



Mirator 2/23 (2024)

eISSN 1457-2362

Glossa ry - Keskiajan tutkimuksen seura / Sällskapet för medeltidsforskning /

Society for Medieval studies in Finland

<https://journal.fi/mirator>

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0



VERTAISARVIOITU
KOLLEGIALT GRANSKAD
PEER-REVIEWED
www.tsv.fi/tunnus

“Until I plant my spear in Byzantium itself”: Bohemond of Antioch’s Rhōmaiōn (Im) Persona(tion)

Matthew Carey Salyer

United States Military Academy, West Point

matthew.salyer@westpoint.edu

To cite this article:

Matthew Carey Salyer. ““Until I plant my spear in Byzantium itself’: Bohemond of Antioch’s Rhōmaiōn (Im) Persona(tion)”. *Mirator* 2/2023 (2024), 24–50.

“Until I plant my spear in Byzantium itself”: Bohemond of Antioch’s Rhōmaiōn (Im) Persona(tion)

MATTHEW CAREY SALYER

“We desire what others desire,” René Girard claims, “because we imitate their desire.”¹ When the “Prince’s Crusade” set out to retake the Holy Sepulchre in 1096, many participants understood their martial pilgrimage in terms of “Christo-mimesis,” a form of “taking the Cross to follow Christ.”² The Norman warlord, Bohemond d’Hauteville, for example, was besieging Amalfi with his uncle, Roger I of Sicily, when he first witnessed “countless hosts of Franks” bound for Jerusalem and “ordered his best manteau cut to shreds and made into crosses.”³ For Bohemond, though, Christo-mimesis clearly involved imitating the *imitatio Christi* of other crusaders as well as Christ’s Passion. He situated himself as mediatorial figure, an interpreter of mass desire. According to the earliest chronicle of the First Crusade, the *Gesta Francorum* (c.1100–1101), Bohemond’s fellow Normans “began to rush so fiercely toward him that Count Roger remained almost alone.”⁴ The *Gesta* tellingly referred to Bohemond cutting his *pallium* (“manteau”) into crosses,⁵ making the sort of ambiguous slippage between sacerdotal and martial vestments, roles, and representa-

¹ René Girard, “Generative Scapegoating,” in Robert G. Hamerton-Kelly, ed., *Violent Origins: Walter Burkert, René Girard, and Jonathan Z. Smith on Ritual Killing and Cultural Formation* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1987), 122.

² William J. Purkiss, *Crusading Spirituality in the Holy Land and Iberia, c. 1095–c. 1187* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2008), 62.

³ “Mox Sancto commotus Spiritu iussit pretiosissimum pallium, quod apud se habebat, incidi, totumque statim in cruces expendit,” *Anonymi Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolymitanorum*, IV, 1–2, ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1890), 151–152. The anonymous author of the original *Gesta* archetype, perhaps a lay Norman knight, was almost undoubtedly connected with Bohemond’s party during the First Crusade. Post-c.1105, the *Gesta* rapidly gave rise to numerous adaptations, recensions, and rewritings including those of Guibert of Nogent, Robert the Monk, Baldric of Dol, and Peter Tudebode.

⁴ “Coepit tunc ad cum eum vehementer concurrere maxima para militum, qui errant in obsidione illa, adeo ut Rogerius comes pene solus remanserit, revursque Siciliam dolebat et maerebat quandoque gente amittere suam,” *ibid.*, 152.

⁵ “Pallium” could refer to either the customary clerical vestment or the formal “pallium quadrangulum” worn by princes and generals. Other contemporary accounts note that Bohemond “ordered the pallium to be brought” to him (“iussit afferi”); the notion of Bohemond wearing the pallium in the *Gesta* is inference. For further discussion, see note 11 in Hagenmeyer, *Anonymi Gesta*, 151. I follow Hagenmeyer in translating “pallium” as “manteau”.

tions that would come to characterize his own crusading rhetoric.⁶ The *Siège d'Antioche*, a late twelfth-century Anglo-Norman verse account falsely attributed to Baldric of Dol, described this sort of mimetic zeal as “vying” (*contençon*) for the Cross.⁷ By 1107, though, when Bohemond framed his Illyrian campaign against the Christian Rhōmaiōn emperor, Alexios I Komnenos,⁸ to Latin audiences as another crusade, the language of *contençon* from a decade prior made less sense as literal *iter Ierosolimitanum*.⁹

As a metaphorical use of geopieties,¹⁰ Bohemond’s association of Constantinople with the *iter Ierosolimitanum* or *via sancti Sepulchri* was rooted in the mimetic emulation of past crusaders, the

⁶ The problem of parsing the historical Bohemond’s speeches from the “Bohemond” of twelfth-century accounts is partly aggravated by the intersection of his c.1105–1106 European tour with the development of the anonymous *Gesta Francorum*, as well as the accounts of Robert the Monk, Baldric of Dol, and others. See Robert the Monk, *Robert the Monk’s History of the First Crusade: The Historia Iherosolimitana*, tr. Carol Sweetenham (London: Routledge, 2005); Baldric of Dol, *The Historia Ierosolimitana of Baldric of Bourgueil*, ed. Steven Biddlecombe (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2014). See, especially, the discussion of sources in Biddlecombe’s introduction. For text-transmission with respect to Bohemond and the First Crusade, see Marcus Bull, “Robert the Monk and his Source(s),” and Damien Kempf, “Toward a Textual Archaeology of the First Crusade,” in Marcus Bull and Damien Kempf, eds., *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2014), 116–140; Kenneth B. Wolf, “Crusade and Narrative: Bohemond and the Gesta Francorum,” *Journal of Medieval History* 17 (1991), 207–216.

⁷ “Lors lur veïssiez prendre | la croiz a contençon,” *Siège d'Antioche* 1.3, laisse 4, Siege of Antioch Project, medievaldigital.ace.fordham.edu/siegeofantioch/the-text/. Accessed 28 March 2023. There is no complete text of the poem; the two surviving manuscripts are MS Hatton 77 (Bodleian Library, Oxford, UK), and MS Add. 34114 (British Library, London, UK). See Jennifer Gabel de Aguirre, ed., *La chanson de la Première Croisade en ancien français d'après Baudri de Bourgueil: Édition et analyse lexicale* (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2015).

⁸ For the more familiar “Byzantine” and “Byzantine Empire,” I use “Rhōmaiōn” (Ρωμαίων) and “Rhōmais” (Ρωμαίς) throughout, deferring to the ethnonymic naming conventions for “Byzantine”/“Eastern Roman” during the Komnenian era. In this study, “Rhōmaiōn”/“Rhōmais” better reflects the attendant frictions of transculturation during the First Crusade. For the broader historiographical debate over “Byzantine” nomenclature, see, for example, Anthony Kaldellis, *Romanland: Ethnicity and Empire in Byzantium* (Boston: Harvard UP, 2019); Yannis Stouraitis, *Identities and Ideologies in the Medieval East Roman World* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2022).

⁹ See Georgios Theotokis, “Bohemond of Taranto’s 1107–8 Campaign in Byzantine Illyria – Can It Be Viewed as a Crusade?” *Rosetta* 11 (2012), 72–81. Theotokis argues that “we can conclude that Bohemond’s expedition was a Crusade for it was preached as a *via sancti Sepulchri*, the banner of St. Peter was provided and a papal legate was sent to preach and inspire the masses” (79). He nonetheless acknowledges that “whether or not Pope Pascal had given his full support to the campaign can be debated and all depends on whether we think that the primary sources are credible enough or should be dismissed because they provide information based on hindsight” (79).

¹⁰ The geographer, J.K. Wright coined the term, “geopiety,” as a description for how spiritual or religious meanings map onto specific geographical terrains in “Notes on Early American Geopiety,” *Human Nature and Geography* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1966). For use in context of the Crusades, see, for example, Andrew Jotischky, *The Perfection of Solitude: Hermits and Monks in the Crusader States* (University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 2010), 156; Dorothy Kim, “Rewriting Liminal Geographies: Crusader Sermons, the Katherine Group, and the Scribe of MS Bodley 34,” *Journal of Medieval Religious Cultures* 42.1 (2016), 56–78.

Siege's "esteemed" deeds of "not that long ago."¹¹ At the same time, "taking the Cross" projected imitative desires against a vivid, violent tableau of the imagined future. While twelfth-century chroniclers were sometimes reticent about comparing Frankish exploits in the First Crusade to Biblical "deeds of the Israelite people or Maccabees,"¹² there was little such hesitation about using prophetic language. As Jay Rubenstein remarks, Bohemond's near-contemporaries depicted him speaking as though his campaign to overthrow Alexios would unfold "in *novis temporibus* – the Last Days."¹³ But Bohemond also instigated his audience's desire for lasting, tangible gains, such as might be untroubled by literal apocalypse. Writing c.1115–1141, the Benedictine chronicler, Orderic Vitalis, reflected that Bohemond "promised his chosen adjutants wealthy towns and castles" if they "bore arms to attack the Emperor with him."¹⁴ So did Bohemond, some decades prior, truly think that he lived in the Last Days or not? What did it mean, either for Bohemond's immediate or second-hand audiences, to hear of a campaign instigated in this manner after the First Crusade?

In a strict biographical sense, any answers are speculative. We do not have primary sources written by the Norman warlord that might inform us, and rely instead on post facto accounts, often written decades later. While there were certainly literate or clerically-trained *milites* among the participants in the First Crusade,¹⁵ Nicholas Paul reminds us that scholarship ascribing the "production or manipulation and dissemination of written texts" to Bohemond treats him as "nearly unique among all of the lay lords of Western Christendom at this time."¹⁶ But such enquiries highlight important aspects of Bohemond's portrayal as orator, performer, and rhetorician by his contem-

¹¹ "Seignurs, bien est seü, | et n'est pas lungement, / Estoiert cil proisié | et servi largement / Qui chantoient les faiz | de l'anciene gent." *Siège d'Antioche* 1.3, laisse 1. For characterizations of crusading as the "road to Jerusalem/Holy Sepulchre" in this context, see Suger of Saint-Denis, *Vie de Louis le Gros par Suger Suive de L'Histoire du Roi Louis VII*, ed. Auguste Molinier (Paris: Libraire des Archives nationales et de la Société de l'École des Chartres, 1887), 23, in which Bohemond calls his audience to both a "journey to Jerusalem" ("Ierosolimitano itinere") and an "expedition to the Holy Sepulcher" ("sancti Sepulchri viam"). Purkiss (43) notes that "via sancti Sepulchri" was applied to both the First Crusade and Bohemond's anti-Komnenian campaign by the anonymous author of *La Chronique de St. Maixent, 751–1140*, tr. Jean Verdun (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1979), 154, 168, and 178.

¹² "Licet autem nec Israeliticae plebis nec Machabaeorum aut Aliorum plurium praerogativae, quos Deus tam crebis et magnificis miraculosis inlustravit, hoc opus praelibatum equiparare non audeam, tamen haut longe ab illis gestis inferis aestimatum," in Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana* (1095–1127), ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1913), 117.

¹³ Jay Rubenstein, *Nebuchadnezzar's Dream: The Crusades, Apocalyptic Prophecy, and the End of History* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2019), 14.

¹⁴ "[...] omnes armatos secum in imperatorem ascendere commonuit, ac approbatis optionibus urbes et oppida ditissima promisit," in Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History*, 6 vols, ed. Marjorie Chibnall (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1969–80), 6: 70–71. Orderic, who took a notably critical perspective on Bohemond as self-interested adventurer, used Fulcher of Chartres and Baldric of Dol as sources, but with notable additions. See Daniel Roach, "Orderic Vitalis and the First Crusade," *Journal of Medieval History* 42.2, 177–201.

¹⁵ As Conor Kostick remarks with regards to the authorship of the *Gesta Francorum*, "general considerations of literacy c. 1100, along with the words of the author himself, do not have to lead to a conclusion that such narrative histories were necessarily the work of clerics," in *The Social Structure of the First Crusade* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 13–14. Kostick draws attention to literate milites of the First Crusade such as Baldwin of Boulogne (Baldwin I of Jerusalem) and Pons of Balazuc, who Raymond of Aguilers identified as a contributor to his own account. See Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders: 1095–1131* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997), 218; Bernard Hamilton, *Religion in the Medieval West* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2003), 108.

¹⁶ Nicholas S. Paul, "A Warlord's Wisdom: Literacy and Propaganda at the Time of the First Crusade," *Speculum* 85.3 (2010), 535.

poraries and near-contemporaries. If, as Paul notes, Bohemond was considered “*sapientissimus*” (the wisest) among the leaders of the First Crusade,¹⁷ a “knight of real brilliance” (*magnae mentis eques*),¹⁸ then what made the different threads of his “Last Days” rhetoric seem both coherent and unique to twelfth-century audiences?

Considering Bohemond’s rhetoric highlights the hermeneutical problem posed by First Crusade texts, namely the “problem of primary sources, their contents and nature,” as well as contested historiographical text recensions that posit “one or several archetypes that may have served as a source of information to the chroniclers.”¹⁹ As Damien Kempf remarks, this requires a “move away from a static conception of texts as data” to an understanding of their “dynamic function as literary works, shaped by their intersection with specific actors at different times.”²⁰ Maximalist readings, such as Rubenstein’s account of Bohemond’s anti-Komnenian invectives c.1106,²¹ highlight Bohemond’s slippage between speaker and speech for twelfth-century audiences, whose textual cultures were marked by both a high degree of orality and the rhetorical “detachment of events from a temporal frame.”²² Carol Sweetenham, for example, has argued that the *Gesta Francorum*’s textual archetype was meant to be performed.²³ More broadly, emergent textual cultures in Bohemond’s time “exhibited on all sides the heavy residue of primary orality.”²⁴ Paul Zumthor remarks that this made medieval poetics “marginally less clear” than in prior eras, producing the “increasing illusion of hearing a more personal voice behind the text’s message.”²⁵

In this article, I want to posit that depictions of Bohemond’s rhetorical apocalypticism portray it as a fundamentally descriptive technique rather than a temporal or theological schema. As descriptive register, it was adaptable to different political situations and associated with the mimetic production of Bohemond’s “personal voice” within texts. It was also an inventive, imitative product of Latin-Rhōmaiōn transculturation during the First Crusade. Alexios’s daughter, Anna Komnene,

¹⁷ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 5513, fols 66c–67r, transcribed in Nicholas S. Paul, “Crusade, Memory and Regional Politics in Twelfth-Century Amboise,” *Journal of Medieval History* 31 (2005), 141; qtd. in Paul, “Warlord’s Wisdom,” 534.

¹⁸ William of Apulia, *Guillaume de Pouille: La Geste de Robert Guiscard*, tr. Marguerite Matthieu (Palermo: Institutio Siciliano di Studi Bizantini e Neollenici, 1962), 232; qtd. In Paul, “Warlord’s Wisdom,” 534.

¹⁹ Aryeh Grabois, “The First Crusade and the Jews,” in Khalil I. Semaan, ed., *The Crusades: Other Experiences, Alternate Perspectives. Selected Proceedings from the 32nd Annual CEMERS Conference* (Binghamton: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 2003), 16.

²⁰ Damien Kempf, “Toward a Textual Archaeology of the First Crusade,” in Marcus Bull and Damien Kempf eds., *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory* (Martlesham: Boydell & Brewer, 2014), 116.

²¹ I am thinking, for example, of Rubenstein’s treatment of the apocryphal episode from *The Alexiad* 11.12 in which Anna Komnene claims that Bohemond fakes his own death during his sea voyage across the Mediterranean, which Rubenstein describes as a “charade [that] was the set up for the grand, theatrical tour of France, whose opening act occurred in the churchyard of Saint-Leonard de Noblat in 1106,” in *Nebuchadnezzar’s Dream*, 17. See, more broadly, the treatment of Bohemond’s circle and the production of the *Gesta* in Rubenstein’s “The Deeds of Bohemond: Reform, Propaganda and the History of the First Crusade,” *Viator* (2016), 36–53.

²² Hanz-Werner Goetz, “The Concept of Time in the Historiography of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries,” in Gerd Althoff, Johannes Fried, and Patrick J. Geary, eds., *Medieval Concepts of the Past: Ritual, Memory, Historiography* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002), 153.

²³ Carol Sweetenham, “2000 Cows and 4000 Pigs at One Sitting: Was the *Gesta Francorum* Written to Be Performed in Latin?” *The Medieval Chronicle* 13 (2002), 266–288.

²⁴ Walter J. Ong, “Orality, Literacy, and Medieval Textualization,” *New Literary History* 16.1 (1984), 3.

²⁵ Paul Zumthor, *Toward a Medieval Poetics*, tr. Philip Bennett (Minneapolis: U of Minneapolis P, 1992), 40.

for example, shared Bohemond's prophetic penchant in her quasi-memoiristic *Alexiad* (*Ἀλεξιάς*) (c.1148), depicting the “whole disk of the sun blotted out” before battles and the “whole people[s] [...] exterminated in one single day.”²⁶ As Penelope Buckley remarks, the *Alexiad*'s depiction of her father's “restoration of imperial glory” was “Armageddon [through] a host of analogues,” an “emulation of Crusader rhetoric.”²⁷ But Bohemond, in turn, depended on Rhōmaiōn topoï and contexts for evoking the End Times as – not through – a “host of analogues.” In this regard, it is notable that he is never depicted committing to a fixed interpretive scheme for his “Last Days” mimesis. Instead, his speeches pastiched Rhōmaiōn typologies surrounding the Antichrist's struggle with the “Last Emperor” – particularly those involving Julian the Apostate and St. Mercurius – with Latin experiences during the Siege of Antioch to depict his own fluid position as intercultural mediator, speaker, and potential power broker.

For Zumthor, the idea of “the work” (*l'oeuvre*), the deferred possibilities of “primary orality,” replaces the editorial archetype and thus resists closure²⁸ – an aptly elusive analogue for the cunning son of Robert “Guiscard” (“The Fox/Weasel”). In what follows, I hope to suggest certain key features of orality's “heavy residue” in depictions of Bohemond's anti-Komnenian rhetoric. In the first section, I will establish the resonance of allusions to the Rhōmaiōn apocalyptic tradition in accounts of his political orations, particularly for Franks with first- or second-hand experience of the First Crusade's theatres of war. Second, I will suggest that those allusions dovetailed with his own politico-narrative connection to Antioch through associations with the St. Mercurius cult. To the extent that we grant verisimilitude to near-contemporary accounts of Bohemond's anti-Komnenian performances, it is perhaps here that we see vestiges of the self-promotional. Lastly, I will examine how Anna Komnene responded to depictions of Bohemond's “Rhōmaiōn apocalyptic” character. In other words, how did Komnenian literate elites reread Bohemond into the Rhōmaiōn millenarian discourses that he seems to have adopted or become identified with? Ultimately, the descriptive subject of Bohemond's “Last Days” rhetoric, inexorably bound to broader cultural narratives of crusading and emergent textual cultures, was its own grand inference – Bohemond speaking.

²⁶ Anna Komnene, *The Alexiad*, tr. E. R. A. Sewter (London: Penguin, 2009), 190 [7.2]: “οὐπω παρήλθον ὥραι καὶ τὸ ἡλιακὸν φῶς ἐπιέλοιπεν, ὡς ἀφεγγὴ τὸν ὅλον δίσκον γενέσθαι ὑποδραμούσης αὐτὸν τῆς σελήνης”; 227 [8.5]: “ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅλον ἔθνος μυρίανδρον κατὰ μίαν καὶ μόνην ἀφανίσαι ἡμέραν.” Of the two standard English translations, Elizabeth Dawes's (Routledge, 1928) and E. R. A. Sewter's (Penguin, 1969), I have chosen to use Sewter's as the more idiomatic translation except where otherwise noted. The standard edition of the Greek text is Diether Reinsch and Athanasios Kambylis, eds., *Anna Komnenae Alexias* 2 vols. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2001). Throughout, I cite the Greek according to book and chapter.

²⁷ Penelope Buckley, *The Alexiad of Anna Komnene: Artistic Strategy in the Making of a Myth* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2014), 165–66. For context, see Peter Frankopan, “Perception and Projection of Prejudice: Anna Komnene, the Alexiad and the First Crusade,” in Susan Edgington and Sarah Lambert, *Gendering the Crusades* (Cardiff: U of Wales Press, 2002), 59–76. For the unique position of Anna Komnene, who both broke Rhōmaiōn social conventions and sought to align herself with them as historian-narrator, see Leonora Neville, *Anna Komnene: The Life and Work of a Medieval Historian* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2016).

²⁸ “The work: what is communicated poetically in the hear-and-now; texts, sounds rhythms, visual components; the term encompasses the whole of performance factors; the text: a linguistic sequence gravitating toward closure, and such that its overall meaning is not reducible to the sum of the specific meanings produced by its components in sequence; and I add, for greater clarity, the poem: the text (and, where applicable, the melody) of the work, absent consideration of other performance components,” in Zumthor's *La Lettre et la voix: De la ‘littérature’ médiévale* (Paris: Seuil, 1987), 246. The translation is my own.

Bohemond's "Alexios" and Julian the Apostate: A Rhōmaiōn Antichrist for the Franks

Years later, exiled to the Kecharitomene Monastery, Anna Komnene recalled the first appearance of Latin crusaders at Constantinople. To Anna, the "Kelts" seemed to have arrived "one after another, with arms and horses and the other equipment for war" like an apocalyptic force of nature, "outnumbering the sand of the seashore."²⁹ It was Bohemond, though, her father's erstwhile liegeman (*λίξιος άνθρωπος*) and great antagonist,³⁰ who unsettled her descriptive sensibilities.³¹ He was a figure of striking contrasts. Big and bellicose, his "baptismal name was Mark; but his father, who had heard the legend of the giant Bohemond [...], had given him the name."³² To Normans, Bohemond's grand presence must have underscored his growing reputation, satisfying a "taste for epic."³³ For Komnene, Bohemond's imposing stature lent this "charming" (*ἡδύ*) man an "all-around terrifying aspect" (*ἀπανταχόθεν φοβεροῖς ὑπεθραύετο*).³⁴ At the same time, she echoed frequent descriptions of Bohemond's "extraordinary powers of persuasion and ability to manipulate others."³⁵ Through "adroit self-advertisement,"³⁶ his public persona blended elements of Odysseus-like trickster, pilgrim-prophet, public orator, and *chanson de geste* hero.³⁷ A strange iteration of the Rhōmaiōn sobriquet, *βάρβαρος* (barbarian), to be sure.

Perhaps the oddest role Bohemond assumed was that of visionary homilist. Despite swearing the "customary oath of the Latins" to Alexios in 1097 – an admittedly nebulous description of Anna's that likely misconstrued Norman "fealty" (*fidelitatem*) as vassalage – Bohemond had broken

²⁹ Komnene, *Alexiad*, 274–275 [10.6]: "Ὡσπερ γάρ τινα θείαν ὀμφήν ἐνθήμενος εἰς τὰς ἀπάντων ψυχὰς τοὺς ὀπουδήποτε Κελτοὺς ἄλλον ἀλλαχόθεν σὺν ὄπλοις καὶ ἵπποις καὶ τῇ λοιπῇ τοῦ πολέμου παρασκευῇ συναθροίζεσθαι παρεσκευάζε [...] συνεπήει δὲ τοῖς στρατιώταις ἐκείνοις Κελτοῖς καὶ ψιλὸν ὑπὲρ τὴν ἄμμον καὶ τὰ ἄστρα πλῆθος φοίνικας φέρον καὶ σταυροὺς ἐπὶ ὤμων, γύναϊά τε καὶ τέκνα τῶν σφῶν ἐξεληλυθότα χωρῶν"

³⁰ At the conclusion of his 1107–1108 pseudo-crusade in Illyria and final defeat by Alexios, Bohemond swore to become Alexios's liegeman and received the appellation, "*sebastos*" (revered).

³¹ See Jonathan Shepard, "When Greek Meets Greek: Alexius Comnenus and Bohemund in 1097–98," *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 12 (1988), 185–277.

³² "Marcus quippe in baptisate nominatus est sed a patre suo audita in conuiuio ioculari fabula de Buamundo gigante puero iocunde impositum est," in Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History* 6:71.

³³ Marjorie Chibnall, *The World of Orderic Vitalis, Norman Monks and Norman Knights* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1984), 195; For the account of Bohemond's imprisonment and seduction of "Melaz," see Vitalis 5:359–79.

³⁴ Komnene, *Alexiad*, 384 [13.10]: "ἡδὺ δὲ τι καὶ ἐνεφαίνετο τῷ ἀνδρὶ τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀπανταχόθεν φοβεροῖς ὑπεθραύετο." I depart from Sewter's characterization of Bohemond's aspect as "hard, savage" in translation.

³⁵ Paul, "A Warlord's Wisdom," 534–535.

³⁶ Shepherd, "When Greek Meets Greek," 185.

³⁷ For representations of Bohemond in terms of *chanson de geste* conventions, see Stefan Vander Elst, *The Knight, Cross, and Song: Crusade Propaganda and Chivalric Literature, 1100–1400* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2017); for an overview of Bohemond's role in the First Crusade, see Georgios Theotokis, *The Norman Campaigns in the Balkans, 1081–1109 AD* (: Boydell & Brewer, 2014), 185–199; Georgios Theotokis, *Bohemond of Antioch* (Yorkshire: Pen and Sword Books Ltd., 2020). Jean Flori's *Bohemond d'Antioche: Chevalier d'Aventure* (Paris: Payot & Rivages, 2007) treats Bohemond – or, at least, the popularized figure of Bohemond – as an emblematic figure of the medieval courtly culture of his time. See, also, Simon Thomas Parsons, "The Valiant Man and the villain in the tradition of the Gesta Francorum: Overeating, taunts, and Bohemond's heroic status," in Natasha R. Hodgson, Katherine J. Lewis, and Matthew M. Mesley, eds., *Crusading and Masculinities* (Abington: Routledge, 2019), 36–53.

with Alexios, establishing himself as Prince of Antioch by 1099.³⁸ He returned to Europe in 1104 following his defeat by the Seljuks at Harran, a subsequent three-year captivity, and a subsequent Rhōmaiōn attacks, leaving his nephew, Tancred, behind as Antioch's regent. In Europe, Bohemond went on a speaking tour of Capetian France to raise support for his proposed "third" campaign to the East,³⁹ one that involved making war against Alexios. The *Alexiad* summarized this, noting that Bohemond's "false words" characterized Alexios as "a pagan" (παγάνον) and an "enemy of the Christians" (τῶν Χριστιανῶν πολέμιον).⁴⁰ In the West, however, Bohemond recounted his exploits to adoring crowds, possibly circulating copies of the *Gesta* among literate elites.⁴¹ Bohemond's performances legitimated his social standing in Europe. To the savvy Capetian cleric-statesman, Suger of Saint-Denis, who wrote as eyewitness to Bohemond's orations at Poitiers in 1106, the Norman warlord's "opulent gifts and promises famously won" marriage to Philip I's daughter, Constance of France, who was otherwise reticent about a second marriage with "an unworthy suitor."⁴² To the Benedictine abbot and memoirist, Guibert of Nogent, Bohemond's marriage to Constance made his "partly Frank" Norman descent "very Frankish."⁴³ But Guibert's rhetorical gymnastics depended on Bohemond's ability to represent himself, his principality, and his ambitious designs in a web of historical, hagiographical, and eschatological allusions. Stories about Bohemond's imprisonment by the Turkmen bey, Gümüshtigin Gazi, and subsequent liberation ascribed his success to St.

³⁸ For opposing twelfth-century interpretations of Bohemond's oath to Alexios, see J.H. Pryor, "The Oaths of the Leaders of the First Crusade to Emperor Alexios I Comnenus: Fealty, Homage – πίστις, δουλεία," *Parergon* 2 (1984), 111–141. See, also, Emily Albu's reading of Bohemond's oathtaking/breaking at Antioch in *Gesta Francorum* 10.31–33, found in *The Normans in their Histories: Propaganda, Myth and Subversion* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2001), 160–61.

³⁹ See Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History* 3:182.

⁴⁰ Komnene, *Alexiad*, 332 [12.1]: "καὶ γὰρ περιῶν ἀπάσας τὰς πόλεις καὶ χώρας πολλὴν τὴν κατὰ τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος καταδρομὴν ἐπεποίητο, παγάνον ὀνομάζων αὐτὸν καὶ τῶν Χριστιανῶν πολέμιον."

⁴¹ See John Gordon Rowe, "Paschal II, Bohemond of Antioch, and the Byzantine Empire," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 49 (1966), 185. The "Krey thesis," a hypothesis that Bohemond actively intervened in the production and development of the *Gesta* for self-promotional purposes c. AD 1105, continues to influence historical treatments of his career, even though an increasing number of scholars question Kray's basis for this claim. See August C. Krey, "A Neglected Passage in the *Gesta* and Its Bearing on the Literature of the First Crusade," in Louis J. Paetow, ed., *The Crusades and Other Historical Essays Presented to D. C. Munro by His Former Students* (New York: F.S. Crofts & Co., 1928), 57–58. For reservations about Krey's position, see, for example, Emily Albu, *The Normans in their Histories: Propaganda, Myth and Subversion* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2001). For an overview of Krey's influence and its position in current scholarship, see Paul, "A Warlord's Wisdom," 540–544. My own position is that accepting Rowe's argument about Bohemond's use of the *Gesta* during his promotional campaign does not require the sort of deliberate editorial interventions that Krey's thesis entails.

⁴² "Vacabat domina, comitem Trescensem Hugonem procum aspernata, nec dedecentem sponsum iterata copula appetebat. Callebat princeps Anthiochenus, et tam donis quam promissis copiosus, dominam illam celeberrime sibi copulari Carnoti," in Suger of Saint-Denis, *Vie de Louis le Gros*, 23. For Suger as likely eyewitness to the Council at Poitiers on 26 June 1106, during which Bohemond was determined the leader of a new (anti-Komnenian) expedition to the Holy Land, see Rowe, "Paschal II," 183. Suger composed his panegyric to Louis the Fat, including the account of Bohemond's activities, after his own quasi-retirement from public life c.1139.

⁴³ "Qui cum genus ex Northmannia [...] filiae conjugio iam potitur," in Guibert of Nogent, *Historia Quae Dicitur Gesta dei per Francos, Patrologia Latina*, ed. Jean-Paul Migne, 217 vols (Paris, 1844–64), 156.696.376. Guibert's *Gesta*, written during Bohemond's anti-Komnenian "crusade" (1107–1108) and later revised in 1121, borrowed liberally from the anonymous *Gesta*. Guibert knew crusaders such as Robert of Flanders, which is likely reflected in original interpolations and depictions.

Leonard's miraculous intervention.⁴⁴ Sometime before his death in 1111, the bishop and hagiographer, Galeran of Naumburg, transcribed or composed an account of Bohemond's oration at the shrine church of Saint-Léonard-de-Noblat (1106), replete with the warlord's inventive, personalized references to Nebuchadnezzar's Dream from the Book of Daniel.⁴⁵ In a particularly well-attended invective, Galeran tells us, Bohemond identified Alexios – who Latins were quick to point out “did not inherit the purple through legitimate succession”⁴⁶ – as “Julian the Apostate, another Judas,” and “the cruelest Herod to Christ.”⁴⁷

Bohemond's jeremiad, as recorded by Galeran, is perhaps as close as we can come to a sense of how the warlord's famed eloquence sounded and operated. Luigi Russo notes that it interrupts the narrative structure of the hagiographical *Vita* section that recounts St. Leonard's intervention during Bohemond's captivity.⁴⁸ As such, it seems to constitute both the *Vita*'s ideational centre and the “lasting imprint” of an oral original, “full-bodied and rich in detail.”⁴⁹ At the very least, it is indicative of the impression that Bohemond's rhetoric made on some of his contemporaries. Galeran, for example, concluded his version of Bohemond's deeds in Outremer and speech at Saint-Léonard-de-Noblat by framing the Norman warlord in terms of epic. Notably, Galeran's Bohemond was not simply the grand heroic knight of the *Canso d'Antiocha* or other second-gen-

⁴⁴ The fullest account of St. Leonard's miraculous aid to Bohemond occurs in *Catologus Codicum Hagiographicorum Latinorum Antiquiorum Saeculo XVI qui Asservantur in Bibliotheca Nationali Parisiensi* (Brussels: Bollandists, 1890), 2:274–92, taken from BnF MS 5347, at Saint-Martial, Limoges, at the date of transcription. The version with which this article is concerned occurs in the *Vita et Miracula S. Leonardi Nobiliacensia*, in *Acta Sanctorum* [November] 66.3 (Brussels, Socii Bollandiani, 1910), 160–168, where it constitutes the second miracle in Galeran of Naumburg, *Liber Alter Miraculum*. Hereinafter, I refer to this as *S. Leonardi*, but the miracle accounts collected in the *Vita*, of which Bohemond's is one, are likely composed by different writers. Galeran's account, perhaps commissioned by the clergy at Saint-Léonard-de-Noblat to commemorate Bohemond's visit, would have been composed or transcribed from an unknown witness within five years of Bohemond's visit. Galeran reused and abridged this material in a second *Vita et miracula S. Leonardi auctore Waleranno Episcopo Numburgensi*, in *Acta Sanctorum* [November] 66.3, 173A–182F. The single manuscript of Galeran's *Scriptum Galeranni episcopi de miraculo Boimundi [Vita et miracula S. Leonardi]* likely written for Gertrude of Brunswick is Abt. 95, Nr. 62, in Trier, Bistumsarchiv. For Galeran's role in manuscript production and account versions, see, in particular, Luigi Russo, “Il viaggio di Boemondo d'Altavilla in Francia (1106): un riesame,” *Archivio Storico Italiano* 163.1 (2005), 3–42. See, also, Albert Poncelet, “Boemond et S. Leonard,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 31 (1912), 22–44. For the development of accounts of Bohemond's captivity and rescue, ascribed to the intercession of St. Leonard, see Yvonne Friedman, “Miracle, Meaning and Narrative in the Latin East,” in Kate Cooper and Jeremy Gregory, eds., *Studies in Church History 41: Signs, Wonders, Miracles: Representations of Divine Power in the Life of the Church. Papers Read at the 2003 Summer Meeting and the 2004 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society* (Martlesham: Boydell Press, 2005), 23–134

⁴⁵ “Nunc profecto secundum visionem Nabucodonosor regis [...] vero quasi vento turbinis in mare praecipitato,” in Galeran of Naumburg, *Vita et Miracula S. Leonardi Nobiliacensia*, in *Acta Sanctorum* 66.3 (Brussels, Socii Bollandiani, 1910), 2.28, 164E. The “Nebuchadnezzar's Dream” episode occurs in Daniel 2:1–48.

⁴⁶ “Sed attenendum etiam quod is ipse imperator no ex legitima purpuram [...] principem moliri coepit,” in Guibert of Nogent, *Gesta Dei per Francos* 156.696.375–76.

⁴⁷ “Non hic imperator christianus, sed haereticus vesanus, Iulianus apostata, alter Iudas, Iudaeorum compar, qui pacem simulans bellum concitat, in fratres sicarius, in Christum Herodes cruentissimus, qui Christum in membris suis persequitur, innocentes mactat, effundit sanguinem sanctorum tamquam aquam, ponitque mortalia eorum escas volatilibus caeli,” in Galeran, *S. Leonardi*, 164C–D.

⁴⁸ Russo, “Il viaggio di Boemundo,” 16.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

eration poetic accounts of the First Crusade.⁵⁰ It was the “sign of Bohemond” (*Boimundi signum*) that was “worthy of Virgil’s song” (*Maronis carmine dignum*).⁵¹ The heroic register elided with a schema of rhetorical value that made emphasized the orality of Virgil’s epic and made it analogous to Bohemond’s self-representation.

But why would Bohemond call Alexios “Julian the Apostate,” a rather unconventional allusion for an audience of Franks? In 1105–06, Bohemond promoted his interests “mainly in the form of elaborately performed narrative” rather than the “production or manipulation and dissemination of written texts.”⁵² By 1106, he would have had numerous opportunities to revise his orations. What made Julian seem the persuasive choice? The question begs three considerations. First, Julian was a notorious figure in the Rhōmaiōn apocalyptic tradition, a prefiguration of the Antichrist. He was not, however, well known in the Latin West prior to the First Crusade.⁵³ Second, Bohemond was a grand equivocator, epitomizing what Ralph of Caen, who became Bohemond’s chaplain in 1106, called the deceptive “arts of the Guiscard.”⁵⁴ Indeed, much of his quarrel with Alexios hinged on his shifting interpretation of – or at least his caution toward – his own “*fiducia*” (oath).⁵⁵ His rhetoric in Capetian France was no different. He evoked St. John’s Apocalypse through foxlike similes and juxtapositions – an ambush “like a jaw,” soldiers slaughtered “like [...] helpless lambs,” literal warfare and proximate “spiritual battle,” the inner agon where “the whole army of virtues” and “monstrous prodigies of vice” contended.⁵⁶ He associated the “Prince of Persians” with the “ancient serpent” that “Michael will rise up with his angelic host against.”⁵⁷ He never transposed them, though. He never named names. Instead, he constructed rhetorical bricolage that allowed for numerous possibilities, including his own failure.⁵⁸ Lastly, though, he did make a notable exception to his own rhetorical practices, both in directly naming Alexios as “Julian the Apostate” and in using a decidedly Rhōmaiōn apocalyptic point of reference to do so.

⁵⁰ See Carol Sweetenham and Kinda Paterson, eds., *The Canso d’Antioche: An Occitan Epic Chronicle of the First Crusade* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 8–9, 113–114.

⁵¹ Galeran, *S. Leonardi*, 168E: “Boimundi signum, Maronis carmine dignum, Praesul Galaramnus transcriptit inops Alemannus.”

⁵² Paul, “A Warlord’s Wisdom,” 535, 560.

⁵³ For Julian’s legacy in Byzantine culture, see Stefano Trovato, *Julian the Apostate in Byzantine Culture* (New York: Routledge, 2022); Stephen J. Shoemaker, *The Apocalypse of Empire: Imperial Eschatology in Late Antiquity and Early Islam* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2018).

⁵⁴ Ralph of Caen remarks of Bohemond’s nephew, Tancred, that “melius ipsa ad Wiscardi monet artes recurrere, per quas orbi gloriosus innotuit,” in *Radulphi Cadomensis Tancredus*, ed. Edoardo D’Angelo (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 84. Ralph of Caen accompanied Bohemond on his Illyrian campaign and later served Bohemond’s successor, Tancred, until 1112. His Tancredus describes events from 1096–1105; a reference to the death of Bohemond II, who died in 1130, illustrates that Ralph was still writing at that date. See Natasha Hodgson, “Reinventing the Normans as Crusaders? Ralph of Caen’s *Gesta Tancredi*,” *Anglo-Norman Studies 30. Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2007* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2008), 117–132.

⁵⁵ “Sed vir prudens Boamundus noluit consentire, tantum pro iustitia terrae, quantum pro fiducia imperatoris,” in *Anonymi Gesta Francorum V*, 164.

⁵⁶ “O felix condicio pugnandi, ubi fides idolatriam, iustitia iniustitiam, continentia petulantiam, totusque virtutum exercitus vitiorum debellat portenta.” in *S. Leonardi*, 162A.

⁵⁷ “[...] ubi Michael venit nobis in adiutorium cum multitudine angelorum [...] pro nobis cum antiquo serpent,” in *S. Leonardi*, 162A.

⁵⁸ “Quod si adhuc princeps Persarum in hoc bello nostram permissus est impedire victoriam, faciat Dominus quod bonum est in oculis suis, quoniam etiam hoc modo felices de bello redibimus, quia moriendo triumphabimus,” in *S. Leonardi*, 162A.

In the twelfth century, Constantinople was the “‘great clearing house of East and West,’ in folk literature as well as in all other branches.”⁵⁹ Rhōmaiōn apocalypses in particular “served as a continual bridge between ancient eschatology and the medieval Western world.”⁶⁰ Their emphasis on spectacle and spectatorship bore the “indelible imprint” of Classical Rome’s pageant of “monsters and martyrs” on St. John’s Apocalypse.⁶¹ In turn, “almost all the Church Fathers [saw] in the Roman Empire the power ‘restraining’ the Antichrist and the end of the world.”⁶² Eusebius, for example, praised Julian’s uncle, Kōnstantīnos, for ushering the “amazing spectacle” of the “Blessed One present with the empire itself.”⁶³ The Kōnstantīnian “spectacle” was an idea of posthistorical commonwealth, imperium as Pantokrator-mimesis at the End of Time.⁶⁴ Julian’s brief reign and pagan revanchism posed a clear contradiction to this. In retrospect, though, Eusebian descriptive strategies extended to Julian. Ephrem the Syrian, for example, celebrated Julian’s as both “wonder” and “disgraceful sight,” offering “glory to the One who wrapped the corpse in shame!”⁶⁵ Just as the *‘ûnîṭâ*’s action in Ephrem’s hymn was both symbolically *apokalúptō* (“to disclose”) and literally *kalúptō* (“to cover”), Christian – and particularly Rhōmaiōn – prophetic literature used Julian as an antitype that foregrounded the experience of mass history as a seeming “suppression of [dialectical] time” and “rhythmic oscillations” between themes.⁶⁶ The highly influential *Syriac Julian Romance* (c.363–600) for example, portrayed Julian as “a viper, a wicked and wretched tyrant, and someone who was already dead in life.”⁶⁷ The *Julian Romance* provided topoi and underplot – including Julian as the Antichrist’s precursor – to the *Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius*, *Andreas Salos Apocalypse*, *Visions of Daniel*, and other Rhōmaiōn apocalypses that reconciled Constantinople’s defeats, political setbacks, and receding borders to a “larger Roman-centered

⁵⁹ Paul J. Alexander, “Byzantium and the Migration of Literary Works and Motifs: The Legend of the Last Roman Emperor,” in *Medievalia et Humanistica: Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Culture*, New Series 2, ed. Paul Maurice Clogon (Cleveland: Case Western U, 1971), 47.

⁶⁰ Dorothy deF. Abrahamse, “Introduction,” in Alexander, *Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition*, 2.

⁶¹ Christopher A. Frilingos, *Spectacles of Empire: Monsters, Martyrs, and the Book of Revelation* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2004), 2–5.

⁶² Paul J. Alexander, “The Medieval Legend of the Last Roman Emperor and its Messianic Origin,” *Journal of Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 41 (1978), 9–10.

⁶³ Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, tr. Averil Cameron and Stuart G. Hall (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 67. See, also, Charles Matson Odahl, “The Use of Apocalyptic Imagery in Constantine’s Christian Propaganda,” *Centerpoint: A Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies* 4.3 (1981), 9–21; *Constantine and the Christian Empire* (New York: Routledge, 2010).

⁶⁴ See “Paul Magdalino, “The End of Time in Byzantium,” in *Endzeiten: Eschatologie in den monotheistischen Weltreligionen* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), 119–135.

⁶⁵ Ephrem the Syrian, “Hymns Against Julian: Hymn 3” in *Ephrem the Syrian: Hymns*, tr. Kathleen E. McVey (New York: Paulist Press, 1989), 244.

⁶⁶ John G. Gager, *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity* (Hoboken: Prentice Hall, 1975), 54.

⁶⁷ Jan Willem Drijvers, “Religious Conflict in the Syriac Julian Romance,” in *Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire: The Breaking of a Dialogue (IVth – VIth Century A.D.)*, ed. P. Brown and R.L. Testa (Munster: LIT Verlag, 2011), 141. The principal witness to the Syriac *Julian Romance* is British Library MS Add. 14641. The lost first twelve folios have been partially reconstructed from a palimpsest text in the Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, MS Syr. 378. A “second” *Julian Romance*, likely composed by a different writer, is preserved as British Library, MS Richmond 7192. The oldest manuscript, MS Add. 14641, is a sixth-century copy, establishing a large span of time for dating the urtext, starting with the date of Julian’s death in 363.

eschatological milieu” between 600–1100 C.E.⁶⁸

Although it seemed clear that Kōnstantīnos had “touched off a momentous chain of events,”⁶⁹ Rhōmaiōn historians after Hērākleios’ reign (610–641) were “unable to decide whether their empire would prosper or flounder,” and often “unable to decide whether to celebrate its merits or decry the sins for which God had punished it.”⁷⁰ This historiographical postponement of judgment paralleled a strong emphasis in other literatures on describing and organizing events through the Judgment. “When the Son of Perdition will be revealed,” Pseudo-Methodius claimed, “then the King of the Greeks will go up and come to Golgotha and the Holy Cross will be erected [...] and the King of the Greeks will place his diadem on top of the Holy Cross and will stretch out his two hands to heaven,” concluding the Last Days.⁷¹ By the First Crusade, almost all Rhōmaiōn apocalypses treated Julian’s successor, Jovian, as herald of this “Last Emperor” alongside Julian’s Antichrist antitype. Works that inherited the *Romance*’s genetics through Pseudo-Methodius were less concerned with historical verisimilitude than with staging Julian’s reign as a situation of “stark distinction,”⁷² one that might therefore be used to describe the present. Rhōmaiōn apocalypses conventionalized this pivot between historical and prophetic plotlines through the “technique of *vaticinium ex eventu* – an historical event turned into prophesy.”⁷³ Julian’s death, for example, during his failed Persian Expedition (363), came to be seen as part of an unfolding apocalyptic agon, with various sources crediting his fatal spear wound to the intervention of St. Mercurius.⁷⁴ By Bohemond’s time, alluding to Julian the Apostate evoked a whole schema of relational values involving the intervention of St. Mercurius – God’s executioner – and the appearance of the Last Emperor antitype on the historical stage.⁷⁵

This was an interrogative hermeneutic, though, not what Rubenstein calls a sense of “divine closure.”⁷⁶ *Vaticinium ex eventu* assumed continuous revaluation, rescripting, and nonlinear readings. It shared the compositional principle of literal μεταχαρακτηρισμός (transliteration), through

⁶⁸ Alexy V. Muraviev, “The Syriac Julian Romance and Its Place in the Literary History,” *Khristianskii Vostok* 1.7 (1999), 200.

⁶⁹ Kyle Smith, *Constantine and the Captive Christians of Persia: Martyrdom and Religious Identity in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: U of California P, 2019), 65.

⁷⁰ Warren Treadgold, *The Middle Byzantine Historians* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 1.

⁷¹ Pseudo-Methodius, *The Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius* [from Cod. Vat. Syr. 58], in Paul Alexander, ed., *The Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1985), 50. I have relied on this standard translation for the Syriac Romance. The longevity of Pseudo-Methodius text in the East prior to the First Crusade cannot be underscored enough. Although ascribed to a fourth-century monk, Methodius of Olympus, the text was likely composed in the late seventh century, with Latin and Greek editions appearing by the eighth century. For context, see Christopher Bonura, “A Forgotten Translation of Pseudo-Methodius in Eighth-Century Constantinople: New Evidence for the Dispersal of the Greek Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius during the Dark Age Crisis,” in Nicholas S.M. Matheou, Theofili Kampianaki, and Lorenzo M. Bondioli, eds., *From Constantinople to the Frontier: The City and the Cities* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 270-276.

⁷² Daniel A. Schwartz, “Religious Violence and Eschatology in the Syriac Julian Romance,” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 19.4 (2011), 580.

⁷³ Alexander, *Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition*, 3.

⁷⁴ For St. Mercurius, see Floren Curta, “How to Do Things With Saints: On the Iconography of St. Mercurius’s Legend,” *Revue Roumaine d’Histoire* 34 (1995), 109–129; “St. Mercurius,” in Christopher Walter, *The Warrior Saints in Byzantine Art and Tradition* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 101–109.

⁷⁵ For context, see Paul J. Alexander, “The Medieval Legend of the Last Roman Emperor and its Messianic Origin,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 41 (1978), 1–15; Andras Kraft, “The Last Roman Emperor Topos in the Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition,” *Byzantion* 82 (2012), 213–257.

⁷⁶ Rubenstein, *Nebuchadnezzar’s Dream*, xvii.

which Rhōmaiōn “manuscripts were quite literally refashioned, transferred from the old uncial hand.”⁷⁷ On a grand scale, the Crusades extended forms of intercultural *μεταχαρακτηρισμός* as Latins began adapting Rhōmaiōn apocalyptic discourse to their own uses. By the Sack of Constantinople (1204), Latins regularly depicted Julian’s sacrileges, violent death, or descent into Hell.⁷⁸ By 1200, the famous millenarian abbot, Joachim of Fiore, had included him among his end-times *dramatis personae*.⁷⁹ The fact that this was not yet the case when Bohemond toured Europe highlights an important point. His orations were quite representative of crusader accounts, not because of a shared millenarianism, but because his persuasive reports had a “distinct exegetical fingerprint, composed of a unique collection of biblical references that resonated for its author”⁸⁰ Bohemond’s “Dream,” for example, was poetic, more psalmic than prophetic.⁸¹ He preferred to cast himself as victim, captive.⁸² As a Norman warlord addressing Franks, Bohemond’s use of Julian was idiosyncratic and personalized. However, the use of Rhōmaiōn apocalyptic language as literal description was not. As Nicholas Morton notes, numerous Latin accounts of the First Crusade followed Rhōmaiōn place-naming conventions, and “seem to have been guided by Byzantine authorities in their identification of the different ethnic and religious groups they encountered for the first time.”⁸³ This extended to the use of place-names with apocalyptic significance in Pseudo-Methodius such as “Chorazin” for “Khurasan.”⁸⁴

First-hand accounts of the “East” that borrowed Rhōmaiōn descriptions began circulating during the First Crusade, and the “process intensified as crusaders returned to Europe in large numbers.”⁸⁵ Similarly, most Franks who followed Bohemond against Alexios had “either seen and heard him speak or had spoken with friends or relatives who had done so.”⁸⁶ Indeed, some portion of Bohemond’s audiences in 1105–06 might have understood his Julian allusion through personal experience “taking the Cross” themselves. Among Bohemond’s “second-timers” in 1107

⁷⁷ For *μεταχαρακτηρισμός* (“metakharakterismos”), see Jane Baun, “The Moral Apocalypse in Byzantium,” in *Apocalyptic Time*, ed. Albert I. Baumgarten (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 248.

⁷⁸ See, among others, MS 751 (manuscript), Morgan Library and Museum; E 49–50 inf. (manuscript), Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan; GR 1613, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City State. See various catalogued under “Julian the Apostate” and “Mercurius” in the Princeton Index of Medieval Art.

⁷⁹ See Marjorie Reeves, “Joachimist Influences on the Idea of the Last World Emperor,” *Traditio* 17 (1961), 323–370; for Joachim’s models of the total “concord of the whole Old and New Testaments” and the End of Time, see Joachim of Fiore, *Liber de Concordia Novi ac Veteris Testamenti* [c.1200], ed. E. Randolph Daniel (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1983), and *Expositio in Apocalypsim* (Frankfurt-am-Main: Minerva, 1964).

⁸⁰ Katherine Allen Smith, *The Bible and Crusade in the Twelfth Century* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, Ltd., 2020), 66.

⁸¹ In *S. Leonardi*, Bohemond’s evocation of Daniel 2 is contextualized by Psalms 88:31–34, 67:17, 117:22, 113:1, 93:2, 78:2–3, 17:18, 40:10, and 145:7.

⁸² See Galeran, *S. Leonardi*, 164D–165A.

⁸³ Nicholas Morton, “Encountering the Turks: The First Crusaders’ Foreknowledge of their Enemy; Some Preliminary Findings,” in Simon John and Nicholas Morton, *Crusading and Warfare in the Middle Ages: Realities and Representations: Essays in Honour of John France* (New York: Routledge, 2016), 65.

⁸⁴ See Alan V. Murray, “Coroscane: Homeland of the Saracens in the Chansons de geste and the Historiography of the Crusades,” in Hans van Dijk and Willem Noomen, eds., *Aspects de lépopée romane: Mentalités, idéologies, intertextualités* (Groningen: E. Forsten, 1995), 177–184.

⁸⁵ Simon John, “Historical Truth and the Miraculous Past: The Use of Oral Evidence in Twelfth-Century Historical Writing on the First Crusade,” *The English Historical Review* 130.543 (2015), 269.

⁸⁶ Paul, “A Warlord’s Wisdom,” 561.

were Ralph the Red of Pont-Echanfray, a veteran of Antioch, and Bohemond's half-brother, Guy of Hauteville, who had been in Rhōmaiōn service.⁸⁷ In fact, Bohemond had numerous close Norman connections among Rhōmaiōn mercenaries, including his brother-in-law, William of Grandmesnil, and Peter of Alifa.⁸⁸ Of course, Franks could get the gist of Bohemond's speech without knowing much about Julian. Alexios "persecutes Christ in his members," Bohemond inveighed, "spills the blood of the innocent, and makes their mortal remains food for carrion birds."⁸⁹ Some of Bohemond's most striking language, though, assumed a Saracen's voice when he addressed "begging dogs, stupid foreigners, believing in the Crucified One."⁹⁰ Bohemond's impression mediated two other imitations – his pseudo-crusade as a replica of the *iter Ierosolimitanum* and Alexios as Julian the Apostate – for two audiences. One had seen and heard what Bohemond had. The other desired that experience of Christo-mimetic *contençon* for themselves. To speak to them as a Saracen might instigated the desire to be counted among a niche audience with particular experiences, cultural exposures, and descriptive habits.⁹¹ It invited imagined participation in – and mimetic reproduction of – the sorts of distinct spiritual landscapes that characterized apocalypses as exegetical situations spoken from.

Bohemond's God's Executioner: Translating the Hagiographical Landscape of St. Mercurius

Part of performing "Bohemond" for Franks in 1105–06 also involved an equivalent performance of "Antiochene," one that geolocated the eschatological typologies of Julian and St. Mercurius with Bohemond's seat of power in Outremer. Since 1098, Antioch had been central to Bohemond's politicking in the East. In his *Chronicle* (c.1113–1140), the Armenian historian, Matthew of Edessa, claimed that Greater Khorāsān was terrified of Bohemond, regarding him as the de facto King of the Franks.⁹² The truth behind this was more complicated. As Thomas Asbridge remarks, the region's "turbulent political environment not only facilitated the actual creation of the principality, it also enabled the early princes of Antioch to increase their power through diplomatic maneuver-

⁸⁷ Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, 166.

⁸⁸ *Ibid*, 101.

⁸⁹ "qui Christum in membris suis persequitur, innocentes mactat, effundit sanguinem sanctorum tamquam aquam, pontique mortalia eorum escas volatilibus caeli," in Galeran, *S. Leonardi*, 164D.

⁹⁰ "Canes mendici, advenae stulti, credentes in crucifixum, qui nec semetipsum potuit liberare, et quid vobis prodesse? [...] Eveniat vobis prout isti possunt auxiliari," in Galeran, *S. Leonardi*, 165A..

⁹¹ Transculturation and forms of intercultural brokerage presuppose an intermediating cultural location occupied by "brokers," intentional or otherwise. For context during the First Crusade, see, for example, Steven A. Epstein, *Purity Lost: Transgressing Boundaries in the Eastern Mediterranean, 1000–1400* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2006); Nicholas Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2016); David Abulafia and Nora Berend, eds., *Medieval Frontiers: Concepts and Practices* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002).

⁹² Matthew of Edessa, *Chronicle*, tr. Robert Bedrosian (Long Branch, NJ: Sources of the Armenian Tradition, 2017), 98. <https://editions.byzantini.st/ChronicleME>. There is no authoritative critical edition of the text in either Armenian or translation. The preferred edition of the Armenian is Պատմություն արարեսայ Մատթեոսի մեծի քահանայի Ուռնայեցոյ [History Made by the Great Priest Matthew of Edessa] (Vagharshapat, 1898). I use Bedrosian's English translation of the 1898 Armenian-language edition. See, also, Christopher MacEvitt, "The Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa: Apocalypse, the First Crusade, and the Armenian Diaspora," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 61 (2007), 157–81.

ing.”⁹³ Much of this involved literal and imitative contencion with other Christian lords in Outremer, the crusading “*miles nobiles*” for whom social status had become relatively fluid during the First Crusade.⁹⁴ Indeed, Bohemond’s role in capturing the city performed “two principles cherished by Norman princes: the elevation of a chieftain from a group of equals and the authorization of artifice or trickery as a legitimate means of winning.”⁹⁵ In the Latin West, his continued upward mobility as self-made “*princeps*” in the Holy Land made him a man of note. For Suger of Saint-Denis, Bohemond’s deeds were inseparable from their reception. The warlord was “famous and renowned in the East, and the Saracens had proclaimed his great deeds.”⁹⁶ By inference, this modelled how Latins ought to likewise regard him – a sort of *imitatio Saracenorum*. Being the “famous prince of Antioch” (“*illustrem Anthiochenem principem*”) which “could never have been done without divine help,”⁹⁷ certified Bohemond’s ethos as crusader, speaker, and social climber.

Just as *chanson de geste* motifs emphasized topographical realism,⁹⁸ the conventional geographies of the quasi-oral crusader culture that Bohemond performed in combined literal and spiritual elements. The *Gesta Francorum*’s Antioch, for example, was both a “well planned city” where “there was not a single house or road which was not paved and which did not have water channeled in,”⁹⁹ as well as the hagiographical site that God “greatly loves” because “Saint Peter used to preach there, who converted its people and baptized them.”¹⁰⁰ It was a landscape at the edge of *vaticinium ex eventu*, possibilities and doubts. The *Siège d’Antioche* evoked Antioch through “sandy banks of the river” where “water flowed red with blood,”¹⁰¹ invocations of “Apollo and Nero” that were “not worth a couple of buttons,”¹⁰² a Seljuk administrator, Garsions (Yağısıyan), who behaved “like a lunatic” (“*mult es fols*”) in not surrendering the city.¹⁰³ One striking passage described a “warhorse

⁹³ Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch, 1098–1130* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2000), 48.

⁹⁴ Kostick, *Social Structure of the First Crusade*. Kostick makes the point that the fluid descriptive vocabulary for the First Crusade’s upper strata of nobles illustrates that twelfth-century “historians used terms that applied to magnates for those involved in the decision making, rather than employ the terms that they used exclusively for princes” (241).

⁹⁵ Albu, *The Normans in their Histories*, 158.

⁹⁶ “Virum inter Orientales egregium et famosum, cujus quoddam generosum [...] factum etiam inter ipsos predicabatur Saracenos,” in Suger of Saint-Denis, *Vie de Louis le Gros*.

⁹⁷ Ibid: “et quod nunquam sine diva manu fieri posset.”

⁹⁸ See, for example, *Siège d’Antioche*, note 9, Siege of Antioch Project, medievaldigital.ace.fordham.edu/siegeofantioch/the-text/. Accessed 28 March 2023. For context, see H.S. Kay, “Topography and the Relative Realism of Battle Scenes in the Chansons de geste,” *Olifant* 4.3 (1977), 259–78.

⁹⁹ *Siège d’Antioche*, laisse 84: “Antioche est de lui | la cité apelee; / Unques parler n’oï | de tant bien ordenee, / Ne par si grant engin | fust faite ne fundee. / N’i ad maison ne rue | ne soit pavimentee, / Et o l’eau ne soit | par conduit amenee. / La corsure est si bone | et si acimentee / Que Sarazin i ont | de quivre tregetee.”

¹⁰⁰ Ibid, laisse 83, has the Bishop of Le Puy exclaim: “Seignors, voiez la vile | que Deus solt mult amer; / Jadis l’i soleit l’om | servir et hennorer. / Saint Piere li apostles | i soleit converser / Qui converti la gent | et les fist baptizier.”

¹⁰¹ Ibid, laisse 174: “Des morz et des naffrez | fud jonchiez li sablons, / Et l’eau tute roge | por le sanc des glotuns, / Dunt tant i ad neié | que l’om ne set les nons.”

¹⁰² Ibid: “Mult i fud reclamez | Apolins et Neirons, / Mais onc ne lur valut | le pris de dous butons.”

¹⁰³ Ibid.

complete with half a corpse” wandering through Antioch.¹⁰⁴ Such descriptions shared two important features with Bohemond’s orations. First, the language alluded to apocalypse without imposing meaning, even the case of the corpse-horse, witnessed by every “single child or woman or foot-soldier [...] even anybody lying sick at home”¹⁰⁵ Second, the “apocalyptic” figurative language had a purely descriptive orientation. The Siege, for example, insisted on the moral uprightness of the Franks while depicting them as being “more terrifying than any attack by a viper or serpent, leopard or lion.”¹⁰⁶ Such moments underscores the moral, political, and theological neutrality of apocalyptic metaphors. William the Chancellor, a Norman-Antiochene historian writing shortly after Bohemond’s death, highlighted this, beginning his *Bella Antiochena* with a description of locust hordes destroying Antioch’s crops “by way of a metaphor for a sacrificial victim.”¹⁰⁷ Such meta-textual moments placed highlighted the rhetorical centrality of interpreters, speakers, and writers, rather than the constituent discourses of their metaphors.

The high credence given to oral testimonies after the First Crusade required the rhetorical production (or self-production) of a trusted interlocuter.¹⁰⁸ William of Malmesbury, for example, described his own composition of the *Gesta Regum Anglorum* as the attempt to render “in [his] own words what other men saw and felt” on crusade.¹⁰⁹ Similarly, Guibert of Nobert wrote that “hearing is almost as good as seeing.”¹¹⁰ But seeing what? To Franks, Bohemond’s Antioch had revealed the *via sancti Sepulchri*’s prophetic warrant through wonders. Their meanings, however, were not self-evident. Raymond of Aguilers, who credited himself as one of the first among the Franks of the First Crusade to believe Peter Bartholomew’s claims about the Holy Lance, recounted

¹⁰⁴ Ibid: “Dendroit danz Godefroi | fud merveillos li sons / Qu’ot trenchié Malprianz | de desus les arçons, / Si qu’en l’eau chäi | li miedres des troncons. / L’autre mist en la vile | li destriers qui fud bons: / Ce fud la furcheüre | o tut les esperons.”

¹⁰⁵ Ibid: “Onc en tute Antioche, | dont li chemins est longs, / Ne remist enfançon | ne femme ne geudons, / Neis li malade hom | qui jurent es maisons, / Qu’il n’alassent voier, | trestuz a contençons, / Le destrier Malprianz | u fud la forcheisons.”

¹⁰⁶ Ibid: “Car plus font a duter | les cops de ces Francons Que guivre ne serpent | ne leupard ne leons, Ne ja riens ne valdra | vers els deffensions.”

¹⁰⁷ Walter the Chancellor, *The Antiochene Wars [Bella Antiochena]*, tr. Thomas S. Asbridge and Susan B. Edgington (New York: Routledge, 2018), 1, translates this as “by way of a metaphor for the enemy.” The original in context is “primum igitur locustarum agmina, longe lateque sub metaphora hostiam agitata, accolarum Syriae penetus omnia abstulere uictui necessaria,” in Heinrich Hagenmeyer, ed., *Galterii Cancellarii Bella Antiochena* (Innsbruck: Verlag der Wagner’schen Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1896), 83. Walter’s *Antiochene Wars*, which covers a span 1114–22 C.E., is one of the only extant histories of the Latin settlement that assumes an Antiochene perspective. See, also, Thomas Asbridge, “The Portrayal of Violence in Walter the Chancellor’s *Bella Antiochena*,” in *Syria in Crusader Times: Conflict and Coexistence* (Edinburgh: U of Edinburgh P, 2020), 163–83.

¹⁰⁸ See Simon John, “Historical Truth and the Miraculous Past: The Use of Oral Evidence in Twelfth-Century Latin Historical Writing on the First Crusade,” *The English Historical Review* 130.153 (2015), 263–301.

¹⁰⁹ “Nunc iter Ierosolimitanum scripto expediam, aliorum uisa et sensa meis uerbis allegans,” in William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum: The History of the English Kings*, ed. R.A.B. Mynors, R.M. Thomson, and M. Winterbottom (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998–1999), vol. 1, 592–593. William of Malmesbury’s early-twelfth-century English history depended on Fulcher of Chartres’s account for its passages about the First Crusade. As with Orderic Vitalis, William’s account is notable for its interpolations and digressions from the source material. See Rod Thomson, “William of Malmesbury, historian of crusade,” *Reading Medieval Studies* 23 (1997), 121–134.

¹¹⁰ “cum visui auditum quodammundo supperam profecto crediderim,” in Guibert, *Gesta Dei Per Francos*, 156.395.729C.

Bartholomew' claim that an earthquake at night, causing "such fear [...] that [he] could say nothing but 'God help me,'" precipitated his vision of St Andrew.¹¹¹ Similarly, Peter Tudebode, the Frankish priest who accompanied Raymond of Saint-Gilles on the First Crusade, recorded a night-time wonder that involved fire falling from the sky to the astonishment and terror of both Turks and Franks.¹¹² Bartholomew was likewise terrified and confused by St. Andrew. Both incidents provoked doubts and uncovered tensions between crusading factions. The papal legate, Adhemar of Ley Puy, and a number of nobles thought Peter Bartholomew's tale nonsense, as did Bohemond, who called it a fraud, instigated by Count Raymond, a mere "pretty fiction" from a man who "frequent[ed] taverns and markets, concerning himself with trivialities, a man born at the crossroads."¹¹³ In Robert the Monk's *Historia Hierosolymitana* (c.1107–1120), the priest-interpreter, Herluin, explained the night fire to the Turks as an evil omen.¹¹⁴ It was Herluin, the interlocutor, who considered the odd phenomenon a clear message from Heaven, a "sign as portent" to Turks but a "clear message from God" to the Franks,¹¹⁵ just as it would be Bohemond who interpreted Nebuchadnezzar's Dream a decade later.

Perhaps the most notable miraculous sign associated with Antioch placed Julian the Apostate within the "horizon" of crusader texts, both written and oral.¹¹⁶ In 1098, Qiwam al-Dawla Kerbogha, the Seljuk atabeg of Mosul, laid siege to Antioch. While Bohemond led an attack on the Seljuk

¹¹¹ "In primo terrae moto qui apud Antiochiam factus est [...] adiuva me dicere possem," in Raymond of Aguilers, *A Critical Edition of the Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem of Raymond of Aguilers*, ed. John France (PhD Dissertation, U of Nottingham, 1967), 90.

¹¹² Peter Tudebode, *Peter Tudebode: Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, trans. John Hugh Hill and Laurita L. Hill (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1974), 79; for the Latin text, see Hill and Hill's edition of *Petrus Tudebodus, Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* (Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1977). The order of precedence between Peter Tudebode's account and the anonymous *Gesta* has been much disputed, given that he was an eyewitness whose account is largely interchangeable with the *Gesta*'s. Jay Rubenstein argues that both stem from an earlier archetype in "What is the *Gesta Francorum*, and who was Peter Tudebode?," *Revue Mabillon* 16 (2005), 179–204; Marcus Bull argues for the precedence of the *Gesta* in "The Relationship Between the *Gesta Francorum* and Peter Tudebode's *Historia de Hierosolymitano: The Evidence of a Hitherto Unexamined Manuscript* (St. Catherine's College, Cambridge, 3)," *Crusades* 11 (2012), 1–17. See, also, John France, "The Anonymous *Gesta Francorum* and the *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem* of Raymond of Aguilers and the *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* of Peter Tudebode: An Analysis of the Textual Relationship between Primary Sources for the First Crusade," in John France and William G. Zajac, eds., *The Crusades and their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton* (New York: Routledge, 1998), 39–69.

¹¹³ "'Pulcre' inquit 'commentum est beatum Andream apparuisse homini, quem audio cauponas frequentare, fora percurrere, nugis amicis, triuiis innatum. Honestam elegit sanctus apostolus personam, cui celi panderet archanum! Nam de loco, cui fictus non patet dolus? Si Christianus abdidit, cur altaris proximi latibulum declinauit? Aut si Gentilis seu Iudeus, cur intra parietes ecclesiae, cur secus altare?'" in Ralph of Caen, *Tancredus*, 87.

¹¹⁴ "Scimus pro certo, ipso Deo quem negare suades revelante, quia in proximo est nostra salus, et vester interitus; nostrum gaudium, vestrum detrimentum. Quis vero vobis sero transmisit ignem, qui vos omnes ita perterritur, et de loco in quo tentoria fixeratis ita exturbavit?" in D. Kempf and M.G. Bull, *The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013), 71. As with most early First Crusade sources, Robert the Monk's chronicle combines shared *Gesta* elements with notices and interpolations that stress authorial eyewitness. Robert, for example, claimed to have been present at the Council of Clermont. What we see, then, is often an aesthetic or historiographical metatextual awareness of the role of memory and stylistic "improvement" in written texts.

¹¹⁵ Ibid: "Signum hoc in portentum veniet vobis; nobis in salutem: quoniam ipsius Dei nostri certam inde habemus legationem."

¹¹⁶ I allude, here, to Gadamer's term, the "horizon of the text." See Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, tr. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall (New York: Continuum, 2004).

positions, the *Gesta Francorum* claimed, “countless armies with white horses and white standards came from the mountains” led by St. George, St. Demetrius, and St. Mercurius.¹¹⁷ As James B. MacGregor observes, the “identification of these saints as intercessors for the crusading cause [...] owes as much to geography as their identification as warrior saints.”¹¹⁸ Crusaders believed in the local patronage of saints and naturally relied on Rhōmaiōn ones while campaigning in the East. However, there was another component to this. As with Christian apocalypticism, warrior-saint cults contained the genetics of Classical political culture, with its “double commitment, civil and military.”¹¹⁹ As Christopher Walter observes, each citizen in Classical Rome was “a potential soldier; conversely every soldier was a citizen.”¹²⁰ In a sense, participation in warrior-saint cults enfranchised Franks – if only in their own minds – into the complicated geopieties of the places they campaigned in and occupied throughout the Rhōmaiōn world.

Mercurius was unique in this regard. None of the “Eastern” warrior saints mentioned by the *Gesta* had hagiographic stories that linked them to Antioch, but Raymond of Aguilers implies that Mercurius’s cult was active in the city.¹²¹ It is also notable that only the *Gesta Francorum*, so closely tied to Bohemond’s interests, highlighted Mercurius’s role as intercessor against the Seljuks, and that Southern Italian Normans began representing and venerating this saint after the First Crusade.¹²² This might explain why his role as crusader patron seems to have been contested. Raymond of Aguilers, for example, expressed contempt for some unidentified bones, set apart from other relics at St. Leontius’s church, that at least some Antiochene faithful identified as Mercurius’s.¹²³ Part of this might be attributable to features of Mercurius’s popular, rather than liturgical, cult. Folklore linked him with St. Ahrakas and Augani, two dog-headed (*κυνοκέφαλοι*) barbarians that repented of eating flesh, as well as St. Christopher, the cynocephalus warrior saint linked to Antioch.¹²⁴ Instances of starving crusaders engaging in cannibalism, particularly at Ma’arrat al-Numān, were well-documented and a point of disgrace for Latin chroniclers and their sources.¹²⁵ Anna Komnene

¹¹⁷ “Exibant quoque de montaneis innumerabiles exercitus [...] quorum vexilla omnia errant alba,” in *Anonymi Gesta Francorum*, 337.

¹¹⁸ James B. MacGregor, “Negotiating Knightly Piety: The Cult of the Warrior-Saints in the West, ca. 1070–ca. 1200,” *Church History* 73.2 (2004), 323.

¹¹⁹ Walter, *Warrior Saints*, 20.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*

¹²¹ See the episode at St. Leontius’s church in Antioch in Raymond of Aguilers, *Historia Francorum*, 285–294.

¹²² See Curta, “St. Mercurius’s Legend,” 123–4. The relics of several saints were reserved and venerated by the clergy; the laity supposed that Mercurius and other saints might have been represented in an unidentified box of bones.

¹²³ “Cum vero ab incolis quaereremus si scirent cuius sancti essent illae reliquiae, dicebant alii sancti Mercurii, alii autem sanctorum aliorum.” In Raymond of Aguilers, *Historia Francorum*, 290.

¹²⁴ See Jennie Friedrich, “Saint Christopher’s Canine Hybrid Body and its Cultural Autocannibalism,” *Preternature: Critical and Historical Studies on the Preternatural* 6.2 (2017), 189–211; Zofia Ameisenowa, “Animal-Headed Gods, Evangelists, Saints and Righteous Men,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 12 (1949), 21–45; Danijela Stefanović, “The ‘Christianisation of Hermanibus,’” *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 62.4 (2013), 506–514.

¹²⁵ Numerous twelfth-century sources including Fulcher of Chartres, Raymond of Aguilers, and the anonymous *Gesta* author attest to this, while characterizing the responsibility and extent in different ways. For scholarly treatments, see Lewis A. M. Sumberg, “The ‘Tafurs’ and the First Crusade,” *Medieval Studies* 21 (1959), 224–246; Jay Rubenstein, “Cannibals and Crusaders,” *French Historical Studies* 31.4 (2008), 521–552.

singled out Bohemond, in particular, as someone who ate “meats forbidden by law” (τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου ἀπηγορευμένων κρεῶν) in Syria.¹²⁶ Politicking surrounding the Holy Lance, which coincided with disputes over control of Antioch, might have also been a factor. Ralph of Caen noted, perhaps to highlight factionalism during the Siege of Antioch, that the disputes between Normans and Provençals grew during the two weeks between the Peter Bartholomew’s vision and the Battle of Antioch.¹²⁷ Bohemond seems to have seen the Lance’s discovery as a ploy by Count Raymond and the Provençals to usurp credit for taking and holding Antioch. Mercurius, who the *Gesta* claimed participated in Antioch’s delivery from the Seljuks, was best known through associations with a different “sacred” spear, the one that killed Julian the Apostate. The saint’s demotion after Antioch might almost be expected as chroniclers sought to police narrative options for the Lance that emphasized one crusading faction over another.

Spearing Julian the Apostate to death was the cardinal attribute of Mercurius’s cult. According to tradition, St. Basil the Great (330–379) had prayed for Caesarea’s deliverance from Julian’s wrath. One night, he dreamed that the Virgin Mary sent St. Mercurius to kill Julian. Mercurius’s relics and spear disappeared from his church in Caesarea; when they reappeared, Mercurius’s spear was covered in blood and word came that Julian had been killed in battle. The hagiographic tradition in toto both did and did not claim that the saint came down from heaven to deliver the fatal blow. The “Paris Gregory” manuscript, for example, composed during Basil I’s reign (867–886), paired homiletic text that expressed absolute narrative uncertainty about Julian’s death – “some say he was shot down by the Persians,” by “one of his officers ... [who] ran his sword into the emperor’s viscera,” by “Barbarian jesters,” or a “certain Saracen” – with a miniature illustrations ascribing the killing to St. Mercurius.¹²⁸ Kurt Weitzmann observes that “not only is Mercurius not mentioned in the passage, but also none of the various ways of killing agrees with the attack of the rider in the miniature”; the passage “was not the basis for the painter’s invention, but served

¹²⁶ Komnene, *Alexiad*, 321 [11.9]. In the passage, Anna depicts Bohemond blaming Alexios’s lack of promised logistical support for reducing the Crusaders to cannibalism during the campaign to Antioch: “Υποσχόμενος γὰρ κατόπιν ἡμῶν μετὰ δυνάμεως ἔρχεσθαι πολλῆς, οὐκ ἠθέλησας τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν ἔργοις πιστώσασθαι. ἡμεῖς δὲ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν καταλαμβάνοντες καὶ ἐπὶ τρισὶ μῆσι πολλὰ μογήσαντες πρὸς πολεμίους ἀπεμαχόμεθα καὶ λιμόν, οἷον οὐδεὶς πῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων τεθέαται, ὡς τοὺς πλείστους ἡμῶν καὶ ἀπὸ αὐτῶν τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου ἀπηγορευμένων κρεῶν βεβρωκέναι.”

¹²⁷ Thomas Asbridge, “The Holy Lance of Antioch: Power, Devotion and Memory on the First Crusade,” *Reading Medieval Studies* 33 (2007), 12.

¹²⁸ Gregory Nazianzen, *Invectiva contra Julianum* (II), tr. in Kurt Weitzmann, “Illustration for the Chronicles of Sozomenos, Theodoret, and Malalas,” *Byzantion* 16.1 (1942–43), 114. The Paris Gregory is BnF Grec 510 in the Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris; Weitzmann is using Henri Ormont, *Miniatures des Plus Anciens Manuscrits Grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale du Vie au XIVe Siecle* (Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honore Champion, 1929), plates XV–LX. The passage describing the conflicting oral accounts of Julian’s demise is as follows: “Τὰ μὲν δὴ μέχρι τούτου τοιαῦτα. τὰ δὲ ἐν τεύθειν οὐχ εἰς λέγεται λόγος, ἄλλος δὲ ἄλλω συμφέρεται καὶ συντίθεται, τῶν τε παρόντων ὁμοίως τῇ μάχῃ· καὶ τῶν ἀπόντων. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ Περσῶν αὐτὸν κατηκοντίσθαι φασὶν ἀτάκτοις ἐκδρομαῖς χρώμενον, καὶ ἄττοντα τῆδε κάκεισε σὺν ἐμπληξίᾳ· καὶ ὁμοίον τι περὶ αὐτὸν συμβῆναι τῷ Κύρου τοῦ Παρυσάτιδος, ὃς, τοῖς μυρίοις συνανεληθὼν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἀρταξέρξη, καὶ νεανικῶς μαχόμενος, θράσει τὴν νίκην διέφθειρεν· οἱ δὲ τοιοῦτόν τινα ἐπ’ αὐτῷ διηγοῦνται λόγον· Ἐπὶ τινα λόφον τῶν ὑψηλῶν ἀνεληθὼν, ὡς ἐκ περιωπῆς τὸν στρατὸν ὄψει λαβεῖν, καὶ ὅσος ὑπελείφθη τῷ πολέμῳ μαθεῖν, ἐπειδὴ οἱ φανῆναι πολὺ τὸ πλῆθος, καὶ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀφθονῶς τερον· Ὡς δεινὸν, εἰπείν, εἰ πάντας τῆ Ῥωμαίων γῆ τούτους ἐπανάζομεν· ὡς ἂν τις βασκαίνων αὐτοῖς τῆς σωτηρίας. Ἐφ’ ᾧ τινα τῶν στρατιωτῶν χαλεπήναντα, καὶ οὐ κατασχόντα τὴν ὀργήν, ὄσαι κατὰ τῶν σπλάγχων, ἀλογήσαντα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σωτηρίας. Ὡς δὲ ἄλλοι, τῶν γελοιαστῶν βαρβάρων τινὰ τοῦτο τολμησαί (οἱ τοῖς στρατιώταις ἐπονται, λύπη τε ψυχαγωγία καὶ πότοις ἡδυσμα). Εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ καὶ Σαρακηνῶν τινὲς τὸ κλέος τοῦτο διδοῦσι.”

merely as an instigation to insert a scene of the emperor's death from another source."¹²⁹ Like *μεταχαρακτηρισμός* or the bifurcation between folk and official cults that Raymond of Aguilers noted at Antioch, the Julianic-Mercurius tradition was heteroglossic, emphasizing the "primacy of context[s] over text," each "characterized by its own objects, meanings, and values."¹³⁰ St. John Damascene's version, for example, converted Basil's dream into an image Mercurius with the Theotokos during the First Iconoclasm (c. 726–787).¹³¹ In his *Εκκλησιαστική Ιστορία* (*Church History*, c.1310–1317), the Palaiologan historian, Nikephoros Kallistos, attempted to reconcile his sources by pairing Mercurius with an accomplice, St. Artemius, one of Constantius II's generals who had been martyred by Julian at Antioch.¹³²

The St. Mercurius tradition also sought to reconcile Eusebian strands of "double commitment" in the figure of the monarch who was likewise Christ's spiritual warrior. The *Julian Romance*, for example, replaced St. Basil with Jovian. By Bohemond's time, this *vaticinium ex eventu* revision associated the equestrian saint's intercession with antitypes of the Last Emperor who would defeat the Antichrist and shepherd Christ's flock to Jerusalem. During the First Crusade, there were a number of potential Latin claimants to that title. Bohemond's rival, Raymond of Toulouse, was spoken about thus.¹³³ Godfrey of Bouillon chose to assume the title "Defender of the Holy Sepulchre" (*Advocatus Sancti Sepulchri*) rather than "King of Jerusalem" in part to circumvent the legend.¹³⁴ The infamous *plebs pauperum* known as "Tafurs" perhaps saw this role fulfilled by their own "King Tafur."¹³⁵ Still others anticipated Charlemagne, risen from the dead.¹³⁶ However, Bohemond alone actively used these rhetorical contexts to attack the *basileus Rhōmaiōn*, echoing the "perlocution" that Florin Curta sees operant in Mercurius's cult. In a perlocutionary claim, Curta explains, context "represents the true social setting in which the speech event takes place."¹³⁷ In the West, some elements of setting were relatively fixed, such as the association of Mercurius with Bohemond's "deeds and adventures" at Antioch. Others are less recoverable. What might a Norman

¹²⁹ Weitzmann, "Illustrations," 114.

¹³⁰ Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, ed. Michael Holquist and Caryl Emerson (Austin: U of Texas P, 1981), 291.

¹³¹ Curta, "St. Mercurius's Legend," 113; see St. John Damascene, "Defense against those who attack the holy images by our Father among the Saints," in Andrew Louth, tr., *Three Treatises on the Divine Images* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary P, 2003), 54.

¹³² See Nikephoros Kallistes, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 10.34 (PG 146:549d), *Patrologia Graeca*, ed. J.-P. Migne (Paris, 1857–1886).

¹³³ See Thomas Lecaque, *The Count of Saint-Gilles and the Saints of the Apocalypse: Occitanian Piety and Culture in the Time of the First Crusade* (PhD Dissertation, U of Tennessee, 2015); Jay Rubenstein, "Godfrey of Bouillon Versus Raymond of Saint-Gilles: How Carolingian Kingship Trumped Millenarianism at the End of the First Crusade," in *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages: Power, Faith, and Crusade*, ed. Matthew Gabriele and Jace Stuckey (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 59–75.

¹³⁴ For the circumstances surrounding Godfrey's adoption of the title, see William of Tyre, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum* 9:1–2, 5, in *Patrologia Latina* 201, 433–435, 437–438.

¹³⁵ For the "Tafurs" – which likely meant "vagrants" or "paupers" – see Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millenium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1970) 66–73; Sumberg, "The 'Tafurs' and the First Crusade." For "King Tafur" leading the assault on Jerusalem and crowning Godfrey, see Nigel R. Thorpe, ed., *The Old French Crusade Cycle, Vol. VI: La Chanson de Jérusalem* (Birmingham: U of Alabama P, 1992), *laissez* 78, 107, and 156–157.

¹³⁶ Matthew Gabriele, *An Empire of Memory: The Legend of Charlemagne, the Franks, and Jerusalem before the First Crusade* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011), 140.

¹³⁷ Curta, "St. Mercurius's Legend," 109.

“second-timer,” perhaps a veteran of Ma’arrat al-Numān, have thought, listening to Bohemond describe Alexios’s cynocephalus “palace dogs” (*palanti canes*) that “have been strengthened by imperial generosity, and hate you and thirst for your blood?”¹³⁸ What can be said is that Bohemond’s orations performed a twofold mimetic modeling, translating Rhōmaiōn apocalyptic topoi into Latin Christo-mimetic *contençon* and situating himself as instigator. And if Anna Komnene’s account has warrant, some of Bohemond’s end-times rhetoric in 1105–07 extended to an *imitatio Mercurii*. “With many a murder,” she reported him saying in a message to Alexios, “I will fill your cities and lands with murders and blood, until I plant my spear in the heart of Byzantium itself.”¹³⁹

By the Spear: Translating Bohemond Back Into Rhōmaiōn Apocalyptic Discourse

What might the anxieties of a hostile Rhōmaiōn audience, second-hand, illustrate about the outlines and reception of Bohemond’s apocalyptic rhetoric? In a more particular sense, how much credence should be granted to Anna’s account of threat to “plant [his] spear” in the capital? It altogether consistent with the *Alexiad*’s artful characterization of Bohemond as “the devil in human form.”¹⁴⁰ At the same time, “plant[ing] my spear in the heart of Byzantium” does seem indicative of how Bohemond’s audiences understood his apocalyptic rhetoric as a double commitment to both martial and metaphorical violence. And its spectacular performance was received by both Latins and Rhōmaîoi. “Everywhere there was talk of Bohemond’s invasion,” Anna remarked.¹⁴¹ Alexios was perhaps cognizant of Bohemond’s accusation that he was both a pagan and the “usurper” of Nikephoros III Botaneiates’s throne.¹⁴² He corresponded with Venice, Pisa, and Genoa, “forewarning them not to be seduced by Bohemond’s false words,”¹⁴³ even as Bohemond politicked for Paschal II’s papal approval and invoked a spurious letter, purportedly from Alexios, that claimed it was “better [for Byzantium] to be subjected to the Latins than to the abominations” of the

¹³⁸ “Confortati sunt palatini canes imperatoria munificentia, qui te oderunt et sanguinem tuum sitiebant,” in S. Leonardi, 164C.

¹³⁹ Komnene, *Alexiad*, 331 [11.12]: “πολλῶν φόνων καὶ πολλῶν αἱμάτων τὰς σὰς ἐμπλήσω πόλεις καὶ χώρας, ἕως ἂν ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Βυζαντίου τὸ δόρυ πηξαίμην.” The translation is mine.

¹⁴⁰ Ralph-Johannes Lillie, “Reality and Invention: Reflections on Byzantine Historiography,” *Dunbarton Oaks Papers* 68 (2014), 172. Lillie grants the claim no credence because it occurs at the climax of an “illogical” episode that “serves the sole purpose of impressing this characteristic of Bohemond on the reader’s mind in the most graphic way” (171–172).

¹⁴¹ Komnene, *Alexiad*, 334 [12.1]: “ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ τοῦ Βαϊμούντου διαπεραιώσις ἀπανταχῆ διεδίδοτο.”

¹⁴² Alexios had overthrown Nikephoros in 1081 C.E. As Jonathan Harris notes, Bohemond’s invective was “a grave one to Western ears because it meant that Alexios had won his throne by overthrowing his rightful lord, a violation of the oath of fealty that he was assumed by Westerners to have taken to the previous emperor. Exactly the same charge had been used to justify the Norman invasion of England in 1066.” See Jonathan Harris, *Byzantium and the Crusades* (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014), 94.

¹⁴³ Komnene, *Alexiad*, 332 [12.1]: “ὁ γοῦν βασιλεύς, τὰ διὰ τοῦ Ἀλεξίου πρὸς αὐτὸν διαμνησθέντα ἀκηκόως, εὐθύς κατὰ πάσας τὰς χώρας, Πίσσαν τε καὶ Γένουαν καὶ Βενετίαν γράμματα ἐπέστειλε, προπαρασκευάζων αὐτοὺς μὴ συναπαχθέντας τοῖς ἀπατηλοῖς τοῦ Βαϊμούντου λόγοις ἐκείνων συνεφέψεσθαι.”

Seljuks.¹⁴⁴ It is certainly possible that the threat was “a pure fabrication of Anna or another – oral or written – source.”¹⁴⁵ Equally, though, the threat-as-fabrication would have been quite in keeping with Bohemond’s performances and the awareness contemporaries had of his penchant for absorbing and imitating existing discourses of his time, mediating his own position as named character within them. The outlines or seams of his perlocutionary contexts are perhaps drawn into greater relief by the particular pressure they seem to put on Rhōmaiōn accounts of him like Komnene’s. If Bohemond’s Alexios was “the bloodiest Herod,” for example, the *Alexiad*’s Robert Guiscard was “even worse, for Herod raved only against newborns.”¹⁴⁶

In the *Alexiad*, the image of the spear is likewise typological, apocalyptic as Mercurius’s, organizing history into patterns of violence around Alexios’s body, not Julian’s. For Komnene, spears foregrounded and threatened the Eusebian conflation of Christ’s body and the imperial body politic by extension. Descriptions of Alexios’s generational struggle with the Normans, the *Alexiad*’s constant circulation of “touched sword[s] and spear[s],” often focused on moments when spears penetrated flesh. Alexios “drove his spear” through one Norman’s chest; it “pierced [another] Kelt’s breast”; a “certain Kelt” penetrated one of Alexios’s men with his spear, “passing [it] by the lung” as it “forced its way right through him”; the Greeks showed Aspietes, one of Alexios’s commanders, “the spear and the wound” in an almost iconographic fashion.¹⁴⁷ At turns, descriptions of spear violence that Anna claims left Alexios’s enemies astonished veered into the quasi-miracu-

¹⁴⁴ “ego enim tamquam profuffus factus sum et cotidie a facie Turcorum et Pincinatorum angustior et fugio, quia exercitum eorum fortem sentio. malo igitur subiectus esse Conchristianis Latinis quam perfidorum infestari delubriis,” in [Alexios I Komnenos?], “Epistula Alexii Komneni ad Robertus I comitem Flandrensem,” in Heinrich Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae et Chartae as Historiam Primi Belli Sacri Spectantes Quae Supersunt Aevo Aequales ac Genuinae* (Innsbruck: Verlag der Wagner’schen Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1901), 20. See Einar Jorenson, “The Problem of the Spurious Letter of Emperor Alexios to the Count of Flanders,” *The American Historical Review* 55.4 (1950), 814–815. Jorenson provides an excellent overview of the manuscript history and debate over the Epistula’s authenticity and provenance. For Paschal II’s knowledge of Bohemond’s “crusade” against Alexios, see J.G. Rowe, “Paschal II, Bohemond of Antioch and the Byzantine Empire,” *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester* 49.1 (1966), 165–202.

¹⁴⁵ Lillie, “Reality and Invention,” 171.

¹⁴⁶ Komnene, *Alexiad*, 42 [1.12]: “ταῦτα μὲν ἄντικρος, καθάπερ εἶπον, μανίας ἦσαν Ἡρώδου ἢ καὶ πλέον Ἡρώδου. ἐκεῖνος μὲν γὰρ κατὰ τῶν βρεφῶν ἐμεμήνει μόνον, οὗτος δὲ καὶ κατὰ παίδων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων.”

¹⁴⁷ Komnene, *Alexiad*, 125 [4.7]: “Πρότερος δὲ ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ διθύνας τὴν χεῖρα παῖει τοῦτον διὰ τοῦ δόρατος· τὸ δὲ αὐτόθεν διὰ τῶν μαζῶν εἰς τὰ μετάφρενα διεκβάλλεται. Καὶ τὸν μὲν βάρ βαρον αὐτίκα εἶχε γῆ· εὐθὺς γὰρ τοῦτον ἀφήκε καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ τῆς τρώσεως καιρίας γεγεννημένης,” and 336 [12.2]: “Ὁ δὲ τοῦ ξίφους ἐπιδραξάμενος δέχεται τὴν τοῦ Κελτοῦ βιαίαν φορὰν καὶ τιτρώσκειται μὲν καιριωτάτην πληγὴν, τοῦ δόρατος τὸν πνεύμονα μὲν παραμείψαντος, ἐκεῖθεν δὲ διὰ τῆς ῥάχεως διενεχθέντος. Ὁ δὲ μήπω συγχυθεὶς τῇ πληγῇ μηδὲ τῆς ἔδρας ἐκκυλισθεὶς, ἀλλ’ ἐδράσας ἑαυτὸν ἰσχυρότερον παῖει τὸν βάρβαρον κατὰ τῆς κόρυθος καὶ δίχα διαιρεῖ καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ τὴν κόρυθα. Καὶ πίπτουσι καὶ ἄμφω τῶν ἵππων, ὁ μὲν νεκρὸς ὁ Κελτός, ὁ δ’ Ἀσπιέτης ἔτι ἐμπνέων. Ὅν οἱ ἄμφ’ αὐτὸν ἀνελόμενοι γεγονότα παντάπασιν ἔξαιμον καὶ καλῶς ἐπιμεληθέντες πρὸς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα ἤνεγκαν, δεικνύντες καὶ <τὸ> δόρυ καὶ τὴν πληγὴν καὶ τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κελτοῦ διηγούμενοι.” For Komnene’s sources for the *Alexiad*’s battle pieces, see Kyle Sinclair, “Anna Komnene and Her Sources for Military Affairs in the *Alexiad*,” *Estudios Bizantinos* 2 (2014), 143–185.

lous.¹⁴⁸ In one battle piece involving Robert Guiscard's Normans, Alexios's warhorse, Sgouritzes, seemed "inspired by Divine Providence," as if "taking the wings of Pegasus," and the "barbarians spears, striking at thin air, fell from their hands; others which had pierced the emperor's clothing, remained stuck there and were carried off with the horse when he jumped."¹⁴⁹ Anna described the "extraordinary sight" of Norman "spear-points, thrust toward [Alexios's] right side, [that] suddenly straightened him and kept him in equilibrium," attributing this to "some divine power."¹⁵⁰

However, Komnene's spear descriptions staged conflicts between Normans and Rhōmaïoi as *disequilibrium* between the spiritual and temporal, paralleling the text's attempts at mimetic interpenetration. The *Alexiad's* Holy Lance in particular highlighted the presence of *contençon* between Christians. Longinus's Spear was a site of contested meaning, much as Bartholomew's Lance had been for Normans and Provençals at Antioch. Anna, perhaps alluding to Crusader claims about authenticity, conflated "spear" and "nail" in her descriptions of it.¹⁵¹ It was also a hermeneutic tool for enforcing "authoritative" interpretations of violence. After his Illyrian campaign failed, for example, Bohemond swore to Alexios on "the Nails, the Spear that pierced Our Lord's Side."¹⁵² Taking an oath on the Spear, which involved speaking Alexios's formulae as his own, "fixed" Bohemond as an object of the imperial gaze. Rhōmaiōn monarchs did not reciprocate oaths; they

¹⁴⁸ Notably, in such scenes, Anna at least rhetorically constructs a shift from historical reportage to the imaginative and pseudo-miraculous. "In the course of this account," she writes, "partly from the nature of history and partly because of the great importance of these events, I have forgotten that it is my father whose successes I am writing of" (125). For the shifting literary structures at play in Komnene's *Alexiad*, see Larisa Orlov Vilimonović, *Structure and Features of Anna Komnene's Alexiad: Emergence of a Personal History* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam UP, 2018). For the "pseudo-miraculous" as convention, see Andras Kraft, "Miracles and Pseudo-Miracles in Byzantine Apocalypses," in Maria Gerolemou, *Recognizing Miracles in Antiquity and Beyond* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2018), 111–133.

¹⁴⁹ Komnene, *Alexiad*, 124 [4.7]: "τὸ δὲ ὅλον εἰπεῖν, ὑπὸ θείας προνοίας ἐμπνευσθεὶς πάλλεται τε εὐθὺς καὶ διαέριος γίνεται καὶ ἐπὶ ἄκρου τῆς εἰρημένης πέτρας ἐφίσταται ὡς περὶ ὑπόπτερος κουφισθεὶς καί, τοῦτο δὴ τὸ τῶν μύθων, Πηγάσου πτερὰ λαβὼν· Σγουρίτζην τουτοῖ τὸν ἵππον ὁ Βρυέννιος ὠνόμαζε. τὰ δὲ τῶν βαρβάρων δόρατα ὡς περὶ κενεμβατήσαντα τὰ μὲν καὶ τῶν χειρῶν τούτων ἐξέπεσον, τὰ δὲ διαπεπαρμένα τοῖς μέρεσι τοῦ ἐσθήματος τοῦ βασιλέως ἐναπομείναντα μετεωρισθέντα τῷ ἵππῳ συνηκολούθησαν. ὁ δὲ εὐθὺς ἀποκόπτει τὰ ἐπαγόμενα δόρατα."

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.: "ἀναμεταξὺ δὲ τούτων φθάνουσιν αὐτὸν οἱ διώκοντες, οἱ καὶ παίουσιν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν ἀριστερὰν πλευρὰν διὰ τῶν δοράτων (ἐννέα δὲ ξύμπαντες) καὶ ἐπὶ θάτερα κλίνουσι. τάχα δὲ ἂν καὶ ἐπεπτώκει, εἰ μὴ τὸ ξίφος, ὃ τῇ δεξιᾷ κατεῖχε χεῖρι, ἔφθασεν ἐναπερσεῖσθαι τῇ γῆ. αἱ μὴν καὶ ἡ τοῦ μύωπος ἀκμὴ τοῦ ἀριστεροῦ ποδὸς ἐνδακοῦσα τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ἐφροῖδος, ὃ ὑπόστρωμα λέγουσιν, ἀκλινέστερον τὸν ἵππότην ἐποίει. καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ τῇ λαιᾷ τῆς χαίτης δραξάμενος τοῦ ἵππου ἀνεῖχεν ἑαυτόν. βοηθεῖται μὲντοι ἐκ θείας τινὸς δυνάμεως σωτηρίαν παρὰ ἑχθρῶν αὐτῷ κομιζούσης παραδόξως."

¹⁵¹ . For the problem of "spear-point" and "nail," which Komnene uses idiosyncratically, see Georgina Buckler, *Anna Komnene: A Study* (London: Oxford UP, 1929), 467–468. In *Byzantium and the Crusades*, Harris makes the point that Komnene refers to Peter Bartholomew's Lance as the "Holy Nail," as if to distinguish from the "true" Spear in Rhōmaiōn possession (73). The "Holy Nails" proper, referred to in Bohemond's oath to Alexios, denoted the nails used at the Crucifixion.

¹⁵² Komnene, *Alexiad*, 394 [13.15]: "Ὁμνυμι γὰρ εἰς τὰ πάθη τοῦ ἀπαθοῦς καὶ σωτήρος Χριστοῦ καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀήτητον ἐκείνου σταυρὸν, ὃν ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν ἀπάντων σωτηρίας ὑπέμεινε, καὶ εἰς τὰ προκείμενα παναγέστατα εὐαγγέλια, ἃ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἅπασαν ἐσαγήνευσε· ταῦτα γὰρ κρατῶν ἐπόμνυμι καὶ τὸν πολῦτιμον σταυρὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ συμπαραλαμβάνων τῷ νῶ καὶ τὸν ἀκάνθινον στέφανον καὶ τοὺς ἡλούς καὶ τὴν λόγχην ἐκείνην τὴν διατηρήσαντα τὴν δεσποτικὴν καὶ ζωσποῖον πλευρὰν πρὸς σέ, τὸν κράτιστον καὶ ἅγιον ἡμῶν βασιλέα κύριον Ἀλέξιον." Komnene gives a version of the Treaty of Devol, which concluded Bohemond's pseudo-crusade against Alexios, at length in the *Alexiad*. For Bohemond's failed Illyrian campaign of 1107–1108, see Theotokis, *Norman Campaigns*; Peter Stephenson, "The Rise of the West, I: Normans and Crusaders (1081–1118)," in *Byzantium's Balkan Frontiers: A Political Study of the Northern Balkans: 900–1204* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000), 156–187.

“promise[d] and grant[ed] through a chrysobull whatever privileges [were] being granted, but the oath seems [to have been] demanded only of others.”¹⁵³ As Angeliki Laiou remarks, foreigners like Bohemond were thus “brought into an orderly, hierarchical relationship with the Byzantine state” through a “process of normalization, of inscribing the ‘other’ into an order created and recognized by ‘self.’”¹⁵⁴

To the extent that the *Alexiad* reflects Komnenian-era mentalités, this “process of normalization” involved realigning Bohemond with the conventional tropes and figures of Rhōmaïōn apocalyptic discourses that Bohemond leveraged in the West. Much as Walter the Chancellor did, Komnene described locust hordes appearing “by way of a metaphor,” preceding the “mighty host” of Franks that took the Cross in the 1090’s. Such moments were meant to be decipherable. Rhōmaïoi “came to recognize locusts as the forerunners” of the crusaders.¹⁵⁵ “Prophets at the time” interpreted the swarms, “which abstained from the wheat but ravaged the vines,” as “a sign that the Keltic army would refrain from interfering in the affairs of Christians but bring dreadful affliction on the barbarian Ishmaelites.”¹⁵⁶ Komnene or her sources likely recalled St. John’s Apocalypse, in which the Fifth Trumpet heralds chimeric locusts with human faces, shaped “like horses prepared for battle,” and “commanded not to harm the grass of the earth [...] but only those men who do not have the seal of God.”¹⁵⁷ This is particularly evident in the *Alexiad*’s synecdochic treatment of the worst “Kelts,” the Guiscards. St. John’s locusts were revealed by “smoke [arising] out of the [bottomless] pit like the smoke of a great furnace”; Bohemond was “like the acrid smoke which precedes a fire.”¹⁵⁸ “Father and son,” Anna continued, “you might liken to caterpillars and locusts, for what was left by Robert, [Bohemond] fed on and devoured.”¹⁵⁹ Notably, Anna’s description lack the symbolic clarities that her Rhōmaïōn “prophets” trafficked in. The metaphors mix; the cause-and-effect relationship between Bohemond and Robert inverts itself. Her simultaneous emphasis on similitude rather than meaning – “like,” “might liken to” – underscores Bohemond as a figure of monstrous artifice, a parody of God’s “dreadful affliction” on unbelievers.

In the “chiliastic climate” of Komnenian Byzantium,¹⁶⁰ Bohemond’s apocalypticism embodied the threat of rival perlocution, reframing typological readings of Alexios and Bohemond, Rhōmaïoi

¹⁵³ Angeliki E. Laiou, “The Foreigner and the Stranger in 12th Century Byzantium: Means of Propitiation and Acculturation,” in *Byzantium and the Other: Relations and Exchanges*, ed. Cécile Morrison and Rowan Dorin (London: Routledge, 2012), 89.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 91.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 275.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 276. It is worth noting that Rhōmaïōn apocalyptic literatures described Muslims (“Ishmaelites”) in the same terms as the *Alexiad*’s “Kelts.” *The Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius*, for example, describes a vision in which “the entire Promised Land came under their control. The land was filled with them and their camps. They went about like locusts. They were naked, ate flesh in vessels [of] flesh, and drank animals’ blood” (116).

¹⁵⁷ Revelation 9:4–7.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 9:2; Komnene, *Alexiad*, 43 [1.14]: “καὶ ἦν ὡς ἀληθῶς πρὸ τοῦ πυρὸς καπνὸς δριμύτατος καὶ πρὸ τῆς μεγάλης πολιορκίας πολιορκίας προοίμιον.”

¹⁵⁹ Komnene, *Alexiad*, 43 [1.14]: “βρούχους καὶ ἀκρίδας εἶπεν ἄν τις αὐτοῦς, τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν· τὰ γὰρ κατάλοιπα Ῥομπέρτου ὁ τούτου υἱὸς Βαϊμούντος προσεπενείματο καὶ κατέφαγεν.”

¹⁶⁰ As Jelena Erdeljan remarks in *Chosen Places: Constructing New Jerusalems in Slavia Orthodoxa* (Leiden: Brill, 2017) regarding Alexios’s successor, John II Komnenos, “at the end of his reign, at the moment of a fatal accident during a hunting party, this emperor prepared himself not only to reclaim Antioch from the Crusaders, but to lead his armies further toward the Holy Land,” 119. For context, see, also, Maria K. Papathanassiou, *The Occult Sciences in Byzantium* (Leiden: Brill, 2019).

and Franks, within the established Rhōmaiōn framework. As Tzevetelin Stepanov remarks, Alexios was quite possibly “tempted to see himself as being the Last Roman Emperor before the *End of Times*.”¹⁶¹ His “Scythian war” against the Pechenegs (1086–1091) nested with tropes about the end-times struggle against “Gog and Magog”;¹⁶² the “Kelts,” particularly the Guiscards, matched descriptions of blonde-haired barbarians from the West in Rhōmaiōn apocalypses;¹⁶³ the eschatological situation of the First Crusade – which made the position of Antioch pressing – promised the Last Emperor’s foreordained defeat of the “Ishmaelites.”¹⁶⁴ Notably, Alexios directed the installation of – and remained fascinated by – a grand mosaic of the Last Judgment in the imperial palace. According to the Komnenian poet, Nicholas Kallikles, it was utterly unconventional, depicting Alexios squarely within the “left hand order and flame” of God’s wrath at the End of Time.¹⁶⁵ As with Bohemond’s use of apocalyptic allusions in Capetian France, Alexios’s Last Judgment seems to have reflected his own distinct exegetical “fingerprints.” In *Epitome of Histories*, his *protasēkrētis*, John Zonaras, noted that Alexios believed he would not die until he entered Jerusalem, not in imitation of the Latin *iter Ierosolimitanum* but in fulfillment of Pseudo-Methodius’s prophecies.¹⁶⁶ If, at turns, Alexios supposed himself to be the Last Emperor, then Bohemond fit the role of “Son of Perdition,” whose lies would be exposed through the hermeneutic *apokálypsis* of the Spear.

Komnene’s remarkable description of Bohemond’s “constitution, mental and physical,” the “certain charm about him” and “alarm his whole person inspired,” made a spectacle of him in two senses.¹⁶⁷ First, it sought to expose, catalogue, and control him as an object of the Rhōmaiōn gaze, a figure within the Last Emperor mythos. Second, it focused on the performative effect he had on an audience. The same principle was operant in the “false miracle” Komnene described as the occasion

¹⁶¹ Tzevetelin Stepanov, *Waiting for the End of the World: European Dimensions, 950–1200* (Leiden: Brill, 2020), 93.

¹⁶² Ibid, 88; for the Komnenian war against the “Scythians,” see Marek Mesko, “Anna Komnene’s Narrative of the War Against the Scythians,” *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 19.2 (2014), 53–67; Victor Spinei, *The Romanians and the Turkic Nomads North of the Danube Delta from the Tenth to the Mid-Thirteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 2009); Mykola Melnyk, *Byzantium and the Pechenegs: The Historiography of the Problem* (Leiden: Brill, 2022). In various contexts, “Gog and Magog” occur in the Bible in Genesis 10, Ezekiel 38, and Revelation 20:8. For context, see William J. Aerts, “Gog, Magog, Dogheads, and Other Monsters in the Byzantine World,” in A.A. Seyed-Gohrab, F. Doufikar-Aerts, and S. McGlinn, eds., *Embodiments of Evil: Gog and Magog. Interdisciplinary Studies in the “Other” in Literature & Internet Texts* (Leiden: Leiden UP, 2011), 23–35; Emeri van Donzel and Andrea Schmidt, *Gog and Magog in Early Christian and Islamic Sources: Salam’s Quest for Alexander’s Wall* (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

¹⁶³ For the correlation between the Guiscards/Normans and the prophesy that “‘when the blond king will come from the West, I [the Gate] will open by myself’; and then the Westerners who spoke the Latin language would rule and dominate,” see Stepanov, *Waiting for the End*, 146.

¹⁶⁴ See András Kraft, “On the Eschatological Elucidation of the ‘Ishmaelite’ Phenomenon,” Oxford University Research Archive, 2010; Emmanouela Grypeou, “‘A People Will Come From the Desert’: Apocalyptic Perceptions of the Early Muslim Conquests in Contemporary Eastern Christian Literature,” in *Apocalypticism and Eschatology in Late Antiquity: Encounters in the Abrahamic Religions, 6th to 8th Centuries*, ed. Hagit Amirav, Emmanouela Grypeou, and Guy G. Stroumsa (Paris: Peters, 2017), 292–309.

¹⁶⁵ Nicholas Kallikles, qtd. in Galina Tirnarić, “Divine Images and Earthly Authority at the Chora parekklesion in Constantinople,” in *Negotiating Secular and Sacred in Medieval Art: Christian, Islamic, and Buddhist*, ed. Alicia Walker and Amanda Luyster (New York, Routledge, 2016), 90.

¹⁶⁶ John Zonaras, *Epitome historiarum libri XVIII* 3 vols., Th. Buttner-Wobst, ed., in *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae* (Bonn, 1897), 3:760.

¹⁶⁷ Komnene, *Alexiad*, 384 [13.10]. For the famous passage, see Margaret Mullett, “Bohemond’s Biceps: Male Beauty and the Female Gaze in the Alexiad of Anna Komnene,” in *Byzantine Masculinities*, ed. Dion Smythe (New York: Ashgate, 2008).

for his threat to “plant [his] spear in Byzantium.” According to Anna or her sources, Bohemond faked his own death, returning to Europe in a coffin, accompanied by a slaughtered cock meant to mimic the odour of a putrefying corpse.¹⁶⁸ At Corfu, Bohemond “resurrected,” issuing his threat to Alexios through the local *doux* “I want you to know,” Bohemond was reported to have said, “that, although I was dead, I have come back to life, again; I have escaped your clutches [...] [and] as far as you and your friends are concerned, I am a corpse; but to myself and my friends, it is manifest that I am a living man, plotting a diabolical end for you.”¹⁶⁹ In keeping with the Antichrist’s role as parodist, the *Alexiad*’s Bohemond performs a false Resurrection. If true, Bohemond’s description of his own ruse as “diabolical” gestures toward his acute awareness of the discourses he operated within, his “cunning ear.” “Bohemond himself,” Komnene wrote, “derived more pleasure than anyone from his imaginary misfortune.”¹⁷⁰ If invented, either by Komnene or others, the episode nonetheless speaks to the pressures Bohemond placed on stable elements in those discourses. In either case, Anna’s own narrational scheme for the episode underscores two important things that are borne out across contemporary sources. First, Bohemond is depicted as having had an acute awareness of how stories travelled “faster than the beating of a bird’s wings,” how they did “the rounds.”¹⁷¹ Second, Bohemond is depicted as understanding how the same sign might mean different things to different discursive communities, to “you and your own” (*σοι [...] τοῖς σοῖς*) or “to myself and my own” (*ἐμοὶ δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἐμαυτοῦ*).¹⁷²

Conclusions

The threat posed by Bohemond’s use of Rhōmaiōn apocalyptic discourses – or the opportunities it shaped – had to do with his canny ability to shape and reshape common traditions as situational, highly personalized speech. Anna Komnene remained outside the perlocutions of her own pseudo-apocalyptic narrations as historian-critic. Alexios sought to understand his role in the Eusebian dispensation through their interpretive application. The range of sources written within living memory, both Frankish and Rhōmaiōn, seem to suggest that Bohemond used them as frustrating pastiche. In Europe, his orations were part of a political pseudo-theatre that involved relics, props, and a supporting cast that included Scythian peoples of “Gog and Magog,” several “eminent

¹⁶⁸ Komnene, *Alexiad*, 329 [11.12]. For the episode, see Emily Albu, “Bohemond and the Rooster: Byzantines, Normans, and the Artful Ruse,” in *Anna Komnene and Her Times*, ed. Thalia Gouma-Peterson (New York: Garland, 2000), 157–168.

¹⁶⁹ Komnene, *Alexiad*, 331 [11.12]: “πάντα γὰρ ὀφθαλμὸν καὶ πᾶσαν χεῖρα καὶ γνώμην διαλαθὼν ἐν σχήματι ἀποτεθνηκότος, νῦν καὶ ζῶν καὶ κινούμενος καὶ τὸν ἀέρα πνέων ἐκ τῆσδε τῆς Κορυφοῦς διαπέμπω πάνυ μεμισημένας ἀγγελίας τῆ σῆ βασιλεία, ἃς καὶ ἀναμαθῶν οὐκ ἂν περιοχαρῶς ἀποδέξαιο, ὡς τῷ μὲν Ταγγρὲ καὶ ἐμῷ ἀνεψιῷ τὴν Αντιόχου πόλιν παρακατεθέμην, πρὸς τοὺς σοὺς στρατηγούς ἀντίμαχον ἀξιόμαχον καταλείψας αὐτόν, αὐτὸς δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν ἄπειμι χώραν, σοὶ μὲν νεκρὸς φημιζόμενος καὶ τοῖς σοῖς, ἐμοὶ δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἐμαυτοῦ καὶ ζῶν καὶ κατὰ σοῦ δεινὰ βουλευόμενος. ἐφ’ ᾧ γὰρ τὴν ὑπὸ σὲ Ῥωμανίαν κλονήσῃν, καὶ ζῶν ἀποτέθηκα καὶ ἀποθανῶν ἔζησα.”

¹⁷⁰ Ibid: “καὶ ἐδόκει μὲν τοῦ χρωτὸς εἶναι τοῦ Βαϊμόντου τὸ βαρὺ τῆς ἀναπνοῆς τοῖς ἔξωθεν ἠπατημένοις· πλεον δὲ ἐκεῖνος ὁ Βαϊμόντος τοῦ ἐπιπλάστου κακοῦ συναπέλαυνεν, ὥστε ἔγωγε θαυμάζω πῶς τοσαύτην ὑπήνεγκε τῆς ῥίνος πολιορκίαν ζῶν ἔτι μετὰ νεκροῦ συμφερόμενος σώματος.”

¹⁷¹ Ibid, 329 [11.12]: “καὶ ἡ φήμη διέτρεχεν ἀπανταχῇ πτερῶν ταχυτέρα καὶ τὸν Βαϊμόντον νεκρὸν ἐκίρουτε.”

¹⁷² Komnene, *Alexiad*, 331 [11.12]. I diverge from Sewter’s translation as “your and your friends” here.

Greeks and Thracians” deprived of the “dignities of their ancestors,” and a pretender who claimed to be the son of Romanos IV Diogenes (1068–1071).¹⁷³ In such a context, did Bohemond appear the antitype of the Last Emperor, a Jovian invoking Heaven’s aid against Julian the Apostate? Did he stage himself more like the antitype of St. Mercurius, interceding on behalf of the “true” *basileus Rhōmaiōn*? What mattered was that, in being either, both, or none as opportunities dictated or audiences imagined, Bohemond’s rhetorical mediations both drew on and destabilized the Latin and Rhōmaiōn forms of apocalyptic mimesis he used. Nicholas Paul makes a valuable distinction between twelfth-century historical narratives of the First Crusade that sought to “express a collective identity and attempt to shape wider social memory” and Bohemond’s use of “a charismatic personal presence, a well-crafted story, and a carefully staged performance” to garner support for his anti-Komnenian ambitions.¹⁷⁴ Bohemond’s orations, however, sought to conflate the two in the production of his own speaking persona.

Within a generation, “Bohemond” came to signify a kind of equestrian figure of speech in “Last Days” rhetorical descriptions, just as the “Last Days” had constituted descriptive technique for Bohemond the speaker. Tellingly, Komnene noted that “locusts did not precede the Kelts [who landed at Illyria in 1107] as they had on previous occasions, but a great comet appeared in the sky, greater than any other seen in the past.”¹⁷⁵ It was a common ground for divergent apocalyptic interpretations.¹⁷⁶ According to Matthew of Edessa, learned Armenians thought it signified the coming of a second Alexander the Great who would rule the world.¹⁷⁷ Some Rhōmaiōn observers “likened it to a javelin” (*ἀκοντίαν ἔφασσαν εἶναι*),¹⁷⁸ threatening to unsettle Rhōmaiōn apocalyptic meanings with something like Bohemond’s *vaticinium ex eventu*. Indeed, coins minted during Alexios’s reign depicted the Great Comet of 1106 interrupting the Virgin’s coronation of Alexios, perhaps as Last Emperor.¹⁷⁹ Nor did Bohemond’s defeat, retirement to Apulia, or death ebb the force of his counternarratives. He became, in effect a mimetic model. Just as Bohemond had been the “exact image and living replica” of his father,¹⁸⁰ Antioch’s regent, Tancred, “spoke” and “mouth[ed] out threats” against Alexios “like a tragic actor” – and in *imitatio Boamundus*. To Rhōmaïoi, whom he assured he “would never release his grip on Antioch,” he was a “mighty irresistible giant, with his feet firmly planted on the ground like some dead weight,” to whom “all Romans were [...] noth-

¹⁷³ “Diogenis augusti aliosque de Grecis seu Tracibus illustres secum habebat quorum querela de Alexio imperatore qui per proditionem illis antecessorum stemmata suorum abstulerat, magis ad iram contra eum feroces Francos incitabat,” in Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History*, 70–71. For context, see Marguerite Mathieu, “Les Faux Diogènes,” *Byzantion* 22 (1952), 133–148; Bohemond’s Scythian captives would not have been part of his “theatre” until late 1106, when several Scythian mercenaries were captured during a raid on Otranto by Isaac Kontostephanos. Bohemond brought them to Rome during his attempt to gain Paschal II’s support. See Rowe, “Paschal II,” 188.

¹⁷⁴ Paul, “A Warlord’s Wisdom,” 566.

¹⁷⁵ Komnene, *Alexiad*, 340–341 [12.4]: Ἀκρις μὲν οὖν οὐ προηγέσατο τῶν Κελτῶν καθ’απερεὶ τῶν πρότερον διελθόντων.”

¹⁷⁶ Anna’s comet was a sun-grazer, designated as X/1106 C1, and commonly known as the “Great Comet of 1106.” It reappeared as the Great Comet of 1882 and Comet Ikeya-Seki (1965).

¹⁷⁷ Matthew of Edessa, *Chronicle*, 109.

¹⁷⁸ Komnene, *Alexiad*, 341 [12.4].

¹⁷⁹ See Michael Hendry, *Coinage and Money in the Byzantine Empire, 1081–1206* (Washington: Dunbarton Oaks, 1969).

¹⁸⁰ Komnene, *Alexiad*, 42 [1.14]: “ὅλως γὰρ οὗτος τοῦ πατρὸς ἀποσφράγισμα ἦν καὶ τῆς ἐκείνου φύσεως ἔμψυχον ἐκμαγεῖον.”

ing more than ants, the feeblest of living things.”¹⁸¹ Perhaps some Normans at Antioch recalled St. Mercurius when Tancred told Alexios’s envoys that he “would set his throne high above the stars” and “bore with his spear point through the walls of Babylon.”¹⁸² Likely, those in Anna Komnene’s circle recalled Bohemond. Those were, after all, still strange days.

¹⁸¹ Ibid, 402 [14.2]: “καὶ ἑαυτὸν μὲν εἶναι τὸν Νίνον τὸν μέγαν τὸν Ἀσσύριον καὶ ὡσπερ τινὰ γίγαντα μέγαν καὶ ἀνυπόστατον καὶ ἄχθος ἀρούρης ἐστῶτα τῇ γῆ, τοὺς δὲ Ῥωμαίους ξύμπαντας μύρμηκας ἐλογίζετο καὶ τῶν ζώων τὰ ἀσθενέστατα.”

¹⁸² Ibid, 401 [14.2]: “εὐθὺς τὰ τοῦ γένους ἐποίει καὶ ὑπὸ ἀλαζονείας ὀγκούμενος ὑπεράνω τῶν ἀστρῶν θήσειν τὸν θρόνον ἠλαζονεύετο καὶ τοῦ δόρατος τῇ ἀκμῇ διατετραίνειν ἠπείλει τὰ τεῖχη τὰ Βαβυλώνια ἔλεγέ τε διαρρήδην καὶ ἐξετραγώδει τὴν δύναμιν.”