerum Germanicarum, Nova Series (SS rer. Germ. N.S.) 2:164 (1923; reprint, 1996); Ekkehard of Aura,
information 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 narrative of the journey of different Crusader groups through Hungary. 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 mas-sacrificed the Jews.

What is particularly intriguing is that there are several clear similarities between the Hebrew account and the Latin one. For example, both use a similar image to describe how Emicho’s men were killed. Shlomo writes: “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.” Albert states: “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.” As this essay will show, there are several more examples of such similarities between the sources (see table 1), though there are also differences. Did Shlomo read Albert’s chronicle? Did both writers use a common source? Was the information translated from the Latin into the Hebrew, and, if so, how? What can one learn from this about the way in which Shlomo composed his account and Jews and Christians shared information in twelfth-century Rhineland in general? This essay aims to answer these questions.

Shlomo’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

---

4 Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, ed. and trans. Susan Edgington (Oxford, 2007), xxiii–xxv, 12–29, 52–71.
5 Eva A. Haverkamp, ed., *Hebräische Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen während des Erlsten Kreuzzugs* (Hannover, 2005), 484–89.
6 מצע בכמה חזרה ייחו כלים אלו מאוהב בעתות. יד סרטון על מב למד יד שירד ועבשה (Haverkamp, ed., *Hebräische Berichte*, 489). English translation from Shlomo Eidelberg, ed., *The Jews and the Crusaders: The Hebrew Chronicles of the First and Second Crusades* (Madison, WI, 1977), 70.
7 “Mirabile dictu! Tanta fugitiiorum 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).
### Table 1. The Historia Ierosolimitana and Shlomo’s chronicle: A side-by-side comparison

| The Historia Ierosolimitana* | Shlomo bar Shimshon’s chronicle† |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| exercitus illius copiosus, ut harena maris innumerabilis qui a diversis coniunctus conuenerat, scilicet Francigene, Sueui, Bawarii, Lotharingii. (12) | וכבר אתה מואר عليه כל הון על שפת היה...знак בא על החדש, ישובו רוחו. (487) |
| Hiis locatis, protinus regnatori Ungrie 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. (12) | ישלחו אליהם מבצעי אלՌֹועַבּ ונדנַרַאי לאמֶר: נבְּדוּה עַבְּרָאֶדֶּךָ. להמח背包, לְךָ דבר בְּלֵךָ, לְךָ רבְּעָ. (485) |
| Petrus ... cum uniueris sociis Maleuillam deserens, ... Maroam transire disposituit. Sed paucas naues, numero tantum centumquinquaginta, in toto litore repert. ... Vnde quamplurimi quibus naues defecerant, iunctura lignorum et copulatione uiminum transire certabant. (18) | כלה נמל משכFTER יבש מש钍 עַבְּרָאֶדֶּךָ נַבְּדוּה עַבְּרָאֶדֶּךָ, נבְּדוּה עַבְּרָאֶדֶּךָ לעכל דותרי ולא. (485) |
| ac tardo et extremos exercitus detruncare et transfigere non parcentes. (20) | כי זהתחילולזנבכלהנחשלים (487) |
| sicut hi pro uero affirmant qui presentes uix euaserunt. (48) | והפֵּלֶחֶת באנהוּשֵׁמה. (489) |
| episcopum Ruothardum. (50) | והמעון שלמה ורוטהר. (309) |
| Iudeos in spaciosissimo domus sue solio ... constituit. (52) | והכניסו כל תַּכְּלוּת אחר המְעַלֵּיו. (309) |
| Sed hiis ad presidium regis Meseburch unientibus quod fluius Danubii et Lintax plauditibus firmat, pons et porta presidii clausa reperitur ex preceptor egis Vngarie. (52) | והצלוות כדי מצור עם הסֶמֶרֶת המְעַלֵּיו. ...יזכור וצק הנמלים הנַבְּדוּה עַבְּרָאֶדֶּךָ. (487) |
Table 1. (Continued)

| The Historia Ierosolimitana* | Shlomo bar Shimshon’s chronicle† |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| **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. (22)** | **תֹּורֶפֶּו אַחֲרָּם יִוְוִינִיָּם מֵכָּלָּם זֶה הֵנָּהּ דּוֹגָּה יִבְרֹת וּלַחֲמָה Ferry תַעֲשֶׂה פְּדִירַהּ בְּמָרָה. (489)** |
| **Pontes enim longa uetustate dirauertos reparauerunt / Vngari ... sine tardatione fugientes persequeruntur. (56)**‡ | **טֹבְעַת בְּנֵהוֹר הָדוֹרָנִי יִהוּדָּאִים אֲלֵפֶּמָה יִבְרֹת בָּהוֹת. דָּעַד שֶׂדֶדֶּה עַל גָּבֶּם מַעְרִידַהּ עַל (489).** |
| **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. (58)** | **וַיְהִי תְהוֹם. הָבָּא מֵהָיָה אֲחַזַּת אוֹתוֹת עָנָה אָבָרֹת בָּשְׂדָּה מְנָגְּלָה מְשָׂחֵת אָפָרְוָה. וַיְהִי חֹזֶה חוֹלָל בָּכַל מַעֲקֵפָּה שְׁדָּנְגֵת הָוֹלָלָה. הָחָזֶה חֹזֶה חוֹזֶה חוֹזֶה חוֹזֶה חוֹזֶה חוֹזֶה חוֹזֶה חוֹזֶה. וָאָמֶר אֲלֵיהֶם: רָאָה שָׂמֶה חוֹזָה חוֹזֶה חוֹזֶה חוֹזֶה חוֹזֶה חוֹזֶה. וָאָמֶר אֲלֵיהֶם: (300).** |

*Albert of Aachen, Historia Ierosolimitana, ed. and trans. Susan Edgington (Oxford, 2007).
†Eva A. Haverkamp, ed., Hebräische Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen während des Ersten Kreuzzugs (Hannover, 2005).
‡Note that elements from both Latin stories are incorporated in the short Hebrew phrase.
against the Jews in 1096, which were also described in several Latin sources.8 Owing 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 historiographic attention.9 Historians have noted that these chronicles contain many stories or literary elements that correspond to those in contemporary Christian sources. Particular events are often described in similar terms, and Jewish and Christian narratives both reflect similar cultural perceptions of martyrdom, saint-hood, violence, and religious rituals.10

8For a review of the Latin sources, see 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, see Avraham David, “Historical Records of the Persecutions during the First Crusade in Hebrew Printed Works and Hebrew Manuscripts” (in Hebrew), in Facing the Cross: The Persecutions of 1096 in History and Historiography, ed. Yom Tov Assis, Michael Toch, Jeremy Cohen, Ora Limor, and Aharon Kedar (Jerusalem, 2001), 193–205. For new editions of the Hebrew sources, see Haverkamp, ed., Hebräische Berichte, 246–493; and Avraham Fraenkel, Abraham Gross, and Peter Sh. Lehhardt, eds., Hebräische liturgische Poesien zu den Judenverfolgungen während des Ersten Kreuzzugs (Wiesbaden, 2016).

9For historiographic reviews, see 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, IN, 2001), 9–26, and Sanctifying the Name of God: Jewish Martyrs and Jewish Memories of the First Crusade (Philadelphia, 2004), 31–54; Eva Haverkamp, “Martyrs in Rivalry: The 1096 Jewish Martyrs and the Thebean Legion,” Jewish History 23 (2009): 319–42, 320–22 (esp. n. 5); Avraham Grossman, “The Cultural and Social Background of Jewish Martyrdom in 1096” (in Hebrew), in Assis, Toch, Cohen, Limor, and Kedar, eds., Facing the Cross, 55–73, 55–56 n. 1; and Judith Bronstein, “The Crusades and the Jews: Some Reflections on the 1096 Massacre,” History Compass 5 (2007): 1268–79.

10Yitzhak (Fritz) Baer, “The Persecution of 1096” (in Hebrew), in Sefer Assaf, ed. M. D. Cassuto, Joseph Klausner, and Joshua Guttmann (Jerusalem, 1953), 126–40, and “The Religious-Social Tendency of ‘Sepher Hassidim’” (in Hebrew), Zion 3 (1937): 1–50, 3–5; Robert Chazan, European Jewry and the First Crusade (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1987), 38–40, 59–70, 89–90, 94, God, Humanity, and History: The Hebrew First Crusade Narratives (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 2000), 190–91, 200–210, and “The Story of the Jewish Community of Cologne—1096” (in Hebrew), Alei Sefer 11 (1984): 63–71, 66–67; Eidelberg, ed., The Jews and the Crusaders, 16–18; Shmuel Shepkaru, Jewish Martyrs in the Pagan and Christian Worlds (Cambridge, 2006), 185–210, “Death Twice Over: Dualism of Metaphor and Realia in 12th-Century Hebrew Crusading Accounts,” Jewish Quarterly Review 93 (2002): 217–56, 229–39, 247–48, “From After Death to Afterlife: Martyrdom and Its Recompense,” Association for Jewish Studies Review 24 (1999): 1–44, 37–42, and “To Die for God: Martyrs’ Heaven in Hebrew and Latin Crusade Narratives,” Speculum 77 (2002): 311–41; Jeremy Cohen, “The ‘Persecutions of 1096’—from Martyrdom to Martyrology: The Sociocultural Context of the Hebrew Crusade Chronicles” (in Hebrew), Zion 59 (1994): 169–208, 181–85, 191–95, 199–206, and Sanctifying the Name of God, 62–64, 87–90, 120–29, 154–57; 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, 2002), 449–516, 467–72, and “From ‘Deus Vult’ to the ‘Will of the Creator’: Extremist Religious Ideologies and Historical Reality in 1096 and
Scholars have explained these similarities in two major ways, approaches that 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 as the events unfolded. 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 such communication had a decidedly hostile tone and purpose. It therefore stands to reason that, with some variations, Jews and Christians used similar terms to discuss issues of conversion and martyrdom.11

The second historiographic 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. Thus, the similarities between Jewish and Christian narratives should be attributed mostly to a cultural influence of the majority over the minority—or to a shared culture—rather than to a resemblance in eyewitness accounts.12 This essay 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 demonstrates that Shlomo bar Shimshon became familiar with a version of the chronicle of Albert of Aachen through oral or written vernacular channels and used it as one of his major sources.

Scholars who discuss the chronicle that is presumed to have been authored by Shlomo generally agree that it is actually a compilation of earlier sources

Hasidei Ashkenaz” (in Hebrew), in Assis, Toch, Cohen, Limor, and Kedar, eds., Facing the Cross, 92–100; Abraham Gross, “Historical and Halakhic Aspects of the Mass Martyrdom in Mainz: An Integrative Approach” (in Hebrew), in Assis, Toch, Cohen, Limor, and Kedar, eds., Facing the Cross, 171–92, 175–76; Lucia Raspe, “The Black Death in Jewish Sources: A Second Look at “Mayse Nissim,”” Jewish Quarterly Review 94 (2004): 471–89, 475–79; Israel Jacob Yuval, Two Nations in Your Womb: Perceptions of Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages (in Hebrew) (Tel Aviv, 2000), 166–67, 176–77, 189–91, 217–18, and “The Language and Symbols of the Hebrew Chronicles of the Crusades” (in Hebrew), in Assis, Toch, Cohen, Limor, and Kedar, eds., Facing the Cross, 101–17, 116–17; Lena Roos, “God Wants It!” The Ideology of Martyrdom in the Hebrew Crusade Chronicles and Its Jewish and Christian Background (Turnhout, 2006), 87–271; Haverkamp, “Martyrs in Rivalry.”

11Robert Chazan, “The Facticity of Medieval Narrative: A Case Study of the Hebrew First Crusade Narratives,” Association for Jewish Studies Review 16 (1991): 31–56, God, Humanity, and History, 190–91, 200–210, and European Jewry, 38–40, 59–70, 89–90, 94; Gross, “Historical and Halakhic Aspects,” 171–72.

12Ivan G. Marcus, “The Representation of Reality in the Narratives of 1096,” Jewish History 13 (1999): 37–48, and “A Jewish-Christian Symbiosis,” 467–72; Cohen, “The ‘Persecutions of 1096,’” 205–8; Roos, “God Wants It!” 26–27, 270–71; Shepkaru, “To Die for God,” 334–35; Haverkamp, “Martyrs in Rivalry”; Baer, “The Persecution of 1096,” 127–30.
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. 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. Shlomo Eidelberg argues that he wrote only this section and that a different editor added the other sections sometime before 1146, contending that the last parts of the chronicle contain stronger German influences and were probably composed later. 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 throughout the text the editor of the chronicle (who also wrote parts of it) referred 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.

There is another reason—that is, his affinity with the community of Mainz—to believe that Shlomo was the editor of the chronicle. He 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 toward the Mainz community. Such sympathy is clearly evident in the sections describing the events in Worms and Mainz. Also, in the last paragraphs of
the chronicle, which describe the establishment of the Speyer community by Jewish refugees from Mainz, the author refers to Mainz as “our hometown, the place of our forefathers.”18 The fact that two other separate sections, one at the beginning and one at the end of the text, show such a strong affinity with Mainz suggests that Shlomo bar Shimshon of Mainz was the one who edited them. It is not impossible that an unknown editor who was affiliated in some way with the community of Mainz compiled Shlomo’s work and the other material and edited the entire corpus sometime between 1140 and 1146. Nevertheless, on the basis also of the work of Noble and Haverkamp, I argue that the most likely scenario is that Shlomo himself added the other parts to his description of the events around Cologne, and subsequent analysis will continue to be based on this premise. Still, most of the conclusions drawn 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 which 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 established around the Theban Legion martyrs. More than simply pointing out the similarities, she carefully discusses the ways in which Shlomo 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 between the two narratives in some of the literary elements and in the overall structure. Nevertheless, it remains 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 his story that are so unique that they could not have been found somewhere else. Haverkamp thus concludes that Shlomo drew on the contemporary shared culture of Jews and Christians but was not necessarily familiar with and did not necessarily use particular Christian sources.20

Shlomo may well have relied on another Christian source, 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

---

18 עיר מולדתינו, מקום אבותינו (Haverkamp, ed., Hebräische Berichte, 491).
19For parallels and differences within the Hebrew chronicles, see Haverkamp, ed., Hebräische Berichte, 246–493; Roos, “God Wants It!” 111–12, 149–51, 195–96, 221–22, 262–65; and table 1 above.
20Haverkamp, “Martyrs in Rivalry.”
21Albert of Aachen, Historia Ierosolimitana, xxiii–xxv. For an older edition of the text, one based on a different manuscript, see Recueil des historiens des Croisades, 4:270–711.
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 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, even assuming that Shlomo had direct access to a manuscript, it would be impossible to determine which one he might have used. But it is likely that Albert’s chronicle was known in the area of Mainz during the 1140s.

Several historians have noted that some information in Shlomo’s chronicle does 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, he 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 suggest-

---

\(^{22}\) 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, 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 diss., University of London, 1991), 11–30, and “Albert of Aachen and the Chansons de Geste,” in *The Crusades and Their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton* (Aldershot, 1998), 23–37. For a demonstration that, in addition to these sources, Albert simply invented details to complete his narrative, see Yuval Noah Harari, “Eyewitnessing in Accounts of the First Crusade: The *Gesta Francorum* and Other Contemporary Narratives,” *Crusades* 3 (2004): 77–99, 95–98.

\(^{23}\) MS Laud Misc. 561 and 562, Bodleian Library, Oxford University; Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxxvii–xlvi; Edgington, “The Historia Iherosolimitana,” 42–57.

\(^{24}\) Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxxvii–xlxi; Edgington, “The Historia Icherosolimitana,” 42–70. 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 other manuscripts originating in the Low Countries were lost.

\(^{25}\) Baer, “The Persecution of 1096,” 128–30. 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. See Haverkamp, ed., *Hebräische Berichte*, 49–63, 70–136; Chazan, *God, Humanity, and History*, 52–56; Abulafia, “The Interrelationship between the Hebrew Chronicles,” 221–39; Eidelberg, ed., *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 15–19; and Roos, “God Wants It!,” 11–16.
ing that both chroniclers documented similar information independently.\textsuperscript{26} Eidelberg takes the same position, discussing Albert’s account as a source independent of the Hebrew chronicle.\textsuperscript{27} Kenneth Stow also points out one particular case 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.\textsuperscript{28} Indeed, a close, side-by-side reading of these two texts reveals significant correlations, as we will see. Still, the question remains, were Baer 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 toward answering this question, the following analysis offers 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 several such correlations in the descriptions of the events of 1096 in Mainz.\textsuperscript{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.”\textsuperscript{30} This is similar to what is written in the Historia: “He settled the Jews in the very large hall of his house.”\textsuperscript{31} In this case, Shlomo’s wording is closer to Albert’s than to that in other Hebrew accounts.\textsuperscript{32} Moreover, the name of the bishop of Mainz, Ruthard, appears in these two chronicles but not in other Hebrew sources.\textsuperscript{33} In general, Shlomo’s chronicle contains much more information about the development of the crusade than do the other two Hebrew accounts. It discusses the actions that Pope Urban II took to launch the crusade as well as the motivations of such major European nobles as Godfrey of Bouillion. Most notably, it mentions Peter the

\textsuperscript{26} Chazan, European Jewry, 59–70, 89–90, 94 (esp. 59, 94). See also Chazan, God, Humanity, and History, 65–67.

\textsuperscript{27} Eidelberg, ed., The Jews and the Crusaders, 17–18. Haverkamp also points to some of the similarities but offers no explanation of how they came to be. See Haverkamp, ed., Hebräische Berichte, 97, 487 n. 19, 489 n. 23.

\textsuperscript{28} Kenneth Stow, “Conversion, Apostasy, and Apprehensiveness: Emicho of Flonheim and the Fear of Jews in the Twelfth Century,” Speculum 76 (2001): 911–33, 916.

\textsuperscript{29} See Chazan, European Jewry, 61–63, 89–90, 94.

\textsuperscript{30} הכניסכלהקהלבחדרהפנימישלו (Haverkamp, ed., Hebräische Berichte, 309). The translation appeared in Eidelberg, ed., The Jews and the Crusaders, 28.

\textsuperscript{31} “Iudeos in spaciosissimo domus sue solio … constituit” (Albert of Aachen, Historia Ierosolimitana, 52–53).

\textsuperscript{32} Compare Haverkamp, ed., Hebräische Berichte, 293. Heinrich Graetz noted the similarity of this Latin phrase to the wording of another Hebrew account, but that in Shlomo’s text seems closer. See Heinrich Graetz, Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart: Aus den Quellen neu bearbeitet, 11 vols. (Leipzig, 1853–75), 6:360.

\textsuperscript{33} (Haverkamp, ed., Hebräische Berichte, 309); “episcopum Ruothardum” (Albert of Aachen, Historia Ierosolimitana, 50).
Hermit and the journey of his group through the Rhineland eastward. 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. For this reason, earlier Hebrew chroniclers ignored him completely, yet Shlomo chose to report on his journey in detail. The Historia describes Peter as the one who initiated the crusade and acted as one of its major leaders. The fact that Shlomo adopted this point of view supports the line of reasoning that he knew Albert’s account, as do the other examples above.

Even so, 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. Such individuals could easily have 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. A closer look at the peculiar story of the Crusaders’ goose makes 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 Jews, who were told by their Christian neighbors that this miracle was indisputable evidence that the Lord had chosen Christianity over Judaism. Albert of Aachen presents a similar story, including the same hint of ridicule concerning the gullibility of lower-class Crusaders. However, one cannot on the basis of this story definitively

34 Haverkamp, ed., Hebräische Berichte, 471, 485–89. See also 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. See Suzanne Duparc-Quioc, ed., Chanson d’Antioche (Paris, 1976), 20–21, 30–36.
36 שום שאלתי פיה זכאי. (משםسألתי פיה זכאי, שלמה בר שמואל, הורקתי והمؤרים במגנצא, מסמך שלמה בר איילון, 433); Eidelberg, ed., The Jews and the Crusaders, 55. For the suggestion that Shlomo used this practice to write only some of his text, see Chazan, “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. See 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; and Harari, “Eyewitnessing in Accounts of the First Crusade,” 95–96.
38 Haverkamp, ed., Hebräische Berichte, 300–301.
39 Albert of Aachen, Historia Ierosolimitana, 58–59.
conclude 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 to that of this Hebrew chronicle than to that of the Historia. Moreover, other Latin accounts—those of Guibert of Nogent and Ekkehard of Aura—report on the Crusaders’ goose. It is plausible that, even if this story sounds like a colorful tale conceived by a creative chronicler, it refers to an actual historical event. The best explanation for the correlation between the Historia and Shlomo’s chronicle is that both writers were documenting the same event, not that one text influenced the other. Accordingly, it is not enough to point to the similarities between the texts in order to prove that Shlomo indeed knew Albert’s account or that Shlomo and Albert had a common source.

To demonstrate a historical connection between Shlomo’s chronicle and the Historia, the following passages focus on the last part of the Hebrew account, in which Shlomo writes about the journeys of the Crusaders through Hungary. This section of the account has received much less attention since it portrays events that happened after the attacks against the Jews had been carried out. Other medieval Hebrew sources do not contain parallel sections as their writers probably considered relevant only events involving Jews. As noted above, most of the Christian sources also ignore these events or describe them only briefly. Consequently, even the fact that the chronicles of Albert and Shlomo are the two main sources that discuss this issue in detail suggests a connection between them. Yet there are much stronger reasons to presume that such a connection existed.

The chronicles of Shlomo and Albert offer several examples of similar descriptions of the events in Hungary (see table 1 above). Both accounts provide a detailed depiction of the journey taken by Peter the Hermit and his men. Shlomo depicts the first contact between Peter and King Coloman I as follows: “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

40Haverkamp, ed., Hebräische Berichte, 300–301; Guibert of Nogent, Dei gesta per Francos, 331; Ekkehard of Aura, Hierosolymita, 5:19; Raspe, “The Black Death in Jewish Sources,” 475–77 (esp. n. 17); Rubenstein, “Guibert of Nogent, Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres,” 31.
41Eidelberg, ed., The Jews and the Crusaders, 17–18; Stow, “Conversion, Apostasy, and Apprentensiveness,” 916; Chazan, God, Humanity, and History, 65–67, and European Jewry, 63–64; Baer, “The Persecution of 1096,” 128–30.
42Haverkamp, ed., Hebräische Berichte, 484–89.
43See n. 3 above.
manner and not harm his subjects in any city.”44 While this account relies on a biblical passage (Num. 21:21–22),45 it also presents a clear 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

Indeed, despite the differences in style and language (which are only to be expected), the content of these two passages is almost identical, as Baer notes.47 Shlomo tells another story about Peter’s group that resembles the account in 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 in his discussion of the hasty crossing of the river between the cities of Zemun and Belgrade:49 “Peter . . . left

44Eidelberg, ed., The Jews and the Crusaders, 68; וידישו עליו מלכון אלו מלך הונגריה ולאמר: נעברו
45As other scholars have pointed out. See Eidelberg, ed., The Jews and the Crusaders, 68, 159
46“Hiis locatis, protinus regnatori Vngrie nuncia direxit, quatenus sibi suisque consociis pa
teret aditus et transitus per medium regni eius. Quod illi concessum est, ea conditione in
terposita, ne in terra regis predam contingeret, sed pacifice uiam teneret, omnia uero quibus
indigeret exercitus sine iurgio et lite precio mutuarent.” Albert of Aachen, Historia Ierosolim-
47Baer, “The Persecution of 1096,” 128.
48. ——.—–
49Albert refers to the river “Maroam,” which is the Morava. However, the river flowing be-

between Zemun and Belgrade is the Sava, a tributary of the Danube. Shlomo refers only to the
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.”

In this case, there are some differences between the accounts: for example, one claims that the Crusaders dismantled wooden houses to build a bridge, while the other states that they constructed rafts from available timber. Nevertheless, the problem that the Crusaders faced and the solution that they found are described in similar terms. In addition, both accounts characterize Peter’s group as a “great army, as innumerable as the sand of the sea.” They also depict the attack against this group in the same manner. Shlomo writes that “[the Hungarians] began to slay those who lagged behind,” Albert that “they beheaded and stabbed those who were slow and at the tail end of the army.” While Shlomo insists that the attackers killed every last one of the Crusaders, Albert maintains that they were able to regroup and that many of them arrived at Constantinople. But the parallels between the stories are clear.

After he describes the fate of Peter’s group, Shlomo turns to the journey of another Crusaders’ group—this one led by Count Emicho of Flonheim—through Hungary. Again, his account echoes Albert’s. He states, for example: “The kingdom of Hungary was completely closed because of the enemies of the Danube in his account, and thus both chronicles contain 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 repert. . . . Vnde quamplurimi quibus naues defecerant, iunctura lignorum et copulatione uimium transire certabant” (Albert of Aachen, Historia Ierosolimitana, 18).
51 “exercitus illius copiosus, ut harena maris innumerabilis” (Albert of Aachen, Historia Ierosolimitana, 12–13); “כה הוה גאון גוי חולא אש אש על שפת וים” (Haverkamp, ed., Hebräische Berichte, 487); “They were very great in number, an assemblage as multitudinous as the grains of sand upon the seashore” (Eidelberg, ed., The Jews and the Crusaders, 69). Compare 1 Sam. 13:5.
52 “ac tardos et extremos exercitus detruncare et transfigere non parcentes” (Albert of Aachen, Historia Ierosolimitana, 20–21).
53 Some historians mistakenly refer to Emicho of Flonheim as Emicho of Leningen. See Ingo Toussaint, Die Grafen von Leiningen: Studien zur leiningischen Genealogie und Territorialgeschichte bis zur Teilung von 1317/18 (Sigmaringen, 1982), 25–28; Hannes Möhring, “Graf Emicho und die Judenverfolgungen von 1096,” Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter 56 (1992): 97–111, 102–4; and Stow, “Conversion, Apostasy, and Apprehensiveness,” 915.
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’s account of the same event corresponds to Shlomo’s: “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 that city’s 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.\(^{59}\) The story of Emicho’s group thus provides further evidence for the correlation between the two chronicles.

Interestingly, Shlomo seems to have combined 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: “The Greeks pursued [Emicho’s men] from all sides [after they were defeated] 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 depiction is to assume that Shlomo (or his source) conflated...
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, the second the battle of Emicho’s group against the Hungarians near Mosonmagyaróvár (i.e., Miesenburch or Mosony). The Bulgarians (“the Greeks”) certainly did not attack Emicho’s men, who never advanced farther 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).  

This may be taken as further evidence that Shlomo was familiar with some of the information presented in the *Historia* but also as an indication that this information was somehow distorted.

Even though Shlomo confused different parts of the narrative, it is evident that he constructed his story in a manner similar to that in which the *Historia* was constructed. As is evident in table 2, almost all the components of Shlomo’s story appear in the first book of Albert’s work and in a similar order. Not all the details match, but the structure of the narrative is clearly identical. One might argue that this is coincidental, that Albert and Shlomo simply chose to present the events in 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 in Hungary, Shlomo flipped the order, probably since he organized this section of his account according to the structure presented in the *Historia*.

In short, there are significant similarities between the two descriptions of the journey of the Crusaders through Hungary (see table 1 above). Thus, it is evident that Shlomo used the *Historia*, or a source related to it, as the basis for this section and possibly 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 Baer and Haverkamp excluded) as these pointed out only parallel ideas, beliefs, or cultural elements. However, some sections in Shlomo’s chronicle and the *Historia* share particular narrative structures, phrases, and even words. In this

62 Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 22–25, 54–57; Eidelberg, ed., *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. See Haverkamp, ed., *Hebräische Berichte*, 485. In fact, Peter’s army probably took a route different than the one used by Emicho and never crossed the Leitha. See 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 יָשַׁבְרוּ גָּשִׁים. Compare “pontes enim longa uetustate dirutos reparauerunt” (Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 56); n. 61 above; and table 1 above.
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 those in Central Europe—had no knowledge of Latin64 and probably no access to the relevant manuscripts, manuscripts usually being 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 Historia 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 The Hebrew account should therefore be considered a partial variant, not a copy, of the Latin one.

63Albert of Aachen, Historia Ierosolimitana, xxxvii–xlvi; Edgington, “The Historia Ierosolimitana,” 42–70.
64Kirsten A. Fudeman, Vernacular Voices: Language and Identity in Medieval French Jewish Communities (Philadelphia, 2010), 1–2, 14–18; Raspe, “The Black Death in Jewish Sources,” 477; Roos, “God Wants It!” 42–46.
65Albert of Aachen, Historia Ierosolimitana, xxxvii–xlvi; Edgington, “The Historia Ierosolimitana,” 42–57.
66For example, the descriptions of the conflict between the Hungarians and the Crusaders over the selling of food and of the hostages who turned against Emicho. See Haverkamp, ed., Hebräische Berichte, 484–89. There are some vague parallels in the Historia, but Shlomo may have simply invented these details or found them elsewhere. See Albert of Aachen, Historia Ierosolimitana, 18–21, 66–71. Eidelberg and Baer note these “mistakes” in Shlomo’s account. See Eidelberg, ed., The Jews and the Crusaders, 17–18; and Baer, “The Persecution of 1096,” 129.
In his chronicle, Shlomo seems to claim that he had eyewitness accounts of the events in Hungary: “And the remnant [of the massacre of the Crusaders] came, and our hearts heard and rejoiced, for the Lord showed us vengeance against our enemies.”

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 the structure gives the impression that the information about the massacre 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 the plural) who endured the Crusaders’ attacks in 1096, 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. So how did the information conveyed by the survivors reach Shlomo decades later? One possible explanation is that Jewish elders conveyed the testimonies they heard in 1096 to Shlomo later on or that he himself met old Christian survivors. Yet we have noted that Shlomo’s text is very similar to the Historia in some particular details and phrases, thus suggesting that they had common sources or that the former relied on the latter. It is unlikely, however, that Shlomo and Albert heard similar testimonies since Shlomo worked around forty years after Albert. Another explanation is that a different Hebrew writer, working closer to the time of the battles in Hungary, composed this description and that Shlomo later added it to his account of the events. Yet the different sections of Shlomo’s chronicle seem similar in language and style and combine logically into a complete narrative. It is more likely that the way in which 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.”

If this is the case, it is even more difficult to explain how Shlomo obtained 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 he used some vernacular version of a First Crusade account. The

---

67 כיהראנויינקמהבאויבינו, הפליטהבאהושמעהושימחלvoie (Haverkamp, ed., Hebräische Berichte, 489).
68 Haverkamp, ed., Hebräische Berichte, 433.
69 See the discussion above of the reasons to believe that Shlomo was the single editor of the chronicle. See also Haverkamp, ed., Hebräische Berichte, 59–63.
70 “sicut hii pro uero affirmant qui presentes uix euaserunt” (Albert of Aachen, Historia Ierosolimitana, 48–49). Similar statements appear occasionally throughout Albert’s text. See Harari, “Eyewitnessing in Accounts of the First Crusade,” 95–96.
first scenario suggests that a German version of the *Historia* circulated in the Rhineland during the first half of the twelfth century but has not survived in any 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—that 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. He therefore suggested that the two texts had a common source—the Lotharingian Chronicle.\(^{73}\) However, Susan Edgington has put forward the possibility 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. Even so, she agrees that Albert used some written or oral vernacular sources that did not survive, even if he did not use a whole, now 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 in 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 he knew Middle High German well, possibly as his native language. Noble has shown that, like that of the other Hebrew chroniclers of the First Crusade, his language was heavily influenced by the vernacular German. This is evident not

\(^{71}\) 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*. See 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. See Philip David Handyside, “The Old French Translation of William of Tyre” (PhD diss., Cardiff University, 2012), 119–27. 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 Ierosolimitana,” 17–23.

\(^{73}\) Peter Knoch, *Studien zu Albert von Aachen: Der erste Kreuzzug in der deutschen Chronistik* (Stuttgart, 1966), 29–63, 152–206.

\(^{74}\) Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxvi–xxviii; Edgington, “The Historia Ierosolimitana,” 11–30, and “Albert of Aachen and the Chansons de Geste.” See 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. See Jay Rubenstein, “What Is the *Gesta Francorum*, and Who Was Peter Tudebode?” *Revue Mabillon* 16 (2005): 179–204.
only in particular terms and phrases but also in certain grammatical structures.\textsuperscript{75} This is true for the entire chronicle, including the parts that were apparently influenced by the \textit{Historia}. If these parts were a direct translation of the Latin text, one would expect to see more Latin influences 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).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{78} Shlomo probably learned of this (German) name from an unknown vernacular source, not from the Latin version of the \textit{Historia}. Another example that indicates a vernacular source is the references to Peter the Hermit. We have seen that Shlomo is the only Hebrew writer to mention Peter, and this suggests that Christian traditions led him to do so. Still, he refers to Peter not by his Latin name, Petrus, but by vernacular versions of it. When he first mentions Peter, he calls him “Piderbalrat,” probably a mispronunciation of “Peter Prälat,” that is, Peter the Prelate in Middle High German.\textsuperscript{79} Later, he refers to him as “Pidron the priest,” a unique form of this name that appears nei-

\textsuperscript{75}Noble, “Yiddish Calques in Rabbinic Hebrew,” 174–77; Eidelberg, ed., \textit{The Jews and the Crusaders}, 15. See also Erika Timm, \textit{Graphische und phonische Struktur des Westjiddischen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Zeit um 1600} (Tübingen, 1987), 357–86. For different opinions regarding the language spoken by Jews in the medieval German Empire, see Alexander Beider, \textit{Origins of Yiddish Dialects} (Oxford, 2015), 1–10.

\textsuperscript{76}דונאי (Haverkamp, ed., \textit{Hebräische Berichte}, 487–89). The Latin form is \textit{Danubius}. See, e.g., Albert of Aachen, \textit{Historia Ierosolimitana}, 14, 16, 52, 56. The Middle High German term is \textit{Tuonowe} (but later \textit{Donaw} or \textit{Donau}). See Jacob Grimm, \textit{Deutsche Grammatik, Vierter Theil} (Gütersloh, 1898), 1:479. Shlomo, like Jews in later generations, used a form closer to the Slavic \textit{Dunaj}. See Beider, \textit{Origins of Yiddish Dialects}, 428. For the Slavic influence on early Judeo-German, see Timm, \textit{Graphische und phonische Struktur des Westjiddischen}, 360–61.

\textsuperscript{77}רואס צלאה יוה אימכוהרשע, פשהו מולהוהים (Haverkamp, ed., \textit{Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen}, 487).

\textsuperscript{78}Haverkamp, ed., \textit{Hebräische Berichte}, 267, 307–15; Albert of Aachen, \textit{Historia Ierosolimitana}, 50–57; Ekkehard of Aura, \textit{Ekkehardi chronicon universale}, 6:208, 215, and \textit{Hierosolymita}, 5:20; \textit{Annalista Saxo}, 6:729–30; Otto of Freising, \textit{Chronica sive historia de duabus civitatibus}, MGH, SS rer. Germ. 45:311 (1912; reprint, 1984); Toussaint, \textit{Die Grafen von Leiningen}, 26–28; Möhring, “Graf Emicho,” 102–3. 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. See Heinrich Beyer, ed., \textit{Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der jetzt die Preussischen Regierungsbzirke Coblenz und Trier bildenden mittelrheinischen Territorien}, 3 vols. (Coblenz, 1860–74), 1:451 (no. 395), 568 (no. 512).

\textsuperscript{79}רואס צלאה יוה אימכוהרשע, פשהו מולהוהים (Haverkamp, ed., \textit{Hebräische Berichte}, 470–71 [esp. n. 3]).
ther 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 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 probably relied on an early version of the *Chanson d’Antioche* and perhaps on other related poems, a vernacular version of the *Historia* could have also referred to Peter by this unique name. 82 Thus, these examples indicate 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 demonstrates that, in order to write his account, Shlomo used a Christian source (or sources) related to the chronicle of Albert of Aachen that 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 of the crusade may also have been influenced by it. This is an important conclusion for the study of First Crusade chronicles. While it is evident that some of these chronicles influenced each other, historians often assume that such influence was direct, that is, 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
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80 Peninsula (Haverkamp, ed., *Hebräische Berichte*, 471, 485–87); “Sacerdos quidam Petrus nomine, quondam heremita” (Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 2); Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta per Francos*, 121.

81 Duparc-Quiox, ed., *Chanson d’Antioche*, 30, 40, 317, 364; Nigel R. Thorp, ed., *The Old French Crusade Cycle: La chanson de Jérusalem* (Tuscaloosa, AL, 1992), 162, 165, 174, 185, 191–92, 194, 212–14; Geoffrey M. Myers, ed., *The Old French Crusade Cycle: Les chétifs* (Tuscaloosa, AL, 1981), 11, 40, 42, 56, 84.

82 Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxvi–xxvii; Edgington, “The Historia Ierosolimitana,” 11–17, and “Albert of Aachen and the Chansons de Geste.” 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. See Timm, *Graphische und phonische Struktur des Westjiddischen*, 361–65; and Beider, *Origins of Yiddish Dialects*, 375–411.

83 In the context of this study, see Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxvi–xxviii; Edgington, “The Historia Ierosolimitana,” 11–30, and “Albert of Aachen and the Chansons de Geste”; Rubenstein, “Guibert of Nogent, Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres,” 24–37, and “What Is the Gesta Francorum?” 179–204; and Harari, “Eyewitnessing in Accounts of the First Crusade,” 77–99.
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 in his chronicle. As shown above, older Hebrew accounts, as well as the testimonies of eyewitnesses, supplied him with an abundance of details regarding the attacks on the Jews in 1096. 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.” He adds a series of biblical verses describing the vengeance of God against the enemies of the Jews and the future salvation of Israel. Finally, he dedicates a short passage to the building of a new synagogue in Speyer and the rehabilitation of the Jewish community there. In this manner, he 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. He 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, 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). 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.

84Haverkamp, ed., *Hebräische Berichte*, 49–63, 70–136, 433; Chazan, *God, Humanity, and History*, 52–56, 63–65; Abulafia, “The Interrelationship between the Hebrew Chronicles,” 221–39; Eidelberg, ed., *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 15–19; Roos, “God Wants It!” 11–16.
85שבראינווןעשנופ нашем (Haverkamp, ed., *Hebräische Berichte*, 489); Eidelberg, ed., *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 71.
86Haverkamp, ed., *Hebräische Berichte*, 490–93.
87Compare Baer, “The Persecution of 1096,” 129–30; Chazan, *God, Humanity, and History*, 66–67; and Eidelberg, ed., *The Jews and the Crusaders*, 19.
88Haverkamp, ed., *Hebräische Berichte*, 373–75, 469. All the same, the other Hebrew chronicles present ideas of divine retribution against the Christians, yet this retribution is expected at the End of Days, not in the course of history. See Yuval, *Two Nations in Your Womb*, 108–14, 119–23, 151, 156–59; and Shepkaru, *Jewish Martyrs*, 192–205.
Moreover, Shlomo found in Albert’s chronicle (or in a vernacular source related to it) criticism of the Crusaders and in particular of Emicho and his men. After describing the massacre of Emicho’s army by the Hungarians, 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 fornicating unions and had punished the exiled Jews (who are admittedly hostile to Christ) with a great massacre, rather from greed for their 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 for 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 he 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 on the basis of the Historia). Even if Christians told and wrote this story as part of their crusading narrative, he did not see it as an inherently Christian story and used it for his own purposes. This conclusion suggests that he 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 composed 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 Hebrew crusade chronicles as part of the general literature produced in the aftermath of the First Crusade while carefully considering the possibility that detailed narratives crossed lingual and geographic boundaries.90

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

90 As was the case with Latin and vernacular sources. See Albert of Aachen, Historia Ierosolimitana, xxvi–xxviii; Edgington, “The Historia Iherosolimitana,” 11–30, and “Albert of
Second, 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 Baer, 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 leads to speculative arguments. In addressing this challenge, I have 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. Employing a similar approach to study more of the early texts of European Jewry can contribute much to a field constricted by limited historical sources.
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