



University of Huddersfield Repository

McCabe, Mark

'Opus Virile': Masculinity and Crusade Narratives 1200-1309

Original Citation

McCabe, Mark (2020) 'Opus Virile': Masculinity and Crusade Narratives 1200-1309. Doctoral thesis, University of Huddersfield.

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/35327/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>

**'OPUS VIRILE': MASCULINITY AND CRUSADE
NARRATIVES 1200-1309**

MARK MCCABE

A thesis submitted to the University of Huddersfield in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Huddersfield

January 2020

Copyright Statement:

- i. The author of this thesis (including any appendices and/ or schedules to this thesis) owns any copyright in it (the “Copyright”) and s/he has given The University of Huddersfield the right to use such Copyright for any administrative, promotional, educational and/or teaching purposes.
- ii. Copies of this thesis, either in full or in extracts, may be made only in accordance with the regulations of the University Library. Details of these regulations may be obtained from the Librarian. This page must form part of any such copies made.
- iii. The ownership of any patents, designs, trademarks and any and all other intellectual property rights except for the Copyright (the “Intellectual Property Rights”) and any reproductions of copyright works, for example graphs and tables (“Reproductions”), which may be described in this thesis, may not be owned by the author and may be owned by third parties. Such Intellectual Property Rights and Reproductions cannot and must not be made available for use without permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property Rights and/or Reproductions.

Abstract

This thesis examines the representation and function of masculinity in crusade narratives 1200-1309. It specifically considers elite masculinity as this was the concern of the authors of these narratives. This addresses an important scholarly gap and will demonstrate that masculinity was a vital concept to the historical representation of these crusades. To achieve this a close of analysis of the following texts will be undertaken: Richard of Templo's account of the Third Crusade, *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*. Peter of Vaux-de-Cernay's history of the Albigensian Crusade, *Historia Albigensis*. Robert of Clari's Fourth Crusade recollection, *La Conquête de Constantinople*. The final text is John of Joinville's memoir and personal account of the Seventh Crusade, *Vie de Saint Louis*. A gendered analysis of these texts will reveal that the representation and function of masculinity served a practical purpose either as a didactic tool or narrative device. The use of a variety of narratives about different crusades authored by a diverse selection of people reveal universal understandings of the importance of gender performance during the period under investigation. To achieve this both medieval ideas of gender and the following sociological theory will be applied to these texts: hegemonic masculinity, performativity, homosociality and hypermasculinity. This will demonstrate that crusade narratives are a rich and valuable source of information regarding elite masculinity and make a useful knowledge to our understanding of gender in the Middle Ages that have hitherto been overlooked.

Contents

Acknowledgements	7
Abbreviations.....	8
Chapter One: Introduction.....	12
1. Historians and Masculinity.....	19
2. Historians and the Crusades	25
3. Crusades and Masculinity	27
4. Crusade Narratives	29
4.1. Language	31
4.2. Modern Approaches to Crusade Narratives	32
4.3. Historical Writing in the Middle Ages	34
4.4. Truth and Verisimilitude.....	36
5. Thirteenth-Century Elite Masculinity.....	38
5.1. Medieval Gender Theory	38
5.2. Defining Twelfth and Thirteenth-Century Elite Medieval Masculinity.....	42
5.3. Cardinal Virtues.....	43
5.4. Chivalric Ideals	54
6. Thesis Layout	64
7. Conclusion	67
Chapter Two: The Representation of Hegemonic Masculinity in the <i>Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi</i>	69
1. The Third Crusade	72
2. Historiography of the Text	73
3. Historiography about Richard.....	76
4. Richard and Philip Competing.....	79
4.1. Entering Sicily.....	80
4.2. Justice in Sicily	86
4.3. Acre Leadership Skills: Largesse and Prowess	89
4.4. Philip's Departure.....	96
5. Richard and Conrad	98
5.1. Conrad's Failings	99
5.2. Richard: Industry and Hypermasculinity	107
6. The King's Speech.....	112

6.1. Jaffa Speech.....	113
6.2. Jerusalem Speech	116
6.3. Unity Speeches	119
7. Conclusion	123
Chapter Three: ‘Hagiographical Masculinity’, The Representation of Simon of Montfort in Peter of Vaux-de-Cernay’s <i>Historia Albigensis</i>	125
1. Overview of the Albigensian Crusade and Historiography	134
2. Simon’s Background.....	138
3. Peter’s Background.....	141
4. Simon of Montfort: Characteristics of Leadership	145
5. Justice.....	151
6. Prowess.....	155
7. Temperance.....	158
8. Prudence	163
9. Honour	166
10. Piety	171
11. Death of Simon	178
12. Conclusion	180
Chapter Four: Masculinity Discourse in Robert of Clari’s <i>La Conquête de Constantinople</i>	182
1. Overview of Fourth Crusade	183
2. Clari’s Background	187
3. Constantinople Decision	192
4. Constantinople Stories.....	195
5. Performing Masculinity at Constantinople	208
6. The Second Siege of Constantinople: Framing the Decision	214
7. Prowess, Dividing the Loot and its Moral Outcomes.....	222
8. Electing the Emperor and Dividing the Nation	227
9. Conclusion	233
Chapter Five: The Masculine Experience and the Experience of Masculinity on the Seventh Crusade in John of Joinville’s <i>Vie de Saint Louis</i>	234
1. John of Joinville and his <i>Vie</i>	238
2. Autonomy, Agency and Loss of Control	243
3. Honour and Shame	250
4. Mansurah	253
5. Captivity.....	263

6. Remaining in the Holy Land.....	273
7. Homosociality	277
8. Dishonour.....	282
9. Conclusion	287
Conclusion.....	288
Bibliography.....	296

Word Count: 84815

Acknowledgements

First, I wish to thank my supervisor Katherine Lewis for her support, insight, wisdom and kindness throughout my studies, from undergraduate level to writing this thesis. It has been a privilege to have learnt from the best, and as such without her this work would not have been possible.

I am grateful to have been a recipient of the University of Huddersfield's Vice-Chancellor's Scholarship which allowed me to pursue these studies. The staff in the History department have been brilliant for the past eight years. In particular I wish to thank Pat Cullum whose advice in my first year of undergraduate studies gave me the belief to pursue studying medieval history. I must also pay thanks to Sarah Bastow, Rob Ellis and Keith Laybourn.

A big thanks goes to fellow postgraduate students at Huddersfield that have made this time the most enjoyable, and whose thoughts, advice and general camaraderie I have benefitted from, in no particular order: Ashley Firth, Rob Piggott, Emma Levitt, Charlotte Mallinson, Dave Green, Nicolò Ferrari, Andy Cook and Calum Leatham.

My family have been an incredible support throughout this, a big thanks to Paul, Natasha, Belinda and Brendan. A special thanks belongs to my mother, Tatiana, whose help, support and belief made this possible. Lastly, I wish to thank my wife, 晟琳, for always being there and making this journey an enjoyable one, 爱你一万年! This thesis is dedicated to the memory of my grandparents. Thank you so much.

Abbreviations

Ambroise	Ambroise, <i>The History of the Holy War: Ambroise's "Estoire de la Guerre Sainte"</i> , ed. & trans. Marianne Ailes & Malcom Barber, 2 vols (Woodbridge, 2003)
<i>Chanson</i>	<i>La Chanson de la Croisade Albigeoise</i> , ed. & trans. Eugène Martin-Chabot, 3 vols (Paris, 1931-61)
Chronica	<i>The Chronicle of William of Puylaurens: The Albigensian Crusade and its Aftermath</i> , trans. M. Sibly & W. A. Sibly (Woodbridge, 2003)
Clari	Robert of Clari, <i>La Conquête de Constantinople</i> , ed. & trans. Peter Noble (Edinburgh, 2005)
Devizes	Richard of Devizes, <i>Chronicon</i> , ed. John T. Appleby (London, 1963)
Gerald of Wales	Gerald of Wales, <i>De Principis Instructione</i> , ed. & trans. Robert Bartlett (Oxford, 2018)
Huntingdon	Henry of Huntingdon, <i>Historia Anglorum</i> , ed. & trans. Diana Greenaway (Oxford, 1996)
<i>Hystoria</i>	Peter Vaux-de-Cernay, <i>Petri Vallium Sarnaii monachi Hystoria Albigenensis</i> , ed. Pascal Guébin & Ernest Lyon, 3 vols (Paris, 1926-39)
<i>Itinerarium</i>	‘Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi’, <i>Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I</i> vol. I, ed. William Stubbs (London, 1864)

- Joinville John of Joinville, *Vie de Saint Louis*, ed. Jacques Monfrin (Paris, 2014)
- Malmesbury William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum* I, ed. & trans. Roger A. B. Mynors, completed by Rodney M. Thompson & Michael Winterbottom (Oxford, 1998–9)
- Maréchal* *L'Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal*, ed. & trans. Anthony J Holden, Stewart Gregory & David Crouch, 3 vols (London, 2002)
- Nicholson *Chronicle of the Third Crusade: A translation of the Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*, trans. Helen J. Nicholson (Aldershot, 2001)
- Noble & Head Noble, T.F.X. & Head, T., *Soldiers of Christ: Saints and Saints Lives from Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (London, 1995)
- Puylaurens William of Puylaurens, *Chronique*, ed. Jean Duvernoy (Toulouse, 1996)
- Sancti Geraldi* Odo of Cluny, 'De Vita Sancti Geraldi Auriliacensis Comitis,' *Patrologiae Cursus Completus series Latina cxxxiii*. ed. J.P. Migne (Paris, 1853), pp. 639-710
- Sibly *The History of the Albigensian Crusade: Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay's Historia Albigensis*, trans. M. Sibly & W. A. Sibly (Woodbridge, 1998)
- Smith* Joinville and Villehardouin, *Chronicles of the Crusades*, trans. Caroline Smith (London, 2008)
- Shirley Shirley, J., *The Song of the Cathar Wars: a History of the Albigensian Crusade* (Farnham, 2014)
- Suger Suger, *Vie de Louis VI le Gros*, ed. Henri Waquet (Paris, 1929)

- Villehardouin Geoffrey of Villehardouin, *La Conquete de Constantinople*, ed. & trans. Jean Dufournet (Paris, 2004)
- Vitalis Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. & trans. Marjorie Chibnall, 6 vols (Oxford, 1969–80)

Notes on Translations and Style

Established translations have been used throughout but adaptations made where necessary. Names of people have been Anglicised throughout in order to standardise them. References to Ambroise, *L'Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal* and *La Chanson de Roland* have used their line numbers as modern editions and translations have utilised these, meaning they can be cross checked. Bible quotations are from the Douay-Rheims Version.

Chapter One: Introduction

During Lent of 1188 Gerald of Wales accompanied Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury, on a preaching tour of Wales organised by Henry II of England (d. 1189) to recruit men to fight on crusade.¹ This was in response to the defeat of the Kingdom of Jerusalem's army on 4 July 1187 at the Battle of Hattin against Saladin, Sultan of Egypt and Syria, and his subsequent conquest of Jerusalem on 2 October.² Gerald wrote:

A sermon was given at Abergavenny and many took the Cross. A certain nobleman of those parts, called Arthenus, came in great humility to meet the Archbishop, who was in a hurry to reach Usk Castle. Arthenus apologized for not having arrived sooner. When the Archbishop asked him if he would take the Cross, he answered: "I cannot take such a step without consulting my friends." "Ought you not to discuss the matter with your wife?" asked the Archbishop. Arthenus looked down at the ground with some embarrassment: "This is man's works which we are considering. There is no point in asking the advice of a woman." Thereupon he took the Cross from the Archbishop without waiting any longer.³

Crusading, here, was thus perceived as a constituent part of what it meant to be a man in this period. To be a man was not defined by possessing certain reproductive organs nor being of a certain age. It was defined by acting in accordance to social expectations deriving from their

¹ For more see: Huw Pryce, 'Gerald's journey through Wales', *Journal of Welsh Ecclesiastical History*, 6 (1989), 17-34.

² See: Norman Housley, 'Saladin's triumph over the Crusader States: The battle of Hattin, 1187', *History Today*, 37, 7 (1987), 17-23.

³ trans. Thorpe, L. (trans.), *The journey through Wales: and, The description of Wales* (Harmondsworth, 1978), p. 109; Gerald of Wales, 'Itinerarium Kambriae et Descriptio Kambriae', *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera* vol. VI, ed. James F. Dimock (London, 1868), pp. 48-49: 'Sermone igitur apud Abergevenni facto, plurimisque ad crucem conversis, vir quidam nobilis partium illarum, cui nomen Arthenus, ad archiepiscopum versus castellum Oschae jam properantem humiliter accessit; quod ei citius non occurrerat veniam petens. Super crucis itaque susceptione conventus, "Absque amicorum," inquit, "consilio res haec fieri non debet." Cui archiepiscopus; "Numquid ergo cum uxore tua habiturus es inde consilium?" At ille vultu demisso verecunde respondit; "Ad aggrediendum," inquit, "opus virile, non est expetendum consilium muliebre.'"

gendered role: we term this their masculinity.⁴ To reinforce the point that crusading and masculinity intertwined comes from the evidence that Arthenus acknowledged his decision to go on crusade would be negotiated through the consensus of his homosocial group. Hence the opinions of a wife or any woman could be dismissed because it would be a threat to his status within this homosocial milieu. Consequently Arthenus' reaction indicates that how he responded to the call to join the crusade was a measure of his manliness.

However, Arthenus's perception of his masculinity has been left uninterrogated. This suggests his actions were the norm and unworthy of discussion, that men went on crusade because that is what men did. But a century earlier a man would not be defined by whether or not he went on crusade because the idea of crusading did not exist. Natasha Hodgson, Katherine Lewis and Matthew Mesley have stated that, 'traditionally, crusading has been approached and interpreted as a male enterprise, but without attention to the gender identity of its participants.'⁵ Furthermore they continue:

Ideas about masculinity formed an inherent part of the mindset of societies in which crusading happened, and of the conceptual framework informing both those who recorded the events and those who participated. These ideas need to be examined and interrogated if we are to approach a fully contextualised understanding both of what happened and how those events were experienced, comprehended, and portrayed.⁶

Indeed, it is clear from Arthenus' words that the crusade being a male enterprise was the forefront of his thinking, and as this thesis will explore, it was also the forefront of many authors' thinking when it came to write about the crusades.

⁴ Although this is not a medieval term it is commonly used by historians analysing medieval men's gender identities.

⁵ Natasha Hodgson, Katherine Lewis, & Matthew Mesley, 'Crusading and Masculinities: Introduction', *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Natasha Hodgson, Katherine Lewis, & Matthew Mesley (London, 2019), p. 1.

⁶ Hodgson, Lewis, & Mesley, 'Introduction', pp. 2-3.

Whilst Gerald's vignette was about men of various social backgrounds, crusading was by the 1180s intrinsically linked with elite masculinity through being perceived a duty of kings and lords. This was because they were the only ones who could organise and execute military operations of such a magnitude required by crusading. This belief had been engendered by those who had set out from western Europe in 1096 on the First Crusade (1096-99), conquered Jerusalem and large swathes of land in Syria and Palestine bringing them under Christian lordship. The success of this endeavour caused an outpouring of writing on the subject with some contemporary commentators placing it as the most defining event of their times. For example Robert the Monk said: 'since the creation of the world what more miraculous undertaking has there been (other than the mystery of the redeeming Cross) than what was achieved in our own time by this journey of our own people to Jerusalem?'⁷ Thus it was considered to have no known precedent.⁸ Indeed crusading and writing about crusading became an important cultural development, one that sustained the other in a symbiotic relationship.⁹ This is best evidenced in the large amount of surviving manuscripts relating to First Crusade narratives, most notably Robert the Monk's, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, of which there are 84 extant manuscripts produced from the twelfth to sixteenth century.¹⁰ Moreover to demonstrate this relationship a copy of *Historia Iherosolimitana* was presented to Frederick Barbarossa the Holy Roman Emperor (d. 1190) before he set off on the Third Crusade (1189-92).¹¹ These narratives thus reinforced elite masculinity and crusading.

Furthermore, some those who wrote of the First Crusade made it clear that the warrior participants were ideal men, which explicitly determined their success. For example Henry of Huntingdon (d. 1157) has a short summary of the First Crusade in his *Historia Anglorum*, he

⁷ Sweetenham, C.(trans.), *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade* (Aldershot, 2005), p. 77; Robert the Monk, *The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk*, ed. Damien Kempf & Marcus Bull (Woodbridge, 2013), p. 4: 'Sed post creationem mundi quid mirabilis factum est preter salutifere crucis misterium, quam quod modernis temporibus actum est in hoc itinere nostrorum Iherosolimitarum?'

⁸ For an overview of First Crusade accounts and their reaction to the success see: Christopher Tyerman, *The Debate on the Crusades* (Manchester, 2011), pp. 7-36.

⁹ See below.

¹⁰ Robert the Monk, *The Historia*, p. xlii.

¹¹ Marcus Bull & Damien Kempf (ed.), *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory* (Woodbridge, 2014), p. 5.

described the crusaders: 'Here were present the foremost of all ages, shining sons of the west, all signed with the Cross, all stronger than any left behind in their kingdoms.'¹² According to Henry not only were the crusaders idealised as being the elite but those who did not go were considered unmanly. Crusaders were therefore better men than non-crusaders because they demonstrated their manhood.

In the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Orderic Vitalis (d. 1142) recorded the response to the success of the First Crusade and how it inspired other elite males (*proceres*) to imitate the martial prowess of the crusaders by launching the 1101 crusade:

When the good news had been received of the renowned champions who had set out on pilgrimage and had won glorious victories over the infidels of the east in the name of Christ, the nobles of the west were inspired by their unconquered courage and unexpected successes, and their kinsmen and neighbours were moved by their example to undertake a similar enterprise. Many burned with zeal to go on pilgrimage, to see the Holy Sepulchre and the Holy places, and to prove their knightly prowess against the Turks.¹³

This description tells us that crusading was not just about pilgrimage, but also testing oneself against the Turks in combat. Thus crusading provided men with new opportunities to demonstrate their masculinity and to do so in the service of holy war, by putting their masculine skills to work to achieve the highest purpose.

However, it was not just clerical writers who thought this, vernacular texts written for lay audiences such as the *Chanson d'Antioche* suggests that many people of various backgrounds in

¹² Huntingdon, p. 424: 'Hic affuerunt electissimi omnium temporum, filii fulgentes occidentis, omnes signo crucis insigniti, omnes in regnis suis reliquorum fortissimo.'

¹³ Vitalis V, p. 322: 'Bonis rumoribus auditis de illustribus athletis qui peregre profecti sunt et in oriente contra ethnicos in nomine Christi dimicantes gloriose triumpharunt, occidui proceres inuictam probitatem et insperatos euentus eorum zelati sunt consobrini et affines eorum strenuitatis exemplo ad simile opus excitati sunt. Multos nimirum accendit feruor peregrinandi, sepulchrum Saluatoris et sancta loca uisendi, et virtutem militiamque suam contra Turcos exercendi.'

Western European society held these views. The *Chanson d'Antioche* was composed around 1180, decades after the events of the First Crusade that it retold.¹⁴ This work celebrated the First Crusade leaders, especially Godfrey of Bouillon, Baldwin of Boulogne, Bohemond of Taranto, Tancred of Hautville, Robert of Normandy, Robert of Flanders and Raymond of Saint-Gilles. This genre would have had an audience covering the whole social spectrum but for elite males these now legendary figures functioned as direct exemplars. Moreover, William of Malmesbury (d. 1143) writing in his *Gesta Regum Anglorum* believed that those involved in the First Crusade deserved no limits to praise:

Let poets with their eulogies now give place, and fabled history no longer laud the heroes of Antiquity. Nothing to be compared with their glory has ever begotten by any age. Such valour as the Ancients had vanished after their death into dust and ashes in the grave, for it was spent on the mirage of worldly splendour rather than on the solid aim of some good purpose; while of these brave heroes of ours, men will enjoy the benefit and tell the proud story, as long as the round world endures and the holy Church of Christ flourishes.¹⁵

Crusading had thus begun a new epoch for the elite warrior who could earn hero status achieved through courage and ensure their deeds would live on through exploits that were clerical approved because they were done in the defence and furthering of Christianity.¹⁶

The previous quotes from Huntingdon, Vitalis and Malmesbury are important to acknowledge because these three authors were writing general chronicles, not accounts focused specifically on the First Crusade. Therefore crusading was important to these historians because of what it revealed about the nature and qualities of those who took part, and these views were not just

¹⁴ For more on the author and history of the *Chanson d'Antioche* see: *Chanson d'Antioche: An Old-French account of the First Crusade*, ed. & trans. Susan Edgington & Carol Sweetenham (Farnham, 2011), pp. 3-49.

¹⁵ Malmesbury, p. 654: 'Cedant ergo poetarum preconia, nec priscos heroas uetas attollat fabula. Nichil umquam horum laudi comparabile ulla genuere secula; nam et si qua illorum fuit uirtus, in sepuchrales fauillas post mortem euauit, quod potius in mundialis pompae fumum quam in ullius boni solidum effuse fuerit. Istorum autem fortitudinis sentietur utilitas et ostendetur dignitas quam diu orbis uolubilitas et sancta uigebit Christianitas.'

¹⁶ See below for fortitude, pp. 48-49.

expressed in crusading panegyrics such as Guibert of Nogent's *Gesta Dei Per Francos* (c. 1108).¹⁷ All the above writers were Anglo-Norman but they shared similar ideals to both historians and elite males in France, whose cultural background offered a similar outlook. As David Crouch has demonstrated there were more connections between the English and French aristocracy in a cultural sense than differences.¹⁸ It is men belonging to this group who will be the main concern of this thesis, those who were either under the lordship of the Kings of France or England.

The subject of this thesis is to investigate how these ideals of elite masculinity were maintained in crusade narratives written during the thirteenth century. Each chapter will focus on a specific text from a different crusade that has not yet been analysed for its presentation of masculinity. Beginning with Richard of Templo's account of the Third Crusade, *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*. Then followed by Peter of Vaux-de-Cernay's *Historia Albigensis* which concerns the Albigensian Crusade (1209-29). Next Robert of Clari's *La Conquête de Constantinople* about the Fourth Crusade (1202-04). The final text is John of Joinville's, *Vie de Saint Louis*, which was his personal account of the Seventh Crusade (1248-54). As will be shown, different authors used concepts of masculinity in different ways. Although they did not explicitly refer to masculinity the fact that they used terminology and presented both characters and events in terms of whether or not they upheld standards of manly behaviour make them invaluable sources of information about medieval gender ideology and perceptions of what it meant to be a man.¹⁹ Furthermore, for contextual evidence in this thesis, ideas of correct elite male behaviour can also be garnered from other types of texts such as mirror-for-princes, an example of which is Gerald of Wales' *De Principis Instructione* (c. 1216) and also chivalric histories such as the anonymously written *L'Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal* (c. 1226). These texts offer models of masculinity to be

¹⁷ Guibert of Nogent, 'Gesta Dei Per Francos', *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux* vol. IV (Paris, 1879), pp. 113-264.

¹⁸ David Crouch, *The Birth of Nobility: Constructing Aristocracy in England and France: 900-1300* (Harlow, 2005), p. 2.

¹⁹ Derek Neal argues: 'Finding gendered meaning in the actions, disputes, and desires of men, however documented, is an act of inference and interpretation.' However sometimes in the medieval period articulations of what was deemed manly in particular contexts were explicit. Derek Neal, *The Masculine Self in Late Medieval England* (Chicago, 2008), p. 245.

emulated, and what this ideal constituted will be discussed below. Likewise the crusade narratives under investigation judge both men and events in similar terms through either extolling certain men, framing certain important decisions or even by just describing their own personal experience of crusading. All of these are linked by how they were defined against contemporary ideals of manliness. More details on these individual narratives will be discussed in their respective chapters.

This is the first full length study to bring these various texts and crusades together to demonstrate the significance masculine ideals held for these writers, and that gender performance was central to understandings of crusading. A gendered reading of crusade narratives offers a new historiographical approach to these texts that will provide a better understanding about the society that produced them, the authorial intentions of the writers, and of how gender functioned in the thirteenth century. The reason for choosing this period is because the thirteenth century was the most active period for crusading. Although the first text under discussion, *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*, deals with the Third Crusade which followed Saladin's abovementioned victory, it failed in its aim to regain Jerusalem for the Christians. Moreover the text was not composed until 1216 suggesting the need for it to be written to either inspire crusaders or offer advice on how to proceed.²⁰ During this period crusading expanded in scope covering various geographical areas beyond Jerusalem and the Levant which had hitherto been the main focus of crusading.²¹ There was also a changing nature of what defined a crusade.²² Following the unsuccessful Third Crusade, came the crusades named and numbered by modern historians as the Fourth (1202–04), Fifth (1217–21), Sixth

²⁰ Debate surrounds the date of the authorship with a recent conference paper suggesting it was composed c.1201. However this does not alter its purpose: Stephen Spencer, *Ralph of Coggeshall's Account of the Third Crusade and Its Relationship with Richard de Templo's Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*, Paper presented at International Medieval Congress Leeds (July 2019).

²¹ Notwithstanding the conquest of Lisbon on the Second Crusade nor the expansion of crusading activity in the Baltic. See: Jonathan Phillips, *The Second Crusade: Extending the frontiers of Christendom* (New Haven, 2010).

²² Jessalynn Bird, Edward Peters, & James M. Powell, *Crusade and Christendom: Annotated Documents in Translation from Innocent III to the Fall of Acre, 1187-1291* (Philadelphia, 2013), p. 24.

(1228-29), Seventh (1248-54), Eighth (1270) and Ninth (1271-72). These saw military expeditions carried out in Europe, Byzantium and North Africa. In between these were also crusades known as the Barons' Crusade (1239-41), Children's' Crusade (1212) and a crusade against heresy, called the Albigensian Crusade (1209-1229). Moreover crusading did not solely exist within these numbered crusades. Independent people ventured east on their own initiative as both pilgrim and soldier.²³ All this crusading activity resulted in a further outpouring of writing about these crusades and rewritings of the twelfth-century crusade narratives. Along with the expansion of crusading in the thirteenth century was also the expansion of different types of writing about crusading, including a shift beyond monastic narratives to vernacular participant accounts which will be discussed below. These developments fed and further cemented the aforementioned relationship between crusading and masculinity.

This study will not limit itself to looking for the range of representations of masculinity within crusade narratives and pointing them out. It will also consider how masculinity functioned as a narrative framing device, and how it could be used to justify the behaviour of individuals or groups. Prior to the central analysis an overview will be given on how masculinity has been applied to other fields of medieval history and crusade studies. This will be followed by a survey of medieval history writing, then a review of thirteenth-century elite masculinity, and this chapter will end with a description of the thesis layout.

1. Historians and Masculinity

Research into masculinity in the medieval period stems from the women's history movement.²⁴

This important movement investigates the often-neglected role women played in history.

However, probing into the roles of women and how they were socially constructed is

²³ For example see: Fordham Medieval Digital Projects, *Independent Crusaders Mapping Project*, Retrieved from <https://medievalomeka.ace.fordham.edu/exhibits/show/independent-crusaders-project->.

²⁴ For an overview on masculinity as a tool for historical analysis see: John Tosh, 'The History of Masculinity: An Outdated Concept?', *What is masculinity?: Historical dynamics from antiquity to the contemporary world*, ed. John Arnold & Sean Brady (Basingstoke, 2013), pp. 17-34.

problematic if questions of gender identity and its construction are only applied to women, and men are left aside.²⁵ Men, like women, acted according to socially constructed roles and this is what studying masculinity delves into. It seeks to find how these roles were constructed, maintained, challenged and redefined. John Tosh, one the leading advocates of studying historical configurations of masculinity, states the importance of doing so is because, 'gender has become a core historical concept, which has challenged and in part overthrown the received wisdom in social, cultural, and political history.'²⁶ Tosh asserts that masculinity is not only found in areas where men are but it permeates all across society, leaving nothing untouched, stating: 'Within this wider frame historians do not so much attempt a history of masculinity as analyse the relationship between men's gender and the other ways in which their identity and behaviour are structured in specific historical formations.'²⁷

Much of the early studies into medieval masculinity began in the 1990s when scholarship on medieval masculinity gathered momentum. These were essays in edited collections which demonstrated the abundance of material that could be researched for future scholarship. In 1994 Clare Lees edited the collection, *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages*, an early study of masculinity in the medieval period.²⁸ It contains essays considering both men in the social and literary worlds of the period. In this collection Jo Ann McNamara's essay, 'The Herrenfrage: The Reconstruction of the Gender System, 1050-1150', considered the Gregorian reform of the clergy in the eleventh century and how the introduction of clerical celibacy changed contemporary notions of masculinity.²⁹ McNamara's work remains influential and has been frequently cited since its publication. It is important to this dissertation because many

²⁵ The most often cited text that compellingly puts forth the arguments for studying gender is: Joan Scott, 'Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis', *The American Historical Review*, 91, 5 (1986), 1053-75.

²⁶ John Tosh, 'Hegemonic masculinity and the history of gender', *Masculinities in politics and war*, ed. Stefan Dudink, Karen Hagemann & John Tosh (Manchester, 2004), p. 41.

²⁷ Tosh, 'Hegemonic masculinity', p. 41.

²⁸ Clare Lees (ed.), *Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages* (Minneapolis, 1994).

²⁹ Jo Ann McNamara, 'The "Herrenfrage": the restructuring of the gender system, 1050-1150', *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages*, ed. Clare Lees (Minneapolis, 1994), pp. 3-29.

crusade narratives were written by clerics whose own notions of masculinity were inserted into their representations of the crusaders. They tended to focus on clerical ideas of restraint and celibacy celebrating crusaders who were more clerical or monk-like in their actions. For example Ralph of Caen in his *Gesta Tancredi* described First Crusade leader Godfrey of Bouillon as having ‘more of the qualities of a monk than he did of a soldier. However, he was not less experienced in secular virtues. He knew how to wage war, to arrange a line of battle and to find glory in arms.’³⁰ However, McNamara’s work has been challenged by further studies on masculinity because in her analysis of celibacy she openly asked the question: ‘can one be a man without deploying the most obvious biological attributes of manhood? If a person does not act like a man, is he man? And what does it mean to “act like a man”, except to dominate women?’³¹ For secular men this was not the case and even on crusade, though practicing abstinence and chastity, they were still men and considered manly through fighting for their religion, not by simply dominating women.

Vern Bullough’s essay in Lees’ collection also marked a historiographical milestone as he set out to define medieval masculinity, concluding with his tripartite definition that to be a man in this period was to protect, provide and procreate.³² However, this definition has come under scrutiny as it leaves out many types of men and aspects of their experience. Hodgson has challenged how this can be applied to crusaders who often left their family unprotected whilst also having to remain chaste, thereby failing at two of Bullough’s attributes of manhood.³³ Moreover there are questions about those who fail in certain aspects of Bullough’s definition. For example, certain

³⁰ Bachrach, B., & Bachrach, D. S. (trans.), *The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen: A history of the Normans on the First Crusade*, (Farnham, 2005) p. 37; Ralph of Caen, ‘Gesta Tancredi’, *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux* vol. III (Paris, 1866), p. 615: ‘potius monachorum lux quam militum dux emicabat. Nec minus tamen ea quae saeculi sunt noverat tractare, praeliari, ordinare acies, armis gloriam propagare.’

³¹ McNamara, ‘The Herrenfrage’, p. 5.

³² Vern Bullough, ‘On being a male in the Middle Ages’, *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages*, ed. Clare Lees, (Minneapolis, 1994), pp. 31-45.

³³ Natasha Hodgson, ‘Normans and competing masculinities on crusade’, *Crusading and Pilgrimage in the Norman World*, ed. Kathryn Hurlock & Paul Oldfield (Woodbridge, 2015), pp. 195-213.

warrior kings, such as Godfrey of Bouillon or Richard the Lionheart, who did not procreate did not have their manhood questioned because of it.

Dawn Hadley's edited collection from 1999, *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, contains fourteen essays demonstrating the value of using masculinity as a form of analysis for improving our knowledge of the past. Whereas the Lees collection mostly contains essays by literary scholars, most of the essays in Hadley's were by historians. Therefore differing methodological approaches and types of sources are employed between the two. Introducing the collection, Hadley professes that new research centred on the construction of masculinity will bring forth 'the rewriting of traditional historical discourses.'³⁴ The collection spans the whole medieval period but two essays in particular, William Aird's and Matthew Bennett's, were among the first explorations of elite medieval lay masculinity and chivalry. Bennett's work is especially relevant to this thesis and will be discussed below.³⁵

Most studies of medieval masculinity have tended to focus on clerics and monks. This is unsurprising since the writers of the period tended to be male clerics, but also because clerics differed from the norm regarding their masculinity. These men gave up 'classic' markers of masculinity such as fatherhood and bearing weapons. Clerical identity as argued by McNamara underwent many changes in the high Middle Ages which was reflected in their writings and hence has been studied in great depth.³⁶ However, despite being the dominant form, lay masculinity has not been studied in as much depth as clerical masculinity. But there have been some significant exceptions.

³⁴ Dawn M. Hadley 'Introduction', *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. Dawn M. Hadley (Harlow, 1999), p. 3.

³⁵ William M. Aird, 'Frustrated masculinity: the relationship between William the Conqueror and his eldest son', *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. Dawn M. Hadley (Harlow, 1999), pp. 39-55; Matthew Bennett, 'Military masculinity in England and northern France c.1050 - c.1225', *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. Dawn M. Hadley (Harlow, 1999), pp. 71-88. See below, p. 54.

³⁶ For examples see: P.H. Cullum & Katherine Lewis (ed.), *Holiness and Masculinity in the Middle Ages* (Cardiff, 2004); P.H. Cullum & Katherine Lewis (ed.), *Religious Men and Masculine Identity in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2013); Jennifer Thibodeaux (ed.), *Negotiating Clerical Identities: Priests, Monks and Masculinity in the Middle Ages* (Basingstoke, 2010).

Ruth Karras's 2003 study, *From Boys to Men*, was the first single-authored book about medieval masculinity.³⁷ She analysed three different types of masculinity: knights, university students, and craftsmen. Karras's study is significant in exploring how different versions of masculinity were affected by social status and social roles, rather than trying to look for a singular masculinity that all men conformed to. Another important facet of Karras's work is that she established how men developed from boyhood rather than looking at the already formed male. This is pertinent to this thesis because the detailed discussion of knightly masculinity and chivalry underlies much of what is discussed here. Derek Neal's 2008 work, *The Masculine Self in Late Medieval England*, considered what it meant to be a man during this period, although he explicitly did not consider elite men in his study.³⁸ Neal used various forms material, from traditional sources but also included literary ones too, and his study has proved fruitful because he draws ideas of masculinity from these sources that do not champion masculinity as such, but do imply it through its discourse.

Significant works on medieval kingship and masculinity, marking a historiographical shift, have been published recently. Considering kingship Christopher Fletcher's study of Richard II was the first full length study to use ideas about manhood as method of judging kings and debating their actions.³⁹ Fletcher analysed contemporary understandings of masculinity to shed light on why Richard acted as he did and how his masculinity was viewed by contemporaries. Fletcher argues against the common viewpoint ascribed to by many modern historians that Richard acted in unmanly ways simply because he was not an effective warrior highlighting instead the significance of other failings which centred on his manhood such as his lack of zeal for vengeance.

³⁷ Ruth Karras, *From Boys to Men: Formations of Masculinity in Late Medieval Europe* (Philadelphia, 2003).

³⁸ Neal, *The Masculine Self*, for excluding knights and chivalry see p. 7.

³⁹ Christopher Fletcher, *Richard II: Manhood, youth, and politics, 1377-99* (Oxford, 2008).

Likewise, Lewis's work on Kings Henry V and Henry VI demonstrates the value of interpreting the representation of kings and their actions in historical narratives within contemporary notions of gender identity.⁴⁰ By doing so, the modern reader receives a clearer insight into how and why kings were depicted by contemporaries. Lewis argues that men and kings who are considered innately manly:

appear to have no palpable gender identity at all, or at least not one which requires any sort of serious consideration. This leaves them as the uninterrogated norm from which others deviate and does not allow for the possibility that their manhood could have been created and presented in particular forms in order to serve specific political needs.⁴¹

By interrogating elite men's representations, we gain a better insight into why actions and decisions were taken by them, and how they were perceived by others. Essentially, kings as gendered beings were limited in how they could act, as acting outside the parameters of elite masculinity would cause concern. However, conducting oneself as an ideal male would lead to contemporary praise and adoration, as demonstrated by the fact that Henry V was so highly regarded.

The most important aspect of Fletcher and Lewis's work on medieval kingship and masculinity is that it demonstrates that placing historical actors in their historical contexts is the most important form of analysis when trying to understand the past. Too often historians have judged historical actors by the standards of their own day or according to generalised notions of what it means to be a man and criticised them accordingly. These works are also important for laying the groundwork of compiling the attributes and changing nature of elite masculinity in the period and for proving the value of reconsidering medieval narratives from a gendered perspective. However, as we shall see, this approach has not yet been widely applied to crusades studies.

⁴⁰ Katherine Lewis, *Kingship and Masculinity in Later Medieval England* (London, 2013).

⁴¹ Lewis, *Kingship and Masculinity*, p. 5.

2. Historians and the Crusades

The popularity of crusading as an academic subject has led to a great deal of scholarship, which even includes monographs solely concerned with historiographical surveys and historical debates.⁴² Moreover general histories continue to be written often fitting in with the concerns of the present time for the authors and audiences. For example in his 2019 survey, *The World of the Crusades*, Christopher Tyerman states: 'With violence in the name of religion no longer appearing as outdated, eccentric or alien as it did only half a generation ago, the crusades persist in giving pause for thought.'⁴³ For medieval writers religious violence was but one component of the crusading period and a reason for their writing. They were also concerned with other issues, be it race, identity, trade, travel, and various strands of politics. Likewise the modern historians have also been concerned with how these issues have been represented in crusade narratives. This is because crusading was not something that was undertaken by a select few in a geographical periphery but it in fact played a central role in the society in which it encompassed. Furthermore as argued by Hodgson, Lewis, and Mesley, 'ideas about masculinity formed an inherent part of the mindset of societies in which crusading happened, and of the conceptual framework informing both those who recorded the events and those who participated.'⁴⁴ Thus it is a key concept found within these narratives but still yet underexplored in comparison to other theoretical approaches.

Crusade studies has recently seen many narratives being approached with literary scrutiny, and as noted by Stephen Spencer, this has yielded many fruitful analyses.⁴⁵ His own, excellent research into the use and function of emotions in crusade narratives has shown the value of re-assessing

⁴² For example the following are full length studies concerned just with historical debates and historiographical surveys of the crusade: Norman Housley, *Contesting the Crusades* (Oxford, 2006); Tyerman, *Debate*; Andrew Jotischky, *Crusading and the Crusader States* 2nd (London, 2017).

⁴³ Christopher Tyerman, *The World of the Crusades* (Newhaven, 2019), p. xviii.

⁴⁴ Hodgson, Lewis, & Mesley, 'Introduction', pp. 2-3.

⁴⁵ For a list of works that have taken this approach see note 8 in Stephen Spencer, 'Piety, brotherhood and power: the role and significance of emotions in Albert of Aachen's *Historia Ierosolimitana*', *Literature Compass*, 13, 6 (2016), 423-43.

narratives and overturning historical arguments over how medieval actors have been judged.⁴⁶ For example, by placing characters' emotional actions in the context of how people of the time understood them we can see that they are functioning within certain social norms rather than appearing unstable, as often modern writers tend to see them. Moreover, his interest lies in thinking about why certain decisions have been made to represent individuals and events in particular ways that convey truth without necessarily being strictly 'accurate'. This approach is taken in this thesis due to the nature of some of the subjects involved, particularly Richard the Lionheart and Simon of Montfort who have various, and often conflicting, accounts written about them.

Regarding this thesis the most important thematic approach thus far to crusade studies is gender. Initially beginning with Susan Edgington and Sarah Lambert's edited collection *Gendering the Crusades*, this includes various essays that explored gendered roles, and experiences covering numerous crusades and geographical areas.⁴⁷ In 2005 Deborah Gerish asserted the need for more gender theory to be applied to crusade studies.⁴⁸ But it was not until 2007 when Hodgson produced the first and still sole full length study in English of women's roles in the crusades.⁴⁹ Hodgson's work demonstrates the value of looking at gender roles in the period and how women may fulfil different gender roles throughout their lifetime. But all of these studies

⁴⁶ Stephen Spencer, 'The emotional rhetoric of crusader spirituality in the narratives of the First Crusade', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 58 (2014), 57-86; Spencer, 'Piety'; Stephen Spencer, "'Like a Raging Lion": Richard the Lionheart's Anger during the Third Crusade in Medieval and Modern Historiography', *The English Historical Review*, 132, 556 (2017), 495-32.

⁴⁷ Susan Edgington & Sarah Lambert (ed.), *Gendering the Crusades* (Cardiff, 2001). The vast majority of the thirteen essays focus on women. Other works which focused on the role of women include: Helen Nicholson, 'Women on the Third Crusade', *Journal of Medieval History*, 23, 4 (1997), 335-49; Christoph Maier, 'The roles of women in the crusade movement: a survey', *Journal of Medieval History*, 30, 1 (2004), 61-82.

⁴⁸ Deborah Gerish, 'Gender theory', *Palgrave Advances in the Crusades*, ed. Helen J. Nicholson (Basingstoke, 2005), pp. 130-47.

⁴⁹ Natasha Hodgson, *Women, Crusading and the Holy Land in Historical Narrative* (Woodbridge, 2007).

predominantly focused on gender as it pertained to women. In comparison to other areas of medieval history scholars of the crusades were slow to consider issues of men and masculinity.⁵⁰

3. Crusades and Masculinity

Over the last decade masculinity informed analysis of the crusades has started to appear. Andrew Holt's 2010 essay 'Between Warrior and Priest: The Creation of a New Masculine Identity during the Crusades', looked at the ideal presentation of warriors in the crusades by the churchmen who were writing the narratives of the First Crusade.⁵¹ Holt put forth the notion of the crusader being a hybrid monk-warrior figure that was newly developed through the First Crusade rather than considering existing masculinities and what constituted knightly masculinity. He concluded with a generalisation of the ideal type of warrior that would be required for crusading success in clerical opinions. Whilst certainly a breakthrough in the field Hodgson critiques Holt's approach because his use of crusader implies all men were like this, even though he only talks about certain elite males that were presented in the accounts.⁵² Hence it is important to acknowledge in this study the focus is on elite males, not crusaders in general.

Further to this Hodgson has researched Norman identity in crusade narratives.⁵³ She notes there is not a single ideal of masculinity to be found, because crusaders comprised of various people from all backgrounds, differing in age, social status, wealth, occupation and identity. By way of illustration she focuses explicitly on the characteristics of Norman masculinity. The Normans in this period were known throughout Europe as avid warriors who were fixated on expanding their territories. Hodgson considers how their masculinity competed with other masculinities on

⁵⁰ One notable exception to consider crusading and masculinity in art is Anne Dunlop, 'Masculinity, crusading, and devotion: Francesco Casali's fresco in the Trecento Perugian *Contado*', *Speculum*, 76, 2 (2001), 315-36.

⁵¹ Andrew Holt, 'Between warrior and priest: the creation of a new masculine identity during the crusades', *Negotiating Clerical Identities: Priests, Monks and Masculinity in the Middle Ages*, ed. Jennifer Thibodeaux (Basingstoke, 2010), pp. 185-203.

⁵² Hodgson, 'Normans', p. 202.

⁵³ Hodgson, 'Normans'.

the crusade, with the aim of establishing how crusaders more broadly fit into the contemporary spectrum of medieval maleness.

Kirsten Fenton produced an essay about gender in William of Malmesbury account in the First Crusade, demonstrating how the framing of gender roles, for both women and men, were integral to the how the crusade was represented.⁵⁴ Likewise in the same collection Simon Yarrow considers First Crusade leader Bohemond and his gendered depiction by Orderic Vitalis.⁵⁵ This involved considering Vitalis' creation of a story demonstrating Bohemond's masculinity despite having suffered the unmanly ignominy of being imprisoned. Matthew Mesley considered clerical masculinity in First Crusade narratives which focused on Adhemar of Le Puy the papal legate.⁵⁶ Mesley established that the presentation of Adhemar on the First Crusade was done in order to present clerical masculinity as being superior to that of lay masculinity for use by future clerical involvement in the crusades. Hodgson has published on clerical masculinity and reputation of Arnulf of Chocques, the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem.⁵⁷ Hodgson used masculinity to explore the rise of one of the more controversial Latin Patriarchs of Jerusalem and explain how he divided opinions among contemporary writers. From these examples it is clear that crusading and masculinity is a broad subject from which many beneficial studies can emerge.

During the writing of this thesis a collection of essays edited by Hodgson, Lewis and Mesley about the crusades and masculinity was published.⁵⁸ This had many important takes on the subject with essays concerned over a wide range of time, geographical periods, various masculinities and ethnicities. The editors sought 'to demonstrate that incorporating masculinity

⁵⁴ Kirsten Fenton, 'Gendering the First Crusade in William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum Anglorum*', *Intersections of Gender, Religion and Ethnicity in the Middle Ages*, ed. Cordelia Beattie & Kirsten Fenton (London, 2011), pp. 125-39.

⁵⁵ Simon Yarrow, 'Prince Bohemond, Princess Melaz, and the Gendering of Religious Difference in the Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis', *Intersections of Gender, Religion and Ethnicity in the Middle Ages*, ed. Cordelia Beattie & Kirsten Fenton (London, 2011), pp. 140-57.

⁵⁶ Matthew Mesley, 'Episcopal authority and gender in the narratives of the First Crusade', *Religious Men and Masculine Identity in the Middle Ages*, ed. P.H. Cullum & Katherine J. Lewis (Woodbridge, 2013), pp. 94-111.

⁵⁷ Natasha Hodgson, 'Reputation, authority and masculine identities in the political culture of the first crusaders: The career of Arnulf of Chocques', *History*, 102, 353 (2017), 889-913.

⁵⁸ Natasha Hodgson, Katherine J. Lewis, & Matthew Mesley (ed.), *Crusading and Masculinities* (London, 2019).

within analysis of the crusades and of crusaders is an essential approach that greatly enhances our understanding of crusading as an ideal, an institution, and an experience.⁵⁹ The essays contained within it, some of which will be made use of in this analysis, demonstrate the fruitful pursuit of further research into the crusades. Examples of such include Christoph Maier's views on crusade preaching and departure scenes, Joanna Phillips' consideration of illness and masculinity, and Hodgson's use of the representation of fear.⁶⁰ However, it should be noted that there has not previously been a full-length study that has looked at how central a role the notion of masculinity and its function played in crusade narratives. In this respect this thesis seeks to make a unique and ground-breaking contribution to scholarship.

4. Crusade Narratives

The success of the First Crusade engendered a large amount of writing in a such a short space of time that had hitherto been unknown in the medieval period, especially regarding Latin eyewitness narratives.⁶¹ Marcus Bull and Damien Kempf assert 'the burst of writing was a response to a sense of the compelling irruption of the unusual and noteworthy.'⁶² The magnitude of the event spurred people to write and re-write texts, which continued to be done for further crusades. Since this thesis will present a detailed analysis of four narratives each individual chapter will provide an in-depth background on the authors, their origins and other information that shaped their texts. As such, here a broad overview of medieval historical writing, of which accounts of the crusades form a part, will be given.

⁵⁹ Hodgson, Lewis, & Mesley, 'Introduction', p. 1.

⁶⁰ Christoph Maier, 'Propaganda and masculinity: gendering the crusades in thirteenth-century sermons', *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Natasha Hodgson, Katherine. J. Lewis, & Matthew Mesley (London, 2019), pp. 21-35; Joanna Phillips, 'Crusader masculinities in bodily crises: incapacity and the crusader leader, 1095–1274', *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Natasha Hodgson, Katherine. J. Lewis, & Matthew Mesley (London, 2019), pp. 149-64; Natasha Hodgson, 'Leading the people "as duke, count, and father": the masculinities of Abbot Martin of Pairis in Gunther of Pairis', *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Natasha Hodgson, Katherine. J. Lewis, & Matthew Mesley (London, 2019), pp. 199-221.

⁶¹ Peter Damian-Grint, *The New Historians of the Twelfth-century Renaissance: Inventing Vernacular Authority* (Woodbridge, 1999), p. 72.

⁶² Bull & Kempf, *Writing the Early Crusades*, p.3.

This thesis is concerned with representations of masculinity in crusade narratives. This genre of texts is not a medieval creation but a modern one which Hodgson defines as enveloping the following: ‘chronicles, *gesta*, *historiae*, genealogies, annals and hagiographical works.’⁶³ These were the genres medieval historian used to produce their narratives, which also affected the audience’s expectations and their reception of what was transmitted. The texts under investigation in this thesis include a *historia*, *gesta*, and a *vie* (or *vita* in Latin). These all trace their origin back to the classical period but it is important to note that they often would overlap and did not remain rigidly distinct.⁶⁴ *Historia* recounted a certain subject, person or peoples, whilst *gesta* or *res gesta* celebrated deeds done and much of this focus was based on outstanding individuals or groups of people. The purpose of this was to commemorate the events by those involved in order to incentivise emulation by later people and also motivate those listening to perform such deeds that they themselves become subject to a *gesta*.⁶⁵ As Matthew Kempshall notes the purpose of *gestae* was to be recited out loud.⁶⁶ Therefore the people who make up the subject of *gestae*, usually the social elite and in particular warriors, would have likewise been the intended audience. A life (*vita* or *vie*) celebrated a particular individual and conformed to certain expectations of genre including an account of the worthy deeds performed by the individual.⁶⁷ In the post-Christianisation of the Roman Empire these were specifically written about saints and included information beyond their life’s deeds, such as their death and posthumous miracle workings. Knowledge of the crusades does not come solely from *historiae*, *gestae* or *vitae*. Other evidence can inform us about the events and perceptions of the crusades. These documents include letters written for public and private purposes, papal documents such as bulls and encyclicals.⁶⁸

⁶³ Hodgson, *Women*, p. 8.

⁶⁴ For an in depth overview of medieval historiography see the excellent: Matthew Kempshall, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History, 400-1500* (Manchester, 2012).

⁶⁵ Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 23.

⁶⁶ Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 23.

⁶⁷ Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 142.

⁶⁸ On the papacy and crusades see: Rebecca Rist, *The Papacy and Crusading in Europe, 1198-1245* (London, 2009); Thomas Smith, *Curia and crusade: Pope Honorius III and the recovery of the holy land, 1216-1227* (Turnhout, 2017). On letters see: Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate, *Letters from the east: Crusaders, pilgrims and settlers in the 12th-13th centuries* (Farnham, 2010).

Additionally, evidence comes from charters, preaching sermons, and even songs.⁶⁹ They are used in this study to set context and give comparison with narratives.

4.1. Language

This study is concerned with narratives written in Latin and Old French. The languages of a text are generally indicative both of its author and its intended audience. Latin texts were written by clerics who would also have been the intended audience in addition to some highly educated lay people.⁷⁰ This does not mean that the information would remain within this circle of people. It could be transmitted orally to people who could not read. For example, mirrors-for-princes, although written in Latin in this period, were clearly intended for elite men who were expected to rule and this information would have been conveyed to them in some method.⁷¹ Alternatively, Old French texts were written by lay people initially, although later French would be adopted by clerical writers as well. Gabrielle Spiegel argues this shift to the laymen writing history in the vernacular was a response by the aristocrats against the growing centralization of the monarchy under King Philip II (d. 1223).⁷² Writings in Old French provided a broader audience and would have been read by those with a literate background but also through oral transmission they could possibly reach everyone who spoke Old French.

Old French was spoken across a large geographical area that encompassed not just France, as it was then, but also the realm belonging to the English kings of this period. Elite males in England and of the Anglo-Norman and Angevin areas would have spoken Old French or at least a dialect

⁶⁹ For charters see: Giles Constable, 'Medieval charters as a source for the history of the crusades', in *The Crusades: The Essential Readings*, ed. Thomas F. Madden (Oxford, 2002), pp. 129-53. On preaching see: Christoph Maier, *Preaching the Crusades: Mendicant Friars and the Cross in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1994); Penny Cole, *The preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095-1270* (Cambridge, 2013); Peter Edbury, 'Preaching the crusade in Wales', *England and Germany in the High Middle Ages: In Honour of Karl J. Leyser*, ed. Alfred Haverkamp (Oxford, 1996), pp. 221-33; Jessalynn L. Bird, 'Preaching and crusading memory', *Remembering the Crusades and Crusading*, ed. Megan Cassidy-Welch (Abingdon, 2017), pp 13-33; On songs see: Linda Paterson, *Singing the Crusades French and Occitan Lyric Responses to the Crusading Movements, 1137 - 1336* (Cambridge, 2018).

⁷⁰ Chris Given-Wilson, *Chronicles: The writing of history in medieval England* (London, 2004), p. xxi.

⁷¹ Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 24. More on this below.

⁷² Gabrielle Spiegel, *The Past as Text the Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (London, 1999), p. 179. For more on the rise of French vernacular history see: Gabrielle Spiegel, *Romancing the Past: The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-century France* (Berkeley, 1995).

of it because as Marianne Ailes affirms it was ‘the dominant vernacular of the period.’⁷³ This means that these texts had a large audience of people who spoke or understood a common language which also linked their own social mores and cultural customs. Jean Blacker argues that we should not see the Latin-vernacular divide as being absolute, instead she argues texts in the two languages were highly related despite them being produced by people of different social backgrounds, and that the texts shared much in common.⁷⁴ Moreover, because of this, the audience of texts should not be seen as divided and separate, because both clerical and secular worlds would have heard these stories meaning they were not for one or the other.⁷⁵ Therefore the linguistic divide between the texts under scrutiny in this thesis does not point to a rigid audience division.

4.2. Modern Approaches to Crusade Narratives

To modern sensibilities history is generally considered to be a true account of past events based on facts and evidence. This is drawn from the eighteenth-century theory of the scientific method during the Age of Enlightenment and applied to studying the past.⁷⁶ Since the nineteenth century until the present this form of empiricist history, or what has been termed re-constructionist history, has held sway. This led to historians trying to discover what had actually happened in the past by mining texts for data in a scientific fashion and excluding fictional and rhetorical elements in order to reconstruct a narrative which could be considered to be true. The best known application of this approach to the crusades was Steven Runciman’s, *A History of the Crusades*.⁷⁷ Furthermore an outdated approach of medieval narratives can be seen in the following example from Paul Archambault who exemplifies a problematic ahistorical approach often taken to medieval chronicles. Here is his view of Robert of Clari’s work:

⁷³ Marianne J. Ailes, ‘Early French chronicle -- history or literature?’, *Journal of Medieval History*, 26, 3 (2000), 301-12.

⁷⁴ Jean Blacker, *The Faces of Time: Portrayal of the Past in Old French and Latin Historical Narrative of the Anglo-Norman Regnum* (Austin, 1994), p. xiii.

⁷⁵ Blacker, *The Faces of Time*, p. 137.

⁷⁶ For an overview of different approaches to history regarding reconstruction, construction and deconstruction see: Alun Munslow, *Deconstructing History* 2nd (London, 2006).

⁷⁷ Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades* 3 vols (London, 1951-54).

His brief chronicle is wrapped in a shroud of insuperable ignorance. He participated in none of the great decisions; he did not know that the plan to attack Constantinople had been hatched since or before the departure of the expedition from Venice; he knew nothing about the military strategy that had preceded the battles in which he fought, a lacklustre and solipsistic figure; he knew nothing finally about the art works he plundered or the cities he helped devastate... Of doubts, hesitations, and moral misgivings he seems to have had few; but neither his moral conscience nor his sense of logic was sufficiently honed to permit him to arrive at any significant conclusions... its worth lies in in momentary flashes of conscience that offer an embarrassing refutation to Villehardouin's glib and all symmetrical apologies.⁷⁸

Archambault's main problem with the text produced by Robert appears to be that it does not write about what Archambault wants to know and does not have the level of 'factual' detail required to make it a useful account of the Fourth Crusade, therefore he derides it. This is a flawed approach to any historical document and why Archambault's own criticisms can be dismissed. Robert of Clari has also been treated dismissively by historians writing more recently who take an empirical (and thus limited) approach to his account.⁷⁹

Through analysing medieval narratives empirically much contemporary accounts of crusades have been discarded from studies because they could not offer anything more to the reconstructionist historian. They were not studied for the information they contained within, as Justin Lake states: 'the intentions, mentalities, and social context of their authors were relegated to secondary consideration.'⁸⁰ Thus, the study of these texts as historical artefacts and a focus on them not just for what information they convey but how they present that information and why, is vital to our understanding of medieval culture and society in general, and to the crusades more

⁷⁸ Paul Archambault, *Seven French chroniclers: Witnesses to history* (Syracuse, 1974), pp. 27-28.

⁷⁹ See below, pp. 186-88.

⁸⁰ Justin Lake, 'Current approaches to medieval historiography', *History Compass*, 13, 3 (2015), 89.

specifically.⁸¹ This is because historical writing had a subjective purpose and was not done purely to record objective facts.⁸² A failure to understand the content and composition of medieval histories, as shown above, has led to some poor understandings of the medieval world and its writers.

4.3. Historical Writing in the Middle Ages

In the seventh century Isidore of Seville produced an influential account of the ‘rules’ of history in his work, *Etymologiae*.⁸³ History was an account of deeds done but these also had to be deeds considered to be worthy of remembrance. The purpose of history according to Isidore was wholly didactic and useful for the living to learn from the deeds of the great about ‘many things of necessity.’⁸⁴ History was differentiated from other forms of writing because of its purpose of telling the truth, as Isidore explains: ‘history, ‘plausible narration’ (*argumentum*), and fable differ from one other. Histories are true deeds that have happened, plausible narrations are things that, even if they have not happened, nevertheless could happen, and fables are things that have not happened and cannot happen.’⁸⁵ This notion of truth differs from the modern definition. Instead, the intent of being truthful was the important part rather than today’s definition of ‘hard facts.’ Some historians in the twelfth century discussed issues surrounding the writing of history and the accusations they could be subject to, for example in his history of the Kingdom of Jerusalem William of Tyre (d. 1186) wrote:

Indeed, either by pursuing the truth of deeds he [the historian] will arouse the hatred of many on himself, or in order to explain away indignation he will be silent about the course

⁸¹ This is very well illustrated by the essays in Bull & Kempf, *Writing the Early Crusades*.

⁸² For a more in depth overview of the purpose behind historical writing see Justin Lake, ‘Authorial intention in medieval historiography’, *History Compass*, 12, 4 (2014), 344–60.

⁸³ Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, ed. W. M. Lindsay (Oxford, 1911).

⁸⁴ Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, I xliii: ‘multa necessaria.’

⁸⁵ trans. Barney, S. A., Lewis, W. J., & Beach, J. A. (2006). *Etymologies Isidore of Seville*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p. 67; Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, I xliv: ‘Item inter historiam et argumentum et fabulam interesse. Nam historiae sunt res verae quae factae sunt; argumenta sunt quae etsi facta non sunt, fieri tamen possunt; fabulae vero sunt quae nec factae sunt nec fieri possunt.’

of deeds in which certainly he is not lacking in fault. For to disregard true events and diligently conceal them, is well known as being contrary to his duty.⁸⁶

Those writing history therefore believed they had a moral duty to report history truthfully and not fall into making falsehoods nor being overtly biased towards their patrons. Historians took this vocation seriously and took issue with those who they believed were not following these rules. In one of the best examples of the period William of Newburgh (d. 1198) condemned Geoffrey of Monmouth's (d. 1155) controversial text *Historia Regum Britanniae* in which the story of Arthur and the Merlin prophecies are told. William that Geoffrey, 'having given, in a Latin version, the fabulous exploits of Arthur (drawn from the traditional fictions of the Britons, with additions of his own), and endeavoured to dignify them with the name of authentic history'; and on the Merlin prophecies: 'he has unscrupulously promulgated the mendacious predictions of one Merlin, as if they were genuine prophecies, corroborated by indubitable truth, to which also he has himself considerably added during the process of translating them into Latin.'⁸⁷ Geoffrey claimed to have received his information on Arthur and Merlin from a Welsh text and he was now bringing it to a wider audience by translating it into Latin. It is for this reason that William became angry undoubtedly due to the fact that people believed it was real history. However, the historians in the texts under analysis in this thesis did not give their views on the nature of historical writing but they would have followed the convention as described by Isidore, William of Tyre and William of Newburgh.

⁸⁶ William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens (Turnhout, 1986), p.97: 'Aut enim rerum gestarum veritatem prosequentes, multorum in se conflabunt invidiam; aut indignationis gratia leniendae, rerum occultabunt seriem in quo certum est non deesse delictum. Nam rerum veritatem studiose praeterire, et occultare de industria, contra eorum officium esse dignoscitur.'

⁸⁷ Stevenson, J. (trans.), *The Church Historians of England* vol. IV ii (London, 1856), p. 398; William of Newburgh, 'Historia Rerum Anglicarum', *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I* vol. I, ed. Richard Howlett (London, 1884), p. 12: 'pro eo quod fabulas de Arturo ex priscis Britonum figmentis sumptas et ex proprio auctas per superductum Latini sermonis colorem honesto historiae nomine palliavit...dum eas in Latinum transfunderet, tanquam authenticas et immobili veritate subnixas prophetias vulgavit.'

4.4. Truth and Verisimilitude

Authors were intent on establishing the veracity of their history. This was achieved by authors through their explanation of how they obtained knowledge of the information they presented in their texts. This could either be through claiming knowledge as coming from eyewitnesses, or the fact that someone who was worthy had said they knew of it. Eyewitness testimony was considered more authoritative than most forms of knowledge but oral testimony was also highly regarded.⁸⁸ Simon John has explored the use of oral evidence in narratives of the First Crusade and how this has been discarded by some modern historians even though people of the twelfth century would have regarded it as being true.⁸⁹ Writers often stated their own witnessing of events they describe as a method of ensuring the truth of their reports. For example Robert of Clari ended his narrative with a statement declaring its veracity: ‘Now you have heard the truth ... which is the testimony of one who was there, who saw it and heard it.’⁹⁰ Bull gives an in depth analysis to this type of evidence based on a select reading of crusade narratives.⁹¹ One of Bull’s arguments is that the historian should not take the declaration of being an eyewitness at face value but interrogate the texts to demonstrate this autopsy at work.⁹² Second hand knowledge from eyewitnesses was also used to justify reports they did not witness but because of their good skills as a historian or the fact that the person they heard it from could be considered reliable meant it was acceptable to include certain information.⁹³ Sometimes historians could not vouch for the veracity of the source they used and often would declare this.⁹⁴

However the authors of the accounts under analysis in this thesis were not eyewitness to all the events they describe nor do they make clear where they obtained their source material. Questions

⁸⁸ Damian-Grint, *New Historians*, p. 68. For more on eyewitness authority see pp. 68-72.

⁸⁹ 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, 543 (2015), 263-301.

⁹⁰ Clari, p. 132: Ore avés oï le verité... que chis qui i fu et qui le vit et qui l’oï le tesmongne.’

⁹¹ Marcus Bull, *Eyewitness and Crusade Narrative* (Woodbridge, 2018).

⁹² Bull, *Eyewitness*, p. 338.

⁹³ John, ‘Historical truth’, 271.

⁹⁴ Damian-Grint, *New Historians*, p. 69; John, ‘Historical truth’, 271.

may therefore arise as to the authenticity of events depicted, especially as, in order to build their narratives they deployed a rhetorical device termed verisimilitude. This is described by Kempshall as ‘narrating what *might* have happened (*narratio ut rei gestae*), by the task of constructing or ‘making up’ a ‘fictive’ and plausible account of events.’⁹⁵ This does not imply an attempt to deceive from the author but allowed them to give as full an account as possible. For example we know some writers describe events that they did not witness nor state their sources but do give convincing accounts of what happened, for example one of the texts under investigation in this thesis, the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi* gives no indication of where they got their information from or if the author was an eyewitness or questioned eyewitnesses. As such it has been the work of modern historians to investigate its links with other writings. Although modern historians may argue that the use of verisimilitude was not real or at least not an accurate account, to the medieval audience this would not have mattered as they were prepared to accept the author’s plausible speculations as a true account.⁹⁶

However, this dissertation is not concerned not with the ‘facts’ per se, but chiefly with the representation of masculinity and its purpose. Blacker states:

Historical discourse itself begs examination, as a major form of expression. When the search for historical accuracy is suspended, the techniques commonly associated with fictional narrative such as modes of characterization, recurrent motif, local colour and dialogue lose their traditional association with imaginative fiction and can thus be viewed for what they are. Elements in the formation of narrative.⁹⁷

By following this approach we can learn from these narratives the authors’ perception of masculinity, how it was utilized by them and to what ends. This can be achieved through

⁹⁵ Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 368.

⁹⁶ Modern historians likewise do have to fill in the gap using speculation as to what happened.

⁹⁷ Blacker, *The Faces of Time*, p. 55.

understanding the contemporary socio-cultural context of these writers and the methodologies they deployed. Consequently, as noted above by Stephen Spencer modern literary approaches to these texts this has produced beneficial studies.⁹⁸ This evidenced none more so than his own work on the emotional rhetoric used to describe Richard the Lionheart on crusade, which is discussed below.⁹⁹ This is where we now must turn to establish the context of twelfth and thirteenth-century understandings of gender and masculinity.

5. Thirteenth-Century Elite Masculinity

The following discussion will consider how elite masculinity in the period under discussion was formulated and to what rules men were expected to subscribe. Furthermore, in common with a number of other studies of medieval masculinity, modern sociological theory will be incorporated. The approaches include: performativity, hegemonic masculinity, homosociality, and hypermasculinity.

5.1. Medieval Gender Theory

Elite medieval masculinity from the late twelfth through the thirteenth century was not a fixed concept. Elite medieval masculinity cannot simply be described in the form of a checklist that can be ticked off to show compliance to an ideal. It changed and adapted to the times. One of the best examples of this can be seen in the emergence of the concept of chivalry, which came into existence in the later twelfth to early thirteenth century.¹⁰⁰ There were, however, some properties that remains constant and integral to how men should act. These will be discussed as they apply to the masculinity enacted by the men in the crusade narratives. Firstly, a discussion

⁹⁸ See above, p. 24. Justin Lake likewise states: 'It is now generally accepted that the techniques of rhetorical and literary criticism can yield important conclusions about the practice and purpose of medieval historiography.' Lake, 'Current approaches', 92.

⁹⁹ Spencer, 'Like a Raging Lion'; see below, p. 74.

¹⁰⁰ For an overview of medieval chivalry see the following select but not exhaustive surveys: Richard Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe* (Oxford, 1999); Richard Kaeuper, *Medieval Chivalry* (Cambridge, 2016); Maurice Keen, *Chivalry* (New Haven, 2005); Jean Flori, 'Knightly society', *The New Cambridge Medieval History IV, c.1024-c.1198, Part I*, ed. David Luscombe & Jonathan Riley-Smith (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 148-84.

of medieval conceptions of gender is needed, followed by one of the knighthood, then a survey of the key characteristics of the type of elite manhood under analysis.

The European Middle Ages owed its ideas of biological sex difference as the basis of gender identity to the classical past. These ideas were most influentially disseminated in the early medieval period through the writings of Isidore of Seville and his major work *Etymologiae*.¹⁰¹ This was an encyclopaedia of knowledge based on the definition of words. From this seventh-century text we know that although it was biologically essentialist and based on possessing certain reproductive organs, these ideas were also upheld by linguistic notions. According to Isidore: A man (*vir*) is so called, because in him resides greater power (*vis*) than in a woman – hence also ‘strength’ (*virtus*) received its name – or else because he deals with a woman by force (*vis*).¹⁰² This definition presents sex difference as being based on strength, power and domination. Men dominate women, and they do this because they are stronger. Consequently women are defined by their weakness in comparisons to men, as Isidore writes ‘the word woman (*mulier*) comes from softness (*mollities*), as if *mollier* (cf. *mollior*, “softer”).’¹⁰³

Isidore saw strength and weakness as being integral to the difference between sexes, and this was the reason why men were dominant over women in his opinion. This thinking held up the patriarchal structure of society. However, all was not lost for women as he continued to explain that sometimes women could overcome this inherent weakness by performing manly actions:

A ‘heroic maiden’ (*virago*) is so called because she ‘acts like a man’ (*vir* + *agere*), that is, she engages in the activities of men and is full of male vigour. The ancients would call strong

¹⁰¹ The most recent edition and translation of Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologies* is: Stephen A. Barney, W. J. Lewis, J. A. Beach and Oliver Berghof, *Etymologies Isidore of Seville* (Cambridge, 2006). For the manuscript tradition in the medieval period to demonstrate its relevance throughout the middle ages see: Baudouin Van den Abeele, ‘La tradition manuscrite des *Etymologies* d’Isidore de Séville: pour une reprise en main du dossier’, *Cahiers de recherches médiévales (XIIIe-XVe siècles)*, 16 (2008), 195-205.

¹⁰² trans. Barney, Lewis, & Beach, p. 242; Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, XI.ii.17: ‘Vir nuncupatus, quia maior in eo vis est quam in feminis: unde et virtus nomen accepit; sive quod vi agat feminam.’

¹⁰³ trans. Barney, Lewis, & Beach, p. 242; Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, XI.ii.18: ‘Mulier vero a mollitie, tamquam mollier.’

women by that name. ... But if a woman does manly deeds, then she is correctly called a heroic maiden, like an Amazon.¹⁰⁴

This idea was still widespread in the period under consideration in this analysis. Women were often praised for ‘manly’ behaviour and overcoming weakness which may have led to them being triumphant. There were other words with the *vir-* stem that linked behaviour to gender namely *viriliter* which was often used by writers to suggest that an action was done manly. This was mainly found in relation to fighting or waging war.¹⁰⁵ Furthermore, *virtus* had strong connotations of ideal masculinity in the medieval period, as Kirsten Fenton argues, it was not just a definition of strength but was linked to ideas of ‘courage ... bravery and valour but also to virtue in the sense of moral excellence and already in Late Antiquity to [ideal] masculinity.’¹⁰⁶ Manliness could therefore be performative and not necessarily a matter of biology.

Performativity is a sociological gender theory formulated by Judith Butler. She asserts, ‘the action of gender requires a performance that is *repeated*’, furthermore that ‘repetition is at once a re-enactment and reexperiencing of a set of meanings already socially established; and it is the mundane and ritualized form of their legitimation.’¹⁰⁷ Using Butler’s theory it can be determined that elite medieval masculinity had to be performed in front of an audience. The audience could be members of the same social group but also people outside of the social group. During this period the king was the apex of elite masculinity. This form of masculinity had to be publicly performed in order to justify the exalted position that came with the role. The theory of gender performance has been used in various analyses of medieval masculinity and is an oft quoted theory.¹⁰⁸ None more so than in works looking at kingship, as Lewis has demonstrated kings

¹⁰⁴ trans. Barney, Lewis, & Beach, p. 242; Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, XI.ii.22: ‘Virago vocata, quia virum agit, hoc est opera virilia facit et masculini vigoris est. Antiqui enim fortes feminas ita vocabant. Virgo autem non recte virago dicitur, si non viri officio fungitur. Mulier vero si virilia facit, recte virago dicitur, ut Amazona.’

¹⁰⁵ For a detailed background on *viriliter* see: Fletcher, *Richard II*, pp. 25-44.

¹⁰⁶ Kirsten Fenton, *Gender, Nation and Conquest in the works of William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge, 2008), p. 43.

¹⁰⁷ Judith Butler, *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity* 2nd (London, 2002), p. 178.

¹⁰⁸ For example: Hadley ‘Introduction’, p. 14; Lewis, *Kingship and Masculinity*, p. 6.

were gendered beings whose success was built around embodying masculinity and ensuring it was performed for the benefit of others.¹⁰⁹ Likewise this applied to elite male warriors. For example, descriptions of men either preparing for battle or marching are often given in texts in order to give the audience listener or reader (depending on genre) an image of this ideal masculinity. Bull uses the term *mise-en-scène* to describe these images, a borrowing from analyses of theatre or cinema, that refers to the setting of a scene.¹¹⁰ For example, this is a description of the Frankish army from *La Chanson de Roland*:

The tenth division is formed with brave knights from France, They are one hundred thousand chosen from among our best captains. They have robust bodies and fierce countenances, They have hoary heads and white beards, They have donned their hauberks and their double-mailed byrnies, They have girded swords made in France and Spain, They have fine shields with many distinctive devices. Then they mounted up, they clamour for battle, They shouted “Monjoie!” and Charles is with them.¹¹¹

From this imagery we can know that these men are ideal. They are shown to be performing masculinity which was done for an audience, usually the enemy to strike fear in them, or self-doubt. Another example, this time from the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Richardi* describes the crusaders leaving Vezelay, France, and embarking on the Third Crusade:

There you would have seen a martial band of youth: assembled from various regions, fit and ready for war. It seemed that they would easily master the whole breadth of the globe, overcome the countries of every nation, penetrate the retreats of sundry peoples. You would have reckoned that no rough terrain, no fierce enemy could defeat them, and that

¹⁰⁹ See above p. 24.

¹¹⁰ Bull, *Eyewitness*, p. 65.

¹¹¹ *La Chanson de Roland* vol. II, ed. & trans. Gerard J. Brault (London, 1984), lines 3084-92: ‘La disme eschele est des baruns de France, / Cent milie sunt de noz meillors cataignes. / Cor sunt gaillarz e fieres cuntenances, / Les chegs fluriz e les barbes unt blanches, / Osberc vestuz e lur brunies dubleines, / Ceintes espees franceises e d’Espagne, / Escuz unt genz, de multes cunoisances. / Puis sunt muntez, la bataille demandent, / Munjoie escrient, od els est Carlemgne.’

they would never give way before any injury – as long as they supported each other in one mind with unified strength and mutual assistance.¹¹²

By performing their gender role correctly in front of an audience it was deemed that these men would be successful in their endeavours.

Returning to Isidore, although his definition of being a man was shown to be as being in opposition to a woman, historians now view ideas of medieval masculinity as being about men defining themselves in relation to other men, not women.¹¹³ As Lewis argues, ‘given the “natural” subordination of women they were arguably irrelevant to many men’s sense of self as a man.’¹¹⁴ It is this sense of self as a man that must be now defined.

5.2. Defining Twelfth and Thirteenth-Century Elite Medieval Masculinity

Our knowledge of elite masculinity in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries comes to us mainly through literary sources and historical narratives. As a result Matthew Strickland observes that the historian ‘is forced to a disproportionate extent to approach the action and mentality of warrior nobility through the distorting lens of clerical writers.’¹¹⁵ However, this does not mean that the characteristics of ideal knighthood was left solely to the construction of the clerical writers, as Kaeuper argues, they actively had input into these ideals and at the least ‘warriors functioned as co-creators.’¹¹⁶ Therefore historians should not be anxious over using texts written by clerics because the ideals to be found within them were accepted as being ‘compatible with their high sense of status, function, and mission.’¹¹⁷

¹¹² trans. Nicholson, p. 150; *Itinerarium*, p. 149: ‘Ibi videre fuit diversis oriundam regionibus, bellis aptam Martiam juventutem, quae videretur totius orbis latitudinem facile domitura, omnium nationum superatura regiones, seu diversarum gentium penetratura recessus; nulla vincendam aestimares asperitate locorum vel immanitate hostium: nullis quidem cessuram injuriis, dummodo communicate virtute sese mutuis unanimes tuerentur auxiliis.’

¹¹³ Karras, *From Boys to Men*, pp. 10-11; Lewis, *Kingship and Masculinity*, p. 7.

¹¹⁴ Lewis, *Kingship and Masculinity*, p. 7.

¹¹⁵ Matthew Strickland, *War and Chivalry: The Conduct and Perception of War in England and Normandy, 1066-1217* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 8.

¹¹⁶ Kaeuper, *Medieval Chivalry*, p. 23.

¹¹⁷ Kaeuper, *Medieval Chivalry*, p. 23.

It should be noted that although clerics and knights performed different gender roles they were customarily of the same social background. Among a group of brothers some may have grown up to be warriors and some clerics. There was a fluid exchange of ideas between the groups of men as seen from the fact that some of these men could cross roles in their lifetime. One of the most famous examples in crusading history is King Baldwin I of Jerusalem (d. 1118). A veteran of the First Crusade, he had, before joining his brothers on the crusade as a warrior, been educated as a cleric and held benefices.¹¹⁸ We can therefore be confident that what the clerics wrote about in their representations of elite warrior masculinity was close enough to what elite laymen themselves believed to be the code of their lifestyle.

5.3. Cardinal Virtues

The first set of coded behaviour for elite masculinity under discussion here comes from the cardinal virtues. These were ideas that formed the basis of medieval kingship and other important leadership positions. The virtues could be traced back to both biblical and ancient texts. This long history justified them as indispensable forms of character that should be learnt and imitated in order to practice good leadership.¹¹⁹ The virtues are prudence, justice, temperance and fortitude. Medieval writers used them in works on both political theory and mirrors for princes. They feature especially in the works of John of Salisbury (d. 1180) and Gerald of Wales.¹²⁰ Gerald's *De Principis Instructione* is a mammoth work in which he put together his thoughts on ideal kingship and leadership qualities. Gerald's work offers advice and includes examples from both the bible and the ancients to justify acting in a certain manner. Gerald wrote for the Angevin kings, Henry II, Richard and John, completing the text around 1217. Whether or

¹¹⁸ Alan Murray, 'Baldwin I of Jerusalem (d. 1118)', *The Crusades an Encyclopaedia*, ed. Alan Murray (Oxford, 2006), pp. 132-33.

¹¹⁹ For the use of the Cardinal virtues in the Middle Ages see: István P. Bejczy, *The cardinal virtues in the Middle Ages: A study in moral thought from the fourth to the fourteenth century* (Leiden, 2011). For an interesting collection of essays on the use of the Cardinal virtues in the twelfth century see: István P. Bejczy & Richard G. Newhauser (ed.), *Virtue and ethics in the twelfth century* (Leiden, 2005).

¹²⁰ István P. Bejczy, 'Gerald of Wales on the cardinal virtues: a reappraisal of *De principis instructione*', *Medium Ævum*, 75, 2 (2006), 191-201.

not they acted on his advice we are uncertain, as Lewis states men learnt from observing other men not reading books.¹²¹ Nonetheless, Gerald's work does give an understanding of how rulers should act, and thus his work will be used throughout this thesis for contextual purposes. His work along with others who used histories as guidance for contemporary behaviour demonstrates a common understanding amongst clerical writers about how best to act. In the opening of his *Historia Anglorum*, Henry of Huntingdon explicitly links the writing of history to recollections of the cardinal virtues being put into practice: 'Where does the grandeur of valiant men shine more brightly, or the wisdom of the prudent, or the discretion of the righteous, or the moderation of the temperate, than in the context of history?'¹²² Henry continues this point claiming Homer should be read as a manual for kingship:

Homer showed, as clearly in a mirror, the prudence of Ulysses, the fortitude of Agamemnon, the temperance of Nestor, and the justice of Menelaus, and on the other hand, the imprudence of Ajax, the feebleness of Priam, the intemperateness of Achilles, and the injustice of Paris, and in his narrative, he discussed what is right and proper more clearly and agreeably than the philosophers.¹²³

Thus from Henry's words we know that men would be judged by how they act in accordance with the cardinal virtues. Moreover Gerald explained that possessing these virtues individually was not enough, all four had to be maintained and balanced: 'Likewise if someone lacks one of the virtues, although he may appear to have many others, he nevertheless has none of them

¹²¹ Lewis, *Kingship and Masculinity*, p. 18.

¹²² Huntingdon, p. 2: 'Vbi autem floridius enitescit uirorum fortium magnificentia, prudentium sapientia, iustorum iudicia, temperatorum modestia, quam in rerum contextu gestarum?'

¹²³ Huntingdon, p. 2: 'Homerus autem uelut speculo eliquans prudentiam Vlixis, fortitudinem Agamemnonis, temperantiam Nestoris, iusticiam Menelai, et econtra imprudentiam Aiakis, debilitatem Priami, intemperantiam Achillis, iniusticiam Paridis, honestum et utile, et his contraria, lucidius et delectabilius philosophis historiando disseruit.'

effectually, or beneficially.¹²⁴ As such they all interlinked and in many ways were dependent on each other.

The transmission of the cardinal virtues through mirrors for princes was a mainstay for educating elite men throughout the later Middle Ages. Lewis asserts the texts were produced to ensure kings knew their role and its requirement. Furthermore she argues for their use as a framework for evaluating kings and elite men.¹²⁵ This is because the writers of historical narratives used this framework to judge kings and others when recounting their characters and actions.

Before going into details of the individual virtues first the sociological theory of hegemonic masculinity will be discussed because it directly links kingship to embodying masculinity. Thus it provides the framework for analysing such men. Hegemonic masculinity is one of the most influential social theories to be applied to the study of masculinity. It is the concept of a form of masculinity which is the most exalted by a culture. Theorised by R.W. Connell, John Tosh neatly sums it up as ‘the masculine norms and practices which are most valued by the political dominant class and which help to maintain its authority.’¹²⁶ Although Connell believed the theory could only be applied to modern societies and people, it has been used widely by historians as a method of evaluating groups of dominant or elite males and the relationships and hierarchies between these men.¹²⁷ It has also notably been applied by Katherine Lewis in a comparative analysis of medieval kings.¹²⁸

¹²⁴ Gerald of Wales, p. 390: ‘Sic et qui una uirtute caret, quanquam multas alias habere uideatur, nullam tamen efficaciter aut salubriter habet.’

¹²⁵ Lewis, *Kingship and Masculinity*, pp. 17-18.

¹²⁶ R. W. Connell & James W. Messerschmidt, ‘Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept’, *Gender and Society*, 19, 6 (2005), 829-59; R. W. Connell, *Masculinities* 2nd (Cambridge, 2005); Tosh, ‘Hegemonic masculinity’.

¹²⁷ For studies on the use of hegemonic masculinity as category of historical analysis see: Tosh, ‘Hegemonic masculinity’; Simon Yarrow, ‘Masculinity as a World Historical Category of Analysis’, *What is masculinity?: Historical dynamics from antiquity to the contemporary world*, ed. John Arnold & Sean Brady (Basingstoke, 2013), pp. 114-38. For studies that have used hegemonic masculinity as category of analysis see the following, though not exhaustive: Jacobus Adriaan du Pisani, J.A. ‘Hegemonic masculinity in Afrikaner nationalist mobilisation, 1934-48’, *Masculinities in politics and war*, ed. Stefan Dudink, Karen Hagemann & John Tosh (Manchester, 2004), pp. 157-76; Henry French

Hegemonic masculinity is not necessarily formulated by those who practice it, as we shall see, in the case of crusade narratives it is shaped by the writers and what they believe to be ideal masculinity based on wider socio-cultural norms. Hegemonic masculinity is in essence an ideal that will not be achieved by the majority of men but it is aspirational for all men. Certainly elite males, specifically the nobility, should aim to reach this standard. For example, a king as an apex male should embody hegemonic masculinity so that others are inspired and wish to emulate him. This could be achieved through adhering to the cardinal virtues and other standards of behaviour. Failure to do so may see his masculinity questioned, especially because his position of pre-eminence was based on embodying this ideal and the opportunities it offered to the subordinate males in the social group. This failure in the case of some kings, as demonstrated by Lewis, led to them being deposed.¹²⁹ Thus the theory is useful to reading crusade narratives that present kings and other elite men as either upholding or failing to match hegemonic masculinity ideals.

To return now to the four cardinal virtues. The virtue of justice is known in Latin as *justum* or *justitia*, in Old French as *justice* (or a variation such as *jostice*) or *juste* when used as an adjective, and *justicia* in Medieval Occitan. This was often considered the chief attribute of a king because it is through justice a ruler ensures the ‘safety and tranquillity for the lesser folk.’¹³⁰ This was of central importance in the medieval period and critical to how a king was viewed. If he could not bring peace he was deemed as not enacting his role correctly and this is why the political theorist and mirror-for-prince author John of Salisbury deemed it be the queen of virtues.¹³¹ Kings swore a coronation oath to the effect that they would uphold justice through the lands they ruled.¹³²

& Mark Rothery, ‘Hegemonic Masculinities? Assessing Change and Processes of Change in Elite Masculinity, 1700-1900’, *What is masculinity?: Historical dynamics from antiquity to the contemporary world*, ed. John Arnold & Sean Brady (Basingstoke, 2013), pp. 139-66; P.H. Cullum, ‘Clergy, masculinity and transgression in late medieval England’, *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. Dawn M. Hadley (Harlow, 1999), pp. 178-96.

¹²⁸ Lewis, *Kingship and Masculinity*.

¹²⁹ Lewis, *Kingship and Masculinity*, p. 219.

¹³⁰ Gerald of Wales, p. 118: ‘minoribus securitatem custodiat et tranquillitatem.’

¹³¹ John of Salisbury, *Polycraticus*, ed. & trans. Cary Nederman (Cambridge, 1990), p. 135.

¹³² For coronation oaths see: L.G.W. Legg, *English Coronation Records* (London, 1901), pp. 30-42.

King Stephen of England was criticised for the lack of justice in the realm during his rule that saw his tenure as being termed the ‘anarchy’ by later historians. Contemporaries were equally unimpressed, and he was accused of being a king in name only. This was a reference to the fact that although he held the title of being king, his inability to effectively rule and let injustice pervade the country meant that he was not performing the role of king.¹³³ This links to the theory of the king being the head of the body politic, one of John of Salisbury’s theories on the politics of kingship.¹³⁴ A body lacking a head is not of much use. Bjorn Weiler has commented on the role of justice and keeping the peace by kings, arguing that it was not solely about having power but having a ‘an inner disposition and a mindset that was constant in the pursuit of its goals, and which put basic moral precepts above personal gain or political expediency.’¹³⁵ Therefore justice was a characteristic that kings needed to develop and possess, and was only applicable to the most elite of men who wielded social and political authority.

Prudence is known in Latin as *prudens*, Old French as *prudence* or *pro*, and Medieval Occitan as *prudenza*. This is the ability to come to a decision using wisdom. This can mean by taking counsel, or individually weighing up information before acting. It essentially means not acting on an emotional response but instead with thoughtfulness and consideration. John of Salisbury wrote about its importance in his *Metalogicon*, arguing: ‘Prudence a virtue whose object is the investigation, perception and skilful utilization of truth.’¹³⁶ Gerald of Wales believed possessing prudence meant a ruler could not be deceived, therefore improving his ability to judge or make judgment on issues after hearing numerous pieces of information.¹³⁷ In Orderic Vitalis’ history of

¹³³ For Stephen’s reign along with contemporary and modern views see: Keith Stringer, *The Reign of Stephen: Kingship, Warfare and Government in Twelfth-century England* (London, 1993); Edmund King, *King Stephen* (London, 2011).

¹³⁴ On the body politic see John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, p. 66.

¹³⁵ Bjorn Weiler, ‘Royal Justice and Royal Virtue in William of Malmesbury’s *Historia Novella* and Walter Map’s *De Nugis Curialium*’, *Virtue and Ethics in the Twelfth Century*, ed. István Bejczy & Richard Newhauser (Leiden, 2005), pp. 322-23.

¹³⁶ McGarry, D. D., *The Metalogicon of John of Salisbury: A twelfth-century defense of the verbal and logical arts of the trivium* (Philadelphia, 2009), p. 221.

¹³⁷ Gerald of Wales, p. 138.

the First Crusade a speech is given by the crusade leader Bohemond in front of Byzantine emperor Alexius II describing prudence:

it is the quality of an inexperienced man to exhaust himself in enterprises where strong passion produces no effect. But the way of prudence for a strong man is to hide his feelings where his strength alone cannot achieve his purpose. It is prudent to put off to a future time what you cannot accomplish immediately. Again a man who thunders threats when he can do nothing more and who, when he can, overlooks past injuries, deserves to be called a fool and a coward.¹³⁸

Moreover, Orderic also praised King Henry I of England for his prudence and use of wise counsel:

King Henry did not follow the advice of rash young men as Rehoboam did but prudently took to heart the experience and advice of wise and older men ... Because he humbly deferred to men of experience he deservedly governed many provinces and peoples.¹³⁹

Prudence demonstrated manhood in contrast to a youth, who did not act manly but rashly. As Fletcher acknowledges, a lack of prudence leads to 'worldly failures.'¹⁴⁰ These failures often manifested in either poor governance or even death in battle due to poor advice taking. Therefore it was not age that defined manhood but being able to act prudently.

Fortitude is known in Latin as *fortitudo*, in Old French as *force*, and in Medieval Occitan as *força*. This virtue can also be called courage, as it required the ability to fight in the name of prudence

¹³⁸ Vitalis V, p. 46: 'Extremae imperitiae genus est hominem ibi totum efflare spiritum ubi commotus animus nullum habebit effectum. Porro prudentiae modus est potestatum hominem se ipsum dissimulare ubi potentia sua nequit appetitui satisfacere. Prudentiae est in tempus differre quod continuo non possis explore. Rursus socordiae et ignaviae redarguendus est, qui cum ultra non possit intonare minis, cum vero possit illatae obliuiscitur improbitatis.'

¹³⁹ Vitalis V, p. 298: 'Henricus rex imprudentum consilia iuuenum sicut Roboam secutus non est sed sapientum argutias monitusque senum sagaciter amplexatus est... Et quia humiliter sophistis obsecundauit merito multis regionibus et populis imperauit.'

¹⁴⁰ Fletcher, *Richard II*, p. 20.

and justice, demonstrating Gerald's assertion above of the virtues being interlinked. Being a king in this period meant being a leading warrior requiring direct engagement in battle. Gerald stated: 'Magnificence which is also called fortitude, not only adorns rulers, but also makes great men of any kind greater through the power of its virtue.'¹⁴¹ Kings had to show fortitude, courage and bravery in battle because to not do so could mean disaster befalling their army. Kings were expected to lead from the front giving inspiration to followers. For example here is William of Newburgh describing King Henry II of England fighting the Welsh, he wrote: 'When the king, therefore, rapidly hastening to the spot, had gladdened the astonished army by his presence.'¹⁴² This caused the English to turn from a position of defeat into victory based solely on the Henry's presence and fortitude. Kings who went into battle frequently and were regarded as being warrior-kings in the Middle Ages tended to be the most popular, this was the reason why Richard I of England was so celebrated during the thirteenth century, and for centuries afterwards too.

Fortitude was a virtue because it was only men who could wage war, not women nor children. Waging war was the chief way by which to demonstrate that one had this trait of manhood. Lewis discusses an important example of this regarding Henry V and the tennis balls incident. Henry's youth was used by the French in an attempt to ridicule him and the gift of tennis balls suggested he should remain playing youthful games, leaving waging war to men.¹⁴³ The antithesis of fortitude was the unmanly trait of cowardice. Orderic Vitalis openly shamed those who he believed were cowards in his account of the First Crusade. He accused William of Grandesmil, his brother Aubrey, Guy Troussel and Lambert the Poor among others as being 'utterly terrified by the previous day's battle and so fearful of the morrow that they fled, letting themselves down the wall with ropes. Consequently they were called the "clandestine rope-dancers" to their

¹⁴¹ Gerald of Wales, p. 108: 'Magnificencia uero, que et fortitudo dicitur, non solum principes ornat, sed eciam magnos quosque sue uirtutis efficacia maiores reddit.'

¹⁴² trans. Stevenson, p. 448; William of Newburgh, 'Historia', p. 108: 'Cum ergo rex ocius aduolans turbatum exercitum proprio exhilarasset, resumptis ilico animis et viribus.'

¹⁴³ Lewis, *Kingship and Masculinity*, p. 106.

lasting disgrace.’¹⁴⁴ The most damning verdict of fleeing came from Henry of Huntingdon and his criticism of Stephen of Blois leaving the siege Antioch to return home from the First Crusade in 1098, he wrote: ‘Count Stephen fled like a woman.’¹⁴⁵ Thus this was one of the worst traits a man could display because it openly questioned their manhood.

Therefore to counter the notion courage and fortitude were keenly encouraged. However, fortitude was not just the ability to fight bravely, it was the also the method of ensuring justice was done. Fortitude could be achieved through the implicit threat of violence, or a show of force. It was essential to the ability to dominate over other men, thereby reinforcing the position of the apex male. However, balance was essential as too much fortitude could be a bad thing, which brings us to temperance.

The virtue of temperance, known in Latin as *temperantia* or *modestus*, Old French as *tempreure*, Medieval Occitan as *temprar* or *tremprar*, refers to restraint. This is an ideal of masculinity because if one has temperance one has self-control and is not a slave to emotions or desires. Gerald argued that it prevented impulses of feelings such as anger, indulgences and lust.¹⁴⁶ Temperance also ensured all the previous mentioned virtues were held in balance without going too far away from the desired mean. For example temperance interlinks with prudence because a lack of restraint leads to bad decision making. Other things that could lead to failing at temperance came with the indulgence in destructive behaviour. For example such temptations could manifest for the elite males in the form of sexual desire, lust for riches or gratifying violence. Katherine Lewis argues self-mastery was essential to both kingship and manhood in the Middle Ages, and specifically in the case of King Edward III it formed the bedrock of both these characteristics.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁴ Vitalis V, p. 98: ‘Hesterni belli timore perterriti sunt et ut in crastinum aufugerent solliciti funibus per murum demissi sunt unde ad suam diuturnam ignominiam ‘furtivi funambuli’ vocati sunt.’

¹⁴⁵ Huntingdon, p. 436: ‘Stephanus igitur comes muliebriter aufugiens.’

¹⁴⁶ Gerald of Wales, p. 80.

¹⁴⁷ Lewis, *Kingship and Masculinity*, pp. 2-3.

In the period under analysis self-mastery was the first rule of being a king.¹⁴⁸ Gerald asserted a king must 'rule through model behaviour and examples of a praiseworthy life,' undoubtedly for his subjects to emulate.¹⁴⁹ Therefore if a king was not temperate it is unlikely his followers or other subjects would be.

One threat to male temperance was the presence of women. For example the late twelfth-century text known as the Pseudo-Turpin explicitly linked the military defeats of Darius to Alexander the Great and Mark Anthony's to Octavius as being caused by them allowing women to accompany them and their armies, suggesting, 'they are simultaneously a hindrance to the soul and body.'¹⁵⁰ Moreover, John of Salisbury's report of Eleanor of Aquitaine's behaviour on the Second Crusade specifically linked her, among other things, to its catastrophic failure.¹⁵¹ Nonetheless, whilst a real man should be able to resist temptation, expelling women from military environment seemed the most prudent course of action.

Total sexual abstinence was not a requirement of lay masculinity, in fact the requirement to produce a male heir was integral to kingship as it would secure the kingdom, but it was also a marker of virility.¹⁵² But relative abstinence in laymen was praised by writers who were often clerics who had themselves taken a vow of chastity. The following is an example of a knight named Ansold from Orderic Vitalis' *Historia Ecclesiastica* who receives high praise for his temperance in many areas:

The knightly Ansold inspired all his companions to virtue by his temperance and set an example even to monks living under a rule by the sober strictness of his abstinence. He

¹⁴⁸ Cecilia Gaposchkin, *The Making of Saint Louis: Kingship, Sanctity, and Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (London, 2010), p. 55.

¹⁴⁹ Gerald of Wales, p. 188: 'moribus electis et uite laudabilis exemplis informare.'

¹⁵⁰ *Karolellus; atque, Pseudo-Turpini Historia Karoli Magni et Rotholandi*, ed. Paul Gerhard Schmidt (Stuttgart, 1996), p. 126: 'impedimentum animae simul et corporis.'

¹⁵¹ John of Salisbury, *The Historia Pontificalis of John of Salisbury*, ed. & trans. Marjorie Chibnall (Oxford, 1986), pp. 52-53.

¹⁵² Lewis, *Kingship and Masculinity*, p. 196.

never ate apples in an orchard, and never tasted grapes in a vineyard or nuts in a wood. He helped himself only to the dishes that were brought to his table at regular hours saying it was the part of brute beasts and not of men to eat whatever came to them by chance without consideration of time and place. A lover of chastity, he was content with lawful marriage, and attacked the filthiness of lust not, like a layman, with coarse abuse, but like a doctor the church, openly with reasoned proofs. He praised fasting and bodily abstinence in all men and practised these virtues stalwartly all his life in so far as a layman can. He abstained from every form of plunder, and prudently preserved the fruits of his labour.¹⁵³

Various temptations were linked here in Orderic's description all of which could lead to indulgence and therefore should be avoided to maintain virtue.

Intemperance was also held responsible for rashness and recklessness in battle and was often cited for its disastrous consequences in this context by medieval writers. In *La Chanson de Roland*, the eponymous hero was condemned for his lack of temperance that caused the death of many of his fellow soldiers: 'For heroism tempered with common sense is a far cry from madness; Reasonableness is to be preferred to recklessness. Frenchmen have died because of your senselessness.'¹⁵⁴ The virtue of temperance was thus integral to how medieval men were represented in crusade narratives.

At this point it is worth interjecting with the sociological theory of hypermasculinity. This would seem to counter the arguments made about embodying the cardinal virtues of temperance but it is linked to fortitude and justice. In her analysis of Russian President Vladimir Putin, Elizabeth

¹⁵³ Vitalis III, pp. 180-82: 'Frugalitate sua militaris vir cunctos sibi coherentes ad honestatem prouocabat parsimoniaeque modesta restrictione, regularibus etiam personis exemplum portendebat. Numquam poma in uiridario comedit numquam uuas in uinea nec auellanas in silua gustauit. Canonicis solummodo ad mensam quae apponebantur sumebat horis, dicens brutorum animalium esse non hominis comedere quicquid fors suggereret absque consideratione loci et temporis. Legali conubio contentus castitatem amabat et obscenitatem libidinis non ut laicus uulgari uerbositate uituperabat, sed ut doctor aecclesiasticus argutis allegationibus palam condemnabat. Ieiunia et omnem continentiam carnis in omnibus laudabat et ipse uiriliter in se pro modulo laici retinebat. A rapinis omnimodo abstinebat suasque res labore partas callide serabat.'

¹⁵⁴ *La Chanson de Roland*, lines 1723-26: 'Kar vassalage par sens ne nest folie; / Mielz valt mesure que ne fait estultie. / Franceis sunt morz par vostre legerie...'

Woods defines hypermasculinity as, ‘an exaggerated set of cultural norms and behaviours usually associated with males, as a strategy for creating not just legitimacy, but also a scenario of power itself.’¹⁵⁵ Scenarios of power are explained as ‘as a set of political messages conveyed as much through symbolism and signals, ceremonies and rituals, as through texts and doctrines.’¹⁵⁶ Most modern sociological studies that use hypermasculinity as a tool of analysis tend to focus on schools or prisons because these are spaces in which normative social behaviour often does not apply.¹⁵⁷ These are spaces cut off from the rest of society and it is because of this that hypermasculinity develops. It is fair to argue that the theatre of war also belongs in this category and this is why it can be applied to the crusades. The crusades took place far from the society and places from which the crusaders came, this allowed them to push the norms of behaviour and act in ways that would have been inappropriate back in the Latin west. This is explicitly in reference to forms of violence that would have ordinarily broken these rules.

Hypermasculinity has been used to analyse modern day fiction in the form of both televisual and cinematic presentations and literature.¹⁵⁸ These studies are concerned with the portrayals of hypermasculinity to mass audiences and they are useful for thinking about how crusaders are represented in crusade narratives and what these representations are trying to achieve. For example, are they inserted for entertainment or do they have functional purpose in trying to shape behaviour? Or both? Acts committed by crusaders that can be termed hypermasculine, usually violent interactions, will be shown to play a role in both hegemonic masculinity and homosociality. They are done usually to further cement a hegemonic position whilst

¹⁵⁵ Elizabeth Wood, ‘Hypermasculinity as a scenario of power: Vladimir Putin's iconic rule, 1999-2008’, *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 18, 3 (2016), 329-50.

¹⁵⁶ Wood, ‘Hypermasculinity’.

¹⁵⁷ For examples of hypermasculinity used in studies on prisons and schools see: Tea Torbenfeldt Bengtsson, ‘Performing Hypermasculinity: Experiences with Confined Young Offenders’, *Men and Masculinities*, 19 (2016), 410-28; Chris Hickey & Amanda Mooney, ‘Challenging the pervasiveness of hypermasculinity and heteronormativity in an all-boys’ school’, *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 45, 2 (2018), 237-53.

¹⁵⁸ For example see: Nicole B. Cox & Lauren J. DeCarvalho, “‘Ride Free or Die’ Trying: Hypermasculinity on FX's *Sons of Anarchy*”, *Journal of Popular Culture*, 49, 4 (2016), 818-38; Gregory Phipps, ‘Constructing masks of hypermasculinity: The depiction of rampage school shootings in contemporary American novels’, *Studies in the Novel*, 47, 1 (2015), 99-115.

simultaneously done as a homosocial performance to further the boundaries of the homosocial group's exclusivity. This is because other groups of males and females cannot perform these acts due to physical inability and lacking the required weaponry. In studies of medieval masculinity hypermasculinity has been underused to explain representations of extreme behaviour committed by men, however, Tina Boyer has used it in her survey on giants in medieval literature and Gareth Evans in his study of Norse Sagas, but it has not been applied to crusade narratives.¹⁵⁹

Overall it can be concluded that embodying the cardinal virtues would make a king or elite male be considered as the hegemonic male and analysing for representations of these is a useful method for reading crusade narratives, as we shall see.

5.4. Chivalric Ideals

The cardinal virtues were guidance for ruling, but a king was also a knight and knights too had a set of values to which they subscribed. Whilst being a knight meant belonging to a group of people of a certain social status and fighting on horseback, becoming an elite warrior required more than an accident of birth and being able to mount a horse. Bennett charts the social process of how a boy is made it into a knight through education.¹⁶⁰ Indeed Karras argues, it was not just social status that made a man a knight, it was the training and practicing of certain skills that when came to fruition demonstrated his aptitude for knighthood. It was when he had proven himself to other men that he eventually became a man.¹⁶¹ However the knight's ability to function as a warrior was only part of what made him a man. The other part was the ability to live according to a code of behaviours and morals that were deemed to make him worthy and more elite than other men from outside his social class.

¹⁵⁹ Tina Boyer, *The Giant Hero in Medieval Literature* (Leiden, 2016); Gareth Evans, *Men and Masculinities in the Sagas of Icelanders* (Oxford, 2019).

¹⁶⁰ Bennett, 'Military masculinity'.

¹⁶¹ Karras, *From Boys to Men*, p. 36.

The best-known code of conduct in relation to the knighthood is chivalry. Debates among historians about when chivalry emerged and became a central ideology for a code of behaviour have tended to focus on the late twelfth to early thirteenth century.¹⁶² Prior to this elite masculinity was based on the conduct of being a *preudomme*. Explaining this, Crouch states: ‘That a *preudomme* did this or did that was the way that proper conduct was taught to the young, and all the young aspired to be recognised in time as a *preudomme*.’¹⁶³ For Crouch ‘the likeliest root of the word is the Latin *probus* (upstanding, honest).’¹⁶⁴ The qualities that comprised of being a *preudomme* were not codified in the same sense that the cardinal virtues were. Instead the qualities are understood from writings that explicitly state how a *preudomme* or knight should act. One text that plays a significant role in this thesis for contextual ideas of these chivalric or *preudomme* virtues is *L’Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal*. Composed in the early thirteenth century it offers guidance on how men should act.¹⁶⁵ Additionally John of Joinville helpfully gives some insight into what a *preudomme* should and should not do. In this case these definitions come from King Louis IX himself. Louis was reported to have said: ‘For a *preudomme* is so distinguished and virtuous a being that simply to pronounce the word is satisfying to one’s mouth.’¹⁶⁶ Louis gave advice on matters such as how to dress and speak, how to dilute wine, and also act with humility.¹⁶⁷ This was advice for future rulers but also for elite males in general as Joinville seemed keen to emphasise these points.

Crouch acknowledges that the *preudomme* as found in these literary texts was an ideal type and that few men would have had all the requisites to be thought of as one, but nevertheless it was a model of behaviour to be aimed for, even if not achieved.¹⁶⁸ The following characteristics,

¹⁶² For an overview of various arguments about when chivalry emerged see Kaeuper, *Medieval Chivalry*, pp. 57-84.

¹⁶³ For more on this and a background on the meaning of *preudomme*, see: Crouch, *The Birth of Nobility*, pp. 30-37.

¹⁶⁴ Crouch, *The Birth of Nobility*, p. 30.

¹⁶⁵ It also forms a major part of Kaeuper, *Medieval Chivalry*.

¹⁶⁶ trans. Smith, p. 150; Joinville, p. 160: ‘Car preudomme est si grant chose et si bone chose que neis au nommer emplist il la bouche.’

¹⁶⁷ For details on these see Joinville, pp. 154-60.

¹⁶⁸ Crouch, *The Birth of Nobility*, p. 33.

loyalty, largesse, honour, and vengeance and the Davidic ethic will be discussed here because these comprise the ideals and characteristics that men were judged by in crusade narratives.

Prior to considering these qualities another sociological theory needs to be introduced. Homosociality is the basis for maintaining hegemonic masculinity and also maintaining elite status through re-affirming social barriers and hierarchies. Using it as a tool of analysis involves evaluating the social interactions between men of a certain social group and how they maintain their hegemonic status. Therefore it is suited to analysing how the knighthood defined itself, maintained its favourable status, and also judged its members.

Homosociality is the recognition of masculine identity being 'constructed and socially performed primarily in relation to other men rather than in opposition to women and the feminine.'¹⁶⁹ It refers to the 'nonsexual attractions held by men (or women) for members of their own sex' and it 'promotes clear distinctions between women and men through social institutions.'¹⁷⁰ Furthermore Sharon Bird asserts: 'homosociality promotes clear distinctions between hegemonic masculinities and non-hegemonic masculinities by the segregation of social groups.'¹⁷¹ To apply this sociological theory to elite males in the period under consideration means the knighthood essentially cut itself off from other masculinities by practising social interaction that others could not join in with. For example, it was the knighthood that waged war on horseback, a clear mark of social distinction. Eventually in the late twelfth to early thirteenth century this form of homosociality became defined as chivalry.

One practice of homosociality worth analysing in these elite men is how they created a male only space from which others were excluded. This can be shown through how it was believed wars should be fought, for example it was believed that women and non-warriors should stay away. It

¹⁶⁹ Amanda McVitty, 'False knights and true men: Contesting chivalric masculinity in English treason trials, 1388-1415', *Journal of Medieval History*, 40, 4 (2014), 458-77.

¹⁷⁰ Sharon Bird, 'Welcome to the men's club: Homosociality and the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity', *Gender and Society*, 10, 2 (1996), 120-32.

¹⁷¹ Bird, 'Welcome to the men's club', 121.

involves how they interacted with each other and what was the correct way to do so. Components of masculinity such as largesse and hospitality were key parts of homosocial behaviour and deploying these correctly were linked to notions of honour. Homosociality has been used in recent studies by Rachel Moss and Amanda McVitty, which have both looked at masculinity within knighthood, and they show that it is a valuable method of deconstructing this social group.¹⁷² Karras has used it to look at various masculinities and how they maintain their social distinctions, while Lewis has demonstrated the use of homosociality in regards to Henry V maintaining his hegemonic status.¹⁷³ Ailes has used homosociality to evaluate non-sexual relationships between men, her main arguments were to demonstrate how bonds of friendship between men were described in literary convention.¹⁷⁴ The use of homosociality in this analysis will, like hegemonic masculinity, explain the behaviour of certain individuals and its representation, and noting that this is often misconstrued by modern historians.

Returning to the virtues, loyalty, known as *fidelis* in Latin, *leials* in Old French, and *leial* in Medieval Occitan, was the singular defining measure of chivalric conduct. Kaeuper argues that loyalty to an emperor or king trumped even heroic vigour.¹⁷⁵ For Crouch loyalty was praised due to its synonym, obedience, which was the admired trait of the ancient Roman soldiers.¹⁷⁶ Loyalty was a key homosocial quality because it ensured unity in action thereby making an army as strong as it could possibly be, which was integral to warfare on crusade. Loyalty, according to Crouch, was the principal noble warrior virtue because it was enacted by the swearing of an oath which apotheosised loyalty above others.¹⁷⁷ Therefore loyalty in a knight was ‘intensely personal and

¹⁷² Rachel Moss, “‘And much more I am sorryat for my good knyghts’: Fainting, Homosociality and Elite Male Culture in Middle English Romance’, *Historical Reflections*, 42, 1 (2016), 101-13; Rachel Moss, ‘Ready to disport with you: Homosocial culture amongst the wool merchants of fifteenth-century Calais’, *History Workshop Journal*, 86, 1 (2018), 1-21; McVitty, ‘False knights’.

¹⁷³ Karras, *From Boys to Men*; Lewis, *Kingship and Masculinity*.

¹⁷⁴ Marianne J. Ailes, ‘The medieval male couple and the language of homosociality’, *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. Dawn M. Hadley (Harlow, 1999), pp. 214-37.

¹⁷⁵ Kaeuper, *Medieval Chivalry*, p. 247.

¹⁷⁶ Crouch, *The Birth of Nobility*, p. 56.

¹⁷⁷ Crouch, *The Birth of Nobility*, p. 62.

demanded faithfulness to obligation, being steady and reliable never devious or untrustworthy.¹⁷⁸ Loyalty is one of the key adjectives used to describe William Marshal (d. 1219) in *L'Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal*, for example, it was written, he was 'so valiant and loyal, endowed with every quality, lacking none' and 'he comes from the Young King's household and is valiant and courteous and loyal indeed.'¹⁷⁹ The antithesis of loyalty was treachery. This was frequently denounced in texts and those who committed treacherous acts were shown to be evil and would usually befall a brutal ending. The face of treachery was often seen as Ganelon, the traitor in *La Chanson de Roland*, whose actions lead to the hero's death. In his account of the Third Crusade, *Estoire de la Guerre Sainte*, Ambroise described Isaac the Emperor of Cyprus as being 'more treacherous and more evil than Judas or Ganelon.'¹⁸⁰

Largesse known as *largesse* in Old French, *larv* or *large* in Medieval Occitan. Though no term is used in Latin, *liberalitas* is used to describe a similar function. This was fundamental to elite men in the medieval period. Bestowing largesse was a personal quality, but it was done as an act of fostering social bonds to strengthen homosocial ties. Largesse meant distributing wealth and goods in the form of money, booty, land, or some other variety of material wealth. The second most important theme in *L'Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal* after prowess as a key attribute of chivalry was largesse. It is from this work where a sense of its importance in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries is demonstrated. Describing William Marshal's father, the author wrote:

Sir John the Marshal, so spirited, bold and tireless in his ventures that good men flocked to him – not that he was an earl or a baron of great wealth, but he bestowed largesse on such

¹⁷⁸ Kaeuper, *Medieval Chivalry*, p. 46.

¹⁷⁹ trans. Bryant, p. 47; *Maréchal*, lines 1940-41: 'Qui tant esteit proz e leials, / Entechiez de trestuz les biens / Si qu'il n'i failleit nule riens.'; lines 3084-85: 'De l'ostel le giemle rei vient. / Proz est e corties e leials.'

¹⁸⁰ Ambroise, lines 1384-85: 'Plus traitor e plus felon/ De Judas ou de Guenelon.'

an ever-growing scale that it was a marvel to all: even those with no love for him, beset by envy as they were, were obliged to speak well of him often.¹⁸¹

Furthermore, bemoaning the current state of chivalry, the author of *L'Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal* wrote: 'now the great lords have fettered Chivalry once more: overcome by Sloth, in thrall to Avarice, they've shut Largesse away out of sight!'¹⁸² Describing the Young King Henry (d. 1183), largesse is shown to be an innate quality of the elite man:

He was possessed indeed of every noble quality, for Nobility is born of a good heart and flourishes therein, fulfilling every command of Largesse – for it is in the house of Largesse that Nobility is nurtured. And where did Largesse reside? Tell me: where? In the heart of the Young King.¹⁸³

For Fletcher the purpose of doling largesse was to show proper decorum whilst also demonstrating correct behaviour between men of noble status.¹⁸⁴ It was integral for an apex or hegemonic male in maintaining a loyal band of followers and has been recognised by historians as an indispensable part of medieval kingship and a key attribute on which a reputation can sit.¹⁸⁵ Largesse was an important action to undertake because it displayed a lack of concern over personal material wealth, thereby linking into the virtue of temperance. Also, by doling out largesse one could not be accused of the sin of avarice. Crouch asserts that it also demonstrated a pious nature as it demonstrated 'spiritual concerns over the temporal.'¹⁸⁶ It will be shown to

¹⁸¹ trans. Bryant, p. 27; *Maréchal*, lines 27-38: 'Sire Johan li Mareschals, / Qui tant esteit de grant emprise / e de grant over/ e de grant mise / Qu'entor lui out plenté de buens; / E si n'esteit il mie kuens / Ne baron de tresgrant richesce, / Mais tant foisona sa largesse / ke tut gent s'en merveilloent. / Neïs cil kui point ne l'amoent, / Qui en avoient grant envire, / En conveneit souvent bien dire.'

¹⁸² trans. Bryant, p. 55; *Maréchal*, lines 2686-90: 'Mais or nos ront mise en prison, / Chevalerie li halt home; Par perece, qui les asome, / E par conseil de coveitise / Nos ront largesse en prison mise.'

¹⁸³ trans. Bryant, p. 80; *Maréchal*, lines 5060-68: 'Ne rien n'esteit en lui a dire / De quantqu'a a gentillesse amonte, / Quer de boen cuer naist / e se monte Gentillesce / e flurist e charge, / Quantque largesce li encharge, / Quer bien savez que gentillesce, / Fu nurie en l'ostel largesse. / Ou mest largesse? Dites mei. / Ou? enz el cuer al gienble rei.'

¹⁸⁴ Fletcher, *Richard II*, p. 48.

¹⁸⁵ For an overview of largesse and medieval masculinity and its ancient origins see: Fletcher, *Richard II*, pp. 50-55.

¹⁸⁶ Crouch, *The Birth of Nobility*, p. 69.

have played an important part in crusade leadership and a key evaluation point about certain men's reputation on the crusade.

Honour is known as *honor* in Old French and *onor* in Medieval Occitan. The Latin term is never used directly in this work although the terms are *honestus* or *probus*. This is an abstract characteristic and an emotion, therefore it not something that is acted out but is linked to other actions. Crouch explains that 'honour was not itself a moral quality, simply part of a social mechanism to impose morality,' therefore, 'it was desire for honour and fear of shame that policed the whole system' of noble conduct.¹⁸⁷ Thus it can be said to be explicitly key to homosociality. Honour could manifest in different forms but was usually linked to performing the actions mentioned above and conforming to ideals of elite medieval masculinity. Fletcher explains, 'to act manly in a social as opposed to a military context is to do everything in accordance with honour, doing as ought to be done, affirming one's own status by duly recognizing that of others.'¹⁸⁸

For the writer of *L'Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal* honour was the most important thing for a knight to be endowed with and was superior to any material possession he could hope for, as William himself here was described: 'he wasn't concerned with spoils; he was so intent on fighting well that he gave no thought to booty; he won something of far more value, for the man who wins honour has made a rich profit indeed.'¹⁸⁹

Consequently, honour took many forms but was related to conduct and especially as a form of praising correct behaviour. Its antithesis, shame, was an important method of making sure men acted honourably. Hodgson has written on honour and shame in the Fourth Crusade and concluded they 'were central to the thinking of Clari and Villehardouin, who used them to

¹⁸⁷ Crouch, *The Birth of Nobility*, p. 79.

¹⁸⁸ Fletcher, *Richard II*, p. 48.

¹⁸⁹ trans. Bryant, p. 59; *Maréchal*, lines 3007-12: 'unques al gaaing n'entendi, / Mais al bien faire tant tendi / Que del gaaing ne li chalut. / Il gaainna qui mielz valut, / Quer molt fait cil riche bargainne. / Qui onor conquest e gaainne.'

explain the expectations placed on crusaders and the reciprocal nature of social bonds in the crusade army.¹⁹⁰ Although she did not explicitly link it to masculinity it was a key aspect of elite masculinity. Hodgson also argues for studies of honour and shame being applied to other crusades as it ‘would allow us to understand the relationship between the contemporary use of these concepts and crusading ideals more fully.’¹⁹¹ This thesis takes up that call.

The next key attribute to elite masculinity was vengeance. Known as *ultio* in Latin, *venjance* or *vengeance* in Old French, *venjazon* in Medieval Occitan. This was intrinsically linked to notions of honour and shame. If a man’s honour was defamed then to restore it he must seek vengeance. Fletcher marks vengeance as a property of elite masculinity and to not enact it could be the downfall of elite men. He used the example of Richard II of England who chose mercy over vengeance which was deemed inappropriate to certain men in his court.¹⁹² Kaeuper acknowledges vengeance as an attribute of chivalry because to men ‘obsessed with status and honour, knights knew they must show their enemies – and also demonstrate to their fellow arms bearers in a competitive world – that they would not submit to any perceived debasement.’¹⁹³ This links to the sociological theories of both hegemonic masculinity and homosociality. In short, vengeance had to be performed for the benefit of being seen by other men. The following examples demonstrate vengeance could be used both positively and negatively. First Abbot Suger (d. 1151) described King Louis VI of France (d. 1137) as acting in response to a loss of honour and the importance of attaining vengeance: ‘He stirred up his anger; and it stirred him into action. His desire to get swift revenge for the insult consumed him as he shrewdly and cautiously summoned men from all sides and tripled the size of his host. He frequently groaned

¹⁹⁰ Natasha Hodgson, ‘Honour, Shame and the Fourth Crusade’, *Journal of Medieval History*, 39, 2 (2013), 220-39.

¹⁹¹ Hodgson, ‘Honour, Shame’, 238.

¹⁹² Fletcher, *Richard II*, p. 276.

¹⁹³ Kaeuper, *Medieval Chivalry*, p. 353.

and sighed that it would be better to die than suffer such shame.¹⁹⁴ In another example from Suger regarding Louis VI the use of vengeance comes from a battle speech which was intended to inspire his men, ‘using flatteries and threats, he began urging them to fight with greater daring and fervour, and to avenge the wrongs done them if a good chance arose.’¹⁹⁵ A further example comes from William Marshal fighting in Poitou where vengeance was shown to be a motivation for his prowess in response to his uncle being killed in battle:

Burning to avenge his uncle, no ravening lion was ever so savage with its prey: anyone who got in his way he put to a painful, dismal end. He would have avenged the earl indeed if he hadn’t run into their lances and had his horse killed beneath him. But being unsaddled didn’t slow him down! He could see no possible way of escape – a band of more than sixty attacked him all together, all bent on overwhelming him and taking him captive – but he showed not the slightest sign of fear.¹⁹⁶

Vengeance was linked to reputation and as a response to action. It was important to how men acted, were perceived and judged. Susanna Throop has demonstrated the use of vengeance as a motivation for crusading was a powerful force and that it increased as crusading continued from its origins in the late eleventh century through until the early thirteenth century.¹⁹⁷

Finally to discuss is the Davidic ethic. This idea is based on the belief that the duty of the knighthood was to protect the weak, such as women, children, poor and clergy, against those who sought to prey on them. The term used here though was created by Crouch and was not

¹⁹⁴ Abbot Suger, & Cusimano, R., & Moorhead, J. (trans.), *The Deeds of Louis the Fat* (Washington D.C., 1992), p. 33; Suger, p. 24: ‘ut cito injuriam ulciscatur exestuans, undecumque triplicate exercitu sagaciter eque ut prudenter, crebro ingeminate suspirio decentius mortem quam verecundiam sustinere.’

¹⁹⁵ trans. Cusimano & Moorhead, p. 100; Suger, p. 162: ‘tanto ferocious et audacious, si oportunitas condonet, dimicare, illatam injuriam punire tam blandiciis quam minis excitare laborat.’

¹⁹⁶ trans. Bryant, p. 45; *Maréchal*, lines 1665-81: ‘Molt fue del vengeir angoissos; / Unkes nuls liuns fameinos/ Ne fu si cruels sor sa preie; / N’ert trové nul en sa veie / Qu’il nel mette a duel e a hunte. / Molt eüst vengié ben le conte, / Mais o les glaives le soupristrent, / Son chival soz lui ocistrent; / E quant a terre se senti, / Unkes por ce ne s’alenti. / Pus n’I recouvra qu’il seüst / Por ce qu’eschiver les peüst. / Sor lui corurent, ce me semble, / Plus de sesante tuit ensemble, / Qui toz le voleient suprendre / E toz tesoent a lui prendre, / Semblant fait que point ne s’asmaie.’

¹⁹⁷ Susanna Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance* (Farnham, 2011).

used by contemporaries, therefore there is no medieval terminology. The name comes from the book of Psalms believed to have been composed by King David.¹⁹⁸ It is associated with homosociality because it defined the distinction the knighthood had with those from outside their status, who were weaker and unable to protect themselves. This trait can be found in medieval writings, for example the following was said by Charlemagne about Roland from the Pseudo-Turpin, he was, ‘the cleric’s wall, the walking stick of the orphans and widows, the food and refreshment for poor and rich, alleviator of the church.’¹⁹⁹ Furthermore, Abbot Suger described Louis VI thus: ‘He took care that the churches prospered and zealously sought peace for those who prayed, those who toiled and the poor, which had not been doing for a long while.’²⁰⁰ Likewise Orderic Vitalis described Geoffrey, the son of Count Routrou of Mortagne, as ‘God-fearing, and devoted to the church a staunch defender of the clergy and God’s poor.’²⁰¹ For the crusades this ideal was important because it would manifest in defending the non-fighting elements of the pilgrims who were involved, the vast majority of people, ensuring they made their journey safely.

This has been an overview of the contemporary standards which elite males were held to embody and the characteristics and actions they were expected to deploy. The actions of crusaders as recounted in narrative sources can be compared to these values to see how they either lived up to these or failed to act like men. But also whether or not these rules could be adapted to the crusaders’ situation, and if they can be used to re-think modern misconceptions of crusaders actions.

¹⁹⁸ Crouch, *The Birth of Nobility*, pp. 71-72.

¹⁹⁹ *Pseudo-Turpini*, p. 156: ‘*muris clericorum, baculus orphanorum et viduarum, cibus et refectio tam pauperum quam divitum, relevatio ecclesiarum.*’

²⁰⁰ trans. Cusimano & Moorhead, p. 29; Suger, p. 14: ‘*ecclesiarum utilitatibus providebat, oratorum, laborum et pauperum, quod diu insolitum fuerat, quieti studebat.*’

²⁰¹ Vitalis IV, p. 160: ‘*timens Deum et ecclesiae cultor deuotus, clericorum pauperumque Dei defensor strenuus.*’

6. Thesis Layout

The purpose of this thesis is to investigate the ideal of elite masculinity as depicted in crusade narratives written during the thirteenth century. This involves considering their uses in different forms, with different authors using concepts of masculinity in various ways, as such, different methodological approaches are utilised in each chapter. As stated in the opening of this chapter the term masculinity was not used but we can deduce gendered discourse through other means such as: by how certain men were extolled; important decisions were framed; or even just through authors describing their own personal experience of crusading. All of these are linked by how they were defined against contemporary ideals of manliness.

Chapter Two will consider the purpose of the representation of Richard the Lionheart in the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*. This is an important narrative of the crusade that has been understudied in its own right, despite it being a significant narrative account of the Third Crusade. The use of masculinity in this text and its elaboration of previous accounts of the same subject will answer questions about the author's intent for both writing the text and for the portrayal of Richard. Neither of these questions have been satisfactorily answered by modern historians. This will be done by applying sociological theories of masculinity, principally hegemonic masculinity, and establishing how fruitful they can be in analysing a text such as this. Comparisons to other accounts of the Third Crusade will show the importance the *Itinerarium's* author placed on the correct performance of masculinity and how it was integral to successful crusading, moreover in order to strengthen its stance the text also contains numerous examples of unmasculine behaviour. The chapter will take the following structure. First the construction and maintenance of Richard's hegemonic masculine identity will be explored. Then an analysis of the contrasting masculinities of King Richard to King Philip II and Conrad of Montferrat, claimant to the Kingdom of Jerusalem. Finally an analysis of the use of direct speeches made by King Richard and others will demonstrate moments of the authors consciousness and their

authorial intention. Overall this will establish that for ideal masculinity to be presented by a writer a contrasting representation of failing masculinity must be constructed for didactic purposes. By comparing the *Itinerarium* with other texts that offer a different version of events or different representations of Richard we can consider why authors depict him in contrasting ways. This chapter will establish that the representation of Richard offered by the *Itinerarium* was intended to instruct future kings in both successful crusading and kingship, and that successful kingship entailed successful masculinity.

Chapter Three will consider the representation of Simon of Montfort in Peter of Vaux-de-Cernay's *Historia Albigensis*. This text is about the Albigensian Crusade and focuses on its chief protagonist Simon of Montfort. This chapter will argue for Peter of Vaux-de-Cernay's *Historia Albigensis* being a form of 'hagiographical masculinity' due to the representation of Simon as a martyr. Previously no crusader had a text produced about them in this fashion. Most historians of the Albigensian Crusade have not really investigated the representation of Simon within Peter's account, instead they have used it and other texts to focus on the violence and motives of the crusaders. However, if we consider Peter's text as a form of hagiography, which has distinct rules from history writing, then the presentation of Simon within it offers an understanding of the author's intention for writing. The chapter will focus on Peter's presentation of Simon conforming to the ideals of masculinity but expressing these within the register of hagiographical masculinity. Beginning with the justification for Simon's election to the crusade's leadership, it will then take a thematic look at the virtues Simon possessed, these are: justice, prowess, temperance, prudence, honour and piety. Additionally, Peter contrasted Simon with his enemies, who were also the enemy of the crusade more widely, showing them to be examples of flawed masculinity. This is a hagiographical trope because they were constructed on the basis of opposition. The central argument for this representation was that it had become apparent that the destruction of heresy would require military power and, according to Peter's account, in

order to be successful this enterprise had to be led by a man who conformed to ideals of elite lay masculinity.

Chapter Four will consider the work of low-status knight, Robert of Clari, and his account of the Fourth Crusade *La Conquête de Constantinople*. This differs from the previous chapters because it is authored by an elite male participating in the war he described. As a subordinate male to the elite leadership his history's value lies in offering us more than just knowledge of the crusade but revealing that ideals of elite masculinity framed the crusade's most significant decisions. This provides a more insightful understanding of such a text's audience and their expectations about how events and their narrations are described than has previously been offered. It will compare Robert's framing of events with other narratives, such as Geoffrey of Villehardouin's, to consider why these historians wrote as they did. Additionally, we gain insight into how standards of elite masculinity were refracted down to men of lower status and the view of the subordinate male in comparison to those of the hegemonic status. The chapter structure will focus on some of the key decisions and events of the crusade including the decision to go to Constantinople, the Constantinople stories, the siege and sack of the city, the election of the emperor, and the downfall of the leading crusaders. The chapter's central arguments are that Robert's text demonstrated the centrality of gender identity in explaining important events that were undoubtedly controversial whilst absolving himself of blame, and how the leaders' failure to keep homosocial norms caused the downfall of both the Greek and Latin emperors.

Chapter Five will offer an analysis of John of Joinville's *Vie de Saint Louis*. It will consider the masculinity of an elite man writing about himself in the first person, an issue which has not previously been considered. Joinville's autographical presentation was unprecedented but hitherto most historians have only been concerned with the portrayal of Louis IX of France, the eponymous hero of the text. However, the text is also a personal account of Joinville's own feelings and thoughts. It will be shown that unlike the previous forms of crusading narratives

examined this one showed the horrors of the war and was not at all heroic in its depiction. Joinville suffers many anxious crises that will show his own notions of masculinity were effectively destroyed when he was captured by Islamic forces in Egypt. A critical insight into the mind of someone who should have acted differently instead gives us a psychological insight to the men who fought in these wars and the intense pressure they went through. Additionally, Joinville's revelations into ideas of autonomy and honour provide a key understanding to reading his texts demonstrating its use beyond the representation of the saint-king. It will discuss the following issues in regard to Joinville's use of masculinity in various differing forms: autonomy, honour and shame, the events at Mansurah, the crusaders captivity, their stay in the Holy Land, and themes of homosociality and dishonour. It will be demonstrated that this is the first text that we can determine to be one of lived masculinity in the crusades, making it vital for further research.

The thesis will end with a conclusion that will summarise what has been achieved and offer general thoughts that pertain to this analysis and possible further lines of enquiry.

7. Conclusion

For elite men in the thirteenth century crusading had become integral to their masculinity. However, it was one component of what made them elite males. They followed certain ideas and ideologies on how they should conduct themselves. This came either in the form of the cardinal virtues or the chivalric virtues. In turn various forms of literature were produced to act as a guide, exemplify, and extol these virtues, defining correct male conduct. During the twelfth century it was performing these on crusade that was seen as the pinnacle of embodying these values. Performing manliness and writing about it were thus, in a sense, symbiotic.

Gender, and in this case, masculinity, is a useful tool of analysis in approaching medieval histories, helping us to unpick these narratives for their discourse of the construction and

utilisation of masculinity. Moreover, other sociological approaches to these representations have been beneficial to our understandings of medieval gender construction. These have been fruitfully applied in various instances in of medieval history and has recently begun to be used in analysing crusade histories. This thesis will now turn to applying this analysis to crusade narratives that has thus far not been approached in this way to demonstrate that masculinity was vital to the representation of individuals and events.

Chapter Two: The Representation of Hegemonic Masculinity in the *Itinerarium*

Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi

Richard the Lionheart's presentation in the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi* (henceforth *Itinerarium*) lends itself well to interpretation informed by Connell's theory of hegemonic masculinity. This helps us understand the tactics its author used to depict Richard as superior to other men, and that the qualities inherent to hegemonic masculinity were essential to crusade leadership. Significantly this account of Richard's crusade begins by establishing him as the first nobleman to take the cross in response to the Christians' defeat by Saladin at Hattin on 4 July 1187:

He preceded everyone in this action, inviting them to follow his example. His father Henry, the king of the English, was already approaching old age. However, he disregarded his father's white hairs, and the kingdom – which was due to come to him by right – and the difficulties of so great a journey, and used no pretext to avoid the undertaking. The Lord, judging this man's constancy as worthy of reward, chose him first to incite all the others. And when all the other princes had either died or retreated, He retained him as executor of His affairs.²⁰²

Richard's hegemonic masculine position was established by highlighting that he was singled out by God. This favour confirmed his exceptionalism among the leaders. In turn his actions reinforced his hegemonic position because he incited (*incentorem*) others to follow. Men wanted to

²⁰² trans. Nicholson, p. 47. *Itinerarium*, p. 32: 'et omnes praecedit facto, quos invitat exemplo. Pater ejus rex Anglorum Henricus jam vergebat in senium; ipse tamen et patris canitiem, et regni jus sibi debitum, et itineris tanti difficultates dissimulat, nec ullis occasionibus a coepto declinat. Hanc viri constantiam Dominus remunerandam judicans, quem primum aliorum omnium incentorem elegit, eum caeteris principibus vel defunctis vel regressis negotii Sui executorem reservavit.'

do what Richard did, to act as he acted. This fits in with John Tosh's argument that the successful maintenance of hegemonic masculinity depends on being able to set terms of manhood through its definition and its values and assert hegemony over others.²⁰³

The second point that positioned Richard as the hegemonic male is the reference to his father King Henry II. We are told of Henry's decline into old age (*vergebat in senium*) and his white hairs (*canitiem*), the purpose of this was to show that he had passed the stage of manly vigour. He no longer had the desirable attributes or standards that other more 'youthful' men wished to possess. Henry was now in the senior age, the point of decline and no longer at peak manhood.²⁰⁴ There was a suggestion of him not being physically able to go into war against the Muslim armies of the East. Lewis argues in relation to the decline of Edward III of England that, 'manhood, once secured, was not limitless, but could be lost if encroaching old age led to a diminution of faculties and self-control.'²⁰⁵ This can be applied to this description here of Henry II, he was neither an ideal man nor king.

In the opening quotation the remark that Richard did not 'use any opportunity to avoid the undertaking' is highly suggestive of Henry's failure to go east despite numerous pledges to do so.²⁰⁶ In a representation diametric to Henry Richard was eager to go and do his duty. This is not surprising given this was written by someone trying to promote a new crusade and offering Richard as a model for imitation. However, the author clearly believed crusading to be a requisite of kingship and as such it was a means of judging kingship.

²⁰³ Tosh, 'Hegemonic masculinity', p. 44.

²⁰⁴ For medieval understandings of lifecycle stages and the implications for masculinity see: Lewis, *Kingship and Masculinity*, pp. 7-9.

²⁰⁵ Lewis, *Kingship and Masculinity*, p. 9. In this case Lewis is discussing King Edward III of England but it is still relevant to the perception Henry II.

²⁰⁶ For a review of Henry's non-existent crusading see: Hans Mayer, 'Henry II of England and the Holy Land', *The English Historical Review*, 97, 385 (1982), 721-39.

Richard's primacy in signing up to what became known as the Third Crusade (1189-92) was indicated in other narratives, both Ambroise and Richard of Devizes explicitly acknowledge it.²⁰⁷ However, they did not make the comment that Richard's father was elderly. Nor did they offer the flash forward of Richard being the only leader to return with honour, a clear reference to the death of Holy Roman Emperor Frederick Barbarossa and the incomplete crusade of King Philip Augustus of France, who was accused of retreating in the quote. The *Itinerarium* contends that the crusade was a success for Richard, at least in comparison to the other leaders. Therefore, the *Itinerarium's* audience would learn that Richard's actions were laudable and worthy of being emulated, despite the crusade not achieving its initial aim of recapturing Jerusalem from Islamic dominion. The text suggests that they should not blame Richard for this, but rather the failure of other men to embody the ideal masculinity requisite for crusading success.

The presentation of Richard's kingly masculinity within the *Itinerarium* is the concern of this chapter. It will argue that the *Itinerarium* is more than a crusade narrative; it is a kingship manual that uses the crusade because this is where kingship was most tested. The construction and maintenance of Richard's hegemonic masculine identity will be explored as follows: First, an analysis of the contrasting masculinities of King Richard to King Philip II and Conrad of Montferrat, claimant to King of Jerusalem. Then, an examination of direct speeches attributed to Richard and how these were used to convey notions of kingship and masculinity. By comparing the *Itinerarium* with other texts that offer a different version of events or different representations of Richard we can consider why authors depict him in contrasting ways. This chapter will establish that the representation of Richard offered by the *Itinerarium* was intended to instruct future kings in both successful crusading and kingship, and that successful kingship entailed

²⁰⁷ Ambroise, lines 63-64; Devizes, p. 5. for further details about Ambroise see below p. 69. For Devizes see: G. H. Martin, 'Devizes, Richard of (c.1150–c.1200)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004) [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23516>, accessed 18 Nov 2016]

successful masculinity. These lessons were also applicable to other high status laymen. However, first some background on the events and the text.

1. The Third Crusade

Pope Gregory VIII issued *Audita Tremendi* on 29 October 1187 which launched the crusade in response to the news of the crusaders defeat at Hattin by Saladin.²⁰⁸ The response was impressive with the Kings Henry II of England and Philip II of France agreeing to go, along with Frederick Barbarossa the Holy Roman Emperor. Organisation took a while, Barbarossa set out first in April 1189, however he died en route in Anatolia causing his army to disintegrate. Some of the Germans went home but others continued including his son Frederick who later died at Acre. Henry and Philip organised a peace treaty to allow them to go on crusade but Henry's death in 1189 meant this had to be renegotiated by the new king, Richard. This further delayed departure. Nonetheless the two kings finally arrived at Acre in June 1191, which was in Muslim hands, but under siege. This siege had begun two years previously by King Guy of Jerusalem. The crusaders recaptured it in July 1191 and immediately afterwards Philip returned home. The crusade continued with a major battle at Arsuf on 7 September 1191 where the crusaders claimed victory over the Muslim army. Saladin's response was to destroy the city of Ascalon. The crusaders rebuilt Ascalon and improved Jaffa, both ports that would be vital to attack Jerusalem. Twice a march on Jerusalem occurred but the crusaders did not launch an attack due to a fear they would be attacked by Saladin's field army whilst besieging the city. In 1192 a truce was brokered but not before a battle at Jaffa in August at which once more the crusaders claimed victory over Saladin. Richard left the Holy Land on 9 October 1192 determined to return in the future and reclaim Jerusalem. Despite appearing to be a failure from a crusaders' perspective, modern

²⁰⁸ As often stated in studies of the Third Crusade it has yet to be the subject of a monograph. However, the following selection offer lucid reconstructions of events: Christopher Tyerman, *God's War: A New History of the Crusades* (London, 2007), pp. 341-474; Thomas Asbridge, *The Crusades: The war for the Holy Land* (London, 2012), pp. 367-516.

historiography has regarded it somewhat as a success due to the fact it helped maintain the existence of the crusader states, and it personally enhanced Richard's reputation.²⁰⁹

2. Historiography of the Text

Debate surrounds the identity of the author of the *Itinerarium* as they do not declare who they are in the text. A number of scholars have argued that it was compiled by Richard of Templo and that he wrote sometime before 1220, probably 1216, as such this is the name that will be used throughout this thesis.²¹⁰ Templo was prior of the Augustinian priory of Holy Trinity London, a role he held from 1222 to ca. 1248.²¹¹ It consists of six books; the first has been labelled by Hans Mayer, IP1, and is a composite text that recalled the fall of Jerusalem in 1187 and the start of the siege of Acre in the aftermath of Saladin's victory.²¹² The remaining five books, known as IP2, deal with King Richard's crusade, and this is the focus of the following analysis.²¹³ Whether Templo was the author or not does not change the central arguments about the nature and significance of the text's presentation of Richard.

The *Itinerarium* is not an original work, it is closely based on Ambroise's *Estoire de la guerre sainte*, written c.1195.²¹⁴ This is an Old French verse account of the crusade by someone in King Richard's army, most likely from Normandy.²¹⁵ However, the sections of the *Itinerarium* based on Ambroise are not a simple translation of the eyewitness account into Latin prose in order to give

²⁰⁹ Jotischky, *Crusading*, pp. 155-62. On Richard's reputation, see below, pp. 72-75.

²¹⁰ Nicholson, p. 11. For further arguments on Richard of Templo being the compiler/author see: Michael Staunton, *The Historians of Angevin England* (Oxford, 2017), p. 143. See above p. 17 for recent developments.

²¹¹ Nicholson, p. 11.

²¹² *Das Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, ed. Hans Mayer (Stuttgart, 1962). Helen Nicholson continues the naming IP1 and designates books 2-6 as IP2. This will continue throughout this piece.

²¹³ See Nicholson, pp. 6-14.

²¹⁴ Staunton, *Historians*, p. 129. For studies on Ambroise's work see: Jean Flori, 'Ambroise, propagateur de l'idéologie Plantagenêt', *Culture politique des Plantagenêt (1154-1224) Actes du colloque tenu à Poitiers du 2 au 5 mai 2002*, ed. Martin Aurell (Poitiers, 2003), pp. 173-87; Marianne J. Ailes, 'Heroes of war: Ambroise's heroes of the Third Crusade', *Writing War: Medieval Literary Responses to Warfare*, ed. Corinne Saunders, Françoise Le Saux & Neil Thomas (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 29-48; Marianne J. Ailes, 'The admirable enemy? Saladin and Saphadin in Ambroise's *Estoire de la guerre sainte*', *Knighthoods of Christ: Essays on the History of the Crusades and the Knights Templar, Presented to Malcolm Barber*, ed. Norman Housley (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 51-64. Marcus Bull has a dedicated chapter to Ambroise in Bull, *EyeWitness*, pp. 193-255.

²¹⁵ Peter Damian-Grint, 'Ambroise (fl. 1188-1195), crusader and historian', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004), Retrieved 7 December 2018 from: <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-66813.4>.

the story more authority.²¹⁶ Though the general overall details and narrative of the crusade remain the same, the differing presentation of the characters and events serve to make the *Itinerarium* distinctive from Ambroise, not just a copy. This suggests the authors had different interests in describing events and different motives for producing the text. Ambroise celebrates Richard as the pinnacle of the warrior elite whose prowess in fighting Muslims is the central celebration of his work. The *Itinerarium* furthers this emphasis, adding Richard's kingship as integral to Richard's actions and decisions. It was not just his prowess that was important to the author but also the kingly virtues of justice, prudence and temperance. The *Itinerarium* achieved this presentation of Richard through elaborating Ambroise's descriptions of events and personas, giving his own views of both Richard and the events of the crusade rather than echoing Ambroise's, the text is therefore not derivative but instead a different perception of events.

William Stubbs edited the Latin text of the *Itinerarium* publishing it in 1864.²¹⁷ At that time Ambroise's work had not been discovered making the *Itinerarium* the most important account of the Third Crusade. However, since the discovery of Ambroise's work in 1872 the *Itinerarium* has been downgraded in scholars' analyses of the crusade.²¹⁸ This is unsurprising since, as discussed in Chapter One, the pursuit of factually recreating the historical narrative has been the main force driving studies of the crusades and crusade narratives prior to the cultural turn in their analysis.²¹⁹ Thus scholarly interest in the *Itinerarium* has been limited, besides the editions and translations offered by Stubbs, Mayer, and Nicholson, it has been little studied. Most discussion of it is to be found in general books on medieval historiography, or studies of the Third Crusade. Without Nicholson's wonderful translation the text would be even more underutilised. One of

²¹⁶ See Chapter One above about Latin and vernacular perceptions of history, p. 30; p. 34.

²¹⁷ 'Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi', *Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I* vol. I, ed. William Stubbs (London, 1864). There are seven manuscripts that have been split into four groups which are effectively different versions. Stubbs used the unique manuscript C which Nicholson translated. For more see, Nicholson, p. 5. For list of manuscripts see: *Itinerarium*, pp. lxxi-lxxix. Staunton also provides a manuscript list: Staunton, *Historians*, p. 144 n. 84.

²¹⁸ The first publication of Ambroise's text is: *L'Estoire de la Guerre Sainte par Ambroise*, ed. & trans. Gaston Paris (Paris, 1897).

²¹⁹ See above, pp. 32-33.

the few pieces of scholarship focusing solely on the *Itinerarium* is Beth Spacey's analysis of martyrdom and masculinity in the text.²²⁰ However, as established by Spacey, and as we shall see, the *Itinerarium* is of both empirical and cultural value, because as already stated it is not a translation.

Crucially, the fact that the *Itinerarium* is based on Ambroise's work raises the question of why it was written when there was already a complete account of the crusade available. Hitherto this has not been satisfactorily answered. Michael Staunton argues that the *Itinerarium* being written circa twenty-four years after the events it describes 'allows for a further elaboration of the legend of King Richard, which had already begun in his lifetime in Ambroise's work. It also reflects current concerns, particularly the preaching of a new crusade.'²²¹ Antonia Gransden asserts that 'the author despite his romantic style is a good historian', which seems to offer the view that we can remove the romantic elements to uncover the 'truth' in the work, an approach which limits the use of the text.²²² Nonetheless, she continues by stating his 'primary loyalty is to the crusade. He praises Richard for preferring the crusade to the government of England and deplores the half-heartedness of the crusaders of his day. He wrote partly to promote enthusiasm for the recapture of Jerusalem.'²²³ Helen Nicholson believes that the purpose of writing the *Itinerarium* 'could have been to bolster the prestige of the English monarchy in a period of political crisis', in reference to the rule of the minor, King Henry III of England.²²⁴ The following analysis will combine Gransden, Staunton and Nicholson's valuable contentions about its purpose by adding the dimension of masculinity, which has not been previously considered in relation to this issue.

²²⁰ Beth Spacey, 'Martyrdom as masculinity in the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*', *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Natasha Hodgson, Katherine J. Lewis, & Matthew Mesley (London, 2019), pp. 222-36. It should be pointed out that Nicholson has published an article in which the *Itinerarium* is compared with another text: Helen Nicholson, 'Following the Path of the Lionheart: The *De ortu Walvianii* and the *Itinerarium peregrinorum et gesta regis Ricardi*', *Medium Aevum*, 69, 1 (2000), 21-33. There are German studies concerning the authorship of the text: Hans Möhring, 'Eine Chronik aus der Zeit des dritten Kreuzzugs: das sogenannte *Itinerarium Peregrinorum* 1', *Innsbrucker Historische Studien* (1982), 149-67.

²²¹ Staunton, *Historians*, p. 143.

²²² Antonia Gransden, *Historical writing in England: c.550 to c.1307* vol. 1 (London, 1974), p. 241. For the earlier discussion of this see, pp. 31-36.

²²³ Gransden, *Historical writing*, p. 241.

²²⁴ Nicholson, p. 11.

This will demonstrate the value and usefulness of the text as evidence for contemporary perceptions of the construction and performance of high status masculinity. Moreover, it will be argued that the function of this construction was to offer a model for elite males who were required to lead an army for the recovery of Jerusalem. By emulating the deeds of Richard and preventing the errors of the Third Crusade they would be victorious.

3. Historiography about Richard

Despite the lack of scholarly interest in the *Itinerarium* the same cannot be said for Richard the Lionheart. He has been scrutinised by modern scholars for over a century and a half. Although more recently there has not been much new work on him in the Anglosphere he has been the subject of large edited collections emanating from both Germany and France.²²⁵ These have focused on his kingship but also on his legendary status. Therefore Richard as a subject of enquiry is important not just for what this tells us about an individual man and king, but for the light studying Richard sheds on many wider issues including gender identity. Consequently more can be done by Anglophone historians.²²⁶

Depending on the individual historians' views on kingship and crusading, their assessments of Richard have generally covered the spectrum from denunciation to praise.²²⁷ More often than not these views tell us more about the scholars' own time and how these ideas of kingship and crusading have been viewed and evolved. William Stubbs, in his introduction to the *Itinerarium*, condemned Richard's overall kingship, noting that it fell 'between the initiation of good principles of law under Henry II, and the development of good principles of government in the

²²⁵ The following German language collection has forty-five articles: Alexander Schubert (ed.), *Richard Löwenherz: König -- Ritter -- Gefangener* (Speyer, 2018). Meanwhile there are eighteen essays in this French language collection: Nicolas Prouteau (ed.), *Richard Cœur de Lion: Entre mythe et réalités* (Gand, 2016).

²²⁶ Notable exceptions include: Thomas Wagner, 'The illness of King Richard and King Philippe on the Third Crusade: an understanding of *arnaldia* and *leonardie*', *Crusades*, 10 (2011), 23-44; Thomas Asbridge, 'Talking to the enemy: the role and purpose of negotiations between Saladin and Richard the Lionheart during the Third Crusade', *Journal of Medieval History*, 39, 3 (2013), 275-96. Spencer, 'Like a Raging Lion'; Richard R. Heiser, 'The court of the Lionheart on crusade, 1190-2', *Journal of Medieval History*, 43, 5 (2017), 505-22.

²²⁷ A historiographical overview of Richard's kingship and crusading is given in John Gillingham, *Richard I* (London, 1999), pp. 1-14 and in Ralph Turner & Richard Heiser, *The Reign of Richard Lionheart: Ruler of the Angevin Empire, 1189-1199* (Harlow, 2000), pp. 1-16.

reign of John.²²⁸ Additionally he chastised Richard as ‘a bad son, a bad husband, a selfish ruler, and a vicious man,’ however he acknowledged his contemporary popularity asserting, ‘he yet possessed some qualities which the men of the time accepted as better than the wicked wisdom of his father, and which made his tyranny less intolerable than his brother’s weakness.’²²⁹ A similar appraisal was offered by Runciman, who concisely pronounced Richard ‘a bad son, a bad husband and a bad king, but a gallant and splendid soldier.’²³⁰ Runciman’s repetition of the word bad suggests a failing at numerous roles to which he was judged. Runciman and Stubbs’ words contrast the modern and medieval views on Richard, and how these differ: to modern audiences he was bad but to his contemporaries he was popular. James Brundage scorned Richard for being ‘personally proud and vain,’ and claiming he, ‘dearly loved the pomp and display of court ceremonies and ecclesiastical rituals, especially those which cast him in a starring role.’²³¹ As will be shown this display was in fact an integral part of the performance of kingship. It was vital for the king to be splendid and for people to see splendour being enacted. The most scathing view offered of Richard and his crusade comes from Michael Markowski who denounced Richard’s crusading reputation believing him to have been personally the reason for its failure: ‘The Third Crusade could not have had an enemy more devastating than the foot-dragging Lionheart.’²³² And, ‘by failing to march the last few miles to Jerusalem, he turned his back on the goal set by Pope Gregory VIII.’²³³ It should be noted that Markowski derives his criticism of Richard from contemporary crusading ideology voiced by clerics, not military commanders who may have known better, as will be illustrated later.²³⁴ However, this chapter will show that, despite modern criticisms, according to contemporary notions of elite masculinity Richard’s decisions were in fact the correct ones to take.

²²⁸ *Itinerarium*, p. x.

²²⁹ *Itinerarium*, p. xvii.

²³⁰ Runciman, *History* III, p. 75.

²³¹ James Brundage, *Richard Lion Heart* (New York, 1974), p. 37.

²³² Michael Markowski, ‘Richard lionheart: Bad king, bad crusader?’, *Journal of Medieval History*, 23, 4 (1997), 359.

²³³ Markowski, ‘Richard lionheart’, 351-65.

²³⁴ See below, pp. 115-18.

Certainly, Richard has often been criticised in terms of contemporary standards of what is acceptable behaviour, his execution of enemy captives at Acre in 1191 has come to symbolize the perceived barbarity of the crusades.²³⁵ However, this is not an appropriate way to approach Richard or any medieval ruler, in fact we need to judge him by the standards and expectations of his own day. This view is shared by those who, like John Gillingham, have sought to assess Richard on his own terms.²³⁶ Moreover, in attempting to understand Richard's behaviours and actions Gillingham argues, 'what mattered to Richard most was honour – or at any rate his reputation for honour, especially at the most critical moments such as the decision to take up arms against his father or later the decision to make peace with Saladin.'²³⁷ Fletcher has argued for honour as being absolutely key to high status masculinity.²³⁸ Jean Flori similarly to Gillingham argues Richard 'wanted to incarnate chivalric ideology, and put into action the dream that there could be no good prince who was not a knight, nor good king except surrounded by knight; in fact, to make chivalry a principle of government.'²³⁹ This is what makes Richard an important case study because his reputation for chivalry caused writers to present him as the personification of ideal masculinity. This is why he became legendary in his own lifetime but also the reason why the accounts of the Third Crusade offer various representations of him.²⁴⁰ More recently two studies have presented Richard's crusade more favourably than previous. First is Thomas Asbridge's article on Richard's negotiations with Saladin which concludes by suggesting that Richard's diplomatic skills were either equal or even better than Saladin's, something which historians had not given him credit for.²⁴¹ This counters older perceptions of Richard being an impulsive warrior who negotiated only with his sword. Second is Stephen Spencer's article surveying instances of Richard's anger and how it was deployed by medieval historians of the

²³⁵ See: Gillingham, *Richard I*, pp. 169-70.

²³⁶ Gillingham, *Richard I*, p. ix.

²³⁷ Gillingham, *Richard I*, p. 105.

²³⁸ Fletcher, *Richard II*, p. 147; Also see above, pp. 58-59.

²³⁹ Jean Flori, *Richard the Lionheart King and Knight* (Edinburgh, 2006), p. 238.

²⁴⁰ For legends about Richard in his own lifetime see: Bradford Broughton, *The Legends of King Richard I, Coeur De Lion: A Study of Sources and Variations to the Year 1600* (Paris, 1966).

²⁴¹ Asbridge, 'Talking to the enemy', 275-96.

Third Crusade.²⁴² Spencer states, ‘there exists a disparity between how most medieval chroniclers perceived Richard’s wrath and the evaluations of modern historians; and that the nature of the source material curtails any attempt to reconstruct the “reality” of the king’s temperament.’²⁴³ As such Spencer demonstrates the problems with approaching medieval sources without considering correctly the cultural understandings of such representations. More on Spencer will be discussed within the analysis. It is the representation of Richard within the *Itinerarium* that shall now be considered.

4. Richard and Philip Competing

As established the presentation by of Richard in the *Itinerarium* fits the framework of Connell’s theory of hegemonic masculinity. John Tosh elucidates Connell’s ideas by explaining that hegemony in its Gramscian concept invites challenge and contestation.²⁴⁴ Certainly the relationship between Richard and Philip, as neighbouring rival kings who vied for the hegemonic position meant contest between these two was inevitable. Moreover, as Ruth Karras argues, males must assert their dominance repeatedly in front of other men in order to maintain it.²⁴⁵ Thus there was a need for the *Itinerarium* to present Richard as being better than Philip, especially because when he was writing, as Nicholson argues, Philip was now a more powerful king than the current king of England.²⁴⁶ But in the past Richard had been more powerful than Philip, and the *Itinerarium* wanted to reinforce this for his audience to learn how to return to this supremacy once more. This was achieved through direct comparisons of the kings’ actions.

As kings of neighbouring countries Richard and Philip’s relation with each other was complex and fraught with often changing dynamics. Added to this was the complication of Richard’s mother Eleanor of Aquitaine (d. 1204) previously being married to Philip’s father King Louis

²⁴² Spencer, ‘Like a Raging Lion’, 495-532.

²⁴³ Spencer, ‘Like a Raging Lion’, 500.

²⁴⁴ Tosh, ‘Hegemonic masculinity’, pp. 45-46.

²⁴⁵ Karras, *From Boys to Men*, p. 33; p. 38.

²⁴⁶ Nicholson, p. 11.

VII of France (d. 1180), which meant they shared two half-sisters.²⁴⁷ These ties made them close in a certain sense, although how they viewed this relationship and what they made of this connection is impossible to ascertain for certain. There had been points in time when they were both in league together against Henry II, and Richard had been betrothed to Alice, Philip's sister.²⁴⁸ However Richard taking the cross and then becoming king set him on a path of self-determination. He asserted himself by going on crusade and repudiating Alice in favour of finding a bride that worked in his favour politically, as he no longer needed Philip's support.²⁴⁹ However, on the crusade these two had to set aside their rivalry but this was easier said than done. Indeed the crusade could be said to have enhanced their competitiveness, for example who would be overall leader? Holy Roman Emperor Frederick Barbarossa was the obvious candidate before he died but afterwards this was not clear. This competitiveness has often been seen as detrimental to the crusade, for example by Jim Bradbury and Christopher Tyerman.²⁵⁰ However, as we shall now explore, the *Itinerarium* praised Richard for his competitive behaviour because it made him kingly in comparison to Philip.

4.1. Entering Sicily

The first example of Richard and Philip being shown in competition with each other in the *Itinerarium* comes with them entering Messina, Sicily in September 1190. This episode can be interpreted as an instance of kingship as gender performance. As established in Chapter One, kings were expected to act in a certain fashion because they were elite males, thus they were performing their gender in front of other men to demonstrate their dominance and exclusivity. Ambroise made this explicit:

²⁴⁷ Gillingham, *Richard I*, pp. 26-27.

²⁴⁸ Gillingham, *Richard I*, pp. 84-87.

²⁴⁹ John Gillingham argues that Richard favoured a political alliance with Navarre hence the marriage to Berengaria: John Gillingham, 'Richard I and Berengaria of Navarre', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 53, 128 (1980), 157-73.

²⁵⁰ See below, p. 85.

it is the custom and tradition that when princes of degree, as high as the king of France, who is of such repute throughout the world, and as high as the king of England, who has such honour throughout the lands, should enter a city of town or land, such as Sicily, then he should come as a great lord, on account some of some people and their talk.²⁵¹

However the *Itinerarium* elaborated on this, writing:

It is a recognised custom that when a king in particular, or the prince of some country is on the march, his progress should be as distinguished and grand and project as much authority as the power he actually holds. He should not appear less than he is; no, his appearance should match his actual power. The king's splendour should reflect his royal office; his exterior appearance should declare his inner virtue. As it is commonly said: "The man that I see, I expect you to be." What is more, appearance is governed by character. Whatever sort of character the ruler has, it is naturally reflected in outer appearance.²⁵²

From this we understand that there were established expectations of how a king must carry himself. It was more than a title, he must appear and act like a king because this revealed his inner character and virtue (*virtutem*). The visual demands of kingship are clear and the fact that a proverb is used to reinforce this suggests that it was a well-established concept. Moreover, this terminology establishes the link between performance and gender: one is never simply a man, one has to do manliness. Hence both are performative. Furthermore, kings were known to represent the body politic, as John of Salisbury wrote: "The prince is placed at the head of the republic, subject only to God and to those who are his deputy on earth, because the human body

²⁵¹ Ambroise, lines 559-68: 'Soignors, costume est e usages / Que quant princes de halt parages, / Si haut com est li rois de France / Dont par le monde ad tel parlance, / E com est li reis de Engleterre, / Ki si grant henor ad en terre, / Entrë en cite ou en vile, / N'en tele terre com est Sezille, / Qu'il i deit venir com halt sire / Por plusor genz e por lor dres.'

²⁵² trans. Nicholson, p. 156; *Itinerarium*, pp. 155-56: 'Publici moris esse dignoscitur, ut quisque rex praesertim, et princeps terrae, talis tantusque procedat, et tanta fulgeat auctoritate, quanta fuerit praeditus potestate, quatenus non sit minor habitus quam potentia, immo pari convenient aptitudine, ut rex regio splendescat obsequio, et ejus virtutem exterior praedicet apparentia; vulgo namque dicitur, "Qualem te video, talem spero." Porro modus habitudinis formam trahit ex animo praesidentis; talis nimirum erit forma praedicati, qualem permiserit natura subjecti.'

is invigorated by the soul and ruled by the head.²⁵³ Instead the *Itinerarium* suggests that a king's appearance was linked to perceptions of how his realm was viewed by outsiders. Thus, unlike the body politic theory which is abstract, this performative theory of kingship is tangible and can be viewed and evaluated by spectators.

The *Itinerarium* continues with contrasting reports of both Philip and Richard's entrances to Messina. From these descriptions we can discern the ideals that kings were supposed to uphold. They offer a clear difference between the representation of these two monarchs which further emphasised the need for a king to conduct himself correctly. First Philip is described, as he arrived a week before Richard on 14 September 1190. Arriving on a single ship with no entourage, the local residents had turned out in force to see this renowned man, but:

as if he was avoiding human gaze, he took himself secretly into the city's castle harbour.

Those waiting on the shore for his arrival accused him of being timid and jeered him, saying that this king could not easily accomplish great deeds of valour since he was so wary of human gaze. So, disappointed in their hope of seeing him, they returned indignantly to their homes.²⁵⁴

Philip's discreet entry rather than a showy public one led the locals to cast aspersions on his character. The belief that his style of entry was evidence of timidity was connected to a belief that he would not be valorous in war and the use of 'virtutum' (courage) is a direct accusation of lacking manly ability or strength. They believed that demeanour was linked to action, and that the nature of Philip's arrival implied something about his nature: a lack of prowess. Philip's lack

²⁵³ John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, ed. Clemens Webb (London, 1909), p. 540: 'Princeps uero capitis in re publica optinet locum uni subiectus Deo et his qui uices illius agunt in terris, quoniam et in corpore humano ab anima uegetatur caput et regitur.'

²⁵⁴ trans. Nicholson, p. 157; *Itinerarium*, p. 156: 'tanquam visus hominum refugiens, in ipsius urbis castelli portum latenter se ingressit. Cujus adventum praestolantes in littore pusillanimitatem ejusdem arguentes, et exprobrantes, non facile talem regem posse fore magnarum virtutum patratores, cui sic esset suspectus visus hominum, sicque spe videndi eum frustrati, redierunt indignantes ad propria.'

of manly qualities on entering Messina presaged his later failure on the crusade when his only involvement was at the siege of Acre. He did not take to battle in the open like Richard, and so this presentation was a reading backwards of Philip's character due to how later events transpired. Contrarily, when Richard arrived at Messina he unsurprisingly made a much more impressive entry than Philip:

Then, when rumours spread that the noble-minded king of England was approaching, the people rushed out in crowds, wanting to see him. Pouring on to the shore they struggled to stand where they could see him coming in. Look! Far away they saw the sea covered with innumerable galleys, and from afar the sound of war trumpets echoed in their ears, with clarions resounding clear and shrill. As the fleet came nearer, they saw galleys rowing in good order, adorned and laden throughout with various sorts of weapons, with countless standards and pennants on the tips of spear shafts fluttering in the air in beautiful array... You would have seen the sea boil as the great number of rowing oars approached. The ears of the onlookers rang with the thundering of war-trumpets... and they were thrilled with delight at the approach of this diverse uproar. Then behold the glorious king! With the troops of sailing galleys like an accompanying escort, he stood out on a prow which was higher and more ornate than the rest, as if to see things unknown or to be seen by the unknown. Willingly putting himself on show for all to see, he was carried towards the densely packed shore. Elegantly dressed, he came ashore, where he found the sailors whom he had sent on ahead waiting for him with others in his service. They received him joyfully and brought forward the warhorses and his noble horses which he had entrusted to them for transportation. The locals flocked in from all sides to join his own people in escorting him to his lodging, the common folk talked among themselves about his great magnificence, which had left them stunned. "This man is certainly worthy of authority! He deserves to be set over peoples and kingdoms. We had heard of his great reputation, but the

reality that we see is far greater.” ... When the [local Greeks] saw the king’s impressive landings their arrogance was somewhat checked. They realised that the kings were stronger and more glorious than they.²⁵⁵

Flori and Brundage commented on the impression that Richard’s entry made suggesting that it was choreographed by Richard himself.²⁵⁶ This seems entirely likely, the quote above with Richard ‘willingly putting himself on show for all to see’ is indicative of his awareness of the importance of being seen and presenting a splendid persona. Jonathan Phillips argues that the difference between Philip and Richard’s entrances reflected the kings’ character and personality, as well as a difference in wealth.²⁵⁷ Whilst for Gillingham the reason behind the two different entrances showed the difference between the kingdoms of France and England. He contends that Philip had fewer men than Richard because many French nobles made their own way to the Holy Land and Richard’s army was larger because of the centralized nature of his power which ‘reflects the contrasting structures of their two kingdoms.’²⁵⁸

By placing these accounts of the two entries together the *Itinerarium* framed this incident in terms of competition between the two men in which Richard was shown to be the apex male, maintaining his position of hegemony over Philip. This is evidenced by the image of Richard being surrounded by many people. Unlike Philip who is presented as a solo arrival, or at least no

²⁵⁵ trans. Nicholson, p. 157-58; *Itinerarium*, pp. 156-57: ‘Porro rex Anglise ille magnanimus, ex quo fama praedicante divulgabatur adventare, catervatim ruunt populi, illum cernere cupientes, et in littus se ingerentes certatim occupant sedes illum ascendentem visuri. Et ecce! eminus prospiciunt mare galeis opertum innumeris, et vox a longe intonabat in aures eorum tubarum reboantium, et lituorum clarius et acutius resonantium. Interea propius accedentibus fuit videre galeas seriatim remigantes, variis undique ornatas et refertas armaturis, ventilantibus ad auram innumeris ordine decoro signis et penuncellis, in hastilium summatibus, ... et ex vario tumultuantium accessu delectationem excitari. Cum ecce! rex magnificus juxta navigantium galearum catervatim obsequio stipatus, caeteris eminentiori et ornatiori prostans in prora, ... fertur in littus obsitum densarum turbarum agminibus, et omnibus tanquam se ultro videndum exponens. Eleganter ornatus, in littus ascendit; ubi nautas, quos eo praemisera, cum caeteris addictis obsequiis suis reperit, eum gratanter excipientes, et dextrarios et equos suos nobiles sibi pridem commissos, ad vecturam exhibentes. Confluunt hinc inde cum suis indigenae, prosequentes ipsum usque ad hospitium suum. Super cujus tanta gloria vulgus attonitum conferebat ad invicem, “Hic quidem dignus imperio! Hic merito constituitur super gentes et super regna, cujus fama olim audita multo minor est ipsa veritate quam videmus.” Griffonum, dum reges tanta cum virtute viderent appulsos, in parte repressa est arrogantia; quippe qui se perpenderent virtute inferiores et Gloria.’

²⁵⁶ Flori, *Richard the Lionheart*, p. 94; Brundage, *Richard*, p. 80.

²⁵⁷ Jonathan Phillips, *Holy Warriors: A Modern History of the Crusades* (London, 2010), p. 146.

²⁵⁸ Gillingham, *Richard I*, p. 129.

entourage is mentioned, suggesting it was not impressive nor did he have the number of followers Richard was shown to have had. Richard's dress and interaction with his men and horses, established his paramount standing in the masculine hierarchy and also his military power by having a group of nobles over whom he ruled and who supported him. This public performance won the crowd over and the quoted response that he was worthy of command and ruling people, reinforced the point he was making, justifying Richard's performance and that this was how a king should act. This entry established the crusaders' superiority over the local Greeks in Sicily. Once more this was used to presage Richard's own successful campaign in comparison to Philip.

This whole vignette was meant, in part, to be instructive for the audience. Kings needed to act in this manner as performance was linked to success, while the descriptions do suggest differences of character and resources among the kings as argued by the above historians, the key significance of the different entries lies in what it tells us about their performances of kingship and masculinity. Kings had to be seen to have the bearing and entourage of a king not just holding the title. For the contemporary writers it was an important statement of prestige that they could use as proof of Richard's superiority. It was not only Ambroise and the *Itinerarium* that recorded the Messina entrance in this way, Richard of Devizes and Roger of Howden both made comments stating Richard's entrance was quite a spectacle which amazed onlookers.²⁵⁹ Whether or not Richard was more successful than Philip in their kingship is a matter of opinion among modern historians. For example, as McGlynn argues Philip was certainly seen to be less warrior-like than Richard, but he outlived his rival and may have achieved more than him.²⁶⁰ But did this matter to contemporaries? It would seem not.

²⁵⁹ Devizes, p. 17; Roger of Howden, *Chronica* vol. III, ed. William Stubbs (London, 1870), pp. 55-56.

²⁶⁰ Sean McGlynn, 'Fighting the image of the reluctant warrior: Philip Augustus as *rex-not-quite-so-bellicosus*', *The Image and Perception of Monarchy in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. Sean McGlynn & Elena Woodacre (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 2014), pp. 148-67.

4.2. Justice in Sicily

The *Itinerarium* also made a clear distinction between the two kings when it came to enacting justice. The main evidence for this again came from an incident in Sicily in which the crusaders broke out into violence with the local population of Messina. This was eventually quelled by Richard, whilst Philip was presented as seemingly unwilling to address the problem. Modern historians have analysed this incident as placing Richard in an unfavourable light. For example, Jim Bradbury, the modern biographer of Philip II, described Richard's Messina experience as him acting, 'with his usual promptness and aggression', he decried Richard's conduct, saying, 'he was the master and he would let all and sundry know it. He attacked those who offered any opposition or snub.'²⁶¹ Tyerman also similarly comments on Richard's actions negatively, arguing, the crusaders' 'stay was marked by intricate diplomacy punctuated by violence as Richard, in particular, sought to impose himself through high-handed aggression.'²⁶² These arguments do a disservice to the events because it was not Richard who instigated them and they also do not take into account that his capture of Messina showed him deploying justice, for which he was praised by contemporaries.

Justice was the most important of the cardinal virtues and as Flori notes, Richard's display of enacting it 'provided several of the chroniclers with another opportunity to emphasise the moral superiority of the king.'²⁶³ The *Itinerarium*, by comparing the two kings' action and inaction in Sicily, intended to establish Richard's superior kingship. Another important facet of this incident is that it also turned into a demonstration of prowess when Richard took Messina. This was not simply a military victory but an incident which thus allowed Richard to demonstrate his excellence with respect to two key masculine virtues essential to kingship: justice and prowess.

²⁶¹ Jim Bradbury, *Philip Augustus King of France 1180-1223* (Harlow, 1998), p. 83.

²⁶² Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 442.

²⁶³ Flori, *Richard the Lionheart*, p. 96.

This incident began because the Greek inhabitants of Messina were treating the crusaders badly. They verbally and physically insulted those labelled as pilgrims, and even secretly murdered some, disposing their bodies in the sewer.²⁶⁴ This had begun before Richard and Philip arrived, meaning the pilgrims were powerless to do anything due to being outnumbered. However, according to *Itinerarium*, ‘... the enemy acted without foresight, because they forgot that their kings would soon arrive.’²⁶⁵ This suggests that both Philip and Richard would be involved in enforcing justice. Eventually a serious amount of violence broke out later after the kings’ arrival when a pilgrim argued with a local woman selling bread. He had offered less than the asking price, at which she complained. This escalated into a crowd of people surrounding the man, hitting him and pulling his hair and almost leaving him for dead. We are told:

... there was an outcry, but King Richard tried to restore peace and goodwill. He issued an assurance that he had come in peace, and simply with the intention of performing his pilgrimage. Nor did he cease pleading for peace until each side had promised to keep the peace and returned peacefully to their homes.²⁶⁶

On this occasion Richard used non-violent means in order to resolve the situation through diplomacy to reach a peaceful consensus. It is clear that he wished the locals to view him and the crusade as penitents, not an invading army. However, this did not stop the locals from further causing harm to the pilgrims and the next time Richard had to employ violence to impose law and order.

The next day, 4 October 1190, Richard and Philip were in talks with the Sicilian justiciars to reach a written treaty about keeping peace in Messina. Whilst this was ongoing word arrived that

²⁶⁴ Ambroise, lines 535-58; *Itinerarium*, p. 155.

²⁶⁵ trans. Nicholson, p. 156; *Itinerarium*, p. 155: ‘minus quidem in eo providi quod regum ipsorum eo non pensarent adventum.’

²⁶⁶ trans. Nicholson, p. 159; *Itinerarium*, p. 158-59: ‘Facto clamore, rex Ricardus petiit pacem et amicitiam, asserens se venisse pacificum, et ad exsequendam peregrinationem simpliciter fuisse eo usque profectum; nec prius a perorando super pace obtinenda destitit, quam pacis securitate promissa, singuli secederent pacati in sua.’

some crusaders were being attacked and killed. He was told to ignore this news as being false but according to the *Itinerarium*, when a second messenger followed by a third one reported the same he decided not to believe the doubters. The *Itinerarium* continues, ‘without delay the king hurried out of the conference and set off on horseback with the intention of breaking up the quarrel and pacifying those involved.’²⁶⁷ Richard arrived at the scene of the dispute, tried to break up the fighting but suffered verbal abuse from the Sicilians. However, ‘refusing to put up with their ridicule, he at once put on his armour, took up his weapons, shut them up inside their city and laid siege to it, taking them by surprise.’²⁶⁸ Violence had to be deployed as a last resort as diplomacy had failed this time. The exemplary nature of Richard’s conduct here was further emphasised by contrast to Philip, who on hearing of the fighting ‘hurriedly left the conference place and took refuge in the palace where he was lodged,’ suggesting a fear for his own safety and a wish to save himself above all else.²⁶⁹ Contrastingly Richard bravely rode out to save those in trouble, and in doing so went on to conquer Messina, even raising his flag above the city to demonstrate his possession, and therefore rule over it.²⁷⁰

The contrast between the kings cannot be starker, one acted like a justice-dispensing warrior leader, whilst the other was hiding! Philip was presented as cowardly, clearly lacking the attributes of a king. This is not surprising since, as we have seen, the narrative explicitly stated that he was deemed timid due to the manner of his arrival. This further supports the contention that in both cases the way in which the kings arrived revealed crucial aspects both of their character and kingship, as illustrated by subsequent events. When justice needed to be deployed Philip was found to be wanting, the message was clear that Richard’s actions were deemed the worthier. Richard’s deeds were manly and chivalrous because he took up his sword for vengeance against

²⁶⁷ trans. Nicholson, p. 160; *Itinerarium*, pp. 159-60: ‘tunc sine mora rex accelerans, relicto colloquio, vectus equo eo venit, ea scilicet intentione et intuitu, ut litem dirueret, et litigantes pacificaret.’

²⁶⁸ trans. Nicholson, p. 160; *Itinerarium*, pp. 159-60: ‘ipse vero irrisionis talium impatiens se statim armis munivit assumptis, et ipsos inclusos in civitate obsidione subita cingebat.’

²⁶⁹ trans. Nicholson, p. 160; *Itinerarium*, p. 160: ‘cum ecce! a loco colloqui properanter se in palatium quo fuerat hospitatus, recepit.’

²⁷⁰ *Itinerarium*, p. 164.

those harming the people he had promised to protect.²⁷¹ Personal honour became involved when he reacted to verbal insults directed at him. This counters Bradbury's assertion about Richard acting arrogantly and wanting to show that he was the master.²⁷² Richard was acting within the expectations of a king who only resorted to violence as a last resort. Failure to act against the violence was unmanly, as demonstrated by Philip. Thus kingship is shown to be performed and enacted, and whilst both men were technically kings only Richard acted like one here. The benefits of Richard's ideal kingly behaviour were clear: the crusaders remained in Messina for another six months after Richard's taking of the city, and it remained trouble free.²⁷³ This kind of justice enforcement was needed by crusade leadership for practical reasons, and it was also a requirement of elite masculinity to be able to implement it.

4.3. Acre Leadership Skills: Largesse and Prowess

The siege of Acre was initiated by King Guy of Jerusalem in August 1189 before the Third Crusade had begun, but it was essentially the first major event of the crusade since that is where those coming from the West made their way.²⁷⁴ By the time Richard and Philip had arrived in June 1191, the siege had been continuing for almost two years, and so the fall of Acre only a few weeks later on 12 July 1191 meant the kings' presence was a vital, if not pivotal contributor to this swift victory. Certain chroniclers describing their arrival wished to demonstrate the importance of their presence and its foreshadowing of the subsequent victory, but they also made sure to present Richard as being superior to Philip. For example, Richard of Devizes recorded: 'the king of the French had arrived at Acre before Richard and was much thought of by the natives, but when Richard came the king of the French was extinguished and made nameless, even as the moon loses its light at sunrise.'²⁷⁵ This expresses Richard's hegemonic

²⁷¹ For honour and vengeance see Chapter One, pp. 59-62.

²⁷² See above, p. 85.

²⁷³ Gillingham, *Richard I*, p. 192.

²⁷⁴ The siege of Acre now has a dedicated monograph, for an overview of events see: John Hosler, *The Siege of Acre 1189-1191* (London, 2018). Alternatively see: Tyerman, *God's War*, pp. 403-17 and pp. 448-55.

²⁷⁵ Devizes, p. 42.

position, designating him the most important leader of the crusade. The perception of Richard's superiority to Philip was also indicated by William of Newburgh who noted the rivalry between the two kings, presenting Philip as being jealous of Richard. He wrote: 'when the king of England, nobly triumphant, had joined the siege from Cyprus, presently the seeds of dissension manifestly sprung up, at the instigation of the devil, between him and the king of France, who was already sore at his successes.'²⁷⁶ William claimed this jealousy manifested through Philip's demand for half the gains won in Cyprus, which can also be seen as undermining his masculinity because he was shown to lust after temporal possessions which he had not deserved since he played no role in their acquisition.²⁷⁷

The arrival of Richard at Acre was not just for the benefit of onlookers, it served another practical purpose. For example, the *Itinerarium*, offering an elaboration of Ambroise's account, frames Richard's hegemonic position as enticing men to join him under his leadership: 'the Pisans were astonished at the greatness and glory of King Richard. They came before him and offered him homage and loyalty, submitting themselves of their own accord to this authority and committing themselves to serve him.'²⁷⁸ In fact we know that the Pisans had additional political motives for this submission and wanted to ally themselves with Richard because their maritime rivals from Genoa had been helping Philip.²⁷⁹ But the *Itinerarium* gave no hint of this, nor of any other explanation for the homage thus emphasising the impact which Richard's appearance and reputation had upon those around him.

²⁷⁶ trans. Stevenson, p. 590; William Newburgh, *Historia*, p. 353: 'Cum ... rex Anglorum a Cypro triumphator inclitus ad obsidionem venisset, mox inter ipsum et regem Francorum, quem ejus jam mordebat felicitas, manifeste dissidendi seminaria, auctore Sathana, provenerunt.'

²⁷⁷ For the conquest of Cyprus see: Mariusz Misztal, 'Richard the Lion-Heart's Conquest of Cyprus and its Presentation in the Versified *Estoire De La Guerre Sainte*', *Poetry and its language: papers in honour of Teresa Bela*, ed. M. Gibińska & W. Witalisz (Frankfurt am Main, 2012), pp. 51-72; James Brundage, 'Richard the Lion-Heart and Byzantium', *Studies in Medieval Culture*, 6/7 (1976), 63-70.

²⁷⁸ trans. Nicholson, p. 203; *Itinerarium*, pp. 212-13: 'Pisani regis Ricardi attoniti magnificentia et gloria, venientes ante eum, obtulerunt ei homagia sua et fidelitates, ejus se gratis obligantes imperio, et mancipientes obsequio.'

²⁷⁹ For more on the Pisan and Genoese role in the Third Crusade see Jonathan Phillips, 'The Third Crusade in context: contradiction, curiosity and survival', *Studies in Church History*, 51 (2015), 92-114. For Genoese and Pisans supporting the rival king see: Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 450.

There was a continuation of the competition between Richard and Philip but this now focused on the act of largesse. During the siege of Acre doling largesse became divisive. According to the *Itinerarium*:

King Richard came as was said, with an army and warlike valour. He later learnt that the king of France paid each knight three gold coins a month, and as a result had won the favour and gratitude of everyone. King Richard did not wish anyone to seem superior to him or even his equal in dealing of any kind. He ordered a proclamation to be made to the whole army that he would pay a fixed rate of four gold coins a month to each knight who wanted employment regardless of country of origin. So King Richard was universally extolled. It was declared that he surpassed everyone, not only in his merits and grace but also in the gifts he gave and his noble character.²⁸⁰

This has been criticised by some modern commentators as shedding a negative light on Richard. For example Bradbury suggested that Richard was deliberately provocative, that it was an attempt to flaunt his wealth and poach men from Philip.²⁸¹ Whereas Asbridge notes that it may have been perceived as 'pure, arrogant one-upmanship' from Richard but nevertheless it was effective in enlarging his army and giving him the balance of military power.²⁸² Flori also emphasises the positive affects it had for Richard because it resulted in his siege engines being better guarded than Philip's.²⁸³ However, this was not done just to annoy Philip but because largesse served an important social function. Fletcher asserts that largesse and gift giving

²⁸⁰ Ambroise, lines 4563-686; trans. Nicholson, p. 204; *Itinerarium*, pp. 213-14: 'venit rex Ricardus, sicut prcedictum est, cum exercitu et virtute bellorum. Qui postquam didicerat regem Franciae singulis mensibus erogasse singulis militibus tres aureos, et inde omnium obtinisset favorem et gratiam, rex Ricardus, ne quem in quibuscunque gerendis videretur habere superiorem, immo nec parem, voce praeconaria in omni jussit exercitu denunciari, ut milites singuli, cujuscunque regionis oriundi, qui stipendiis egerent, ab ipso reciperent singulis mensibus quatuor aureos, certa conditione statutos. Laudem ergo regis Ricardi efferebant universi, ipsum praedicantes aliis quibuscunque merito praecellere et gratia, qui cunctos etiam superavit in donariis et magnanimitate.'

²⁸¹ Bradbury, *Philip Augustus*, p. 90.

²⁸² Asbridge, *The Crusades*, p. 435.

²⁸³ Flori, *Richard the Lionheart*, p. 120.

functioned ‘as a marker of status.’²⁸⁴ As discussed in Chapter One its purpose was to cultivate social bonds thereby strengthening homosocial ties, which was integral to elite masculinity.²⁸⁵ As the richest man there, Richard’s status had to be marked by this action. If he did not pay the most he would have been criticised by the contemporary commentators. Hence the *Itinerarium* stated Richard could not bear to be perceived as below another man in status. Modern observers may think it was an ostentatious display of wealth presenting Richard as an arrogant show off, but this is a misinterpretation of medieval values because it fails to consider what medieval people wanted from their kings and also the performative nature of medieval kingship.

The editorial comments added by the *Itinerarium* to Ambroise’s account suggested this incident was important. This is further evidenced in relation to the amount of wages paid by Richard in comparison to Philip. Ambroise declared Richard’s offer of four gold coins to Philip’s three was ‘the right wages which should be distributed.’²⁸⁶ Whereas the *Itinerarium* stated Richard did not want to be outdone by Philip, Ambroise presented Philip as underpaying the soldiers thus conveying the notion that he was miserly. Being miserly is the antithesis of doling largesse. Whilst in a sense Ambroise’s presentation of the event is similar in results to the *Itinerarium*, with Richard presented more positively than Philip, the *Itinerarium*’s re-representation of the scene again suggests a didactic purpose. This was achieved by stressing the positive nature of Richard’s actions rather than Ambroise’s negative presentation of Philip.²⁸⁷ This was not the only instance of largesse being doled out by Richard, it was remarked upon several times throughout the text, for example at Christmas 1190 in Cyprus:

No less, to round off the festival perfectly King Richard gave each person gifts of incalculable value in accordance with their rank. He used to regret that he had wasted a day

²⁸⁴ Fletcher, *Richard II*, p. 48.

²⁸⁵ For homosociality see above, pp. 56-57.

²⁸⁶ Ambroise, lines 4563-686.

²⁸⁷ Richard of Devizes offered a different story regarding both kings’ attitude to largesse in which Richard is seen to be liberally giving whilst Philip was miserly, see: Devizes, pp. 42-43.

when he had not given anything away. His generosity could only be compared to that of the emperor Titus, whose “right hand scattered help”.²⁸⁸

We can see therefore how integral it was to his kingship and to maintaining homosocial bonds which, in turn, maintained his hegemonic position along with his reputation. The comparison to a Roman emperor likewise established Richard’s position as an ideal leader, more so that this was one who conquered Jerusalem.²⁸⁹

Now to turn to a consideration of prowess, as this was the main marker by which men could establish their superiority over each other. Richard was a known avid warrior before the crusade and he continued this path during the crusade through his defence of Christianity and the attempt to reclaim Jerusalem. Demonstrating prowess was vital to the construction of medieval elite masculinity because as Karras argues, ‘violence was the fundamental measure of a man because it was a way of exerting dominance over men of one’s own social stratum.’²⁹⁰ By being victorious over other men, a warrior defined his position in the hierarchy of masculinity.

As already discussed Richard demonstrated his prowess by capturing Messina in Sicily, and he also conquered Cyprus in May 1191 whilst travelling to Acre. Both Richard and Philip were expected to demonstrate their warrior leader skills when they arrived at Acre. However, soon after arriving Richard was first taken ill, shortly after Philip also became ill. This is an important issue because as Joanna Phillips argues, ‘to be a crusader leader was to inhabit a role predicated on capacity and physical ability,’ furthermore, ‘the bodily integrity of the male crusader leader

²⁸⁸ trans. Nicholson 171-2; *Itinerarium*, p.173: ‘Quinimmo, inaestimabilis pretii largitus est singulis rex Ricardus pro dignitate donaria, ad perfecte consummandam festivitatis gratiam. Diem nimirum se dolebat perdidisse, qua nihil se contingeret donasse, Titi solius liberalitati comparandus, cujus “Dextra sparsit opes.”’ The quote on Titus was taken from Suetonius.

²⁸⁹ Nick Vincent has considered the comparison of Richard and Titus in other aspects in: Nicholas Vincent, ‘William of Newburgh, Josephus and the new Titus’, *Christians and Jews in Angevin England: The York Massacre of 1190, Narratives and Contexts*, ed. Sarah Rees Jones & Sethina Watson (Woodbridge, 2013), pp. 57-90.

²⁹⁰ Karras, *From Boys to Men*, p. 21.

was key to his performance in that role.²⁹¹ Therefore an ill king could have his masculinity questioned because of his failure to embody his role. The cause of their illness and how they reacted were represented in markedly contrasting ways by the *Itinerarium*. Richard was struck down by an illness called Arnoldia.²⁹² This was probably a form of malaria or scurvy causing Richard to be bedridden.²⁹³ Despite this, Philip, who was not ill at this point, was unwilling to let Richard's absence prevent him launching the long-awaited attack on Acre. This began at the end of June 1191. However this was not successful, and in describing the fighting the *Itinerarium* ends by proclaiming many deaths afflicted the French army, at which people became distraught, believing the long-awaited presence of the two kings signalled a false dawn and that they were in fact no better off than before.²⁹⁴ This failure was further compounded by ignominy for Philip, when in response to his siege engines being burnt down he, 'was thrown into such a furious rage that he fell sick from grief. He was so distraught that he would not mount his horse.'²⁹⁵ As Spencer argues the use of 'furore' to describe anger in medieval narratives was done to demonstrate insensate fury, thus here when applied to Philip it demonstrated he lacked temperance over his emotions.²⁹⁶

However, Philip's illness was in fact similar to Richard's and thus not actually caused by grief due to the loss of his siege engine.²⁹⁷ Therefore the *Itinerarium* was deliberately misleading as to why Philip was ill. The purpose of this obfuscation was to present Richard as superior to Philip, because Philip's behaviour was indicative of an unmanly disposition. He was shown to lack self-mastery; having no control over his emotions.²⁹⁸ Allowing himself to be overcome by grief prevented him from engaging the enemy. Conversely, in order to demonstrate Richard's

²⁹¹ Phillips, 'Crusader masculinities', p. 151; p. 158.

²⁹² *Itinerarium*, p. 214.

²⁹³ Flori, *Richard the Lionheart*, p. 120. For more on this disease and the one suffered by Philip see: Wagner, 'The illness'.

²⁹⁴ *Itinerarium*, p. 214.

²⁹⁵ trans. Nicholson, p. 206; *Itinerarium*, p. 217: '...tanto irae furore turbatus est, quod prae tristitia decidit in languorem, sicut dicebatur, et equum non ascendebat ex desolatione et confusione.'

²⁹⁶ Spencer, 'Like a Raging Lion', 503.

²⁹⁷ Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 450.

²⁹⁸ For self-mastery as a property of elite masculinity see, p. 50.

superiority over Philip the *Itinerarium* described a distraught Richard demanding to engage the enemy despite his illness. Richard was, ‘confined to bed suffering from a severe fever, completely wretched because he saw the Turks insolently challenging and attacking our people with increasing frequency but he could not engage them in battle because he was ill. He suffered more torture from the insolent Turkish raids than from the burning fever.’²⁹⁹ It was not the illness that was causing him pain, it was his people being attacked and his inability to respond to this. However, with the siege ongoing Richard was determined to play some part in the fighting:

King Richard had not yet completely recovered from his sickness. However, he was eager for action because he was very anxious to capture the city... He had himself carried out to it on a silken bed, to discourage the Saracens with his presence and encourage his own to fight. There he used his crossbow, with which he was skilled, and killed many by firing bolts and darts at them.³⁰⁰

Richard even though unable to fight from horseback still managed to engage in the enemy by other means. The report here also suggested that Richard was aware of perceptions of him being lazy, thus he knew his masculinity was being questioned which confirms Phillip’s assertion that, ‘incapacity represented a threat not only to the execution of his role as leader, but also his reputation and masculine identity.’³⁰¹ Furthermore, the *Itinerarium* added to Ambroise’s account the part about Richard’s presence being used to discourage the Saracens.³⁰² This insertion is again proof that the physical presence of the leader, even when he could not fight, was integral as a

²⁹⁹ trans. Nicholson, p. 209; *Itinerarium*, p. 220: ‘... acrius febribus molestatus, lecto decubuerat, plurimum desolatus, quod Turcos videret nostros frequentius provocantes, et importunius se ingerentes, quibus prae infirmitate congregi nequibat: gravius enim torquebatur ille Turcorum importunis irruptionibus, quam ferventissimis quibus urebatur febribus.’

³⁰⁰ trans. Nicholson, p. 213; *Itinerarium*, p. 224-25: ‘Rex Ricardus nondum plene de infirmitate convaluerat. Verum tamen gerendorum sollicitus, magnopere vacabat urbi capiendae ... seque illuc fecit deportari in culcitra serica, ut Saracenos sua oneraret praesentia, et suos animaret ad pugnandum. Inde sua utebatur balista, cujus erat peritus, et plures jaculis peremit emissis et pilis.’

³⁰¹ Phillips, ‘Crusader masculinities’, p. 159.

³⁰² Ambroise, lines 4921-81.

morale booster, and played a significant role in the victory, and its inclusion must therefore be for its didactic potential.

4.4. Philip's Departure

Shortly after the crusaders had taken Acre on 12 July 1191 Philip announced his shock decision to return home to France. This was despite the fact that the crusade's objective of regaining Jerusalem from Muslim control had not yet been completed. Modern scholars have put forth various reasonings for him doing so. Asbridge believes Philip was a king first, crusader second and that his heart was not in crusading but rather in enlarging his realm.³⁰³ Tyerman suggests 'Philip may have resented the personal dominance Richard asserted as soon as he reached Acre.'³⁰⁴ Jim Bradbury defended Philip's decision, suggesting, he 'had good cause to think he was needed in France. The prolonged absence of a monarch was always harmful to a state in this period. The king was head of the government and for all the careful arrangements he had made, Philip knew there was no substitute for his own presence.'³⁰⁵ However, Bradbury does not mention that the same reasoning could be applied to Richard, especially given the threat posed by his brother John. Yet Richard did not leave. Moreover, Bradbury asserts Richard had been difficult to work with and was argumentative with everyone.³⁰⁶ He concludes by stating, 'Philip's role at Acre was integral and part of the best success' of the crusade.³⁰⁷ Conversely McGlynn states: 'for all Philip's later victories, Philip's chivalrous standing sunk at Acre and recovered only partially in France thanks to royal biographers. Few would forget his desertion of the cause. This was the exact opposite of the glory that a crusade should bestow on a king, even one who, like Richard, ultimately failed in his holy mission to retake Jerusalem.'³⁰⁸ This difference of opinion is testament to the fact that Bradbury's spirited defence of Philip is based on the later French

³⁰³ Asbridge, *The Crusades*, pp. 447-48.

³⁰⁴ Tyerman, *God's War*, pp. 450-51.

³⁰⁵ Bradbury, *Philip Augustus*, p. 93.

³⁰⁶ Bradbury, *Philip Augustus*, p. 94.

³⁰⁷ Bradbury, *Philip Augustus*, p. 95.

³⁰⁸ McGlynn, 'Fighting the image', pp. 163-64.

sources such as Rigord, which do not reflect how the *Itinerarium* represented Philip and Richard.³⁰⁹

Various opinions were expressed by contemporary chroniclers as to why Philip departed when he did. For example, William of Newburgh claimed that Philip could not acclimatise to the heat of the Levant and derided him as ‘branding himself with the mark of effeminacy.’³¹⁰ Ambroise recorded Philip’s decision as based on him being ill, to which Ambroise countered: ‘But there is no witness that illness gives a dispensation from going with the army of the Almighty King, who directs the path of all kings.’³¹¹ Significantly, the *Itinerarium* did not give a reason for Philip’s departure, simply stating the king believed his crusade vow was discharged but there was criticism of his decision to leave:

It was his duty to guide this great crowd of people, to encourage the Christian people in such pious and necessary work and to ensure the progress of such an arduous undertaking! What was the use of his eager intention to complete that long journey when he was going to return so quickly? What an extraordinary way of discharging a vow, when he had hardly entered the country and had such brief triumphs against the Turks.³¹²

The kingly expectation of leading the crusade and recovering Jerusalem was further emphasised:

[the] most powerful and prestigious of Christian kings he certainly deserved to capture the city. Yet because he had greater strength and more outstanding prestige than others he was

³⁰⁹ For Rigord see: Rigord, *Histoire de Philippe Auguste*, ed. & trans. Elisabeth Carpentier, Georges Pon, & Yves Chauvin (Paris, 2006).

³¹⁰ William of Newburgh, *Historia*, pp. 356-57: ‘delicati sibi ... notam inurens.’

³¹¹ Ambroise, lines 5238-65: Mais nus n’ad de ço testimoine / Que maladie en seit essoigne / D’ ale en l’ost le rei demaine / Qui toz les reis conduit e maine.’

³¹² trans. Nicholson, p. 223; *Itinerarium*, p. 236: ‘cujus intererat tantam populi multitudinem regere, et in opus tam pium populo Christiano tam necessarium instigare, et negotii tam ardui procurare processum! O quid tantopere viam longissimam eam avida pene inutiliter pervenerat intentione, praepropere rediturus! O quam egregie votum absolutum, terram scilicet tantum intrasse, et tam brevibus in Turcos decertasse triumphis!’

held to have a greater responsibility for the recovery of that desolate country, destitute of aid, which the Gentiles had entered to pollute.³¹³

This emphasis here was on his failure to enact ideal kingship which stood in stark contrast to Richard who would remain and continue to fight. As such The *Itinerarium's* contrasting of Richard and Philip's actions and the competitive framework in which they were placed were intended to show Richard's elite masculine superiority. Once Philip had left Richard needed another foil against which his superior manliness could be measured. Thus the *Itinerarium* drew comparisons between Richard and Conrad instead, in order to keep up the emphasis on his hegemonic status in relation to other lesser men.

5. Richard and Conrad

Despite Philip leaving, much of his army remained to continue the crusade. Conrad of Montferrat was placed in charge of the French army, along with the duke of Burgundy, by Philip, rather than letting Richard command all.³¹⁴ Conrad claimed the crown of the Kingdom of Jerusalem through marriage to Princess Isabella, thus challenging the claim of Guy of Lusignan who claimed the crown through being married to Queen Sibylla, who died during the siege of Acre, both of these women were sisters of the former king, Baldwin IV (r. 1174-85).³¹⁵ Richard and Philip joined the debate on who should rule the kingdom, Richard supporting Guy, and Philip supporting Conrad and Isabella.³¹⁶ However, the arguments surrounding the throne are

³¹³ trans. Nicholson, p. 224; *Itinerarium*, p. 237: 'circa obtinendam civitatem, tanquam videlicet regum Christianorum potentissimus et excellentissimae dignitatis merito acquisivisse; unde quanto virtute potentior et excellentia praestantior, tanto recuperandae terrae desolatae et auxilio destitutae, in quam gentes venerunt polluendam, teneretur obnoxior.'

³¹⁴ For a short biography of Conrad of Montferrat see: David Jacoby, 'Conrad of Montferrat (d. 1192)', *The Crusades an Encyclopaedia*, ed. Alan Murray (Oxford, 2006), pp. 273-74. For more on Conrad also see: David Jacoby, 'Conrad, marquis of Montferrat and the kingdom of Jerusalem (1187-1192)', *Trade, Commodities and Shipping in the Medieval Mediterranean*, ed. David Jacoby, (Aldershot, 1997), pp. 187-238.

³¹⁵ For more on Guy of Lusignan see: Jonathan Riley-Smith, 'The crusading heritage of Guy and Aimery of Lusignan', in *He Kupros kai boi Staurophories / Cyprus and the Crusades*, ed. Nikos Coureas & Jonathan Riley-Smith (Nicosia, 1995), pp. 31-45. Peter Edbury, 'Propaganda and faction in the Kingdom of Jerusalem: the background to Hattin', *Kingdoms of the Crusaders: From Jerusalem to Cyprus*, ed. Peter Edbury (Aldershot, 1999), pp. 173-89; Bernard Hamilton, *The Leper King and His Heirs* (Cambridge, 2000).

³¹⁶ For background on this dispute see Tyerman, *God's War*, pp. 406-09.

beyond this chapter, instead this section will look at the comparisons drawn between Richard and Conrad's actions as kings within the *Itinerarium*. Inevitably Richard was presented as conforming to the ideals of elite masculinity whilst Conrad failed at them, and in turn at kingship. The purpose of this presentation was manifold. It took away any blame for the crusade's failure from Richard by presenting Conrad as a problematic man who prevented the crusade army from being unified. This also served the further purpose of demonstrating that Richard was right to have preferred the claims of Guy over those of Conrad, because Conrad did not exhibit the right qualities to rule the kingdom of Jerusalem.

This section will analyse the *Itinerarium's* presentation of Conrad's failings. It will then move to how Richard was presented in comparison to Conrad. From this it will be argued that part of the purpose was to inculcate the norms of good kingship into the audience, achieved through conforming to elite masculine ideals.

5.1. Conrad's Failings

Conrad of Montferrat was cousin to both German Emperor Frederick Barbarossa and King Louis VII of France. His family had a long crusading pedigree. His brother William Longsword had been betrothed to Sibylla, sister of King Baldwin IV of Jerusalem. He died before she gave birth to their son, the ill-fated King Baldwin V. Conrad arrived in the Holy Land in the immediate aftermath of Saladin's victory at Hattin on 4 July 1187. He took over the city of Tyre ensuring its defence against Saladin. Unimpressed with King Guy he refused him entry into the city, believing he himself should be king because he held Tyre. This caused Guy to march to Acre and begin the siege there.³¹⁷ Marrying Isabella on 24 November 1190 he claimed to be king through right of his wife.

³¹⁷ Jacoby, 'Conrad'.

Eventually the issue of Conrad or Guy being king was settled in 1192. The decision was made by Richard based on asking what the local barons wanted. They chose Guy because ‘they considered him to be of more use to the kingdom because he was the more powerful.’³¹⁸

Whereas they rejected Guy because he:

had so far been unsuccessful in the business of winning the kingdom [so] they thought the most essential thing was to create a new king whom everyone would obey, to whom the country could be entrusted, who would wage the people’s wars and whom the whole army would follow.³¹⁹

From this it was clear that waging war was considered the most appropriate action for a king and in fact central to the reason Conrad was selected by the people. It was crucially important that a king of Jerusalem be an accomplished warrior leader because of the circumstances of it being surrounded by enemies. This was reinforced when Richard sent ambassadors to tell Conrad the decision. Framing his duty as a gendered role, Conrad was told that he was to be king, ‘on condition that he come with his army to take on manfully (*viriliter*) the responsibilities of the kingdom, exact vengeance (*ultionem*) from the Turks, and apply himself henceforth to the government of the kingdom of Jerusalem, as it would belong to him.’³²⁰ The use of ‘viriliter’ in regards to the responsibilities can be deduced as an emphasis on military concerns and Conrad’s need to be an affective military leader. The position required someone with the requisite manliness to carry out the masculine requirement of vengeance (*ultionem*).³²¹ As Fletcher notes vengeance was a required response to shame or loss of honour, and this is how the crusaders and

³¹⁸ trans. Nicholson, p. 303; *Itinerarium*, p. 335: ‘exorabant Marchisum in principem elevandum et defensorem, quoniam quidem ipsum reputabant regno magis necessarium, quia potentiorum.’

³¹⁹ trans. Nicholson, pp. 302-03; *Itinerarium*, p. 335: ‘quia rex Guido regni negotium obtinendi nondum potuit ad effectum deducere, necessarium quam maxime censebant in terra regem novum creandum, cui omnes obedirent, cui terra committeretur, qui praeliaretur bella populi, quem denique cunctus sequeretur exercitus.’

³²⁰ trans. Nicholson, pp. 304-05; *Itinerarium*, p. 337: ‘Quatenus veniret regni negotia viriliter cum exercitu suo gesturus, ultionem in Turcos exacturus, et ut de caetero regno Jerosolimitano tanquam suo intenderet gubernando.’

³²¹ Fletcher, *Richard II*, p. 25. Vengeance is also identified by Fletcher as a manly trait as it is a response to shame and loss of honour, p. 34.

Latin Franks viewed the loss of Jerusalem.³²² They needed this to be rectified and honour restored. Nonetheless, the problem was that Conrad refused to enact these characteristics, in fact, the following will now discuss two examples of this and how he instead exhibited cowardice and lust making him unkingly. This was in contrast to Richard who could counter both.

Conrad's cowardice was presented by his seeming reluctance to fight. This failing had a major effect on the crusade. After the conquest of Acre the crusaders' plan was to move south down the Levantine coast then head inland towards Jerusalem. Instead Conrad headed in the opposite direction to Tyre. King Richard, wanting to continue the crusade and complete its objective, sent ambassadors to Conrad to get him to join with crusaders, which was what Conrad was expected to do as a claimant of the title of King of Jerusalem. The *Itinerarium* records: 'the marquis made an irate reply to these three ambassadors. In no way would he come – giving as his excuse that he feared the presence of King Richard.'³²³ Here Ambroise and the *Itinerarium's* account diverge. The ambassadors sent to Conrad in Ambroise's account, on hearing the marquis's reply were reported to have, 'thought less of him', while the *Itinerarium* recorded, 'tried to soothe him with flattery.'³²⁴ This difference between these two accounts is that Ambroise offers judgment whilst the *Itinerarium* offers advice on how to counteract the problem. Nonetheless, the ambassadors failed to achieve what they had set out to do and so when Richard was told of what had happened he was extremely angry.³²⁵ Subsequently Richard sent Duke Hugh of Burgundy and two other leading French nobles to persuade Conrad to come with his army. The *Itinerarium* argued Conrad's 'presence certainly seemed essential for progress in these matters. He aspired to obtain the kingdom but he was running away from getting it.'³²⁶ Then recording what happened

³²² For vengeance as a property of elite masculinity see above, pp. 61-62.

³²³ trans. Nicholson, p. 230; *Itinerarium*, p. 242: 'His tribus legatis indignanter respondit Marchisus, quod nullatenus veniret, praetendens occasionem quod formidaret regis Ricardi praesentiam.'

³²⁴ Ambroise, line 5432: 'Si sachiez que mains l'en preiserent.'; trans. Nicholson, p. 230; *Itinerarium*, p. 242: 'blanditiis eum tentaverunt mitigare.'

³²⁵ *Itinerarium*, p. 242.

³²⁶ trans. Nicholson, p. 230; *Itinerarium*, p. 242: 'Ejus quippe praesentia negotiorum profectibus videbatur necessaria, praecipue cum ad obtinendum regnum aspiraret, quod refugiebat acquirere.'

to these new ambassadors the *Itinerarium* wrote: ‘on King Richard’s behalf they firmly requested the marquis to come to their aid in Syria – as he himself hoped to gain the lordship of that country. He replied rudely and arrogantly, asserting that in no way would he come, but would take care of his own city.’³²⁷ Here Conrad’s cowardice manifested in a fear of Richard, causing him to refuse to fight for the kingdom he claimed to rule. This was quite a strange situation because a king should never refuse to defend his kingdom, defending it was part of his kingly duty. For example, Gerald of Wales described Philip Augustus as ‘taking up arms against Henry II to manfully assert his claim to the Auvergne’, demonstrating it was an attribute of elite masculinity to deploy arms to defend one’s rightful lands, which was a part of the concept of honour.³²⁸ This example demonstrates that Philip could act in a manly way in certain circumstances, such as defending his own land but seemingly not the Holy Land. Likewise Orderic Vitalis praised Godfrey of Bouillon thus: ‘he was almost always engaged in war against the Philistines, and thanks to his great courage, enlarged the boundaries of his kingdom.’³²⁹ But Conrad appeared to be satisfied with solely holding Tyre. Moreover the suggestion of him running away (*refugiebat*) from his kingdom has connotations of a coward fleeing the battlefield. This is an attack on his manhood as the idea of fleeing from battle was considered shameful, this was expressed clearly in *L’Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal*, which decried: ‘Flee when no one’s chasing you? Never! God forbid! How shameful.’³³⁰ In fact joining battle was something to be relished according to the author: ‘God forsake anyone who’d rather be elsewhere!’³³¹ Additionally, fighting in battle was vital, as argued by Karras above, because it was here men demonstrated their manhood.³³² This links back once more to the performative nature of

³²⁷ trans. Nicholson, p. 230; *Itinerarium*, p. 242: ‘regis Ricardi rogantibus, ut Marchisus in eorum veniret adiutorium in Syriam, cujus se sperabat obtenturum dominium, proterve respondit et arroganter, se contestans nullo modo venturum, immo civitatis suae curam habiturum.’

³²⁸ Gerald of Wales, p. 572: ‘arma sumere et Aluerniam uiriliter uendicare decreuit.’

³²⁹ Vitalis V, p. 341: ‘et in procinctu bellico pene assiduus contra Philisteos constitit ingentique probitate fretus regni fines dilatauit.’

³³⁰ trans. Bryant, p. 49; *Maréchal*, lines 2053-55: ‘Fuïr s’en quant nuls ne vos chace, / Ce n’ert ja fait; ja Dex ne place! / Molt nos porreit ester grant honte.’

³³¹ trans. Bryant, p. 49; *Maréchal*, lines 2065-66: ‘Que ja Damnedue nel conduie / Qui aillors de ci voldra estre!’

³³² See above, p. 78.

masculinity and kingship. In addition there was a higher purpose to Conrad's kingship, the necessity of regaining Jerusalem from the Muslims, which added a further pressing reason for him to act in its defence. This is why other elite males were shown to be perplexed at Conrad's behaviour.

Conrad's actions (or lack of) caused an impediment to the crusade and left the French contingent effectively leaderless. This had serious ramifications which manifested when many of the French crusaders would not leave Acre to march south to Jerusalem at the end of August 1191. The *Itinerarium* presented these crusaders thus:

The people came out of the city in a trickle, because they were too addicted to idleness and easy living, and the city had too many pleasures, i.e. excellent wine and the most beautiful girls. Most of them led a dissolute life, resorting to women and wine, so that the city was polluted by their foolish pleasure-seeking and the gluttony of its inhabitants. Their shameless behaviour made wiser faces blush.³³³

It was clear these men lacked the hegemonic masculine example and control essential to an army, because as shown by their drinking and relations with women men would fall into unrestrained lustful behaviour. The role of the leader was to be wise about how men should act and enforce rules to prevent them becoming immoral and incapable, which is how they were presented here. Conrad's inability within the *Itinerarium* either to recognise this or implement it demonstrated his own lack of manliness.

Contrastingly, the account continued with Richard imposing his leadership over other men by prising the crusaders away from Acre to continue the crusade. The *Itinerarium* wrote: 'after consultation it was arranged that in order to eradicate this unsightly blemish no woman should

³³³ trans. Nicholson, p. 235; *Itinerarium*, p. 248: 'Populus nimiae deditus desidia, et luxui, tenuiter egrediebatur ab urbe, quae nimis erat deliciis abundans, videlicet, vino peroptimo, et puellia pulcherrimis. Mulieres igitur frequentantes et vina, nimis dissolute se gerebant quam plurimi, ut civitas pollueretur a luxuria insipientium et gula inhabitantium in ea, a quorum impudentia facies sapientiorum contrahebat ruborem.'

leave the city with the army; they should remain in the city. The only exception was laundresses on foot, who would not be a burden on the army nor a cause of sin.³³⁴ Glover and Kaplan have shown that women's presence in the male space, such as the battlefield, make men forget what they are supposed to be doing, thereby undermining them as men.³³⁵ This incident has been used to explore the roles of women in the crusade.³³⁶ But it is also an important episode to show how male behaviour was managed. These men that were engaging in pleasures of flesh and consumption were acting inappropriately, especially on a crusade. Thus the removal of women was practical as a means of trying to ensure that men did not give in to lust and commit sins, which would have caused the loss of divine favour. As explored in Chapter One, in the late twelfth century many writers often blamed women's presence on campaign as a reason for failure.³³⁷ King Richard dealt with this by setting a high standard of masculine behaviour in his own person and thus having the authority to enforce it upon others. Herein lies the importance of the *Itinerarium's* account of Richard's attempt to turn the crusade into a male space.³³⁸ The comparison between Richard and Conrad's leadership ability was clear; if Conrad had conformed to the ideals of elite masculinity then he would have acted as Richard did. But he did not reach these standards. Instead he lacked moral strength and authority, key attributes of kingship.

The next instance to consider regarding Conrad's unmanly behaviour involves Conrad himself giving into lust and thus once more neglecting his duty as a king. In 1192 the crusaders were rebuilding Ascalon from which they could launch an attack on Jerusalem. The *Itinerarium* reported that Richard sent ambassadors to Conrad who was in Tyre requesting that he should

³³⁴ trans. Nicholson, p. 235; *Itinerarium*, p. 248: 'Ad auferendam autem hujus maculae rubiginosam spurcitiam, procuratum est de consilio, ne qua mulier exiret a civitate cum exercitu, sed remanerent in civitate, nisi tantum pedites lotrices, quae non forent oneri, nec occasio peccati.'

³³⁵ David Glover & Cora Kaplan, *Genders* 2nd (London, 2009), p. 88.

³³⁶ For example, see: Nicholson, 'Women', 335-49, especially p. 337; Hodgson, *Women*, pp. 136-37.

³³⁷ See above, p. 51.

³³⁸ Alan Murray notes that the Third and Fourth Crusades use of ships as transport was initiated to reduce the presence of women on the crusade: Alan Murray, 'Contrasting masculinities in the Baltic crusades: Teutonic Knights and secular crusaders at war and peace in late medieval Prussia', *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Natasha Hodgson, Katherine J. Lewis, & Matthew Mesley (London, 2019), p. 114.

come and join Richard's army in Ascalon.³³⁹ An additional clause was added that Conrad should, 'be earnest in executing his duties on behalf of the kingdom to which he aspired, commanding him to do this on the basis of the oath of loyalty which he had previously made to the king of France.'³⁴⁰ Once more expectations surrounded Conrad's actions. The aforementioned oath sworn by Conrad to Philip upon his departures had not been lived up to, meaning he would be perceived as acting without honour, a key attribute of his manhood.³⁴¹ The *Itinerarium* recorded Conrad's response to Richard's request:

that degenerate (*degener*) marquis made a perverse and mocking response to this mandate. He claimed that he would in no way come unless he could first hold a conference with King Richard, otherwise he would not lift a foot to go to the army, nor would a foot lift him. So, they agreed to meet at Casal Imbert for a conference.³⁴²

This differs from Ambroise's version of events, who recorded Conrad's response thus: 'The marquis sent back the message that he would not set foot in the camp before he spoke with the king. Later, so it seems, they spoke together at Casal Imbert.'³⁴³

The change in tone and the greater detail that the *Itinerarium* added to Ambroise's account could be explained by the author's frustration about Conrad's obstinate behaviour, so he expressed this as an attack on Conrad's manhood and honour. The Latin adjective 'degener', translated here as degenerate, can also mean 'inferior to ancestors', 'ignoble' or 'unworthy'. These words make an explicit connection to his failure to live up to established standards of masculinity. He was not being the man he should be in relation to his status. Moreover he was not concerned for the loss

³³⁹ Ambroise, lines 8121-218.

³⁴⁰ trans. Nicholson, p. 290; *Itinerarium*, p. 319: 'vices suas executurus ex animo, pro parte regni ad quod aspiraverat: et hoc mandavit ei super praestitum olim super eodem coram rege Franciae etiam fide media juramentum.'

³⁴¹ For honour see Chapter One, pp. 59-60.

³⁴² trans. Nicholson, p. 290; *Itinerarium*, pp. 319-20: 'Super hoc mandato perverse sentiens et subsannans, ille degener Marchisus asserebat se eo nullatenus venturum, nisi prius habito cum rege Ricardo colloquio. Aliter autem ad exercitum protestatus est quod nec pedem portaret, sed nec pes ipsum. Verumtamen ex conducto apud casellum Ymberti convenerunt postmodum ad colloquium.'

³⁴³ Ambroise, lines 8121-218: 'E li marchis lui remanda / Qu'en l'ost son pié n'en portereit / Devant ço qu'a lui parlereit. / E puis parlerent il ensemble / Al Casal Ymbert – ço me semble.'

of honour this incurred instead demonstrating a sense of self-interest. Additionally his response to Richard showed him lacking decorum or understanding of how to socially interact with people of equal or higher status than himself. It essentially further demonstrated the point that he was not performing kingship to the required standards.

Richard and Conrad held their prearranged conference at Casal Imbert in February 1192 but could not reach an agreement on how to proceed with the crusade. The *Itinerarium* had hopes for this meeting, writing: 'if through divine grace they came to some agreement, they could proceed more efficiently in their affairs and the whole kingdom could be administered more effectively by their combined authority.'³⁴⁴ It was only through unity that anything successful would be achieved. But these hopes were not fulfilled, as the *Itinerarium* reported Conrad 'endeavoured to excuse himself from any involvement with the army, resorting to specious quibbling.'³⁴⁵ Consequently the *Itinerarium* attacked Conrad's masculinity writing that after the meeting Conrad left the military camp, returned to his base at Tyre and 'and devoted himself to the marriage bed' (*contulit uxoriis thalamus*).³⁴⁶ In this case 'uxoriis' can also mean 'enslaved to one's wife', the ambiguity thus implies a gendered attack on Conrad. Since he was newly married, and king only by marriage, he was understandably keen to produce an heir as soon as possible, but this justification is not mentioned in the *Itinerarium*. Instead the implication was that Conrad was overindulging in his sexual appetite, when he should have been devoting himself to battle. He was not practising self-mastery but instead under the power of a woman demonstrating his lack of manhood. Furthermore, by not remaining in the army in order to defeat the Islamic army he was cowardly. He clearly demonstrated no interest in the crusade, in regaining Jerusalem or any notion of Christian brotherhood. He was the antithesis of working for the common good, instead displaying self-interest again. This was not how a king, or ideal man should act.

³⁴⁴ trans. Nicholson, p. 293; *Itinerarium*, p. 323: 'si forte gratia divina concordantes in unam sententiam efficacius in agendis proficerent, et totius regni res publica ex utriusque communicata virtute fortius administraretur.'

³⁴⁵ trans. Nicholson, p. 293; *Itinerarium*, p. 323: 'et argumentosis cavillationibus se nitebatur a negotiorum exercitio excusare.'

³⁴⁶ trans. Nicholson, p. 293; *Itinerarium*, p. 323: 'contulit uxoriis thalamus.'

Richard, in comparison to Conrad, was not shown to give in to lust or be spellbound by a woman. Although he married Berengaria at Cyprus on 12 May 1191 her absence from the narrative presented by the *Itinerarium* is striking.³⁴⁷ This is part of the tactic noted above whereby the *Itinerarium* emphasises that Richard making the crusade an almost entirely male space where abstinence from sexual relations and desire was enforced. This was earlier demonstrated by not allowing most of the women to leave from Acre with the army, even his own wife and sister. Although Richard needed to produce an heir, hence the marriage occurring en route to the Holy Land, this did not take precedence over the crusade, unlike lustful Conrad.

5.2. Richard: Industry and Hypermasculinity

Richard was often shown to be acting with energy, a characteristic of elite masculinity, which manifested through him being industrious.³⁴⁸ The purpose of Richard's industry and labour was to demonstrate his leadership, which was both paramount and incomparable with others, although there are also practical reasons for both. The key point is the ways in which they were represented in the text. For example, whilst at Ascalon in 1192 it was decided that the crusaders would rebuild the fortified city that Saladin had torn down to prevent its use. Richard, recognizing his actions as being integral to success and also a motivator for others, was directly involved with the rebuilding. To demonstrate this the *Itinerarium* recorded:

the king played a prominent part in the work as he did in all his operations. By building with his own hands, urging others on and distributing money he helped the work to advance more effectively. On his encouragement, each of the chiefs and magnates took responsibility for completing a part of the building, each according to their means. If any of them abandoned the work because of their lack of money, the noble-minded king, whose heart was greater than his rank, would bestow on them whatever they needed from his own

³⁴⁷ Gillingham, *Richard I*, p. 125.

³⁴⁸ On energy see: Fletcher, *Richard II*, p. 63.

resources. So, the work advanced so much at his nod, with his persuasion, through his efforts and expense that it was said he was responsible for the complete rebuilding of three-quarters of the city.³⁴⁹

This fostered Richard's hegemonic status. He was shown to be an equal within his homosocial circle, doing as his men were doing. However, his largesse set him apart because he could fund others. This was done to maintain the work spirit and group dynamic that was integral to homosocial bonds and more importantly achieving the results demanded from the crusade. Lewis identifies equality in the camp as being integral to Henry V's own leadership skills because it engendered 'proper esprit de corps' and that Henry 'was not asking anything of his men that he was not prepared to do himself.'³⁵⁰ This applied to Richard here in this situation and the presentation of this episode functioned as an exemplar for kingship on crusade. This was also an important vignette because Markowski, using Ambroise's dissatisfaction as evidence, accused Richard of not progressing the crusade since rebuilding Ascalon was not a direct attack on Jerusalem.³⁵¹ Gillingham notes that it was 'sound military strategy but it was not for this that many soldiers had crossed the sea.'³⁵² However it was for Richard to manage the crusade as wisely as possible and not run headfirst into a defeat, even if that was what the pilgrims may have wanted. Richard knew that the attack on Jerusalem needed careful planning and preparation, and part of this was to develop a strong homosocial bond among his troops.

Another example of Richard's industry whilst based at Ascalon was when he rescued Christian captives that were being transported by Saladin. Richard had gone to reconnoitre a castle at

³⁴⁹ trans. Nicholson, p. 289; *Itinerarium*, p. 317: 'Rex ibidem operando etiam insignis enituit, qui in omnibus operibus suis singularis eminebat; ipse manibus aedificando, ipse sermone persuadendo, ipse impensas distribuendo, efficacius proficiebat. Ad cujus exhortationem singuli procerum et magnatum proportionaliter, pro suae possibilitatis facultate, partem amplexati sunt consummandam. Quorum si quis, deficient forte pecunia, ab operando defecisset, tunc rex magnanimus corde major quam dignitate, eisdem impertiebat de facultatibus suis, prout singulos noverat indigere. Ipso denique innuente, ipso persuadente, ipso operam impendente simul et impensas, in tantum opus invaluit, ut tres aedificandae civitatis partes ejus sumptibus dicerentur consummate.'

³⁵⁰ Lewis, *Kingship and Masculinity*, p. 126.

³⁵¹ Markowski, 'Richard lionheart', 355.

³⁵² Gillingham, *Richard I*, p. 192.

Darum to plan its capture, whilst at the same time, according to the *Itinerarium*, the Turks were moving 1200 Christian prisoners. Richard attacked, killing numerous Turks, taking hostages, capturing horses and importantly releasing the Christian prisoners. The *Itinerarium* summed up this vignette proclaiming: 'Who can doubt that God brought about the king's arrival, which was so essential to the captives? If he and his people had not arrived then, all those he rescued from the enemy's hands would without doubt have been condemned to perpetual slavery.'³⁵³ Once more Richard's actions in helping others are shown to be important, and achieved because he was an active king; if he had not gone out he would not have crossed paths with these Turks with the captives. It was his prowess that caused them to be defeated and ensured that the Christians were saved. For this, Ambroise called him St Leonard, the saint who freed prisoners.³⁵⁴ Otherwise these captives would have not been saved but instead taken into slavery and eventual death.

Another method of contrasting Richard and Conrad's behaviour was through demonstrations of Richard acting in a hypermasculine way. This is the notion of demonstrating extreme violence in order to present a scenario of power.³⁵⁵ This furthered Richard's hegemonic masculine status reinforcing his leadership abilities and setting him apart from other men. The first instance from the *Itinerarium* is the presentation of Richard hunting down Muslims for sport in the spring of 1192 while he was awaiting his messengers to return from Tyre, with Conrad in tow. The *Itinerarium*, based on Ambroise, recorded the following event:

King Richard kept up untiring activity, pursuing the Turks tirelessly and persistently. There was never his like in that country, or anyone whom the Turks feared so much: he attacked them so often, wearing them down without a break, frequently charging almost alone

³⁵³ trans. Nicholson, p. 290; *Itinerarium*, p. 319: 'Quis regis eo adventum, captivandis tam necessarium, a Deo procuratum dubitaverit? Qui nisi tunc cum suis sic venisset, universi quos excussit a manu hostili, proculdubio perpetua damnarentur servitute.'

³⁵⁴ Ambroise, lines 8121-218.

³⁵⁵ See above, pp. 52-53.

against many. Almost every day that he happened to run into the Turks he would carry back perhaps ten, or twelve, or twenty, or thirty heads of his enemies. He also brought back captives alive, whatever seemed best to him. Never in Christian times were so many Saracens destroyed by one person.³⁵⁶

The fact that he was shown to be alone furthers the idea of his hypermasculinity. This was an extreme act of violence done to strike fear into his enemies. It also ensured his own people of their safety and emphasised him as the provider of that safety. Consequently this reinforced his hegemonic position as no other men were shown to act in this way, nor were any comparable as the text stated. This scenario was intended to indicate the prowess and bravery of Richard, demonstrating his exceptional strength and martial skill. This also provided a model for future crusade leaders.

The next recorded incident took place on 22 April 1192 and told of how Richard was in a joust with a boar. This incident, unlike the one just mentioned, was not found in Ambroise, or any other work about Richard. It fits into Carol Sweetenham's arguments about anecdotes, which are often found in crusade narratives. Sweetenham defines an anecdote as a self-contained story within a narrative which is a breakaway from the main narrative; it must appear to be an authentic story, and it is told for a purpose, either, amusement, illustration or edification.³⁵⁷ Sweetenham argues an anecdote's function was to make a good story, which it certainly does in this case, but it also functioned to demonstrate Richard's embodiment of ideal masculinity. The story, too long to recount here, ended with them charging at each other three times, which the *Itinerarium* described thus: 'They each attacked each other again. The boar launched a charge

³⁵⁶ Ambroise, lines 8929-63; trans. Nicholson, p. 309; *Itinerarium*, p. 343: 'rex Ricardus infatigabili exercitio Turcos invadens infatigabiliter persequabatur et pertinaciter. Nunquam enim similis illi comparuit in terra illa; quem Turci sic metuerent, qui sic ipsos afficeret, sine intermissione contereret, se pene solum frequentius in multos ingereret, capita hostium reportaret, singulis fere diebus quibus Turcos sibi contingeret occurrere, nunc capita decem, nunc duodecim, nunc viginti, nunc triginta. Nihilominus, cum sibi visum esset, vivos reducebat captivos. Nunquam profecto per unum hominem tot Saraceni deleti sunt temporibus Christianis.'

³⁵⁷ Carol Sweetenham, 'What really happened to Eurvin de Créel's donkey? Anecdotes in sources for the First Crusade', *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory*, ed. Marcus Bull & Damien Kempf (Woodbridge, 2014), p. 76.

against the king; the king brandished his sword as it came and struck the back of its neck, cutting into it. While the boar was stunned by the blow the king moved quickly, spun his horse around again and cut the boar's throat.³⁵⁸ Hodgson has discussed this incident and compared it to the incident on the First Crusade when the crusade leader Godfrey of Bouillon fought a bear.³⁵⁹ She concludes that it was used to demonstrate Richard's prowess and his riding skills but that unlike the incident involving Godfrey there was no moral judgement to this story.³⁶⁰ Helen Nicholson notes the story was used in the fourteenth century in the romance *De ortu Walwani* in which the main character Gawain is shown to replicate many of Richard the Lionheart's deeds from the Third Crusade.³⁶¹ Nicholson also notes a long tradition of boar hunting in literary tradition although this case was not a hunt, but a head-to-head.³⁶² The story added to the notion of Richard's prowess and bravery. But it can be further viewed as an instance of hypermasculinity as again it involved violence in order to assert his position as the hegemonic male. Fighting a boar in this manner would have linked Richard to the stories of Hercules, who fought a boar as part of his twelve labours and fighting wild beasts does seem to be a trope that captured the essence of legendary warriors.³⁶³ The anecdote also served to demonstrate the prowess needed to be a king, which when seen in contrast to every other male on the crusade only Richard displayed, especially in comparison to Conrad who, though supposed to be a king, demonstrated none of the required physical or mental attributes, according to the *Itinerarium*. The contrasts between Richard and Conrad within the *Itinerarium* were elaborations of Ambroise's text to demonstrate the need for ideal masculinity to be embodied by a king who led a crusade. It also removed the

³⁵⁸ trans. Nicholson, p. 310; *Itinerarium*, p. 345: 'Deinde singulis sese repetentibus, aper cursu a concito invasurus regem aggreditur; cui rex venienti vibrato gladio cervicem illisit pertransiens. Quem ad ictum validissimum stupidum effectum rex accelerans, equo regyrato, subnervavit.' For full account of the story see: *Itinerarium*, pp. 344-45.

³⁵⁹ Natasha Hodgson, 'Lions, Tigers, and Bears: Encounters with Wild Animals and Bestial Imagery in the Context of Crusading to the Latin East', *Viator*, 44, 1 (2013), 65-93.

³⁶⁰ Hodgson, 'Lions', 91. Godfrey was accused of not focusing on the crusade by going out hunting and therefore his injuries received from the engagement with the bear were his own fault.

³⁶¹ Nicholson, 'Following the Path', 21-33.

³⁶² Nicholson, 'Following the Path', 21-33.

³⁶³ For example see: Robin Hard, *The Library of Greek Mythology* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 75-76.

blame for the crusade's failings from Richard, instead placing the blame upon those who failed to live up to the conventions of elite manhood.

6. The King's Speech

The use of direct speech, known as *sermocinatio*, is arguably one of the best methods of understanding authorial intention. This is because the author does not just give a descriptive account of events that transpired but instead used their own artistic creativity to imagine how the scene would have played out. Albeit as Kempshall argues they had to 'be made up credibly – words, style and *mores* all had to be made appropriate to the character and circumstances of the person to whom they were being attributed.'³⁶⁴ Moreover, by inserting words into the mouths of characters the writers used rhetoric to give their own point of view or interpretation of events. The didactic purpose of historical writing meant that *sermocinationes* can be viewed as the authorial voice coming through the text, which highlighted what they wanted the audience to pay attention to and learn from.³⁶⁵ Accordingly they had to deploy verisimilitude when creating these speeches, if they did not do so the audience might not find them believable and thus reject the didactic message located within the speech.³⁶⁶

The author's didactic message can be gleaned through comparison of *sermocinatio* between different accounts of the same event. For example, Anne Curry has analysed the different recorded versions of King Henry V's Agincourt battle speeches.³⁶⁷ Curry argues the difference in speeches was based on the background and education of the writers themselves. Therefore 'they did not need to know what Henry actually said. They could draw on their learning to provide the speech he ought to have made.'³⁶⁸ As such, recorded speeches were not direct accounts of what was actually said and this form of authorial ventriloquising tells us above all how authors and

³⁶⁴ Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 307.

³⁶⁵ Stephen Nichols, 'Discourse in Froissart's Chroniques', *Speculum*, 39, 2 (1964), 279-87.

³⁶⁶ For the discussion of verisimilitude see above, pp. 35-37, and Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 368.

³⁶⁷ Anne Curry, 'The battle speeches of Henry V', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 34 (2008), 77-97.

³⁶⁸ Curry, 'Battle speeches', p. 81.

their audiences thought. Importantly, as Claudia Claridge notes, considering direct speeches has been an underutilised analytical tool in medieval studies.³⁶⁹ The sheer volume of crusade narratives gives us plenty of opportunity to see the ways in which speeches were employed to give differing versions of events. Comparisons between these is one way to understand authorial intention behind their writing or at least gain an insight into why they offered the presentation they did.

There are twenty-one recorded instances of direct speech by King Richard from Books II to VI of the *Itinerarium*. Either these are short interjections such as ‘To arms’ (*armate vos*) or they are long conversations or monologues.³⁷⁰ This section will analyse Richard’s speeches in the *Itinerarium* in comparison to those in Ambroise and other sources in order to further the argument that the purpose of the *Itinerarium* was to present ideal kingship and masculinity as integral to crusade leadership. To do this the following three examples of King Richard’s speech will be considered: Richard’s battle speech before the Jaffa fracas, the decision as to why he would not attack Jerusalem and one on the theme of unity.

6.1. Jaffa Speech

The speech that best demonstrates the notion of the king being the hegemonic male came in an oration from Richard just before the Battle of Jaffa in 8 August 1192. John Bliese’s seminal study of medieval battle speeches identified as the most common theme in these were appeals to chivalric and martial virtues, especially, bravery, valour, manliness and prowess, and this is certainly true in the following case.³⁷¹ Richard gave the speech when the crusaders’ camp suffered a surprise attack by the Muslims. They had to quickly organise themselves in to battle array, and the writers praised Richard for organising this. In Ambroise’s account it was stated a speech was

³⁶⁹ Claudia Claridge, ‘Voices in Medieval History Writing’, *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 16, 1 (2017), 7-40.

³⁷⁰ *Itinerarium*, p. 167, p. 189, p. 191, p. 192, p. 205, p. 207, p. 267, p. 274, p. 283, p. 293, p. 315, p. 323, p. 347, p. 361, p. 379, p. 382, p. 404, p. 405, p. 408, p. 416, p. 441.

³⁷¹ John R.E. Bliese, ‘Rhetoric and morale: a study of battle orations from the central middle ages’, *Journal of Medieval History*, 15, 3 (1989), 204.

made by both Richard and one of his leading knights, John of Preaux, which focused on martyrdom.³⁷² However, the *Itinerarium* reported Richard solely as giving a speech mostly couched in gendered terms:

The king ran up and down between them like the active encourager he was. He urged them to be steadfast, condemning as unworthy of their race those whose spirits weakened from cowardice or fear. The King said: “Oppose adversary with a firm and fearless mind. Let courage grow in your breasts to resist the fierce enemy and escape the storms of fortune. Learn to endure adversities, since everything is bearable to those of manly character. Adversities reveal virtues, just as prosperity hides them. Besides, there is nowhere to run. The enemy has already occupied everything, so any attempt to flee means certain death. So you must stand firm. Let urgent necessity become the material for courage. True men should either triumph courageously or die gloriously. We should receive our approaching martyrdom with a grateful heart. But before we die, while life is with us, we should avenge our death, giving thanks to God that we have found in martyrdom the sort of death we were striving for. This is the wages for our labours, and the end of our life and our battle.”³⁷³

The speech’s purpose was to encourage men to fight the enemy in what would have been a testing situation. Richard’s words called to the ideals of masculinity and what this meant. Men, those of ‘manly character’ (*animo virili*) can endure the enemy (*adversis*) and moreover it is in opposing this adversity that their manhood would be tested and proven. It would be unmanly

³⁷² Ambroise, lines 11444-54.

³⁷³ trans. Nicholson, p. 362; *Itinerarium*, pp. 416-17: ‘rex inter singulos discurrens, impiger consolator persuadebat constantiam, damnans languescere degeneres animos, formidine vel ignavia flecti. “Adversis,” inquit, “mentis imperterritae rigorem opponite. Convalescat virtus solidati pectoris obvia hostium asperitati, evasura profecto fortunae procellas. Scitote adversa pati, quoniam omnis fortuna tolerabilis accidit animo virili; quinimmo virtutibus, sicut umbram prospera, sic adversa praestant lucernam. Caeterum, ad fugam non patet locus. Cum cuncta loca jam hostes occupaverint, fugam tentare est mortem adsciscere. Durate igitur, et saevius urgens necessitas fiat materia virtutis. Virorum nimirum est aut fortiter triumphare, aut gloriose mori. Martyrium imminens animo gratanti est excipiendum. Sed antequam moriamur, vita comite, mortem nostram ulciscamur, gratias agentes Deo, quod qualem quaesivimus per martyrium mortem nos invenire contingit. Haec est merces laborum, et finis vitae simul et praeliorum.”’

for them to run away therefore they must have courage. They will be rewarded for courageous behaviour either in victory or martyrdom. This meant there was nothing to lose in the sense of a reward, but they could lose their reputation should they decide to flee and die ignominiously.

This speech arguably has two functions: first it put across the crusading ideology and ideal behaviour needed to attain victory by the crusaders. But it could also be used by a king or crusade leader as a model speech that ought to be made to the men prior to battle commencing. The use of terms that focus on manhood (*Convalescat virtus solidati pectoris, animo virili*) as a method of getting men to fight their religious adversaries demonstrates this because this was the most effective way of ensuring victory. These men feared being labelled unmanly more than anything else, because to be considered unmanly meant they failed to live up to social expectations, which would have been shameful. *L'Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal* made this clear: 'Shameful is the man who willingly acts dishonourably.'³⁷⁴ Therefore these men would know that by not engaging their enemy in war, or especially by fleeing they would be acting dishonourably and showing that they were not men. However to further encourage them martyrdom (*martyrium*) was utilised at the end of the speech to evince that there was no reason to be cowardly and flee because they would receive eternal reward in the afterlife.³⁷⁵ A similar tactic was presented in William of Malmesbury's account of Pope Urban II's speech at Claremont in 1095 in which the First Crusade was launched. Martyrdom was linked to courage in battle by the pope in this case and dying as a martyr offered a reward. The speech was long but some examples include: 'Do you fear death, men of great courage as you are, and of outstanding fortitude and daring?' Also,

³⁷⁴ trans. Bryant, p. 159; *Maréchal*, line 12620: 'Huntuz est qui de gré s'avile.'

³⁷⁵ For crusades and martyrdom see: Jonathan Riley-Smith, 'Death on the First Crusade', *The End of Strife*, ed. David Loades (Edinburgh, 1984), pp. 14-31; H.E. John Cowdrey, 'Martyrdom and the First Crusade', *Crusade and Settlement: Papers Read at the First Conference of the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East and presented to R.C. Smail*, ed. Peter W. Edbury (Cardiff, 1985), pp. 46-56; Colin Morris, 'Martyrs of the Field of Battle before and during the First Crusade', *Studies in Church History*, 30 (1993), 93-104; Caroline Smith, 'Martyrdom and Crusading in the Thirteenth Century: Remembering the Dead of Louis IX's Crusades', *Al-Masāq: Islam and the Medieval Mediterranean*, 15 (2003), 189-96; Helen Nicholson, "'Martyrium collegio sociandus haberet': depictions of the military orders' martyrs in the Holy Land, 1187-1291", *Crusading and Warfare in the Middle Ages: Realities and Representations. Essays in Honour of John France*, ed. Simon John & Nicholas Morton, (Farnham, 2014), pp. 101-18.

those whose lot it is to die will enter the halls of Heaven, and those who live will see the Holy Sepulchre. And what great happiness can there be than for a man during his life on earth to see the places in which the Lord of Heaven passed His earthly life?’ Happy are they who are called to perform those duties that they may win those rewards, and blessed are they who plan to fight these battles that they may obtain those prizes.³⁷⁶

From this it can be deduced that Richard’s words, regarding martyrdom and crusading, as recorded here by the *Itinerarium* were either inspired by notions that dated from the First Crusade as perceived by Malmesbury, or they were common values held by members of the knighthood in general. Certainly they demonstrate Kempshall’s argument that authors have to adapt to a certain style for the audience to find them plausible to have come from the king himself.

6.2. Jerusalem Speech

The decision not to make an attack on Jerusalem during the Third Crusade is one of the most commented on by historians, with various opinions espoused regarding whether or not Richard made the correct decision.³⁷⁷ This is because the purpose of the crusade was to recapture Jerusalem from Saladin. One of the most vocal critics of Richard’s decision is Markowski who breaks down the reasons that Richard should have attacked as thus: ‘any good crusade leader should have done what the army expected, what the pope and crusade preachers expected, and what Saladin expected: make the attempt to enter the city.’³⁷⁸ Despite modern critiques of Richard’s decision, if we unpick the speech made by Richard in the *Itinerarium*, we can see that Richard’s decision was framed as conforming to the ideals of masculinity, and thus presented as

³⁷⁶ Malmesbury, pp. 605-07: ‘mortemne timetis, viri fortissimi, fortitudine et audacia presentes? ... Morituri caeli intrabunt triclinium, victuri videbunt sepulchrum Dominicum. Et quae maior Felicitas quam ut homo in terris agens, videat loca illa in quibus caelorum Dominus conversatus est humanitus? Felices qui ad haec uocantur munia ut illa nanciscantur munera! Fortunati qui meditantur ista prelia ut illa consequantur premia!’

³⁷⁷ For discussions on the Jerusalem question see: Markowski, ‘Richard lionheart’, 358-65; Phillips, *Holy Warriors*, pp. 160-63; Tyerman, *God’s War*, pp. 460-70; Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: A History* 3rd (London, 2014), pp. 171-72; Asbridge, *The Crusades*, pp. 508-09.

³⁷⁸ Markowski, ‘Richard lionheart’, 361.

correct.³⁷⁹ The *Itinerarium*'s version of the speech is a significant elaboration from Ambroise's text.

The decision not to attack Jerusalem was made on 4 July 1192 whilst the crusaders were at Beit Nuba, not far from the Holy City. The majority of pilgrims wished to continue ahead and lay siege to the city. Richard was not inclined to agree with them. In this instance both Ambroise and the *Itinerarium* were in near agreement about the events and Richard's decisions.³⁸⁰ They both gave direct speeches by Richard, which reinforced the decision with authority, with the *Itinerarium*'s being slightly longer. According to the *Itinerarium* Richard refused to lead an attack on Jerusalem:

“you will not see me leading the people in this undertaking,” he said, “for it will bring me blame and disgrace. You are rash in urging me into this venture. However, if you wish to head for Jerusalem now, I will not desert you. I will be your comrade, not your leader. I will follow you, but not precede.”³⁸¹

He then went on to list reasons why they could not do it, considering that Saladin's army would attack them as they besieged the city and that they lacked the numbers to repel them and take Jerusalem. He concluded:

If I were the author of this rash venture and anything unfortunate were to happen to the army while I was leader, which God forbid, I alone would be accused of stupidity. If I were now to lead the army to besiege Jerusalem I would be to blame for endangering everyone. Besides I am absolutely certain that there are some here present, and others in France, whom I know I have wished for a long time and still wish and very much desire that I

³⁷⁹ Some historians agree that he was not in a position to attack, for example: Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 460.

³⁸⁰ Ambroise, lines 10110-200.

³⁸¹ trans. Nicholson, p. 335; *Itinerarium*, p. 379: “nec me,” inquit, “in hoc negotium ducem videbitis ducendi populi, unde notam incurram reprehensionis vel infamiae. Imprudentis quidem est aestimatio huic me deputari praesumptioni. Si autem vobis placuerit nunc Jerusalem petere, vos non deseram; socius ero vester, non dux; prosequar non praecedam.”

should expend my efforts in rash enterprises like this and carry out operations which are open to criticism, so that I will win terrible disgrace. For this reason, I do not judge that we ought to rush rashly headlong into such difficult enterprises when the outcome is so uncertain.³⁸²

Richard was shown to be aware that his reputation was at stake. The key theme for him here was rashness, which has been linked to glory-hunting by Lewis who discusses how it could compromise warfare through over-competitiveness.³⁸³ This was exemplified in accounts of the First Crusade with the death of William of Hauteville, brother of Tancred and nephew of the Italian-Norman Bohemond at the Battle of Dorylaeum in July 1097. Ralph of Caen wrote negatively of his death fighting against the Turks: William 'had no concern for himself. He did not pay attention either to Bohemond's summons to fall back or to the strength of the large enemy force since he burned to join in his brother's audacity.'³⁸⁴

The opinions ascribed to Richard here are couched in terms of kingship and masculinity as he refused to act with imprudence. The speech demonstrated the apprehension surrounding the decision about launching an attack on Jerusalem and outlined the parameters within which the king could act. This centred on Richard's prudence which was displayed through him arriving at his decision through a process of considering the consequences of his actions and how they would be perceived by his enemies. As Gerald of Wales asserted: 'This virtue (prudence) was truly effective at preventing ... fortitude turning to rashness.'³⁸⁵ This shows the oppositional

³⁸² trans. Nicholson, p. 336; *Itinerarium*, p. 380: 'Ego igitur, si hujus praesumptionis auctor existerem, et exercitui, me duce, quid infortunii, quod absit, accideret, solus reputarer arguendus fatuitatis, et super universorum periculo reprehensive, si nunc exercitum ad obsidendam Jerusalem producerem. Caeterum proculdubio certissime novi nonnullos hic in praesentiarum esse, nec non et in Francia tales, qui pridem non ignorantur voluisse, et nunc etiam velle, et plurimum optasse, me talibus negotiis minus provide operam impendisse, sive opera perpetrasse, quae merito possent redargui, et ego contraherem detestabilis crimen infamiae. Eapropter in tam arduorum aggressus negotiorum, sub incertitudine tam dubia, non arbitror incircumspectius praepropere praecipitandum.'

³⁸³ Lewis, *Kingship and Masculinity*, p. 123.

³⁸⁴ trans. Bachrach & Bachrach, p. 48; Ralph of Caen, 'Gesta Tancredi', p. 623: 'sui non meminit, qui nec revocantem Boamundum, nec hostilis vires multitudinis veritus, fraternae fieri comes ardet audaciae.'

³⁸⁵ Adapted translation from Gerald of Wales, p. 136: 'Huius enim virtutis vero efficacie non immerito debetur, quod ... nec fortitudo in temeritatem.'

nature of the two with prudence being the ideal masculine way to act and rashness linked to youthful exuberance. Without prudence a king would fail in his role of protecting his people therefore prudence was necessary in a decision such as this, as clearly some members of the crusading party were desperate to attack Jerusalem. A king had to use restraint against peoples' emotions and act wisely. Therefore it was considered a manly virtue because it was difficult to do. Consequently, Richard's words demonstrate his maturity over those who lacked the foresight to realise what their actions would engender.

Arguably the *Itinerarium* highlighted this point for future crusade leaders and presented this as a decision that could only come from a king because he was the only one who would make these difficult and unpopular decisions. As Richard said, if 'anything unfortunate were to happen to the army while I was leader ... I alone would be accused of stupidity.' This emphasised that a king must regard his reputation and take careful stock before attempts at personal glory which could prove costly, to not only himself but others. This dramatizes the balancing act between opposing characteristics which kings had to perform. Therefore, by contemporary standards of ideal kingship and masculinity Richard should not have attacked Jerusalem, and moreover his decision was sensible based on the practicalities of warfare, despite how Markowski argues he should have acted.

6.3. Unity Speeches

A key theme in the narratives of the Third Crusade was a lack of unity among the crusaders. This division hindered the crusade. It was even pointed out by Ambroise that the First Crusade was successful because they were unified in their objective.³⁸⁶ This was not entirely correct but does not matter because what is important is that he and others believed this to be the case. Unity was an important theme in the *Itinerarium* as demonstrated by the fact that Richard gave at least two full speeches asserting it. As a virtue, ensuring unity or preventing discord comes under

³⁸⁶ Ambroise, lines 8459-98.

prudence.³⁸⁷ It required wisdom and foresight to recognise the problem and likewise to solve it. The following will show how Richard dealt with this issue and how words ascribed to him act both as an example for future crusaders but also acknowledge other factors that prevented his crusade's success.

In 1192 the initial disillusion of some of the crusaders at the lack of progress towards an attack on Jerusalem caused them to question Richard's leadership. Many of the French contingent wished to leave the rebuilding at Ascalon and return to either Tyre or Acre. Richard responded to them with the following words, that were not in Ambroise's verse, therefore we can ascribe them to the *Itinerarium*:

“For it is best,” he said, “if the whole army is present so that we can discuss these things with proper deliberation. Otherwise – God forbid- there maybe disagreements and we may be left dangerously lacking in mutual aid, reduced to desperate straits and overcome by our treacherous enemies.”³⁸⁸

Disunity would cause a division making the crusade vulnerable. This in itself is not highly insightful but the fact that it needed saying is significant. From these words we can see that Richard advocated for prudence to be employed through a joint decision based on consensus.

Unity was again invoked in a situation in which rioting broke out between the Genoese and Pisans based in Acre. The violence began in January 1192 when Duke Hugh of Burgundy left with the French soldiers under his command from Ascalon. They arrived in Acre, at which the Pisans, allies of Richard and King Guy assumed they were trying to take the city for themselves. The Pisans attacked Hugh, the French and the Genoese, who were allied with Conrad. The *Itinerarium* informs us the Genoese sent word to Conrad about what was happening telling him

³⁸⁷ For prudence as a property of elite masculinity see above, pp. 47-48.

³⁸⁸ trans. Nicholson, p. 288; *Itinerarium*, p. 315: ‘expedit enim ... ad capiendum consilium, scilicet virtute et consilio, universitatem exercitus simul adesse, ne forte, quod absit, interveniente discordia, perniciosius a mutuis destituamur auxiliis, et desperabilius ab insidiatoribus expugnemur adversariis.’

to come and help them. We are then told that Conrad came with a large force with the hope of unexpectedly seizing the city. However, the Pisans resisted Conrad and his forces' assault for three days, eventually managing to inform Richard what was happening. Richard was on his way to meet with Conrad, meaning he was near, and he arrived on 20 February 1192. After stopping the violence he gave a speech, which was not recorded by Ambroise, making it original to the *Itinerarium*, Richard said:

Between partners, nothing is more honourable than friendship, nothing more delightful than fellowship, nothing sweeter than agreement and harmony. On the other hand, nothing is more destructive than rivalry. There is nothing that is more dangerous in destroying unity and peace and pollutes the alliance of affection. Whatever is created by the bond of mutual love and strengthened by the grace of friendship is dissolved by the ferment of envy.³⁸⁹

These words made the stance of King Richard, and thus the author clear on the problems with infighting. In fact crusader disunity was apparently such an important factor in the failure to regain Jerusalem in the eyes of the *Itinerarium* that it even recorded a *sermocinatio* given by Saladin to emphasise the point. In response to the French contingent leaving Ascalon on 31 March 1192 to return to Acre, the *Itinerarium* recorded the Muslim enemy welcoming the decision because it weakened the crusaders, Saladin said:

for rivalry has arisen among the Franks and they have withdrawn. The country is left almost without defence since the strength and valour of the Christian army has fallen. Hence, we

³⁸⁹ trans. Nicholson, p. 293; *Itinerarium*, p. 323: 'nihil inter consortes insignius amicitia, nihil familiaritate jocundius, nihil consensu vel concordia suavius, vel unanimitate solidius, nihil e contrario simultate perniciosius, nihil quod periculosius dissipat pacis unitatem, quod et foedus polluit dilectionis. Denique quicquid mutuae caritatis glutino confirmatur, et corroboratur gratia amicitiae, profecto livoris fermento dissolvitur.'

have no doubt that the whole country and its principal cities Acre and Tyre, can be quickly and easily captured.³⁹⁰

Again, unity is stressed here by Saladin. He was pointing out the failings of the crusaders and how it benefitted himself. This was a speech created by the *Itinerarium's* author who could not have known what Saladin had said, but when put into the mouth of Saladin it carried much more weight as a piece of commentary rather than the author inserting his own voice. The use of an enemy as a form of criticism or praise is also an important trope used in crusade narratives with its intention being for the author to use the enemy as a mouthpiece for their own thoughts.³⁹¹ So, in this case the fact that the lack of unity was identified by Saladin as an advantage for him emphasised the importance of unity to the audience. Any future crusade leader reading or listening to this text would have no doubt that ensuring unity was integral to any possible success, and only through a hegemonic leader enforcing unity could this be achieved. Left to their own devices and lacking a strong leader these men ultimately could not achieve their purpose for being in the Holy Land.

The final direct speech made by Richard in the *Itinerarium* is a direct copy from Ambroise's text. Although this is not an original comment made by the *Itinerarium*, what is important is that Ambroise wrote these words before Richard's death but the *Itinerarium* kept them even though Richard had died leaving them unfulfilled. The speech is Richard's farewell to the Holy Land in which he let it be known that he would return to finish the objectives of the crusade. He said: 'O Holy Land, I commend you to God. In His loving grace may He grant me such length of life that I may give you help as He wills. I certainly hope some time in the future to bring you the aid

³⁹⁰ trans. Nicholson, pp. 296-7; *Itinerarium*, p. 327: 'Franci jam... oborta inter ipsos simultate recesserunt, terram deserentes jam fere vacuum defensore, quia robur belli et virtus exercitus Christianorum jam decedit, unde de facili et terram totam et principales civitates, Achonem et Tyrum, obtinendas non diffidimus in brevi.'

³⁹¹ Hodgson makes this point in regard to the often used incident of Kerbogha's mother speech that featured in some accounts of the First Crusade: Natasha Hodgson, 'The role of Kerbogha's mother in the *Gesta Francorum* and selected chronicles of the First Crusade', *Gendering the Crusades*, ed. Susan B. Edgington & Sarah Lambert (Cardiff, 2001), p. 168.

that I intend.³⁹² This was almost word for word to Ambroise's account: 'Ah! Syria! I commend you to God. May the Lord God, by His command, grant me the time, if it is His will, that I may come to your help! For I still expect to save you.'³⁹³ Therefore the audience of the *Itinerarium* would realise that the task was incomplete. This suggests that the *Itinerarium* was written in order to encourage others, especially high status men, to emulate Richard's kingship in order to recover of Jerusalem. Richard's words invited the audience to resume the challenge. For the *Itinerarium* another Lionheart would be required to complete it.

7. Conclusion

The differences in the *Itinerarium's* representation of King Richard from that of Ambroise demonstrates that the work was not a straight translation of an Old French verse text into a Latin prose one. The representation of Richard within the *Itinerarium* was adapted and recreated purposefully, most likely to inspire a leader to continue where Richard's crusade failed and offer leadership advice on how a successful crusade could be achieved. This could have been aimed at King Henry III of England who immediately upon being crowned took the cross for papal protection, although more widely it could be used by any leader as long as Jerusalem was held by Muslims.³⁹⁴ To achieve this Richard was primarily presented as being the paramount embodiment of hegemonic masculinity, with all the qualities this entailed. This status rested on Richard conforming to contemporary notions of elite manhood that were based on the cardinal virtues and the knightly virtues as evidenced by the *Itinerarium* and other contemporary texts. Richard was shown to surmount those who were a threat to his status, which reinforced his hegemony. Those kings or leading men who did not live up to these standards endangered the crusade and it was because of them that it failed, not because of Richard's leadership.

392 trans. Nicholson p. 382; *Itinerarium*, p. 442: 'o terra sancta, Deo te commendo, Qui pia Sua gratia mihi tantum vivendi tribuat spatium, ut in beneplacito Suo tibi praestem auxilium, spero quidem, ut propono, tibi quandoque succurrere.'

393 Ambroise lines, 12259-63: 'Hé! Sulie, a Deu te comant! / E Dampnedeus par son comant / Me doinst encore tant d'espace, / Si lui plest, que secors te face, / Car encore te cuit secore.'

³⁹⁴ Alan Forey, 'The crusading vows of the English king Henry III', *Durham University Journal*, 34 (1972), 229-47.

We cannot say that the representation of Richard within the text is strictly 'true' because of the variety between accounts. It was however clearly believable and fitted in with contemporary notions of how Richard was viewed in the years after his death. The representation also gives us a vital insight into how the elite males of the time were viewed and the standards it was deemed they must uphold. The *Itinerarium* is thus an extremely useful guide to the construction and performance of contemporary notions of masculinity and the ways in which these had become intertwined with notions of kingship and crusading by the early thirteenth century.

Chapter Three: ‘Hagiographical Masculinity’, The Representation of Simon of Montfort in Peter of Vaux-de-Cernay’s *Historia Albigensis*

The climactic scene of Peter of Vaux-de-Cernay’s *Historia Albigensis* is the death of the protagonist Simon of Montfort. Simon, the leader of the crusaders fighting heresy in the Languedoc, was killed at the siege of Toulouse on 25 June 1218. Peter wrote:

the count was courageously standing his ground with his men in front of our siege engines near the ditch, to prevent the enemy from renewing their attack on the engines. Suddenly a stone from an enemy mangonel struck Christ’s knight on the head. The blow was lethal. Twice beating his breast he commended his soul to God and the blessed Virgin. Like St Stephen – and stoned to death in that Saint’s city – he went to rest in the Lord’s keeping. Before he received the fatal wound the Lord’s brave knight – say rather, if we are not mistaken, His most glorious martyr – was five times wounded by the enemy archers, like the Saviour for whom he now patiently accepted death, and by whose side he now lives in sublime peace, as we believe.³⁹⁵

In addition to being labelled a martyr by Peter, there are other tropes that framed Simon’s death as martyrdom. First the fact that Simon was in battle against heretics meant like other martyrs he died in defence of the Christian faith. This links to the second trope which was the manner of death and its connection to St Stephen. As reported in Acts of the Apostles Stephen was the proto-martyr whose defence of Christianity before the Sanhedrin resulted in him being stoned to

³⁹⁵ trans. Sibly, p. 277; *Hystoria*, pp. 315-16: ‘Dum staret fortissimus comes cum suis ante machinas suas, sicut jam dictum est, prope fossatum, ne hostes exirent denuo ad sepedictas machinas dirimendas, ecce lapis, mangonello adversariorum projectus, percussit in capite militem Jhesu Christi; qui, ictu letali receptor, pectus suum bis percuteus Deoque et beate Virgini se commendans, morte imitatus beatum Stephanum et ipsius lapidatus in urbe, cum ipso in Domino obdormivit. Nec silendum quod ita fortissimus miles Domini, immo, nisi fallimur, gloriosissimus martyr, priusquam ex ictu lapidis vulnus exceperat mortale quinque a sagittariis vulnera receperat ad similitudinem Salvatoris, pro quo mortem patienter sustinuit, cum quo post mortem, ut credimus, feliciter gloriatur et vivit.’

death.³⁹⁶ The text draws an explicit parallel between the two men because of how they were killed. This is demonstrated in reference to ‘that Saint’s city’ an allusion to the cathedral in Toulouse being named after St Stephen. To further the analogy Stephen was recorded as commending his soul to God which likewise Simon had done.³⁹⁷ Peter’s intention here was to present Simon as another Stephen whose status as proto-martyr transformed him into a saint. The final trope which Peter used to emphasise that Simon’s death was a martyrdom was his description of the five wounds Simon received. These were explicitly compared to the five wounds of Christ, who also ‘bore death patiently.’ Thomas Heffernan has demonstrated the prevalence of these martyrdom tropes within hagiography, or sacred biography, and therefore they would have been familiar to the intended audience of Peter’s work, most likely his fellow monks at the Cistercian abbey of Vaux-de-Cernay.³⁹⁸ Significantly for this thesis Heffernan argues that martyrdom, ‘the ritualized re-enactment of the *imitatio Christi* which led to death, was considered the apex of Christian heroism.’³⁹⁹ It is clear from Peter’s account that this was applicable to his representation of Simon. Anyone reading or hearing this description of Simon’s death would have had the strong impression that Simon was a saint, because of the ways in which Peter employed the established formula for martyrdom.

Peter was not the only one to consider Simon a martyr. According to the *Annals of Dunstable Priory* there were reports of miracles at his tomb.⁴⁰⁰ This suggests a cult was being established around him, undoubtedly because he was considered a martyr. The identification of a high status man who had died a violent death as a martyr was an established phenomenon by this period.⁴⁰¹ Moreover, in 1265 following the death of Simon’s son, Simon of Montfort VI Earl of Leicester

³⁹⁶ Acts 7:57: ‘And casting him forth without the city. They stoned him.’

³⁹⁷ Acts 7:58: ‘And they stoned Stephen, invoking and saying: Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.’

³⁹⁸ For these qualities of martyrdom and their relation to *imitatio Christi* see: Thomas Heffernan, *Sacred Biography Saints and Their Biographers in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1992), p. 75, p. 217, p. 218, p. 249.

³⁹⁹ Heffernan, *Sacred Biography*, p. 249.

⁴⁰⁰ ‘Annals of Dunstable’, *Annales Monastici* vol. III, ed. Henry Richards Luard (London, 1866), p. 61. A modern English translation has recently been published: *Annals of Dunstable Priory*, trans. David Preest & ed. Harriett Webster (Woodbridge, 2018).

⁴⁰¹ André Vauchez, *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 146-59.

at the Battle of Evesham, a cult was established around him due to the perception of him being a political martyr.⁴⁰² This type of martyrdom was one in which certain men died for a political cause which could be equated with dying for the faith.⁴⁰³ However, Simon the elder's death was explicitly due to fighting for the faith rather than political martyrdom, making him a more conventional saint. Danna Piroyansky has demonstrated that by the fourteenth century political martyrs such as Thomas of Lancaster and their cults were used by other elite men as a form of identity in which they shared an exclusive class bond.⁴⁰⁴ This may have been what happened in the case of the veneration of Simon the elder, although no evidence is known beyond what the *Annals* tell us. An opponent of Simon's, the Anonymous continuator of William of Tudela's *Chanson de la Croisade Albigeoise*, recorded the epitaph on Simon's grave. He does not convey its exact words but his response to it indicates that the epitaph described him as a martyr. The continuator was not convinced by this and recorded an invective against the claim of martyrdom:

if by killing men and shedding blood, by damning souls and causing deaths, by trusting evil counsels, by setting fires, destroying men, dishonouring *paratge*, seizing lands and encouraging pride, by kindling evil and quenching good, by killing women and slaughtering children, a man can in this world win Jesus Christ, certainly Count Simon wears a crown and shines in heaven above.⁴⁰⁵

The reference to a crown was a common synonym for being a martyr. This implies that many people believed Simon *was* a martyr, which the continuator clearly found outrageous. He was

⁴⁰² For more on Simon the younger see: Simon Walker, 'Political saints in later medieval England', *The Fifteenth Century, IV: Political Culture in Later Medieval England*, ed. Simon Walker & Michael J. Braddick (Manchester, 2006), pp. 198-222. Also Piroyansky's comments on the younger Simon's virtues being similar to those of his father, as will be shown here: Danna Piroyansky, *Martyrs in the Making: Political Martyrdom in Late Medieval England* (Basingstoke, 2008), pp. 36-37.

⁴⁰³ For more see: Piroyansky, *Martyrs in the Making*, pp. 2-3.

⁴⁰⁴ Piroyansky, *Martyrs in the Making*, p. 38.

⁴⁰⁵ trans. Shirley, p. 176; *Chanson* III, p. 228: 'Si, per homes aucirre ni per sanc expandir / Ni per esperitz perdre ni per mortz consentir / E per mals cosselhs creire e per focs abrandir / E per baros destruire e per Paratge aunir / E per las terras toldre e per Orgolh suffrir / E per los mals escendre e pels bes escantir / E per donas aucirre e per efans delir, / Pot hom en aquest segle Jhesu Crist conquerir, / El deu portar corona e e'l cel resplandir.' Paratge is difficult to translate but roughly means rights to land and honour. See: Shirley, pp. 6-7.

adamant that this was not the case and that, on the contrary, Simon was anything but a martyr. These conflicting views of Simon provide an insight into how ideological differences can lead to very different viewpoints in respect to the representation of individuals and their actions. It is also important to note that these viewpoints are also constructed according to their textual genre. This must be considered by the historian when analysing these texts, more of which will be said below. However, first, in order to further understand the depiction of Simon as a martyr we need to consider that the representations of crusaders as martyrs was well-established by this period.

Crusaders dying in battle and thus being perceived and presented as martyrs can be traced back to narratives of the First Crusade. Jonathan Riley-Smith and H.E.J. Cowdrey have demonstrated that the concept of martyrdom in the crusades was developed mainly by the monastic writers of the First Crusade narratives, not by those who went on the crusade.⁴⁰⁶ As such martyrdom did not play a part in motivating crusaders to embark but was a retrospective theological understanding of the status of those who died on the crusade. In most cases of martyrdom on crusade, the martyr is essentially a crusader who died in battle whilst the narrative in which he is described is concerned with the crusade in general. For example the death of Anselm of Ribemont in February 1099 at the siege of Arqah is presented in many narratives of the First Crusade as a martyrdom. Guibert of Nogent described him dying through being struck by rocks launched from a ballistic machine, declaring: 'Anselm himself, together with many others, underwent a joyous martyrdom, earning the kingdom of heaven as their reward for a holy death.'⁴⁰⁷ However, Anselm was not central to the crusade nor its success; he appears in the narrative only because he dies.⁴⁰⁸ Helen Nicholson and Beth Spacey have shown how members of the military orders were presented as martyrs in some crusade accounts, concerning the Third

⁴⁰⁶ Riley-Smith, 'Death on the First Crusade'; Cowdrey, 'Martyrdom'; For more on crusades and martyrdom see: Morris, 'Martyrs'; Smith, 'Martyrdom'; Nicholson, 'Martyrium'.

⁴⁰⁷ trans. Levine, R., *The deeds of God through the Franks: A translation of Guibert de Nogent's Gesta Dei per Francos* (Woodbridge, 1997), pp. 122-123; Guibert of Nogent, 'Gesta', p. 219: 'Contigit ibidem et alios quamplurimos felix sumpsisse martyrium, et mortis sacrae compendio regna emeruisse caelorum.'

⁴⁰⁸ See Riley-Smith, 'Death on the First Crusade', p. 27; Cowdrey, 'Martyrdom', p. 52.

Crusade onwards.⁴⁰⁹ Once more these deaths are part of the narrative but not central to its purpose, which was to give an account of the crusade rather than of the actions and sacrifice of specific individuals. What makes Peter of Vaux-de-Cernay's narrative unique in respect to other crusade and martyrdom stories is that the whole text focuses on Simon and the war against the heretics. It is not an account of the crusade itself, but of Simon's actions within it, conveyed within the established framework of sacred biography. All of which makes him unprecedented in crusading narratives, because the purpose of the text is to establish the significance and, ultimately, holiness, of Simon's exploits, thus identifying him as a saint. Therefore he rather than the crusade is at the centre of the narrative.

Peter's description of Simon as a martyr, with which this chapter began, has led to the text being labelled 'hagiographic' by Gregory Lippiatt, whilst Mark Pegg has called it a *vita*.⁴¹⁰ But what constituted this text as being hagiography has not been interrogated in detail. Instead the term seems to be used generically due to Peter's presentation of a eulogised, uncritical and often one-sided image of Simon. As we know from the Anonymous continuator above, this was not everyone's opinion. Consequently, hagiographic here is used in its modern sense.⁴¹¹ The issue of Peter's account of Simon's life as hagiography deserves closer examination. A panegyric with a violent death does not necessarily equate to hagiography. Heffernan states that hagiography, 'must construe a life which will illustrate the exemplary behaviour of the subject', therefore it does not follow the rules of history which offer a chronological story of the subject.⁴¹² Saints' lives are generally a collection of vignettes focusing on deeds rather than a narrative of sequential events, though this does not mean they cannot be chronological accounts.

⁴⁰⁹ Nicholson, 'Martyrium'; Spacey, 'Martyrdom'.

⁴¹⁰ Gregory Lippiatt, *Simon V of Montfort and baronial government, 1195-1218* (Oxford, 2017), p. 7; p. 87; Mark Gregory Pegg, *A Most Holy War: The Albigensian Crusade and the Battle for Christendom* (Oxford, 2008), p.160.

⁴¹¹ Hagiography is defined in the Cambridge dictionary as: 'a very admiring book about someone or a description of someone that represents the person as perfect or much better than they really are, or the activity of writing about someone in this way.' <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/hagiography>

⁴¹² Heffernan, *Sacred Biography*, p. 20.

According to Andre Vauchez, the twelfth century saw the beginning of an enthusiasm for saint making due to the canonization of Thomas Becket and Bernard of Clairvaux.⁴¹³ These two were the first saints since Martin and Benedict to be created that were neither Apostles nor Doctors of the Church.⁴¹⁴ The process of canonisation had only recently been formally taken over by the church on the orders of Pope Innocent III (r. 1198-1216). A new judicial procedure was introduced to decide whether canonization should proceed rather than the hitherto process of sanctity being recognized through the peoples' declaration, (*vox populi, vox Dei*).⁴¹⁵ The process of canonization was both expensive and time consuming, and thus did not always succeed. To support the canonization process it was essential to have a hagiographical text. This usually came in the form of either a *vita*, *miracula* or a *passio*, which were used in the first millennium to further enhance the cults that developed around these martyrs.⁴¹⁶ The purpose of these texts was to promote the imitation of the virtues of the saint whilst ensuring they were, 'not marred by extravagant and unedifying tales', as Vauchez puts it.⁴¹⁷ Furthermore, with the papal control of canonization in the thirteenth century, rather than miracles being the most important factor in making a saint, there was a shift to demonstrate that the candidate had led a virtuous life as being the main factor in what made them saintly.⁴¹⁸ The purpose of this was to try and shift the emphasis away from the popular perception of sainthood which mostly rested on miracles performed at shrines. As will be shown Peter's text presents an account of Simon's virtuous life and conforms to many of the conventions of a *vita* and this is why it can be labelled hagiographic.

Furthermore, the fact the protagonist of Peter's text was a layman adds another reason as to why this text is worthy of more detailed investigation. Canonised high status lay saints were often

⁴¹³ Vauchez, *Sainthood*, p. 109.

⁴¹⁴ Vauchez, *Sainthood*, p. 109.

⁴¹⁵ Vauchez, *Sainthood*, p. 37.

⁴¹⁶ Vauchez, *Sainthood*, p. 18.

⁴¹⁷ Vauchez, *Sainthood*, p. 35.

⁴¹⁸ Vauchez, *Sainthood*, p. 47.

men, usually royal, who either gave up their lay lives and status, or at least modified them to some degree. Only rarely were they warriors. Consequently, whilst lay saints were rare, and non-royal ones even rarer, they did exist.⁴¹⁹ Performing one's lay role correctly, without vice or sin, could be deemed worthy of sanctity during this period. This was especially so for those of the ruling classes because as Vauchez argues: '[in] a society where wealth and power were regarded as signs of divine favour and election, the great of this world were *a priori* best placed to achieve salvation and distinction in the eyes of the world at large.'⁴²⁰ For example Count Gerald of Aurillac (c.855-909) was regarded as a saint, though not formally canonised, and he had a *vita* written about him.⁴²¹ Significantly this work, *De Vita Sancti Geraldi Auriliacensis Comitis*, was written by Odo of Cluny (d. 942), whose works were held in the library at the Cistercian abbey of Vaux-de-Cernay. Therefore it is quite possible Peter was aware of this text and it may have been an inspiration for his writing about Simon, a connection that has hitherto not been noted.⁴²² Stuart Airlie argues that Odo's text blurred the genres of history and hagiography when he presented the layman as a saint.⁴²³ Similarly it will be shown that Peter does likewise. Many of the attributes that made Gerald a saint, according to Odo's account, related to his role as a count, but with an emphasis on his religiosity and devotion to protecting the interests of the Church. One description of Gerald by Odo could easily have been said by Peter regarding Simon. He wrote: 'the athlete of the heavenly hosts long struggling in the arena of this earthly life fought manfully against the forces of evil. And indeed keeping the word of life in the midst of a wicked nation, he shone out like a lamp.'⁴²⁴ Whilst Gerald's fight was figurative, Simon's was an actual battle. Carl Erdmann proclaimed Odo's work on Gerald as a clear attempt at changing the

⁴¹⁹ Vauchez, *Sainthood*, p. 283.

⁴²⁰ Vauchez, *Sainthood*, p. 175.

⁴²¹ *Sancti Geraldi*, pp. 639-710.

⁴²² Henry Martin, 'Inventaire des biens et des livres de l'abbaye des Vaux-de-Cernay au XIIe siècle', *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de Paris et de l'Ile-de-France*, 13 (1886), 40.

⁴²³ Stuart Airlie, 'The anxiety of sanctity: St Gerald of Aurillac and his maker', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 43, 3 (1992), 374.

⁴²⁴ trans. Noble & Head. p. 326-327; *Sancti Geraldi*, p. 669: 'Athleta coelestis militia dudum in palestra mundanae conversationis agonizans, cuneos vitiorum viriliter deballavit. Tum vero verbum vitae continens in medio nationis pravae, quasi quaedam lucerna refulgebat.'

perception of the knighthood to a role that served the Church's interests, formulating the conception of the holy warrior.⁴²⁵ Furthermore Jacqueline Murray has used Odo, among others, to consider the way in which clerics and monks militarized monastic and religious life making it attractive for high status men to partake in.⁴²⁶ She examines the role of gender ideology in this noting a key conceptual development whereby such religious men could demonstrate their manliness fighting the metaphorical enemies of the church and saving souls.⁴²⁷ Katherine Allen Smith goes further stating 'monks *were* warriors, whose success in spiritual battle required the possession of many of the same virtues embraced by contemporary knights.'⁴²⁸ Therefore perceptions and self-perceptions of what it meant to be monk or a knight were not clearly demarcated; both types of men could embody ideals of masculinity and be inspirational to one another. Holiness could be demonstrated via masculinity, and vice versa.⁴²⁹

To pull all this together, this chapter will argue that Simon's martyrdom and thus sanctity was based on Peter's representation of him conforming to the ideals of elite masculinity. This representation will be termed 'hagiographical masculinity', in order to express that Simon's masculinity is celebrated in a form deriving from sacred biography. Peter praised Simon's masculinity because it enabled him to take on the heretics successfully. As Peter's history of the conflict described, the professional religious men originally sent by the church to eradicate heresy had failed.⁴³⁰ Therefore, the next option, was to send secular men in to root out heresy from the top down. It had become apparent that the destruction of heresy would require military power and, according to Peter's account, in order to be successful this enterprise had to be led by a man

⁴²⁵ Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, trans. M. W. Baldwin & W. Goffart (Princeton, 1977), pp. 87-89.

⁴²⁶ Jacqueline Murray, 'Masculinizing religious life: sexual prowess, the battle for chastity and monastic identity', *Holiness and Masculinity in the Middle Ages*, ed. P.H. Cullum & Katherine J. Lewis (Cardiff, 2004), pp. 24-42. The blurring of boundaries between the religious and warriors has been dealt with in the following selected (but not exhaustive) works: Katherine Allen Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture* (Woodbridge, 2011); Jennifer Thibodeaux, *The Manly Priest: Clerical Celibacy, Masculinity, and Reform in England and Normandy, 1066-1300* (Philadelphia, 2015).

⁴²⁷ Murray, 'Masculinizing religious life', p. 27.

⁴²⁸ Smith, *War*, p. 4.

⁴²⁹ See: Cullum & Lewis, *Religious Men*.

⁴³⁰ *Hystoria*, pp. 5-51.

who conformed to ideals of elite lay masculinity. Moreover the nature of the conflict required such a leader to add to his weaponry the qualities of holy masculinity. But unlike other exponents of holy masculinity who fought metaphorical battles against the enemies of the church he would fight an actual war.

In order to demonstrate Simon's holiness Peter presented him conforming to the ideals of the cardinal virtues and the other knightly values described in Chapter One but expressing these within the register of hagiographical masculinity.⁴³¹ Peter also contrasted Simon with his enemies, who were also the enemy of the crusade more widely, namely Count Raymond VI of Toulouse (d. 1222) and King Peter II of Aragon (d. 1213). Peter showed them to be examples of flawed masculinity. This is in itself a hagiographical trope because according to Vauchez 'many hagiographical texts were constructed on the basis of classic opposition.'⁴³² This is echoed in Noble and Head's description of Odo of Cluny's *De Vita Sancti Geraldi Auriliacensis Comititis*, they state Odo, 'produces an account of warring virtues and vices – a literary form that reaches far back into both Christian and pagan antiquity - but he focuses on the special virtues required by a layman to meet the challenges of life in the world.'⁴³³ Furthermore research by both Lewis and Constantinou has demonstrated that saints' lives were based on gender performance and behavioural models intent on inspiring lay people not just clerics.⁴³⁴ As such this chapter will place the virtues and vices of the central figures of Peter's narrative in comparison to argue that Peter framed events in order to promote the cult of Simon based on his virtuous masculinity, because as Heffernan asserts this was the purpose of hagiography.⁴³⁵ Moreover it was also

⁴³¹ See above, pp. 43-63.

⁴³² Vauchez, *Sainthood*, p. 521.

⁴³³ Thomas Noble & Thomas Head, *Soldiers of Christ: Saints and Saints Lives from Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (London, 1995), p. 294.

⁴³⁴ Katherine Lewis, 'Male Saints and Devotional Masculinity in Late Medieval England', *Gender & History*, 24, 1 (2012), 112-33; Stavroula Constantinou, 'Performing gender in lay saints' lives', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 38, 1 (2014), 24-32.

⁴³⁵ Heffernan, *Sacred Biography*, p. 35; Gregory Lippiatt also contends that Peter aimed to promote a veneration of Simon: Lippiatt, *Simon V of Montfort*, p. 8.

written as guide for ideal masculinity, probably, primarily as inspiration for monastic readers who could have emulated many of Simon's virtues in their fight against spiritual enemies.

1. Overview of the Albigensian Crusade and Historiography

The Albigensian Crusade (1209-1229) was a war against Cathar heretics in the Languedoc region of what is now France. Launched by Pope Innocent III its intention was to destroy the Cathar heretics whose growth had been perceived as a threat to the Catholic Church's hegemony in the region.⁴³⁶ The Church believed it was the responsibility of the secular lords to ensure that heresy never took a foothold, and it deemed the current lords, especially of Toulouse, as impotent in this respect.⁴³⁷ William of Puylaurens made this explicitly clear, stating: '... now heresy had grown to such a size, with the consent of the barons of the land, that the religious themselves were not able to argue against it, so the hand of the military was required to prosecute it.'⁴³⁸ The fight against heresy had begun the previous century: Bernard of Clairvaux (d. 1153) had preached against heresy in the region in the 1140s, and at the Third Lateran Council of 1179, Canon 27 ordered the excommunication of heretics and those who supported or interacted in any form with them.⁴³⁹ The spark which ignited the crusade was the death of papal legate Peter of Castelnau on 14 January 1208 following a meeting with Count Raymond VI of Toulouse. The murder was never solved as the killer fled to Beaucaire and was never identified. The timing of the crime strongly pointed to it having been either ordered by Raymond, or, akin to the Thomas Becket assassination, having been committed by a wanting-to-please knight loyal to Raymond. Nonetheless, it was the *casus belli* that allowed Innocent to call for a military solution to a long

⁴³⁶ For more on heresy and the Albigensians see: Joseph Strayer, *The Albigensian Crusades* (New York, 1971); Malcom Lambert, *The Cathars* (Malden, 1998); Malcom Barber, *The Cathars Dualist Heretics in Languedoc in the High Middle Ages* (Harlow, 2000); Mark Pegg, 'On Cathars, Albigenses, and Good Men of Languedoc', *Journal of Medieval History*, 27 (2001), 181-95; Beverly M. Kienzle, *Cistercians, Heresy and Crusade in Occitania, 1145-1229* (Woodbridge, 2001); Jennifer Deane, *A History of Medieval Heresy and Inquisition* (Lanham, 2011); Robert Moore, *The War on Heresy: Faith and Power in Medieval Europe* (London, 2012).

⁴³⁷ Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 578.

⁴³⁸ Puylaurens, p. 60: 'Cumque iam tantum heresis excrevisset, magnatibus terre consentientibus, quod non tam studiosos in se posset acuire quam armatam manum militia exercere.'

⁴³⁹ Laurence Marvin, *The Occitan War: A Political and Military History of the Albigensian Crusade, 1209-1218* (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 2-3.

unresolved problem. Initially Raymond was the target of the crusade but in a twist he took the cross becoming a crusader. This entitled him to papal protection of his lands meaning he could no longer be considered a legitimate target.⁴⁴⁰

The Cathars were a heretical sect who proclaimed that there were two gods working in opposition, a good and a bad god. They denied the divinity of Christ and thus rejected the sacraments.⁴⁴¹ This was deemed unacceptable to the Catholic authorities as it countered their teachings. Peter of Vaux-de-Cernay began his work with an overview of the heretics living in the present day south of France. He wanted his audience to know the enemy they were dealing with. His intolerance to those who rejected his own religious beliefs seems to be representative of many in his position at the time. He presented the Albigensians (his own term for the southern heretics) as being misguided and believing in a theocratic structure completely in opposition to that of the Catholic Church.⁴⁴² Peter found this incredible and was personally offended by it. Moreover, according to Peter, aside from a divergence in theological perspectives, they also had differing views on social norms. For example, Peter said they falsely asserted to practice chastity and they do not swear oaths.⁴⁴³ He also contended they were sexually depraved, suggesting they believe a sin cannot be committed from the waist down. Furthermore, he claimed they believed incest with their mother or sister to be no different from other types of sexual intercourse.⁴⁴⁴ Linking their religious beliefs to sexual depravity was an easy form of vilification undoubtedly undertaken by Peter to further justify the crusade against them.

The crusade against the Cathars was known for its brutal warfare and merciless treatment of the heretics. Notable events include the massacre at Béziers and siege of Carcassonne, both 1209, the Battle of Muret 1213 and the sieges of Toulouse 1216-18 up to Simon of Montfort's death in

⁴⁴⁰ *Hystoria*, pp. 79-80.

⁴⁴¹ Jotischky, *Crusading*, pp. 171-72.

⁴⁴² *Hystoria*, pp. 9-10.

⁴⁴³ *Hystoria*, pp. 14-15.

⁴⁴⁴ *Hystoria*, pp. 17-18.

1218. After Simon's death the crusade was continued by Prince Louis of France, the future King Louis VIII, it finally ended with the Treaty of Paris 1229.⁴⁴⁵

Count Raymond VI of Toulouse was one of many lords in the area in which Catharism thrived. He inherited the county in 1194, making him one of the most powerful men in the Languedoc. Elaine Graham-Leigh asserts Raymond, from the beginning of his rule, had strained relations with the church suffering excommunication twice, first in 1196 then again in 1207.⁴⁴⁶ As such his contemporary reputation suffered due to ecclesiastics writing critically about him. His reputation among modern historians is somewhat similar. Jonathan Sumption describes him as 'tactless and vacillating' and as being a failure in the art of soldiering in a land where vassals 'respected few other arts.'⁴⁴⁷ His cowardice and unchivalric behaviour are often held to be epitomized by the murder of Peter of Castelnau, even though, as we have seen, it is not clear that he was responsible.

The Albigensian Crusade is one of the most written about crusades in modern scholarship. Riley-Smith argues the crusade was inevitable given the 'drive to impose uniformity on a society' in around 1200 and was justified by the notion of the Islamic crusades.⁴⁴⁸ Likewise, Tyerman has also argued of its inevitability but that this was due to the political weakness in the area which had the crowns of France, England, Aragon and the Holy Roman Emperor holding certain parts of the Languedoc as overlords.⁴⁴⁹ However, Tyerman brings to the fore the motivations of all involved: 'by legitimizing land grabbing, Innocent invited exploitation by acquisitive adventurers he proved characteristically powerless to restrain.'⁴⁵⁰ From this he concludes that the crusade's objectives were nebulous: 'as a war against Christians, enemies could become allies and vice

⁴⁴⁵ Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, p. 194.

⁴⁴⁶ Elaine Graham-Leigh, *The Southern French Nobility and the Albigensian Crusade* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 48-49.

⁴⁴⁷ Jonathan Sumption, *The Albigensian Crusade* (London, 1999), p. 24.

⁴⁴⁸ Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, p. 192.

⁴⁴⁹ Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 567.

⁴⁵⁰ Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 583.

versa, without clear lines of conflict much beyond the ambitions of Simon of Montfort.⁴⁵¹ This line of argument frames the crusade as non-religious endeavour but in fact as a quest for secular gain. Similarly Asbridge questions the motives of those involved: ‘the campaigns ... proved to be shockingly brutal and largely ineffective, being subject to the self-serving acquisitiveness of the northern French participants.’⁴⁵² Phillips likewise addresses the levels of violence involved describing it as ‘a conflict that brought the horrors of holy war to the heart of Christendom and engendered levels of atrocity unseen in Europe since the barbarian invasions.’⁴⁵³ Laurence Marvin suggests that the frequency with which modern historians write about the Albigensian Crusade is due to the fact that it took place solely in the confines of Western Europe, and the crusaders’ enemy were Christians who had strayed from orthodoxy.⁴⁵⁴ Therefore it is beyond the interests solely of crusade scholars. Recent monographs on the crusade have focused on different aspects. Marvin’s 2008 work, *The Occitan War*, specifically considers the events between 1209-18, which essentially covers the beginning of the crusade until Simon of Montfort’s death, because he thought that not enough detail had been paid to period.⁴⁵⁵ Whereas Sean McGlynn’s 2015 study, *Kill Them All*, focuses on the crusades’ violence rather than religious and political aspects.⁴⁵⁶

One of the more controversial and ongoing debates was initiated by Pegg whose 2001 book, *The Corruption of Angels*, suggests that the Albigensian heresy was manufactured by the crusaders and did not really exist.⁴⁵⁷ Robert Moore continues this argument in his 2008 work *The War on Heresy*.⁴⁵⁸ Pegg’s 2008 book, *A Most Holy War*, claims the Albigensian Crusade, ‘ushered genocide

⁴⁵¹ Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 587.

⁴⁵² Asbridge, *The Crusades*, p. 532.

⁴⁵³ Phillips, *Holy Warriors*, p. 197.

⁴⁵⁴ Laurence Marvin, ‘The Albigensian Crusade in Anglo-American Historiography, 1888-2013’, *History Compass*, 11, 12 (2013), 11-26. Marvin’s essay gives an overview of the current scholarly output until 2013.

⁴⁵⁵ Marvin, *The Occitan War*, p. xiv.

⁴⁵⁶ See: Sean McGlynn, *By Sword and Fire: Cruelty and Atrocity in Medieval Warfare* (London, 2008); Sean McGlynn, *Kill Them All* (Stroud, 2015), pp. 9-10.

⁴⁵⁷ Mark Pegg, *The Corruption of Angels: The Great Inquisition of 1245-1246* (Princeton, 2001).

⁴⁵⁸ Moore, *The War on Heresy*.

into the West by linking divine salvation to mass murder.⁴⁵⁹ Most recently in 2016 Pegg reasserts his view about the non-existence of the heresy in the Languedoc. But Peter Biller criticises this contention in the same collection suggesting Pegg has left out or overlooked certain evidence that points to the existence of religious practices and beliefs in the region that were heretical to Catholicism.⁴⁶⁰

Whatever the nature and extent to which Catharism or heresy existed in the lands covered by the Albigensian Crusade, the fact is that a war did take place and it was fought with the objective of eradicating heresy, all with papal approval, thus making it a crusade. The medieval writers themselves may have had limited knowledge of the opposing beliefs which they deemed heretical. But they understood that the crusade was engendered because the Church had failed to convince the populace of the Languedoc that their beliefs were heterodox, and weak leadership from the lords of the region had done little to curb their spread.

Whilst modern historians have been pre-occupied with the themes of violence and heresy in the crusade they have not yet considered the Albigensian Crusade and its instigators from a gendered perspective or examined how gender used to present the events described.⁴⁶¹ These issues form the focus for this chapter, but first an introduction to both Simon of Montfort and Peter of Vaux-de-Cernay.

2. Simon's Background

Simon of Montfort was the fifth lord of Montfort-l'Amaury in the Île-de-France, he was also earl of Leicester but had his lands confiscated by King John in 1207. Born around 1171 he received a

⁴⁵⁹ Pegg, *A Most Holy War*, p. 188.

⁴⁶⁰ Mark Pegg, 'The paradigm of Catharism; or, the historians' illusion', *Cathars in Question*, ed. Antonio Sennis (York, 2016), pp. 21-52; Peter Biller, 'Goodbye to Catharism?', in *Cathars in Question*, ed. Antonio Sennis (York, 2016), pp. 274-313.

⁴⁶¹ Catharism and gender have been discussed by Yvette Debergue in a study of whether Catharism had different social norms to non-heretics, she was not concerned with the crusade as such: Yvette Debergue, 'Bonas femnas and the *consolamen*', *Journal of Religious History*, 35, 4 (2011), 532-45.

Cistercian education which provided him with literacy and a deeply held piety.⁴⁶² As a vassal of King Philip Augustus he was involved in the Norman wars against the English crown. A hardened warrior, he took the cross in 1199 as part of what became known as the Fourth Crusade, which set out to recover Jerusalem.⁴⁶³ However the diversion of the crusade from the Holy Land and the attacks on the Christian inhabitants of Zara met with his disapproval and he left the crusade in November 1202 making his way with some others to the Holy Land. Nevertheless in 1208 when the opportunity arose he took the cross again to fight in the Albigensian Crusade, and it was in the Midi where Simon made a name for himself. This was achieved through his leadership in a war that was hard fought and brutal. Various opinions have been expressed about him by modern commentators, Pegg describes Simon as ‘an impecunious adventurer who just happened to be more pious if no less avaricious than other nobles like himself.’⁴⁶⁴ McGlynn though, argues for Simon’s exceptionality: ‘he was a soldier’s soldier in every sense: a big, strong man and natural leader who inspired loyalty in his men through personal example and who was unrelenting in his prosecution of war. He was to demonstrate his consummate skills as a general time and again.’⁴⁶⁵ Concerning Simon’s motivations, Jonathan Sumption argues that Simon was ambitious but not cynical to the point of being involved in the crusade in order to acquire lands and that he genuinely despised heresy.⁴⁶⁶ Tyerman describes Simon as a ‘sanctimonious prig’, but acknowledges his split reputation by calling him ‘one of the most revered and reviled men ever to have fought for the cross.’⁴⁶⁷

Interestingly, Laurence Marvin notes that Simon ‘has been ill served by the quality and quantity of biographical works devoted to him. Even though he is one of the most infamous characters in all of medieval – indeed Christian, history – there is a surprising lack of scholarly attention to his

⁴⁶² Lippiatt, *Simon V of Montfort*, p. 1.

⁴⁶³ For the Fourth Crusade see Chapter Four, pp. 182-233.

⁴⁶⁴ Pegg, *A Most Holy War*, p. 89.

⁴⁶⁵ McGlynn, *Kill Them All*, p. 121.

⁴⁶⁶ Sumption, *Albigensian Crusade*, p. 101.

⁴⁶⁷ Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 591; p. 599.

life.⁴⁶⁸ This has now been rectified by Gregory Lippiatt's, *Simon V of Montfort and baronial government, 1195-1218*.⁴⁶⁹ As the title suggests, it focuses on how Simon wielded his power and how he carved out his own principality. Lippiatt dismisses modern moralising over Simon's behaviour arguing against those who just see him as violent and religiously intolerant stating: 'Simon of Montfort may have been a zealot but to finish a historical assessment there adds little to one's understanding of him or his contemporaries.'⁴⁷⁰ Such an approach is central to this thesis. Only by interpreting historical individuals and their representation through contemporary frameworks can we make properly informed judgements about them. Lippiatt's work is a vital and welcome contribution to the historiography of Simon. But he tends to focus on Simon's wielding of power as evidenced from documentary sources such as charters and other legal texts and avoids analysis of the narrative representations of Simon which are what this chapter seeks to explore.

Historians that have taken a dislike or offered a moralistic objection to Simon and his actions have often done so without really engaging with these textual representations of him or the religious and cultural contexts informing their depiction of his actions. The narratives of the crusade are so detailed that they are often taken as fact, and not often analysed in any depth beyond the surface details, rather than considering why events such as this were represented in such a fashion.⁴⁷¹ However, considering authorial intention and motivation gives us a better understanding of the nature and content of these texts. This chapter will consider the employment of gender ideals and the impact this has on the representation of events within them, as well as issues such as genre, and narrative precedents.

⁴⁶⁸ Marvin, *The Occitan War*, p. 55.

⁴⁶⁹ Lippiatt, *Simon V of Montfort*.

⁴⁷⁰ Lippiatt, *Simon V of Montfort*, p. 13.

⁴⁷¹ I am referring to violent acts here and a general acceptance of certain historians to believe they done because the crusaders enjoyed indulging in violence. For more see the example of events at Bram below, p. 151.

3. Peter's Background

Peter of Vaux-de-Cernay was a Cistercian monk at the Abbey of Vaux-de-Cernay. His Latin account of the Albigensian crusade, *Historia Albigensis*, was written between 1212-18. It is largely contemporary and was written in an ongoing process whilst events were still taking place.⁴⁷² Peter's age is unknown. While referring to himself as a schoolboy (*puer elementarius*) in his introduction may be an indication of his age it could also be the trope of self-depreciation expressed by the 'unworthy author'.⁴⁷³ Historians have suggested he would have been about eighteen to twenty in 1212 because he had taken monastic vows by this time.⁴⁷⁴ Peter knew Simon personally, Peter's uncle was Guy, the Abbot of Vaux-de-Cernay, and he tells us that he had accompanied both of them on the Fourth Crusade. Thus it is established that crusading played an important part in both Simon and Peter's lives. Peter made numerous visits to the Languedoc during the crusade and saw much of the action he wrote about.⁴⁷⁵ Marvin asserts that Peter's chronicle is 'essential not only for the depth of basic details he provides, but quite simply for understanding through the eyes of the crusaders how the war was fought'.⁴⁷⁶ Peter's strong personal feeling about events, such as his hatred of the heretics and praise of Simon means that his one sided account gives very few considerations to those who opposed the crusade. For this reason Peter's translators, W.A. Sibly and M.D. Sibly describe him, somewhat disparagingly, as 'a naïve young man, quite intelligent, but unsophisticated, a zealous believer in orthodox dogma (he himself would no doubt have said simply that he was steadfastly faithful), and glad to accept what his superiors told him without question'.⁴⁷⁷ It is not clear who they believe the superiors were whom Peter should have questioned: his uncle the Abbot of Vaux-de-Cernay? The pope? Peter was clearly a product of his society and social milieu, but this does not make him

⁴⁷² It survives in eleven manuscripts, for more details see: *Hystoria* III, pp. xl – lvii.

⁴⁷³ *Hystoria*, p. 2. For the unworthy trope see: Antonia Gransden, 'Prologues in the historiography of twelfth-century England', *England in the Twelfth Century: Proceedings of the 1988 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Daniel Williams (Woodbridge, 1990), p. 55.

⁴⁷⁴ *Hystoria*, p. xxiv; McGlynn, *Kill Them All*, pp. 67-68; Christopher M. Kurpiewski, 'Writing beneath the shadow of heresy: the *Historia Albigensis* of Brother Pierre des Vaux-de-Cernay', *Journal of Medieval History*, 31, 1 (2005), 5.

⁴⁷⁵ Lippiatt, *Simon V of Montfort*, p. 7.

⁴⁷⁶ Marvin, *The Occitan War*, pp. 24-25.

⁴⁷⁷ Sibly, p. xxviii.

unsophisticated. As we shall see, he presents the crusade through a well formulated structure and a build-up of characters that showed literary nous.

Some historians have sought to identify Peter's purpose for writing the *Historia*. Graham-Leigh argues Peter's account 'was constructed for external consumption, to justify the Cistercian legatine version of the crusade.'⁴⁷⁸ This suggests there was anxiety about what had happened but that the focus of the text was not about Simon but on the crusade more broadly. However, the representation of Simon in the text, his ideal masculinity and martyrdom suggest something more. Lippiatt argues it was 'to enumerate Simon's virtuous deeds and justify or mask his questionable actions forming a model for the reader to venerate him.'⁴⁷⁹ Lippiatt makes the sound point that Peter criticises the southerners and heretics for their beliefs and 'routinely presents Simon as an exemplar of masculine rationality and orthodoxy in contrast to the effeminate superstitious and heterodox local nobility.'⁴⁸⁰ He does not expand on this point about masculinity, but this chapter will further his gendered line of argument.

Peter's work has obviously been important in the works of the above-mentioned historians who have concerned themselves with the Albigensian Crusade. Despite this there have only been a few studies that have analysed it as a narrative composition in its own right, for themes and other methods of furthering our understanding of the world of which Peter wrote, and of Peter himself. So far the work has been discussed in the following ways: Graham-Leigh has evaluated Peter's justification of massacres.⁴⁸¹ Whilst Monica Zerner has written about Simon's wife Alice of Montmorency as presented by Peter.⁴⁸² Christopher Kurpiewski's revealing piece tracked Peter's change of style as the crusade developed claiming that after the battle of Muret 1213, he

⁴⁷⁸ Graham-Leigh, *The Southern French*, p. 41.

⁴⁷⁹ Lippiatt, *Simon V of Montfort*, p. 8.

⁴⁸⁰ Lippiatt, *Simon V of Montfort*, p. 87; p. 95.

⁴⁸¹ Elaine Graham-Leigh, 'Justifying deaths: the chronicler Pierre des Vaux-de-Cernay and the massacre of Béziers', *Mediaeval Studies*, 63 (2001), 283-303.

⁴⁸² Monique Zerner, 'L'épouse de Simon de Montfort et la croisade albigeoise', *Femmes. Mariages - Lignages, XIIe-XIVe siècles: Melanges offert à Georges Duby*, ed. Jean Dufournet (Bruxelles, 1992), pp. 449-70.

focusses on Simon as the central figure of the text, rather than crusade as a whole, although as will be demonstrated Simon was central from the beginning of the work.⁴⁸³ More recently Megan Cassidy-Welch has written on the use of blood imagery in Peter's text.⁴⁸⁴ She argues that Peter used blood imagery for various means, such as a portent, the spread of heresy, its use in violence against the heretics and also martyrdom. These examples show the value of further research into the text as a composition because they demonstrate its complexity and Peter's skills and ability as an author. Peter's text is highly valuable not just for what it contains about the crusade and heresy but also for furthering our understanding of why and how he wrote, which in turn reflect the ideals and concerns of the context in which he wrote. This chapter seeks to add to this scholarship by demonstrating that even more can be done with his work, especially from a gendered perspective, which has not yet been attempted.

Beyond Peter's *Hystoria* there are other texts to compare with Peter's view. The *Chanson de la Croisade Albigeoise* was written by William of Tudela and covers the crusade from 1209 to 1213. Written in the Provençal language of the Languedoc its author was a cleric from Navarre but served in the army of Baldwin of Toulouse.⁴⁸⁵ As a native of the region he welcomed the crusade and supported the war against the heretics. Unlike Peter he glorifies many of the crusade's leaders, not solely Simon, including those from both sides, which is more fitting with the *chanson de geste* genre. This was because the genre was a celebration of deeds performed by the knighthood, usually focussing on martial prowess which was central to the entertainment value of them.⁴⁸⁶ Therefore both sides were represented well as long as they operated in accordance with contemporary standards of elite masculinity. According to Graham-Leigh these descriptions of various men being glorified may reflect what William's audience would have wanted since they

⁴⁸³ Kurpiewski, 'Writing beneath the shadow'.

⁴⁸⁴ Megan Cassidy-Welch, 'Images of blood in the *Historia Albigensis* of Pierre des Vaux-de-Cernay', *Journal of Religious History*, 35, 4 (2011), 478-91.

⁴⁸⁵ McGlynn, *Kill Them All*, p. 68.

⁴⁸⁶ *Song of the Cathar Wars*, p. 5.

were fellow Provençals who supported the crusade.⁴⁸⁷ Therefore the influence of genre is imperative to representations and this needs to be recognised by historians when analysing these texts.

William's work ended with events in 1213, most likely after his lord Baldwin of Toulouse's death occurred, but his text was continued by an anonymous writer. Referred to here as Anonymous, this writer was vehemently opposed to the crusade and how it was conducted. Anonymous was probably an eyewitness and participant in the events due to the amount of detail he records, and it can be assumed he was a supporter of the young Raymond VII of Toulouse (d. 1249). His hatred of the crusaders is an inversion of the presentation given by Peter of Vaux-de-Cernay and a welcome differing perspective of events. Linda Paterson suggests 'he sounds a passionate rallying cry to collective Occitan resistance.'⁴⁸⁸ However he was not a heretic nor even a sympathiser, he simply viewed the war as a land grab by northern French barons who were acting under the banner of papal authority but lacked moral justification for their actions. To him this was not a crusade or any recognisable form of holy war. His account covers events to 1219 and McGlynn summed up his work as a presentation of a 'war fought between different peoples of different regions, and not just between faiths.'⁴⁸⁹

William of Puylaurens wrote his *Chronica* as he neared his death in 1275, long after the events described.⁴⁹⁰ However he lived through these events and knew many of the key participants. William served the household of the bishop of Toulouse and was also chaplain to Count Raymond VII of Toulouse from 1245.⁴⁹¹ His work is useful for its details of the church in Toulouse at the start of the crusade and about the history of heresy in the region. William was a

⁴⁸⁷ Graham-Leigh, *The Southern French*, p. 25.

⁴⁸⁸ Linda Paterson, 'Chanson de la Croisade Albigeoise', *The Crusades an Encyclopaedia*, ed. Alan Murray (Oxford, 2006), pp. 236-37.

⁴⁸⁹ McGlynn, *Kill Them All*, pp. 68-70.

⁴⁹⁰ The version used here for the Latin is William of Puylaurens, *Chronique*, ed. Jean Duvernoy (Toulouse, 1996). An English translation has been published: *The Chronicle of William of Puylaurens: The Albigensian Crusade and its Aftermath*, trans. M. Sibly & W. A. Sibly (Woodbridge, 2003); *The Chronicle of William of Puylaurens*, p. xvi.

⁴⁹¹ *The Chronicle of William of Puylaurens*, p. xxiii.

supporter of the war against heresy and blamed poor leadership from the lords for the fact that it arrived and spread in the region. He probably had access to both Peter's work and the *Chanson* when he was writing as there are similarities to both in his work.⁴⁹² It has been noted that his chronicle contains original material but his greater strength lies in the post crusade events such as the inquisition against heresy.⁴⁹³ This is helpful in telling us about both the subsequent developing opinion on events and framing events with hindsight in mind.

4. Simon of Montfort: Characteristics of Leadership

Simon of Montfort was not the original leader of the crusade against the heretics in Occitania. He was just one of many nobles that took part in it. Once the crusaders had successfully taken Béziers and Carcassonne in July and August 1208 it was decided they would need someone to take over these territories and rule them, extirpate heresy, and ensure it would not return.⁴⁹⁴ Peter of Vaux-de-Cernay stated that the leadership position was initially offered to the Count of Nevers and the Duke of Burgundy but they both turned it down.⁴⁹⁵ They were offered it due to being the highest-ranking crusaders present and rejected it most likely due to their own commitments. Moreover the fact their own lands would not have been enhanced by the addition of these territories and that they would probably have to defend them against the men they had taken them from made them even less appealing.⁴⁹⁶

Therefore to choose a leader to rule over these newly acquired territories an election was held. Whilst modern historians like McGlynn argue the crusaders had to choose someone who was hungry for power and fame the medieval historians present a differing view.⁴⁹⁷ Their writings give an insight into the qualities and characteristics they wanted from a leader. Peter informs us the electors were two bishops and four knights from the army, the papal legate, and the Abbot

⁴⁹² McGlynn, *Kill Them All*, pp. 70-71.

⁴⁹³ Marvin, *The Occitan War*, pp. 26-27; McGlynn, *Kill Them All*, pp. 70-71.

⁴⁹⁴ For an overview of these events see: Marvin, *The Occitan War*, pp. 28-68; McGlynn, *Kill Them All*, pp. 64-117.

⁴⁹⁵ *Hystoria*, p. 101.

⁴⁹⁶ Marvin, *The Occitan War*, p. 54.

⁴⁹⁷ McGlynn, *Kill Them All*, pp. 118-19.

of Cîteaux. He recorded: ‘they gave a firm promise to choose the man they knew would best serve the interests of God and [worldly affairs].’⁴⁹⁸ This form of electing a leader can be found in two previous crusades, the First and Fourth. The election of Godfrey of Bouillon after the conquest of Jerusalem in 1099 effectively cemented Godfrey’s position as the ideal crusader and leader ensuring his legacy would live on for centuries.⁴⁹⁹ Likewise the conquest of Constantinople in 1204 led to the election of Baldwin of Flanders to the imperial Byzantine throne when he became the first Latin Emperor of Byzantium.⁵⁰⁰ Both elections were done through a mixture of ecclesiastical and lay persons. Peter tells us the electors, with the help of the Holy Spirit, ‘chose a man true to the Catholic faith, honourable in his way of life and strong in battle.’⁵⁰¹ These traits link back to descriptions of Godfrey of Bouillon as demonstrated by Ralph of Caen’s example in Chapter One which described him as being monk and warrior like.⁵⁰² By the thirteenth century these traits were clearly deemed especially important in regard to both leadership and kingship along with crusading.

Peter continued his account by recording that the Abbot of Cîteaux with the Duke of Burgundy and the Count of Nevers ‘went to Simon of Montfort and urged and begged him to accept what was both a burden and an honour. However, this most singular man firmly refused, declaring that he was inadequate for the task and unworthy of it.’⁵⁰³ This is a common trope to present someone as believing themselves to be unworthy of high office, especially because it would be seen as arrogant to have the self-belief that one held these ideal characteristics. One of the most well-known medieval examples of an individual rejecting a crown due to claims of their own

⁴⁹⁸ trans. Sibly, p. 55. Brackets my own translation; *Hystoria*, p. 101: ‘qui firmiter promiserunt quod illum eligerent quem secundum Deum et seculum scirent utiliore.’

⁴⁹⁹ For the election of Godfrey see John France, ‘The Election and Title of Godfrey de Bouillon’, *Canadian Journal of History*, 18, 3 (1983), 321-30.

⁵⁰⁰ For Baldwin of Flanders election see: Jonathan Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade and the Sack of Constantinople* (London, 2005).

⁵⁰¹ trans. Sibly, p. 55; *Hystoria*, p.101: ‘eligunt virum fide catholicum, moribus honestum, armis strenuum.’

⁵⁰² See above, p. 21.

⁵⁰³ trans. Sibly, p. 55; *Hystoria*, pp. 101-02: ‘Ad ipsum veniunt, monet, rogant, consulunt ut suscipiat onus pariter et honorem; quod cum vir discretissimus instantissime renueret et se fateretur insufficientem pariter et indignum.’

unworthiness comes from Einhard's influential biography of Charlemagne. In his account of how Charlemagne came to be crowned by the pope on Christmas Day 800 Einhard wrote:

'The time that he received the title of Emperor and Augustus. At first he disliked this so much that he said that he would not have entered the church that day, even though it was a great feast day; if he had known in advance of the pope's plan. But he bore the animosity that the assumption of this title caused with great patience.'⁵⁰⁴

Usually in these cases, as Charlemagne certainly did, such men go on to be a praised ruler. This was because they did not lust after power but ruled because it was imposed on them and thus they discharged this duty without self-interest. Charlemagne was a model ruler during this period and by the thirteenth century had come to be seen as a proto-crusader.⁵⁰⁵ His name was invoked by many crusade narrative authors when discussing either pilgrimage or impressive warriors, for example Robert the Monk's account of the First Crusade opens with a speech from Pope Urban II announcing the crusade and telling those present: 'May you be stirred and inspired in your minds by the manly deeds of your predecessors, the probity and greatness of Charlemagne.'⁵⁰⁶

Peter recorded that the Abbot eventually used his papal authority to beg Simon to take the role, to which he agreed. In response Peter wrote: 'So, this noble man took charge of the government

⁵⁰⁴ trans. Ganz, D., *Einhard and Notker the Stammerer Two Lives of Charlemagne* (London, 2008), p. 38; Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*, ed. G. Waitz (Hanover, 1911), p. 32: 'Quo tempore imperatoris et augusti nomen accepit. Quod primo in tantum aversatus est, ut adfirmaret se eo die, quamvis praecipua festivitas esset, ecclesiam non intraturum, si pontifices consilium praescire potuisset. Invidiam tamen suscepti nominis, ... magna tulit patientia.'

⁵⁰⁵ For example of his proto-crusading see: Jace Stuckey, 'Charlemagne as crusader? Memory, propaganda, and the many uses of Charlemagne's legendary expedition to Spain', *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages: Power, Faith, and Crusade*, ed. Matthew Gabriele & Jace Stuckey (New York, 2008), pp. 137-52; Miguel Dolan Gómez, 'Rex Parvus or Rex Nobilis? Charlemagne and the Politics of History (and Crusading) in Thirteenth-Century Iberia', *The Charlemagne legend in medieval Latin texts*, ed. William Purkis & Matthew Gabriele (Woodbridge, 2016), pp. 92-114. For an example of his model kingship see: Wendy Marie Hoofnagle, 'Charlemagne's legacy and Anglo-Norman imperialism in Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum*', *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages: Power, Faith, and Crusade*, ed. Matthew Gabriele & Jace Stuckey (New York, 2008), pp. 77-94; Jace Stuckey, *Charlemagne: The making of an image, 1100-1300* Unpublished doctoral thesis (University of Florida, 2006).

⁵⁰⁶ Robert the Monk, p. 6: 'Moveant vos et incitent animos vestros ad virilitatem gesta predecessorum vestrorum, probitas et magnitudo Karoli Magni regis.'

of the territory for the glory of God, the honour of the Church and the suppression of heresy.⁵⁰⁷

The same trope appears in William of Puylaurens' condensed account of Simon's election. Higher ranked men were offered the role and declined, but, 'a man devoted to God, and of exemplary energy, Simon, Count of Montfort, was then put forward for the task. At first he refused it as the others had done, but then yielded to the entreaties of the prelates and barons, saying that God's business should not be frustrated for the want of a single champion.'⁵⁰⁸ As in Peter's account, Simon is reluctant to take on the role, and only does so because he is compelled by others, and by his duty to serve God.

The *Historia* offered something not found in the other accounts of the Albigensian Crusade: a physical description of Simon. Known as physiognomy, which reads the appearance of the body as a reflection of inner character, physical descriptions of rulers in the medieval period also appear in Einhard's biography of Charlemagne which borrowed its form from Suetonius's Twelve Caesars.⁵⁰⁹ To some extent the description of Simon can be considered reliable due to the author being personally acquainted with his subject:

[Simon] was tall, with a splendid head of hair and fine features; of handsome appearance, broad-shouldered with muscular arms, of excellent physique generally, agile and nimble of hand and foot, quick and active; indeed there was not the smallest fault that even an enemy or envious person could point to.⁵¹⁰

The description essentially proved that Simon was physically endowed with certain traits considered essential to elite masculinity in order to carry out the leadership role to which he had

⁵⁰⁷ trans. Sibly, p. 55; *Hystoria*, p. 102: 'Suscepit igitur terre gubernacula vir clarus ad laudem Dei, honorem ecclesie, depressionem heretice pravitatis.'

⁵⁰⁸ trans. *Chronica*, p. 34; Puylaurens, p. 68: 'inventus est vir Deo devotus et strenuus, Symon comes Montis fortis, qui multis devictus prelatorum precibus et baronum, quod cum ceteris primo recusaverat acceptavit, dicens quod defectu unius campionis nequaquam Dei negotium remaneret.'

⁵⁰⁹ For Einhard's description of Charlemagne see: Einhard, *Vita*, pp. 26-27.

⁵¹⁰ trans. Sibly, p. 56; *Hystoria*, p. 104: 'statura procerus, cesarie spectabilis, facie elegans, aspectu decorus, humeris eminens, brachiis exertus, corpore venustus, membris omnibus agilis et habilis, acer et alacer, in nulla sui vel modica parte, etiam ab hoste vel invidio, reprobatus.'

been elected. Thus while this passage may indeed reflect Simon's actual appearance it also owed something to convention, because his handsome appearance and frame meant he fitted a preconceived idea of both a warrior and a saint.⁵¹¹ Although uncommon to hagiography Odo of Cluny included a physical description of Gerald of Aurillac:

For although 'the flesh is of no avail' [Jn 6.63] and although beauty is a deceiving grace, because it is often the cause of lust and pride, nevertheless in this man it is to be praised, because it was both attractive and free from the foulness of lust. Gerald was of medium height and well proportioned. And while beauty encompassed all his members, his neck was of such shining white and so adorned to suit the eye, that you would think you had hardly seen another so beautiful. ... His bodily agility made him very quick in his movements and he was very strong. What is especially noteworthy, because it shows how admirable he was, is that, having matter for pride, he kept himself humble. How blameworthy are those on the other hand, who, possessing little or nothing, are yet puffed up with pride.⁵¹²

Like the description of Simon, Gerald's description is one of flawless appearance, which links physicality to personality traits.⁵¹³ Similarly throughout his chronicle, William of Tyre gave physical descriptions of all the men who ruled the kingdom of Jerusalem. For example he said the following of King Baldwin III: 'For when he became a man he stood out in elegance as the

⁵¹¹ Yvonne Friedmann states: 'being handsome was a significant aspect of medieval masculinity.' Yvonne Friedman, 'Masculine attributes of the other: The shared knightly model', *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Natasha Hodgson, Katherine J. Lewis, & Matthew Mesley (London, 2019), p. 93.

⁵¹² trans. Noble & Head, pp. 307-308; *Sancti Geraldii*, pp. 650-51: 'Nam licet caro non prosit, licet fallax gratia sit pulchritudo, tamen quia libidinis atque superbiae fomes esse quibusdam solet, laudandum est in hoc viro quod et venustus fuit, et se nec libidinis coeno foedavit. Geraldus igitur staturae mediocris, et totus, ut dicitur, euphormis, id est bene formatus. Et cum unumquodque membrum sua pulchritudo compsisset, collum tamen ita candidulum, et quasi ad normam vivendi decusatum habebat, ut vix aliud tam gratiosum vidisse te putare... Erat praeterea corporis pernicitate multum velox, et virium robore validus. Quod ideirco fit commemorandum ut appareat quoniam laudabilis est qui, materiam superbiendi habens, sese in humilitate depresserit. E contra, quoniam vituperabiles, qui parum vel nil horum habentes intumescunt.'

⁵¹³ Airlie argues that the purpose behind Odo's presentation of Gerald was to demonstrate Odo's own superiority over other aristocrats of his period: Stuart Airlie, 'The anxiety of sanctity: St Gerald of Aurillac and his maker', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 43, 3 (1992), 372-95.

shape and condition of his whole body was distinct ahead of others.’⁵¹⁴ Ashley Firth argues these descriptions were sketched by William in order to establish their effectiveness to rule.⁵¹⁵ We can say the same of Peter’s description of Simon, he was the correct choice for leader as he possessed both the moral and the physical attributes of ideal masculinity which were required to eradicate heresy.

Following the physical description, Peter built on the image of Simon’s suitability to rule by moving from his external to his internal characteristics:

To go on to his more important qualities, he was eloquent of speech, eminently approachable, a most congenial comrade-in-arms, of impeccable chastity, outstanding in humility, wise, firm of purpose, prudent in counsel, fair in giving judgment, diligent in the pursuit of military duties, circumspect in his actions, eager to set about a task, tireless in completing it, and totally dedicated to the service of God.⁵¹⁶

From this we can see that Peter touches on the four cardinal virtues of prowess, justice, temperance and prudence, along with knightly-noble characteristics such as piety and honour. All of these authenticated the choice of Simon as leader because he was an exemplar of hegemonic masculinity. The significance of this will be explored shortly. But first it is important to consider other perspectives and compare how they recounted Simon’s promotion to crusade leadership.

According to William of Tudela Simon was chosen to be leader because he was: ‘a rich and valiant baron, a tough fighting man, wise and experienced, a good horseman, generous,

⁵¹⁴ William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, p. 714: ‘Nam vir factus, sicut facie, et tota corporis habitudine, prae caeteris differenti formae praeeminebat elegantia.’

⁵¹⁵ Ashley Firth, *The Creation of the Jerusalemite Dynasty in the Twelfth Century: Kingship, Military Masculinity and Fatherhood in William of Tyre’s Historia Rerum In Partibus Transmarinis Gestarum*, Unpublished doctoral thesis, (University of Huddersfield, 2016), pp. 125-29.

⁵¹⁶ trans. Sibly, p. 56; *Hystoria*, pp. 104-05: ‘Demum, ut ascendamus ad majora, erat facundia disertus, affabilitate communis, contubernio amabilis, castitate mundissimus, humilitate precipuus, sapientia peditus, in proposito firmus, in consilio providus, in iudicio justus, in milicie exercitiis sedulus, in suis actibus circumspectus, in incipiendis arduus, in perficiendis non defessus, totus Divinis serviciis mancipatus.’

honourable and pleasant, kind, frank, and courteous, a man with a good understanding.⁵¹⁷ Unlike Peter's account Simon did not turn down the offer, instead he demanded a pledge that the others back him should he need their help, to which they agreed. Consequently, Simon at 'once boldly accepted the fief, the land and the country.'⁵¹⁸ William's list of characteristics is based on Simon's skills as a warrior and the wealth and demeanour expected of a high status man. Significantly William did not include anything suggesting a religious motivation or the streak of piety which Peter emphasised, although they may have been implicit to the audience due to the link between chivalry and defending the church's interests. Essentially Simon was shown to have the necessary skills to lead men in a war of conquest which can be explained as being due to the nature of the audience of the text. Peter wrote a hagio-historical account aimed primarily at a monastic audience whereas William of Tudela wrote a vernacular account for the laity that exemplified the warrior elite.⁵¹⁹ It could be that the intertwining of elite masculinity and the concept of chivalry meant that there was no need to emphasise the pious nature of his vocation. All three textual accounts of Simon's election thus highlight that he possessed the masculine qualities necessary to be a crusade leader. The next section will consider how Simon's exploits after his election, as described by Peter, further demonstrate both his masculinity and his holiness.

5. Justice

As noted in Chapter One justice was integral to masculinity and leadership.⁵²⁰ Odo of Cluny made a point of Gerald of Aurillac's desire to enact justice, claiming, 'the thirst and hunger of justice burned in him.'⁵²¹ This was a contributory factor towards Gerald's sanctity which, as discussed above, derived in part from exemplary performance of his secular role.⁵²² Justice was also key to Peter's representation of Simon and was an aspect of Simon's hypermasculinity. The

⁵¹⁷ trans. Shirley, p. 27; *Chanson* I, p. 86: 'Aun riche baron, qui fu pros e valent, / Ardit e combatant, savi e conoisent, / Bos cavalers e larcs e pros e avinent, / Dous e franc e suau, ab bo entendment.'

⁵¹⁸ trans. Shirley, p. 27; *Chanson* I, p. 88: 'Am tant receub la honor vias ardidament, / La terra e l païs.'

⁵¹⁹ Language and audience are discussed in Chapter One, pp. 31-32.

⁵²⁰ As noted in Chapter One justice was integral to masculinity and leadership, p. 46.

⁵²¹ *Sancti Geraldi*, p. 654: 'Iustitiae sitis, ut esuries, ordinatim in eo flagrabat.'

⁵²² See above, pp. 130-31.

enacting of justice through controlled and appropriate violence is often praised in medieval narratives. This is because a lack of justice caused serious problems that usually involved descent into lawlessness and indiscriminate bloodshed which harms the vulnerable. Some of the following examples of Simon's exercise of justice have been viewed by modern commentators as a celebration of extreme violence, even as evidence that Simon took pleasure in violence.⁵²³ But, as we shall see, Peter makes it clear that Simon's actions were justifiable because the punishment was commensurate with the crime. Moreover, underlying the text is a belief that powerful men should use force and even brutality to enact their will in response to those who commit acts which threatens peace.

The first incident involves an act of mutilation at Bram, which McGlynn argues was 'one of the crusade's most notorious events.'⁵²⁴ This occurred in 1210 after conquering the fortified town.

They put out the eyes of the defenders, over a hundred in number, and cut off their noses. One man was spared one eye so that as a demonstration of our contempt for our enemies, he could lead the others to Cabaret. The count had this punishment carried out not because such mutilation gave him any pleasure but because his opponents had been first in atrocities and cruel executioners that they were, were given to butchering any of our men they might capture by dismembering them. It was right that they should fall into the pit they had dug themselves and drink from time to time of the cup they so often administered to others. The count never took delight in cruelty or in the torture of his enemies, he was the kindest of men and the saying of the poet fitted him most aptly: "a prince slow to punish, and quick to reward, who grieved when driven to be hard."⁵²⁵

⁵²³ Pegg, *A Most Holy War*, p. 100-01.

⁵²⁴ McGlynn, *Kill Them All*, p. 138.

⁵²⁵ trans. Sibly, p. 79; *Hystoria*, pp. 148-49: 'hominibus autem castri illius plus quam centum oculos eruerunt, nasos amputaverunt, dimittentes uni eorum unicum oculum, ut in sugillationem inimicorum nostrorum omnes alios duceret Cabaretum. Hoc autem fecit fieri comes, non quia placeret ei talis detruncatio membrorum hominibus illata, set quia adversarii sui hoc inceperant et quosunque de nostris invenire poterant membrorum detruncatione

Thus Simon's behaviour was justified as an appropriate response to his enemy's own cruel conduct. In another case from 1211 Peter recorded that after the siege of Lavaur was successfully completed, Simon had the rebel Aimeric of Montreal led out with eighty other knights to be hanged:

However, after Aimeric, who was taller than the others, had been hanged, the gibbets started to fall down, since through excessive haste they had not been properly fixed in the ground. The count realised that to continue would cause a long delay and ordered the rest to be put to the sword. The crusaders fell to this task with great enthusiasm and quickly slew them on the spot. The Count had the Dame of Lavaur, sister of Aimeric and a heretic of the worst sort, thrown into a pit and stones heaped on her. Our crusaders burnt innumerable heretics, with great rejoicing.⁵²⁶

Here, despite appearing savage, the slaying of the prisoners was done to bring a quick death rather than a prolonged agonising one. However the killing of the heretics was done as a warning to others. Marvin doubts Peter's assertion that Simon 'never took delight in cruelty or in the torture of his enemies' by listing other examples of what he defines as brutish behaviour, such as the storming of Béziers and sentencing a repentant heretic to death.⁵²⁷ However, he concedes that Simon's actions were due to the strict code of loyalty that he lived by; those who likewise did could be expected to be treated well but those who did not would be severely dealt with.⁵²⁸

These instances are characteristic of acts of hypermasculinity, as Elizabeth Wood would describe

carnifices crudelissimi trucidabant; justam enim erat ut, in foveam incidentes quam foderant, biberent aliquando calicem quem aliis propinarant sepiissime; nunquam enim delectabatur nobilis comes aliqua crudelitate vel cruciatibus alienis; omnium siquidem mitissimus erat illudque poeticam ei manifestissime congruebat: Hic piger ad penas princeps, ad premia velox, Quique dolet, quotiens cogitur esse ferox.'

⁵²⁶ trans. Sibly, p. 117; *Hystoria*, p. 228: 'set, cum Aimericus, qui erat major inter alios, suspensus fuisset, cadentibus furcis, que pre nimia festinatione bene non fuerant terre affixe, videns comes quod mora magna fieret, alios occidi precepit; quos peregrini avidissime suscipientes, in eodem loco dicto cicius occiderunt. Dominam etiam castri, que erat soror Aimerici et heretica pessima, in puteum projectam, comes lapidibus obrui fecit. Innumerabiles etiam hereticos peregrini nostri cum ingenti gaudio combusserunt.'

⁵²⁷ For Béziers see: *Hystoria*, pp. 91-92. For the sentencing to death see: *Hystoria*, pp. 117-18.

⁵²⁸ Marvin, *The Occitan War*, p. 73.

it: an extreme form of violence intended to assert power over those viewing.⁵²⁹ Simon's intention was presumably that his actions would cause others to reconsider rebelling against his rule. Although modern historians may decry these acts and see them as reflecting badly on Simon some contemporaries did not. It was in fact part of how high status men needed to act. William of Tudela even included a gruesome death ordered by Simon of Montfort which was not found in the *Historia*. In this case a northern French knight was ordered to be buried alive after he had murdered the uncle of Gerald of Pépieux in 1209.⁵³⁰ This showed Simon was not averse to punishing his own men who committed legal and moral transgressions. Simon's enactment of justice was also justified because it was a means of enforcing control in specific areas and thus fulfilling his aim of eradicating heresy.

In order to further emphasise the rectitude of Simon's conduct Peter provided a contrast to throw him into sharp relief which is a common trope in hagiography.⁵³¹ The *Historia* stated that Count Raymond VI of Toulouse had allowed heresy to encroach into the region under his control because he lacked either the ability to enforce justice or had a lack of desire to do so. This lack of ability to enforce justice manifested itself, for example, through recruiting mercenaries:

the count always had a remarkable liking for mercenaries, whom he employed to rob churches, destroy monasteries and, wherever he could, deprive his neighbours of their possessions. Always he acted as a limb of the devil; a son of perdition, an enemy of the cross, the persecutor of the church, the defender of heretics, the oppressor of the catholic

⁵²⁹ Wood, 'Hypermasculinity', 329-50.

⁵³⁰ *Chanson I*, pp. 102-04.

⁵³¹ Noble & Head, *Soldiers of Christ*, p. 294.

faith, a servant of treachery, forswearer of his word, replete with crime, a veritable treasury of all sins.⁵³²

Raymond was using his lordship to rob the church and feed his own greed. Mercenaries operating in his lands were a clear sign of a lack of justice enacted by a lord because it was essentially his job to maintain peace, not to initiate violence, as Peter accused him of doing. Raymond's self-interest accordingly only furthered the spread of heresy in the Languedoc as he was certainly not presented as offering any counter against it. His lack of justice meant that he failed at upholding a central attribute of elite masculinity.

6. Prowess

An integral method of celebrating Simon of Montfort's masculinity was for the *Historia* to emphasise Simon's prowess, which was equivalent to fortitude. As discussed in Chapter One Gerald of Wales believed fortitude to magnify the greatness of elite men.⁵³³ Certainly, behaviour on the battlefield was key to how Simon was perceived by other men, which demonstrates Karras' argument about the significance of the public performance of violence.⁵³⁴ Moreover this is also an aspect of hagiographical masculinity as evidenced by Odo of Cluny's praise of Gerald of Aurillac, while addressing the anxiety surrounding violence and religion, he wrote:

Let no one be worried because a just man sometimes made use of fighting, which seems incompatible with religion. No one who has judged his cause impartially will be able to

⁵³² trans. Sibly, pp. 24-5; *Hystoria*, pp. 38-40: 'Preterea ruptarios mirabilia semper amplexatus est affectu dictus comes, per quos spoliabat ecclesias, monasteria destruebat omnesque sibi vicinos quos poterat exheredabat. Ita semper se habuit membrum Diaboli, filius perditionis, inimicus crucis, ecclesie persecutor, hereticorum defensio, catholicorum depressio, minister prodicionis, fidei abjuratory, plenus scelerum, peccatorum omnium apotheca.'

⁵³³ See above, p. 48.

⁵³⁴ Karras, *From Boys to Men*, p. 21.

show that the glory of Gerald is clouded by this ... Gerald did not fight invading the property of others, but defending his own, or rather his people's rights.⁵³⁵

Katherine Allen Smith argues the use of martial rhetoric, in relation to spiritual fighting by monastics, permeates through clerical writings.⁵³⁶ And the same ethos also underpins crusade narratives too.⁵³⁷ Therefore it was acceptable to fight in the right circumstances which Gerald defined for his reader thus:

Hereafter, let him who by his example shall take up arms against his enemies, seek also by his example not his own but the common good. For you may see some who for love of praise or gain boldly put themselves in danger, gladly sustain the evils of the world for the sake of the world, and while they encounter its bitterness lose the joys, so to speak, which they were seeking.⁵³⁸

Odo is clear that fighting should only be done for the common good and not self-interest. Whilst some modern historians such as Tyerman and Asbridge have accused the crusaders of only having self-interest the *Historia* presents Simon as fighting for a worthy cause.⁵³⁹ After all, it was on the battlefield that Simon led his men to conquer and destroy the heretical movement. The following is an overview of some instances of Peter's praise for Simon's prowess, in comparison to other accounts, in order to consider why Peter recorded events in the way he did.

Simon's prowess was mentioned once before he was appointed leader of the crusade, coming at the siege of Carcassonne which fell on 15 August 1209. According to Peter, Simon led by

⁵³⁵ trans. Noble & Head pp. 302-03; *Sancti Geraldii*, p. 647: 'nemo sane moveatur, quod homo justus usum praeliandi, qui incongruus religioni videtur, aliquando habuerit. Quisquis ille est, si justa lance causam discreverit, ne in hac quidem parte gloriam Geraldii probabit obfuscandam... Gerladus non aliena pervadendo, sed sua, quin potius suorum jura tuendo confligebat.'

⁵³⁶ Smith, *War*, p. 112.

⁵³⁷ This comes under the wider ideology of Just War during the period. For more see: Frederick Russell, 'Just war', *The Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy*, ed. Robert Pasnau (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 593-606.

⁵³⁸ trans. Noble & Head, p. 303: *Sancti Geraldii*, p. 647: 'Porro autem, qui exemplo ejus adversus inimicos arma sumpserit, ejus quoque exemplo non propriam commoditatem, sed communem quaerat. Videas namque nonnullos qui pro amore laudis aut lucre, sese periculis audenter obijciunt, mala mundi pro mundo libenter sustinent.'

⁵³⁹ See above, p. 135.

example in attempting to capture one of the town's suburbs: '[he] courageously advanced into the ditch ahead of all the others – indeed he was the only knight to do so – and thus played an outstanding part in capturing this suburb.'⁵⁴⁰ This then inspired other men to follow and capture further areas. Simon's performance here set him apart from other men, he is singular, and his actions foreshadow his election as leader. Capturing Carcassonne was an important victory for the crusaders establishing them as a conquering force in the region.

Following the success at Béziers and Carcassonne in 1209, Simon and the crusaders had earned a reputation as being formidable warriors and this perceived prowess caused their enemy to run away before they could engage them. For example Montreal near Carcassonne, was won when its lord fled at the oncoming of the crusaders.⁵⁴¹ Peter stated: 'although his supporters were very few and his enemies numberless, they never dared attack him in open warfare.'⁵⁴² This suggests Simon's presence alone brought fear to his enemies which was praiseworthy as it maintained peace since they would not fight him. Other instances of Simon's fearlessness included his attack on the defenders of Foix, where he 'displayed astounding courage.'⁵⁴³ Peter tells us he charged at the defenders of the gates with a single knight in support forcing the defenders to retreat back inside.⁵⁴⁴ Apparently, he would have followed them in if they had not shut the gate. Later, at the siege of Termes in 1210, when the crusaders' siege engines were attacked Simon 'reached the enemy soldiers who were pulling down the mangonel and, quite alone, compelled them willy-nilly to return to the *castrum*. He pursued them with great courage and put them to flight not without peril to his own life. [Oh courageous prince, o manly virtue!].'⁵⁴⁵ Once more Simon is described as singular demonstrating his exceptionality in comparison to other men. The

⁵⁴⁰ trans. Sibly, pp. 52-53; *Hystoria*, p. 96: 'Primus omnium, immo solus quoad milites, in fossatum se misit audacter, ceteris acius dictum suburbium expugnando.'

⁵⁴¹ *Hystoria*, p. 138.

⁵⁴² trans. Sibly, p. 77; *Hystoria*, p. 146: 'licet infinitos haberet hostes et paucissimos adjutores, nunquam tamen ipsum aggredi ausi sunt bello campali.'

⁵⁴³ trans. Sibly, pp. 80-1; *Hystoria*, p. 151: 'ibi ostendit mirabilem probitatem.'

⁵⁴⁴ *Hystoria*, pp. 151-52.

⁵⁴⁵ trans. Sibly, p. 98. Brackets my own translation; *Hystoria*, p. 189: 'veniensque ad illos qui machinam discindebant, eos in castrum suum solus intrare compulit, vellent nollent, insecutusque eos viriliter, non sine proprie vite dispendio diutius effugavit. O audacia principis, o virtus virilis!'

crusaders were eventually victorious at Termes, Marvin argues the capture of the town cemented Simon's 'reputation as a tough, ruthless soldier with limitless determination who would use terror if necessary.'⁵⁴⁶ Simon's individual actions and courage were clearly viewed as instrumental to the capture, thus confirming that he had been the right choice for leader. Simon's prowess and fortitude were integral both to his standing in the crusade and to the perception of his hagiographic and hegemonic masculinity presented by Peter.

7. Temperance

Temperance was a key cardinal virtue as discussed in Chapter One.⁵⁴⁷ Sexual temperance was a major theme for Odo in his description of Gerald, writing: 'Although by far the most outstanding of his deeds is that he preserved his chastity to old age. For it is chastity alone that imitates the purity of the angels.'⁵⁴⁸ Temperance, as either celibacy or moderate sexual relations with a wife, was highly praised in high status men, because it was an aspect of the self-control deemed essential to ideal rulership. William of Newburgh asserts that David I of Scotland was celibate, despite being married, for religious reasons. And William highlights that being so religious was not a hinderance to his governance of the realm. Indeed William praises his generosity in alms and towards religious institutions.⁵⁴⁹ Near the opening of his account Peter made it clear that he disapproved of Count Raymond VI's lack of temperance, especially regarding what he identified as Raymond's sexual depravity. The reason behind this was to demonstrate Raymond's unfitness to rule, because as Lydia Dubois argues, 'the inability to

⁵⁴⁶ Marvin, *The Occitan War*, p. 93.

⁵⁴⁷ For temperance as a property of elite masculinity see, pp. 50-52.

⁵⁴⁸ trans. Noble & Head. p. 347; *Sancti Geraldii*, p. 690: 'Quamvis illud incomparabiliter in ejus factis immineat, quod usque in senectutem castus perseveravit. Castitas enim sola est quae imitator angelicam puritatem.'

⁵⁴⁹ William of Newburgh, 'Historia', pp. 76-78.

master one's own sexual urges, represented the failure of an unachieved man, who was not strong enough or male enough.⁵⁵⁰ Peter wrote:

[Raymond] was a vicious and lecherous man to the extent that – we can take it as an established fact – he abused his own sister as a way of showing contempt for the Christian religion. Again, from early youth he lost no opportunity to seek out his father's concubines and felt no compunction about bedding them – indeed none of them could please him unless he knew his father had previously slept with her. So it came about that his father frequently threatened to disinherit him, for this enormity as much as for his heresy.⁵⁵¹

Accusing Raymond of incestuous rape is a very serious charge to make, and here Peter wants to establish to his audience that this assertion was not based on rumour or hearsay but on actual fact. This established his depravity, in conjunction with his use of concubines that had been with his own father, which can be read as another hint towards incestuous behaviour.

Peter continued on the theme of sex and Raymond's irreligiosity claiming: 'he paid little attention to the sacrament of marriage that whenever his wife displeased him he sent her away and found another, therefore he had had four wives, of whom three until now are living.'⁵⁵² However, Peter's description of Raymond as engaging in serial marriages implied that Raymond once bored of a wife offloads her and marries again. This behaviour suggests he used the women for sexual pleasure and this lust could not be satisfied, hence the serial marriages. Peter gives no indication that there were practical and political motives at work in Raymond's marriages, as there were in the marriages of any high status man, even though we know two of Raymond's wives died

⁵⁵⁰ Anne-Lydie Dubois, 'The adolescent and the crusader: Journey and rebirth on the path to manhood in the thirteenth century', *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Natasha Hodgson, Katherine J. Lewis, & Matthew Mesley (London, 2019), p. 76.

⁵⁵¹ trans. Sibly, p. 24; *Hystoria*, p. 38: 'Adeo etiam semper fuit luxuriosus et lubricus dictus comes quod, sicut pro certo didicimus, sorore propria abutebatur in contemptum religionis christane; ab infantia etiam sua concubinas patris sui diligentissime querebat et cum illis libentissime concumbebat: vix enim aliqua ei placere poterat, nisi sciret patrem suum prius concubuisse cum ea. Unde etiam pater ipsius, tam propter heresim quam propter enormitatem istam, exheredationem suam ei sepius predicebat.'

⁵⁵² Sibly, p. 23, n. 46.

including Richard the Lionheart's sister Joan (d. 1199) who was married to Raymond when she returned from the Third Crusade in a politically motivated alliance.⁵⁵³

Sexual lust and having a preoccupation with numerous women through constant marriages was considered unmanly behaviour as it showed only concern for the self and disregard for the commonwealth over whom he ruled. Thus it was a clear example of lacking self-mastery, the bedrock of kingship.⁵⁵⁴ Indeed self-interest was often the main accusation against inadequate leaders, especially on crusade as shown in Chapter Two regarding Philip II of France and Conrad of Montferrat.⁵⁵⁵ The focus of a leader should be on the Christian community rather than on individual concerns, let alone pleasures, and it was clear which interested Raymond. Moreover, significantly, a lack of temperance had effects on the other three remaining cardinal virtues, as it was believed that all four had to be maintained to rule justly. Gerald of Wales made this clear: 'if someone lacks one of the virtues, although he may appear to have many others, he nevertheless has none of them effectually or beneficially.'⁵⁵⁶ Similarly, Odo made the following observation about Saint Gerald's mastery:

Very unworthy he thought it, that he who was lord of many people should become a slave to the domination of vices. He went fasting to the law court, lest failing in temperance he should be unable to give a reasonable judgement. For he sought what was of Christ, what was of peace, what might further the common good.⁵⁵⁷

Gerald's temperance was linked to his rationality, conversely it can be assumed the intemperate were irrational. This approach to the significance of temperance further explains Peter's focus on

⁵⁵³ For Joan's marriage to Raymond see: Gillingham, *Richard I*, pp. 306-07.

⁵⁵⁴ Lewis, *Kingship and Masculinity*, pp. 2-3.

⁵⁵⁵ See above, pp. 95-97 and pp. 98-106.

⁵⁵⁶ Gerald of Wales, p. 391: 'Sic et qui una uirtute caret, quanquam multas alias habere videatur, nullam tamen efficaciter aut salubriter habet.'

⁵⁵⁷ trans. Noble & Head, p. 306; *Sancti Geraldii*, p. 650: 'Valde enim indigne ducebat, ut qui multis praelatus erat et dominus, vitiorum dominationi fieret servus. Jejunos ibat ad placitum ne mersa sobrietate rationis iudicio caruisset. Inquirebat autem quid Christi, quid pacis, quod commune bonum praeferret.'

Raymond's sexual depravity and lack of self-mastery which in turn explained the general breakdown in law and order in his lands. It also explains why Peter, on the other hand, was keen to show Simon's temperance, because it was a key aspect of his qualification to rule. In addition, Peter's account of Simon's wife, Alice of Montmorency, further highlighted the contrast between Simon's temperance and Raymond's lustfulness. A key tactic which Peter employed here was to emphasise that Alice played the role of the ideal medieval elite woman, providing vital support for her husband, as we shall see, rather than tempting him to immoderate and sinful sexual indulgence, as Raymond's wives did.⁵⁵⁸ This was important because, as Hodgson argues, crusade narratives often 'evinced concerns about the presence of wives on crusade.'⁵⁵⁹ Therefore Alice's presence had to be dealt with carefully and the *Historia* was clear that it was beneficial as it demonstrated the ideal relationship between husband and wife. Alice was suitably subordinate yet supportive which emphasised Simon's masculinity as he was dominant in both domestic and public life. Peter explained that the couple complemented each other:

I must add that gifted and great as the count was, the Lord provided him with a helpmate like himself – his wife, who was in short, pious, wise and caring. Her piety adorned her wisdom and her concern for others, her wisdom shaped her piety and concern, her concern stimulated her piety and wisdom. To add to all this, the Lord blessed the Countess in her offspring; she gave the Count numerous fine children.⁵⁶⁰

Peter's comments on Alice being a good wife by providing Simon with many children, thus heirs, implicitly highlights Simon's virility. Significantly William of Tudela also praised Alice, writing of her: 'No wiser woman, So God and the faith help me, has anyone ever met in the length and

⁵⁵⁸ For more on Alice see: Zerner, 'L'épouse'.

⁵⁵⁹ Hodgson, *Women*, p. 119.

⁵⁶⁰ trans. Sibly, p. 59; *Hystoria*, pp. 111-12: 'Nec silendum putamus quod cum talis ac tantus sit come iste, providit ei Dominus adiutorium simile sibi, uxorem videlicet, que, ut breviter dicamus, religiosa esset, sapiens et sollicita: in ea quippe religio sapientiam et sollicitudinem adornabat, sapientia religionem et sollicitudinem informabat, sollicitudo religionem et sapientiam excitabat; insuper et Dominus benedixerat dicte comitisse in familie procreatione: comes siquidem habebat ex ea filios multos et pulchros nimis. His in commendatione comitis sepius memorati perstrictis, ad proseguendum narrationis nostre ordinem accingamur.'

breadth of the world.⁵⁶¹ Piety and caring were virtues often associated with women. But stereotypically women were not deemed to have the capacity for wisdom, and this was a part of wider justifications for a gender hierarchy which placed them under the authority of men. Therefore Peter praised her to quite some extent and she was clearly more than just an heir producer. Peter recorded the vital role she played on a number of occasions during Simon's campaign, for example when she arrived with troops at the siege of Toulouse in 1218: 'the countess of Montfort – how like her husband! – arrived with the Bishop of Toulouse from France, accompanied by a large group of crusaders.'⁵⁶² William of Tudela also claimed, like Peter, that she was involved in bringing troops to the crusade. When in 1212 heading out to besiege Moissac Simon of Montfort sent for her: '[the] lady countess, a brave and intelligent woman, and she joined them at Catus, bringing fifteen thousand good fighting men with her.'⁵⁶³ Thus Alice was essentially being a crusade leader herself, fitting in with the convention of a wife acting on behalf of her husband when required and even taking on manly roles.⁵⁶⁴

Peter recorded Alice at the siege of Termes in 1210 performing the classic female role of intercessor when certain crusaders were planning to depart because their forty-day service was completed.⁵⁶⁵ First Simon begged them to stay longer to carry on the siege, 'as they could not be diverted from their purpose, the noble Countess of Montfort threw herself at their feet and begged them passionately not to turn their backs on the Lord's business in the hour of such

⁵⁶¹ trans. Shirley, p. 33; *Chanson* I, p. 118: 'Ela i venc mot tost cant el i ac trames, / Jes plus savia femna, si m'ajud Dieus ni fes, / No sap om en est mon tant can te lonh ni pres.'

⁵⁶² trans. Sibly, p. 273; *Hystoria* II, p. 305: 'ecce comitissa, non dissimilis viro, comiti Montis Fortis, et episcopus Tholosanus venerunt de Francia cum magna multitudine peregrinorum.'

⁵⁶³ trans. Shirley, p. 59; *Chanson* I, p. 260: '... la comtessa a adoncs lo coms mandea, / E venc lai per Catus, mot es pros e senea, / Ab quinze melia omes de bona gent arnea.'

⁵⁶⁴ As demonstrated throughout Hodgson, *Women*.

⁵⁶⁵ For more on intercession by wives in crusading histories see: Hodgson, *Women*, pp. 122-24; For intercession and medieval queenship see: Lisa Benz St. John, *Three medieval queens: Queenship and the crown in fourteenth-century England* (New York, 2012), pp. 33-65; Theresa Earenfight, *Queenship in medieval Europe* (New York, 2013), especially pp. 11-12 and *passim*.

great need, and to give help at this time of crisis to the Count of Jesus Christ.⁵⁶⁶ Here Alice acted as an extension of her husband in the sense that she can beg, and act in a manner far more emotional than would be acceptable in a man. In common with the depiction of a number of queens as intercessors Alice was thereby being deployed as a device that would allow Simon to save face.⁵⁶⁷ Thus Alice conformed to ideal queenly behaviour, and this was clearly a method of establishing Simon's fitness to rule the newly conquered lands in the Languedoc. Alice was a wise and resourceful wife, but nonetheless subservient to Simon, thus in Peter's account she served the purpose of further establishing his elite masculinity. These incidents also further demonstrated Simon's king-like qualities, further embellishing his status. This certainly further set him apart from other high status men described by Peter, both politically and morally, demonstrating the exceptionality which was integral to his sanctity.

8. Prudence

The *Historia* often emphasised Simon's exercise of another cardinal virtue: prudence.⁵⁶⁸ In 1211 at Castelnaudary after seeing his rival the count of Foix heading towards his men to attack them, Simon 'took counsel with his companions as to what action he should take' and here 'various opinions were expressed.'⁵⁶⁹ After deciding to go into battle and winning, Simon wished to attack enemy reinforcements that had arrived, but 'some of his colleagues advised him to wait until the next day, since the enemy were fresh whereas [the crusaders] were weary from battle' Simon agreed and Peter concluded this episode by saying Simon, 'always took advice and was willing to go along with the views of his companions in such matters.'⁵⁷⁰

⁵⁶⁶ trans. Sibly, p. 96; *Hystoria*, p. 185: 'set, cum illi flecti nullo modo potuissent, nobilis comitissa Montis Fortis eorum pedibus se provolvit, affectuose supplicans ne in tante necessitatis articulo negocio Domini exhiberent humerum recedentem comitique Jhesu Christi.'

⁵⁶⁷ Joanna Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship 1445-1503* (Oxford, 2004), p. 7.

⁵⁶⁸ For the significance of prudence to elite masculinity see Chapter One, pp. 47-48.

⁵⁶⁹ trans. Sibly, p. 136; *Hystoria*, p. 267: 'illos qui secum erant consuluit quid facere tunc deberet... Diversis autem diversa sentientibus dicentibus.'

⁵⁷⁰ trans. Sibly, p. 138; *Hystoria*, p. 272: "quod comes facere festinaret, consuluerunt quidam ut differet in diem alteram, eo quod recentes essent hostes, nostri vero prelio fatigati' ... 'suorum semper in hujusmodi obtemperare voluit voluntati.'

Taking advice meant these men shared common ideas of how to proceed, and as such they all shared in the result of actions. Simon's role, or any hegemonic male's, would be to make the final decision, but importantly all men of a similar rank were involved in the decision making, which would strengthen homosocial bonds.⁵⁷¹ Whereas it might be thought that hagiographical masculinity would present Simon engendering all the best ideas himself this was clearly not the case instead the *Historia* presented him working within the confines of the cardinal virtues and the established forms of elite masculinity. This example showed that Simon's strength lay in his prudence, derived from wise council from members of his homosocial group. However there were exceptions to this. Sometimes in certain instances it was shown to have been prudent to reject advice albeit with the provision of a reasonable excuse. One example of this comes from Peter describing the crusaders outside Muret in 1213:

[the crusader knights] ever eager for the fray, urged the count to enter the castrum and join battle with the enemy that day; the count, however, did not wish to do so, since evening was approaching and our knights, as well as their mounts, were weary whereas the enemy were fresh. Moreover, the count wished to display humility and to talk peace with the king and beg him not to go against the church and join Christ's enemies. For these reasons the count did not wish battle to be joined that day.⁵⁷²

In this case Simon's prudence was used to restrain those thirsty for battle by alleging their lack of battle preparedness. But importantly it also showed that Simon was attempting to use war as a last resort against King Peter. Odo of Cluny offered a similar comment about Gerald in which he also thought it best to avoid war if peace can be achieved:

⁵⁷¹ See Chapter One for prudence and counsel, pp. 47-48.

⁵⁷² trans. Sibly, p. 207; *Hystoria* II, p. 147: 'utpote ardentissimi, consuluerunt comiti ut, statim intrans castrum, bellum cum hostibus committeret ipso die; sed comes nullo modo voluit quod ipsa die fieret bellum, quia erat hora vespertina et nostri, tam milites quam equi, erant lassi, hostes vero recentes; preterea ipse comes omnem volebat exhibere humilitatem et offerre regi Aragonum verba pacis et supplicare ne, contra ecclesiam veniens, Christi se jungeret inimicis: hiis igitur de causis noluit comes quod congressus fieret ipsa die.'

Gerald exerted himself to repress the insolence of the violent, taking care in the first place to promise peace most easy to reconciliation to his enemies. And he did this by taking care, that either he should overcome evil by good, or if his enemies would not come to terms, he should have in God's eyes the greater right on his side.⁵⁷³

The battle of Muret in 1213 was one of the major events of the crusade. McGlynn describes it as 'the biggest and most significant land engagement of the whole Albigensian Crusade,' and its impact was felt across Europe due to the amount of first, second and even third hand accounts of it being told.⁵⁷⁴ It resulted in the death of King Peter. However, other writers clearly put Peter's defeat to Simon down to his imprudence. One example from Anonymous, the *Chanson* continuator, recalled Count Raymond offering defensive advice to Peter which was rejected immediately.⁵⁷⁵ However, according to William of Puylaurens: 'the king was unwilling to listen, he said, ascribing Raymond's advice to fear and faintheartedness,' thereby demonstrating Peter's concern with the perception of others and the effect it would have had undoubtedly on his own masculinity.⁵⁷⁶ However significantly the *Historia* does not present King Peter as being imprudent, though in the lead up to the battle the *Historia* suggested the king was under the sentence of excommunication but this is not made explicit, though it was used to justify the battle between the two forces.⁵⁷⁷ The *Historia*'s silence on King Peter's actions in the lead up to the battle of Muret highlights the text's tactic of using ideal masculinity to extol Simon, because this approach makes Simon and his prudent decisions the central cause of victory on the battlefield. Mentioning King Peter's failings would have undermined this image.

⁵⁷³ trans. Noble & Head. p. 302; *Sancti Geraldi*, p. 646: 'Igitur ad insolentiam violentorum reprimendam se jam exercebat, id imprimis certatim observans, ut hostibus pacem, facillimamque reconciliationem promitteret. Quod utique studebat, ut vel in bono malum vinceret, vel si illi dissiderent, jam ante Dei oculos suae parti justitia plenius favisset.'

⁵⁷⁴ McGlynn, *Kill Them All*, p. 231; p. 242.

⁵⁷⁵ *Chanson* I, p. 22.

⁵⁷⁶ Puylaurens p. 88: 'Quem rex audire noluit, metui ascribens et ignaviae que dicebat.'

⁵⁷⁷ *Hystoria* II, pp. 144-45.

9. Honour

It was essential for Peter to show that Simon of Montfort acted with honour and that he did not bring shame upon himself, or others who followed him. This was important because honour was intrinsically linked to reputation among elite males and was crucial to the chivalric code.⁵⁷⁸ The following will analyse how Simon was presented as acting honourably in different spheres and in relation to different kinds of people.

In 1212 Simon and his army were heading to Muret to besiege it.⁵⁷⁹ After arriving in the evening with the knights and the stronger members of the army who had crossed a river to get there, those who were weaker or who were on foot had not been able to make the river crossing. Simon was concerned for the missing people in his army who were under his care. He told his Marshal Guy of Lévis that he wished to return to those who had not made the crossing. Guy told him:

The strongest part of the army is here inside Muret – only crusaders on foot are left on the other side of the river, which is now running so strongly that no one will be able to cross. If you were to go back the Toulousains would be able to come and slaughter you and the crusaders over there.⁵⁸⁰

Simon replied to Guy:

“Far be it from me to follow your advice: these poor men of Christ are threatened with death by the sword; would you have me shelter in this castle? With me, let God’s will be done; I will go and keep them company.” He at once left the castrum, crossed the river and returned to the foot soldiers’ camp, where he stayed for several days with very few knights –

⁵⁷⁸ For honour see, pp. 59-60.

⁵⁷⁹ See, *Hystoria II*, p. 52.

⁵⁸⁰ trans. Sibly, p. 167; *Hystoria II*, pp. 53-54: ‘... Robur exercitus totum est in castro isto, Ultra aquam non sunt nisi pedites peregrini. Preterea tam magna et valida est aqua quod nullus modo posset eam transire. Insuper venire possent Tolosani et vos et omnes peregrinos illos interficere.’

only four or five – until the bridge was rebuilt and the rest of the army crossed over. [O what princely probity, o what invincible virtue!] he did not wish to stay with his knights in the castrum, whilst the crusaders of the poorer sort were unprotected in the open.⁵⁸¹

Once more Simon's exceptionality was highlighted by Peter, and with the phrase, 'O what princely probity, o what invincible virtue' was done in gendered terms of highlighting Simon's ideal masculine behaviour. This is also an instance where Simon was right not to take the advice of his companion. An important aspect of crusade leadership as demonstrated by actions on the First Crusade was moving pilgrims and non-combatants through hostile terrain.⁵⁸² It is important that Simon was shown to be concerned about the welfare of those serving under him as an aspect of his honour, as this fell under the knightly virtue regarding the Davidic ethic which was central to both good knighthood and the code of chivalry.⁵⁸³ From Odo of Cluny there was a similar theme of protecting the weaker and poorer members of society which was used to justify Gerald's sanctity. Odo wrote:

[Gerald was not] led on by love of praise from the multitude, but by love of the poor, who were not able to protect themselves. He acted in this way lest, if he became sluggish through an indolent patience, he should seem to have neglected the precept to care for the poor.⁵⁸⁴

This behaviour was deemed integral to lordship and thus fitted the notion of performing one's role correctly as being a reason for sanctity.

⁵⁸¹ trans. Sibly, p. 167 Brackets my own translation; *Hystoria* II, p. 54: "Absit a me ut faciam quod consulitis! Pauperes Christi expositi sunt morti et gladio. Et ego in munitione manebo? Fiat de me voluntas Domini! Certe ego ibo et manebo cum eis." Statim exiens a castro, transivit aquam et rediit ad exercitum peditum mansitque ibi cum paucissimus (circiter quator vel quinque) militibus plures dies, donec facto ponte, totus transiit exercitus. O magna probitas principis, o virtus invicta! Noluit enim cum militibus manere in castro, dummodo pauperes peregrini expositi essent in campo.'

⁵⁸² Tyerman, *World*, p. 77.

⁵⁸³ Crouch, *The Birth of Nobility*, p. 71.

⁵⁸⁴ trans. Noble & Head, p. 302; *Sancti Geraldii*, p. 646: 'Non... vulgaris amore laudis illectus, sed pauperum dilectione, qui seipsos tueri nequibant infervens. Agebat autem hoc ne forte si inertis patientia torpuisset, praeceptum de cura pauperum neglexisse videretur.'

The example from the *Historia* also showed Simon's superiority to other men of his homosocial group because Guy lacked this consideration for the poorer of the army. Guy was seemingly only concerned with the elite warriors, whereas Simon was not only concerned for the poor, he was willing to share their conditions and dangers. Thus as well as emphasising Simon's exemplary chivalry, this passage also deflected accusations that he was motivated above all by self-interest.

The *Historia* also reported how Simon acted with honour in battle. Of the crusaders' victory at the battle of Muret in 1213, he wrote: 'I must record that the count never thought it fitting to strike anyone in battle whom he might see in flight and with his back towards him.'⁵⁸⁵ Since fleeing from battle was considered shameful in itself, to chase those men down would not further his own honour. Moreover, since he was essentially fighting as a conduit of God, with the battle won and his enemy defeated there was no need to inflict more death. Peter was here showing Simon as being superior to other men in his army because, as Marvin asserts, they did in fact chase the enemy and slaughter them for booty.⁵⁸⁶

Likewise William of Tudela recorded that Simon acted honourably to those non-combatants in Termes whom he defeated: '[Simon] behaved very well and took nothing from the ladies, not even the value of a penny coin or a Le Puy Farthing.'⁵⁸⁷ Nicholson argues that treating women correctly played a significant role in how elite masculinity, embodied by crusaders, was judged by various medieval historians.⁵⁸⁸ Indeed it came under the Davidic ethic of protecting women.⁵⁸⁹ On another occasion Simon 'behaved like a man of honour' when he allowed the body of his enemy Raymond Roger Trencavel to be put on display after his death so the people of his fief

⁵⁸⁵ trans. Sibly, p. 212; *Hystoria* II, p. 155: 'Nec silendum quod comes nobilissimus non est dignatus in bello aliquem percutere, ex quo fugientes vidit et vertere sibi tergum.'

⁵⁸⁶ Marvin, *The Occitan War*, p. 190.

⁵⁸⁷ trans. Shirley, p. 37; *Chanson* I, p. 140: '... i fe mot que cortes, / Que no tole a la donas que valha un poges. / Ni un diner monedat.'

⁵⁸⁸ Helen Nicholson, 'The true gentleman? Correct behaviour towards women according to Christian and Muslim writers: from the Third Crusade to Sultan Baybars,' *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Natasha Hodgson, Katherine J. Lewis, & Matthew Mesley (London, 2019), pp. 100-01.

⁵⁸⁹ See above, pp. 62-63.

could mourn him.⁵⁹⁰ This was undoubtedly a part of the strategy to win the support of the locals about the occupation, but it also demonstrated that Simon knew how to act correctly in certain situations which was essentially how honour was garnered. All this offers opposition to the earlier mentioned criticism from modern historians that he was exclusively brutal and bloodthirsty.⁵⁹¹

Peter even managed to turn shame suffered by Simon into honour when he reflected on the poverty that Simon experienced during his leadership. This was due to not receiving financial help to wage the war, plus the fact that many crusaders were only performing forty days service in order to fulfil their vow and earn the indulgence.⁵⁹² During the siege of Termes in 1210, Peter recorded:

the noble count of Montfort was beset by extreme poverty, to the extent that he was very often even short of bread and had nothing to eat. Frequently – I have it on good authority – when a meal-time was at hand he would deliberately absent himself, ashamed to return to his tent, since it was the time to eat and he did not even have bread.⁵⁹³

This was a method of Simon avoiding shame and keeping honour in the face of poverty as it meant he would not be able to show largesse which would have raised questions regarding his hegemonic status.⁵⁹⁴ Moreover this instance was useful in order to stress the exemplary motivation for his actions furthering the hagiographical nature of this text. Simon would have lived better off in his home of northern France but here he was putting himself through hardship as a demonstration of his religious convictions and devotion to the cause of Christ. This was

⁵⁹⁰ *Chanson* I, p. 100: 'E lo coms de Montfort fe que cortes e bar: / A la gent de la terra...'

⁵⁹¹ See above, p. 152.

⁵⁹² Laurence Marvin, 'Thirty-nine days and a wake-up: The impact of the indulgence and forty days service on the Albigensian crusade, 1209–1218', *The Historian*, 65, 1 (2002), 75–94.

⁵⁹³ trans. Sibly, p. 95; *Hystoria*, pp. 183–84: 'Interea nobilis comes Montis Fortis paupertate tanta et tam urgentissima laborat quod sepiissime, ipso etiam pane deficiente, quod comederet non haberet: multociens quippe, sicut certissime didicimus, imminente hora refectionis, dictus comes se de industria absentabat et pre confusione non audebat in suum redire tentorium, eo quod esset hora comedendi et ipse nec etiam solum panem haberet.'

⁵⁹⁴ For discussion of largesse see above, p. 58–59.

later demonstrated when Peter recorded the extremely hard conditions during the siege of Montgrenier in 1217. This mainly concerned the weather which included stormy winds, bitter snow and torrential rains.⁵⁹⁵ However according to Peter: '[Simon] trusted in Him who commands even the winds and the waters, and with temptation gives also a way to escape.'⁵⁹⁶ Here Simon displays his manly moral strength, refusing to give in and abandon the siege for a more comfortable setting. Instead he remains dedicated, thus this is a form of martyrdom.

Peter's emphasis on Simon's honour most likely came from an anxiety about the nature of this crusade and his text answered contemporary criticisms.⁵⁹⁷ Whilst he portrayed Simon and the crusaders as benefitting from divine providence as per their victories there were clearly dissenting voices against the crusade which questioned the honourability of its undertaking and its leaders. The *Chanson's* Anonymous continuator made this clear when reporting a conversation between Simon and his brother Guy after it was decided to abandon the siege of Beaucaire in 1216. Guy is reported to have told Simon: 'I can tell you for certain that God does not want you to hold the castle of Beaucaire and the rest any longer, for he is watching and considering your behaviour. As long as you get your hands on all the money and the property you do not care in the least how many people die.'⁵⁹⁸ This image of a greedy self-centred man was in clear opposition to the Peter's presentation. This highlights the polarity with which Simon and the crusaders were viewed by the opposing side and therefore why notions of honour and shame were highlighted by the authors of these texts.

⁵⁹⁵ *Hystoria* II, pp. 280-81.

⁵⁹⁶ trans. Sibly, p. 265; *Hystoria* II, p. 281: 'fidens in Illo qui ventis et aquis imperat et cum temptationibus dat proventum.'

⁵⁹⁷ See Anonymous' verdict of Simon cited above for a disapproving view of the crusade, p. 123.

⁵⁹⁸ trans. Shirley, p. 105; *Chanson* II, p. 194: 'eu dic veramens / Que Dieus no vol suffrir que vos siatz tenens / Del castel de Belcaire ni de l'als longamens; / Qu'el gara e cossira vostres captenemens:/ Ab sol que sia vostre tot l'avens e l'argens, / Vos sol non avetz cura de la mort de las gens.'

10. Piety

The thesis of hagiographical masculinity cannot be furthered without reference to the religiosity of the central character. Piety was not a standalone characteristic of masculinity because it was expected in both women and men. But it was presented as an aspect of masculinity in chronicles, especially crusade chronicles. One of the ways this was achieved was through linking piety and religiosity to invincibility on the battlefield, which was also how Odo of Cluny expounded Gerald of Aurillac's victories. Odo explained how Gerald's followers changed their view of him because of his piety:

Gerald who was carried away by his piety in the very moment of battle, had not always been invincible. When therefore they saw that he triumphed by a new kind of fighting that was mingled with piety, they changed their scorn to admiration, and sure of victory they readily fulfilled his commands. For it was a thing unheard of that he or the soldiers who fought under him were not victorious.⁵⁹⁹

Piety would be rewarded by God's favour in battle thereby making it an indispensable property of ideal leadership and elite masculinity. Simon of Montfort's piety was stressed in opposition to his enemies' lack of piety, usually in the form of Count Raymond VI's behaviour. Moreover because crusades were wars based on the notion of defending Christian interests, crusaders had to be presented as pious in order to achieve victory. Lack of piety could be used to ascribe failure in crusading, and certainly was in the case of the failure of the Second Crusade and the fall of the crusader states.⁶⁰⁰ Peter's representation of piety was also used to combat the notion of the

⁵⁹⁹ trans. Noble & Head, p. 302; *Sancti Geraldi*, p. 647: 'quod Gerladus, quem pietas in ipso praeliandi articulo vincebat invincibilis semper esset. Cum ergo viderent quod novo praeliandi genere mista pietate triumpharet, irrisonem vertebant in admirationem. Etiam victoriae secure, servabant alacres quod jubeat. Non enim auditum est aliquando quod vel eum, vel milites ejus, qui sub illius fidelitate pugnauerunt, eventus victoriae fefellisset.'

⁶⁰⁰ Phillips, *The Second Crusade*, p. 273; Malcolm Barber, *The Crusader States* (New Haven, 2012), pp. 324-35.

crusade being a land grab as suggested by Anonymous.⁶⁰¹ If Peter could show Simon as being pious in contrast to Raymond or King Peter then it justified the events which occurred.

The most important factor that contributed to Raymond being represented as impious was his association with the Cathar heretics. Peter wrote:

First it must be said that from the cradle he always loved and cherished heretics, kept them in his domains and honoured them in whatever manner he could. Indeed, it is said that even today, wherever he goes he takes with him heretics dressed as ordinary people so that when the time comes he may die in their hands.⁶⁰²

Peter's intention here was to present Raymond as unsympathetically as possible to further the notion that Raymond was a heretic and he also accusingly said Raymond wanted his son, 'to be brought up at Toulouse amongst the heretics, so that he could learn their beliefs (or rather unbelief).'⁶⁰³ He also stated that Raymond 'reverenced the heretics on bended knee and asked for their blessings and embraced them.'⁶⁰⁴ Peter even claimed that Raymond despised the Catholic Church to the extent that he would bring a clown with him to mass in order to mimic the priest during the liturgy.⁶⁰⁵ Certainly from an orthodox Catholic point of view Raymond did not do enough to eradicate heresy from his lands. However despite Peter's accusations Raymond was not actually a heretic himself; in fact Raymond took the cross and in his will it was requested that

⁶⁰¹ *Chanson* II, p. 2.

⁶⁰² trans. Sibly, p. 22; *Hystoria*, pp. 31-32: 'Primo dicendum quod quasi a primis cunabulis semper hereticos dilexit et fovit et, eos in terra sua habens, qui buscunque modis potuit, honoravit. Usque hodie etiam, sicut asseritur, ubicunque pergit, hereticos sub communi habitu secum ducit, ut, si ipsum mori contigerit, inter manus eorum moriatur.'

⁶⁰³ trans. Sibly, p. 22; *Hystoria*, p. 33: 'quod volebat facere nutririi filium suum apud Tholosam inter hereticos, ut addisceret fidem (immo infidelitatem) illorum.'

⁶⁰⁴ trans. Sibly, p. 22 *Hystoria*, p. 33: 'adorabat hereticos flexis in terra genibus et petebat ab eis benedictionem et osculabatur eos.'

⁶⁰⁵ *Hystoria*, p. 34.

he be buried as a Hospitaller.⁶⁰⁶ Nonetheless Peter argued a strong case against Raymond and his detailed account of his heretical impiety legitimised action against him and his lands.

This depiction of Raymond was also part of Peter's wider tactic for portraying the war as a legitimate crusade, not a land grab. Consequently he presented Simon as acting in the interests of the Church, a contention which drew strength from his description of Simon's previous crusading experience. Simon had taken the cross in 1199 and gone on the Fourth Crusade (1202-04) which originally set out to recover the Holy Land after the Third Crusade's stalemate.⁶⁰⁷ However, when the crusade diverted from its original intention and the crusaders were about to attack the Christian city of Zara on the Dalmatian coast in 1202 Simon refused and left. Peter recorded that Simon ended up in an argument with the Venetians and directly addressed the citizens of Zara saying: 'I have not come here to destroy Christians. I will do you no wrong, and whatever others may do, I will ensure that you suffer no harm from me or mine.'⁶⁰⁸ The fact that he would not fight other Christians furthered the justification for the war in the Languedoc, because Peter made it clear from his account of Simon's conduct at Zara that he was not the sort of man who would attack the innocent for purely mercenary reasons.

Peter often referred to Simon as an 'athlete of Christ' and even as 'Christ's champion', a classic term used in both hagiography and crusade narratives, which emphasised their literal fighting for him, unlike the praying monastic who acted in a figurative sense.⁶⁰⁹ Indeed, this demonstrated Peter believed in the righteous cause of the crusade and Simon's leadership of it, which emphasised the link between Simon and other saints. Peter gave descriptions of actions by Simon highlighting his piety and pious motivations and showing him to fit the mould of an ideal Christian warrior. This was in the sense that his motive for being a warrior was shaped by his

⁶⁰⁶ Barber, *The Cathars*, p. 114; McGlynn, *Kill Them All*, p. 40.

⁶⁰⁷ Further discussion of the Fourth Crusade can be found in the following chapter.

⁶⁰⁸ trans. Sibly, pp. 58-9; *Hystoria*, p. 109: 'Non veni inquit huc ut destruum christianos. Nullum vobis malum inferam, set, quicquid faciant alii, ego a me et meis facio vos secures.'

⁶⁰⁹ *Hystoria* II, p. 205: 'athleta christi'; *Hystoria* II, p. 236: 'athleta fidelissimus'; *Hystoria* II, p. 90: 'Christi pugilem.'

adherence to Christian values. For example Simon was shown to hear mass whenever possible and wherever he may have been. Peter wrote that at the siege of Saint Marcel in March 1212 on Good Friday, Simon ‘became a man totally dedicated to the Catholic religion and to serving God’, when he ‘arranged for the Passion service to be conducted with due solemnity in his tent.’⁶¹⁰ This desire to hear mass often was used by Odo of Cluny to demonstrate Gerald of Aurillac’s piety and sanctity as it showed his adherence to Christian authority, and the same can be said about Simon.⁶¹¹ On the way to Muret in 1213 when they were between Auterive and Muret, Peter wrote:

there was a church nearby, and the count, as was his custom, went in to the church to pray. It was raining heavily at the time, much to the distress of our troops, but as our count, the knight of Jesus Christ, began to pray, the rain stopped and the clouds gave way to clear skies. Boundless bounty of the Creator! The count rose from his prayers and our men passed through the difficult terrain without any impediment from the enemy.⁶¹²

Simon’s actions did not only show his pious nature, they had a positive consequence in the form of divine aid too. Simon’s wish to always hear mass is described by Peter on many occasions, for example on the day of the battle of Muret:

as the count was going into the castle to put on his armour and passing in front of his chapel, he looked inside and saw the Bishop of Uzès celebrating mass... Our most Christian count ran inside, knelt before the bishop, took his hand and said: “Today I offer my soul and body to God and to you.” What princely devotion! He then entered the castle and put

⁶¹⁰ trans. Sibly, p. 146; *Hystoria*, p. 291: ‘utpote totus catholicus et Divino servito mancipatus, in papilione suo Dominice Passionis officium faceret sollempniter celebrari.’

⁶¹¹ *Sancti Geraldii*, pp. 649-50.

⁶¹² trans. Sibly, p. 207; *Hystoria* II, pp. 146-47: ‘erat autem prope locum illum quedam ecclesia, in qua secundum consuetudinem intravit comes causa orationis; inundabat autem ipsa hora pluvia et milite Jhesu Christi, videlicet comite nostro, cessavit pluvia, fiunt nubila in serenum. O inmensa bonitas Conditoris! Cum surrexisset comes ab oratione, statim nostri, reascensis equis, locum predictum transierunt nullumque hostilem obicem invenerunt.’

on his armour; he then returned to the bishop in the chapel and again offered himself and his arms.⁶¹³

Likewise William of Puylaurens also stressed Simon's piety, writing that after the decision to go to battle had been made:

the champions of Christ crucified chose to fight their battle on the eve of the exaltation of the Holy Cross. They made confession of their sins, heard divine service in their usual manner; then, refreshed by the comforting nourishment of the altar and fortified by a modest meal, they took their arms and prepared for battle.⁶¹⁴

This presentation of Simon as being more pious than his fellow men has a strikingly similarity to how Godfrey of Bouillon was presented in William of Tyre's *Chronicon*. William included stories that were not found in earlier accounts of Godfrey's crusade that demonstrated him being intensely pious, the following example comes from William's account of Godfrey's election:

[Godfrey] when in a church and after the celebration of the divine was complete, he was not able to separate from that place. But concerning each image and picture, he questioned the priests and others who had knowledge of such matters on their meaning. Because of this his associates were differently minded thinking it tedious and nauseas. Because of this exceedingly long and annoying waiting time, meals which were prepared at a certain and suitable time, turned to being of little flavour and greatly tasteless. Hearing this the electors said, "blessed is the man who does this. Whilst to some this is reckoned to be a defect but

⁶¹³ trans. Sibly, p. 208; *Hystoria* II, p. 150: 'cum autem, intraret comes municionem castrī, ut se armaret, et transiret per ante basilicam suam, subito introspexit et vidit Uticensem episcopum, celebrantem missam ... statim cucurrit comes christianissimus, flexisque in terram genibus et junctis manibus ante episcopum, dixit ei "Deo et vobis offero hodie animam et corpus meum." O devotio principis! Post hec intrans munitionem, armis suis se munivit, rediensque iterum ad dictum episcopum in prenotata basilica, denuo obtulit ei se et arma sua.'

⁶¹⁴ trans. *Chronica*, p. 47; Puylaurens, pp. 86-88: "Diem instantem Exaltationis sancte Crucis bello Crucifixi Christi pugiles elegerunt, et factis confessionibus peccatorum et audito ex more divino officio, ciboque salutari altaris refecti et prandio sobrio confortati arma sumunt, et ad prelium se accingunt.'

to others it is ascribed as a virtue.” Finally after agreeing in turn and much deliberation they unanimously chose the duke for the role of lord.⁶¹⁵

It was therefore not uncommon for elite men to be presented as being more pious than others and for this to be a standout characteristic of their hegemonic status, which related to Odo’s notion that it linked to their invincibility. Peter also emphasised Simon’s piety as part of the explanation for his great ability and the reasons for his victory, especially in contrast to others who were not pious. For example, the *Historia* described King Peter as he arrived at the battle of Muret as ‘the ungodly King’, whilst William of Puylaurens reported: ‘for at that time the aforementioned King of Aragon, who had prospered against the Saracens, now wanted to test his fortune against the Christians.’⁶¹⁶ This suggested that Peter was not motivated by the Church’s interests but instead his own. The *Historia* often condemned King Peter as being in league with the heretics without actually calling him one, a deliberate ploy designed to paint him in a very negative light, as we saw with his descriptions of Raymond above. For example, the *Historia* claimed the king favoured the heretics cause: ‘[Peter who] was extremely hostile to the business of the faith ... spent a considerable period in associating with excommunicants and with heretics.’⁶¹⁷ As with Raymond, King Peter was not actually a heretic but the *Historia* in this way sought to justify Simon going into battle against him, and to explain Simon’s victory in that battle. This also served to make King Peter another counterpoint who further highlighted Simon’s exemplary qualities, especially his piety.

⁶¹⁵ William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, p. 423: ‘quod ecclesiam ingressus, etiam post divinorum consummatam celebrationem, inde separari non poterat; sed de singulis imaginibus et picturis rationem exigebat a sacerdotibus et iis qui horum videbantur aliquam habere peritiam; ita quod sociis suis affectis aliter, in taedium verteretur, et nauseam: et prandia quae certo et opportuno tempore parata erant, diutina et importuna nimis expectatione, minus tempestive, magisque insipida sumerentur. Quod audientes qui electorum gerebant officium, beatum dixerunt virum cui haec sunt; et cui inter defectus computatur, quod alius sibi ascriberet ad virtutem; tandemque consonantes ad invicem post multas deliberationum partes dominum ducem unanimiter eligunt.’

⁶¹⁶ Puylaurens, p. 84: ‘Ipso namque tempore, predictus rex Aragonum, qui contra Sarracenos fuerat fortunatus, fortunam etiam suam contra christianos voluit experiri.’

⁶¹⁷ trans. Sibly, p. 181, 172; *Hystoria* II, p. 86: ‘excommunicatis quorum fovebat’; *Hystoria* II, pp. 65-66: ‘Petrus qui negotio fidei plurimum invadebat venit Tolosam et fecit ibi multos dies, excommunicatis et hereticis communicando.’

William of Puylaurens went further than the *Historia* in representing King Peter's impiety suggesting the king suffered defeat at Muret because he, 'had lost his senses, and because of his temerity everyone else rushed to behave senselessly, trusting not in the power of the Lord but in the strength of men.'⁶¹⁸ Contrastingly, the crusaders, 'trusting in the lord did not hold back because of their inferior numbers. The prayers of the bishops and good men, devoutly celebrating the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, were with them on that day, when God's champions overcame the enemies of the Cross.'⁶¹⁹ When Simon's forces killed King Peter there was no celebration for this was not about Simon's victory, instead the *Historia* wrote: 'ever a man of great piety, the count dismounted and mourned over the body – a second David over a second Saul.'⁶²⁰ Peter thus is characterised as a proud and lustful man, who loses self-control with disastrous effects for his troops, and this is why he is defeated by Simon, who embodies moral as well as physical strength, and also displays pious empathy. Likening Simon to the King of Israel Peter demonstrated his superiority over Peter and signified him holding divine approval because of his exemplary conduct. After securing victory the *Historia* claimed:

our most Christian Count, walked barefoot from the place where he had dismounted to the church to render thanks to almighty God for the victory he had granted, since he recognised that this miracle had been wrought by God's grace and not the efforts of men. His horse and armour he gave as alms for the poor.⁶²¹

Here we can see that piety was essential for God's grace in victory and Simon publicly displays his awareness of this, thereby also avoiding the sins of pride and vainglory. Simon rightly

⁶¹⁸ trans. *Chronica*, p. 49; Puylaurens, pp. 90-92: 'Cuius mali ille fuit occasio quo furente, propter eius audaciam omnes currebant in furorem, non de virtute Dominica, sed humanis viribus confidentes.'

⁶¹⁹ trans. *Chronica*, p. 49; Puylaurens, pp. 90-92: 'Ceteris eorum adversariis, qui in Domino confidebant, nichil pro sua paucitate hesitantibus, quos etiam episcoporum et bonorum prosequatur oratio virorum, Exaltationem sancte Crucis devote celebrantium illa die, in quo Dei pugiles Crucis eiusdem adversarios superarunt.'

⁶²⁰ trans. Sibly, p. 212; *Hystoria* II, p. 157: 'piissimus comes, videns regem jacentem prostratum, descendit de equo et super corpus defuncti planctum fecit, alterum David super Saul alterum representans.'

⁶²¹ trans. Sibly, p. 213; *Hystoria* II, p. 158: 'christianissimus comes, intelligens tantum miraculum Dei virtute, non humanis viribus, factum esse, ab illo loco ubi descenderat nudus pedes ad ecclesiam perrexit, omnipotenti Deo pro collata victoria gratias repensurus: equum etiam suum et arma dedit pauperibus in elemosinam.'

attributes the victory to God and in a further act of piety even charitably repurposes his warhorse and armour, which would both have been very valuable.

Piety was an overarching theme that in different contexts either linked together or was a foundation for the ideals of masculinity. Those who failed at being pious failed at the other cardinal virtues. The men discussed here needed spiritual guidance to remind them how to act, as could be found in conventional hagiography, and this is why these clerical writers certainly blamed their lack piety as leading to their downfall. In Peter's life of Simon these messages are clearly gendered in outlining the ideal leader.

11. Death of Simon

The *Historia's* coverage of Simon's death opened this chapter and clearly established the presentation of Simon as a martyr thus allowing the theory of hagiographical masculinity to be used as a tool of analysis. However Peter of Vaux-de-Cernay was not the only writer to use Simon's death in order to focus and articulate their thoughts on the crusade leader. William of Puylaurens and Anonymous both gave their views of what Simon's death signified.

Simon died at the siege of Toulouse on 25 June 1218 and all the writers agree that he died from a blow to the head from a rock launched by a catapult. What they disagree on was the circumstances of how it occurred and the implications for Simon's reputation. William of Puylaurens claimed Simon was worn out by the nine years of campaigning and longed for death.⁶²² He described Simon as dying immediately after being smashed on the head and claimed the Toulousains rejoiced whilst the crusaders were in great sadness. William wrote: 'the man who inspired terror from the Meditterean to the British sea fell by a blow from a single stone; at his fall those who had previously stood firm fell down. In him, who was a good man, the insolence

⁶²² Puylaurens, p. 108.

of his subordinates was thrown down.⁶²³ The crusade was held together through Simon's leadership but this could not be maintained indefinitely. Furthermore William recorded that the future Count Raymond VII of Toulouse offered an obituary of Simon praising 'for his fidelity, his foresight, his energy and all the quality which befit a leader', despite being his enemy.⁶²⁴ This confirms they had a shared code of behaviour to which they adhered to and that it was mutually respected, he could have instead decried Simon's behaviour.

Unlike Puylaurens, Anonymous in the *Chanson* used Simon's death to criticise him and evidence his terrible deeds. The writer did this first by framing Simon's death as a shameful one. This was achieved by focussing on who launched the stone that struck him, writing that the mangonel 'was worked by noblewomen, by little girls and men's wives, and now a stone arrived just where it was needed and struck Count Simon on his steel helmet, shattering his eyes, brains, back teeth, fore head and jaw. Bleeding and black, the count dropped dead on the ground.'⁶²⁵ This detail, regarding women, which was not mentioned in the *Historia*, is often presented as an important one by historians in their accounts of Simon's death.⁶²⁶ Nicholson used this example in a survey of women's active roles in battle on crusade, whilst Marvin used it as an example of ordinary people fighting against the crusaders.⁶²⁷ It was feasible that women were indeed involved. But regardless of whether they were or not their inclusion here is significant and the fact that it was highlighted by the writer is suggestive of an unmanly ending. Simon, by being killed by women was thus denied a death at the hand of peers. Being felled by a stone is not a heroic or dignified warrior's death. Moreover the gruesome details are an inversion of the handsome appearance

⁶²³ trans. *Chronica*, pp. 61-2; Puylaurens, p. 108: 'Ecce cuius terror erat a mari Meditraneo usque ad mare Britannicum cadit sub lapidis uno ictu, in cuius casu qui ante steterant corruerunt, et in eo, qui bonus erat percellitur insolentia subditorum.'

⁶²⁴ trans. *Chronica*, pp. 61-2; Puylaurens, p. 108: 'quamvis hostis eius fuisset, ipsum in fidelitate, providentia et strenuitate, et in cunctis que decent principem.'

⁶²⁵ trans. Shirley, p. 172; *Chanson* III, pp. 206-08: 'E tiravan la donas e tozas e molhers. / E venc tot dreit la peira lai on era mestiers/ E feric si lo comte sobre l'elm, qu'es d'acers, / Que'ls olhs e las cervelas e ls caichals estremiers/ E'l front e las maichelas li parte a cartiers; / E'l coms cazec en terra mortz e sagnens e niers.'

⁶²⁶ For example see: Pegg, *A Most Holy War*, p. 160; Marvin, *The Occitan War*, p. 294; McGlynn, *Kill Them All*, pp. 350-51; Sumption, *Albigensian Crusade*, p. 198.

⁶²⁷ Nicholson, 'Women'; Marvin, *The Occitan War*, p. 294.

noted by Peter in his description of Simon.⁶²⁸ Instead we have a mess of a body, not saintly and incorruptible, but destroyed, signifying divine disavowal, at least as far as Anonymous was concerned. The Anonymous also reported the response to Simon's death saying there was celebrations in Toulouse, the news filled the town with joy and 'darkness shone like the day, light blazed and flowered, it raised up *paratge* and buried arrogance... All night long the city celebrated, and outside the besiegers groaned and shook.'⁶²⁹

These claims counter the presentation set out by Peter Vaux-de-Cernay, who, as we have seen, rewrites Simon's death as a heroic martyrdom.⁶³⁰ These comments however do not negate Peter's they simply offer a differing view. Simon could have been exactly how both Peter and the Anonymous describe him. The only difference is the ideological background that framed their accounts and interpretations of Simon's deeds. Indeed depending on perspective, his death could either be read as confirmation of his holy masculinity, or of his cruel tyranny

12. Conclusion

The *Historia* and the representation of Simon within it can be deemed hagiographic throughout. Simon's sanctity did not rest alone on his martyrdom, it was also achieved through his conduct as leader of the crusade, which was enabled by his exemplary performance of elite masculinity. Like Odo of Cluny's presentation of Gerald of Aurillac, Simon had features that set him apart from other men. This was demonstrated through the hagiographic trope of comparison to the non-saintly. Simon's conduct was ideal in comparison to Raymond's flawed behaviour. Simon's actions embodied contemporary notions of masculinity that were based on the cardinal virtues and other knightly ideals. Peter saw that Simon was beyond other men in his actions and probably due to his closeness to Simon wished to write about him to save for posterity his

⁶²⁸ For Peter's description of Simon's physical appearance see above, p. 144.

⁶²⁹ trans. Shirley, p. 173; *Chanson* III, p. 212: 'Venc aitals aventura que l'escurs esclarzic, / Car la clartatz alumpna, que granec e fluric/ E restaurec Paratge e Orgolh sebelic/ ... Tota la noit e'l dia la vila s'esbaudi; / E lo setis de fore sospirec e fremic.'

⁶³⁰ See above, p. 124.

actions, even to create a supporting document for possible canonisation. The suggestion of a cult forming around Simon clearly meant others beyond Peter believed in Simon's sanctity, and believed that the bedrock for that sanctity was his peerless masculinity.

Chapter Four: Masculinity Discourse in Robert of Clari's *La Conquête de*

Constantinople

Robert of Clari ended his *La Conquête de Constantinople*, an account of what is known as the Fourth Crusade (1202-04), with a declaration: 'Now you have heard the truth, of how Constantinople was conquered and how Baldwin the Count of Flanders was emperor and succeeded by his brother, Lord Henry.'⁶³¹ Emperor Baldwin had been elected to rule the newly conquered Constantinople but only a year into ruling he disappeared at the Battle of Adrianople on 14 April 1205 hence why his brother became emperor. Both of these events, the conquest and Baldwin's death, are given equal status here because for Clari they were interrelated. Consequently, this chapter will argue that not only was Clari trying to justify the notorious conquest of Constantinople by Latin forces on 12 April 1204 but he was also writing as a warning to any elite male who failed to adhere to common standards of elite masculinity in this period, be they Greek or Frank. This was because the demise of these emperors was engendered through these failings.

Clari disapproved of the behaviour of the crusade leadership in post-conquest Constantinople and let it be known in his work. Referring to the Latin's defeat at Adrianople he stated: 'In this way God took vengeance on them for their pride and for the bad faith which they had shown to the lower ranks of the army and the horrible sins which they had committed in the city after they had captured it.'⁶³² Baldwin's demise was divine retribution for his and others' failures. These failures centred on being motivated by sinful vice, not by virtue, in attacking Constantinople, hence God's punishment. Clari's criticism of the crusade leaders came from the perspective of a knight who held a subordinate position in the homosocial group which constituted the crusade.

⁶³¹ Clari, p. 132: 'Ore avés oï le verité, confaitement Coustantinoble fu conquise, et confaitement li Cuens de Flandres Baudins en fu empereres, et mesires Henris ses freres après.'

⁶³² Clari, pp. 128-30: 'Ensi faitement se venja Damedieus d'au pour leur orguel et pour le male foi qu'il avoient portée a le povre gent de l'ost et les oribles pekiés qu'il avoient fais en le chité, après chou qu'i l'eurent prise.'

His account reveals a perception that the failure of the leaders to embody hegemonic masculinity caused the problems which led to the crusade ending so disgracefully. Clari's narrative first justified the Byzantine regime change brought about by the Franks which saw Alexius IV replace his uncle Alexius III as Byzantine Emperor. Clari continued by demonstrating that the Latin conquest which deposed Greek rule was also justified because the Greeks failed to act correctly. Thus the fate of these men was self-inflicted because they did not uphold the cardinal or chivalric virtues. This was not the only use of masculinity discourse by Clari, his work was imbued with it. Using masculinity to frame his account of events was how Clari attempted to ensure that his audience would have sympathy with him and agree with his explanations. This was important because the sack of the largest Christian city during what was supposed to be an expedition to recover Jerusalem from Islamic control was highly controversial.⁶³³ In the end his position as a subordinate male gave him limited parameters of operation, he lacked a choice or influence over how events transpired. What more could he do in his position? He used his best weapon: his voice.

1. Overview of Fourth Crusade

Upon becoming pope in 1198 one of Innocent III's first acts was to issue a papal bull promoting a crusade to recover Jerusalem from its Islamic occupiers.⁶³⁴ The Christians lost Jerusalem in 1187 and the subsequent failure of the Third Crusade to regain it meant there was unfinished business. However, what was envisioned and began as one of the best prepared crusades finished with the sacking of two Christian cities. In 1201 crusaders organised a treaty with the maritime power of Venice to ship the crusaders to the Holy Land. With Venice being the embarkation

⁶³³ It still resonates today. For example, 2004 saw the 800th anniversary of the event and Pope John Paul II offered an apology to Bartholomew I, the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople see: Kate Connolly, 'Pope says sorry for crusaders' rampage in 1204', *The Telegraph* (2004, June 30) Retrieved from: <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/italy/1465857/Pope-says-sorry-for-crusaders-rampage-in-1204.html>.

⁶³⁴ The following are full length academic analyses of the Fourth Crusade that give accounts of the events described here: Donald Queller & Thomas Madden, *The Fourth Crusade* 2nd (Philadelphia, 2000); Michael Angold, *The Fourth Crusade* (Harlow, 2003); Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade*. It also forms a significant part of the following works Jonathan Harris, *Byzantium and the Crusades* 2nd (London, 2014); Tyerman, *God's War*, pp. 477-562.

point of the crusade, pilgrims and warriors made their way there. However, the treaty required 33,500 crusaders to come to fulfil the contract. This amount was not forthcoming, consequently, to make their payment the crusaders agreed to attack the city of Zara, a former Venetian possession. The city fell to them on 19 November 1202. In early 1203 the crusaders and Venetians agreed to help the disinherited Byzantine Prince Alexius regain the throne of his father, Isaac II Angelos. Isaac had been deposed, blinded and imprisoned by his own brother, the current Emperor Alexius. The crusaders' support was based on the fact Alexius offered them financial incentives and military support for future crusades. The crusaders arrived at Constantinople with Alexius on 24 June 1203, but the Byzantines did not acknowledge the young prince as expected and besieged the city on his behalf. The first siege of Constantinople was victorious on 17 July 1203 and the young Alexius crowned on 1 August. Unable to fulfil the promises made to the crusaders, or to gain popularity with either the Greek court or the populous, Alexius was eventually overthrown and killed in a coup by Mourtzouphlus on 25 January 1204. Mourtzouphlus then took the throne as Alexius V and all hope of the crusaders gaining further support from Constantinople vanished. The crusaders therefore stormed and sacked Constantinople on 12 April 1204, which saw many relics looted and eventually brought back to the west. As noted above, one of the crusade leaders, Baldwin of Flanders, was installed as Emperor Baldwin and an attempt was made to unite the Roman Church with its Byzantine counterpart and end the schism.⁶³⁵

Innocent's vision of being the man to recover Jerusalem and cement his status as a great pope on par with Urban II, ended in tatters.⁶³⁶ Excommunications were handed out, controversy surrounded every decision made by those who had intended to set out from Venice to the Holy Land but instead sacked two Christian cities. No one wanted to take the blame for what had

⁶³⁵ Angold, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 113.

⁶³⁶ For more on Innocent III see: James Powell (ed.), *Innocent III: Vicar of Christ or lord of the world?* 2nd (Washington D.C., 1994); Jane Sayers, *Innocent III: Leader of Europe 1198-1216* (London, 1994); John Moore (ed.), *Pope Innocent III and his world* (Farnham, 1999).

happened. Responsibility was passed between the Frankish crusading knights, the Venetian maritime power hired to take the crusaders, and the Byzantines themselves.

The conquest of Constantinople was undoubtedly controversial, therefore some of those involved used written accounts to explain why they did what they did, and how the crusade had ended up sacking Constantinople when it had set out for Jerusalem. Two such narratives were written by laymen: Geoffrey of Villehardouin and Robert of Clari. Others from clerical backgrounds had to explain how they had obtained relics that were once located in Constantinople. This was important not only to justify ownership but to also validate the authenticity of the relics. Gunther of Pairis's work was explicitly produced for this reason.⁶³⁷ He wrote an account of his abbot, Martin, who went on the crusade, and how he returned to his home in the Rhineland with numerous artefacts which were listed at the end of the work.⁶³⁸ Hodgson has recently analysed this account through a gendered lens describing how Martin's clerical masculinity was constructed within it.⁶³⁹ Furthermore, even the pope had an apologia written, *Gesta Innocentii Papae*, to try and ensure he was not seen as an instigator of the sack but instead had tried to prevent it.⁶⁴⁰

The personal involvement of these men caused them to write about the crusade, there is a clear division based on clerical and lay viewpoints about who was to blame for events turning out as they did. Indeed because of the impact of what happened some chroniclers give their opinion on the Fourth Crusade in general histories, and they often incriminated the Venetians for causing the whole sequence of errors.⁶⁴¹ On the other hand, as Hodgson has pointed out, Villehardouin and Clari tended to frame controversial decisions as being their own fault or the result of a

⁶³⁷ Angold, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 117.

⁶³⁸ See: Gunther of Paris, *Hystoria Constantinopolitana*, ed. Peter Orth (Hildesheim, 1994). For English translation see: Alfred Andrea, *The capture of Constantinople: The "Hystoria Constantinopolitana" of Gunther of Pairis* (Philadelphia, 1997).

⁶³⁹ Natasha Hodgson, 'Leading the people', pp. 199-221.

⁶⁴⁰ See: Powell, *Deeds*.

⁶⁴¹ See below for blame ascribed to the Venetians, p. 184. For Latin sources of the crusade and reactions beyond the narrative accounts of Clari, Villehardouin and Gunther of Pairis see: Alfred Andrea, *Contemporary Sources for the Fourth Crusade* (Leiden, 2008).

situation they had not anticipated to which they responded by taking the path that was considered honourable.⁶⁴² Furthermore, there is a lack of contemporary Venetian sources about the events which could either be interpreted as them believing they had no case to answer or that they were hiding their guilt on the matter. Unsurprisingly, Byzantine sources saw it as a general act of barbarism from the Latins.⁶⁴³

Modern historians have continued to play the ‘blame game’, which, as we shall see, has been the main focus of studies of the Fourth Crusade. Some have adopted a stance based on their subject of research producing work to exculpate certain groups and shift the blame onto others, for example Donald Queller and Gerald Day authored an essay defending the Venetians participation in the face of critics.⁶⁴⁴ One of the most hyperbolic statements on the Fourth Crusade came from the Byzantist Runciman who said: ‘There was never a greater crime against humanity than the Fourth Crusade.’⁶⁴⁵ Refuting this claim fellow Byzantist Michael Angold suggests that it hardly rates when compared to the crusaders’ sack of Jerusalem in 1099 or the atrocities of the Albigenian crusade.⁶⁴⁶ Thus viewpoints on the event have sometimes been highly subjective and emotionally charged. But as a form of historical enquiry allocating blame is essentially reductionist. The important point is to understand that it was a complex sequence of events, the outcome of which cannot be reduced to the blame of a single group or individual.⁶⁴⁷ This chapter will not concern itself with passing judgments on issues of blame and responsibility, rather it will consider the role of gender ideologies in the opinions of those who produced narrative accounts of the crusade. As such this provides an insight into these peoples’ thinking

⁶⁴² See, for more details: Hodgson, ‘Honour, Shame’.

⁶⁴³ The most important Byzantine source of the crusade is by one of its victims Niketas Choniates a government official and historian: Niketas Choniates, *O City of Byzantium: Annals of Niketas Choniates*, trans. Harry I. Magoulas (Detroit, 1984). For more background on Choniates see this useful collection of essays about him: Alicia Simpson & Stephanos Efthymiadis (ed.), *Niketas Choniates: A Historian and a Writer* (Genève, 2009).

⁶⁴⁴ For example: Gerald W. Day & Donald E. Queller, ‘Some arguments in defense of the Venetians on the Fourth Crusade’, *American Historical Review*, 81, 4 (1976), 717-37.

⁶⁴⁵ Runciman, *History* III, p. 130.

⁶⁴⁶ Angold, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 116.

⁶⁴⁷ As discussed in Jonathan Harris, ‘The debate on the Fourth Crusade’, *History Compass*, 2, 1 (2004), 1-10.

and their social functioning, thus allowing us to consider why they take the stances that they do rather than the surface detail they give of the narrative events.

2. Clari's Background

Geoffrey of Villehardouin and Robert of Clari's narratives from a lay perspective offer the best insight into those who participated on the Fourth Crusade. Geoffrey's account is better known due to his superior position as a leader of the crusade.⁶⁴⁸ However, Robert of Clari's work is equally (if not more) important. Information on Clari is scarce, his birth and death are unknown although it has been suggested he was born c. 1170 and died c. 1216.⁶⁴⁹ He was from Picardy and served in the army of his lord, Peter of Amiens. He names himself twice in his work but gives no reason for his motivation to go on crusade. Possibly he was following his lord out of loyalty, or he may have independently decided to go. His work, *La Conquête de Constantinople*, was written in the Picardy dialect of Old French, Edgar McNeal suggested this meant it was intended for a local audience. It survives in a single manuscript, consequently it was neither widely known nor read at the time suggesting his story may have not been heard outside the confines of his locality in Corbie where it was produced.⁶⁵⁰

There is an inscription on a reliquary at Corbie Abbey which is believed to refer to Clari as the donator of relics brought from Constantinople, stating: 'Blessed be Robilard who brought me from Constantinople.'⁶⁵¹ It is presumed he returned from Constantinople back to France in 1205, a year after the city's conquest.⁶⁵² Beyond this all we know comes from within his text which was written by 1216, most likely dictated by Clari.⁶⁵³ Jeannette Beer speculates that the scribe could have been Clari's brother Aleaumes, who is discussed in his text, although she urges caution in

⁶⁴⁸ For more on Villehardouin's background see: *Smith*, pp. xxiv-xxxi.

⁶⁴⁹ Clari, p. xxiii.

⁶⁵⁰ For the manuscript: Copenhagen, Royal Library, MS 487.

⁶⁵¹ Jeanette Beer, *In Their Own Words: Practices of Quotation in Early Medieval History-Writing* (Toronto, 2014), p. 57: 'Bene sit Robilardo qui me attulit Constantinopoli.'

⁶⁵² Clari, p. xxiii.

⁶⁵³ Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 51.

this assertion due to a lack of evidence.⁶⁵⁴ This is certainly not implausible given we know of other people having their siblings record their pilgrimage or crusading experience. For example Margaret of Beverly recounted her deeds in the Holy Land during the fall of Jerusalem to Saladin to her brother Thomas of Froidmont who recorded them in writing.⁶⁵⁵ The fact Clari's brother performs heroic deeds, as will be discussed further on, certainly strengthens this case.⁶⁵⁶ In his text Clari does not give an explicit purpose for his motivation to have his experiences recorded. However some historians have offered explanations. One is that Clari's book could be seen as an authentication of the relics at Corbie, although Bull asks, if it is about authenticating relics then why does he not list them?⁶⁵⁷ We can only speculate as to Clari's motives: maybe he felt he had a good story to tell, a need for personal justification, or perhaps others urged him to write down his story of him being involved in conquering the unconquerable city, certainly his presentation of the crusade leadership and unmanly Greek emperors suggests he had a didactic purpose for writing.⁶⁵⁸

Robert of Clari and Geoffrey of Villehardouin came from elite backgrounds, as they were both knights, but they were still quite far apart in terms of social status. Villehardouin (d. 1218), as Marshal of Champagne, was a leading member of the nobility; he played a major role in the crusade negotiating the treaty with Venice that was central to the whole reason why the crusade failed to get to the Holy Land. Villehardouin's work justified all the decisions made by the crusaders and thus also legitimised how events turned out as they did. This is unsurprising because post-conquest Villehardouin was appointed marshal of Romania (the Latin Empire), therefore he was bound to try and legitimise events and actions that others deemed highly

⁶⁵⁴ Beer, *In Their Own Words*, p. 60.

⁶⁵⁵ See Hodgson, *Women*, p. 40; p. 48; p. 149; p. 169.

⁶⁵⁶ This issue of possible joint authorship does not affect the analysis of the text, which is presented as being Clari's own account, and therefore that is how it will be treated.

⁶⁵⁷ Bull, *Eyewitness*, p. 293.

⁶⁵⁸ Constantinople had not been conquered by outsiders since its construction: Queller & Madden, *Fourth Crusade*, p. 186.

questionable.⁶⁵⁹ Conversely Clari is often described as a poor knight, both by himself and modern historians, which is a reflection of his social status in relation to the top elite men, it is a relative term rather than an expression of actual financial poverty. It should also be remembered that when writing about oneself in this period it was the usual custom to be self-depreciative.⁶⁶⁰ But we should consider why Clari stated this. It seems to have been a way of making his actions seem more impressive and also to complain about not getting a fair share of booty. Importantly, Clari's status as a subordinate member of the homosocial group of knights gives us a refracted view of how men such as he viewed the elite leadership.

Between the two accounts of these men, Villehardouin's position as a leader of the crusade and his higher social status has meant his account has often been considered the more important. For example, Queller and Madden remark that Clari, 'though a simple man... was not completely uncultured', which implies that his account is somewhat limited.⁶⁶¹ Nonetheless, Queller and Madden do view Clari's text as containing both positives and negatives, they praise him for his valuable information whilst in Venice and argue he 'possessed the gift of a fresh eye, and so he gives us clear and colourful details of battles and buildings and all sorts of things.'⁶⁶² However, they claim that he had 'some weakness' in that he, 'had no head for numbers, or dates, so he should never be relied upon for amounts of money, numbers of men, or chronology without the greatest caution.'⁶⁶³ It would only be fair to call this a weakness if this had been his intention from the outset, but he never claimed it to be. Queller and Madden's opinions of Clari's shortcomings derive from their empirical method, by which they dismiss literary convention as inevitably entailing unreliability.

⁶⁵⁹ For Villehardouin's background see: *Smith*, pp. xxiv-xxxi; For an analysis of his work see: Jeanette Beer, *Villehardouin: Epic historian* (Genève, 1968).

⁶⁶⁰ Gransden, 'Prologues', p. 55.

⁶⁶¹ Queller & Madden, *Fourth Crusade*, pp. 43-44.

⁶⁶² Queller & Madden, *Fourth Crusade*, pp. 43-44.

⁶⁶³ Queller & Madden, *Fourth Crusade*, pp. 43-44.

However, Phillips offers a more positive assessment of Clari's work describing it as 'one of the most vivid and exciting of all crusade narratives.'⁶⁶⁴ Likewise Angold has extolled it, bemoaning the fact that Clari's account has not been held in the same esteem as Villehardouin's by modern historians.⁶⁶⁵ Angold contends that the text's discursive nature is not evidence of it being an artless veteran account but is in fact carefully constructed and Clari's digressions 'are an essential part of the narrative.'⁶⁶⁶ This is in reference to the Constantinople stories that are discussed below, which give recent histories of Byzantine emperors about their rises and downfalls.⁶⁶⁷ More recently Bull has posited that Clari's text is a superior narrative to Villehardouin's, claiming it, 'is the more artfully crafted and considered piece of writing.'⁶⁶⁸ He bases this on Clari's insight into competing cultures and values as form of explanation for how events unfolded, a theme this chapter expands upon. Bull argues that Clari does not rely on the 'relentless machinery of sequential action' that Villehardouin used to tell his story.⁶⁶⁹ Concerning the aforementioned trope of Clari as the 'simple knight', Bull judges that this has affected historians' analysis too negatively.⁶⁷⁰ To contest this Bull argues that in modern military accounts it is the simple raw style of narrative from soldiers that make the most effective texts and are considered most truthful by audiences.⁶⁷¹ Bull's analysis has opened up new perspectives on Clari that can also be applied to other neglected crusade narratives.

Other scholars have recognised the importance of Clari's text beyond its empirical value, highlighting the significance of it being part of an emerging form of vernacular prose, along with Villehardouin's, that had hitherto not existed in the French language. Spiegel argues that these texts were written at a 'crucial moment in the social and political history of medieval France.'⁶⁷²

⁶⁶⁴ Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 51.

⁶⁶⁵ Angold, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 15.

⁶⁶⁶ Angold, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 15.

⁶⁶⁷ See below, p. 193-205.

⁶⁶⁸ Bull, *Eyewitness*, p. 294.

⁶⁶⁹ Bull, *Eyewitness*, p. 296.

⁶⁷⁰ Bull, *Eyewitness*, p. 296.

⁶⁷¹ Bull, *Eyewitness*, p. 305.

⁶⁷² Spiegel, *The Past as Text*, p. 178.

As such, in both Villehardouin's and Clari's work we get the voices of men written in the language they spoke, in the form they would have spoken. No longer is Latin being used as the medium, nor verse, the only form the vernacular had hitherto being presented in. Instead we arguably have a more 'true' expression of men in their own words about what they actually thought, saw, heard, and felt, rather than being constrained by using Latin as the medium of discourse and the issues and conventions that this entailed.⁶⁷³ This importance has been highlighted by Hodgson who has jointly analysed Clari's and Villehardouin's work to demonstrate how notions of honour and shame played a part in their narratives.⁶⁷⁴ Hodgson demonstrates how these concepts functioned as a vital part in both knightly behaviour but also in controversial events. Honour and shame were central concepts in elite masculinity of this period and therefore her work gives us a better understanding of how men acted.⁶⁷⁵

Thus the value of Robert of Clari's text has been questioned and even passed over in favour of other accounts. Although recent research has countered this, notably by Hodgson and Bull, the full potential of the text has yet to be explored. Consequently, the purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate that Clari's text deserves detailed attention in its own right. Its importance lies beyond simply being a means of testing the 'accuracy' of Villehardouin's work, which is how Angold believes it has often been treated.⁶⁷⁶ This will be achieved by demonstrating, through the lens of gendered reading, that Clari's work revealed the values of elite masculinity that were key both to framing decisions at the time, and also instrumental in shaping his narrative of events. To achieve this the chapter will consider the following actions and events: the decision to go to Constantinople; performative masculinity and prowess at Constantinople, and post-conquest dishonour and electing the emperor. The purpose of this is to further our knowledge and understanding of how elite males in the early thirteenth century made sense of their world. Men

⁶⁷³ For the shift to vernacular prose see: Damian-Grint, *New Historians*, p. 173.

⁶⁷⁴ Hodgson, 'Honour, Shame'.

⁶⁷⁵ As discussed in Chapter One Hodgson does not actually use the term 'masculinity' in this article, although she is talking about it implicitly. See, p. 60.

⁶⁷⁶ Angold, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 11.

were expected to act in accordance with their defined gendered roles and through analysing Clari's perspectives on how elite men acted we can see the extent to which men on the Fourth Crusade lived up to these roles. Clari's account demonstrates that notions of masculinity shaped both action and discourse for these elite males.

3. Constantinople Decision

Despite capturing Zara in November 1202 to pay off the debts owed to the Venetians the economic situation of the crusaders did not improve much. Robert of Clari was keen to highlight this as it became a method of introducing into his work the origins of the idea of going to Constantinople. The crusaders' diversion to Constantinople was decided upon with the intention of bringing a regime change, replacing the current 'usurper' with his nephew, and accruing funds to continue their campaign. This, according to Phillips would make the diversion morally justifiable and ensure the crusade was not seen as being directed against Byzantium.⁶⁷⁷ At this point there was no desire to overthrow the Byzantine emperors and replace them with Latins. Therefore this section will discuss how Clari used his narrative to frame the decision in a unique way that is not found in Villehardouin's account. Clari's narrative offers two reasons for going to Constantinople, both framed within the discourse of masculinity as a justification for action: the first is the account of the short argument Prince Alexius put forward to persuade the crusade leaders to support him; the second a long form narrative of recent events involving previous emperors which demonstrated Byzantine failures to embody Latin masculinity.

The decision to go to, and eventually conquer, Constantinople was extremely controversial in the immediate aftermath of the event, and today amongst historians it continues to enflame debates.⁶⁷⁸ The purpose here is not to offer a new angle on this decision or who was to blame

⁶⁷⁷ Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 130.

⁶⁷⁸ See Madden's description of a conference panel regarding Byzantine and the West in: Thomas Madden, 'Outside and Inside the Fourth Crusade', *The International History Review*, 17, 4 (1995), 726-43; An excellent historiographical overview is provided in Harris, *Byzantium*, pp. 1-5 and also Harris, 'The debate', 1-10.

but instead consider Robert of Clari's presentation of the decision.⁶⁷⁹ First of all it is worth considering Villehardouin's account of how the decision was made for comparison. He used concepts of masculinity invoking honour and shame, telling his readers that the crusader leaders received a letter from King Philip of Germany imploring them to help his brother-in-law Alexius, son of the deposed Byzantine Emperor Isaac. According to Villehardouin Philip wrote:

since you have left home in the cause of God, right and justice, you should, if you are able, restore their inheritance to those who have been wrongly dispossessed. And Alexius will offer you the most favourable terms ever offered to anyone and give you the greatest possible assistance in conquering the lands overseas.⁶⁸⁰

However there was disagreement about supporting Alexius with concerns raised by lay men and clerics asserting that they had not set out to campaign against Christians. Villehardouin said those in favour responded with: 'You should know that if the land overseas is ever to be recovered, it will be achieved by way of either Egypt or Greece, and that if we reject this treaty we will be forever shamed.'⁶⁸¹ The shame to be incurred by rejecting this treaty is ambiguous. Is it shame for denying a request from the King of Germany? Shame for not helping the dispossessed man? Or shame for failing to take an opportunity which could result in the restoration of Jerusalem? Villehardouin's method of framing it as an honourable act shut down debate of whether or not it was the right decision: for him it definitely was. To admit otherwise would be to admit shameful behaviour.

Clari offered an alternative account of how Alexius' situation was brought to the attention of the crusade leadership. Like Villehardouin Clari described the crusaders being in Zara and not having adequate funds to continue to Egypt or Syria:

⁶⁷⁹ For a background on the decision see: Queller & Madden, *Fourth Crusade*, pp. 82-100.

⁶⁸⁰ trans. *Smith*. p. 26; Villehardouin, p. 84: 'Pour ce que vous alez et pour Dieu et pour droit et pour jostice, si devez a ceuls qui sont desherité a tort rendre leur heritage, se vous poez. Et li vous fera la plus haute couvenance qui onques fust fete a gent et la plus riche, a la terre d'outremer conquerre.'

⁶⁸¹ trans. *Smith*. p. 26; Villehardouin, p. 86: 'Et sachiez que par la terre de Babiloine ou par Grece sera la terre recoveree, et se nous refusons ceste couvenance nous somes honiz a tout jorz.'

The Doge of Venice saw clearly that the pilgrims were not in a good position; so he spoke to them and said: “Lords in Greece there is a very rich land, very well supplied; if we could find a reasonable excuse to go there and to take provisions and other things from the land until we are completely reprovisioned, it would seem to me a good plan and we could surely go to the Holy Land.”⁶⁸²

As luck would have it Boniface of Montferrat immediately responded thus:

Lords, last Christmas I was in Germany at the court of my lord the emperor. There I saw a young man who was the brother of the Emperor of Germany’s wife. That young man was the son of emperor Isaac of Constantinople, whose brother had treacherously stolen the empire from him. Whoever could have this young man on his side could surely go the land of Constantinople and take stores and anything else for the young man is the rightful heir.⁶⁸³

This speech allowed Clari to turn his attention to his main point: ‘Now I will stop talking about the pilgrims and the fleet, so that I can tell you about this young man and the Emperor Isaac...’⁶⁸⁴ He then began his ‘Constantinople stories’ which will be discussed shortly. In this instance Clari had used Enrico Dandolo (d. 1205), the doge of Venice and Marquis Boniface of Montferrat (d. 1207) to initiate the narrative of them lacking funds and having to find a solution. Bull suggests this would appear to conspiracy theorists that they were plotting to attack Constantinople at this point.⁶⁸⁵ This reading can be supported by the fact that Clari followed the account of Dandolo and Boniface’s exchange with a lengthy account providing evidence of

⁶⁸² Clari p. 20: ‘Li dux de Venice vit bien que li pelerin n’estoient mie a aise; si parla a aus et si leur dist: “Seigneur, en Grece a molt rike tere et molt plentive de tous biens; se nous poiemes avoir raisnaule acoison d’aler y et de prendre viandes en le tere et autres coses, tant que nous fuissimes bien restoré, che me sanleroit boins consaus, et si porriemes bien outre mer aler.”’

⁶⁸³ Clari p. 20: ‘Seigneur, je fui antan au Noel en Alemaigne, a le court mon siegneur l’empereour. Illueques si vi .j. vaslet qui estoit freres a le femme l’empereur d’Alemaigne. Chus vaslés si fu fix l’empereur Kysac de Constantinoble, que uns siens freres le avoit tolu l’empire de Constantinoble par traïson. Qui chu vaslet porroit avoir,” fist li marchis, “il porroit bien aler en le tere de Constantinoble et prendre viandes et autres coses, car li vaslés en est drois oirs.”’

⁶⁸⁴ Clari p. 20: ‘Or vous lairons chi ester des pelerins et de l’estoire, si vous dirons de chu vaslet et de l’empereur Kysaac...’

⁶⁸⁵ Bull, *Eyewitness*, p. 315.

Byzantine unworthiness to rule. However, the representation of the doge and Boniface should not be used to argue they were looking for a reason to attack Constantinople, rather this exchange was used to set up the stories in which Clari gave strong arguments to turn their attention to regime change in Byzantium. Nonetheless, like Villehardouin's account, Boniface's words in Clari's narrative convey the whole episode couched in terms of honour, shame and vengeance. Savvas Neocleous points out that the Byzantines did not follow the Latins' notion of primogeniture and that holding the office of Byzantine Emperor was itself proof of rightful possession.⁶⁸⁶ Therefore Boniface's assertions that Prince Alexius was the rightful heir, as reported by Clari, would not have been the viewpoint of the Greeks themselves, who believed Alexius III to be their rightful ruler, rather than Prince Alexius, as later events demonstrated. However, Clari's intention was not to set out a legal defence for the benefit of the residents of Constantinople instead he explained to his French audience how the argument in favour of lending the crusade's support to Alexius was sold to him and other crusaders. As evidenced by Villehardouin's words above, it was honourable to help the dispossessed. This can be seen as part of Clari's wider tactic for persuading his audience that the attack on Constantinople was a legitimate act, one they could condone because it fell in with their own notions of what was a legitimate use of force in response to an action against them.⁶⁸⁷ This is just one example of how the consideration of the text's audience is crucial to understanding its presentation of information. Thus the literary and ideological function of this presentation should be considered instead of simply trying to gauge the extent to which an account is 'factually true.'

4. Constantinople Stories

As already noted, after recounting the discussion between Dandolo and Boniface about supporting Prince Alexius Clari gave three stories involving recent events from the reigns of Byzantine emperors. Clari stated at the beginning 'this is the story that we have heard,' suggestive

⁶⁸⁶ Savvas Neocleous, 'Financial, chivalric or religious? The motives of the Fourth Crusaders reconsidered', *Journal of Medieval History*, 38, 2 (2012), 191.

⁶⁸⁷ Neocleous, 'Financial', 191.

of it being a common one told among crusaders.⁶⁸⁸ More recently research by Massimiliano Gaggero has uncovered a link between these stories in Clari's work and ones found in the Old French Continuation of William of Tyre known as *Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le Trésorier*.⁶⁸⁹ Gaggero convincingly argues that both texts have similar stories about the Byzantine emperors and were both produced in Corbie.⁶⁹⁰ This demonstrates that these ideas about the Byzantines were in circulation in Western Europe and not just a fanciful creation by Clari to justify Latin intervention. Therefore these stories should have been known to those involved in the crusade as they arguably played a role in their judgment of the Byzantine emperors. Furthermore they could also have been used to judge the conduct and downfall of the Latin leaders in the post-conquest period.

Rima Devereaux terms these as the Manuel, Isaac, and Conrad stories.⁶⁹¹ This refers to Emperor Manuel I Comnenus (1143-80), Isaac II Angelos (1156-1204) and Conrad of Montferrat. It must be acknowledged that these stories have been little discussed by scholars excepting Devereaux and Bull. Otherwise they have mostly been judged inaccurate and as evidence of xenophobia towards the Greeks, thus adding to the perception that Clari's account is only valuable in confirming Villehardouin's account.⁶⁹² However, as will be shown, these stories demonstrated the function of masculinity discourse in explaining and justifying behaviour and action. Moreover Clari clearly believed they were important to his narrative of the crusade hence including them.

⁶⁸⁸ Clari, p. 20: 'Ensi l'avons oï tesmoignier.'

⁶⁸⁹ Massimiliano Gaggero, 'Western Eyes on the Latin East: The *Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le Trésorier* and Robert of Clari's *Conquête de Constantinople*', *The French of Outremer: Communities and Communications in the Crusading Mediterranean*, ed. Laura K. Morreale & Nicholas L. Paul (New York, 2018), pp. 86-109.

⁶⁹⁰ Gaggero, 'Western Eyes on the Latin East', pp. 98-99.

⁶⁹¹ Rima Devereaux, 'Constantinople as Model: Riches and Poverty in Girart de Roussillon and Robert de Clari's *Conquête de Constantinople*', *Epic and Crusade: Proceedings of the Colloquium of the Société Rencesvales British Branch held at Lucy Cavendish College Cambridge 27-28 March 2004*, ed. Philip Bennett, Anne Cobby, & Jane Everson (Edinburgh, 2006), p. 5.

⁶⁹² For Robert's Constantinople stories being anti-Greek see: C.P. Bagley, 'Robert de Clari's *La Conquête de Constantinople*', *Medium Ævum*, 40, 2 (1971) 109-15. Queller and Madden take this perspective calling Villehardouin the official historian of the crusade: Queller & Madden, *Fourth Crusade*, p. 18. A similar view is shared in: Runciman, *History III*, p. 483.

For Devereaux these stories ‘propose a model for an ideal relationship between Western and Byzantine nobles, and implicitly posit a popular insurrection as a model for Western intervention in Byzantine affairs.’⁶⁹³ Hodgson argues that the stories ‘underlined [Clari’s] support for the conquest in knightly terms, by right of arms’, however she does not analyse these stories in detail.⁶⁹⁴ Building on their contentions, there is more to be said about the issues of gender at work in these stories. They offered a comparison between Byzantine and Latin masculinity which invited the conclusion that it was the failure of the Greeks to act in the manner of Latin Franks that allowed the Westerners to legitimately intervene in Byzantine politics. As Nagel argues, hegemonic masculinity is the standard to which ‘other masculinities compete or define themselves.’⁶⁹⁵ Therefore the Greeks could be termed as embodying a subordinated masculinity in relation to the crusaders who embodied the hegemonic position. Simply put, the Byzantines were unmanly compared to the Latins.

However first an overview of contemporary Latin attitudes to the Greeks is necessary to understand more of why Clari wrote these stories.⁶⁹⁶ Tensions between the Latins and Greeks intensified during the eleventh century with the reform papacy advocating papal primacy, a position the Byzantine emperor claimed for himself.⁶⁹⁷ This led to a schism between the two churches. Nonetheless the crusade movement was in part initiated by the Byzantines with their request for help in 1095 from the pope in combatting the Seljuks of Rum. Hoping for mercenaries to fight under Greek command, instead there arrived armies under papal command with the intention of liberating Jerusalem from Islamic hands. The geographical position of Byzantium along with its economic and military clout was integral to crusading success. Support was forthcoming from the emperor in Constantinople, Alexius Comnenus, but Byzantium was

⁶⁹³ Devereaux, ‘Constantinople as Model’, p. 5.

⁶⁹⁴ Hodgson, ‘Honour, Shame’, 235.

⁶⁹⁵ Joane Nagel ‘Masculinity and nationalism: Gender and sexuality in the making of nations’, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 21, 2 (1998), 242-69.

⁶⁹⁶ An excellent overview of the crusades from a Byzantine perspective can be found in Peter Lock, *The Routledge Companion to The Crusades* (Abingdon, 2006), pp. 358-75. For full length studies see: Ralph-Johannes Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States 1096-1204* (Oxford, 1993); Harris, *Byzantium*.

⁶⁹⁷ Lock, *Companion*, p. 359.

often criticised by crusaders from the First Crusade onwards through subsequent crusades, into the early thirteenth century, and beyond. Criticisms from crusaders were based on not receiving the aid they demanded from the Byzantines or the contention that the Byzantines were treacherous, or only self-interested. Whilst the *Gesta Francorum* was quite critical of Emperor Alexius and his role in the First Crusade, Guibert of Nogent in re-writing the narrative turned some of these issues into a strong diatribe against the Greeks, especially their religion and culture. Guibert accused Alexius Comnenus of being a usurper. Furthermore he suggested Alexius passed a law demanding that families with many daughters had to send one to brothels to raise money for imperial funds. Guibert also claimed that Alexius demanded sons be castrated making them useless for military service hence why the Franks were requested by the emperor to help him fight the Seljuk Turks.⁶⁹⁸

Crucially, from the writings of the First Crusade onwards anti-Greek sentiment was often espoused in gendered terms, characterising the Greeks as unmanly.⁶⁹⁹ These attitudes were articulated explicitly by Odo of Deuil (d. 1162) in his account of the Second Crusade (1147-1149). Odo identified Greek treachery to be at the heart of crusaders' suffering during the crossing of Anatolia. Here is one example of his views and their reliance on gendered ideas:

And then the Greeks degenerated entirely into women, putting aside manly vigour both of words and of spirit, they lightly swore whatever they thought could please us, but they neither kept faith with us nor maintained respect for themselves. In general they really have the opinion that anything which is done for the holy empire cannot be considered perjury.

⁶⁹⁸ Guibert of Nogent, 'Gesta', p. 133.

⁶⁹⁹ For more on these views see: Marc Carrier, 'Perfidious and Effeminate Greeks: The Representation of Byzantine Ceremonial in the Western Chronicles of the Crusades (1096-1204)', *Annuario. Istituto Romeno Di Cultura e Ricerca Umanistica*, 4 (2002), 47-68.

Let no one think that I am taking vengeance on a race of men hateful to me and that because of my hatred I am inventing a Greek whom I have not seen.⁷⁰⁰

This was clearly an attack on the Greeks' masculinity; Odo claimed they were effeminate thus explaining their unreliability and treachery. They lacked loyalty and fidelity to their oaths, integral attributes of Latin elite masculinity. Moreover, Odo's views were based on experience unlike Guibert's. Indeed, anti-Greek ideas were maintained on the Third Crusade when, as Diggelmann has argued, Greek representation by Latin writers continued to be constructed in the same stereotypical and negative fashion.⁷⁰¹ As we shall see similar opinions building on such traditions about the Greeks, were given by the Fourth Crusade's participants to justify their own behaviour.

Returning to Clari, the first story he presented was about Emperor Manuel I Comnenus.⁷⁰² This recalled how Latin-Byzantine relations were good under Manuel. Clari wrote: 'This emperor was a very worthy man (*molt preudons*) and the most powerful of all the Christians there ever were and the most generous (*plus larges*).'⁷⁰³ Clearly he had manly characteristics, being a *preudomme* and providing largesse that was appreciated by the Franks.⁷⁰⁴ Clari tells us that Manuel 'loved the Franks very much and trusted them greatly.'⁷⁰⁵ But jealousy amongst the Byzantine courtiers saw them demand that Manuel remove the Franks from his court. Manuel acquiesced, to which the Greeks responded: 'Ah! Sire in that case you will act wisely and we will serve you very loyally!'⁷⁰⁶ However, Manuel secretly had a plan to expose the Byzantines' disloyalty and lack of prowess. After announcing the expulsion of the Franks from his lands he held a secret meeting with the

⁷⁰⁰ Odo of Deuil, *De Projectione Ludovici VII in Orientem*, ed. & trans. Virginia Berry (New York, 1962), p. 56: 'tunc Graeci penitus frangebantur in feminas; omne virile robur et verborum et animi depsonentes, leviter iurabant quicquid nos velle putabant, sed nec nobis fidem sibi verecundiam conservabant. Generalis est enim eorum sententia non imputari periurium quod fit propter sacrum imperium. Nec me putet aliquis odiosum genus hominum persequi et odio eorum fingere quem non vidi.'

⁷⁰¹ Lindsay Diggelmann, 'Of Grifons and tyrants: Anglo-Norman views of the Mediterranean world during the Third Crusade', in *Old Worlds, New Worlds: European Cultural Encounters, c.1000-c.1750*, ed. Lisa Bailey, Lindsay Diggelmann & Kim M. Phillips (Turnhout, 2009), pp. 11-30.

⁷⁰² For more on Manuel Comnenus' rule see: Lilie, *Byzantium*, pp. 142-221; Harris, *Byzantium*, pp. 99-120.

⁷⁰³ Clari, p. 20: 'Si fu molt preudons chis empereres et li plus rikes de tous les crestiens qui onques fuissent et li plus larges.'

⁷⁰⁴ For more on *preudomme* see Chapter One, pp. 55-56.

⁷⁰⁵ Clari, p. 20: '... amoit molt Franchois et mout les creoit.'

⁷⁰⁶ Clari, p. 20: 'Ha! Sire, or feriés vous molt bien et nous vous servirons molt bien!'

Franks and arranged a fraudulent confrontation in which they would refuse to leave. Manuel would then demand his Byzantine men fight against the Franks to test them. He stated: 'Then I will see how my people will behave.'⁷⁰⁷ This all went to plan and when the Greeks were confronted by the Franks Clari recorded:

When the emperor saw that they were advancing towards him and his people to join battle, he said to his people: "Lords, now make ready to acquit yourselves well. Now you can surely take vengeance on them." As soon as he said that, the Greeks became very frightened of the Latins who, they could see, were drawing near them, and the Latins made a great show of attacking them. When the Greeks saw that, they turned in flight, leaving the emperor entirely alone.⁷⁰⁸

Manuel rebuked his countrymen:

Lords, now it can be seen clearly in whom I should put my trust; you ran away when you should have helped me, you left me all alone. And if the Latins so wished, they could have cut me into pieces. But now I command you that not one of you be so daring or so bold ever again that he speaks of my generosity nor of the fact that I favour the Franks, for I like them and put more trust in them than in you.⁷⁰⁹

The Greeks were humbled after this. This story gives a dichotomous presentation of the two groups of men. The Franks showed loyalty and obedience to Manuel whilst the Greeks showed cowardice and disobedience, thus drawing on stereotypes about Greek effeminacy which, as we have seen, were well-established by the time Clari wrote. The lack of ideal masculinity displayed

⁷⁰⁷ Clari, p. 22: 'Adont si verrai comment me gent se proveront.'

⁷⁰⁸ Clari, p. 22: 'Quant li empereres vit qu'il venoient vers lui et vers se gent pour combater, si dist a se gent: "Seigneur, or pensés du bien faire. Or vous poés vous bien vengier d'aus." Si comme il eut che dit li Grieu eurent molt grant paour des Latin que il virrent si aprochier d'aus, et li Latin fisent grant sanlant d'aus corre sus. Quant li Grieu virrent chou, si torment en fuies, si laissant l'empereur tretot seul.'

⁷⁰⁹ Clari, p. 22: 'Seigneur, or puet on bien veir en cui on se doit fier; vous vous en fuistes quant vous me deustes aidier, si me laissastes tout seul. Et, se li Latin vaussissent, il m'eussent tot decopé en pieches. Mais or kemanch jou, que nus de vous ne soit si osés ne si hardis qu'il jamais paraut de me largueche, ne de chou que j'aim les Francois, car je les aim et si me fi plus en aus que en vous.'

by the Greeks, but practiced by the Franks, proved their inability to act in accordance to normative behaviour required of elite men. Manuel, even though Greek himself, demonstrated an awareness that the Frankish men were far superior to his own subjects, and that is why he was so generous towards the Franks. Clari here used the Byzantine Emperor himself to voice standard gendered criticisms of the Greeks which centred on the importance of homosociality among elite men. Upholding the virtue of loyalty led to receiving largesse and good favour. Greek disloyalty meant Manuel could not trust his own men and if something did happen then it would be the Franks that protected him, thus there were no longer any homosocial bonds tying the emperor with his men. Clari's story is set during the period of the late 1170s to 1180s in which Manuel was criticised for his relationship with the Westerners which witnessed anti-Latin riots break out in Constantinople.⁷¹⁰ It was likely intended by Clari to represent the beginning of the downfall of Byzantine power caused implicitly through their inability to match Frankish notions of chivalric masculinity. Once loyalty between the emperor and his men had dissipated structures of power will break down as the next two stories show. They illustrate an understanding of homosociality as same sex bonds that are reinforced through loyalty to a superior or the group and by the expectation that everyone follows the rules of the group.⁷¹¹

The Isaac story recounted Isaac Angelos' rise to the throne. This is the same Isaac who was deposed by his brother Alexius III, and it was his son Prince Alexius who was asking the crusaders for help.⁷¹² It began by explaining the rise of Andronicus I Comnenus (r. 1183-85) who was originally made steward of Manuel's young son and successor, Alexius II Comnenus.⁷¹³ Andronicus subsequently killed the young boy and his mother, the former empress. After having himself crowned, Clari reported: 'he had all those arrested whom he knew to be upset; he had

⁷¹⁰ Harris, *Byzantium*, p. 121.

⁷¹¹ McVitty, 'False knights', 458-77.

⁷¹² For more on Isaac Angelos see: Lilie, *Byzantium*, pp. 222-45; Harris, *Byzantium*, pp. 136-70.

⁷¹³ For more on Andronicus see: Lilie, *Byzantium*, pp. 222-45; Harris, *Byzantium*, pp. 121-36.

their eyes put out and had them killed and they died shamefully.⁷¹⁴ He also raped numerous women about which Clari disapprovingly stated: ‘he acted so disloyally (*desloiautés*) that never was there any traitor or any murderer who did as much as he did.’⁷¹⁵ Clari characterises these rapes as a betrayal of the women’s husbands in conjunction with them being a despicable act. Because of this many nobles fled Constantinople including Isaac. Significantly the implication of this passage is that the emperor’s lust led him to destroy crucial homosocial ties with the elite males upon whom his power relied. His lust also compelled him to break the Davidic ethic through attacking women. Consequently, according to Clari’s account then Andronicus’ unmanliness caused him to act in tyrannical ways.

Eventually Isaac returned to Constantinople where he lived in poverty, but once this was known by Andronicus he sent his men to arrest and kill him. Isaac attacked one of these men: ‘he drew his sword and struck the steward through the head, so that he cut it in two right down to the teeth.’⁷¹⁶ Such prowess engendered a reaction. When those ‘who were with the steward saw that young man had cut through the steward in this way, they took flight.’⁷¹⁷ News spread of the incident and Isaac rode to the Hagia Sophia where the people gathered demanding he be crowned emperor because of how he ‘had killed this evil devil and murderer’, and they were reported to have said: ‘He is brave and bold to have carried out such a daring deed.’⁷¹⁸ Such prowess demonstrated Isaac’s fitness to rule, especially in comparison to the unprincipled Andronicus. At first the patriarch refused to crown Isaac claiming Andronicus would have him killed, to which the masses responded: ‘if he did not crown him they would cut off his head.’⁷¹⁹ Thus the people proclaimed Isaac’s right to rule. He evinced ideal masculinity and thus kingship

⁷¹⁴ Clari, pp. 24-26: ‘...si fait il prendre trestous chiaux que il seut que il en pesoit qu’il estoit empereres; si leur fait il crever les iex et destruire et de male mort morir...’

⁷¹⁵ Clari, p. 26: ‘... et fist tant de si grans desloiautés, que onques nus traîtres ne nus mourdrissierres tan n’en fist comme il fist.’

⁷¹⁶ Clari, p. 28: ‘Si traist il s’espee, si fert il chu balliu par mi le teste, si qu’il le pourfendi trestout dusques es dens.’

⁷¹⁷ Clari, p. 28: ‘qui estoient avec le balliu virrent que li vaslés avoit si pourfendu le balliu, si s’en fuirent.’

⁷¹⁸ Clari, p. 28: ‘eut chu maufé et chu mordreisseur ochis’... ‘Chist est vaillans et hardis, quant si grant hardement entreprist a faire.’

⁷¹⁹ Clari, p. 30: ‘... que s’il ne le coronoit, qu’il li couperoient le teste.’

through demonstrating both commitment to justice and enforcing it through a hypermasculine act of prowess.⁷²⁰ Andronicus was presented as both cruel and sexually depraved which reflected his lack of restraint and self-mastery. After being crowned Isaac was taken to the throne of Constantine where he distributed the treasures of the palace to the people much to their pleasure thereby demonstrating the key masculine attribute of largesse and charity. As such he had restored the homosocial bonds that had been destroyed by his predecessor. Andronicus tried to flee but was captured by locals who brought him back before Isaac, who asked him to explain why he had acted so badly towards many people. Andronicus replied haughtily: 'I am not going to deign to answer you!'⁷²¹ Isaac handed over Andronicus to the townspeople to let them have their vengeance, which they did by leading him around the city tied to a camel's behind with those he passed by stabbing him with knives and swords until he died.⁷²² Andronicus' dishonourable behaviour was rewarded with a dishonourable death. It is significant in this story that Clari describes Isaac as embodying the qualities of an ideal ruler as this then becomes part of the justification of restoring him and his son Prince Alexius to the throne.

The Isaac story continued: he brought back his brother Alexius from exile making him his steward. However, 'he became very arrogant about this stewardship which he held, for the people of all the empire were too respectful towards him and too fearful because he was the emperor's brother,' according to Clari.⁷²³ Unlike Isaac who had demonstrated his position through his actions, Alexius was treated in this way purely because of his relationship to Isaac, not on account of his own qualities. Alexius' arrogance led him to seize power for himself. When on a hunting trip with Isaac, Alexius 'treacherously seized him and put out his eyes.'⁷²⁴ Afterwards he imprisoned his brother and had himself crowned emperor, as Alexius III.⁷²⁵ Once

⁷²⁰ This duality is praised by, for example, Gerald of Wales, p. 119.

⁷²¹ Clari, p. 32: 'que je ne vous en dengneroie respondre.'

⁷²² Clari, p. 34.

⁷²³ Clari, p. 36: 'Adont si s'enorgueilli si de chele baillie qu'il eut, que kes gen de tout l'empire le renommoient trop et redoutoient pour chou qu'il estoit freres l'empereur...'

⁷²⁴ Clari, p. 36: 'si le prent il par traïson, si li creva les iex.'

⁷²⁵ See Harris, *Byzantium*, pp. 155–56; pp. 162–63.

more this episode illustrated a failing in the virtue of loyalty, undoubtedly this was perceived as even more heinous to Clari's audience because they were brothers.

Clari thus showed how the role of steward, an important close advisor to the emperor, had twice recently caused the holder of this position to depose the true emperor. This can be interpreted as Clari establishing the unreliability of the Greeks because if an emperor cannot trust his closest advisor then all loyalty is questionable. These two elite men, Andronicus and Isaac abandoned all forms of homosocial behaviour and acted in their own self-interest which was motivated by greed, lust and indulgence in violence.

Clari ended the Isaac story by stating:

Now you have heard how Isaac came to power and how he was emperor and how his son went to Germany, who was summoned by the crusaders and the Venetians on the advice of Marquis of Montferrat their leader, as you have already heard in this narrative, that they should have a reason to go to the land of Constantinople.⁷²⁶

This unequivocally justified to the audience the forthcoming action against Constantinople because the young Alexius, son of Isaac, was deemed the true heir by the Latins even though under Byzantine custom, as Neocleous argued above, this was not the case.⁷²⁷ An important motif in Clari's account has been identified by Devereaux: the issue of how power comes to be acknowledged. In the case of Isaac he was made emperor by the people, whereas Andronicus and Alexius made themselves emperor without the consent of the people.⁷²⁸ Devereaux suggests this is a foreshadowing of the crusaders' future conquest of Constantinople because in the first part of the Isaac story Andronicus was punished by the people for his usurpation and violent rule, whereas Alexius III had yet to suffer the same fate. But he would receive his just

⁷²⁶ Clari, p. 36: 'Or avés oï comment Kyrsac vint avant et comment il fu empereres et comment ses fix ala en Alemaingne, pour qui li croisié et li Venicien envoierent par le conseil du marchis de Monferras, leur maistre, si comme vous avés oï en l'estoire devant, pour che qu'il eussent acoison d'aler en le tere de Coustantinoble.'

⁷²⁷ See above p. 193.

⁷²⁸ Devereaux, 'Constantinople as Model', pp. 6-7.

punishment from the crusaders.⁷²⁹ Devereaux's approach can be further developed by considering the masculine attribute of vengeance. Vengeance was enacted by the Greek people on Andronicus but not yet on Alexius. Clari's audience already knew that the crusaders subsequently deposed Alexius III on behalf of Prince Alexius. So including the story about how Alexius came to power helped justify the crusaders' intervention in ways which established that Alexius had not been rightful ruler, and the crusaders were righteously punishing him as a result. Clari set up the Latin justification for intervention because of the necessity of Byzantium being ruled by someone who embodied ideal masculinity in order to maintain political order and support for crusading. Clari recorded one further story which continues these themes in order to strengthen his case for the western intercession.

The Conrad story told of help given by Conrad of Montferrat to the Byzantine emperor in quelling a rebellion against him in 1187, when the general Alexius Branas attempted to seize the throne.⁷³⁰ Clari does not name the emperor but since the story continues from where he left off it must be assumed to be Alexius III but in fact it was Isaac. Whether this was intentional or not is impossible to prove but it is worth noting that the story helps the crusaders' cause more if it was Alexius. Conrad was the brother of Fourth Crusade leader Boniface of Montferrat, hence Clari stated: '[Boniface] made greater efforts than anyone else who was there to go to Constantinople, because he wanted to avenge an injury which the Emperor of Constantinople who was ruling the empire had done to him.'⁷³¹ Conrad's role in the Third Crusade was discussed in Chapter Two, but his presentation by Clari and its difference from the *Itinerarium's* shows how certain characters can be used differently by different authors to shape their messages. As such finding the 'real' individual from such texts is a fraught undertaking.

⁷²⁹ Devereaux, 'Constantinople as Model', pp. 6-7.

⁷³⁰ Harris, *Byzantium*, p. 158.

⁷³¹ Clari, p. 40: 'Et li marchis de Monferras y metoit plus paine que nus qui y fust d'aler en Coustantinoble, pour che qu'il se voloit vengier d'un mesfait que li empereres de Coustantinoble, qui l'empire tenoit, li avoit fait.'

Clari tells us that Conrad had come to Constantinople on his way to the Holy Land and offered his help to the emperor to combat the rebellion against him. Apparently the emperor could not fight against the rebellion because 'he had neither the hearts nor the help of the people.'⁷³² Conrad suggested they fight together. They organised into separate squadrons and at the front Conrad led the way out of the city, the emperor ought to have followed but instead Clari reported: 'the emperor turned back and had the gate shut behind him.'⁷³³ Conrad was left alone to fight whilst the emperor was safe from Branas. Nonetheless, demonstrating Latin prowess, Conrad overcame Branas. When the insurgents fled the emperor opened the gates and chased those fleeing. Later Conrad questioned the emperor's behaviour but was rebuked with: 'Bah! so that's the way of it now!'⁷³⁴ Instead it turned out the emperor was now plotting against Conrad. This was exposed to Conrad by a friendly Greek who told him: '... the emperor and his traitors have plotted a great act of treason to capture you and have you killed.'⁷³⁵ Bewildered, Conrad escaped Constantinople and headed to the Holy Land, where Clari reported a muddled account of his actions there.⁷³⁶

Devereaux states: 'in this story Clari shows us that the West's service of the East is frustrated by the cowardice and treachery of the present Greek emperor.'⁷³⁷ Indeed, and it was clearly gendered in terms of presentation. For instance, the emperor's motive is never stated in this story, most likely as a method of demonstrating his irrationality, which was clearly a device for presenting him as being unmanly.⁷³⁸ The important point was that he had failed to act with honour towards Conrad and this broke homosocial ties between the two men as he acted with self-interest. It was again the contrast between Latin prowess and Byzantine inaction that was emphasised by Clari, in order to stress that a ruler had to be a warrior. Therefore the Byzantine

⁷³² Clari, p. 40: '...qu'il n'avoit mie bien le cueur de ses gens ne l'aiwe.'

⁷³³ Clari, p. 40: 'se li fait il fremer le porte après.'

⁷³⁴ Clari, p. 42: 'Ba! Ensi est ore!'

⁷³⁵ Clari, p. 42: '...li empereres et si traiteur ont pourpallee une grant traïson qui vous prendront, si vous feront destruire.'

⁷³⁶ Clari, pp. 42-48.

⁷³⁷ Devereaux, 'Constantinople as Model', p. 6.

⁷³⁸ For irrationality as an unmanly trait in opposition to male rationality see: Connell, *Masculinities*, p. 186.

emperor's manhood was questioned because he needed outsiders to come and do the manly work of countering the rebellion, because he could not. This was a theme throughout Clari's stories.

In relation to the Conrad story, Clari's claim that Boniface therefore 'he wanted to avenge an injury which the Emperor of Constantinople who was ruling the empire had done to him,' has been questioned by Bull, who argues that the failure to mention this later on before the second siege of Constantinople suggests Clari was stating this as a plot device.⁷³⁹ Furthermore, Bull purports Clari's creation of these stories was to show off his story-telling craft.⁷⁴⁰ Once more this seems likely and confirms this chapter's assertion that Clari was a more perceptive writer than has been recognized by most scholars that have read him. Furthermore, the analysis here builds on Bull's contentions by highlighting the effective use Clari made of masculinity discourse in plotting both the stories and the wider narrative within which they appear. These stories account for just over twenty percent of Clari's text. This showed the importance to Clari of laying out a defence of the events that were about to occur, unlike Villehardouin who offered no substantial arguments for going to Constantinople other than declaring from the outset, regarding Alexius' plea for help: 'if we reject this treaty we will be forever shamed.'⁷⁴¹ Clari wanted to tell his audience that this unmanly behaviour of the Byzantines, especially of some of their leaders, wrought their own destruction. As such he justified the forthcoming Latin conquest, but he was predicting the downfall of Latin rulers as well. Clari ended this part of his narrative by reporting the bishops' giving their approval for the plan to go to Constantinople and restore the 'true' emperor. Asked if it would be a sin to go there, the bishop replied: '... for it was not at all a sin.

⁷³⁹ Clari, p. 40: 'voloit vengier d'un mesfait que li empereres de Coustantinoble, qui l'empire tenoit, li avoit fait.' Bull, *Eyewitness*, p. 316.

⁷⁴⁰ Bull, *Eyewitness*, p. 317.

⁷⁴¹ trans. *Smith*, p. 26; Villehardouin, p. 86: 'Et sachiez que par la terre de Babiloine ou par Grece sera la terre recoveree, et se nous refusons ceste couvenance nous somes honiz a tout jorz.'

Rather it was a great charitable act, for, since they had the rightful heir who had been disinherited, they were well able to help conquer his right and to take revenge on his enemies.⁷⁴²

5. Performing Masculinity at Constantinople

Following the arrival of the crusaders at Constantinople Clari's narrative until the second siege of the city depicted the crusaders upholding masculine virtues and maintaining homosociality. The first siege of Constantinople (5-18 July 1203) resulted in a regime change with Alexius III fleeing and Isaac Angelos being reinstalled as emperor with Prince Alexius as co-emperor.⁷⁴³ Clari's presentation of this offensive from the arrival of the Latins at Constantinople through to discussing the assault on the city was framed by notions of manliness. This expanded on Villehardouin's account which often presented events matter-of-factly lacking the literary style of Clari.⁷⁴⁴ Clari's account offers examples of high status masculinity as a property that needed to be performed in front of an audience to demonstrate dominance.⁷⁴⁵ As such Clari used masculinity discourse to establish the Latins' moral, political and military superiority over the Greeks.

When the crusaders arrived by ship at Constantinople in 1203 Clari described the whole fleet together, writing, they were decked out and decorated 'so beautifully that it was the most beautiful sight in the world.'⁷⁴⁶ He continued, stating, when the people inside Constantinople 'saw this fleet which was so richly adorned, they looked on in wonder. And they climbed on the walls and on the houses to behold this marvel.'⁷⁴⁷ Smith argues that descriptions of naval might are a literary device presented to convey the image of power.⁷⁴⁸ This can be linked to notions of strength achieved through displaying power without actually having to resort to violence, as

⁷⁴² Clari, p. 48: '... Disent que che n'estoit mie pechiés. Ains estoit grans aumosnes, car, puis qu'il avoient le droit oir qui deserités estoi, bien li pooient aidier a sen droit conquerre et de ses enemis vengier.'

⁷⁴³ For an overview of events see: Queller & Madden, *Fourth Crusade*, pp. 119-34; Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade*, pp. 162-84.

⁷⁴⁴ For Villehardouin see: *Smith*, pp. 41-51.

⁷⁴⁵ See Chapter One, p. 40.

⁷⁴⁶ Clari, p. 50: '... si belement, que ch'estoit le plus bele cose du monde a eswarder.'

⁷⁴⁷ Clari, p. 50: '... virrent chel estoire qui si estoit belement appareilliés, si l'eswarderent a merveille. Et estaiient monté seur les murs et seur les maisons pour eswarder chele merveille.'

⁷⁴⁸ Caroline Smith, *Crusading in the Age of Joinville* (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 66-67.

argued by Karras.⁷⁴⁹ Clari tells us the crusaders were enamoured by the city of Constantinople, the biggest city some of them had ever laid eyes upon.⁷⁵⁰ Clari, by offering this Byzantine perspective of the crusaders' fleet, demonstrated how grand the scene was and how impressive it was to his enemy. Rather than marvelling they were probably wary because a foreign fleet arriving was not something to be welcomed. Furthermore, by recording the size of Constantinople from the Latin perspective Clari alluded to the enormity of what would follow, hinting at the prowess which would be required to take such a city.

Clari used this device of describing the reactions of the Byzantines to the crusaders a second time. Emperor Alexius III tried to pay off the crusaders with gold and silver to entice them to leave. But they rejected this and instead prepared for war. Clari gave the Byzantine point of view:

When the citizens saw this great fleet and navy and they heard the noise of the trumpets and the tabors which were making such a din, they all armed themselves and climbed on to the houses and the rooftops of the city. It seemed to them that the whole sea and the land trembled and that the sea was completely covered by ships.⁷⁵¹

Clari illustrated the crusaders' magnificence and the threat they posed from the Byzantine perspective to relate to his audience the immense size and threat of the fleet. It also offered a view that the Greeks would be foolish to oppose the crusaders' demands, as having such a powerful enemy would only result in their destruction.

Further on, describing the two opposing armies lining up against each other, Clari recounted:

there was no horse which was not covered with coats of arms or silken cloths over all the other coverings. Three, four, or five companies of infantry followed each of the squadrons

⁷⁴⁹ Karras, *From Boys to Men*, p. 38.

⁷⁵⁰ Clari, p. 50; Villehardouin also tells of peoples' impressions at seeing Constantinople for the first time. He did not though imagine the Byzantines' perspective of the crusaders: Villehardouin, p. 102.

⁷⁵¹ Clari, p. 52: 'Quant le gent de le vile virrent chel grant navie et chel grant estore et il oïrent les sons des buisines et des tabors qui faisoient grant noise, si s'armerent trestout et monterent seur les maisons et seur les tors de le vile. Si leur fu bien avis que toutes le mer et le tere tranlast, et que toute le mers fust couverte de nes.'

at the tails of the horse. And they were riding in such tight formation that there was no one so bold as to dare to ride ahead of the others.⁷⁵²

Bull describes this as Clari depicting the performance of aristocratic values being played out.⁷⁵³ This is certainly the case as it links to the notion of performed masculinity and how it was integral in a military context as a display of force to the enemy. Such displays of splendour and uniformity implied martial discipline, which was a key aspect of warrior masculinity.

Continuing, Clari tells how the crusaders were seriously outnumbered in comparison to the Byzantines, therefore having to resort to filling their ranks with non-trained soldiers, in this case grooms and cooks. These armed themselves with copper pots and other kitchen appliances and were coated in saddle cloths and blankets: ‘they were so ugly and hideous that the ordinary foot soldiers of the emperor ... felt great fear and panic when they saw them.’⁷⁵⁴ The Greeks were so afraid they did not even dare to move towards them. As fanciful as it seems for the Greeks to be afraid of such poorly equipped troops it fits in with the idea that the Greeks were unmanly and effeminate. Plus the message was clear that the crusaders were determined to use any resources and manpower available to take the city.

When the fighting commenced Clari offered the perspective of the Byzantines again:

the ladies and the maidens of the palace had come up to the windows and other people from the city, both women and young girls, had climbed on the city walls to watch that squadron ride past and the emperor on the other side, and they were saying to each other

⁷⁵² Clari, p. 58: ‘ne n’i avoit cheval qui ne fust couvers de couvretures d’armes ou de dras de soie par deseure toutes les autres couvretures. Et .iij. compaignes ou .iiij. ou .v. de serjans a pie sivoient cascune des batalles as kewes des chevax. Et chevauchioient si rengié et si serré qu’il n’estoit nus si hardis qui osast chevauchier devant l’autre.’

⁷⁵³ Bull, *Eyewitness*, p. 326.

⁷⁵⁴ Clari, p. 56: ‘si k’il estoient si lait et si hideus que le menue gent a pie l’empereur... en eurent grant peur et grant hisde, quant il les virent.’

that it looked as if ours were made up of such handsome angels, because they were so richly armed and their horses so finely caparisoned.⁷⁵⁵

This literary device was an important method of self-evaluation, however, Peter Noble questioned how Clari knew the Byzantine perspective.⁷⁵⁶ Queller and Madden suggest that Clari was giving his own image of himself, whilst Phillips proposes that Clari was presenting the fighting as if it was a tournament.⁷⁵⁷ Significantly, with respect to tournaments, Karras argues ‘aristocratic men reaffirmed their masculinity by performing deeds before the gaze of those who were not masculine, and displaying the rewards of women’s admiration before other men.’⁷⁵⁸ It is unlikely that Clari could have known what these women and maidens actually said to each other on seeing the crusader army. But he used them here as a means of expressing and further emphasising the impressiveness of the crusader forces, especially as outer beauty was held to signal inner virtue.⁷⁵⁹ Given the traditional role of women in evaluating and testifying to performances of masculinity it is significant that these women are shown to recognise quality in their enemies. Clari thereby constructs an ‘objective outsiders’ account of the handsomeness, and thus, implicitly, the honourableness and manhood of the crusaders.

The role of women in evaluating masculinity was further evidenced when Clari described Alexius III retreating from the crusaders’ charge and going back into the city for protection, despite being in a seemingly advantageous position. Clari commented that the emperor ‘was severely criticised by the ladies and the young girls and everyone else,’ because he had not engaged against a smaller force than his own.⁷⁶⁰ Therefore his failure to perform in front of women brought dishonour to him. Queller and Madden have used this passage to demonstrate Clari’s simplistic

⁷⁵⁵ Clari, p. 60: ‘Et les dames et les damiseles du palais estoient montees as fenestres, et autres gens de la cité, et dames et demiseles, estoient montees as murs del la chité, et esgardoient chevauchier chele bataille et l’empereur d’autre part, et disoient entr’ax que che sanloit des noes que che fussent angle, si erent il bel, pour chou qu’il estoient si belement armé et leur cheval si belement couvert.’

⁷⁵⁶ Peter Noble, ‘Eyewitnesses of the Fourth Crusade -- the war against Alexius III’, *Reading Medieval Studies*, 25 (1999), 83.

⁷⁵⁷ Queller & Madden, *Fourth Crusade*, p. 127; Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 179.

⁷⁵⁸ Karras, *From Boys to Men*, p. 49.

⁷⁵⁹ See above, pp. 147-49.

⁷⁶⁰ Clari, p. 62: ‘si fu molt blasmés durement et de dames et de demiseles, et d’un et d’autres...’

understanding of events.⁷⁶¹ But this is how Clari and his contemporaries made sense of the world, and it was not simplistic, it was a plausible depiction of the significance and impact of defined gender roles and the implications of failing to perform them properly. Clari presented the emperor as worthy of criticism because he had not performed his gender role or his socio-political role which required him to stand firm and defend those who could not defend themselves. Thus the women were quite right to criticise him.

Alexius' failure to defend his people seriously undermined his status as leader. Clari claims that the Byzantines demanded a leader who would fight, writing: '... the citizens said to the emperor that he should deliver them from the Franks who had besieged them and that unless he fought them, they would go for the young man whom the Franks had brought and would make him their emperor and lord.'⁷⁶² Despite promising he would fight, Alexius fled in the night Nicetas Choniates (d. 1217) the Byzantine courtier who wrote a history covering events from 1118-1207, described Alexius fleeing thus:

This miserable wretch among men was neither softened by the affection of children nor constrained by his wife's love, nor was he moved by such a great city, nor did he, because of his love for his life and his cowardice, give thought to anything else save his own salvation, and even this was doubtful, since he had to quit so many provinces and cities and all his kin.⁷⁶³

It was not just a lack of fortitude displayed here by Alexius, he also failed to fulfil other masculine roles of father and husband, which should have impelled him to try to defend the city. Instead he was cowardly and thought of nothing but his own safety, thereby proving his essential unfitness to rule. Conversely Villehardouin was unable to explain why Alexius fled and put it

⁷⁶¹ Queller & Madden, *Fourth Crusade*, p. 128.

⁷⁶² Clari, p. 64: 'et disent chil de le vile a l'empereur qu'il les delivrast des Francois qui les avoient assis, et que s'il ne se combatoit a aus, qu'il iroient pour le jone vaslet que li Francois avoinet amené s'en feroient empereur et leur seigneur.'

⁷⁶³ trans. Harry I. Magoulias: Choniates, *Annals*, p. 299.

down to a miracle, as he clearly believed the Byzantine emperor to have been in a position of strength.⁷⁶⁴ However, the implication which can be drawn from Clari's work is that the display of prowess from the crusaders, signalling their superior manhood caused Alexius to flee. As we saw earlier, Alexius had taken the throne by underhand methods, and his flight further confirmed that he had never been qualified to rule. By the judgement of his own people Alexius could not exercise the roles required in an emperor, and therefore had to be replaced.

The impressive nature of the crusaders was further confirmed by Clari's inclusion of an incident in which the Sultan of Konya (Iconium) an exile at the Byzantine court asked them to help him regain his rightful territory which had been usurped by his brother. This was almost a duplicate of the reason for the crusaders' presence in Constantinople. This incident is unique to Clari's account. Clari explained the request was based on the crusaders' actions, he reported the sultan stating: 'you have acted very bravely and very nobly in conquering so great a prize as Constantinople... and in restoring the rightful heir of Constantinople to his throne and crowning him emperor.'⁷⁶⁵ Phillips has analysed this event and taken it at face value, discussing the pros and cons of such an offer.⁷⁶⁶ However, since we know that Clari's distance from the leadership was such that he could not be relied upon for knowledge of the inner workings of the decision making of the leadership, we should question its strict accuracy. The purpose of this vignette, like the one about the Greek women's perspective of the crusaders was to show outside approval of the crusaders. It reinforced Clari's own justification for backing a coup against the incumbent Byzantine emperor, by painting it as a chivalric endeavour. The incident of the dispossessed sultan has echoes to one that occurred on the First Crusade when Godfrey of Bouillon was approached by the Muslim leader Omar of Azaz to help him fight off a threat from the Turks.⁷⁶⁷ In this case the motive was also the crusaders' prowess. Here Clari deploys the use of 'the other',

⁷⁶⁴ Villehardouin, pp. 130-32.

⁷⁶⁵ Clari, p. 66: 'vous avés fait molt grant barnage et molt grant proeche, qui si grant cose comme Constantinoble est, ... avés conquis, et avés remis le droit oir de Coustantinoble en sen siege et coroné l'avés a empereur.'

⁷⁶⁶ Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 191.

⁷⁶⁷ Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana* (Oxford, 2007), p. 346.

which Leona Cordery defines its use as an essential tool in creating one's own identity, not only to be used to focus on someone who is different.⁷⁶⁸ Moreover, Carol Sweetenham has shown that Christian writers or crusaders use it as literary device to mirror back their own values and rightness.⁷⁶⁹ Here though as well as demonstrating the crusades values, Clari's use of the crusaders actions being approved by a Muslim or women, allowed him to imply that the crusaders were not acting in their own interests but within the framework of universal norms, specifically masculinity, as evidenced with him using the terms 'nobly' and 'bravely'. Furthermore, because these groups, women and Muslims, were subordinate to the hegemonic masculinity their approval gave justification to the hegemonic elite, which in turn reinforced their hegemonic position because their actions were seen as something only elite males could do.

6. The Second Siege of Constantinople: Framing the Decision

This section will discuss Clari's depiction of the decision by the crusaders to lay siege to Constantinople a second time and install their own Latin emperor. As already discussed, the coup against Alexius III and the re-installation of his brother Isaac and nephew Alexius IV to the Byzantine throne was carried out by the crusaders and the Venetians. This was framed by Clari in terms of upholding noble ideals related to elite masculinity. But at the time it was primarily done for practical reasons, in order to keep the crusade alive, as Alexius had promised to reward them with funding to continue on their way to either Egypt or the Holy Land. However, issues arose following Alexius' inability to pay the crusaders what they were owed.⁷⁷⁰

Recording the events of winter 1203, Villehardouin made it clear that he believed, along with other members of the crusade leadership, that Alexius IV had failed to keep his promises of

⁷⁶⁸ Leona Cordery, 'The Saracens in Middle English literature: a definition of otherness', *Al-Masāq*, 14, 2 (2002), 88.

⁷⁶⁹ Carol Sweetenham, 'Crusaders in a hall of mirrors: the portrayal of Saracens in Robert the Monk's *Historia Iherosolimitana*', *Languages of Love and Hate: Conflict, Communication, and Identity in the Medieval Mediterranean*, ed. Sarah Lambert & Helen Nicholson (Turnhout, 2012), p. 57

⁷⁷⁰ For an overview of these issues regarding payment see: Queller & Madden, *Fourth Crusade*, pp. 148-50; Harris, *Byzantium*, pp. 170-71.

payment and that 'all his intentions were wicked.'⁷⁷¹ Both Villehardouin and Clari reported the crusaders asking Alexius IV for the money that had been agreed. Clari claimed the emperor wanted to be crowned first before settling with them.⁷⁷² Clari stated: 'When he was crowned, the barons asked for their money. And he said he would gladly pay them what he could. And then he paid fully one hundred thousand marks.'⁷⁷³ However this was not the full sum and so Clari wrote:

Afterwards the emperor went to see the barons and told him that he had nothing except Constantinople and that it was worth little if he had nothing else, for his uncle held all the cities and castles which ought to be his; and he begged the barons to help conquer the surrounding territories and he would very willingly give more of his money. Then they replied that they were very willing to do this.⁷⁷⁴

Alexius' position here established him as not being a hegemonic male because he did not have full control over Byzantine territories, his position as emperor and his access to the wealth of his own lands was dependent on Latin support and that this would become problematic.

While some Latins went to help Alexius other crusaders remained in Constantinople to rebuild the walls. Isaac, Alexius' father, was supposed to pay them for this work but did not. Once more the Franks asked for their money to which Alexius said he had nothing to give them and so they agreed a new date to settle the payment, but Clari says this came and again they were not paid.⁷⁷⁵

A further payment extension was given. Queller and Madden believed Alexius was buying for time knowing the majority of crusaders were demanding to leave Constantinople and resume the crusade and would thus eventually leave with or without being paid.⁷⁷⁶ Villehardouin's account is

⁷⁷¹ trans. *Smith*, p. 56; Villehardouin, p. 148: 'que il ne queroit se mal non.'

⁷⁷² Clari, p. 69.

⁷⁷³ Clari, p. 68: 'Et quant il fut coronés, li baron requisent leur paiement. Et il dist qu'il paieroit molt volontiers chou qu'il porroit. Et paia adonque bien .c.m. mars.'

⁷⁷⁴ Clari, p. 70: 'Après li empereres request les barons, et si leur dist que il n'avoit fors Constantinoble, et que peu li vauroit s'il n'avoit autre cose, car ses oncles tenoit toutes les chités et les castiaux qui siens devoient ester; et request les barons que il li aidassent a conquerre de le tere entor, et li leur douroit encore du sien molt volontiers. Adonques respondirent que che voloient il mot volontiers.'

⁷⁷⁵ Clari, p. 70.

⁷⁷⁶ Queller & Madden, *Fourth Crusade*, p. 150.

similar to Clari's, he records Alexius being given an ultimatum in his court by the Franks telling him to uphold the agreement. Foreigners making demands upon the emperor in his own court was perceived as an act of defiance by the observing Byzantines.⁷⁷⁷ So when Villehardouin returned to the crusaders camp, after giving his report he simply stated: 'And so the war began.'⁷⁷⁸

Another issue compromising Alexius' status was that he listened to poor council thus failing to uphold the virtue of prudence. This occurred through his reliance on Mourtzouphlus who was released with Isaac after the coup against Alexius III. Clari gave a forewarning of the trouble ahead when he recorded Mourtzouphlus being appointed head steward: 'for which the emperor afterwards was very badly rewarded.'⁷⁷⁹ Devereaux correctly asserts that the appointment of Mourtzouphlus directly recalled the Constantinople stories given by Clari, because in these stories the men who were appointed steward (Andronicus and Alexius) turned out to be usurpers.⁷⁸⁰ Mourtzouphlus would be no different, and he began by advising Alexius IV not to give the crusaders any money but to send them away. Clari recorded: 'And Alexius believed this advice, as he did not want to pay them anything.'⁷⁸¹ By taking this imprudent advice Alexius demonstrated poor kingship: from the crusaders' perspective he was dishonourable in trying to get out of a deal which he had sworn to uphold, additionally he imprudently took advice which only enraged an army camped outside his city. According to Clari: 'the barons replied that if he did not pay them, they would seize so much of his property that they would be paid.'⁷⁸² Phillips and Harris have both suggested that Alexius was in a situation that required balance between meeting his obligations to the crusaders and also his own peoples' expectations of what an

⁷⁷⁷ Villehardouin, p. 152.

⁷⁷⁸ trans. *Smith*, p. 58; Villehardouin, p. 152: 'Einsint comença la guerre.'

⁷⁷⁹ Clari, p. 64: 'dont li empereres eut puis après molt mal werredon.'

⁷⁸⁰ Devereaux, 'Constantinople as Model', pp. 11-12.

⁷⁸¹ Clari, pp. 70-72: 'Et Alexes si creï chu conseil, si ne leur vaut nient paier.'

⁷⁸² Clari, p. 72: 'Et li baron li respondirent que, s'il ne les paioit, il pourcacheroient tant du sien qu'il seroient païé.'

emperor had to do.⁷⁸³ These were gendered expectations but Alexius lacked both the personal and political mastery to satisfy both sides.

Alexius' obstinate behaviour came to a head in a parlay between him and Doge Dandolo, an incident only recorded by Clari, on the shore at the harbour outside the city of Constantinople. Most historians do not consider this incident in their works, probably because they think Clari is unreliable, as discussed earlier.⁷⁸⁴ Phillips does mention it but only to suggest that it was a last ditch attempt at preventing the crusaders from attacking Constantinople.⁷⁸⁵ This incident was recorded in direct speech by Clari which reinforced its importance in the narrative. It was essentially an important vignette offering the audience a summary of events thus far. Clari wrote that the doge came to Alexius:

“Alexius what do you think you are doing?” said the Doge, “take care for we pulled you out of great misery. Then we made you lord and crowned you as emperor; will you not keep to our agreements, will you do nothing more?” “No”, said the emperor, “I will not do any more than I have done!” “No?” said the Doge, “Wicked boy; we have raised you from shit” said the Doge, “and we will put you back in the shit; I defy you and understand that I will do you all the harm I can from this moment on.”⁷⁸⁶

From Clari's account of the Doge's words it is clear that Alexius simply was not a man and not just because the doge referred to him as a boy. He lacked maturity and capability. His position and manhood existed solely with Venetian support, without which he was nothing. Additionally he was shown to lack understanding of this being the case. He also failed to understand that being an elite male meant acting with virtue and honour, thus his own position of being an

⁷⁸³ Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 215; Harris, *Byzantium*, p. 171.

⁷⁸⁴ See above, p. 187.

⁷⁸⁵ Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 218.

⁷⁸⁶ Clari, p. 72: “Alexe, que cuides tu faire?” fist li dux, “preng warde que nous t’avons geté de grant caitiveté. Si t’avons fait seigneur et coroné a empereur; ne nous tenras tu mie” fist li dux, “nos convenenches, ne si n’en feras plus? – Naje,” fist li empereres, “je n’en ferai plus que fiat en ai! – Non?” dist li dux, “garchons malvais; nous t’avons”, fist li dux, “geté de le merder et en le merde te remeterons; et je te desfi et bien saches tu que je te pourcacherai mal a men pooir de ches pas en avant.”

emperor could be questioned. This instance is a clear demonstration of manhood not being defined in age but by character. Dandolo was in his mid-nineties at this point and as an extremely old man he should ordinarily have been subordinate to the Alexius, who was in his early twenties. But Clari presents Dandolo as the hegemonic male rather than Alexius. Dandolo highlights not only that Alexius' position is dependent on the crusaders' support but that his conduct is immature, that of a wicked boy, not of a man. This scene was vital to Clari's narrative because it provided justification for the action subsequently taken by the crusaders against the incumbent emperor. It recalled the Constantinople stories and previous unmanly rulers who did not deserve to sit on the throne, an all too familiar pattern for Clari's audience.

Many inside Constantinople were equally unimpressed with Alexius, and Mourtzouphlus rode the wave of angst against him.⁷⁸⁷ Clari tells us the Byzantines wanted rid of Alexius because he 'did not seem to them to be any good.'⁷⁸⁸ Mourtzouphlus pitched his credentials to replace Alexius by saying he would rid the Franks within a week of being in charge, the people agreed they would make him emperor if he upheld this pledge.⁷⁸⁹ Choniates' narrative broadly confirms the Byzantines' feelings about the lack of action from the reigning emperors and the success of Mourtzouphlus' bid for power.⁷⁹⁰ Then, according to Clari, Mourtzouphlus immediately went and strangled Alexius and his father Isaac.⁷⁹¹ The treacherous steward trope is once more evidenced by Clari, thereby justifying the need for intervention against the Byzantines, because they had a ruler who failed to live up to Latin standards of masculinity.

In a twist the death of Alexius was used to the crusaders' advantage because Clari tells us they would avenge him. This may seem strange given that the doge's words had already seemed to be a declaration of war.⁷⁹² But Villehardouin confirmed Clari's claim, demonstrating this was how

⁷⁸⁷ Queller & Madden, *Fourth Crusade*, p. 159.

⁷⁸⁸ Clari, p. 74: '... ne leur sanloit mie boins.'

⁷⁸⁹ Clari, p. 74.

⁷⁹⁰ Choniates, *Annals*, p. 307.

⁷⁹¹ Clari, p. 76.

⁷⁹² Clari, p. 76.

the crusaders used Alexius' death to justify their subsequent attack on the city; Gunther of Pairis likewise wrote, 'For the death of the wretched youth brought a wicked fate,' suggesting that he was sympathetic to Alexius' plight.⁷⁹³ As already established enacting revenge was a key attribute of elite masculinity.⁷⁹⁴ Angold believes the crusaders used the notion of regicide as an excuse knowing Constantinople was there for the taking as they 'represented the only effective military and naval power.'⁷⁹⁵ Whilst this may be so, for Clari to frame the decision to attack as valid and manly showed that there was anxiety surrounding the event and the subsequent outrage it incurred. Therefore everything had to be justified and framed correctly in order to convince others that they had acted legitimately. This was done by Clari through presenting the Greeks as unmanly and the crusaders as exemplars of honourable masculinity. Thus the cause for war was finalised and it was agreed they would launch an attack.

The first and second sieges of Constantinople were presented very differently by Clari. Whilst the first siege and capture of Constantinople was achieved through essentially a show of force that brought about Alexius III's flight from the city, the second siege involved hard fought warfare that required an inordinate amount of strength and courage from the crusaders. Clari did not use anti-Greek rhetoric for the first siege as a motivation for the crusaders. But for the second siege where the aim was to take the city for themselves, rather than on behalf of a Greek claimant, this rhetoric came to play a part. There seems to have been a shift in perspectives and the second assault on Constantinople was also framed with regular crusading rhetoric which had hitherto not been used. Both Clari and Villehardouin gave descriptions of the clerics going through the army ranks justifying the forthcoming action, Villehardouin stated that they claimed the attack would be 'right and just'.⁷⁹⁶ Clari reported them saying:

⁷⁹³ Villehardouin, p. 156; Gunther of Paris, *Hystoria Constantinopolitana*, p. 136: 'Ob iuvenis mortem miseram ferret improba sortem.'

⁷⁹⁴ See above, pp. 60-61.

⁷⁹⁵ Angold, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 99.

⁷⁹⁶ Villehardouin, p. 156: 'est droite et juste.'

For in times past the people of the city had obeyed the creed of Rome, and now they were disobeying it, when they said the Roman creed had no value and that all those who believed in it were dogs. And the bishops said that in the circumstances it was their duty to attack them and that it was in no way a sin rather it was a great work of charity.⁷⁹⁷

He continues:

For they were traitors and murderers, who were disloyal when they murdered their rightful lord, and they were worse than Jews. The bishops said that in the name of God and the pope they were absolving all those who attacked them, and the bishops commanded the pilgrims to confess and take communion very devoutly, and that they should not be at all afraid to attack the Greeks, for they were the enemies of God. Orders were given that all the loose women in camp should be sought out and removed and that they should be sent far away from the camp.⁷⁹⁸

Angold argues this discourse was ‘designed to stir the deepest emotions created by a belief in the sacrosanct character of loyalty to a lord.’⁷⁹⁹ Queller and Madden offer a different view claiming these words were in effect an attempt to make the forthcoming action a crusade by presenting the recovery of Constantinople for Catholicism.⁸⁰⁰ In the first siege Clari framed events as the men acting within the structure of what was considered rightful according to chivalric norms. This time the siege was framed in a religious context and being led by the church. It is clear Clari used both religious and gender ideals to justify the crusaders’ attack. As discussed in Chapter One loyalty to a lord was paramount to how an elite man should conduct himself. Therefore

⁷⁹⁷ Clari, p. 86: ‘Car anchienement avoient esté chil de le chité obedient a le loi de Rome, et ore en estoient inobedient, quant il disoient que li lois de Romme ne valoit nient, et disoient que tout chil qui i crooient estoient chien. Et disent li vesque que par tant les devoit on bien assalir et que che n’estoit mie pechiés, ains estoit grans aumosnes.’

⁷⁹⁸ Clari, p. 88: ‘Car il estoient traiteur et mordrisseur, et qu’il estoient desloial, quant il avoient leur seigneur droiturier mordri, et qu’il estoient pieur que Juis. Et disent li vesque qu’il assoloient de par Dieu et de par l’apostoile tous chiaus qui les asaurroient, et quemanderent li vesque as pelerins qu’il se confessaisseent et kemeniaissent tout molt bien, et qu’il ne doutaissent mie a assalir les Grieus, car il estoient enemi Damedieu. Et quemanda on que on quesist et que on ostant toutes les foles femmes de l’ost et que on les envoiait bien loins en sus de l’ost.’

⁷⁹⁹ Angold, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 100.

⁸⁰⁰ Queller & Madden, *Fourth Crusade*, p. 174.

gendered ideals were implicated here.⁸⁰¹ Moreover the Greeks were emasculated through their associations with Jews, this othered them, making them unmanly through being disloyal, which is another instance of Sweetenham's argument of othering being used to demonstrate the superiority of the crusaders' own values and the inferiority of the enemy.⁸⁰²

It is significant that in Clari's work, and also mentioned by Villehardouin, that the crusaders, both the Franks and the Venetians, decided how they would select an emperor and divide the city before they had even begun the attack.⁸⁰³ Clari also reported that they swore to uphold certain rules relating to the notion of keeping restraint in victory:

all those in the camp were made after to swear on relics that gold and silver booty and new cloth, worth five sous or more, should all be brought straight to the camp except for tools and food, and they would not use force on any woman or rob her of the clothes which she was wearing. For anyone guilty of this would be killed. They were made to swear on the relics that they would not lay a hand on any monk or cleric or priest, unless he were under arms, nor would they break into churches or monasteries.⁸⁰⁴

By inserting this Clari attempted to explain that the post-conquest behaviour which saw the city sacked was not in accordance with how they should have acted or with how the leaders ordered them to act. Nonetheless, as became notoriously well-known, the crusaders did all the things which they had sworn not to do.

The rituals of communion, absolution and purification through dismissing women, in addition to the oaths they took about their actions post-victory, all point to the intention that they would act in the manner of ultimate masculine self-mastery and not succumb to any form of lust, be it

⁸⁰¹ See above, p. 57.

⁸⁰² Sweetenham, 'Crusaders in a hall of mirrors', p. 57.

⁸⁰³ Clari, p. 84; Villehardouin, p. 162.

⁸⁰⁴ Clari, p. 84: 'si fist on jurer seur sains a tous chiaus de l'ost que les waains d'or et d'argent et de nuef drap, a le vaillance de .v. sols et de plus, aporteroient tout a l'ost a droite partie hors euxius et viande, et que il a femme forche ne feroient ne ne despoulleroient de drap que ele eust vestu. Car qui en esteroit atains il seroit destruis. Et se leur fist on juruer seur sains que il main ne meteroient seur moine, ne seur clerc, ne seur prestre, s'il n'estoit en desfense, ne qu'il ne froisseroient eglise ne moustier.'

based on greed, sex or violence. What Clari attempted to establish here was that the decision to attack and the method in which this was carried out should not be reduced to the unmasculine traits of greed and bloodlust. By presenting the build-up in such terms indicates that many people had come to see it as a shameful act of inexcusable barbarity, motivated above all by greed. Furthermore Clari here then justifies his own participation in the events and tries to convince his audience that they were done with honour.

7. Prowess, Dividing the Loot and its Moral Outcomes

Peter Noble termed the Fourth Crusade as the crusade without heroes due to the fact that Villehardouin and Clari do not make their story revolve around the military heroics of individuals as can be found in accounts of both the First and Third Crusades.⁸⁰⁵ Nevertheless there are some instances in which Clari made an effort to record the deeds of certain men in battle demonstrating prowess and it is worth considering these representations.

Clari's descriptions of prowess on display by the crusaders demonstrated their superior fighting ability, bravery, and fortitude, over the Greeks. First he described two knights who got onto the city walls from the ladders that were placed on a ship. One of these, Andre of Urboise, Clari wrote, stood there being attacked but no danger was done to him because of his armour, eventually he drew his sword and 'when they saw him standing up, they were so taken back and were so frightened they fled down a storey.'⁸⁰⁶ Villehardouin also confirms this claim.⁸⁰⁷ Clari explains that God did not allow Andre to be wounded because it was His will for the city to be conquered by the crusaders. Consequently the Byzantines 'all be shamed because of their treachery and the murder which Mourtzouphlus had committed and their disloyalty.'⁸⁰⁸ This

⁸⁰⁵ Peter Noble, '1204, The Crusade without Epic Heroes', *Epic and Crusade: Proceedings of the Colloquium of the Société Rencensvales British Branch held at Lucy Cavendish College Cambridge 27–28 March 2004*, ed. P. E. Bennett, A. E. Cobby, & J. E. Everson (Edinburgh, 2006), pp. 89-104.

⁸⁰⁶ Clari, p. 90: 'Quant chil virrent en pies, si furent si esbahie si eurent grant peur qu'il s'en fuirent en l'autre estage dessous.'

⁸⁰⁷ Villehardouin, p. 166.

⁸⁰⁸ Clari, p. 90: 'por le traison d'aus et pour le murdre que Morchofles avoit fait et pour le desloiauté d'aus, ... et que il fussent tot honni...'

demonstrated that the Greeks were being rightfully punished because they had enabled Mourtzouphlus' actions, which implied a failure of virtue and honour among the population more widely. By contrast the crusaders were God's manly instrument of vengeance.

The next example of bravery that Clari wished to extol was displayed by his own brother, Aleaumes. The fact he was a priest made this even more exemplary. Although priests and other men who were clerics were not supposed to shed blood we know that they would occasionally involve themselves in violent behaviour.⁸⁰⁹ Clari's brother was described as being 'so brave (preus) in every crisis that he was the first in all the attacks wherever he was.'⁸¹⁰ It was at the capture of the tower of Galata that Aleaumes proved himself worthy of such comments. Here the crusaders had managed to break a small hole into the wall and Clari reports:

they looked through and saw so many people of all ranks that it seemed to them that half the world was there so that they did not dare risk entering it. When Aleaumes the priest saw that no one dared enter, he jumped forward and said that he would enter.⁸¹¹

However, Clari forbade him, nevertheless Aleaumes,

got down on all fours. And when his brother saw this, he took him by the foot and began to drag him back. In the end, despite his brother, whether he was willing or not, the priest got in. When he was inside, a really large number of those Greeks ran at him. And the ones on top of the walls began to throw down enormous stones. When the priest saw this, he took out his knife and charged them, making them all flee before him like cattle, so he said to

⁸⁰⁹ Thibodeaux, *The Manly Priest*, pp. 144-46.

⁸¹⁰ Clari, p. 92: '...qui si estoit preus en tous besoins qu ch'estoit li premiers a tous les assaus ou il estoit.'

⁸¹¹ Clari, p. 92: 'si eswarderent par mi, et virent tant de gent, et haut et bas, que sanloit que demis li mondes i fust, si qu'il ne s'osoient enhardir d'entrer i. Quant Aliaumes li clers vit que n'i osoit entrer, si sali avant et dist qu'il i enterroit.'

those outside, to Lord Pierre and his men: “Lord, come boldly in! I can see them withdrawing in defeat and turning to flight.”⁸¹²

Queller and Madden believe this story sounds improbable but only believe it because Choniates confirmed it.⁸¹³ Hodgson contends Aleaumes’s actions turned from bravery to rashness.⁸¹⁴ However another way of interpreting it is that it was Clari’s own cowardice that was put on display here as he did not have the same bravery of someone, who, as a priest, was not considered to be as manly as him, or expected to take a direct part in the fighting. As such, here it would seem that being a knight was not an automatic signifier of bravery nor a priest one of meekness. In this situation bravery could be embodied and performed by anyone, therefore it was the performance that should be judged not the social identity of the performer. This is significant because when the division of booty took place post-conquest this was based on rank. Clari tells us that at this Aleaumes demanded a knight’s share due to his feats of arms. Some argued against this since he was not a knight by rank but a clerk. Aleaumes’ actions were vouched for, according to Clari: ‘the Count of Saint Pol gave a ruling that he too should have a knight’s share, for he had done more feats of arms and brave deeds than any three hundred knights there did, and the Count of Saint Pol bore witness to this.’⁸¹⁵ Confirmation from the count should discount the idea that Clari’s version of events was not entirely objective. It is revealing to see evidence of a man like Clari’s brother defying his role and being rewarded for it and ultimately showing up other men for their failures to act to the contemporary notions of elite masculinity. This indicates that Clari understood gender as a matter of performance.

⁸¹² Clari, pp. 92-94: ‘Et li clers dist que si feroit, si se met ens a pies et mains. Et quant ses freres vit chou, so le prent par le pie, si commence a sakier a lui. Et tant que maugré sen frere, vausist ou ne dengnast, que li clers i entra. Quant il fu ens, se li keurent sus tant de ches Grius que trop. Et chil de deseur les murs li acuellent a geter grandesmes pierrres. Quant li cler vit chou, si sake le coutel, si leur keurt sus, si les faisoit aussi fuir devant lui comme bestes; si disoit a chiaux de defors, a seigneur Pierron et a se gent: “Sire, entrés hardiement! Je voi qu’il se vont molt deconfissant et qu’il s’en vont fuiant.”’

⁸¹³ Queller & Madden, *Fourth Crusade*, p. 183.

⁸¹⁴ Hodgson, ‘Honour, Shame’, 231.

⁸¹⁵ Clari, p. 116: ‘Tant que li cuens de Saint Pol fist le jugement que aussi devoit il partir comme uns chevaliers, que plus i avoit il fait d’armes et de proeches, cheli testimoinga li cuens de Saint Pol, que teux .ccc. chevaliers en i eut il ne fisent.’

Returning to the battle, the crusaders' prowess caused the Byzantine emperor to flee, after which the crusaders entered the city and proceeded to sack it.⁸¹⁶ Debates continue about how violent this was. Choniates stated:

they plundered with impunity and stripped their victims shamelessly, beginning with their carts. Not only did they rob them of their substance but also the articles consecrated to God... What then should I recount first and what last of those things dared at that time by these murderous men?⁸¹⁷

Clari, unsurprisingly, whitewashed any extreme actions claiming the crusaders 'behaved themselves with great circumspection.'⁸¹⁸ Angold suggests Clari's perspective is believable and that the sack of the city was not as vicious as is often depicted.⁸¹⁹ This is a more measured approach than Runciman's claim that it was one of the greatest crimes against humanity.⁸²⁰ Clari's passing over the sack of the city in detail was most likely because it was a notorious event by the time he wrote. There was no honour in describing it; the audience knew what had happened and the fact the Clari then goes on to describe the acquisition of houses and palaces one would assume this was achieved through violent methods. Instead Clari wished the audience to know the despicable behaviour of the nobles in regard to dividing the wealth of the city.

Clari reported that after the city was taken the nobles gathered and decided what to do with the spoils without the men from the lower ranks having any knowledge of it. Clari stated that the nobles took the best houses for themselves: 'And from that moment they began to betray the

⁸¹⁶ For an overview of the sacking see: Queller & Madden, *Fourth Crusade*, pp. 193-203.

⁸¹⁷ trans. Magoulias: Choniates, *Annals*, pp. 314-15.

⁸¹⁸ Clari, p. 96: 'si se tinrent cout coi.'

⁸¹⁹ Angold, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 101; Many historians use Choniates account as a basis for their own narratives. This is unsurprising given he provides the most detailed account but caution must be used because the status of Byzantine and their relationship to the West was integral into representation of the sacking. For example see: Queller & Madden, *Fourth Crusade*, p. 198; Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 259; pp. 265-68; For various opinions by historians from the medieval to the modern see: Harris, 'The debate', 1-10.

⁸²⁰ Runciman, *History* III, pp. 130-31.

lower ranks and to show bad faith and a lack of comradeship for which they paid very heavily.⁸²¹ When the rich men were seen acting so greedily, Clari recorded: ‘and when the lower ranks discovered this, they each went as fast as they could to seize whatever they could.’⁸²² This was counter to the oath that Clari said everyone had sworn. Clari’s anger was clearly with the noble elite, and the fact that their own lack of restraint and greedy indulgence thus caused the lower men to likewise act greedily. To Clari the nobles had broken a homosocial bond by using their position to enrich themselves which was a betrayal of the lower status men who also risked their lives to take the city, this was bad lordship. This clearly harks back to the Constantinople stories where the good emperors like Manuel and Isaac explicitly acted to maintain homosocial bonds through largesse. It was the greedy emperors like Andronicus and Isaac that only enriched themselves at the expense of their subjects. A good lord should have shared out the booty in an appropriate manner and this expectation informs Clari’s account. The Latin nobles were now masters of the city and making the same mistakes as their Greek predecessors, whose downfall Clari recorded as being brought about by their lust and greed. They were failing to uphold elite masculine values. For Clari, once this had happened, there was then essentially only bad faith between the elite leadership and the rest of the knights. Villehardouin as a knight of a higher social status and leader of the crusade does not bemoan the division of the goods per se although he does similarly observe that some hoarded for themselves and did not put their gains into the common pot.⁸²³

As discussed in the opening of this chapter, and further below, Clari linked the nobles’ dishonourable handling of the spoils to their defeat at the battle of Adrianople in 1205.⁸²⁴ Angold argues that Clari here was incensed due to the unfair division of the booty.⁸²⁵ But Clari’s words were also didactic and offered a moralising reason for the defeat and for Emperor Baldwin’s

⁸²¹ Clari, p. 98: ‘Et tresdout commenchierent il a traïr le menue gent, et a porter leur male foi et male compaignie, que il compererent puis molt kier.’

⁸²² Clari, p. 98: ‘Et quant le povre gent s’aperchurent, si alerent don’t quie miex miex, si prisent chou qu’il atainsent.’

⁸²³ Villehardouin, pp. 172-74.

⁸²⁴ See below, p. 230.

⁸²⁵ Angold, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 118.

disappearance and death. His audience would have understood this message because Clari's narrative, drawing on gendered expectations, made clear that these were the same moral failures that had caused the Byzantines to be usurped by the Latins.

8. Electing the Emperor and Dividing the Nation

Modern historians usually end their narratives with the election of Baldwin, or skim over post-conquest events.⁸²⁶ Clari's story, like Villehardouin's, did not stop there. This is because the moral of the story was not yet complete. For Clari writing the account was not just about describing the taking of Constantinople and offering an apologia for his and the crusaders' actions. The final section of this chapter will argue that Clari also wanted to explain why Byzantine emperors acted in such a perfidious manner, no matter if they were Greek or Latin. The riches of the land caused men to act in an unmanly way thus contravening established standards of elite masculinity, which, as Clari's text reveals, were believed to be divinely sanctioned. This is best demonstrated in his account of the post conquest division of the Byzantine empire, but first, who should be emperor had to be decided.

The election of Baldwin to Latin Emperor was recorded by Clari and it suggested division among the crusaders. In fact Clari positioned himself as being against Boniface of Montferrat holding the title. Clari demonstrated the lack of homosocial consensus among the crusade leaders which had broken down since they conquered Constantinople, when they began hording loot for themselves. This established their individual greed. This can be seen again in Clari's description of the election. He wrote: "... all the counts and all the leaders gathered one day in the Palace of Boucoleon, which the marquis [Boniface] held, and said to each other that they should choose an emperor."⁸²⁷ The Latins and Venetians would choose ten electors each. Clari recorded: 'When the marquis heard this, he wanted to put in his own men and those who he

⁸²⁶ For example Queller & Madden, *Fourth Crusade*.

⁸²⁷ Clari, p. 110: 'tout li haut home s'asanlerent un jor u palais de Bouke de Lion, que li marchis tenoit, et dissent entr'aus qu'il fesissent empereur.'

through would elect him to be emperor, and he wanted to be emperor straight away.⁸²⁸ Clari thus presented Boniface as lusting after the position therefore not displaying temperance which straight away indicated that he was not fit to rule. Clari then reported that Doge Dandolo ordered: ‘before we elect an emperor I want the palaces to be under guard of the body of the army... let whoever is to be emperor have the palaces without argument whether from the marquis or the Count of Flanders or anyone at all.’⁸²⁹ It can be seen here that Dandolo perceived that greed had crept into these men’s thinking, and that the losers would not give up their ‘winnings’ so easily, thus he took measures to ensure that there was no conflict over property once the election had been held. Significantly Villehardouin likewise confirmed greed and desire being manifest in those who wanted to be elected: ‘Inevitably, a large number of men yearned for or lusted after a dignity as great as that of emperor of Constantinople.’⁸³⁰ Clari’s account highlights that the disunity brought about by self-interest and greed only came to the fore once Constantinople had been conquered.

Moreover Boniface of Montferrat had been the embodiment of ideal masculinity earlier on in Clari’s narrative. In 1201 when the crusaders needed a leader for the crusade Clari reported that Boniface was summoned to meet the counts in order to replace the recently deceased Count Theobald of Champagne who had held the position previously. Clari reported the barons stating:

“Lord, we have summoned you because the Count of Champagne, our lord, who was our commander, has died. We summoned you as the worthiest man (*le plus preudomme*) that we know and the one who could best advise us on our project, God willing! So we all beg you for God’s sake that you become our lord and for the love of God take the cross.” And with these words the barons knelt before him and said to him that he should not worry about

⁸²⁸ Clari, p. 110: ‘Quant li marchis oï chou, si i vout metre les siens et chiaux que il cuidoit qui l’esleussent a emperreur, et voloit ester empereres entresait.’

⁸²⁹ Clari, p. 110: ‘je voel que anchois que on eslise empereur, que li palais soient wardé de le kemune wardé de l’ost ... que chis qui ert empereres ait les palais sans nul contredit, ne de marchis, ne du conte de Flandres, ne d’un ne d’autre.’

⁸³⁰ trans. Smith, p. 69; Villehardouin, p. 174-76: ‘Et ne puet ester que a si grant chose comme est l’empire de Costentinoble n’eüst moult d’abeanz et d’envieus.’

money, for they would give him a large part of the money which the Count of Champagne had left the crusaders.⁸³¹

Evidently Clari was convinced that Boniface's reputation as being the *le plus preudomme* was crucial to his selection, indicating explicitly that Boniface's qualifications were based on his embodiment of elite masculinity with all the chivalric values this entailed. Clari and his contemporaries believed that crusade leadership required a man who fitted the contemporary notions of hegemonic masculinity at the helm if it were to be successful. This is confirmed by Villehardouin's account, who recorded himself as stating:

Pay attention, my lord, I will give you one piece of advice, if you will allow me. Marquis Boniface of Montferrat is a fine preudomme, and one of the most highly respected men alive today. If you were to ask him to come here, to take the sign of the cross and put himself in the count of Champagne's place and if you were to give him the leadership of the army, he would accept straight away.⁸³²

This is strikingly similar to Clari's account as they both based Boniface's leadership qualities on his 'preudomme' status. What emerges from these accounts is that Boniface had the qualities of ideal masculinity and leadership before the crusaders had arrived in Constantinople. Thus it was the city and the events which happened there that brought out in Boniface and other nobles the unmanly traits described by Clari in relation to the election.

⁸³¹ Clari, p. 6-8: "Sire, nous vous avons mandé pour che que li cuens de Champainge, nos sires, qui estoit nos maistres, est mors. Et nous vous mandames pour le plus preudomme que nous saviennes, et qui le greigneur consell pooit metre en nostre afaire, le voie Damadieu! Si vous proions tout pour Dieu que vous soiés nos sires, et que vous pour l'armour de Damedie pregniés le crois." Et a ches paroles s'agenouillerent li baron lui et si le dirent qu'il ne s'esmaïast mie d'avoir pourcachier, que il li dourroient grant partie de l'avoir que li cuens de Champaigne avoit laissé as croisiés.'

⁸³² trans. *Smith*, p. 13; Villehardouin, p. 60: 'Seigneurs, ... je vous loeroie une chose, se vous vous y acordiez. Le marchis Boniface de Montferrat est moult prisié .I. des plus prisiez qui hui cest jor vive. Se vous le mandiez que il venist ça et preïst la croiz et se meist ou leu le conte de Champaigne et li donissiez la seignorie de l'ost, je croi que le feroit.'

Returning to the election, Clari's report of what happened furthers the view that homosociality had broken down in the face of competition between individuals, because he stated that they could not decide on the electors. Clari said the doge told the barons:

they should choose their ten and that he would quickly elect his own ten. And when the barons heard this, each one wanted to put in his own men. The count of Flanders wanted his own men there as did Count Louis, the Count of Saint Pol and the other leading men, to such an extent that they could not agree at all whom they should choose or elect.⁸³³

This carried on and Clari reported:

The disagreement lasted a full fortnight, for they could not agree; there was no day on which they did not meet for this business, and at last in the end they agreed that the clerics of the army, the bishops, the abbots who were there should be the electors.⁸³⁴

Villehardouin does not mention any of this delaying or inability to choose electors. Clari's account implies that there was frustration among the lower ranks at this situation and it is significant that this delay was caused by individual greed and desire to be elected emperor. Rather than the men not wanting to be emperor due to humility or seeing the role as a divinely ordained burden as Simon of Montfort did, instead these men desired the riches and power it would bring.⁸³⁵

The division between the elite men who wanted to be emperor shifted down through to the lower status people. Clari made this clear when announcing the decision of the electors, writing: 'When they had gathered, they were all silent. The majority were very frightened and alarmed

⁸³³ Clari, p. 112: 'si dist li barons qu'il esleussent les leurs .x., que il aroit molt tost eslit les sirens .x. Et quant li baron oïrent chou, si i vaut metre cascuns les siens. Li cuens de Flandres i vaut metre les siens, li cuens Loeis, li cuens de Saint Pol et li autre rike homme, et tan que onques a chele voie ne sepeurent accorder quex il I mesissent ne eslisissent.'

⁸³⁴ Clari, p. 112: 'Et dura bien cheste descorde .xv. jors, qu'il ne se pooient concorder; si n'estoit jour qu'il n'assanlaissent pour chestui afaire, et tant que au deesrain se concorderent que li clergiés de l'ost, li Vesque, li abé, qui i estoient, en fussent esliseur.'

⁸³⁵ See above, p. 144.

that the marquis would be nominated. And the supporters of the marquis were very afraid that someone other than the marquis would be nominated.⁸³⁶ Baldwin of Flanders was announced the winner at which Clari reported: 'When the name was heard, all the Franks were very glad. And there were others there who were very upset, like those who supported the marquis.'⁸³⁷ Those in the individual retinues would obviously want their leader to become emperor as they would personally benefit from it. Thus self-interest affected them too. According to Clari the election was not being conducted correctly, in terms of judging which of the nobles was best qualified to rule. As a subordinate male who lacked influence he attacked the elite males for their failings and expressed these in clearly gendered terms.

The election of Baldwin did not in any way reunite the crusaders and restore the homosocial bonds that had been broken post-conquest. In fact from Clari's account divisions increased between Baldwin and Boniface. Initially, Baldwin offered lands to Boniface, but Boniface requested the kingdom of Salonika. The new emperor said he could not give him that because it was not his to give, and Clari reported: 'When the marquis [Boniface] saw that he could not have it, he was very angry.'⁸³⁸ Later when Baldwin went to visit Salonika Boniface sent him a message telling him not to go there because it was his land. This outraged Baldwin who replied that the land was not Boniface's and as such Boniface could not prevent him from going. In response to this Boniface besieged Demotika which was held by Baldwin. Boniface then took it upon himself to take other cities held by Baldwin either through treason or force.⁸³⁹ Clari tells us that Baldwin's men threatened to cut Boniface's men to pieces for this treachery and finally, 'when [Boniface] knew the emperor was coming back he was very frightened like someone who had done

⁸³⁶ Clari, p. 112: 'Quant il furent assanlé, si furent tout coi. Si avoient li pleuseur grant peur et grant doute que on ne nommast le marchis. Et chil qui se tenoient devers le marchis avoient grant doute que on ne nommast autrui que le marchis.'

⁸³⁷ Clari, p. 114: 'Quant le parole fu oïe, si en furent tout li Francois molt liés. Et teus autres i eut qui en furent molt dolent, si commen cil qui devers le marchis se tenoient.'

⁸³⁸ Clari, p. 118: 'Quant li marchis vit qu'il n'en pooit mie avoir, s'en fu tous courchiés.'

⁸³⁹ Clari, p. 120.

something very wrong,' and so handed himself over to Doge Dandolo and others for safety.⁸⁴⁰

Villehardouin also tells of this event, mainly because he was sent to talk sense to Boniface and get him to stand down. But he offered no insight into the actions of these men instead he complained about their break down in relations.⁸⁴¹

Eventually Baldwin and Boniface came to an agreement and Baldwin granted Boniface the kingdom of Salonika.⁸⁴² Clari's narrative then gave a summary of events from 1205 onwards, recording the deaths of both Baldwin and Boniface. As discussed in the opening of this chapter Baldwin's death occurred after he had been captured at the battle of Adrianople in 1205. Clari did not go into detail about the battle probably because he was not there having left to return to France.⁸⁴³ The exact fate of Baldwin after the battle was not known at the time nor to modern historians. But Clari tells us that the enemy Cumans charged at the Franks at such great speed that they killed many of them and that emperor Baldwin was lost, never to be seen again.⁸⁴⁴ It was at this point Clari offered his moralising explanation for what had happened as stated in the opening of this chapter: 'In this way God took vengeance on them for their pride and for the bad faith which they had shown to the lower ranks of the army and the horrible sins which they had committed in the city after they had captured it.'⁸⁴⁵ Immediately after this he reported that Boniface died fighting the Cumans who invaded his territory at Salonika.⁸⁴⁶ As has already been discussed, the outcome of battles was commonly viewed as evidence of divine judgement on those who both won and lost. In the context of Clari's narrative Baldwin and Boniface's deaths in battle were linked by their failure to embody and uphold the standards of elite masculinity, which had disastrous implications for their status as leaders, and thus for those men under their

⁸⁴⁰ Clari, p.122: 'Quant li marchis seut que li empereres revenoit, si eut molt grant peur, si comme chis qui molt meffait.'

⁸⁴¹ Villehardouin, pp. 188-94.

⁸⁴² Clari, p. 127.

⁸⁴³ For the Battle of Adrianople see Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 290.

⁸⁴⁴ Clari, p. 128.

⁸⁴⁵ Clari, pp. 128-30: 'Ensi faitement se venja Damedieus d'au pour leur orguel et pour le male foi qu'il avoient portée a le povre gent de l'ost et les oribles pekiés qu'il avoient fais en le chité, après chou qu'i l'eurent prise.'

⁸⁴⁶ Clari, p. 130.

authority. Clari's account recounted how earlier emperors lusted after riches and by doing so eventually came to their own downfall through unmanliness. This was the case even for the Latin emperor, which given the superiority of Franks over Byzantines which Clari establishes in his text, the Latin emperor ought to have conducted himself more honourably. But even he was brought down by an inability to exercise self-mastery in the face of great temptation. Thus he was punished, and the future of the Latin empire was placed in jeopardy.

9. Conclusion

This chapter has explored the potential of Robert of Clari's crusade narrative beyond providing support to Villehardouin's text. Instead Clari's work offers an insight into how the discourse of masculinity could be used to frame and make sense of a major controversial event; the conquest of Constantinople. Arguments that Clari was simple, like his narratives, cannot be upheld. He was complex and so was his story. As such we get the insight into how standards of elite masculinity were refracted down to men of lower status and the view of the subordinate male in comparison to those of the hegemonic status. Clari presented protagonists and antagonists as being in conflict over gender norms. For him acting according to norms of masculinity was a vital means of justifying many of the actions taken by the crusaders, despite outside condemnation. If the Greeks had adopted Frankish values then none of what transpired needed to have happened; their city would not have been besieged twice and then sacked. Moreover Clari placed a high value on homosociality, describing how its breakdown led to the Greeks' downfall but was also significant in the Latins' victory. Yet after that victory was achieved the temptations of wealth and power destroyed that unity and led to the Latin leaders acting in unmanly ways, which earned God's punishment. Therefore, Clari's work demonstrated that acting according to notions of elite masculinity was essential for all leaders; everything that brought these men's downfall, be it Greek or Frankish, was because they failed to grasp this.

Chapter Five: The Masculine Experience and the Experience of Masculinity on the Seventh Crusade in John of Joinville's *Vie de Saint Louis*

Before embarking on what is known as the Seventh Crusade in 1248 John of Joinville, seneschal of Champagne, was given advice by his cousin on how he should act:

“You are going overseas”, he said. “Take care of how you return, since no knight, whether rich or poor, can come back without shame if he leaves those of Our Lord’s humbler people with whom he set out in Saracen’s hands.”⁸⁴⁷

Thus an elite man’s honour would be judged by how he conducted himself on crusade. For Joinville this consideration would be at the forefront of his decisions and judgments on crusade. It was also an integral message of his work, *Vie de Saint Louis*, a celebration of King Louis IX of France (r. 1214-70) addressed to the king’s great-grandson, also named Louis, who later became Louis X (r. 1314-16). As king of France, the younger Louis would be expected to go on crusade, perform with honour and ensure the people under his care would be treated correctly. The point raised by Joinville’s cousin was a warning to think about actions and how they would be perceived. Men had to have both agency and autonomy in order to be able to act honourably. Indeed Joinville knew how he should act, however, in his account of the Seventh Crusade Joinville lost his agency and control of self and situation on numerous occasions in battle and during captivity. But he always attempted to act with honour nonetheless. The passages relating to these issues are some of the most descriptive and resonating parts of his work. Furthermore, these two themes, autonomy and honour, relate to ideals and practices of masculinity and, as will be demonstrated, play a crucial function in Joinville’s narration and laudation of Louis.

⁸⁴⁷ trans. *Smith*. p.249; Joinville, p. 392: ‘Vous en alez outre mer, fist il. Or vous prenés garde au revenir, car nulz chevaliers, ne povres ne riciez, ne peut revenir que il ne soit honni se il lesse en la main des Sarrazins le peuple menu Nostre Seigneur en la quell compaignie il est alé.’

Despite being the best planned and financed crusade, the Seventh Crusade led by Louis IX failed in its objective of regaining Jerusalem from Islamic control. Louis took the cross in 1244 in response to recovering from illness. It was his crusade and not initiated by the papacy.⁸⁴⁸ Therefore the venture rested on him and he took a major active role in its planning including the construction of a port, Aigues-Mortes, specifically to leave from.⁸⁴⁹ The crusaders departed in the summer of 1248. Arriving on the Egyptian coast in 1249, after a stopover in Cyprus to regroup, the crusaders won a swift victory at Damietta on 6 June seizing the city without much resistance from the Ayyubids. Louis led the crusade on towards Cairo but the crusaders had trouble crossing the Nile near Mansurah. After trying to build a pontoon across they were eventually shown a place where there was a ford in the river. A major battle was fought at Mansurah between 8 to 11 February 1250, ending in a pyrrhic victory for Louis. Attempts were made at peace negotiation between the crusaders and Ayyubids but whilst this happened sickness broke out in the crusader camp and eventually they attempted to retreat to Damietta. However, they were captured and many were killed by the chasing Muslims. The king and many nobles were ransomed whilst other less fortunate were executed. For their release the crusaders had to hand back Damietta and pay 800,000 bezants. In May 1250 with their freedom paid at an enormous cost the crusaders departed Egypt and went to Acre where Louis remained until 1254, undertaking works of piety and charity before eventually returning to France.

The crusade has not been subject of a monograph in its own right. Like the Third Crusade it forms sections of general crusading texts and also a major part of studies of Louis IX's kingship.⁸⁵⁰ Joinville's account provides much of the information about what transpired on the

⁸⁴⁸ Jotischky, *Crusading*, p. 231.

⁸⁴⁹ For the preparations and planning see: William Chester Jordan, *Louis IX and the Challenge of the Crusade* (Guildford, 1979).

⁸⁵⁰ Beyond Joinville's account of the crusade Peter Jackson has produced an edited collection of primary sources: Peter Jackson, *The Seventh Crusade, 1248-1254: Sources and Documents* (Aldershot, 2007). For historians' reconstructions of the crusade see especially: Tyerman, *God's War*, pp. 770-802; Asbridge, *The Crusades*, pp. 577-608. For the career of Louis IX see: Jordan, *Louis IX*; Richard, *Saint Louis Crusader King of France* (Cambridge, 1992); Jacques Le Goff, *Saint Louis* (Notre Dame, 2009). For Louis' sanctity and post death reputation see Cecilia Gaposchkin, 'Boniface VIII, Philip the Fair, and the Sanctity of Louis IX', *Journal of Medieval History*, 29, 1 (2003), 1-26; Gaposchkin, *The*

crusade and is the key text for how it has been remembered and understood by modern audiences, even though it was not so well known in the period it was written.⁸⁵¹ During the medieval period other hagiographical accounts of Louis were much better known.⁸⁵²

The purpose of this chapter is to consider how masculinity was embodied and enacted on the crusade as this is the first text to be written in which a participant gives us a first person insight into the mindset of a crusader, more specifically an elite male crusader. Although texts written by military participants date back to the First Crusade with the *Gesta Francorum* and continued through to both Villehardouin and Clari's account of the Fourth Crusade, these were written from a third person perspective.⁸⁵³ The authors did not focus on themselves nor could they be termed homodiegetic.⁸⁵⁴ As Caroline Smith explains, 'it was not until the production of John of Joinville's *Vie de Saint Louis* that a first person, and truly personal, extended account of a crusade was written.'⁸⁵⁵ Indeed, part of Joinville's importance rests on the fact it is the first text to be written in French by someone in the first person describing their own experiences. Nataša Polgar argues for Joinville's use of 'I' as possibly being 'connected with the emergence or birth of individuality during the thirteenth century.'⁸⁵⁶ This may be so but what it also does, as will be demonstrated throughout this chapter, is give authority to the events described. Joinville gives us the opportunity to learn how a high status man perceived his own, and others', conduct in relation to contemporary ideals of gender and chivalry. As with the works discussed earlier in this thesis, Joinville's text clearly identifies the performance of ideal masculinity as essential to crusading success.

Making of Saint Louis; Cecilia Gaposchkin & Sean Field (ed.), *The sanctity of Louis IX: Early lives of Saint Louis by Geoffrey of Beaulieu and William of Chartres* (Ithaca, 2014).

⁸⁵¹ See Gaposchkin, *The Making of Saint Louis*, p. 182, n.5.

⁸⁵² See for example: Gaposchkin & Field, *The sanctity of Louis*.

⁸⁵³ Sophie Marnette, 'The experiencing self and the narrating self in medieval French chronicles', *The Medieval Author in Medieval French Literature*, ed. Virginie Greene (New York, 2006), p. 118.

⁸⁵⁴ For a discussion on the term homodiegetic and its use in crusade narratives see: Bull, *Eyewitness*, p. 306.

⁸⁵⁵ Smith, *Crusading*, p. 43.

⁸⁵⁶ Nataša Polgar, 'Joinville: a hagiographic story about oneself and about the other', *Narodna umjetnost*, 45, 1 (2008), 28.

Notions of what it meant to be an elite man permeate throughout Joinville's text. Within it many men are judged by whether or not they conformed to these standards. But Joinville did not just use his work to praise and denounce others and their actions. He also critiques himself by admitting to losing his manhood through self-confessed cowardice and the experience of fear. This chapter argues that there are two reasons for this, first to convey the notion of the crusade being a penitential act in which the pilgrim should suffer. Second Joinville's account of his own actions and responses are contrasted with Louis', demonstrating Louis's hegemonic masculine superiority over Joinville, evincing his excellent kingship and, more importantly, his sanctity.

From the beginning of his work Joinville describes ideal kingship in terms of ideal masculinity, then throughout the crusade he judges himself, Louis, and others, as to whether he or they conformed to these masculine ideals. Every decision and often minor actions are enveloped by contemporary understandings of how a man should conduct himself. John Tosh argues that, 'questions of behaviour and agency have for too long been sidetracked by a historical practice dominated by questions of meaning and representation.'⁸⁵⁷ This applies to some scholarship on medieval masculinity, although this is partly due to the nature of surviving sources which often make it difficult to recreate experience as opposed to ideals. But Joinville wrote and described the masculinity which he himself lived out or tried to live out. An analysis of Joinville's crusade narrative therefore offers an excellent insight into both the behaviour and agency of men from an elite background in western Europe in the thirteenth century.

This chapter will consider the following aspects of Joinville's crusade: First an examination of autonomy and the importance of this attribute to Joinville's account, following this an overview of Joinville's understanding of honour to describe his crusade and presentation of Louis.⁸⁵⁸ Then an analysis of how these two aspects were deployed regarding the battle of Mansurah and the

⁸⁵⁷ Tosh, 'The History of Masculinity', p. 18.

⁸⁵⁸ An approach influenced by Hodgson, 'Honour, Shame'.

crusaders' captivity. Following this a consideration of other key points in the narrative that used masculinity as a theme such as the decision to remain in the Holy Land, homosociality, and examples of dishonour. Initially though we must consider Joinville, his work, and his relationship with Louis.

1. John of Joinville and his *Vie*

John of Joinville was born in 1225. He inherited the titles of lord of Joinville and seneschal of Champagne upon his father's death in 1239. Educated at the court of Count Thibault IV of Champagne, Joinville became a squire to the count at the age of sixteen. When Louis' crusade departed in 1248 he would have been twenty-three and, as he tells us, married with two children.⁸⁵⁹ Tyerman describes his crusading pedigree as impeccable.⁸⁶⁰ His grandfather died on the Third Crusade, two uncles were involved in the Fourth Crusade, and his father fought in both the Albigensian and Fifth Crusades.⁸⁶¹ Therefore like many of his time and before him crusading was integral to Joinville's identity as an elite aristocratic male. As Nicholas Paul has demonstrated, going on crusade was perceived as an act of memorialisation of one's ancestors and a transmitted duty of the nobility.⁸⁶² This can be taken further to state it was defining characteristic of their elite masculinity.

Before setting out on crusade Joinville was not a liegeman of Louis, he did not pay homage to him as Champagne was not under the king of France's domain, however, he became so on the crusade. This led to a close relationship between the two. Upon returning to France in 1254 Joinville and Louis maintained their close relationship and Joinville would occasionally attend the royal court. It was through the crusade and the friendship engendered between these two that Joinville's social status increased. However, when Louis announced his second crusade in 1268

⁸⁵⁹ This biographical information is based on Smith, *Crusading*, p. 47; Gaposchkin, *The Making of Saint Louis*, p. 181.

⁸⁶⁰ Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 782.

⁸⁶¹ Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 782.

⁸⁶² Nicholas Paul, *To Follow in their Footsteps: The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages* (Ithaca, 2012), p. 27.

Joinville refused to join him, believing the king was too frail to go himself.⁸⁶³ Louis' death in 1270 led to a canonisation enquiry in 1282 in which Joinville gave evidence to support the former king's candidature.⁸⁶⁴ Living into his nineties Joinville's extraordinary life came to an end on 24 December 1317.⁸⁶⁵

Joinville's work known now as *Vie de Saint Louis* was commissioned by Joan of Navarre, Philip IV of France's queen, with the intention of producing a record of Louis IX's words and deeds.⁸⁶⁶ It was completed in 1309 and, as noted above, dedicated to her son, the future Louis X.⁸⁶⁷ Joinville ended his prologue telling the young king: 'I am sending it [the book] to you and your brothers and others that hear it might heed its good lessons and put those lessons into practice, and thereby make themselves pleasing to God.'⁸⁶⁸ Joinville regarded Louis IX as a model king that should be used as a template for his great grandson to imitate and learn from.⁸⁶⁹ Joinville states his book is split into two parts, the first dealing with Louis IX's conduct in relation to the church and its benefit to the kingdom and the second part his knightly deeds.⁸⁷⁰ However, the work produced by Joinville is not a straight forward mirror-for-princes. Smith has demonstrated that of the 769 numbered paragraphs that make up Joinville's text over 550 are concerning Louis's first crusade.⁸⁷¹ Thus Joinville placed the crusade and himself at the centre of most of his work. This is unusual for historical narratives related to the mirror-for-princes genre which tended to be third person accounts of kings or great men worthy of emulation. Surrounding the crusade narrative is the framing material. This includes the opening of the work in which

⁸⁶³ Joinville, p. 586.

⁸⁶⁴ Smith, *Crusading*, p. 47.

⁸⁶⁵ Smith, *Crusading*, p. 48.

⁸⁶⁶ Joinville, p. 144: '*un livre des saintes paroles et des bons faiz nostre roy saint Loys*'.

⁸⁶⁷ Smith, *Crusading*, p. 47.

⁸⁶⁸ trans. Smith., p. 144; Joinville, p. 152: 'le vous envoie je pour ce que vous et vostre frere et les autres qui l'orront y puissant prendre bon exemple, et les exemples metre a oeuvre, par quoy Dieu leur sache gré.'

⁸⁶⁹ Therefore the text is similar to the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi* in its intention but explicitly produced for this purpose. See Chapter Two, p. 122.

⁸⁷⁰ Joinville, p. 145.

⁸⁷¹ Smith, *Crusading*, p. 52.

Joinville described Louis' kingship and the qualities he possessed.⁸⁷² After the crusade the narrative deals with Louis' return to France and his moral reform.⁸⁷³ Many historians believe the *Vie* to have been composed as a composite with various parts written at different times.⁸⁷⁴ Both of the framing sections were written for Louis' canonisation process in 1297.⁸⁷⁵ It has been suggested by Jacques Le Goff that the section about the crusade was written shortly after Joinville returned to France from the Holy Land in 1254, although Cecelia Gaposchkin contends that it was written later shortly after Louis's death in 1270.⁸⁷⁶ Although it is beyond the remit of this chapter to confidently offer a date for composition it is accepted here that the section on the crusade was produced first, and only later incorporated into the final version of the text created for Louis' canonisation.⁸⁷⁷

Various opinions have been expressed by historians on the nature of Joinville's text. For example Norman Housley asserts that 'Joinville's text is to some extent hagiographic and didactic – much more importantly it is a set of personal memoirs and a portrayal of a deep friendship.'⁸⁷⁸ Le Goff rejects Joinville's own claim that he was writing the text for Joan of Navarre or her son but argues that he was in fact writing for himself.⁸⁷⁹ This is evidenced by the fact that a large chunk of his narrative deals solely with himself and his relationship with Louis. Gaposchkin argues that the text had 'as one of its overarching purposes the articulation of a model of just and saintly kingship directed toward Philip the Fair [Philip IV], in whom Joinville was disappointed, and his heirs, whom he hoped to influence with the positive model of Louis.'⁸⁸⁰ Philip IV was Louis' grandson and the father of Louis X. I would agree with Gaposchkin's argument but also add

⁸⁷² Joinville, pp. 152-210.

⁸⁷³ Joinville, pp. 542-82.

⁸⁷⁴ Smith, *Crusading*, pp. 61-62; Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, p. 379.

⁸⁷⁵ Gaposchkin, *The Making of Saint Louis*, p. 183.

⁸⁷⁶ Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, p. 379; Gaposchkin, *The Making of Saint Louis*, p. 182.

⁸⁷⁷ This argument is against the contention that the text was written in a single go as proffered by Jacques Monfrin in his introduction to Joinville, pp. 69-79.

⁸⁷⁸ Norman Housley, *The Crusaders* (Stroud, 2002), p. 98.

⁸⁷⁹ Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, p. 383.

⁸⁸⁰ Gaposchkin, *The Making of Saint Louis*, p. 182. Joinville was not alone in criticising Philip as Gaposchkin also argues Pope Boniface VIII used Louis' canonisation bull to criticise Philip's kingship: Gaposchkin, 'Boniface VIII'.

Joinville was writing for a king who had no knowledge of crusading from his own father, as Philip never went on crusade.⁸⁸¹ Therefore he was teaching the young Louis X about what was required of him as a man who went on crusade from a personally informed perspective. As such the text is a mirror-for-princes but also memoir.

Joinville's narrative account of the Seventh Crusade is considered by crusades historians to be highly important but not just for what it tells us about the course of the crusade itself. Asbridge asserts that it 'offers one of the most visceral and illuminating insights into the human experience of crusading.'⁸⁸² Likewise Phillips states Joinville's, 'gossipy style and acute observations constitute probably the most readable crusader narrative of all.'⁸⁸³ While Tyerman observes: '[this] extraordinary account of Louis's crusade remains the most detailed and vivid personal description of any crusade,' adding that '[Joinville] provides one of the most vivid pictures of the experience of medieval fighting, the chaos, camaraderie, improvisation, horror and sheer bravery of the battlefield.'⁸⁸⁴

Joinville's account has also been used by many historians studying Louis IX. Le Goff asserts that Joinville's uniqueness lay in the fact he was a layperson and therefore did not just portray Louis as a saintly figure but gave us the portrayal of Louis as a warrior.⁸⁸⁵ Gaposchkin claims the crusade part of Joinville's text 'was not designed to showcase Louis as a saint, but rather remember him chiefly as a (fallible) man, a chivalric crusader, a feudal king, and a friend, as dictated by Joinville's own experiences with Louis.'⁸⁸⁶ Furthermore Le Goff argues that without Joinville's work 'Saint Louis would not be what he has been since the fourteenth century—a living image.'⁸⁸⁷ Recently Joanna Phillips has considered Joinville's narrative using a gendered

⁸⁸¹ Philip took the cross in 1313 but died in 1314 before being able to complete his vow.

⁸⁸² Asbridge, *The Crusades*, p. 581.

⁸⁸³ Phillips, *Holy Warriors*, p. 248.

⁸⁸⁴ Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 776, p. 793.

⁸⁸⁵ Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, p. 377.

⁸⁸⁶ Gaposchkin, *The Making of Saint Louis*, p. 182.

⁸⁸⁷ Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, p. 729.

lens through a discussion on Louis' illness and its implication for his masculinity.⁸⁸⁸ Phillips concludes that masculine ideals are intrinsically linked to embodiment, and illness can affect both the leadership capacity and the masculine reputation of a crusade leader negatively.⁸⁸⁹

It is important to establish from the outset that the close relationship between Joinville and Louis is integral to the representation of events in Joinville's text. As will be shown what Joinville tells us about what he himself did and Louis did must be considered together as they often complement each other. Thus this chapter considers Joinville's self-presentation, not just his depiction of the king, which has been the concern of the majority of historians until now.

Other studies of Joinville have been produced on various themes such as Capetian queenship, clothing, experiences of sea voyages, and interactions with the 'other', in this case non-Christians including, Bedouins, Muslims and Mongols, and also cities.⁸⁹⁰ But as Smith notes, the 'full potential of Joinville's *Vie* as a source for the motivation and experiences of crusaders in the thirteenth century has not yet been fully exploited.'⁸⁹¹ The following analysis aims to address this observation by focusing on masculinity, which has not received substantial consideration in the scholarship.⁸⁹² Among the issues included here are the effect the crusade had on high status men including the trauma that they underwent in both battle and captivity. Moreover, imprisonment is rarely discussed in detail by crusade historians as it does not offer much insight into the

⁸⁸⁸ Phillips, 'Crusader masculinities'.

⁸⁸⁹ Phillips, 'Crusader masculinities', pp. 158-59.

⁸⁹⁰ Afrodésia McCannon, 'Two Capetian queens as the foreground for an aristocrat's anxiety in the *Vie de Saint Louis*', in *Capetian Women*, ed. Kathleen Nolan (New York, 2003), pp. 163-76; Reginald Hyatte, 'The habit makes the monk: clothes/cloth and valuation in Joinville's *Vie de saint Louis*', *Studi francesi*, 50, 1:148 (2006), 7-16; Irit Ruth Kleiman, 'The shirt is closest to the body: on Joinville's *Memoirs*', *English Language Notes*, 53, 2 (2015), 61-74; Huguette Legros, 'Nostre roy saint Looys au péril de la mer dans la *Vie de saint Louis* de Joinville', *Mondes marins du Moyen Age. Actes du 30e colloque du CUER MA, 3, 4 et 5 mars 2005*, ed. Chantal Connochie-Bourgne, (Aix-en-Provence, 2006), pp. 285-95; Marie-Madeleine Castellani, 'Bédouins, Tartares et Assassins, les figures de l'Autre oriental', *Bien Dire et Bien Apprendre*, 26 (2008), 137-49; Shirin Khanmohamadi 'Casting a "sideways glance" at the crusades: the voice of the other in Joinville's *Vie de Saint Louis*', *Exemplaria*, 22, 3 (2010), 177-99; John Tuthill, 'Cities and kingship in the medieval West: Joinville's Louis IX and Paris', *The Middle Ages in Texts and Texture: Reflections on Medieval Sources*, ed. Jason Glenn (Toronto, 2011), pp. 273-84.

⁸⁹¹ Smith, *Crusading*, p. 11.

⁸⁹² With the exception of Phillips, 'Crusader masculinities'.

crusade itself, but for discussions of elite masculinity it provides a valuable insight into the experience and impact of emotions, especially fear.

2. Autonomy, Agency and Loss of Control

A defining factor of masculinity which apparently transcends both time and place is autonomy. David Gilmore has shown in his study of various cultures' construction of masculinity that autonomy is a key concept.⁸⁹³ This is because to have autonomy is not to be dominated but instead to have dominion over someone else, women or children, and other men. Other terms synonymous with autonomy include agency and control.⁸⁹⁴ To have these is to be a man, to be deprived of them is unmanly. Historians have shown that autonomy and other similar attributes such as agency and control were deemed integral to hegemonic masculinity in various past settings.⁸⁹⁵ Joinville made this clear when explaining how the crusade came to be. He established that Louis' decision to go on crusade was an expression of autonomy. According to Joinville in 1244 Louis made a promise to God whilst severely ill: 'It was said that he was so unwell that one of the women attending him wanted to draw the sheet over his face, saying he was dead,' another woman disagreed, 'saying his soul was still in his body.'⁸⁹⁶ Louis overheard this and according to Joinville: 'Our Lord worked in him and restored him immediately to health, for he had been struck dumb and unable to speak. He asked for someone to give him the cross, and they did.'⁸⁹⁷ Some modern historians have seen this as a pivotal moment in Louis' life because it marked him as taking the reins of the kingdom from his mother's influence, essentially making him an autonomous ruler. William Chester Jordan posits that between taking the cross and going on crusade, 'it is fairly certain that in those years he became his own man,' maybe it would be also

⁸⁹³ David Gilmore, *Manhood in the making: Cultural concepts of masculinity* (New Haven, 1990), pp. 48-51; pp. 199-200.

⁸⁹⁴ Gilmore, *Manhood in the making*, p. 129.

⁸⁹⁵ Tosh, 'Hegemonic masculinity', p.42.

⁸⁹⁶ trans. Smith, p. 173; Joinville, p. 210: 'dont il fu a tel meschief, si comme il le disoit, que l'une des dames qui le gardoit li vouloit traire le drap sus le visage et disoit que il estoit mort... il avoit encore l'ame ou cors.'

⁸⁹⁷ trans. Smith, p. 173; Joinville, pp. 210-12: 'Nostre Seigneur ouvra en li et li envia santé tantost, car il estoit esmuys et ne pouoit parler. Il request que en li donnast la croix et si fist on.'

fair to say that this was when Louis *became* a man.⁸⁹⁸ This was because Louis, even though king, was still under the influence of his mother Blanche of Castile at this point. She had ruled France since the death of her husband Louis VIII in 1226 because Louis IX was only twelve at the time.⁸⁹⁹ To what extent Louis ruled or Blanche did is debateable but what is certain was that by announcing he was to go on crusade he can be seen as asserting himself. Additionally as James Naus states Louis made the vow to crusade ‘because he understood his participation in the crusades to be a necessary function of being the French king.’⁹⁰⁰ Therefore Louis, like Richard the Lionheart, did not have a choice because crusading was intertwined with both kingship and masculinity.⁹⁰¹

Immediately after Louis took the cross his brothers likewise all took it, followed by Duke Hugh of Burgundy and Count William of Flanders.⁹⁰² These were all leading men in the country and they took the cross because Louis had done so. They were not inspired by a papal bull, nor some event in the Holy Land.⁹⁰³ This is a classic example of hegemonic masculinity in action because once the apex male does something others wish to emulate him, plus as nobles, crusading was also part of their duty, and here was an opportunity to discharge that duty. Moreover the crusade gave Louis the opportunity to unite the barons of the country who had rebelled against him between 1241 and 1242 and reforge broken bonds.⁹⁰⁴ The potential for crusading glory allowed men to join Louis’ crusade whilst Louis himself could enforce peace deals in rebellious areas, which he did successfully.⁹⁰⁵

⁸⁹⁸ Jordan, *Louis IX*, p. 13.

⁸⁹⁹ For a recent monograph in English see: Lindy Grant, *Blanche of Castile: Queen of France* (New Haven, 2016).

⁹⁰⁰ James Naus, *Constructing Kingship: The Capetian Monarchs of France and the Early Crusades* (Manchester, 2016). p. 2.

⁹⁰¹ This issue was discussed in Chapter Two, p. 69.

⁹⁰² Joinville, p. 212.

⁹⁰³ Despite this being a possible motivation of Louis, although not mentioned by Joinville, for more see: Jotischky, *Crusading*, p. 247.

⁹⁰⁴ See Jordan, *Louis IX*, pp. 14-35.

⁹⁰⁵ Jordan, *Louis IX*, p. 160.

Joinville does not give us a reason for his decision to go on the crusade. After naming many of the country's leading barons that took the cross he tells us that he also took the cross.⁹⁰⁶ This suggests that he did it because that is what so many other men of his status were doing. Nonetheless he does give us a description of his departure from his home which elicits his feelings concerning what he was about to undertake:

And then I left Joinville, not to enter my castle again until my return. I was on foot, barelegged and wearing a hairshirt. I went thus on pilgrimage to Blecourt, Saint Urbain and other shrines thereabouts. As I made my way to Blecourt and Saint-Urbain, I did not want to cast my eyes back towards Joinville at all, fearful that my heart would melt for the fine castle and two children I was leaving behind.⁹⁰⁷

Smith argues convincingly Joinville here presented a motif of sacrifice.⁹⁰⁸ This is in reference to him leaving his children and castle. To go further it could be said that by departing as a penitential pilgrim and not a crusader knight, that he was sacrificing his identity. He was giving up two symbols of his manhood, his children that demonstrated his virility and his castle as a symbol of his family's status and honour, which also represented his own strength and power. Christoph Maier argues that 'men were encouraged to embrace and endure the emotional hardships of crusading caused by physical suffering and separation from families with a view to the spiritual rewards gained from the crusade.'⁹⁰⁹ For Maier this was integral to their masculine identity.⁹¹⁰ Furthermore, this passage supports Hodgson's assertion that for men crusading entailed adopting a gender identity different to Bullough's definition of conventional medieval

⁹⁰⁶ Joinville, p. 212.

⁹⁰⁷ trans. *Smith*, p.176; Joinville, pp. 218-20: 'Et lors je me parti de Joinville sanz rentrer ou chastel jusques a ma revenue, a pié, deschaus et en langes, et ainsi alé a Blechicourt en pellerinage et a Saint Urbain et aus autres cors sains qui la sont. Et endementiers que je aloie a Blechicourt et a Saint Urbain, je ne voz onques retourner mes yex vers Joinville, pour ce que le cuer ne me attendrisist du biau chastel que je lessioie et de mes .II. enfans.'

⁹⁰⁸ Smith, *Crusading*, p. 65.

⁹⁰⁹ Maier, 'Propaganda', p. 26.

⁹¹⁰ Maier, 'Propaganda', p. 29.

masculinity.⁹¹¹ Whilst departure scenes in medieval texts have often been seen as a trope this was a real event told by Joinville.⁹¹² By telling us his own story of his crusade experience from the beginning he reinforced to the audience that he was there and that he actually saw what he recounts of Louis, thus establishing his link to the saint.

During the crusade itself Joinville more than once acknowledged his loss of control over both himself and the scenarios he underwent. This manifested through fear engendered by the situations he found himself in. Smith asserts Joinville's uniqueness lies in the fact that unlike the *chanson de gestes* his account explored the fear and suffering of himself and others.⁹¹³ Fear was a natural response to being on a military campaign and it had to be overcome. Even men who were professional warriors and used to fighting battles would suffer from fear. Bliese has demonstrated that one of the main purposes of medieval battle speeches was to persuade men to overcome this fear.⁹¹⁴ Alastair Macdonald has demonstrated that it is fruitful to gain an understanding of soldiers' fears and other emotions on the battlefield from medieval narrative sources.⁹¹⁵ Macdonald argues that depictions of courage are easy to understand in medieval battle accounts because of the code of chivalry in which courage played a vital role, however, he states, 'it is particularly difficult to reach insight into the psychological torments that could undermine the resolve of the warrior from our medieval sources.'⁹¹⁶ Furthermore, death on campaign was the greatest fear for men, and as Macdonald demonstrates examples of men experiencing fear were often omitted from battle chronicles for the shame it could induce.⁹¹⁷ However hegemonic males could not express fear because as leaders they were expected to possess the bravery and self-mastery to surmount this emotion. Moreover, they had to set an example to inspire the men

⁹¹¹ This is discussed in the introduction above, p. 21.

⁹¹² For more on departure scenes in medieval writing see: Charlotte C. Morse, 'Scenes of farewell in the Middle Ages', *Studies in Late Medieval and Early Renaissance Texts in Honour of John Scattergood: "The Key of All Good Remembrance"*, ed. Alan J. Fletcher, Anne Marie D'Arcy and John Scattergood (Dublin, 2005), pp. 241-58.

⁹¹³ Smith, *Crusading*, p. 133.

⁹¹⁴ Bliese, 'Rhetoric and morale', 204.

⁹¹⁵ Alastair J. Macdonald, 'Courage, fear and the experience of the later medieval Scottish soldier', *Scottish Historical Review*, 92, 2 (2013), 181.

⁹¹⁶ Macdonald, 'Courage, fear', 185; 198.

⁹¹⁷ Macdonald, 'Courage, fear', 201; 205-06.

over whom they had authority. Their hegemonic status was reinforced when they were brave in a situation in which other men expressed fear. As Katie Walter has shown many writers in the Middle Ages dealt with the problem of trying to get men to fight.⁹¹⁸ She asserts the use of sadness and endurance was used to help men to overcome fear.⁹¹⁹ The emphasis on endurance fits in with the penitential crusader and in the case of this crusade also applied to those in captivity who had to endure suffering but were fully aware of the spiritual reward. Recent work by Hodgson suggests the use of fear in crusade narratives, 'was not an admission of cowardice and by extension a lessening of masculine quality, but an acknowledgement of human reaction to a dire situation subsequently resolved and triumphed over only by faith in God.'⁹²⁰ However, what will become clear in the following analysis is that Joinville's expression of fear was presented in contrast to Louis displaying a lack of fear, this comparison is integral to the text's presentation of both men.

Joinville's first experience of fear and a loss of autonomy came during the winter of 1249-50 when the crusaders were trying to cross the Nile near Mansurah where they had set up camp to build a causeway across the river. The Egyptian army were on the opposite side of the river doing all they could to prevent the construction of the causeway. This manifested in launching incendiary bombs at the crusaders' camp known as Greek fire, a deadly substance that had featured in almost all accounts written by those who went on crusade since the First Crusade.⁹²¹ It had always caused amazement and concern from the westerners because of its ferociousness.

⁹¹⁸ Katie L. Walter, 'Peril, flight and the sad man: medieval theories of the body in battle', *War and Literature*, ed. Laura Ashe and Ian Patterson (Cambridge, 2014), p. 21.

⁹¹⁹ Walter, 'Peril, flight', p. 25.

⁹²⁰ Hodgson, 'Leading the people', p. 213.

⁹²¹ For more on Greek fire see: Alex Roland, 'Secrecy, technology, and war: Greek fire and the defense of Byzantium, 678-1204', *Warfare in the Dark Ages*, ed. John France & Kelly DeVries (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 419-43.

Joinville commented: 'It made such noise as it came that it was if the heavens thundered; it seemed as if a dragon was flying through the air.'⁹²²

Joinville recorded an instance of the Ayyubids firing Greek fire from a petrary at the crusaders. A fellow knight with Joinville, Walter of Curel, told them that if their defences were hit with the Greek fire then they would be burned and killed, additionally he told them, 'and if we leave the defences we have been charged with guarding, we will be shamed.'⁹²³ This meant they would have to be brave and suffer a bombardment whilst on guard. The only advice Walter could offer was to get on their knees and pray as only God could protect them.⁹²⁴ Having to resort to prayer demonstrated a clear lack of control of the situation. Joinville recalls the fear he experienced due to Greek fire, telling us that on one occasion one of the cat-castles, a piece of machinery used in siege warfare, on the riverbank he was defending was hit, he wrote: 'we rushed out ... We put out the fire, but before we managed to do so the Saracens struck every one of us with arrows fired across the river.'⁹²⁵ This was a dangerous task, one knight described the fire as being akin to a 'great hedge of flame' whilst the arrows added to the injuries.⁹²⁶ Joinville continues describing how he and his men were ordered to guard the cat-castles at night after the king's brother, Charles of Anjou, and his men, had taken the day shift. Joinville confessed his discomfort of the situation saying: 'our hearts were very ill at ease on the day the king of Sicily guarded the cat castles by day, when we were due to take over that night. This was because the Saracens had completely shattered our cat-castles, using the petrary to throw Greek fire at them in broad daylight. They had previously only done so at night.'⁹²⁷ Joinville then admitted that 'no-one dared

⁹²² trans. *Smith*. p.196; Joinville, p. 268: 'Il fesoit tele noise au venir que il sembloit que ce feust la foudre du ciel; il sembloit un dragon qui volast par l'air.'

⁹²³ trans. *Smith*. p.196; Joinville, p. 266: 'et se nous lessons nos deffenses que l'en nous bailees a garder, nous sonmes honnis.'

⁹²⁴ Joinville, p. 268.

⁹²⁵trans. *Smith*. p.197; Joinville, pp. 268-70: 'Nous saillimes Nous esteingnimes le feu, et avant que nous l'eussions estaint, nous chargerent les Sarrazins touz de pylés que il traioient au travers du flum.'

⁹²⁶ trans. *Smith*. p.197; Joinville, p. 268: 'une grant haye qui vient ardant'.

⁹²⁷ trans. *Smith*. p.197; Joinville, p. 270: '...nous devons guierter la nuit et nous estions en grant messaise de cuer pour ce que les Sarrazins avoient tout confroissié nos chas chastiaus, les Sarrazins anenerent la perriere de grant jour, ce que il n'avoient encore fet que de nuit, et geterent le feu gregois en nos chas chastiaus.'

go into the cat-castles' because of this.⁹²⁸ The Ayyubids hit their cat-castles, burning them, of which Joinville wrote: 'when this happened the king of Sicily [Charles of Anjou] went out of his mind, so much so that he wanted to rush into the fire to put it out... but if he was enraged by this, I and my knights praised God for it because if we had been on guard that evening we would have all been burned.'⁹²⁹

Joinville's fear and loss of control of the situation he found himself in grew to the extent that he was relieved the cat-castle had burned down before he would have to guard it. Contrastingly Louis responded to the Greek fire thus:

Each time our saintly king heard that they had launched Greek fire at us, he sat up in his bed, reached out his hands to Our Lord and said as he wept, "Sweet Lord God, protect my people for me!" And I truly believe that his prayers served us well in our time of need. Every time that the fire came down that night he sent one of his chamberlains to ascertain how we were fairing, and if the flames had done us any harm.⁹³⁰

Louis's calmness was a counterpoint to Joinville's agitation and terror. It was these oppositions that demonstrated Louis' sanctity as they set him apart demonstrating his exceptionalism. Louis demonstrated manly self-control thanks to his faith in God, and this was exemplary, both for those there at the camp, and for those reading the text.

⁹²⁸ trans. *Smith*. p.197; Joinville, p. 270: 'nulz n'osoit aler aus chas chastiaus.'

⁹²⁹ trans. *Smith*. p.197; Joinville, p. 270: 'Dont le roy de Sezile estoit si hors du sens que il se vouloit aler ferir ou feu pour estaindre; et ce il en fu couroucié, je et mes chevaliers en laomes Dieu, car se nous eussions guictié le soir nous eussions esté touz ars.'

⁹³⁰ trans. *Smith*. p.196; Joinville, p. 268; 'Toutes les foiz que nostre saint roy ooit que il nous getoient le feu grejois, il s'en estoit en son lit et tendoit ses mains vers Nostre Seigneur et disoit en plourant: "Biau Sire Diex, gardez moy ma gent!" Et je croi vraiment que ses prieres nous orent bien mestier au besoing. Le soir, toutes les foiz que le feu estoit cheu, il nous envoioit un de ses chamberlans pour savoir en quel point nous estions, et se le feu nous avoit fait point de doumage.'

3. Honour and Shame

As earlier stated Joinville was expected to go on crusade as his family had a long history of being involved in previous expeditions.⁹³¹ Additionally the quote from his cousin that opened this chapter made it clear that he would return with shame if he did not comport himself with honour. It can be deemed then that crusading was a key part of his masculine identity and living up to familial expectations and acting with honour was an essential part of his conduct. Hodgson has demonstrated that honour and shame were integral to how actions were carried out and represented on the Fourth Crusade and were used to explain why events transpired as they did.⁹³² Her approach can also be applied to Louis' crusade. As discussed in Chapter One honour and shame were integral to enforcing noble conduct.⁹³³ They also ensured conformity in how men could act in accordance to their gender role deeming what was acceptable for a man to do and not do.

Both the concept and the term honour (*honneur*) were used by Joinville in his narrative. For example he opens his work by telling us it was written 'to do further honour to this true saint.'⁹³⁴ Furthermore, it was used to frame situations and incidents to demonstrate his own honourable behaviour and that of others, and alternately shame those who did not act honourably. What was considered honourable to Joinville can be surmised using his report of Louis' statement which seems to define honour: '... keep yourself from knowingly doing or saying anything that, if the whole world were to come to hear of it, you would not willingly acknowledge by saying: "I did that", or "I said that."' ⁹³⁵

In Joinville's text praising honour was done more enthusiastically than shaming those who lacked it. Sometimes he would not name those who had acted shamefully, a trait which can also be

⁹³¹ See above, p. 236.

⁹³² Hodgson, 'Honour, Shame'.

⁹³³ See above, pp. 59-62.

⁹³⁴ trans. *Smith*. p.141; Joinville, p. 146: '...a l'onneur du vrai cors saint.'

⁹³⁵ trans. *Smith*. p.148; Joinville, pp. 154-56: 'Donques vous gardez que vousne faites ne ne dites a vostre escient nulle riens que se tout le monde le savoit, que vouse ne peussiez congnoistre: "Je ai ce fait, je ai ce dit."'

found in the twelfth-century crusade narrative of Guibert of Nogent's *Gesta Dei per Francos*. Guibert stated, about those who had run away from Antioch during the First Crusade: 'I would name the towns they came from, were I not constrained by my close friendship with some members of their family to limit my remarks, thereby protecting them from shame.'⁹³⁶ Similarly he wrote: 'There were other deserters from the holy army also, who, when they came back to their native land, were held in contempt and denounced as infamous everywhere. Some of them we do not know; others we know very well but prefer not to humiliate them.'⁹³⁷ This was done to save the face of those who had acted shamefully through cowardice. However Joinville wrote when many of the men, whom he said acted shamefully on crusade, had already died indicating that dishonour went beyond life's temporality.

Being honourable was clearly a central part of how Joinville conducted himself, even if sometimes this brought dishonour or shame on to others. For example whilst the crusaders stopped over in Cyprus on the way to Egypt in January 1249, Joinville reported that the empress of Constantinople, Marie of Brienne (d. 1275), arrived on the island and requested him to come and fetch her to take her to the king. She did not have any belongings or clothes with her except for what she was wearing. So Joinville sent for cloth and other materials for her to make a dress. When a member of the king's entourage, Philip of Nanteuil, found out about this he told the king. Joinville learnt that Philip had said to Louis that he, Philip, and the other barons had been 'deeply shamed' by Joinville when he had sent these things to the empress because 'they had not been aware of her need.'⁹³⁸ Joinville does not comment further on this development but by implication Joinville felt that he had acted correctly in helping the empress, as it would have been shameful for her to be sent to Louis in her travel dress. Additionally, Joinville would surely have

⁹³⁶ trans. Levine, p. 99; Guibert of Nogent, 'Gesta', p. 194: 'Municipium quoque eorum, ex quo agnominabantur, exprimerem, nisi generis eorum amica mihi contiguitate devictus, pudori ipsorum parcere definissem.'

⁹³⁷ trans. Levine, p. 99; Guibert of Nogent, 'Gesta', p. 194: 'Exitere et alii hujus sanctae militia desertores: qui quum in patriam repedassent, probro et execrationi habiti, ubique conclamabantur infames: quorum quidem aliquos ignoramus; quibusdam vero, quorum in promptu notitia est, derogare nolumus.'

⁹³⁸ Joinville, p. 228: 'grant honte'... 'il ne s'ent estoient avisez avant.'

been criticised if he had not provided her with cloth for a new dress. Philip seems to be angry because he feels that Joinville's actions have revealed a shortcoming in his own behaviour. On a basic level he was probably angry that Joinville had beaten him to it and could now benefit from having helped the empress. Whatever the truth of the matter, what can definitely be ascertained is that there was a conflict about correct behaviour linked to honour and shame.

Furthermore, since Joinville was writing for Louis IX's grandson, the future Louis X, it is unsurprising that much of the discourse of honour comes through examples of either Louis' behaviour or words. As the text was used as proof of his sanctity Louis' actions stand out as examples for his readers to learn from. Joinville gives numerous examples of what Louis considered honourable behaviour. Some of these centred on pious behaviour which demonstrated humility. For example Louis asked Joinville if he washed the feet of the poor on Maundy Thursday to which Joinville responded with disgust:

I replied I did not, since it did not strike me as a seemly thing to do. He told me that I should not despise doing this, for God had done so, "And you be particularly reluctant to do what the king of England does; he washes and kisses the feet of lepers."⁹³⁹

Here Joinville was shown to be arrogant, as if his social status precluded him from doing this. Louis' shaming of him brought about a re-consideration that kings and other elite men are not above the work of God. Overall, honour played a central role in Joinville's understanding and reporting of events in his narrative and was clearly a message he was trying to impart to his audience, as we shall now see.

⁹³⁹ trans. Smith. p. 318; Joinville, p. 558: 'et je li respondi que nanin, que il ne me sembloit pas bien. Et il me dit que je ne le devoie pas avoir en despit, car Dieu l'avoit fait, "car moult envis feriés ce que le roy d'Angleterre fet, qui lave les piez aus mezeaus et beze."

4. Mansurah

The battle of Mansurah in February 1250 was a pivotal moment in the crusade. On 8 February 1250 the crusaders had managed to cross the Nile in their attempt to march on Cairo, after trying to bridge it with a pontoon. On the other side of the river was the town of Mansurah and outside it a Muslim military camp. Louis' brother, Robert of Artois, along with the Templars, were first to cross the river, however they did not wait for everyone else to get across as planned, instead they launched an attack on the camp. This was successful but they continued into the town where they were locked in and slaughtered. Louis and the remaining crusaders managed to regather and fight off the Muslim army and were victorious because they camped in their enemies' camp that night. While the crusaders did gain a victory at Mansurah, Jean Richard describes it as 'a strategic defeat.'⁹⁴⁰ Furthermore, Phillips has labelled it as the event that probably ended Louis' crusade.⁹⁴¹ This is because of the enormous loss of lives that the battle caused which severely hampered further military expeditions. Issues of both autonomy and honour played a vital role in the presentation of events during this battle by Joinville. These will be dealt with in the discussion of the following events: Robert of Artois' death, Joinville's experience of the battle, and Joinville's presentation of Louis.

Robert of Artois' ill-fated attack on Mansurah which also dragged in the Templars, condemning them all to doom, is crucial to understanding ideas of chivalric masculinity in this period. To many modern historians Robert's actions ought to be condemned, for example, Le Goff describes Robert unsympathetically declaring him 'the embodiment of the despicable Frenchman who piled dishonour on distasteful boasting,' causing the crusade's failure.⁹⁴² Although some historians have sought to understand Robert's motivations the result of what occurred can only be seen as having a negative effect on the crusade.⁹⁴³ Joinville does not explicitly ascribe the

⁹⁴⁰ Richard, *Saint Louis*, p. 124.

⁹⁴¹ Phillips, *Holy Warriors*, pp. 253-54.

⁹⁴² Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, p. 351.

⁹⁴³ For example see: Asbridge, *The Crusades*, p. 596.

defeat to Robert's behaviour, because as discussed above shameful behaviour is rarely ascribed to named people within his text. But in any case, Joinville did not need to specifically blame Robert since his actions said it all.

Joinville tells us the Templars and Robert argued over who should be in the vanguard for the attack on the Islamic enemy after they had crossed the river beginning the battle of Mansurah, Joinville wrote:

as soon as the count of Artois had crossed the river, he and all his men threw themselves on the Turks, who fled before them. The Templars let him know that he had done them a great dishonour by going on ahead, when he should have gone after them. They asked him to let them go ahead, as the king had decided they should.⁹⁴⁴

Robert did not respond. Joinville continues:

When the Templars saw what was happening, they believed they would be dishonoured if they were to allow the count of Artois to stay ahead of them. And so they all set spur, as and when each saw his chance, and gave chase to the Turks who were fleeing before them.⁹⁴⁵

This ended in disaster for all those involved with Robert, his men and the Templars being massacred, as described at the start of this section. Other accounts go into longer detail about this but from Joinville we receive his perception that the Templars were motivated by honour to

⁹⁴⁴ trans. *Smith*. pp. 199-200; Joinville, pp. 274-76: 'Or avint ainsi que si tost comme le conte d'Artois ot passé le flum, il et toute sa gent ferirent aus Turs qui s'en fuioient devant eulz. Le Temple li manda que il leur fesoit grant vileinnie quant il devoit aler après eulz et li aloit devant; et li prioient que il les lessast aler devant, aussi comme il avoit esté acordé par le roy.'

⁹⁴⁵ trans. *Smith*. p.200; Joinville, p. 276: 'Quant les Templiers virent ce, il se penserent que il seroient honniz se il lessaient le conte d'Artois aler devant eulz; si ferirent des esperons qui plus plus et qui miex miex, et chacerent les Turs qui s'enfuioient devant eulz...'

their own detriment.⁹⁴⁶ Robert's rashness and youthful folly here were to blame for his demise. But this reasoning did not apply to the Templars. They were concerned with being deemed shameful because it was their duty to protect the king's brother thus they had to follow him, even though he was acting so recklessly, which in turn led to their deaths. Whilst Robert's demise can certainly be pinned on his failure to act prudently, which was a failure of manliness, the Templars died attempting to preserve their honour and thus their masculinity. Therefore complexity surrounded these decisions because actions on the battlefield do not have an inherent meaning in relation to gender identity, for example Robert could have been successful and have been lauded for his prowess. Consequently, it is the success or otherwise of those actions which determines whether individuals are deemed to have acted in a manly fashion or not.

Once the fighting had begun Joinville gave an account of his experience during the battle as well as recording the king's actions. It is based on these passages that Tyerman states Joinville 'provides one of the most vivid pictures of the experience of medieval fighting, the chaos, camaraderie, improvisation, horror and sheer bravery of the battlefield.'⁹⁴⁷ This is an important point to consider because hitherto crusade narratives presented battles written from a third person perspective and usually in a form suggesting heroic actions and general bravado.⁹⁴⁸ Joinville's account of the battle described not just his actions but his emotions. Joinville's describes the fighting he undertook:

And so we attacked them. While we were pursuing them though the camp, I saw a Saracen mounting his horse as one of his knights held the bridle. As he had his hands on his saddle, ready to mount, I struck him dead. When his knight saw this he left his lord and the horse, as I made another pass he thrust his lance between my two shoulders, pinning me down on my horse's neck so hard that I could not draw the sword I had at my belt. I had to draw the

⁹⁴⁶ For a longer version of events see: 'Continuation de Guillaume de Tyr, de 1229 à 1261, dite du manuscrit de Rothelin', *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux* vol. II (Paris, 1859), pp. 602-06.

⁹⁴⁷ Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 793.

⁹⁴⁸ For example see Robert of Clari's description of the siege of Constantinople above, p. 207; pp. 220-222.

sword strapped to my horse, and when the knight saw that I had drawn this sword, he released his lance and left me.⁹⁴⁹

However, after being de-horsed and forced to fight on foot, Joinville says his fellow knight, and comrade, Erart of Sivery suggested they should move to a ruined house nearby and await the king. Joinville reported: ‘as we went there, on foot and on horse, a great horde of Turks rushed at us. They brought me to the ground, rode over me and sent the shield flying from my neck.’⁹⁵⁰ When Joinville and his companions entered the house they backed themselves into a corner, he described his enemies on the floors above stabbing their lances at them. The crusaders defended themselves vigorously in this incident according to Joinville so much so that, ‘they received the praises of all the *preudommes* in the army and from those who were witness to the deed and those who heard tell of it.’⁹⁵¹ From this it can be deduced that the experience of war was retold to their homosocial group in order to celebrate such performances and to gain honour from other members of the group. However in this instance both their autonomy and their lives hung in the balance and it was only through prowess that both were successfully preserved. Moreover Joinville’s recollection of events did not portray him personally demonstrating prowess, in fact the opposite could be said. Continuing, Joinville described the horrific injuries sustained by those knights being attacked:

There my lord Hugh of Ecot was wounded by three lance blows in the face, as was my lord Ralph, and my lord Frederick of Louppy by a lance between the shoulders; the wound was so large that blood came from his body as from the bunghole of a barrel. My lord Erart of

⁹⁴⁹ trans. Smith, p. 200; Joinville, pp. 276-78: ‘et lueur courumes sus. Endementres que nous les chacions parmi l’ost, je resgardai un Sarrazin qui montoit sur son cheval; un sien chevalier li tenoiet le frain. La ou il tenoiet ses .II. mains a sa selle pour monter, je li donnai de mon glaive par dessous les esseles et le getai mort. Et quant son chevalier vit ce, il lessa son seigneur et son cheval, et m’apoia, au passer que je fis, de son glaive entre les .II. espaulles et me coucha sur le col de mon cheval et me tint si pressé que je ne pavoie traire m’espee que j’avoie centre. Si me couvint triare l’espee qui estoit a mon cheval; et quant il vit que j’oz m’espee traite, si tira son glaive a li et me lessa.’

⁹⁵⁰ trans. Smith, p.201; Joinville, p. 278: ‘Ainsi comme nous en alions a pié et a cheval, une grant route de Turs vint hurer a nous et me porterent a terre, et alerent par desus moy et volerent mon escu de mon col.’

⁹⁵¹ trans. Smith, p.201; Joinville, pp. 278-80: ‘... il furent loez de touz les preudommes de l’ost, et de ceulz qui virent le fait et de ceulz qui l’oïrent dire.’

Sivry received a sword blow full in the face, so that his nose was hanging down over his lip.⁹⁵²

Joinville's graphic description of these wounds demonstrate how memorable this event was for himself, these were not generic descriptions of wounds as found in some chronicles but a further demonstration of the vividness and authenticity of his account. Such serious injuries had the potential to compromise masculinity. Anything that prevented a knight from enacting his role as a warrior was essentially a loss of manhood. However, it could also be a marker of masculine strength, skill and bravery to take a blow of such devastation and remain alive, as Erart had done here.⁹⁵³ Moreover the prominent scarring such a battle wound would provide would have determined his warrior status despite the disability it may have afflicted.⁹⁵⁴ Thus Erart's wounds, although they could invoke a squeamish response from the audience demonstrated his manliness. Contrastingly Joinville was seemingly not involved in the fighting in the house, or at least he does not describe himself being so, instead he tells us: "Then I remembered my lord Saint James, "Dear lord Saint James, on whom I call, help me and save me in this need!"⁹⁵⁵ Resorting to prayer demonstrated a complete loss of control over his situation. The only agency he had left was to pray for an intercession. Unable to fight the Muslims himself he called upon the Moorslayer.⁹⁵⁶

Responding to this Joinville records the wounded Erart asking him if he should get help from Louis' brother Charles, Count of Anjou, who they could see outside the house. But this was not

⁹⁵² trans. *Smith*. p.201; Joinville, p. 280: 'La fu navré mon seigneur Hugue d'Escoc de .III. glaives ou visage, et mon seigneur Raoul et mon seigneur Ferri de Loupey d'un glaive parmi les espaules; et fu la plaie si large que le sanc li venoit du cors aussi come le bondon d'un tonnel. Mon seigneur Erart de Syverey fu feru d'une espee parmi le visage, su que le nez li cheoit sus le levre.'

⁹⁵³ Iain A. MacInnes, 'Heads, Shoulders, Knees and Toes: Injury and Death in Anglo-Scottish Combat, c. 1296–c.1403', *Wounds and Wound Repair in Medieval Culture*, ed. Larissa Tracy and Kelly DeVries (Leiden, 2015), p. 108.

⁹⁵⁴ MacInnes, 'Heads, Shoulders, Knees', p. 117-18.

⁹⁵⁵ trans. *Smith*. p.201; Joinville, p. 280: 'Et lors il me souvint de mon seigneur sain Jacque: "Biau sire saint jaque, que j'ai requis, aidiés moy et secourez a ce besoing!"'

⁹⁵⁶ St James was believed to have appeared at the mythical battle of Clavijo in 834 or 843 in support of the Christians fighting the Moors. See: Jan Van Herwaarden, 'The origins of the cult of St. James of Compostela', *Journal of Medieval History*, 6, 1 (1980), 126.

a simple question from Erart; Joinville records it as being inflected by notions of honour and shame, for he quotes Erart saying: 'My lord, if you thought that neither I nor my heirs would be reproved for it, I would go and seek help for you from the count of Anjou.'⁹⁵⁷ But Joinville reassured Erart that it would be an honourable thing to do as it would help save their lives and that Erart was in mortal danger if he did not get help. Thus Charles of Anjou came to their aid causing the Saracens to flee.⁹⁵⁸ It was thanks to Erart that Joinville and the others were rescued, however Joinville tells us that Erart subsequently died from his wound.⁹⁵⁹ It can be inferred that Erart's actions would be deemed courageous and this was not tempered by his horrific injury, in fact, it likely added to his reputation, not least because it could be perceived as evidence of the sacrifice he had made that his companions might live.

Importantly, Joinville's recollection of the conversation demonstrated standards of manhood as being forefront in how men perceived their ability to act. Erart's concern for his honour plus that of future generations of his family established that he could not act without the consensus of other men. Implicitly Erart was concerned that going to seek for help might be perceived as an admission of weakness, or even as evidence of cowardice. Thus he consulted his companions rather than acting independently, because it was crucial to avoid giving the impression that, as a group they could not help themselves and needed a stronger man to help them, which effectively rendered them unmanly. Hence, he needed reassurance that under these dire circumstances and given his mortal wound, asking for help would be an honourable act. Joinville's insight into this decision making process poses crucial questions of how masculinity formed individual and collective decision making in battle. Could it be inferred that some men might have chosen to die instead of asking for help because it would have compromised their manhood? This is certainly plausible since cowardice had been called out by writers since the First Crusade and the

⁹⁵⁷ trans. *Smith*. p.201 Joinville, p. 280: 'Sire, se vous cuidiés que moy ne mes hers n'eussions reprouvier, je vous iroie querre secouse au conte d'Anjou...'

⁹⁵⁸ Joinville, p. 280.

⁹⁵⁹ Joinville, p. 280.

reputation of some men had suffered from acting cowardly.⁹⁶⁰ Returning to the example of the Templars and Robert of Artois, this would confirm that some elite men, in order to not be deemed shameful or unmanly, went to dangerous and even fatal extents. The fact that this shame could be passed on to their descendants demonstrated the levels of anxiety surrounding such actions. Furthermore, honour and shame thus affected the agency and autonomy of these men as it was integral to their decision making; they may not have wanted to engage in certain behaviour knowing it was dangerous but could not prevent themselves from doing so because of honour and its importance to them.

Immediately after this Louis arrived:

As I was there on foot with my knights, who were wounded as I have already described, the king arrived with his entire battalion, accompanied by a great din and great noise of trumpets and kettledrums, and halted on a raised path. I never saw a man so finely armed; he could be seen from the shoulders up, set above the rest of his men, with a gilded helmet on his head and a German sword in his hand. When the king stopped there, the good knights that he had in his battalion ... threw themselves among the Turks, along with other valiant knights from the king's battalion. And know that this was a very fine feat of arms, for no one fired either a bow or a crossbow, but rather there were blows of maces and swords from the Turks and our men, who were all ensnarled with each other.⁹⁶¹

⁹⁶⁰ See Guibert of Nogent's comment above, p. 248.

⁹⁶¹ trans. *Smith*, p.202; Joinville, p. 282: 'La ou je estoie a pié et mes chevaliers, aussi blecié comme il est devant dit, vint le roy atoute sa bataille a grant noyse et a grant bruit de trompes et de nacaires, et se aresta sur un chemin levé. Mes onques si bel armé ne vi, car il paroît de sur tote sa gent des les espuals en amon, un heaume doré en chief, une espee d'Alémainge en sa main. Quant il fu la haresté, ses bons chevailers que il avoit en sa bataille le roy... se lancerent entre les Turs, et pleus des vaillans chevaliers qui estoient en la bataille le roy. Et sachiés que ce fu un tres biau fait d'armes, car nulz n'i traioit ne d'arc ne d'arbalestre, ainçois estoit le fereïs d'emaces et d'espee des Turs et de nostre gent, qui touz estoient melez.'

Jonathan Elukin points out that Louis was not presented by Joinville as actually being involved in the fighting, suggesting that this passage is ‘a set piece right out of a chivalric epic.’⁹⁶² Elukin argues that this conveys an idea of Louis as an ineffective warrior.⁹⁶³ But Louis clearly did bring a sense of order to the chaos Joinville described preceding his arrival. Louis brought control to the situation through his inspirational presence thus conforming to the hagiographical trope of the saint bringing sharp relief to a situation.⁹⁶⁴ Though the fighting continued Louis’ presence brought management and leadership to what had until then been a desperate situation. Joinville’s vivid description of the king and the sounds accompanying his arrival attest to Louis’ magnificence and to Joinville’s credibility as a witness. Furthermore, Louis’ presentation firmly placed him as an example of hegemonic masculinity surrounded by his leading men. Joinville’s presentation of Louis in this situation could also be linked to his prayers to St James; James did not appear, but Louis did.

Moreover, contrary to Elukin’s assertion Louis did in fact engage in fighting. Joinville later says that two nobles told him:

Six Turks came and took the king by the bridle and were leading him away captive when he single-handedly freed himself with the great sword blows he gave them. When his men saw that the king was defending himself, they took heart and abandoned their attempts to cross the river in order to go to his aid.⁹⁶⁵

⁹⁶² Jonathan M. Elukin, ‘Warrior or saint? Joinville, Louis IX’s character, and the challenge of the crusade’, *Center and Periphery: Studies on Power in the Medieval World in Honor of William Chester Jordan*, ed. Katherine L. Jansen, Guy Geltner and Anne E. Lester (Leiden, 2013), p. 189.

⁹⁶³ Elukin, ‘Warrior or saint?’, p. 184.

⁹⁶⁴ During the defence of Antioch in June 1098 the anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* recorded the intervention of St. George, St. Mercurius, and St. Demetrius on the crusaders side. See: *Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, ed. Rosalind Hill (London, 1962), p. 69. For more on this see: Beth C. Spacey, ‘The celestial knight: evoking the First Crusade in Odo of Deuil’s *De projectione Ludovici VII in orientem* and in the anonymous *Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris*’, *Essays in Medieval Studies*, 31 (2015), 65-82.

⁹⁶⁵ trans. *Smith*. p. 204; Joinville, p. 286: ‘VI. Turs estoient venus au frain le roy et l’emmenoient pris, et il tout seul s’en delivra aus gran cops que il leur donna de l’espee. Et quant sa gent virent que le roy metoit deffense en li, il pristrent cuer et lesserent le passage du flum et se tresent vers le roy pour aidier.’

Louis was therefore inspiring other men with his demonstration of manly prowess. The Rothelin continuation of William of Tyre also took this line, stating:

[Louis] ordered all who were with him to close ranks and keep strictly together. He exhorted them strongly, and told them they must not be afraid of the is great number of unbelievers riding towards the, for Our Lord Jesus Christ, for whose sake they were here, was stronger and mightier than any other... Many of ours who fought in this battle said and affirmed afterwards that if the king had not behaved with such courage and energy, they would all have been taken and killed. Never in this battle did the king turn his face away or try and keep himself safe from the Turks. He exhorted and comforted our people and gave them fresh heart; fiercely did they defend themselves, overwhelmed as they were and subjected to wave after wave of Saracen attack.⁹⁶⁶

Louis's leadership was vital as it demonstrated his calm behaviour in front of a terrifying adversity, he displayed bravery and fortitude which had a crucial revitalising effect on his army, encouraging them to try and match his exploits despite being so outnumbered. To highlight the inspiration which Louis provided Joinville states: 'People say that we would have all been lost that day had it not been for the presence of the king himself.'⁹⁶⁷

Furthermore to dispute Elukin's assertion that, 'the battle of Mansurah confirmed that Louis was fundamentally ineffective on the battlefield,' there is additional evidence from another source to consider.⁹⁶⁸ The provost of the Hospitallers Henry of Ronnay praised Louis' actions that day:

"Oh my lord," said the provost, "you should be greatly comforted for no king of France has ever had such a great honour as has come to you. In order to attack your enemies you swam

⁹⁶⁶ Shirley, J., *Crusader Syria in the Thirteenth Century the Rothelin Continuation of the History of William of Tyre with part of the Eracles or Acre text* (Farnham, 1999), pp. 96-7.

⁹⁶⁷ trans. *Smith*. p. 204; Joinville, p. 286: 'Et dit l'en que nous estions trestous perdus des celle journee ce le cors le roy ne feust.'

⁹⁶⁸ Elukin, 'Warrior or saint?', p. 189.

across a river, you defeated them and ran them from the field, and captured their engines and their tents, in which you will now sleep tonight.”⁹⁶⁹

To suggest Louis surpassed other French kings in honour attained through battle evinced that he displayed prowess and courage in how he fought. This was not hyperbole or sycophancy as Louis himself would have been aware of his own ancestors’ prowess. However, despite Louis’ personal valour because he suffered enormous losses such as the death of his brother and numerous soldiers including those of the Military Orders, it essentially ended the military aspect of the crusade. Consequently, Joinville’s account of Mansurah highlights to the reader that despite this Louis and many other men came out of the battle with honour, and that in the long term, this was the only thing they won that day. For example, Joinville linked honour to the style of warfare enacted, as shown with his description of Louis when he stated: ‘And know that this was a very fine feat of arms, for no one fired either a bow or a crossbow, but rather there were blows of maces and swords from the Turks and our men, who were all ensnarled with each other.’⁹⁷⁰ Stringed weapons were not those used by elite men, they were considered unknightly therefore they were for the lower orders and required less skill to the extent that women could use them when necessary.⁹⁷¹ Swords and maces required training and strength to be used effectively hence why this instance is seen an honourable chivalric style of warfare, because only elite men could use them effectively, proving their exclusivity.

Significantly Joinville concluded his account of the battle by describing those who had either brought shame upon themselves or acted honourably, writing: ‘in this battle there were many supposedly worthy men who shamefully fled ... They took flight in panic, and we could not get

⁹⁶⁹ trans. *Smith*. p.206; Joinville, p. 290: ‘Hé, Sire...vous en ayés bon reconfort: car si grant honneur n’avint onques au roy de France comme il vous est venu, car pour combatre a vos ennemis avze passé une riviére a nou, et les avez desconfiz et chaciez du champ, et gaaigné leur engins et leur herbeges, la ou vous gerrés encoure ennuit.’

⁹⁷⁰ trans. *Smith*. p.202; Joinville, p. 282: ‘Et sachiésque ce fu un tres biau fait d’armes, car nulz n’i traioit ne ‘darc ne d’arbalestre, ainçois estoit le fereis de maces et d’espees des Turs et de nostre gent, qui touz estoient melez.’

⁹⁷¹ David Hay, ‘Arms and Armor’, *Women and gender in medieval Europe: An encyclopedia*, ed. Margaret Schaus (London, 2017), p. 37.

any of them to say with us. I could name several of them, but I will refrain from doing so because they are dead.⁹⁷² From Joinville's account it can be inferred they were not named due to the reputation of their offspring rather than their own reputation. However, Joinville praised others at Mansurah, singling out Guy Mauvoisin writing: 'for he came out of Mansurah honourably... Both he and his men acquitted themselves well that day.'⁹⁷³

5. Captivity

After the debacle at Mansurah and the subsequent deterioration of the crusaders' situation the decision was made to retreat to Damietta on 5 April 1250. It was during this withdrawal that the crusaders were captured by the Islamic forces who were chasing them down. The capture and imprisonment of the crusaders was described graphically by Joinville and provides some of the most evocative moments in the narrative, especially regarding issues of autonomy and honour. This is one of only two accounts of a captive during the crusades giving a first-hand account of their experience.⁹⁷⁴ The imprisonment was short, lasting from 8 April to 6 May 1250. However it is rarely discussed in detail by crusade historians as it does not offer much insight in to the crusade itself. As noted above, it marked an end to the military aspect of the campaign, thus seemingly making it considered not worthy of much discussion. Gaposchkin and Cassidy-Welch have discussed these passages but they focus on Louis and what the text reveals about him, rather than about Joinville.⁹⁷⁵ Elukin contends: 'Louis became the true hero of Joinville's tale during the hardship of imprisonment. As a captive, the king did not have to rely on feats of arms to demonstrate his courage. He could be resolute, pious, and patient in the face of great danger

⁹⁷² trans; *Smith*. p.207; Joinville, p. 292: 'En celle bataille ot moult de gent, et de grant bobant, qui s'en vindrent moult honteusemnet fuiant... et s'enfuirent effreement ne onques n'en peurent nul arester delez nous, dont je en nommerioie bien, des quies je me soufferré, car mort sont.'

⁹⁷³ trans. *Smith*. p.207; Joinville, p. 292: 'car il en vint de la Massourre honorablement... qui ot grant los, il et sa gent, de celle jornee... se prouverent bien.'

⁹⁷⁴ The other being Walter the Chancellor's account after the Battle of the Field of Blood in 1119. Yvonne Friedman, *Encounter between enemies: Captivity and ransom in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Leiden, 2002), p. 105.

⁹⁷⁵ Cecilia Gaposchkin, 'The captivity of Louis IX', *Quaestiones medii aevi novae*, 18, 8 (2013), 5-114; Cassidy-Welch, M., *Imprisonment in the Medieval Religious Imagination, c. 1150-1400* (Basingstoke, 2011), pp. 101-23; For more on captivity during the crusades see: Friedman, *Encounter between enemies*.

and apparent hopelessness.⁹⁷⁶ Since Elukin, like others, solely focused on the representation of Louis in the text, disregarding much of Joinville's own presence, it is worth reiterating that the description of Joinville's experience and Louis's must be read together in order to make full sense of these representations. As a prisoner Joinville was at the mercy of his captors; he could be executed at any time, as he recorded happening to others. Therefore, as we shall see, Joinville's captivity and the fear it induced was an emasculating experience.

The episode of Joinville's capture occurred during the crusaders' retreat by ships down the Nile back to Damietta. Knowing their ships were about to be boarded by the Ayyubids Joinville asked those around him on their thoughts as to what they should do: surrender to the Sultan's galleys or surrender to the Saracens on the land. It was agreed to surrender to the Sultan. However, Joinville reported that his cellarer protested and offered a third option: 'In my opinion we should all allow ourselves to be killed; that way we will all go to Paradise.'⁹⁷⁷ To this Joinville gave the terse response: 'But we didn't pay any attention to him.'⁹⁷⁸ When they were boarded Joinville was captured by a Saracen who claimed Joinville to be the king's cousin. Joinville did not correct him but instead viewed this man as his saviour from certain death.⁹⁷⁹ This whole situation demonstrated that Joinville had social capital and thus value which his cellarer did not. Joinville could avoid death due to being worth a ransom fee, therefore utilising his elite status to avoid being slaughtered. Those of lower status could not, instead they were executed.

After being given a blanket to wear by his captors, Joinville stated: 'because I was afraid and unwell, I began to shake violently.'⁹⁸⁰ This admission of fear in combination with physical frailty is surprising especially for a high status man whose role required him to be strong and

⁹⁷⁶ Elukin, 'Warrior or saint?', p.193.

⁹⁷⁷ trans. Smith, p. 224; Joinville, p. 332: 'Je m'acorde que nous nous lessons touz tuer, si nous en irons touz en paradis.'

⁹⁷⁸ trans. Smith, p. 224; Joinville, p. 332: 'Mez nous ne le creumes pas.'

⁹⁷⁹ Joinville, p. 334.

⁹⁸⁰ trans. Smith, p.226; Joinville, pp.334-36: 'Et lors, pour la poour que je avoie, je commençai a trembler bien fort, et pour la maladie aussi.'

courageous. As earlier discussed Macdonald suggests that examples of nobles being afraid are usually omitted from chronicles.⁹⁸¹ This vulnerability is further emphasised as Joinville explains that he believed he was suffering from an incurable ailment, an abscess in his throat. His people too were convinced he was about to die and began crying. However Joinville's captors reassured them and provided medicine which cured him.⁹⁸² Thus the Ayyubids demonstrated their absolute control over Joinville's life; they could have killed him or left him to die, but on both occasions he was saved, yet not by his own efforts. This served to emphasise Joinville's passivity; he was not acting, he was being acted upon, and was entirely dependent on the mercy of his captors. Joinville described other elite comrades likewise being emasculated by the circumstances. For example:

My lord Ralph of Vanault who was in my company, had his hamstrings cut in the great Shrove Tuesday battle [at Mansurah] and could not stand on his feet. But know that an elderly Saracen knight who was on board the galley would carry him, hanging from his neck to the latrines.⁹⁸³

This must have been a humiliating experience; not only was Ralph incapacitated by injury, but he was reliant on an old man to help him carry out a basic bodily function. There is also an element of infantilization here, which further underlines the debasement of Ralph's masculinity.

Joinville's record of being in captivity was punctuated with instances of fellow prisoners being killed in front of him. As powerful men he and his companions were used to making decisions and having power of life and death over others but were now in the situation of being dependent on their enemies, trusting that their own status would make them valuable enough to save. This can be seen in the following example:

⁹⁸¹ Macdonald, 'Courage, fear', 205-06.

⁹⁸² Joinville, p. 336.

⁹⁸³ trans. *Smith*, p.226; Joinville, p. 336: 'Mon seigneur Raoul de Wanou, qui estoit entour moy, avoit esté esjareté a la grant bataille du quaresme prenant et no pooit ester sur ses piez; et sachiez que un vieil Sarrazin chevalier qui estoit en la galie le portoit aus chambres privess a son col.'

The admiral had me and all the other prisoners who had been captured on the water taken on to the bank of the river. My lord John, my good priest, fainted while they were bringing him out of the galley's hold. They killed him and threw him into the river. His clerk, who also fainted because he had the camp sickness, was struck on the head with a stone bowl. He too was killed and thrown into the river. As they were bringing other sick people out from the galleys where they had been held captive, there were Saracens ready, their swords drawn, to slay those who fell and throw them all into the river. I told them, through my Saracen, that this struck me as a wicked thing to do since it was contrary to the teachings of Saladin, who said that one must not kill any man once one had given him one's bread and salt to eat. In reply I was told that these men were worth nothing since their illness rendered them helpless.⁹⁸⁴

The illness of the prisoners meant that they had no value. Joinville's helplessness here further demonstrates his emasculated status. Despite his best efforts he could not perform his knightly role as a protector of the weak and infirm, he could only watch them die.

Subsequently Joinville recorded being reunited with other high status prisoners, he wrote: 'When I entered there the barons all displayed such joy that you could not hear thing and, praising Our Lord, they said they thought they had lost me.'⁹⁸⁵ However, Joinville's relief was short-lived:

We had hardly been there any time when one of the most high-ranking men there made us all get up, and he led us into another pavilion. The Saracens were holding many knights and

⁹⁸⁴ trans. *Smith*. p.227; Joinville, p. 338: 'l'amiraut me fit descendre et tous les autres prisonniers qui avoient esté pris en l'yaue sur la rive du flum. Endementieres que on trehoit mon seigneur Jehan, mon bon prestre, hors de la soute de la galie, il se pausma, et en le tua et le geta l'en ou flum. Son clerc, qui se pasma aussi pour la maladie de l'ost que il avoit, l'en li geta un mortier sus la teste, et fu mort et le geta l'en ou flum. Tandis que l'en descendoit les autres malades des galies ou il avoient esté en prison, il y avoit gens sarrazins appareillés, les espees toutes nues, que ceulz qui cheoient il les occioient et getoient touz ou flum. Je leur fis dire a mon Sarrazin que il me sembloit que ce n'estoit pas bien fiat, car c'estoit contre les enseignments Salehadinm qui dit que l'en ne doit nul home occire puis que en li avoit donné a manger de son pain et do son sel. Et il me respondi que il ne se pooient aidier pur les maladies qui avoient.'

⁹⁸⁵ trans. *Smith*. p.228; Joinville, p. 340: 'Quant je entrai leans, les barons firent touz si grant joie que en ne pooit goute oïr, et en louoient Nostre Seigneur, et disoient que il me cuidoient avoir perdu.'

other people prisoner in a yard surrounded by an earthen wall. These men were led out from the enclosure in which they had been held, one by one, and the Saracens asked them, “Do you want to renounce your faith?” those who refused to do so were taken to one side and beheaded, while those who reneged were taken to another.⁹⁸⁶

This was performed in front of the high status men as an act of hypermasculinity in order to convince them to agree to the Saracens’ demands of the crusaders handing over castles in Outremer.⁹⁸⁷ However they could not do this as the castles were not theirs to give. It is likely that these executions were not actually a direct threat to Joinville and other high status men because of their ransom value, and so he did not express fear in this situation. However this changed when Joinville reported:

... a large body of men came into our pavilion: young Saracens with swords at their belts. They brought with them a man of great old age, completely white haired, who had asked us whether it was true that we believed in a God who had been taken prisoner for us, was wounded and killed for us, and came back to life on the third day. And we replied, ‘Yes.’ Then he told us that we should not be disheartened if we had suffered persecutions for him. “Because”, he said, “you have not died for him as he died for you. And if he had the power to bring himself back to life, you can be certain that he will free you when he pleases.” Then he went away, and all the other young men after him. I was very glad about this because I had been quite convinced that they had come to cut off our heads. And it was not long after this that the sultan’s men came and told us that the king had negotiated our release.⁹⁸⁸

⁹⁸⁶ trans. *Smith*. p.226; Joinville, p. 340: ‘Nous n’eumes gueres demouré illec quant nous fist lever l’un des plus riches homes qui la feust, et nous mena un autre paveillon. Mout de chevaliers et d’autres gens tenoient les Sarrazins pris en une court qui estoit close de mur de terre. De ce clos ou il les avoient mis les fesoient traire l’un après l’autre, et leur demandoient: “Te weulz tu renoier?” Ceulz qui ne se vouloient renoier, en les fesoit mettre d’une part et copier les testes, et ceulz qui se renoioient d’autre part.’

⁹⁸⁷ Joinville, p. 342.

⁹⁸⁸ trans. *Smith*. p.229; Joinville, p. 342: ‘Maintenant que il s’en furent alez se feri en nostre pavellion une grant tourbe de gent, de joenes Sarrazins, les espees çaintes, et amenoient avec eulz un home de grant viellesce, tout chanu, le quel

This time Joinville expressed fear because his status no longer ensured his survival and he thought he was going to die. This was another instance of hypermasculinity being enacted, but for once in a crusade narrative the crusaders are the victims of the extreme violence. In this case it demonstrated the power held by the Ayyubids over the crusaders asserting their dominance over both them and the situation. Despite this the crusaders showed bravery in holding firm and refusing to give in to the demands despite witnessing the executions. These reprieves at the close point of death continued even after Joinville and the other leading French men had had their release negotiated by Louis. Following their liberation the crusaders had been put on galleys to take them back to Damietta when a group of Muslim soldiers came aboard:

at least thirty of them came on to our galley, drawn swords in their hand and Danish axes hanging at their necks. I asked my lord Baldwin of Ibelin, who knew the Saracens language well, what these men were saying. He replied that they said they had come to cut off our heads.⁹⁸⁹

Some men accepted their fate, beginning to make their final confessions, Joinville says:

...for my part I could not recall any sins I had committed. Instead I was thinking the more I tried to defend myself and the more I tried to escape, the worse it would be for me. And

nouse fist demander se c'estoit voir que nous creions en un Dieu qui avoit esté pris pour nous, navré et mort pour nous, et au tiers jour resuscité; et nous respondimes: "Oÿl." Et lors nous dit que nous ne nous devions pas desconforter se nous avions soufertes cer persecuciones pour li, "car encore," dit il, "n'estes vous pas mort pour li ainsi comme il fu mort pur vous; et se il ot pooir de li resusciter, soiés certain que il vous delivrera quant li plera." Lors s'en ala, et touz les autres joenes gens après li, dont je fu moult lié, car je cuidois certainement que il nous feussent venu les teste trancher. Et ne tarja gueres après quant les gens le soudanc vindrent, qui nous distrent que le roy avoit pourchacié nostre delivrance.' Cassidy-Welch suggests this strange story of the mysterious figure was inserted as 'attempt to give some kind of transcendent religious meaning to the capture and chaos. Cassidy-Welch, *Imprisonment*, p. 120.

⁹⁸⁹ trans. *Smith*. p.233; Joinville, p. 352: 'Il en vindrent bien .XXX., les espees toutes nues es mains a nostre galie et au coul les haches danoises. Je demandai a mon seigneur Baudouyn d'Ibelin qui savoit bien le sarrazinnois, que celle gent disoient; et il me respondi que il disoient que il nous venoient les testes trancher.'

then I signed my self with the cross and knelt at the feet of one of the Saracens who held a carpenter's Danish axe, and said, "Thus died Saint Agnes."⁹⁹⁰

Joinville, seemingly believing this was his time to face the executioner, described Guy of Ibelin kneeling beside him and confessing his sins to him. Joinville as the makeshift confessor absolved him but then wrote: 'when I got up from that spot I could not remember anything that he had said or told me.'⁹⁹¹ The lapse of his memory was probably due to the fear of his imminent death. However Joinville then reported:

'They made us get up from where we were and imprisoned us in the galley's hold; many of our people thought they had done this because they did not want to attack us all together, but rather to kill us one by one. We stayed there in a miserable condition all that night; we were lying so close together that my feet were touching the good Count Peter of Brittany and his were right next to my face.'⁹⁹²

This can be seen as having been a very demeaning experience for Joinville and the other high status men.

Eventually Joinville and his fellow captives were released but this experience of captivity entailed a loss of what defined him and others as elite men. They were stripped of autonomy, agency and control over themselves and others. They were vulnerable and at the mercy of their captors who used their leverage and dominance to mentally and physically torture the crusaders. Whilst the crusade was a form of penitential warfare and thus Joinville's suffering was of spiritual value, his

⁹⁹⁰ trans. *Smith*, p.233; Joinville, p. 352: 'Mes endroit de moy, ne me souvint onques de pechié que j'eusse fait, ainçois m'apensai que quant plus me deffenderoie et plus me ganchiroie, et pis me vauroit. Et lors me seignai et m'agemoillai au pié de l'un d'eulz, qui tenoit une hache danoise a charpentie, et dies: "Ainsi mourut saint Agnès." For thirteenth century perceptions of St Agnes see her entry in the Golden Legend: Jacobus of Voragine, *The Golden Legend* vol. I, trans. William Granger Ryan (Princeton, 1993), pp. 101-04.

⁹⁹¹ Joinville, p. 352.

⁹⁹² trans. *Smith*, p.233; Joinville, p. 354: 'Il nous firent lever de la ou nous estions et nous mistrent en prison en la sente de la galie; et cuiderent moult de nostre gent que il l'eussent fait pour ce que il ne nous voudroient pas assaillir touz ensemble, mes pour nous tuer l'un après l'autre. Leans fumes a tel mischief le soir, tout soir, que nous gisions si a estroit que mes piez estoient endroit le bon conte Perron de Bretaingne, et les siens estoient endroit le mien visage.'

imprisonment was clearly a shameful experience. However, imprisonment did not have the same impact upon Louis.

Joinville was not with Louis during the king's captivity but he tells us the king told him about his experience when they were at sea sailing from Egypt to Acre.⁹⁹³ Louis was shown to be calm and resolute in front of his captors. This demonstrated both his exemplary fortitude and the exceptional holiness that sanctified him. Cassidy-Welch believes his prison account was included in Joinville's work and other hagiographical texts related to the king because it was further evidence of his sanctity.⁹⁹⁴ But it also demonstrated that unlike Joinville and the other men Louis was not emasculated by imprisonment, instead his conduct here further emphasised his manliness.

First Joinville recounted that Louis was threatened with a leg breaking device. Louis responded to this by saying that he was 'their prisoner and they could do what they liked with him. When they saw that they could not prevail over the good king with threats, they went back to him and asked him how much money he was willing to give the sultan.'⁹⁹⁵ Louis' refusal to show fear towards his captors' threats demonstrated bravery and self-mastery. This incident was included not just to show Louis' sanctity but also to show the audience how they should act in such a situation: a king must have faith and show no fear because he is above other men. Moreover, Louis' calm bravery also achieves a practical result: unable to scare him with the threat of torture his captors do not carry out the threat, which is thus shown to be empty, but instead open negotiations.

⁹⁹³ Joinville, p. 404.

⁹⁹⁴ Cassidy-Welch, *Imprisonment*, p. 122.

⁹⁹⁵ trans. *Smith*. p. 230; Joinville, pp. 344-46: 'leur respondi le roy que il estoit leur prisonnier et que il pouoient fere de li leur volenté. Quant il virent que il ne pourroient vaincre le bon roy par menaces, si revindrent a li et li demanderent combien il vouldroit donner au soudanc d'argent...'

Louis' composed reaction to extreme violence continued. Another example occurred during the coup against sultan Turan Shah, who was killed by some of his own mamluks.⁹⁹⁶ This was done in front of the captive crusaders. Joinville recorded:

One of the knights who was called Faracataye, slit him [Turan] open with his sword and pulled the heart from his chest. Then he came to the king, his hand all bloody, and said to him, "what will you give me? for I have killed your enemy for you, who would have put you to death had he lived." But the king gave no reply.⁹⁹⁷

They had tried to shock and intimidate Louis with both these episodes, but Louis maintained his poise and did not react in either case. Although Joinville does not say so explicitly, the hagiographic framing of the text implies that Louis' sanctity helps to explain this. Louis' personal piety and religious devotion, as established at length by Joinville, implies that suffering at the hands of his tormentors would have been viewed by Louis as a welcome test of his resolve and a form of *imitatio Christi*.

Louis' behaviour whilst a prisoner impressed his captors even to the point of Joinville recording that they were going to offer him the position of Sultan of Egypt after the coup against Turan Shah. But Louis' strict adherence to his faith was too much for them to endure, for example Joinville tells us they complained that every time Louis left his lodgings he lay on the ground in the shape of the cross and then crossed his whole body, and they feared that as sultan he would force them all to become Christians or else have them killed.⁹⁹⁸ Gaposchkin doubts that Louis or Joinville took this offer seriously.⁹⁹⁹ However, Joinville's purpose in stating it was to show Louis' exceptionality and intense piety through the eyes of his enemies. This is a classic trope of crusade

⁹⁹⁶ See Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 797.

⁹⁹⁷ trans; *Smith*, p. 233; Joinville, p. 352: 'L'un des chevalliers, qui avoit a non Faraquatayem le fendi de s'espee et li osta le cuer du ventre. Et lors il en vint au roy, sa main toute ensanglantee, et li dit: "Que me donras tu, que je t'ai occis ton ennemi qui t'eust mort se il eust vescu?" Et le roy ne li respondi inques riens.'

⁹⁹⁸ Joinville, pp. 358-60.

⁹⁹⁹ Gaposchkin, 'The captivity of Louis IX', p. 97.

narratives, as was discussed in Chapter Two regarding Saladin's speech in the *Itinerarium*, and Chapter Four about Clari's use of the other giving approval to crusaders' actions.¹⁰⁰⁰ Consequently it does not matter whether or not this was a genuine offer from his Muslim captors, or whether Louis believed it to be so. Louis' behaviour in captivity and towards his enemies was part of what made him a saint but it also demonstrated his adherence to standards of kingly masculinity. He did not lose his manhood in the situation unlike Joinville and the other nobles. Joinville's account highlights that his own lived masculinity was vulnerable to both physical and emotional attack. But Louis' masculinity was not. Thus the text underlines both Louis' hegemonic status and Joinville's subordinate position in relation to him, not just because Louis was king, but because Louis was the absolute embodiment of manly virtues.

Louis' exceptionality was further evidenced upon the crusaders release when he refused to cheat the Muslims out of the money he had promised them for his release.¹⁰⁰¹ As already stated Louis was adamant that a man must honour his word and speak with honourable intentions. Louis took an oath to make this payment however some of his counsel had told him not to hand over the money until his brother, the count of Poitiers, had been returned in exchange. Louis disagreed with this assessment clearly perceiving it was a matter of honour that he should fulfil his promise. Later Philip of Nemours announced that he had withheld 10,000 livres in payment from the Saracens, Joinville recorded Louis' reaction:

the king was very angry and said he wanted us to return the 10,000 livres to the Saracens, because he had promised to pay them 200,000 livres before he left the river. Then I [stepped] on my lord Philip's foot and told the king not to believe him, that what my lord Philip said was not true since the Saracen's were the world's greatest cheats in such

¹⁰⁰⁰ See Chapter Two, pp. 120-21 and Chapter Four, p. 211.

¹⁰⁰¹ Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, p. 138.

transactions. My lord Philip said I was right and that he had only spoken in jest. The king said it was an ill-judged sort of joke.¹⁰⁰²

Louis refused to board his boat until all the money had been handed over to the Saracens even though many had advised him against this. When it was fully paid off Louis declared himself to be free of the oath he made.¹⁰⁰³ Here Louis was presented as exceptional and virtuous because he was acting honourably with an enemy and not trying to cheat them like Philip of Nemours. Louis' interaction with the enemy saw him maintaining both his autonomy and sense of honour thereby demonstrating his continued embodiment of manliness. This was in contrast to Joinville and the other nobles who either failed at one of these attributes or both. This is why Louis was held in high esteem by Joinville and why he was a saint.

6. Remaining in the Holy Land

Honour and shame were used by Joinville to frame the decision by Louis to remain in the Holy Land. Modern historians have tried to understand Louis' decision and the reasons behind it. Tyerman suggests that it was shame or embarrassment of returning to France that caused him to stay in the Holy Land.¹⁰⁰⁴ Meanwhile Asbridge thinks shame would have caused Louis to have quietly left and returned home, instead he believes Louis remained to ensure captive crusaders would be released.¹⁰⁰⁵ Joinville described how this decision was reached, in June 1250, whilst the crusaders were in Acre. He recorded the barons telling Louis, through their spokesman Guy Mauvoisin: 'My lord, your brothers and the great men here have considered your situation and have concluded that, for your own honour and that of your kingdom, you cannot remain in this

¹⁰⁰² trans. *Smith*, p. 241; Joinville, p. 272: 'Et le Roy se courrouça trop fort et dit que il vouloit que en leur rendist les .X. mile livres, pour ce que il leur avoit couvent a paier les .CC. mile livres avant que il partisist du flum. Et lors je passe mon siegneur Phelippe sus le pié, et dis au roy qu'il ne le creust pas, car il ne disoit pas voir, car les Sarrazins estoient les plus forceurs qui feussent ou monde; et mon seigneur Phelippe dit que je disoie voir, car il ne le disoit que par moquerie. Et le roy dit que male encontre eust tele moquerie.'

¹⁰⁰³ Joinville, p. 372.

¹⁰⁰⁴ Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 798.

¹⁰⁰⁵ Asbridge, *The Crusades*, p. 607.

country ... So they advise you to go to France.’¹⁰⁰⁶ This was because they believed they did not have enough of a military force to achieve their objectives, which would be dishonourable for Louis. However in contrast Joinville believed that leaving was not the honourable thing to do, he argued back to Guy:

It is said, my lord – I do not know if it is true – that the king has not yet spent any of his money, but only the clergy’s money. So, the king should put his own money to use and send for knights from Morea and from overseas. When they hear that the king is offering sure and generous payments, knights will come from all parts. In this way he could, please God, sustain the campaign for a year. If he were to stay the poor prisoners who were taken captive in God’s service and his own might be released. They will never be set free if the king goes.¹⁰⁰⁷

By implication Joinville here is accusing Louis of not being liberal with his money, an unmanly trait. Other possible implications were of greediness and avarice but he did not accuse the king directly.

Joinville then described being worried that he had shamed Louis as after this Louis would not speak to him during meals, he despaired: ‘I really thought he was angry with me because I had said that he had not yet spent any of his own money, and that he should be spending it freely.’¹⁰⁰⁸

However, later the king came to Joinville leaning on his shoulders and placing his hands on his head, he said:

¹⁰⁰⁶ trans. *Smith*, p.250; Joinville, p. 392: ‘Sire, voz freres et les riches hommes qui ci sont ont regardéa vostre estat, et ont veu que vous n’avez pooir de demourer en cest pais a l’onneur de vous ne de vostre regne... Si vous loent il, sire, que vous en alez en France...’

¹⁰⁰⁷ trans. *Smith*, pp.250-251; Joinville, p. 394: ‘... L’en dit, sire, je ne sai se c’est voir, que le roy n’a encore despendu nulz de ses deniers, ne mes que des deniers aus clers. Si metter le roy ses deniers en despense, et envoit le roy querre chevaliers en la Moree et outre mer. Et quant l’en orra nouvelles que le roy donne bien et largement, chevaliers li venront de toutes pars, par quoy il pourra tenir heberges dedans un an, se Dieu plet; et par sa demouree seront delivrez le povres prisonniers qui ont esté pris ou servise Dieu et ou sien, qui jamés n’en istront se li roys s’en va.’

¹⁰⁰⁸ trans. *Smith*, p.251; Joinville, p. 396: ‘et je cuidoie vraiment que il feust courroucié a moy pour ce que je dis que il n’avoit encoire despendu nulz de ses deniers, et que il despendist largement.’

“I’d like to ask you how a young man like you is so brave as to dare to recommend my staying against all the great and wise men of France, who are urging me to go.” “My lord,” I said, “even if I had wickedness in my heart I would not for any price have advised you to do so.” “Do you mean,” he said, “that I would be doing wrong if I were to leave?” “Yes my lord, so help me God,” and he asked me, “if I were to stay, will you stay?” I told him, “yes, if I can, at either my own expense or someone else’s.” “Then be completely at ease,” he said, “for I’m grateful to you for your advice. But don’t tell anyone that.”¹⁰⁰⁹

This instance has been described by Housley as Joinville being ‘unafraid to speak his mind to the king, a quality which Louis firmly respected.’¹⁰¹⁰ Smith suggests Joinville was trying to present himself as a young rebel speaking out against the mature majority like Roland from *La Chanson de Roland*.¹⁰¹¹ Joinville was twenty-six at the time, ten years Louis’ junior. It seems odd that Louis would have to be schooled by Joinville in what would be right for him to do in this situation and the fact that Louis apparently tells him not to tell anyone about the exchange, might call its reliability into question. But due to the closeness of their relationship it is not entirely implausible. Nonetheless it reinforced the point Joinville wished to make which was that it was shameful to leave the Holy Land in Islamic hands. Louis agreed with him on this, it was others that needed convincing.

There were some instances in which Joinville seemed to consider Louis’ behaviour as dishonourable. The first involved his lack of concern for his wife, Margaret, who had just given birth, in autumn of 1253. Louis was waiting for Joinville to give him a report about the queen

¹⁰⁰⁹ trans. Smith, p.252; Joinville, p. 398: “Tenez vous tout quoy; car je vous weil demander comment vous feustes si hardi que vous, qui estes un joennes hons, m’osates loer ma demouree encontre touz les grans hommes et les sages de France, qui me looient m’alee. – Sire, fis je, se je, avoie la mauvestié en mon cuer, si ne vous loeroie je a nul fuer que vous la feissiés. – Dites vous, fist il, que je feroie que mauvaiz se je m’en aloie? -Si m’aïst Diex, Sire, fis je oïl.” Et il me dit: “Se je demeire, demourrez vous?” Et je li dis que oï, “se je puis ne du mien ne de l’autrui. – Or soiés tout aise, dit il, car je vous sai moult bon gré de ce que vous m’avez loé; mes ne le dites a nullui.”

¹⁰¹⁰ Housley, *The Crusaders*, pp. 98-100.

¹⁰¹¹ Smith, *Crusading*, p. 69.

and the children rather than inquiring in person. Joinville expressed his frustration at Louis stating directly to his audience:

I am telling you these things because I had already spent five years with him, and never yet had I heard him speak about the queen or the children to me or anyone else. And it seems to me that his conduct was not becoming, to be so distant from his wife and his children.¹⁰¹²

Joinville accused Louis of failing in his roles of father and husband, although it is not certain whether he confronted Louis about this since he does not say so. What is clear is that he disapproved. Louis was acting monk-like in a certain respect but he was not a monk, he was a married layman. This seemed to be the crux of Joinville's complaint. There was a need for Louis to act as both a father and husband displaying correct forms of affection whilst also being pious and trying to win divine favour, but these properties had to be balanced which Louis was failing to achieve.

The final criticism of Louis was his response to his mother's death. Louis told Joinville his mother Queen Blanche had died during the spring of 1253, to which Joinville asserted this was a natural occurrence. He told Louis directly:

I am surprised that you, a man of good sense, have demonstrated such great sadness. For you know that the wise man says that a man should not allow whatever distress he has in his heart to appear on his face, because he who does so makes his enemies happy and his friends upset.¹⁰¹³

¹⁰¹² trans. *Smith*. p.294; Joinville, p. 500: 'Et ces choses vous ramentoif je pour ce que j'avoie ja esté .V. ans entour li, que encore ne m'avoit il parlé de la royne ne des enfans, que je oïsse, ne a autrui; et ce n'estoit pas bone maniere, si comme il me semble, d'estre strange de sa femme et de ses enfans.'

¹⁰¹³ trans. *Smith*. p.296; Joinville, p. 504: "...Me je me merueille pas, fis je, que vous qui estes un sage home, avez mené sj grant deul. Car vous savez que le Sage dit que mesaise que l'omme ait ou cuer ne li doit paroir ou visage; car cil qui le fet en fet liez ses ennemis et en mesaise ses amis."

Joinville is reminding Louis that, as a man, he should be able to exercise self-mastery at all times, no matter what he experiences. Joinville believed that the king as the leading man in the nation should not acknowledge such emotions openly. We might ask whether this is a fair comment from Joinville, criticising Louis for a lack of affection for his wife, then criticising him for having too much affection for his mother. Joinville himself seemed to believe Louis' mother was a harsh woman and even told Margaret, upon seeing her cry over Blanche's death: 'For it is the woman whom you most hated who is dead, and yet you show such grief.'¹⁰¹⁴ Joinville's proximity to Margaret could explain his position on Louis' apparent lack of care for her. But the key point is the importance of moderation in both cases.

These acts which called Louis' manliness into question did not need to be mentioned by Joinville. He could have skipped over them, therefore their inclusion served a purpose in relation to the text's status as a mirror for princes. These episodes revealed Louis to be fallible in some respects, underlining that successful kingship required the balance of many essential attributes, such as being a leader who could make unpopular decisions if made for the right cause, or even showing concern for his wife and children despite the pressures of overseeing such an endeavour as leading a crusade.

7. Homosociality

Joinville's interactions with Louis demonstrated their homosocial relationship and reinforced the notion of Joinville's subordinate masculinity in relation to Louis' hegemony. This played a central role within the text and Joinville actually charts his relationship with Louis from its birth demonstrating the close ties between the two men. This in effect gave Joinville the authority to convey a didactic message about kingship to his intended audience, the future Louis X, while his

¹⁰¹⁴ trans. *Smith*. p.296; Joinville, p. 506: 'Car ce estoit la femme que vous plus haiés qui est morte et vous en menez tel deul.'

personal testimony helped support the case for Louis' sanctity. Therefore these interactions play an important function within the text.

Joinville described seeing the king, possibly for the first time, in June 1241 after Louis had knighted some men including his own brother Alphonse. In a feast held in the great hall at Samaur in Anjou Joinville recollected serving other elite men in the presence of the king, notably telling us he carved meat for the king of Navarre.¹⁰¹⁵ Knights serving each other at the table was done to foster strong homosocial bonds in this period and was an integral part of demonstrating their superiority over other men.¹⁰¹⁶ Honourable men served other honourable men, because, as Lewis explains that there was honour in serving a great man and being subordinate to him.¹⁰¹⁷ A king's personal servants were themselves high status men, thus making it an honourable position to have.

Eating together as a homosocial act recurs throughout Joinville's narrative. At one point, shortly after arriving at Acre in 1250, Joinville recalls Louis rebuking him. He wrote:

When I was ready – a good four days after our arrival – I went to see the king. He scolded me and told me that I had been wrong to delay so long in seeing him. He ordered that, since I valued his love so dearly, I should eat with him each morning and evening without fail, until such time as he had decided what we were to do, whether to return to France or not.¹⁰¹⁸

¹⁰¹⁵ Joinville, p. 202.

¹⁰¹⁶ Bennett, 'Military masculinity', pp.73-74.

¹⁰¹⁷ Lewis, *Kingship and Masculinity*, p. 121.

¹⁰¹⁸ trans. *Smith*, p.247; Joinville, p. 386: 'Quant je me fu areé, bien .IIII. jours après ce que nous fumes venuz, je alai veoir le roy; et m'enchoisonna et me dit que je n'avoie pas bien fet quant je avoie tant tardé a le veior; et me commenda si chier comme j'avoie s'amour, que magasse avec li adés et au soir et au main, jusques a tant que il eust areé que nous ferions, ou d'aler en France ou de demourer.'

Joinville's failure to interact with Louis was deemed dishonourable, a slight towards the king. The story also reinforced Joinville's close relationship with the king and thus, again, his authority as clearly he was very special to Louis.

On one occasion Louis asked what it would cost to retain Joinville in his service, to which Joinville gave a revealing response:

I told him I did not want him to give me any more money than he had done already but that I wanted to make a different bargain with him. "Since you get angry when you are asked for something," I said, "I want you to agree that if I ask for something from you during this year, you will not get angry." Hearing this he began to laugh out loud and said that he would retain me on these terms. He took me by the hand and led me over to the legate and his council and told them about the bargain we had struck. They were very happy about this because I was the richest man in the army.¹⁰¹⁹

Multiple meanings of rich and powerful are used here by Joinville; whichever intention he wished to convey they both signalled his elitism in comparison to others. This brought honour to Joinville and here he seems to be bragging about his close relationship with Louis. The benefits of intimate association with a hegemonic man were not just material but could also enhance a subordinate man's reputation.

In addition to his relationship with Louis Joinville had to maintain his own household of knights whilst on crusade and in the Holy Land. These homosocial bonds were crucial in maintaining his

¹⁰¹⁹ trans. *Smith*, p.269; Joinville, p. 442: 'Et je li dis que je ne vouloie que il me donnast plus de ses deniers que ce que il m'avoit donné, mes je vouloie fere un autre marché a li. "Pour ce, fis je, que vous vous couroucies quant l'en vous requiert aucune chose, si weil je que vous m'aiés couvenant que se je vous requier aucune chose toute ceste annee, que vous ne vous courrouciés pas; et se vous me refusés, je ne me courroucerai pas." Quant il oï ce, si commença a rire moult clerement et me dit que il me retenoit par tel couvenant, et me prist par la main et me mena par devers le legat et vers son conseil, et leur recorda le marché que nous avions fait; et en furent moult lié pour ce que je estoie le plus riche qui feust en l'ost.'

honour. For example he recalled ensuring his men were treated with courtesy when they dined with him, regarding drinking he said:

I bought a least a hundred barrels of wine, and I always had the best one drunk first. I diluted the valet's wine with water and that of the squires with less water. At my own table my knights were provided with a large flask of water, and they diluted the wine as they pleased.¹⁰²⁰

The difference in social standing is marked out by how strong men's wine can be. But the incident also tells us that Joinville wanted to be honourable by supplying his men with fine wine and ensuring that they would never go without. Within this sub-group of knights this made him the hegemonic male, drinking was an important form of social interaction, which he had to undertake in order to maintain this position.¹⁰²¹ It is noteworthy that in this homosocial grouping there is still a strict hierarchy. It could be deemed that knights were allowed to dilute their wine as they wished because they had attained full manhood; they had the status and physique that allowed them to drink it neat if they wished. Those below who have no choice in their dilution had not attained full manhood and thus are managed by those above them. It also maintained a social distinction determined by gender.

Finally Joinville recorded a story of kindness that further demonstrated the mutually supportive bonds between knights. It involved a feast Joinville hosted at Sidon on All Saints' Day 1253. Joinville says a poor knight came there with his wife and four sons. After the dinner was finished he called the rich men together and said: 'Let's do a really good deed and remove the burden of

¹⁰²⁰ trans. *Smith*, p.270; Joinville, p. 444: 'Et achetoie bien .C. tonniaus de vin, et fesoie touz jours boire le meilleur avant; et fesoie tremper le vin aus vallés d'yaue, et ou vin des escuiers moin d'yaue; a ma table servoit l'en devant mes chevaliers d'une grant phiole de vin et d'une grant phiole d'yaue, si le temproient si comme il vouloient.'

¹⁰²¹ Karras discusses drinking and its role in developing and maintaining homosocial bonds: Karras, *From Boys to Men*, pp. 95-97; p. 143.

his children from this man. If each one of you will take one, so will I.¹⁰²² The poor knight could not afford to raise these children and thus the richer knights stepped in. Joinville described the man's reaction: 'when the poor knight saw this he and wife began to weep with joy.'¹⁰²³ This incident was an act of charity and largesse. Charity, largesse and other communal interactions were vital for how Joinville maintained social bonds with other knights and men of his status. Moreover, this showed his own leadership abilities and was a chance for him to relate the ideals of knighthood and what made knights superior to other men of lower social status. In the instance of the 'adopted' boy there is a sense that Joinville and his comrades acknowledged their social exclusivity. Although the man with too many children to look after is a knight his financial situation restricts his ability to ensure his children can maintain this status. Therefore Joinville and the others are upholding these young boys' position, recognising their social distinction from others and ensuring this is maintained. Joinville followed up the story with the progress of the child he chose saying that years later when they reunited he found out he had indeed become a knight: 'The young man could barely tear himself away from me. He said to me 'My lord, may God reward you, for it was you who placed me in the honourable position.'¹⁰²⁴ Joinville reported that he knew nothing of the other three brothers' fate, which may imply that only he had carried out his responsibility fully. Significantly the reason for this vignette's inclusion may be, as Smith argues, because Joinville's work was a celebration of thirteenth-century knightly values that Joinville believed were now lacking in the fourteenth century, at the point when his account was finished.¹⁰²⁵ This possibility further enhances the status of Joinville's text as a guide to ideal kingship and masculinity.

¹⁰²² trans. *Smith*, p.294; Joinville, p. 500: 'Feson une grant aumosne et deschargons cest povre d'omme de ces enfans; et preinge chascun le sien, et je en prenai un.'

¹⁰²³ trans. *Smith*, p.294; Joinville, p. 500: 'Quant le povre chevalier vit ce, il et sa femme, il commencerent a plorer de joie.'

¹⁰²⁴ trans. *Smith*, p.294; Joinville, p. 500: 'a peine se pooit departir de moy, et me disoit: "Sire, Dieu le vous rende, car a cest honneur m'avez vous mis."'

¹⁰²⁵ Smith, *Crusading*, p. 54.

8. Dishonour

Joinville criticised behaviour he deemed shameful throughout his narrative. In general most of these episodes involved behaviour that was the antithesis of ideal masculinity. These instances often involved unnamed perpetrators sometimes in order to publicly shame them but these *exempla* also needed to be exposed and reported in order to produce better behaviour for the audience of his work.

Some men could not live up to the ideals that they were supposed to embody. For example Joinville shamed a knight who was caught in a brothel. This instance took place at Caesarea where Louis was sitting as judge. Joinville tells us that ‘in accordance with the custom of the country’ the knight had to choose between two punishments.¹⁰²⁶ Joinville explained:

either the prostitute would lead him through the camp by a cord tied around his genitals while he was wearing just his chemise, or he would lose his horse and his armour and be expelled from the camp. The knight surrendered his horse and armour to the king and left the camp.¹⁰²⁷

This interesting vignette and the punishment here is similar to others used in the Midi in France during this period, in which a naked couple would have to run through a town tied together, sometimes involving beatings.¹⁰²⁸ John Arnold suggests that this form of public shaming for adulterers known as *la course* was unique to this area, which suggest the laws of the Midi were being enacted in the Kingdom of Jerusalem by Louis.¹⁰²⁹ The fact that the knight gave up his position in Louis’ entourage in order to prevent a public shaming is quite telling. This suggests

¹⁰²⁶ trans. *Smith*, p.270; Joinville, p. 446: ‘... selonc les usages du païs.’

¹⁰²⁷ trans. *Smith*, p.270; Joinville, p. 446: ‘Le jeu parti fu tel, ou que la ribaude le menroit par ‘ost en chemise, une corde liee au genetaires, ou il perdroit son cheval et s’armeure, et le chaceroit l’en de l’ost. Le chevalier lessa son cheval au roy et s’armeure, et s’en ala de l’ost.’

¹⁰²⁸ John Arnold, ‘Sexualité et déshonneur dans le Midi (XIIIe-XIVe siècles): Les péchés de la chair et l’opinion collective’, *Cahiers de Fanjeaux*, 52 (2019), p. 308. I am very grateful to John Arnold for giving me a copy of this essay before its publication.

¹⁰²⁹ Arnold, ‘Sexualité et déshonneur’, p. 308.

he felt that the dishonour involved in being publicly shamed in this fashion could not be overcome. Arnold suggests *la course* was scarcely administered in reality and a fine was an alternative punishment.¹⁰³⁰ That would seem to be the case here although a loss of status was prescribed rather than a cash payment.

Being made an example of to such a degree would surely have been intended to prevent other elite males, who should have known better, from going to brothels. Since it is only one example it is difficult to project this instance on to other men and the options they would have taken in such circumstances. Would they have done the same or opted for public humiliation? The link to chastity and crusading was certainly an important aspect of how elite men should act whilst on crusade.¹⁰³¹

Another case that Joinville discussed about honour involved an anonymous group of men suffering divine retribution for their behaviour. Joinville recorded that whilst hearing mass on Shrove Tuesday 1250 for Hugh of Landricourt who had been killed:

Six of my knights were leaning against a number of sacks full of barley. Because they were talking loudly in my chapel and were disturbing the priest, I went to tell them to be quiet, and said it was a disgraceful thing for knights and gentlemen to talk while Mass was being sung. And they began to mock me and said, laughing, that they were arranging a new marriage for Hugh of Landricourt's wife. I scolded them and told them that such words were neither right nor seemly, and that they had forgotten their companion too hastily. And God's vengeance on them was such that the following day was the battle of Shrove

¹⁰³⁰ Arnold, 'Sexualité et déshonneur', p. 316.

¹⁰³¹ Mesley, 'Episcopal authority', p. 110.

Tuesday, in which they were all either killed or mortally wounded. Thus the wives of all six needed to remarry.¹⁰³²

These men were acting dishonourably as they held no respect for the dead man nor the religious service going on around them. Their thoughts and behaviour suggested an undertone of sexual immorality and Joinville ascribed divine intervention as bringing forth their downfall. The main factor of shameful behaviour cannot be pinpointed from Joinville's story: was it the fact they were at mass? That they had broken a homosocial rule through discussing the wife of a comrade? Their disrespect to his memory or the mocking of Joinville? All were shameful and indicative of immorality and unmanliness, and this anecdote demonstrates what happened to those who did not respect homosocial norms.

To Joinville apostasy was a category of shameful behaviour because it involved a rejection of oaths and pledges. Rejecting Christianity was deemed unacceptable under any circumstances and it is not difficult to see why when crusading ideology centred on the defence of Christianity and the willingness to die for this cause. The high praise for martyrdom affirms this. Likewise knighthood itself was deemed a form of Christian vocation according to Maurice Keen.¹⁰³³ Moreover Richard Kaeuper asserts knights saw their role during this period as defenders of Christendom and enforced it with their swords, a role that was jointly negotiated between themselves and the clergy.¹⁰³⁴ Therefore apostasy can be viewed as a rejection of two identities: the social role and the spiritual one. Robert Swanson states that apostates incurred a social death in the Middle Ages and usually apostasy only occurred following military defeat or capture,

¹⁰³² trans. *Smith*, p. 219; Joinville, p. 322: 'La ou il estoit en biere en ma chapelle, .VI. de mes chevaliers estoient apuiez sus plusieurs saz pleins d'orge; et pour ce que il parloient haut en ma chapelle et que il faisoient noise au prestre, je luer alai dire que il se teussent, et leur dis que vileine chose estoit de chevaliers et de gentilz homes qui parloient tandis que l'en chantoit la messe. Et il me commencierent a rire et me distrent en riant que il li remarieroient sa femme. Et je les enchoisonnai et leur dis que tiex paroles n'estoient ne bones ne beles, et que tost avoient oublié leur compaignon. Et Dieu en fist tel vengeance que l'endemain fu la grant bataille du quaeresme prenant, dont il furent mort ou navrez a mort, par quoy il ocuvint leur femmes remarier toutes .VI.'

¹⁰³³ Keen, *Chivalry*, p. 49.

¹⁰³⁴ Kaeuper, *Medieval Chivalry*, Ch. 9 but especially p. 308.

mainly because it involved the threat of death.¹⁰³⁵ To all Christians of various social status during this period it was more honourable to die for one's faith than shamefully reject it. When apostasy resulted it was never justifiable on rational or theological grounds thus in relation to the Seventh Crusade it was framed by Joinville as being motivated by worldly considerations. For example, Joinville described Louis encountering a man who was working for the Ayyubids but could speak French. Described as being, 'a very well dressed and very handsome Saracen,' he presented Louis with milk and flowers and spoke to him in French.¹⁰³⁶ Joinville records: 'the king asked him where he had learned French and he said that he had been a Christian. "Be gone with you," said the king, "I'll not speak to you anymore!"'¹⁰³⁷ Clearly Louis detested apostasy more than anything else, especially as he was known as a fervent converter of non-Christian into Christians, and because this man spoke French he may have thought he had the chance to convert him. Instead finding someone who had joined the enemy was disgraceful to him.¹⁰³⁸

Joinville took the man to one side to find out his story. The man claimed to have been born in Provins, France and had come to the Egypt with King John of Brienne on what was the Fifth Crusade. He had remained in Egypt married and was now 'an important and wealthy man.'¹⁰³⁹ Joinville asked him directly: 'Don't you understand that if you were to die in this condition you'd be damned and go to Hell?' The man affirmed that he did, but then said he could not go back to the Christian side because he feared 'poverty and reproach', and that he preferred to 'live rich and at ease' rather than put himself in that position.¹⁰⁴⁰ The factor of the crusade being a form of penitential suffering also amplified this man's weakness as this episode came immediately after the crusaders had undergone their imprisonment. They had suffered and could have given in and

¹⁰³⁵ Robert Swanson, *Religion and Devotion in Europe, c.1215-c.1515* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 263.

¹⁰³⁶ trans. *Smith*, pp. 242-3; Joinville, p. 376: 'un Sarrazin molt bien attiré et moult bel home.'

¹⁰³⁷ trans. *Smith*, p. 243; Joinville, p. 376: 'Et le roi li demanda ou il avoit apris françois et il dit que il avoit esté crestian; et le roy li dit: "Alez vous en, que a vous ne parlerai je plus!"'

¹⁰³⁸ For his zeal of converting non-Christians see: Michael Lower, 'Conversion and St Louis's Last Crusade', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 58, 2 (2007), 211-31. More recently on his conversions of Muslims: William Chester Jordan, *The Apple of His Eye: Converts From Islam in the Reign of Louis IX* (Princeton, 2019).

¹⁰³⁹ trans. *Smith*, p. 243; Joinville, p. 376: 'grant riche home.'

¹⁰⁴⁰ trans. *Smith*, p. 243; Joinville, p. 376: "'Ne savez vous pas bien que se vous mourrés en ce point, que vous seriez damné et iriez en enfer?" ... "le povreté ... le reproche... riche et aise..."'

renounced their faith, especially when threatened with execution, but they did not unlike the apostate before Louis. These reasons were deemed shameful by Joinville; clearly it was more honourable to suffer than turn one's back on Christianity. This was also encapsulated in a further instance of apostasy discussed. This time Joinville was talking to the admiral who had captured his men in early April 1250 on the Nile. When Joinville was being moved to prison the admiral announced that Joinville's sailors had renounced their faith. Joinville responded:

said that he should not have any confidence in them, for just as swiftly as they had abandoned us so would they abandon the Saracens, if they saw a time and place to do so. And the admiral replied that he agreed with me, for Saladin said that one never saw a bad Christian become a good Saracen, nor a bad Saracen become a good Christian.¹⁰⁴¹

These men as sailors had no ransom value and they had presumably converted because the only other option would have been death. We can assume that Joinville would have preferred them to have chosen the latter. Additionally the fact that Joinville and his enemy agreed on converts not being the most reliable of people suggests that these elite men of different background shared a certain commonality of behavioural standards. This was because converts could not be trusted to keep their word, which was essential for how elite men were judged. As already shown Louis refused to lie and break promises to his enemies and criticised his men who had tried to cheat his enemies, this was why he was angry at the apostate because this was even worse behaviour.

Thus maintaining honour and avoiding shame were integral to the performance of elite masculinity within Joinville's narrative. This dictated how men acted or at least should act. Honour should be forefront in their considerations whilst the use of shame was explicitly

¹⁰⁴¹ trans. *Smith*. p. 227; Joinville, p. 338: 'et je li dis que il n'eust ja fiance en eulz, car aussi tost comme il nous avoient lessiez, aussi tost les leroient il se il veoient ne leur point ne leur lieu. Et l'amiraut me fist response tele que il s'acordoit a moy, que Salehadin disoit que en ne vit onques de mauvais crestian bon Sarrazin, ne de mauvais Sarrazon bon crestian.'

invoked to criticise substandard behaviour which could be then divinely punished or alternatively exposed to criticism.

9. Conclusion

Joinville's text provides a unique insight into the practice of elite masculinity during a crusade. It is not just a hagiographic account of Saint Louis. Instead it is the first direct indication we have of how a high status lay crusader perceived himself in relation to established gender norms. Within Joinville's account ideal masculinity was integral to crusading success and also to successful kingship. This forms part of the didactic message which Joinville sought to convey to the future Louis X. Joinville's account conveys his lived masculinity, and it certainly reflects the same notions of masculinity found in other narratives analysed in this thesis. This demonstrates the connection between clerical writers and their representation of what occurred and the lived experience of those who wrote. This furthers Kaeuper's arguments about how chivalry was not just a clerical construct but was co-authored with the warriors who practised this coded behaviour.¹⁰⁴² Joinville's account offers new avenues of exploration when it comes to the masculinity performed by the elites of the thirteenth and fourteenth century. His own candid admissions of emasculation need to be further interrogated along with how imprisonment affected notions of masculinity and whether or not such notions changed behaviours in the crusades, or war.

¹⁰⁴² See Chapter One, p. 42.

Conclusion

This thesis aimed to offer an analysis of the varying methods of how masculinity was used to construct thirteenth-century crusade narratives. Opening with Arthenus' words that going on crusade was man's work, the Introduction chapter established that the First Crusade saw a shift in how manliness was defined in the twelfth century. Fighting the Turks in defence of the Holy Sepulchre offered a new paradigm to be emulated. This was in addition to the established markers of ideal male conduct which was based on the cardinal virtues and chivalric virtues. These conventions are to be found in texts of various genres that both celebrated and educated elite males. This thesis then sought to apply these values to interrogate the construction of four crusade narratives with varying results. Differences emerged in relation to the status of the author, their purpose for writing, and genre conventions. Chapter Two showed how the re-representation of Richard the Lionheart from earlier texts was constructed using the qualities of kingly masculinity. This served a didactic purpose for future crusade leaders to emulate. Chapter Three demonstrated how elite men could earn sainthood through correctly enacting their role as a holy warrior. Building on the conventions of hagiography Peter of Vaux-de-Cernay offered a presentation of Simon of Montfort as a martyr whose holiness was evinced through his performance of a secular lord fighting heresy. In Chapter Four, for Robert of Clari the key to understanding the events of the Fourth Crusade could only be explained through the failure of various persons to adhere to the rules of masculinity. The construction of his narrative required certain individuals to be shown to adopt unmanly behaviours and attitudes that was deemed complicit to their downfall. This was unique to Clari's account as his fellow crusader and author, Villehardouin, offered no such explanation. Possible reasons for these differences include their status, motivation for writing, and their audience. It is also worth suggesting, although impossible to ascertain, that their personality could be key to their approaches. In Chapter Five

Joinville's text was approached in a new method of trying to interrogate the author and his experience of the crusade rather than the eponymous subject of his work, Louis IX. Here was an autobiographical rendering of the author's masculinity, an important yet understudied facet of Joinville's work. However caution was raised regarding how far this depiction could be viewed as 'real' as once more conventions of genre have to be taken into consideration.

Another purpose of this thesis was to demonstrate the value of many narratives that have hitherto been underutilised by historians in both the fields of crusades and medieval gender. Overall this was achieved by demonstrating that medieval narratives have far more uses than enquiring for the 'truth' about an event. Crusade historians have for far too long dismissed literary convention instead preferring to mine these narratives for facts. But it is also vital to consider how and why the author tells us what happened, even if we know that the author is exaggerating or being creative. As established in this thesis a key aspect of our understanding of these texts rests on our knowledge of these authors. Their motivations for writing went beyond just telling a story, it served a purpose. Either it was didactic, justificatory, or memorialising and depictions within it conformed to a form of masculinity that followed one or more of these purposes. This is important to consider for crusade historians because the crusades were not just a series of wars occurring decades apart. They continuously informed various aspects of social, political and religious life. Thus the historian cannot only consider the events of the individual crusades but must consider narratives written about them and the function they played.

Although the chapters in this work have analysed diverse crusade narratives written by authors of various backgrounds there are emergent themes that apply to all of them. In particular all the texts lend themselves very fruitfully to analysis which employs the theory of hegemonic masculinity, whether this was the main theme as in the *Itinerarium* and the *Historia Albigensis*, or secondary as in the works of Clari and Joinville. Hegemonic masculinity is a key theme because it links to one of the most important aspects of crusading: leadership. Leaders during this period,

and throughout the Middle Ages, had to be exemplary which entailed embodying the ideal qualities which were deemed to constitute high status manhood. This was crucial to how they were judged, for Richard the Lionheart, Simon of Montfort and Louis IX were all exemplary despite not achieving their original crusade objectives, it was the leaders of the Fourth Crusade, Baldwin of Flanders and Boniface of Montferrat who were not successful. Crusades were long campaigns in which those involved were tested to their limits. How those involved responded to this was key to their reputation afterwards, whether successful or a failure.

In addition to the theory of hegemonic masculinity there are other modern theoretical approaches to gender identity which provide very useful means of analysing these accounts, especially the theory of gender as performance. Correct performance of masculinity was key to elite male status. For both kings and lesser nobles, demonstrations of masculinity and dominance were required in order to justify and maintain their hegemonic standing and authority, in both military and non-military contexts. As evidenced, one form of maintaining their hegemony was through performing hypermasculine acts which proved their strength or singularity both to those of similar status, and to those below them. Instances of performativity and hypermasculinity analysed in this thesis have often been interpreted by modern historians as either a king or noble showing off or as acts of sadistic violence. However, applying such theories has demonstrated that the depiction of these acts served both a political and didactic purpose, to tell the audience of these narratives that here was ideal masculinity in action and that this was how other men should act, especially on crusade.

Homosociality was key to maintaining hegemonic masculinity and unity among crusaders and is thus another valuable modern concept applicable to these narratives. Hegemonic masculinity is deemed to be the most valued form of masculinity, therefore in order to maintain this exclusivity performing correct homosocial behaviour was of central importance to these men. A knight or lord could be singular and perform hypermasculine acts, but without the support of fellow

knights they were ineffective. Those deemed to be ideal men, and especially those considered to be ideal leaders knew how to interact with other men for their mutual advantage, and failure to interact correctly was fundamental to the downfall of other men and the overall crusade. Such incidents were set out as clear lessons in these narratives and the desire to provide blueprints for ideal high-status masculinity was clearly a motivation behind their composition, which fits in with the understanding of historical writing being didactic.

These sources are excellent for understanding a much wider range of contemporary concepts and preoccupations beyond the crusades they discuss. They should be more substantially investigated in relation to issues of gender than they have been to date. This study is not the final word on the depiction of masculinity within these texts, it is just the beginning. All the narratives here can be further delved into to advance our knowledge and understanding of the construction of elite masculinity in this period. For example more could be said on the *Itinerarium's* depiction and evaluation of other men beyond King Richard, especially regarding the construction of the crusaders' enemy, the Islamic forces led by Saladin, and how cross-cultural comparisons affected the crusaders' own masculinity. Moreover the representation of Richard as the embodiment of ideal kingship and ideal masculinity continued after his death in various genres such as romances and other later medieval repackaging of crusade narratives, which could be further analysed from a gendered perspective.

The *Historia Albigensis* has much to say on the Cathars and their depiction which reveals how an enemy can be framed in regard to their failure to uphold the standards of masculinity. This, in turn tells us how gender was used as a rhetorical tool to justify crusading or holy war against perceived threats or enemies, another issue which would benefit from further consideration. Moreover it is hoped that the theory of hagiographical masculinity can be applied to other texts, either crusade narratives or saints' lives in order to further our understanding of interactions between holiness and masculinity in the period.

There is more to be said about Clari's text with regards to decisions made on the crusade and how these were taken, such as the decision to go to Zara, and the extent to which these were affected by contemporary notions of manhood and honour. Moreover, this chapter demonstrated that studies do not only need to focus on a text's hegemonic construction of masculinity via the depiction of key individuals. It is also vital to consider how masculinity, and its depiction, functioned as a framing device for the author, and what this can tell us about audience expectations both of gender and of crusading narratives.

Joinville's text could be further interrogated for his own experience of crusading, friendship and imprisonment. Additionally his emotional responses to such experiences needs further consideration, which has not been looked at here due to constrictions of space. Furthermore the depiction of Louis' could be further considered in terms of gender as Joinville's *Vie* included material on Louis' character and rule beyond his crusading which have not been included here, but which were essential to the representation of him as both an ideal king and saint. Further comparisons of Joinville's presentation of Louis could be made with other texts which include alternative hagiographic narratives recounting his life, contemporary letters written during the crusade, accounts from writers such as Matthew Paris, and also Islamic perspectives of the king.

The publication in 2019 of the collection of essays, *Crusading and Masculinities*, demonstrated that gender theory can be productively applied to a broad range of crusading areas covering diverse places and cultures, and also different time periods. What can be concluded is that masculinity and crusading were intertwined for an extended period. The contents of the narratives of the First Crusade written in the aftermath of the crusade's success played an important role in the perception and development of later crusades; as demonstrated in this thesis there were events or similarities that could be found in the earlier First Crusade narratives. However, with the notable exception of Hodgson, these are still largely uninterrogated for their construction of masculinity. Even the *Crusading and Masculinities* collection did not make much use of these texts,

except for Simon Parsons' essay on the *Gesta Francorum*.¹⁰⁴³ Nevertheless Robert the Monk, Guibert of Nogent and Baldric of Dol's reworking of the *Gesta Francorum* provides an insight into their views of ideal masculinity as practiced by the crusaders which could form the focus for future study. Furthermore as shown in Chapter One many writers who were not writing crusade narratives, such as William of Malmesbury and Orderic Vitalis offered their own versions of the First Crusade based on some of these re-workings and their accounts of crusading would also benefit from further gendered analysis. These would be valuable because they would provide insight to how these authors perceived and tried to formulate this new idea of masculinity in relation to the unprecedented nature of the First Crusade.

As demonstrated by Katherine Lewis in *Crusading and Masculinities*, the idea of crusading and masculinity did not end because crusading did not take place to the Holy Land after the fall of Acre in 1291 but it in fact continued for several centuries, into the early modern period.¹⁰⁴⁴ William Caxton's use of Godfrey of Bouillon and the other participants of the First Crusade demonstrated that the ideal of crusading leadership and masculinity which they embodied still held sway almost four centuries later and there is much more to be said about interrelationships between crusading and masculinity in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

Moreover the crusades engendered the phenomenon of the Military Orders. These were secular knights who took monastic vows and were thus a combination of various ideas of masculinity. Analysis of this group of men using masculinity has been fairly limited despite their general interest to historians. A notable exception is provided by Beth Spacey's essay in *Crusading and*

¹⁰⁴³ Simon Parsons, 'The valiant man and the *vilain* in the tradition of the *Gesta Francorum*: overeating, taunts, and Bohemond's heroic status', *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Natasha Hodgson, Katherine J. Lewis, & Matthew Mesley (London, 2019), pp. 36-52.

¹⁰⁴⁴ Katherine Lewis, "'... doo as this noble prynce Godeffroy of boloyne dyde': chivalry, masculinity, and crusading in late medieval England', *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Natasha Hodgson, Katherine Lewis, & Matthew Mesley (London, 2019), pp. 311-28.

Masculinities, which considered the martyrdom of the Templar Jakelin of Mailly.¹⁰⁴⁵ Additionally there is Emanuel Buttigieg's study of the Hospitallers which includes masculinity as a key theme, although covering the period 1580-1700 it is outside of the Middle Ages.¹⁰⁴⁶ Certainly there is much more to be said with regards to the Military Orders, for example from the creation of the Knights Templar in 1119 to their dissolution in 1312, ideal masculinity was used to justify its formation and its downfall was likewise pinned on the belief they had corrupted these ideals.¹⁰⁴⁷

This thesis has provided new historiographical insight into the depiction of individuals such as Richard the Lionheart and Simon of Montfort, both of whom have been criticised by modern historians for their actions. But as demonstrated here they were actually acting within the parameters of ideal masculinity and thus deemed to be meeting contemporary expectations in exemplary fashion. Furthermore events such as the conquest of Constantinople were spun by Clari to be perceived not as Latin acts of barbarity fed by greed, but as actually demonstrating the manliness, rather than the unmanliness of the Christian forces. And finally, from Joinville's work we need to explore Joinville's emasculation in order to understand Louis IX's exceptionality. This was important to undertake because Hodgson, Lewis and Mesley state that masculinity and crusading needs 'to be examined and interrogated if we are to approach a fully contextualised understanding both of what happened and how those events were experienced, comprehended, and portrayed.'¹⁰⁴⁸ This thesis has responded to this, demonstrating the value of a gendered approach for a more developed understanding both of medieval ideas of masculinity and of crusading and crusaders from these thirteenth-century narratives. Future studies of the crusades must continue to take account of masculinity when considering depictions of events, motivations

¹⁰⁴⁵ Spacey, 'Martyrdom'.

¹⁰⁴⁶ Emanuel Buttigieg, *Nobility, Faith and Masculinity: the Hospitaller Knights of Malta, c.1580-c.1700*, (London, 2011).

¹⁰⁴⁷ For more on this issue see: Ruth Karras, 'Knighthood, compulsory heterosexuality, and sodomy', *The Boswell Thesis: Essays on "Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality"*, ed. Mathew Kuefler (Chicago, 2006), pp. 273-286.

¹⁰⁴⁸ Hodgson, Lewis, & Mesley, 'Introduction', p. 3.

for crusading and the writings produced about them. A failure to appreciate that medieval men, both authors and subjects, judged themselves and each other in accordance to gender norms is a failure to understand these men.

Bibliography

Primary sources:

Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, ed. & trans. Susan Edgington (Oxford, 2007)

Ambroise, *The History of the Holy War: Ambroise's "Estoire de la Guerre Sainte"* ed. Marianne Ailes and Malcom Barber, 2 vols (Woodbridge, 2003)

— *L'Estoire de la Guerre Sainte par Ambroise*, ed. & trans. Gaston Paris (Paris, 1897)

Andrea, A.J. *Contemporary Sources for the Fourth Crusade* (Leiden, 2008)

‘Annals of Dunstable’, *Annales Monastici*, vol. III, ed. Henry Richards Luard (London, 1866), pp. 3-420

— *Annals of Dunstable Priory*, trans. David Preest & ed. Harriett Webster (Woodbridge, 2018)

Bachrach, B., & Bachrach, D. S. (trans.), *The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen: A history of the Normans on the First Crusade*, (Farnham, 2005)

Barber, M. & Bate, K., *Letters from the east: Crusaders, pilgrims and settlers in the 12th-13th centuries* (Farnham, 2010)

Chanson d'Antioche: An Old-French account of the First Crusade, ed. & trans. Susan Edgington & Carol Sweetenham (Farnham, 2011)

Choniates, Niketas, *O City of Byzantium: Annals of Niketas Choniates*, trans. Harry I. Magoulias (Detroit, 1984)

‘Continuation de Guillaume de Tyr, de 1229 à 1261, dite du manuscrit de Rothelin’, *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux* vol. II (Paris, 1859), pp. 483-639

Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*, ed. G. Waitz (Hanover, 1911)

— Ganz, D. (trans.), *Einhard and Notker the Stammerer Two Lives of Charlemagne* (London, 2008)

Geoffrey of Villehardouin, *La Conquete de Constantinople*, ed. & trans. Jean Dufournet (Paris, 2004)

— Joinville and Villehardouin, *Chronicles of the Crusades*, trans. Caroline Smith (London, 2008)

Gerald of Wales, ‘Itinerarium Kambriae et Descriptio Kambriae’, *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, vol. VI, ed. James F. Dimock (London, 1868)

— Thorpe, L. (trans.), *The journey through Wales: and, The description of Wales* (Harmondsworth, 1978)

— *De Principis Instructione*, ed. & trans. Robert Bartlett (Oxford, 2018)

Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolimitanorum, ed. Rosalind Hill (London, 1962)

Guibert of Nogent, ‘Gesta Dei Per Francos’, *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux*, vol. IV (Paris, 1879), pp. 113-264

— trans. Levine, R., *The deeds of God through the Franks: A translation of Guibert de Nogent's Gesta Dei per Francos* (Woodbridge, 1997)

Gunther of Paris, *Hystoria Constantinopolitana*, ed. Peter Orth (Hildesheim, 1994)

— *The Capture of Constantinople: The "Hystoria Constantinopolitana" of Gunther of Paris*, trans. Alfred Andrea (Philadelphia, 1997)

Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, ed. & trans. Diana Greenaway (Oxford, 1996)

Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, ed. W. M. Lindsay (Oxford, 1911)

'Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi', *Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I* vol. I, ed. William Stubbs (London, 1864)

— *Das Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, ed. Hans Mayer (Stuttgart, 1962)

— *Chronicle of the Third Crusade: A translation of the Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*, trans. Helen J. Nicholson (Aldershot, 2001)

Jackson, P., *The Seventh Crusade, 1248-1254: Sources and Documents* (Aldershot, 2007)

Jacobus of Voragine, *The Golden Legend* vol. I, trans. William Granger Ryan (Princeton, 1993)

John of Joinville, *Vie de Saint Louis*, ed. & trans. Jacques Monfrin (Paris, 2014)

— Joinville and Villehardouin, *Chronicles of the Crusades*, trans. Caroline Smith (London, 2008)

John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, ed. Clemens Webb (London, 1909)

— *The Historia Pontificalis of John of Salisbury*, ed. & trans. Marjorie Chibnall (Oxford, 1986)

— *Policraticus*, ed. & trans. Cary J. Nederman (Cambridge, 1990)

— *Metalogicon* (Turnhout, 2010)

Karolellus; atque, Pseudo-Turpini Historia Karoli Magni et Rotholandi, ed. Paul Gerhard Schmidt (Stuttgart, 1996)

L'Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal, ed. & trans. Anthony J Holden, Stewart Gregory & David Crouch, 3 vols (London, 2002)

La Chanson de la Croisade Albigeoise, ed. & trans. Eugène Martin-Chabot, 3 vols (Paris, 1931-61)

— *The Song of the Cathar Wars: a History of the Albigensian Crusade*, trans. Janet Shirley (Farnham, 2014)

La Chanson de Roland vol. II, ed. & trans. Gerard J. Brault (London, 1984)

Odo of Cluny, 'De Vita Sancti Geraldii Auriliacensis Comitis,' *Patrologiae Cursus Completus series Latina cxxxiii*. ed. J.P. Migne (Paris, 1853), pp. 639-710

Odo of Deuil, *De Profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem*, ed. & trans. Virginia Berry (New York, 1962)

Peter Vaux-de-Cernay, *Petri Vallium Sarnaii monachi Hystoria Albigenis*, ed. Pascal Guébin & Ernest Lyon, 3 vols (Paris, 1926-39)

— *The History of the Albigensian Crusade: Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay's Historia Albigenis*, trans. M. Sibly & W. A. Sibly (Woodbridge, 1998)

Ralph of Caen, 'Gesta Tancredi', *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux*, vol. III (Paris, 1866), pp. 587-716

Richard of Devizes, *Chronicon*, ed. John T. Appleby (London, 1963)

Rigord, *Histoire de Philippe Auguste*, ed. & trans. Elisabeth Carpentier, Georges Pon, & Yves Chauvin (Paris, 2006)

Robert of Clari, *La Conquête de Constantinople*, ed. & trans. Peter Noble (Edinburgh, 2005)

Robert the Monk, *The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk*, ed. Damien Kempf & Marcus Bull (Woodbridge, 2013)

Roger of Howden, *Chronica* vol. III, ed. William Stubbs (London, 1870)

Shirley, J. (trans), *Crusader Syria in the Thirteenth Century the Rothelin Continuation of the History of William of Tyre with part of the Eracles or Acre text* (Farnham, 1999)

——— *The Song of the Cathar Wars: a History of the Albigensian Crusade* (Farnham, 2014)

Stevenson, J. (trans.), *The Church Historians of England* vol. IV ii (London, 1856)

Suger, *Vie de Louis VI le Gros*, ed. & trans. Henri Waquet (Paris, 1929)

Suger, & Cusimano, R., & Moorhead, J. (trans.), *The Deeds of Louis the Fat* (Washington D.C., 1992)

Sweetenham, C.(trans.), *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade* (Aldershot, 2005)

Vitalis, Orderic, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. & trans. Marjorie Chibnall, 6 vols (Oxford, 1969–80)

William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, ed. & trans. Roger A. B. Mynors, completed by Rodney M. Thompson & Michael Winterbottom, 2 vols (Oxford, 1998-9)

William of Newburgh, 'Historia Rerum Anglicarum', *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I* vol. I, ed. Richard Howlett (London, 1884)

William of Puylaurens, *Chronique*, ed. Jean Duvernoy (Toulouse, 1996) — *The Chronicle of William of Puylaurens: The Albigensian Crusade and its Aftermath*, trans. M. Sibly & W. A. Sibly (Woodbridge, 2003)

William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens (Turnhout, 1986)

Secondary sources:

Ailes, M.J., 'The medieval male couple and the language of homosociality', *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. Hadley, D.M. (Harlow, 1999), pp. 214-37

——— 'Early French chronicle -- history or literature?', *Journal of Medieval History*, 26, 3 (2000), 301-12

—— 'Heroes of war: Ambroise's heroes of the Third Crusade', in *Writing War: Medieval Literary Responses to Warfare*, ed. Saunders, C., Le Saux, F., & Thomas, N. (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 29-48

—— The admirable enemy? Saladin and Saphadin in Ambroise's *Estoire de la guerre sainte*, *Knighthoods of Christ: Essays on the History of the Crusades and the Knights Templar, Presented to Malcolm Barber*, ed. Housley, N. (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 51-64

Aird, W.M., 'Frustrated masculinity: the relationship between William the Conqueror and his eldest son', *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. Hadley, D.M. (Harlow, 1999), pp. 39-55

Airlie, S., 'The anxiety of sanctity: St Gerald of Aurillac and his maker', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 43, 3 (1992), 372-95

Angold, M., *The Fourth Crusade* (Harlow, 2003)

Archambault, P. J., *Seven French Chroniclers: Witnesses to history* (Syracuse, 1974)

Arnold, J. H., 'Sexualité et déshonneur dans le Midi (XIIIe-XIVe siècles): Les péchés de la chair et l'opinion collective', *Cahiers de Fanjeaux*, 52 (2019), pp. 305-39

Asbridge, T. S., *The Crusades: The war for the Holy Land* (London, 2012)

—— 'Talking to the enemy: the role and purpose of negotiations between Saladin and Richard the Lionheart during the Third Crusade', *Journal of Medieval History*, 39, 3 (2013), 275-96

Bagley, C. P., 'Robert de Clari's *La Conquête de Constantinople*', *Medium Ævum*, 40, 2 (1971), 109-15

Baldwin, P. B., *Pope Gregory X and the crusades* (Woodbridge, 2014)

Barber, M., *The Cathars Dualist Heretics in Languedoc in the High Middle Ages* (Harlow, 2000)

—— *The Crusader States* (New Haven, 2012)

Barney, S. A., Lewis, W. J., Beach, J. A. & Berghof, O., *Etymologies Isidore of Seville* (Cambridge, 2006)

Beer, J.M.A., *Villehardouin: Epic historian* (Genève, 1968)

—— *In Their Own Words: Practices of Quotation in Early Medieval History-Writing* (Toronto, 2014)

Bejczy, I. P. & Newhauser, R. G., *Virtue and ethics in the twelfth century* (Leiden, 2005)

Bejczy, I.P., 'Gerald of Wales on the cardinal virtues: a reappraisal of *De principis instructione*', *Medium Ævum*, 75, 2 (2006), 191-201

—— *The cardinal virtues in the Middle Ages: A study in moral thought from the fourth to the fourteenth century* (Leiden, 2011)

Bengtsson, T. T., 'Performing Hypermasculinity: Experiences with Confined Young Offenders', *Men and Masculinities*, 19 (2016), 410-28

- Bennett, M., 'Military masculinity in England and northern France c.1050 - c.1225' *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. Hadley, D.M. (Harlow, 1999), pp. 71-88
- Benz St. John, L., *Three medieval queens: Queenship and the crown in fourteenth-century England* (New York, 2012)
- Biller, P., 'Goodbye to Catharism?', *Cathars in Question*, ed. Sennis, A. (York, 2016), pp. 274-313
- Bird, J. L., Peters, E. & Powell, J. M., *Crusade and Christendom: Annotated Documents in Translation from Innocent III to the Fall of Acre, 1187-1291* (Philadelphia, 2013)
- Bird, J.L., 'Preaching and crusading memory', *Remembering the Crusades and Crusading*, ed. Cassidy-Welch, M. (Abingdon, 2017), pp 13-33
- Bird, S. R., 'Welcome to the men's club: Homosociality and the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity', *Gender and Society*, 10, 2 (1996), 120-32
- Blacker, J., *The Faces of Time: Portrayal of the Past in Old French and Latin Historical Narrative of the Anglo-Norman Regnum* (Austin, 1994)
- Bliese, J.R.E., 'Rhetoric and morale: a study of battle orations from the central middle ages', *Journal of Medieval History*, 15, 3 (1989), 201-26
- Boyer, T.M., *The Giant Hero in Medieval Literature* (Leiden, 2016)
- Bradbury, J., *Philip Augustus King of France 1180-1223* (Harlow, 1998)
- Broughton, B.B., *The Legends of King Richard I, Coeur De Lion: A Study of Sources and Variations to the Year 1600* (Paris, 1966)
- Brundage, J.A., *Richard Lion Heart* (New York, 1974)
- 'Richard the Lion-Heart and Byzantium', *Studies in Medieval Culture*, 6/7 (1976), 63-70
- Bull, M. & Kempf, D. (ed.), *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory* (Woodbridge, 2014)
- Bull, M., *Eyewitness and Crusade Narrative* (Woodbridge, 2018)
- Bullough, V.L., 'On being a male in the Middle Ages', *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages*, ed. Lees, C. A. (Minneapolis, 1994), pp. 31-45
- Butler, J., *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity* 2nd (London, 2002)
- Buttigieg, E., *Nobility, Faith and Masculinity: the Hospitaller Knights of Malta, c.1580-c.1700* (London, 2011)
- Carrier, M., 'Perfidious and Effeminate Greeks: The Representation of Byzantine Ceremonial in the Western Chronicles of the Crusades (1096-1204)', *Annuario. Istituto Romeno Di Cultura e Ricerca Umanistica*, 4 (2002), 47-68

Cassidy-Welch, M., *Imprisonment in the Medieval Religious Imagination, c. 1150-1400* (Basingstoke, 2011)

—— ‘Images of blood in the *Historia Albigensis* of Pierre des Vaux-de-Cernay’, *Journal of Religious History*, 35, 4 (2011), 478-91

Castellani, M., ‘Bédouins, Tartares et Assassins, les figures de l'Autre oriental’, *Bien Dire et Bien Apprendre*, 26 (2008), 137-49

Claridge, C., ‘Voices in Medieval History Writing’, *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 16, 1 (2017), 7-40

Cole, P. J., *The preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095-1270* (Cambridge, 2013)

Connell, R. W. & Messerschmidt, J. W., ‘Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept’, *Gender and Society*, 19, 6 (2005), 829-59

Connell, R. W., *Masculinities* 2nd (Cambridge, 2005)

Constable, G., ‘Medieval charters as a source for the history of the crusades’, *The Crusades: The Essential Readings*, ed. Madden, T.F. (Oxford, 2002), pp. 129-53

Constantinou, S., ‘Performing gender in lay saints' lives’, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 38, 1 (2014), 24-32

Cordery, L. F., ‘The Saracens in Middle English literature: a definition of otherness’, *Al-Masāq*, 14, 2 (2002), 88-99

Cowdrey, H.E.J., ‘Martyrdom and the First Crusade’, *Crusade and Settlement: Papers Read at the First Conference of the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East and presented to R.C. Smail*, ed. Edbury, P.W. (Cardiff, 1985), pp. 46-56

Cox, N. B. & DeCarvalho, L. J., “‘Ride Free or Die’ Trying: Hypermasculinity on FX's *Sons of Anarchy*”, *Journal of Popular Culture*, 49, 4 (2016), 818-38

Crouch, D., *The Birth of Nobility: Constructing Aristocracy in England and France: 900-1300* (Harlow, 2005)

Cullum, P. H. & Lewis, K. J. (ed.), *Holiness and Masculinity in the Middle Ages* (Cardiff, 2004)

—— *Religious Men and Masculine Identity in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2013)

Cullum, P.H., ‘Clergy, masculinity and transgression in late medieval England’, *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. Hadley, D.M. (Harlow, 1999), pp. 178-96

Curry, A., ‘The battle speeches of Henry V’, *Reading Medieval Studies*, 34 (2008), 77-97

Damian-Grint, P., *The New Historians of the Twelfth-century Renaissance: Inventing Vernacular Authority* (Woodbridge, 1999)

—— ‘Ambroise (fl. 1188–1195), crusader and historian’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004), Retrieved 7 December 2018 from: <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-66813.4>.

Day, G. W. & Queller, D. E., ‘Some arguments in defense of the Venetians on the Fourth Crusade’, *American Historical Review*, 81, 4 (1976), 717-37

Deane, J. K., *A History of Medieval Heresy and Inquisition* (Lanham, 2011)

Debergue, Y., ‘*Bonas femnas* and the *consolamen*’, *Journal of Religious History*, 35, 4 (2011), 532-45

Devereaux, R., ‘Constantinople as Model: Riches and Poverty in Girart de Roussillon and Robert de Clari’s Conquête de Constantinople’, *Epic and Crusade: Proceedings of the Colloquium of the Société Rencensvales British Branch held at Lucy Cavendish College Cambridge 27–28 March 2004*, ed. P. E. Bennett, A. E. Cobby & J. E. Everson (Edinburgh, 2006)

Diggelmann, L., ‘Of Grifons and tyrants: Anglo-Norman views of the Mediterranean world during the Third Crusade’, *Old Worlds, New Worlds: European Cultural Encounters, c.1000-c.1750*, ed. Bailey, L., Diggelmann, L. & Phillips, K.M. (Turnhout, 2009), pp. 11-30

Du Pisani, J.A., ‘Hegemonic masculinity in Afrikaner nationalist mobilisation, 1934-48’, *Masculinities in politics and war*, ed. Dudink, S., Hagemann, K., & Tosh, J. (Manchester, 2004), pp. 157-76

Dubois, A., ‘The adolescent and the crusader: Journey and rebirth on the path to manhood in the thirteenth century’, *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Hodgson, N.R., Lewis, K.J., & Mesley, M., (London, 2019), pp. 72-86

Dunlop, A., ‘Masculinity, crusading, and devotion: Francesco Casali's fresco in the Trecento Perugian *Contado*’, *Speculum*, 76, 2 (2001), 315-36

Earenfight, T., *Queenship in medieval Europe* (New York, 2013)

Edbury, P. W., ‘Preaching the crusade in Wales’, *England and Germany in the High Middle Ages: In Honour of Karl J. Leyser*, ed. Haverkamp, A. (Oxford, 1996), pp. 221-33

—— ‘Propaganda and faction in the Kingdom of Jerusalem: the background to Hattin’, *Kingdoms of the Crusaders: From Jerusalem to Cyprus*, ed. Edbury, P.W. (Aldershot, 1999), pp. 173-89

Edgington, S. B. & Lambert, S., *Gendering the Crusades* (Cardiff, 2001)

Elukin, J.M., ‘Warrior or saint? Joinville, Louis IX's character, and the challenge of the crusade’, *Center and Periphery: Studies on Power in the Medieval World in Honor of William Chester Jordan*, ed. Jansen, K.L., Geltner, G. & Lester, A.E. (Leiden, 2013), pp. 183-94

Erdmann, C., *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, trans. Baldwin, M. W. & Goffart, W. (Princeton, 1977)

Evans, G.L., *Men and Masculinities in the Sagas of Icelanders* (Oxford, 2019)

Fenton, K. A., *Gender, Nation and Conquest in the works of William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge, 2008)

———‘Gendering the First Crusade in William of Malmesbury’s *Gesta Regum Anglorum*’, *Intersections of Gender, Religion and Ethnicity in the Middle Ages*, ed. Beattie, C. & Fenton K.A. (London, 2011), pp. 125-39

Firth, A.S., *The Creation of the Jerusalemite Dynasty in the Twelfth Century: Kingship, Military Masculinity and Fatherhood in William of Tyre’s Historia Rerum In Partibus Transmarinis Gestarum*, Unpublished doctoral thesis, (University of Huddersfield, 2016)

Fletcher, C. D., *Richard II: Manhood, youth, and politics, 1377-99* (Oxford, 2008)

Flori, J., ‘Ambroise, propagateur de l’idéologie Plantagenêt’, *Culture politique des Plantagenêt (1154-1224) Actes du colloque tenu à Poitiers du 2 au 5 mai 2002*, ed. Aurell. M. (Poitiers, 2003), pp. 173-87

———‘Knightly society’, *The New Cambridge Medieval History IV, c.1024-c.1198, Part I*, ed. Luscombe, D. & Riley-Smith, J. (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 148-84

——— *Richard the Lionheart King and Knight* (Edinburgh, 2006)

Forey, A.J., ‘The crusading vows of the English king Henry III’, *Durham University Journal*, 34 (1972), 229-47

France, J., ‘The Election and Title of Godfrey de Bouillon’, *Canadian Journal of History*, 18, 3 (1983), 321-30

French, H. & Rothery, M., ‘Hegemonic Masculinities? Assessing Change and Processes of Change in Elite Masculinity, 1700-1900’, *What is masculinity?: Historical dynamics from antiquity to the contemporary world*, ed. Arnold, J.H. & Brady, S. (Basingstoke, 2013), pp. 139-66

Friedman, Y., *Encounter between enemies: Captivity and ransom in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Leiden, 2002)

———‘Masculine attributes of the other: The shared knightly model’, *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Hodgson, N.R., Lewis, K.J., & Mesley, M., (London, 2019), pp. 89-99

Gaggero, M., ‘Western Eyes on the Latin East: The *Chronique d’Ernoult et de Bernard le Trésorier* and Robert of Clari’s *Conquête de Constantinople*’, *The French of Outremer: Communities and Communications in the Crusading Mediterranean*, ed. Morreale, L.K. & Paul, N. L. (New York, 2018), pp. 86-109

Gaposchkin, ‘Boniface VIII, Philip the Fair, and the Sanctity of Louis IX’, *Journal of Medieval History*, 29, 1 (2003), 1-26

——— *The Making of Saint Louis: Kingship, Sanctity, and Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (London, 2010)

——— ‘The captivity of Louis IX’, *Quaestiones medii aevi novae*, 18, 8 (2013), 5-114

Gaposchkin, M. C. & Field, S.L. (ed.), *The sanctity of Louis IX: Early lives of Saint Louis by Geoffrey of Beaulieu and William of Chartres* (Ithaca, 2014)

Gerish, D., 'Gender theory', *Palgrave Advances in the Crusades*, ed. Nicholson, H. J. (Basingstoke, 2005), pp. 130-47

Gillingham, J., 'Richard I and Berengaria of Navarre', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 53, 128 (1980), 157-73

———*Richard I* (London, 1999)

Gilmore, D. D., *Manhood in the making: Cultural concepts of masculinity* (New Haven, 1990)

Given-Wilson, C., *Chronicles: The writing of history in medieval England* (London, 2004)

Glover, D. & Kaplan, C., *Genders* 2nd (London, 2009)

Gómez, M.D., 'Rex Parvus or Rex Nobilis? Charlemagne and the Politics of History (and Crusading) in Thirteenth-Century Iberia', *The Charlemagne legend in medieval Latin texts*, ed. Purkis, W.J. & Gabriele, M. (Woodbridge, 2016), pp. 92-114

Graham-Leigh, E., 'Justifying deaths: the chronicler Pierre des Vaux-de-Cernay and the massacre of Béziers', *Mediaeval Studies*, 63 (2001), 283-303

———*The Southern French Nobility and the Albigensian Crusade* (Woodbridge, 2005)

Gransden, A., *Historical writing in England: c.550 to c.1307* vol. 1 (London, 1974)

——— 'Prologues in the historiography of twelfth-century England', *England in the Twelfth Century: Proceedings of the 1988 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Daniel Williams (Woodbridge, 1990), pp. 55-81

Grant, L., *Blanche of Castile: Queen of France* (New Haven, 2016)

Hadley, D.M. 'Introduction', *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. Hadley, D.M. (Harlow, 1999), pp. 1-18

Hamilton, B., *The Leper King and His Heirs* (Cambridge, 2000)

Hard, R., *The Library of Greek Mythology* (Oxford, 1997)

Harris, J., 'The debate on the Fourth Crusade', *History Compass*, 2, 1 (2004), 1-10

———*Byzantium and the Crusades* 2nd (London, 2014)

Hay, D., 'Arms and Armor', *Women and gender in medieval Europe: An encyclopedia*, ed. Schaus, M. (London, 2017), pp. 36-37

Heffernan, T.J., *Sacred Biography Saints and Their Biographers in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1992)

Heiser, R. R., 'The court of the Lionheart on crusade, 1190-2', *Journal of Medieval History*, 43, 5 (2017), 505-22

Hickey, C. & Mooney, A., 'Challenging the pervasiveness of hypermasculinity and heteronormativity in an all-boys' school', *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 45, 2 (2018), 237-53

Hodgson, N. R., 'The role of Kerbogha's mother in the *Gesta Francorum* and selected chronicles of the First Crusade', *Gendering the Crusades*, ed. Edgington, S.B. & Lambert, S. (Cardiff, 2001), pp. 163-76

——— *Women, Crusading and the Holy Land in Historical Narrative* (Woodbridge, 2007)

——— 'Honour, Shame and the Fourth Crusade', *Journal of Medieval History*, 39, 2 (2013), 220-39

——— 'Lions, Tigers, and Bears: Encounters with Wild Animals and Bestial Imagery in the Context of Crusading to the Latin East', *Viator*, 44, 1 (2013), 65-93

——— 'Normans and competing masculinities on crusade', *Crusading and Pilgrimage in the Norman World*, ed. Hurlock, K. & Oldfield, P. (Woodbridge, 2015), pp. 195-213

——— 'Reputation, authority and masculine identities in the political culture of the first crusaders: The career of Arnulf of Chocques', *History*, 102, 353 (2017), 889-913

——— 'Leading the people "as duke, count, and father": the masculinities of Abbot Martin of Pairis in Gunther of Pairis', *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Hodgson, N.R., Lewis, K.J., & Mesley, M. (London, 2019), pp. 199-221

Hodgson, N.R., Lewis, K.J., & Mesley, M., 'Crusading and Masculinities: Introduction', *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Hodgson, N.R., Lewis, K.J. & Mesley, M. (London, 2019), pp. 1-18

Holt, A. 'Between warrior and priest: the creation of a new masculine identity during the crusades', *Negotiating Clerical Identities: Priests, Monks and Masculinity in the Middle Ages*, ed. Thibodeaux, J. D. (Basingstoke, 2010), pp. 185-203

Hoofnagle, W.M., 'Charlemagne's legacy and Anglo-Norman imperium in Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum*', *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages: Power, Faith, and Crusade*, ed. Gabriele, M. & Stuckey, J. (New York, 2008), pp. 77-94

Hosler, J., *The Siege of Acre 1189-1191* (London, 2018)

Housley, N., 'Saladin's triumph over the Crusader States: The battle of Hattin, 1187', *History Today*, 37, 7 (1987), 17-23

——— *The Crusaders* (Stroud, 2002)

——— *Contesting the Crusades* (Oxford, 2006)

Hyatte, R., 'The habit makes the monk: clothes/cloth and valuation in Joinville's *Vie de saint Louis*', *Studi francesi*, 50, 1:148 (2006), 7-16

Jacoby, D., 'Conrad, marquis of Montferrat and the kingdom of Jerusalem (1187-1192)', *Trade, Commodities and Shipping in the Medieval Mediterranean*, ed. Jacoby, D. (Aldershot, 1997), pp. 187-238

——— 'Conrad of Montferrat (d. 1192)', *The Crusades an Encyclopaedia*, ed. Murray, A.V. (Oxford, 2006), pp. 273-74

- John, S., '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, 543 (2015), 263-301
- Jordan, W. C., *Louis IX and the Challenge of the Crusade* (Guildford, 1979)
- *The Apple of His Eye: Converts From Islam in the Reign of Louis IX* (Princeton, 2019)
- Jotischky, A., *Crusading and the Crusader States* 2nd (London, 2017)
- Kaeuper, R. W., *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe* (Oxford, 1999)
- *Medieval Chivalry* (Cambridge, 2016)
- Karras, R. M., *From Boys to Men: Formations of Masculinity in Late Medieval Europe* (Philadelphia, 2003)
- 'Knighthood, compulsory heterosexuality, and sodomy', *The Boswell Thesis: Essays on "Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality"*, ed. Mathew S. Kuefler (Chicago, 2006), pp. 273-286.
- Keen, M. H., *Chivalry* (New Haven, 2005)
- Kempshall, M. S., *Rhetoric and the Writing of History, 400-1500* (Manchester, 2012)
- Khanmohamadi, S., 'Casting a "sideways glance" at the crusades: the voice of the other in Joinville's *Vie de Saint Louis*', *Exemplaria*, 22, 3 (2010), 177-99
- Kienzle, B. M., *Cistercians, Heresy and Crusade in Occitania, 1145–1229* (Woodbridge, 2001)
- King, E., *King Stephen* (London, 2011)
- Kleiman, I. R., 'The shirt is closest to the body: on Joinville's *Memoirs*', *English Language Notes*, 53, 2 (2015), 61-74
- Kurpiewski, C. M., 'Writing beneath the shadow of heresy: the *Historia Albigensis* of Brother Pierre des Vaux-de-Cernay', *Journal of Medieval History*, 31, 1 (2005), 1-27
- Lake, J., 'Authorial intention in medieval historiography', *History Compass*, 12, 4 (2014), 344-60
- 'Current approaches to medieval historiography', *History Compass*, 13, 3 (2015), 89-109
- Lambert, M., *The Cathars* (Malden, 1998)
- Laynesmith, J. L., *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship 1445-1503* (Oxford, 2004)
- Le Goff, J., *Saint Louis* (Notre Dame, 2009)
- Lees, C. A. (ed.), *Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages* (Minneapolis, 1994)
- Legg, L.G.W., *English Coronation Records* (London, 1901)

Legros, H., 'Nostre roy saint Looÿs au péril de la mer dans la *Vie de saint Louis* de Joinville', *Mondes marins du Moyen Age Actes du 30e colloque du CUER MA*, 3, 4 et 5 mars 2005, ed. Connochie-Bourgne, C. (Aix-en-Provence, 2006), pp. 285-95

Lewis, K. J., 'Male Saints and Devotional Masculinity in Late Medieval England', *Gender & History*, 24 1 (2012), 112-33

——— *Kingship and Masculinity in Later Medieval England* (London, 2013)

——— "' . . . doo as this noble prynce Godeffroy of boloyne dyde": chivalry, masculinity, and crusading in late medieval England', *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Hodgson, N.R., Lewis, K.J. & Mesley, M. (London, 2019), pp. 311-28

Lilie, R., *Byzantium and the Crusader States 1096-1204* (Oxford, 1993)

Lippiatt, G.E.M., *Simon V of Montfort and baronial government, 1195-1218* (Oxford, 2017)

Lock, P., *The Routledge Companion to The Crusades* (Abingdon, 2006)

Lower, M., 'Conversion and St Louis's Last Crusade', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 58, 2 (2007), 211-31

Macdonald, A.J., 'Courage, fear and the experience of the later medieval Scottish soldier', *Scottish Historical Review*, 92, 2 (2013), 179-206

MacInnes, I.A., 'Heads, Shoulders, Knees and Toes: Injury and Death in Anglo-Scottish Combat, c. 1296–c. 1403', *Wounds and Wound Repair in Medieval Culture*, ed. Tracy, L. & DeVries, K. (Leiden, 2015), pp. 102-27

Madden, T.F., 'Outside and Inside the Fourth Crusade', *The International History Review*, 17, 4 (1995), 726-43

Maier, C., *Preaching the Crusades: Mendicant Friars and the Cross in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1994)

——— 'The roles of women in the crusade movement: a survey', *Journal of Medieval History*, 30, 1 (2004), 61-82

——— 'Propaganda and masculinity: gendering the crusades in thirteenth-century sermons', *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Hodgson, N.R., Lewis, K.J. & Mesley, M. (London, 2019), pp. 21-35

Markowski, M., 'Richard lionheart: Bad king, bad crusader?', *Journal of Medieval History*, 23, 4 (1997), 351-65

Marnette, S., 'The experiencing self and the narrating self in medieval French chronicles', *The Medieval Author in Medieval French Literature*, ed. Greene, V. (New York, 2006), pp. 117-136

Martin, G.H., 'Devizes, Richard of (c.1150–c.1200)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004)[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23516>, accessed 18 Nov 2016]

Martin, H., 'Inventaire des biens et des livres de l'abbaye des Vaux-de-Cernay au XIIIe siècle', *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de Paris et de l'Ile-de-France*, 13 (1886), 36-42

Marvin, L. W., 'Thirty-nine days and a wake-up: The impact of the indulgence and forty days service on the Albigensian crusade, 1209–1218', *The Historian*, 65, 1 (2002), 75-94

——— *The Occitan War: A Political and Military History of the Albigensian Crusade, 1209–1218* (Cambridge, 2008)

——— 'The Albigensian Crusade in Anglo-American Historiography, 1888-2013', *History Compass*, 11, 12 (2013), 11-26

Mayer, H.E., 'Henry II of England and the Holy Land', *The English Historical Review*, 97, 385 (1982), 721-39

McCannon, A.E., 'Two Capetian queens as the foreground for an aristocrat's anxiety in the *Vie de Saint Louis*', *Capetian Women*, ed. Kathleen Nolan (New York, 2003), pp. 163-76

McGlynn, S., *By Sword and Fire: Cruelty and Atrocity in Medieval Warfare* (London, 2008)

——— 'Fighting the image of the reluctant warrior: Philip Augustus as *rex-not-quite-so-bellicosus*', *The Image and Perception of Monarchy in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. McGlynn, S. & Woodacre, E. (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 2014), pp. 148-67

——— *Kill Them All* (Stroud, 2015)

McNamara, J.A., 'The "Herrenfrage": the restructuring of the gender system, 1050-1150', *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages*, ed. Lees, C.A. (Minneapolis, 1994), pp. 3-29

McVitty, E. A., 'False knights and true men: Contesting chivalric masculinity in English treason trials, 1388-1415', *Journal of Medieval History*, 40, 4 (2014), 458-77

Mesley, M., 'Episcopal authority and gender in the narratives of the First Crusade', *Religious Men and Masculine Identity in the Middle Ages*, ed. Cullum, P.H. & Lewis, K.J. (Woodbridge, 2013), pp. 94-111

Misztal, M., 'Richard the Lion-Heart's Conquest of Cyprus and its Presentation in the Versified *Estoire De La Guerre Sainte*', *Poetry and its language: papers in honour of Teresa Bela*, ed. M. Gibińska, & W. Witalisz (Frankfurt am Main, 2012), pp. 51-72

Möhring, H., 'Eine Chronik aus der Zeit des dritten Kreuzzugs: das sogenannte Itinerarium Peregrinorum 1', *Innsbrucker Historische Studien* (1982), 149-67

Moore, J., (ed.), *Pope Innocent III and his world* (Farnham, 1999)

Moore, R.I., *The War on Heresy: Faith and Power in Medieval Europe* (London, 2012)

Morris, C., 'Martyrs of the Field of Battle before and during the First Crusade', *Studies in Church History*, 30 (1993), 93-104

Morse, C. C., 'Scenes of farewell in the Middle Ages', *Studies in Late Medieval and Early Renaissance Texts in Honour of John Scattergood: "The Key of All Good Remembrance"*, ed. Fletcher, A. J., D'Arcy, A. M. & Scattergood, J. (Dublin, 2005), pp. 241-58

Moss, R.E., "'And much more I am sorry for my good knyghts': Fainting, Homosociality and Elite Male Culture in Middle English Romance", *Historical Reflections*, 42, 1 (2016), 101-13

—— 'Ready to disport with you: Homosocial culture amongst the wool merchants of fifteenth-century Calais' *History Workshop Journal*, 86, 1 (2018), 1-21

Munslow, A., *Deconstructing History* 2nd (London, 2006)

Murray, A.V., 'Baldwin I of Jerusalem (d. 1118)', *The Crusades an Encyclopaedia*, ed. Murray, A.V. (Oxford, 2006), pp. 132-33

—— 'Contrasting masculinities in the Baltic crusades: Teutonic Knights and secular crusaders at war and peace in late medieval Prussia', *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Hodgson, N.R., Lewis, K.J. & Mesley, M. (London, 2019), pp. 113-28

Murray, J., 'Masculinizing religious life: sexual prowess, the battle for chastity and monastic identity', *Holiness and Masculinity in the Middle Ages*, ed. Cullum, P.H. & Lewis, K.J. (Cardiff, 2004), pp. 24-42

Nagel, J., 'Masculinity and nationalism: Gender and sexuality in the making of nations', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 21, 2 (1998), 242-69

Naus, J. L., *Constructing Kingship: The Capetian Monarchs of France and the Early Crusades* (Manchester, 2016)

Neal, D. G., *The Masculine Self in Late Medieval England* (Chicago, 2008)

Neocleous, S., 'Financial, chivalric or religious? The motives of the Fourth Crusaders reconsidered', *Journal of Medieval History*, 38, 2 (2012), 183-206

Nichols, S. G., 'Discourse in Froissart's Chroniques', *Speculum*, 39, 2 (1964), 279-87

Nicholson, H.J., 'Women on the Third Crusade', *Journal of Medieval History*, 23, 4 (1997), 335-49

—— 'Following the Path of the Lionheart: The *De ortu Walhuanii* and the *Itinerarium peregrinorum et gesta regis Ricardi*', *Medium Aevum*, 69, 1 (2000), 21-33

—— "'Martyrium collegio sociandus haberet": depictions of the military orders' martyrs in the Holy Land, 1187-1291', *Crusading and Warfare in the Middle Ages: Realities and Representations. Essays in Honour of John France*, ed. John, S. & Morton, N. (Farnham, 2014), pp. 101-18

—— 'The true gentleman? Correct behaviour towards women according to Christian and Muslim writers: from the Third Crusade to Sultan Baybars', *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Hodgson, N.R., Lewis, K.J. & Mesley, M. (London, 2019), pp. 100-12

Noble, P., 'Eyewitnesses of the Fourth Crusade -- the war against Alexius III', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 25 (1999), 75-89

—— ‘1204, The Crusade without Epic Heroes’, *Epic and Crusade: Proceedings of the Colloquium of the Société Rencesvales British Branch held at Lucy Cavendish College Cambridge 27–28 March 2004*, ed. P. E. Bennett, A. E. Cobby & J. E. Everson (Edinburgh, 2006), pp. 89-104

Noble, T.F.X. & Head, T., *Soldiers of Christ: Saints and Saints Lives from Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (London, 1995)

Parsons, S.T., ‘The valiant man and the *vilain* in the tradition of the *Gesta Francorum*: overeating, taunts, and Bohemond’s heroic status’, *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Hodgson, N.R., Lewis, K.J. & Mesley, M. (London, 2019), pp. 36-52

Paterson, L.M., ‘Chanson de la Croisade Albigeoise’, *The Crusades an Encyclopaedia*, ed. Murray, A.V. (Oxford, 2006), pp. 236-37

—— *Singing the Crusades French and Occitan Lyric Responses to the Crusading Movements, 1137 - 1336* (Cambridge, 2018)

Paul, N. L., *To Follow in their Footsteps: The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages* (Ithaca, 2012)

Pegg, M. G., *The Corruption of Angels: The Great Inquisition of 1245-1246* (Princeton, 2001)

—— ‘On Cathars, Albigenses, and Good Men of Languedoc’, *Journal of Medieval History*, 27 (2001), 181-95

—— *A Most Holy War: The Albigensian Crusade and the Battle for Christendom* (Oxford, 2008)

—— ‘The paradigm of Catharism; or, the historians’ illusion’, *Cathars in Question*, ed. Antonio Sennis (York, 2016), pp. 21-52

Phillips, J. ‘Crusader masculinities in bodily crises: incapacity and the crusader leader, 1095–1274’, *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Hodgson, N.R., Lewis, K.J. & Mesley, M. (London, 2019), pp. 149-64

Phillips, J., *The Fourth Crusade and the Sack of Constantinople* (London, 2005)

—— *Holy Warriors: A Modern History of the Crusades* (London, 2010)

—— *The Second Crusade: Extending the frontiers of Christendom* (New Haven, 2010)

—— ‘The Third Crusade in context: contradiction, curiosity and survival’, *Studies in Church History*, 51 (2015), 92-114

Phipps, G. ‘Constructing masks of hypermasculinity: The depiction of rampage school shootings in contemporary American novels’, *Studies in the Novel*, 47, 1 (2015), 99-115

Piroyansky, D., *Martyrs in the Making: Political Martyrdom in Late Medieval England* (Basingstoke, 2008)

- Polgar, N., 'Joinville: a hagiographic story about oneself and about the other', *Narodna umjetnost*, 45, 1 (2008), 21-41
- Powell, J. M. (ed.), *Innocent III: Vicar of Christ or lord of the world?* 2nd (Washington D.C., 1994)
- *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III* (Washington, DC., 2004)
- Prouteau, N. (ed.), *Richard Coeur de Lion: Entre mythe et réalités* (Gand, 2016)
- Pryce, H., 'Gerald's journey through Wales', *Journal of Welsh Ecclesiastical History*, 6 (1989), 17-34
- Queller, D.E. & Madden, T.F., *The Fourth Crusade* 2nd (Philadelphia, 2000)
- Richard, J., *Saint Louis Crusader King of France* (Cambridge, 1992)
- Riley-Smith, J., 'Death on the First Crusade', *The End of Strife*, ed. Loades, D. (Edinburgh, 1984), pp. 14-31
- 'The crusading heritage of Guy and Aimery of Lusignan', in *Hē Kupros kai hoi Staurophories / Cyprus and the Crusades*, ed. Coureas, N. and Riley-Smith, J. (Nicosia, 1995), pp. 31-45
- *The Crusades: A History* 3rd (London, 2014)
- Rist, R., *The Papacy and Crusading in Europe, 1198-1245* (London, 2009)
- Roland, A., 'Secrecy, technology, and war: Greek fire and the defense of Byzantium, 678-1204', *Warfare in the Dark Ages*, ed. France, J. & DeVries, K. (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 419-43
- Runciman, S., *A History of the Crusades* 3 vols (London, 1951-54)
- Russell, F.H., 'Just war', *The Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy*, ed. Pasnau, R. (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 593-606
- Sayers, J.E., *Innocent III: Leader of Europe 1198-1216* (London, 1994)
- Schubert, A. (ed.), *Richard Löwenherz: König -- Ritter -- Gefangener* (Speyer, 2018)
- Scott, J.W., 'Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis', *The American Historical Review*, 91, 5 (1986), 1053-75
- Simpson, A. & Efthymiadis, S. (ed.), *Niketas Choniates: A Historian and a Writer* (Genève, 2009)
- Smith, C., 'Martyrdom and Crusading in the Thirteenth Century: Remembering the Dead of Louis IX's Crusades', *Al-Masaq: Islam and the Medieval Mediterranean*, 15 (2003), 189-96
- *Crusading in the Age of Joinville* (Aldershot, 2006)
- Smith, K. A., *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture* (Woodbridge, 2011)
- Smith, T.W., *Curia and crusade: Pope Honorius III and the recovery of the holy land, 1216-1227* (Turnhout, 2017)

Spacey, B. C., 'The celestial knight: evoking the First Crusade in Odo of Deuil's *De projectione Ludovici VII in orientem* and in the anonymous *Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris*', *Essays in Medieval Studies*, 31 (2015), 65-82

—— 'Martyrdom as masculinity in the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*', *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Hodgson, N.R., Lewis, K.J. & Mesley, M. (London, 2019), pp. 222-36

Spencer, S.J., 'The emotional rhetoric of crusader spirituality in the narratives of the First Crusade', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 58 (2014), 57-86

—— 'Piety, brotherhood and power: the role and significance of emotions in Albert of Aachen's *Historia Ierosolimitana*', *Literature Compass*, 13, 6 (2016), 423-43

—— "'Like a Raging Lion': Richard the Lionheart's Anger during the Third Crusade in Medieval and Modern Historiography', *The English Historical Review*, 132, 556 (2017), 495-532

Spiegel, G. M., *Romancing the Past: The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-century France* (Berkeley, 1995)

—— *The Past as Text the Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (London, 1999)

Staunton, M., *The Historians of Angevin England* (Oxford, 2017)

Strayer, J., *The Albigensian Crusades* (New York, 1971)

Strickland, M., *War and Chivalry: The Conduct and Perception of War in England and Normandy, 1066-1217* (Cambridge, 1996)

Stringer, K. J., *The Reign of Stephen: Kingship, Warfare and Government in Twelfth-century England* (London, 1993)

Stuckey, J., *Charlemagne: The making of an image, 1100-1300*, Unpublished doctoral thesis (University of Florida, 2006)

—— 'Charlemagne as crusader? Memory, propaganda, and the many uses of Charlemagne's legendary expedition to Spain', *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages: Power, Faith, and Crusade*, ed. Gabriele, M., & Stuckey, J. (New York, 2008), pp. 137-52

Sumption, J., *The Albigensian Crusade* (London, 1999)

Swanson, R. N., *Religion and Devotion in Europe, c.1215-c.1515* (Cambridge, 1995)

Sweetenham, C., 'Crusaders in a hall of mirrors: the portrayal of Saracens in Robert the Monk's *Historia Ierosolimitana*', *Languages of Love and Hate: Conflict, Communication, and Identity in the Medieval Mediterranean*, ed. Lambert, S. & Nicholson, H.J. (Turnhout, 2012)

—— 'What really happened to Eurvin de Créel's donkey? Anecdotes in sources for the First Crusade', *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory*, ed. Bull, M. & Kempf, D. (Woodbridge, 2014), pp. 75-88

Thibodeaux, J. D. (ed.), *Negotiating Clerical Identities: Priests, Monks and Masculinity in the Middle Ages* (Basingstoke, 2010)

——— *The Manly Priest: Clerical Celibacy, Masculinity, and Reform in England and Normandy, 1066-1300* (Philadelphia, 2015)

Throop, S.A., *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance* (Farnham, 2011)

Tosh, J., 'Hegemonic masculinity and the history of gender', *Masculinities in politics and war*, ed. Dudink, S., Hagemann, K. & Tosh, J. (Manchester, 2004), pp. 41-58

——— 'The History of Masculinity: An Outdated Concept?', *What is masculinity?: Historical dynamics from antiquity to the contemporary world*, ed. Arnold, J.H. & Brady, S. (Basingstoke, 2013), pp. 17-34

Turner, R. V. & Heiser, R. R., *The Reign of Richard Lionheart: Ruler of the Angevin Empire, 1189-1199* (Harlow, 2000)

Tuthill, J., 'Cities and kingship in the medieval West: Joinville's Louis IX and Paris', *The Middle Ages in Texts and Texture: Reflections on Medieval Sources*, ed. Glenn, J. (Toronto, 2011), pp. 273-84

Tyerman, C., *God's War: A New History of the Crusades* (London, 2007)

——— *The Debate on the Crusades* (Manchester, 2011)

——— *The World of the Crusades* (Newhaven, 2019)

Van den Abeele, B., 'La tradition manuscrite des *Etymologies* d'Isidore de Séville: pour une reprise en main du dossier', *Cahiers de recherches médiévales (XIIIe-XVe siècles)*, 16 (2008), 195-205

Van Herwaarden, J., 'The origins of the cult of St. James of Compostela', *Journal of Medieval History*, 6, 1 (1980), 1-35

Vaucher, A., *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1997)

Vincent, N., 'William of Newburgh, Josephus and the new Titus', *Christians and Jews in Angevin England: The York Massacre of 1190, Narratives and Contexts*, ed. Rees-Jones, S. & Watson, S. (Woodbridge, 2013), pp. 57-90

Wagner, T., 'The illness of King Richard and King Philippe on the Third Crusade: an understanding of *arnaldia* and *leonardie*', *Crusades*, 10 (2011), 23-44

Walker, S., 'Political saints in later medieval England', *The Fifteenth Century, IV: Political Culture in Later Medieval England*, ed. Walker, S. & Braddick, M.J. (Manchester, 2006), pp. 198-222

Walter, K. L., 'Peril, flight and the sad man: medieval theories of the body in battle', *War and Literature*, ed. Ashe, L. & Patterson, I. (Cambridge, 2014), pp. 21-40

Weiler, B., 'Royal Justice and Royal Virtue in William of Malmesbury's *Historia Novella* and Walter Map's *De Nugis Curialium*', *Virtue and Ethics in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Bejczy I. P. & Newhauser R. G. (Leiden, 2005), pp. 317-39

Wood, E. A., 'Hypermasculinity as a scenario of power: Vladimir Putin's iconic rule, 1999-2008', *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 18, 3 (2016), 329-50

Yarrow, S., 'Prince Bohemond, Princess Melaz, and the Gendering of Religious Difference in the Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis', *Intersections of Gender, Religion and Ethnicity in the Middle Ages*, ed. Beattie, C. & Fenton K.A. (London, 2011), pp. 140-57

—— 'Masculinity as a World Historical Category of Analysis', *What is masculinity?: Historical dynamics from antiquity to the contemporary world*, ed. Arnold, J.H. & Brady, S. (Basingstoke, 2013), pp. 114-38

Zerner, M., 'L'épouse de Simon de Montfort et la croisade albigeoise', *Femmes. Mariages - Lignages, XIIe-XIVe siècles: Melanges offert à Georges Duby*, ed. Dufournet. J. (Bruxelles, 1992), pp. 449-70

Newspaper:

Connolly, K., 'Pope says sorry for crusaders' rampage in 1204', *The Telegraph* (2004, June 30)
Retrieved from:

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/italy/1465857/Pope-says-sorry-for-crusaders-rampage-in-1204.html>

Website:

Fordham Medieval Digital Projects, *Independent Crusaders Mapping Project*, Retrieved from <https://medievalomeka.ace.fordham.edu/exhibits/show/independent-crusaders-project->

Conference Paper:

Spencer, S.J., *Ralph of Coggeshall's Account of the Third Crusade and Its Relationship with Richard de Templo's Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*, Paper presented at International Medieval Congress Leeds (July 2019)