

The Genesis of Fratricide: An Analysis of Growing Secular and Ethnic Tensions between Byzantium and the West in the Context of the First Crusade

Stephen Scruby

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, University of Florida

Both Anna Comnena and Guibert of Nogent held deep misgivings concerning other peoples—Guibert toward easterners, Anna toward the denizens of western Europe. However, in singular instances, both authors stepped away from their prejudices. Guibert of Nogent and Anna Comnena found worth and honor in specific individuals belonging to their factions' enemies. Of further note is that both authors' objects of admiration were women. The importance of these two surprising instances of the admiration of the "other" cannot be understated. By singling out honorable individuals among their enemies, Anna and Guibert revealed their most dearly held values.

When Robert Guiscard's conquest of southern Italy brought him into direct conflict with the Byzantines, he needed to justify his war against them.¹ Guiscard went to great lengths to legitimize this belligerence towards the Byzantines by means of an aggressive propaganda campaign that built upon and manipulated pre-existing anti-Byzantine and anti-Greek stereotypes. By the 1080s, as Guiscard and his son Bohemond were preparing to invade the Byzantine-held Balkans, this campaign had reached its apogee. Anti-Byzantine stereotypes were especially prevalent in Italy during the preceding century.² Liutprand of Cremona, who had visited Constantinople as the envoy of Otto I, assailed the Byzantines as "soft, effeminate, idle liars of neutral gender."³ Norman propaganda capitalized on the feminine characterization of Greeks by the Lombard bishop. The Lombard chronicler Amato of Montecassino believed Norman seizures of Byzantine lands to be divine punishments for their shortcomings. Through God's intervention, Byzantine territory was "given to the Normans due to the perversity of those who held it..."⁴ Amato became a significant contributor to the Norman propaganda campaign, writing his *History of the Normans* during the height of Norman clashes with Byzantine forces in southern Italy. For their part, the Byzantines received the freshly invigorated Norman vitriol with their customary disdain for "Latins."

Despite this vortex of political and ethnic hostility, the Byzantine princess Anna Comnena made a notable effort to commend a high-ranking member of the Norman camp. Robert Guiscard's wife, Sikelgaita of Salerno, stands apart from her Norman compatriots as a figure of Byzantine admiration in Anna's 12th century work, the *Alexiad*. At four distinct points, Anna praises the wife of one of the Byzantines' greatest enemies. Known in the *Alexiad* as Γαῖτα (Gaita), the Lombard princess rode beside her husband Robert Guiscard against the armies of Emperor Alexius Comnenus, Anna's father and the hero of the work.

Though Gaita was in all ways a foe of her father's empire, Anna could not help but admire her.⁵

Guiscard's marriage to Gaita was instrumental in the expansion of Norman power in southern Italy.⁶ Beyond allying Robert with the ruling family of Salerno, the marriage brought him a wife who, according to Anna, possessed remarkable valor and martial capability. As will be discussed below, Anna reported that Gaita behaved with honor superior to that of her Norman in-laws during a battle with the Byzantines. Prior to this, Anna had portrayed Gaita as also outshining her husband in terms of Christian piety. In the *Alexiad*, she even objects to her husband's making war upon the Byzantines:

This came about, as they say—that the most villainous Robert, who indeed was anxious for battle with the Romans, and had been preparing war for a great deal of time, was hindered by some of the most high-born men in his retinue, and also was being prevented by his own wife, Gaita, on the grounds that the war would be unjust and begun against Christians; often he stayed his hand just as he began to commit to an assault.⁷

By illustrating Gaita's aversion to a war against fellow Christians, Anna immediately places the Lombard woman above her Norman husband, whom she referred to as ῥαδιουργότατος ("most villainous"). She says nothing negative about Gaita.

Eventually, Robert Guiscard made good on his intention to wage war on the Byzantines. Strangely, Anna seems to forget Gaita's initial reluctance to attack other Christians. In her subsequent appearance in the *Alexiad*, Gaita is now an enthusiastic supporter of her husband's new war, joining him in full armor as he marshals his forces at Hydruntum (modern-day Otranto). At this point, one would expect Anna to reverse completely her positive regard for Gaita. Instead, she continues to praise the Lombard princess.

For, having marched there [Salerno], he [Robert] arrived at Hydruntum. He seated himself there, and after enduring for a few days, he received his wife, Gaita (indeed, for she too joined her husband in war, and in truth the woman made a fearsome image, after she had donned full armor). Embracing her, he set out with the entire expedition and captured the city of Brindisi.⁸

Anna gives the reader a new image of Gaita—that of a formidable woman-at-arms. She enhances that image with her liberal use of epic vocabulary. Nearly all of the verbal elements of the passage (Ἀπάρας, διακαρτερήσας, ἐξοπλίσαιτο) are taken from classical sources written in the Ionic dialect, which is often employed in heroic poetry.⁹ To an educated Byzantine, such a choice of words served to enhance the drama surrounding the appearance of a fully-armored Gaita. Anna was well-versed in classical Greek literature, and appropriated the vocabulary of ancient authors in order to add impact to the actions of her father, Emperor Alexius. Instead of treating Gaita as a rival as she does her husband Robert, Anna describes Gaita's character with the same lexical repertoire that she normally reserves for her own father. No higher praise could have been offered by the Byzantine princess.

Anna elevates Gaita most dramatically in the fourth book of her work, in which she recounts the Battle of Dyrrhachium, fought in 1081 between Robert Guiscard and Alexius Comnenus, now Emperor of the Byzantines.¹⁰ Anna initially reported that the battle was turning ill for the Normans. It was only Gaita's excessive heroism that secured victory for the Norman army. Following a failed attack, key elements of Guiscard's forces were routed by Alexius' troops and his Venetian allies.

But they [the Byzantine soldiers] became very firm in their resistance, so the others [the Normans] turned their backs—since they were not all picked men—and threw themselves into the sea. Up to the utmost reaches of their necks [in water], they approached the armed ships of the Romans and Venetians, pleading for safety there, where they were not well-received. And then, as someone tells the story, Robert's consort Gaita—who was riding with him and was another Pallas, if not Athena herself—saw the fleeing soldiers, regarded them with a piercing look, and called to them with a very great voice, saying in her own dialect an equivalent to Homer's words, "How far will you run? Stand firm, be men!" And since she saw them still fleeing, taking up a long spear, she burst forth as a defender, throwing herself at the whole mass of fleeing soldiers. Upon seeing this, they took hold of themselves and called themselves back to the battle.¹¹

Robert's forces rallied to win the battle and took the city from the Byzantines. Several aspects of this passage are noteworthy. Here, Anna selected words that exalted Gaita beyond her own husband's identity, using σύνευνος, meaning "consort" or "bedfellow," seemingly to indicate Gaita's emergence as her own person, entirely distinct from Robert. This is particularly significant because Anna uses the word γυναῖκα, "woman" or "wife," in reference to Gaita in all her other appearances in the work. Anna may have wanted to create this sense of distance between Gaita and the Normans because of their diametrical conduct in the Battle of Dyrrhachium. In a clever reversal of the stereotype famously employed by the Normans against Byzantines, Anna presents the Norman soldiers as effeminate cowards, requiring the urging of a woman to goad them into battle. Gaita even had to explicitly remind the Normans to "be men." Indeed, the victory of the Norman army was due entirely to the woman's comparatively superior martial prowess.¹² Anna embellished Gaita's previous appearances in the narrative with Homeric vocabulary. In this passage, Anna further elaborates her heroic presence by means of a direct comparison between Gaita and the Greek goddess of war, Athena. Anna adds that Gaita uttered a speech echoing Homeric words, albeit in her own language.¹³ By employing this passage, the princess festooned Gaita with the battle regalia of a goddess, armed with the martial and rhetorical skills of the ancients. Given her deference for classical works, this image would have appealed greatly to the Greek noblewoman.

Gaita reverts to the subservient feminine role of her day in her final appearance in the *Alexiad*, standing vigilantly at her husband's deathbed. As Anna relates, "His wife Gaita reached him just as he breathed [his final breaths], with his son weeping near him."¹⁴ Here, Gaita is again described with the word γυναῖκα. No longer the invincible warrior goddess, she is once again the dutiful wife and mother. While Anna's apparent admiration of Sikelgaita in the *Alexiad* is beyond question, her reasons for displaying it in a narrative celebrating her father's life and achievements are less clear. The Byzantine princess idolized classical heroes, and was clearly well-versed in the knowledge of warfare as well. Her precise and technical descriptions of her father's battles and tactics illustrate her facility in such matters. Anna saw in Gaita a kindred spirit—a woman of noble rank who was both learned in the arts of war and capable of independent action. Anna long desired the office of Empress, and perhaps even wished to perform heroic deeds of her own as a sign of her worthiness.

Anna would have had another motive for elevating a woman, though an enemy, above men. She considered herself superior to her brother John II Comnenus, who succeeded her father, in much the same way that she

presented Gaita in comparison to Robert Guiscard. Anna accused Alexius' successors of incompetence in the wake of his reign:

And we had peace until the end of his life. But with the Emperor, all that was most pleasing disappeared, and his achievements all became vain after his demise due to the stupidity of those inheriting the imperial staff.¹⁵

Following her failed attempt to seize the throne, Anna almost certainly harbored a deep bitterness toward her brother. Although her life's goal was thwarted by a man, Anna vicariously enjoyed the fabled success of Gaita, who rose above all the men of her station on the field of battle. In doing so, Gaita heaped disgrace upon the enemies of Anna's empire. The exploits of the Lombard woman provided Anna with the perfect means to respond to the litany of Norman insults against her fellow countrymen.

Two even more curious exultations of an enemy woman mark the male-dominated Latin literature of the First Crusade. The anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum* devoted an entire chapter to a dialogue between the Turk Kerbogha (known as *Curbaran* in Latin), Atabeg of Mosul, and his mother (who remains unnamed). Guibert gives similar attention to the characters in his own version of the work, *Dei Gesta per Francos*.¹⁶ Both authors create a strange dichotomy between the two characters, both of whom are Muslim. Kerbogha is the stereotypical Islamic warlord—proud, raging, licentious, and cruel—but his mother is a voice of reason, an out-of-place advocate for the Christian cause.¹⁷ It is of great interest that two extremely biased Christian authors displayed an eastern woman in such a positive light.

As Kerbogha is making preparations for an assault upon the Crusader armies trapped inside the walls of Antioch, his mother begs him to retreat. In the words of the anonymous author:

Indeed, the mother of the same Curbura (Kerbogha), who was in the city of Aleppo, traveled swiftly to him, and tearfully said: "Son, are these things which I hear true?" He said to her: "Which things?" And she said to him: "I heard that you are going to commence battle with the people of the Franks." He said: "You know the entire truth." She said: "I caution you, son, by the names of all the gods and your great beneficence, not to commit to battle with the Franks, because you are an undefeated soldier, and never have I heard of any sort of rashness from you or your army, and because no person has ever found you fleeing the field from any victor whatsoever."¹⁸

Guibert of Nogent follows this part of the passage closely, but his version of Kerbogha receives even more colorful praise in respect to his martial record from his

mother. She also abruptly recognizes the ascendancy of the Christian religion over her own.

She said, "Son, best of men, I dare to appeal to your most honorable and inborn nobility that you not bring a fight to them [the Franks], lest you invite damage to your reputation. Since the brilliance of your arms shines even to the remotest reaches of the Ocean above India, and even farthest Thule resounds with your praise, why do you deign to sully your blades with the blood of poor men, whom it is senseless to attack, and in whose defeat there is no glory? And since you are able to compel distant kings to tremble, what desire is in your heart to assail wretched foreigners? Son, I admit that you rightfully detest their contemptible persons, but you know for certain that the authority of the Christian religion is superior."¹⁹

The Benedictine historian bemoaned the anonymously authored *Gesta* as a drab work, written with "excessively simple" words.²⁰ Guibert's intention to enrich his *Gesta* with flowery language explains these initial differences between the two passages. However, his version of Kerbogha's mother confirms the superiority of Christianity. Guibert granted this Muslim woman what he believed was the sure wisdom of a Christian Frank. In his memoirs, Guibert described his own mother as a woman who miraculously knew (and feared) the absolute power of the Christian God: "She was not even experienced [in the world], but she had learned to abhor sin by the fear of some blow from above..."²¹ It was almost as if Kerbogha's mother, like Guibert's, perceived the same threat of God's wrath from on high, and cautioned her son against inviting it. Kerbogha and Guibert himself occupy parallel positions in both narratives: Kerbogha in the *Gesta*, Guibert in his memoirs. Guibert heeds his mother's warnings by becoming a monk, but Kerbogha ignores those of his own, bringing about his own ruin. By this contrast alone, Guibert illustrates the superior honor and wisdom of the Franks over the Turks.

Both authors suddenly reveal the surprisingly extensive knowledge of Christian lore displayed by Kerbogha's mother. She predicts that God, on behalf of the otherwise helpless Franks, will defeat her son in the upcoming battle. The anonymous author relates the Turkish woman's attempt to pass on her foresight to her son:

...their God fights for them daily and guides and defends them with His protection by day and night, just as a shepherd watches over his flock. He does not allow them to be injured or molested by any people, and this same God sends to flight anyone who seeks to oppose them, just as He said through the mouth of the prophet David, "Scatter the people that delight in wars," and in another place: "Pour out Thy wrath upon the nations that know Thee not and, against the kingdoms

that call not upon Thy name.” Before they are ready to join in battle, their God, all powerful and mighty in battle, together with His saints, has all their enemies already conquered...²²

The anonymous author and Guibert both have Kerbogha’s mother quoting no fewer than three Psalms in their versions of the *Gesta*.²³ It is doubtful that a Turkish woman, even of high social rank, would have such an intimate familiarity with the Christian Bible. Nor is it likely that one would quote such passages offhand so accurately. Both authors clearly wished to cast Kerbogha’s mother as an instrument of God’s mercy, offering the Turkish general one last chance before he attacked His chosen people, the Franks.

While the anonymous author clearly set the Turkish woman apart from her son, his motives for doing so remain unclear. However, he did cross enemy lines to cast a positive light upon the character of a woman. Guibert of Nogent’s motives are more apparent, as he may have been reminded of his own mother’s warnings against sin as he penned his version of the *Gesta*. Neither Guibert nor the anonymous author held out any positive regard for the denizens of the East, Christian or Muslim alike.²⁴ Given the generally anti-feminine attitude of Latin authors in the

12th century, it is quite noteworthy that these two gave a Turkish woman such positive treatment. However, by turning one of their own highest-ranking women into a divine messenger from God, both *Gesta* authors highlight the hubris and foolhardy nature of the Turks, their sworn enemies. As predicted, Kerbogha attacks the Christian forces in Antioch and is soundly defeated. The Christian wisdom of his Muslim mother is thus confirmed, proving the eminence of the Frankish Crusaders’ cause.

The works of both Anna and Guibert are replete with vitriolic attacks on westerners and easterners, respectively. But in examining these rare passages in their works which offer praise for enemies, their underlying foundation of prejudicial logic becomes readily apparent. A closer look at similar phenomena in Crusades literature will furnish the scholar with fresher and deeper insight into the mental templates that informed the opinions of authors writing about the conflict.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks are due to Dr. Florin Curta and Dr. Konstantinos Kapparis for their invaluable assistance to me in researching this article.

ENDNOTES

¹ Though the Great Schism of 1054 placed the Byzantine church out of communion with Rome, the Byzantines were still considered Christians by western churchmen. Pope Urban II insisted upon the Byzantines’ continued status as Christians at the Council of Clermont in 1095.

² Earlier anti-Byzantine stereotypes in Western Europe often recycled classical ones concerning Greeks in Roman literature. Virgil and Juvenal were common sources of anti-Byzantine inspiration in the Middle Ages.

³ See Liutprand of Cremona, *Liutprand of Cremona: The Embassy to Constantinople and Other Writings*, trans. F.A. Wright (London, 1993), pp. 202–3. Liutprand traveled to Constantinople in 968 to arrange a marriage between the future Otto II and Anna Porphyrogenita, the daughter of Emperor Nicephorus Phocas. The bishop was outraged by what he saw as the excessive vanity of the Greeks—particularly when he was relieved of his purple garments by court officials. The color purple was reserved only for the imperial family at the Byzantine court.

⁴ Amato of Montecassino, *The History of the Normans* III 38, ed. Prescott N. Dunbar and G.A. Loud (Rochester, 2004), pp. 86–109. The Latin text of Amato’s *History of the Normans*, likely written between 1072 and 1080, does not survive. The earliest version is an Old French translation from the 14th century.

⁵ Patricia Skinner made an earlier identification of the relationship between Sikelgaita and Anna. See Patricia Skinner, “‘Halt! Be Men!’: Sikelgaita of Salerno, Gender and the Norman Conquest of Southern Italy,” *Gender and History* 12 (2000), no. 3, pp. 622–41.

⁶ Amato of Montecassino, *History of the Normans* IV 18, pp. 109–31.

⁷ Anna Comnena, *Alexias* I 12, ed. August Reifferscheid (Leipzig, 1884), pp. 42–3. αὐτὸς μὲν, ὡς φασιν, ὁ Ῥομπέρτος ῥαδιοργότατος ὢν καὶ τὴν κατὰ Ῥωμαίων ὀδίνων μάχην καὶ πρὸ πολλοῦ πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον παρασκευαζόμενος ἐκαλύετο μὲν ὡς ἄδικον πολέμων ἄρχων καὶ κατὰ Χριστιανῶν εὐτρεπιζόμενος παρὰ τινῶν τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδοξοτάτων ἀνδρῶν καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς γυναικὸς Γαίτης καὶ ἀνεκόπτετο, πολλὰκις ἐπιχειρήσας τῆς τοιαύτης ὁρμῆς. Anna wrote the *Alexiad*

sometime around 1148. For ease of reference, the pagination used in Reifferscheid will be used for all subsequent references to the *Alexiad*.

⁸ Anna Comnena, *Alexiad* I 15, p. 50. Ἀπάρας γὰρ ἐκέθειν γίνεται κατὰ τὸν Ὑδροῦντα, εἴτ’ ἐκέθει διακατερήσας ὀλίγας ἡμέρας καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα Γαίταν ἀπεκδεχόμενος (καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὴ ξυνεστράτευε τῷ ἀνδρὶ καὶ χρῆμα ἢ ἡ γυνὴ φοβερὸν, ἐπειδὴν ἐξοπλίσατο) ὡς ἐνηγκαλίσατο ταύτην ἐπελθοῦσαν, ἄρας ἐκέθειν πάλιν ὄλω στρατεύματι τὸ Βρεντήσιον καταλαμβάνει.

⁹ The participle διακατερήσας is of Ionic origin, and carries the dramatic meaning “to endure to the end.” It was used by Xenophon and Herodotus. The words Ἀπάρας and ἐξοπλίσατο are also Ionisms. Herodotus used such words in his *Histories* to similar dramatic effect.

¹⁰ The battle at Dyrrhachium, in modern-day Albania, was a Norman victory. Alexius was later able to secure the Balkans from the Normans by defeating Robert’s son, Bohemond, near the Greek city of Larissa.

¹¹ Anna Comnena, *Alexiad* IV 6, p. 145. γενναϊότερον δ’ αὐτῶν ἀντικαταστάντων παλινόρσοι γεγονάσιν, ἐπεὶ οὐ πάντες λογάδες ἦσαν, καὶ τῆ θαλάσσης ἑαυτοὺς ἐπιρρίψαντες ἄχρι τοῦ τραχήλου ταῖς νηυσὶ τοῦ Ῥωμαϊκοῦ καὶ Βενετικικοῦ στόλου πελάζοντες ἐκέθειν ἠτοῦντο τὴν σωτηρίαν καὶ παρ’ ἐκείνων οὐ προσεδέχοντο. ἡ δὲ γε Γαίτα, ὡς λόγος τις φησιν, ἡ τοῦ Ῥομπέρτου σύνευνος αὐτῷ συστρατευομένη, Παλλὰς ἄλλη κἄν μὴ Αθήνην, θεασαμένη τοὺς φεύγοντας δριμύ τούτοις ἐνατενίσασα κατ’ αὐτῶν μεγίστην ἀφείσα φωνὴν μονοῦ τοῦ Ὀμηρικῶν ἐκεῖνο ἐπος τῆ ἰδία διαλέκτου λέγειν ἐφόκει “μέχρι τόσου φεῦξεσθε; στήτε, ἄνδρες ἔστε.” ὡς δὲ ἐτι φεύγοντας τούτους ἐώρα, δόρυ μακρὸν ἐναγκαλισαμένη ὄλους ῥυτίρας ἐνδοῦσα κατὰ τῶν φευγόντων ἵεται. τοῦτο θεασάμενοι καὶ ἑαυτῶν γεγονότες αὐθις πρὸς μάχην ἑαυτοὺς ἀνεκαλέσαντο.

¹² It is important to remember that Gaita was a Lombard, not a Norman. Anna thus elevated her warlike status at the direct expense of the Normans.

¹³ It is extremely doubtful that Sikelgaita had any appreciable knowledge of the Homeric epics.

¹⁴ Anna Comnena, *Alexiad* VI 6, p. 198. καταλαμβάνει δὲ τοῦτον τὰ ἐσχατὰ πνέοντα ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ Γαίτα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ κλαίοντα ἐπ’ αὐτῷ.

¹⁵ Anna Comnena, *Alexiad* XIV 3, p. 238. μέγρι πέρατος αἰῶνος εἰρήνην ἤγομεν. ἀλλὰ γὰρ συγκατέδου τῷ βασιλεῖ πάντα τὰ λόγωνα καὶ κενόσπουδος αὐτῷ ἢ σπουδῇ μετὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ παρέλευσιν γέγονεν ἀβελτηρία τῶν διαδεξαμένων τὰ σκῆπτρα. Alexius Comnenus died in 1118. He named his son John as successor. Anna plotted to usurp her brother's crown, but was discovered and sent into comfortable exile.

¹⁶ The *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum* and *Dei Gesta per Francos* were both written in the first decade of the 12th century. Anna's *Alexiad* was written near the middle of the same century.

¹⁷ Jay Rubenstein made earlier mention of Guibert's treatment of Kerbogha's mother. See Jay Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent: Portrait of a Medieval Mind* (New York, 2002), pp. 99–100.

¹⁸ *Anonymi Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum* XXII 1, ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1890), pp. 323–4. 'Mater vero eiusdem Curburam, quae erat in Aleph civitate, statim venit ad eum, dixitque illi lacrimabiliter: *Fili, suntne vera, quae audio?* Cui ait ille: *Quae?* Et dixit illa: *Audivi quia bellum vis committere cum Francorum gente.* Ait ille: *Verum omnino scias.* Dixit illa: *Contestor te, fili, per omnium Deorum nomina et per tuam magnam bonitatem, ne bellum cum Francis committas, quoniam tu es miles invictus, et nullam imprudentiam ex te aut ex tuo exercitu unquam penitus audivi, et te e campo ab aliquo victore fugientem quisquam minime invenit.'*

¹⁹ Guibert, Abbot of Nogent-sous-Coucy, *Dei Gesta per Francos* V 11, ed. R.B.C. Huygens (Turnholt, 1996), pp. 212–3. "Fili," ait, "virosum optime, per ingenitos tibi liberalissimos mores, queso, contestari te audeam ne eis pugnam inferas, ne tuae detrimentum laudis incurras. Cum enim usque in ulteriorem superioris Indiae Oceanum armorum tuorum claritudo refulgeat tuisque preconiis respondeat ultima Tile, quare pauperum hominum sanguinibus tuos obducere mucrones affectas, quos impetere inanis est pena et superasse nulla sit gloria? Et

cum reges valeas terrere remotos, quid tibi cordi est lacessere advenas miseros? Personae eorum, fili, fateor, merito contemptibiles ducas, sed pro certo noveris quia christianae religionis admodum precellit auctoritas..."

²⁰ Guibert of Nogent, *Dei Gesta per Francos* praefatio, p. 79. 'Erat siquidem eadem Historia, sed verbis contexta plus equo simplicibus et quae multotiens grammaticae naturas excederet lectoremque vapidum insipiditate sermonis sepius exanimare valeret.'

²¹ Guibert of Nogent, *de Vita Sua* I 12, ed. Georges Bourgin (Paris, 1907), pp. 36–7. 'Ita enim non experientia, sed quodam superni metus incussu horrere peccatum didicerat...' Guibert notes in his memoirs that his mother habitually warned him against exciting God's anger through sin.

²² *Anonymi Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum* XXII 4, pp. 325–6. '...Deus eorum pro ipsis cotidie pugnat, eosque diu nocturne sua protectione defendit et vigilat super eos, sicut pastor vigilat super gregem suum, et non permittit eos laedi nec conturbari ab ulla gente, et quicumque volunt eis obstare, idem eorum Deus conturbat illos, sicut ipse ait per os David prophetae: *Dissipa gentes, quae bella volunt,* et alibi: *Effunde iram tuam in gentes, quae te non noverunt, et in regna, quae nomen tuum non invocaverunt.* Antequam vero praeparati sint ad incipiendum bellum, eorum Deus omnipotens et bellipotens simul cum sanctis suis omnes inimicos iam habet devictos...'

²³ See Guibert of Nogent, *The Deeds of God through the Franks*, trans. Robert Levine (Suffolk, 1997), p. 97. Both the anonymous author and Guibert report that Kerbogha's mother quoted *Psalms* 81.8, 78.6, 92.3, as well as *Romans* 9.25.

²⁴ See Guibert of Nogent, *Dei Gesta per Francos* I 5, p. 104, and Rubenstein p. 98. Guibert directly noted that Greek women in particular were vastly inferior to "Gallic" women. One can only imagine what the Benedictine thought of the non-Christian women of the East.