



University of HUDDERSFIELD

University of Huddersfield Repository

McCabe, Mark

Godfrey of Bouillon: Representations of Kingship and Masculinity on the First Crusade

Original Citation

McCabe, Mark (2015) Godfrey of Bouillon: Representations of Kingship and Masculinity on the First Crusade. Masters thesis, University of Huddersfield.

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/27860/>

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/>

**GODFREY OF BOUILLON: REPRESENTATIONS OF
KINGSHIP AND MASCULINTIY ON THE FIRST
CRUSADE**

MARK MCCABE

A thesis submitted to the University of Huddersfield in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Masters by Research in History

The University of Huddersfield

September 2015

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 the prior written permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property Rights and/or Reproductions

Abstract

This thesis uses a gendered reading of twelfth-century narratives of the First Crusade (1096-99) to analyse their presentation of Godfrey of Bouillon (d.1100), one of the crusade leaders and first Latin ruler of Jerusalem. Godfrey's short reign has meant many modern historians consider his life a myth and that most of our knowledge of him was created after his death. This has caused these historians to place little value on researching him. However, using masculinity as an analysis of his deeds allows us to gain ideas about kingly masculinity in the twelfth-century, and how these ideas were disseminated through narratives.

This thesis encompasses many of the twelfth-century crusade narratives which are disregarded by crusade historians because they were not eye witness to the events they describe. However this large corpus of texts can be better utilised to give us more ideas and knowledge about twelfth-century Western European thinking on the ideas of crusading, kingship, war, politics and religion. This means all texts regarding the First Crusade in the twelfth century have value for the insight they offer in this regard.

Masculinity is not something gained through passing a certain age, it had to be learned, and therefore this work focuses on kingly masculinity which is the apex of masculinity and would have been used to inspire many of the warrior classes to go on crusade or how to act in general. These texts helped form the construction of their masculinity by their didactic nature, and they would have learned to be an 'ideal man' through the precedents set by their forbearers. As such these texts are deconstructed in this thesis to show exactly what constituted kingly masculinity in the twelfth-century.

Table of Contents

Abstract	3
Table of Contents	4
List of abbreviations.....	5
Introduction.....	6
Chapter 1	11
Methodology	11
Sources	18
Chapter 2	23
The Election of Godfrey	23
Chapter 3	29
The Leader.....	29
Chapter 4	39
The Warrior.....	39
Chapter 5	53
The Pious.....	53
Conclusion.....	65
Bibliography	68

Word count: 24,665

List of abbreviations

- AA Albert of Aachen, *History of the Journey to Jerusalem, Volume 1: Books 1-6 The First Crusade 1095-1099*, ed. and trans. by Susan Edgington, (Farnham, 2013)
- CA *The Chanson d'Antioche An Old French Account of the First Crusade*, ed. and trans. by Susan B. Edgington and Carol Sweetenham, (Farnham, 2011)
- FC Fulcher of Chartres, *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem, 1095-1127*, trans. by Frances Rita Ryan, ed. By Harold S. Fink, (New York, 2011)
- GF *Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, ed. and trans. by Rosalind Hill, (London, 1962)
- GN Guibert of Nogent, *The Deeds of God through the Franks*, ed. and trans. by Robert Levine, (Teddington, 2008)
- GP Gilo of Paris, *Historia vie Hierosolimitane*, ed. and trans. by Christopher W. Grocock and J. Elizabeth Siberry, (Oxford, 1997)
- PT Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, ed. and trans. by John Hugh Hill and Laurita Hill, (Philadelphia, 1974)
- RA Raymond of Aguilers, *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem*, ed. and trans. by John Hugh Hill and Laurita L. Hill. (Philadelphia, 1968)
- RC Ralph of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi: A History of the Normans on the First Crusade*, ed. and trans. by Bernard S. Bachrach, and David Steward Bachrach, (Abingdon, 2005)
- RM Robert the Monk, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, ed. and trans. by Carol Sweetenham, (Aldershot, 2006)
- WT William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, ed. and trans. by E.A. Babcock and A.C. Krey. (New York, 1943)

Introduction

In 1095 Godfrey of Bouillon, a minor noble from Lower Lorraine, heeded Pope Urban II's call for an armed pilgrimage to the Holy Land to liberate Holy Sepulchre from its Muslim occupiers. Godfrey's exemplary conduct throughout the campaign and its incredible success led him to receive the highest distinction. Following the conquest of Jerusalem in July 1099 he was elected to rule the city and its territories. While not technically king some twelfth-century writers did bestow the title on him, partly because he was the founder of the dynasty of Latin Jerusalemite kings.¹ But he was also given this title because he was held to embody all the qualities of ideal kingship and, therefore, of ideal masculinity too. Godfrey was chosen to rule from amongst a group of noble leaders, who, along with many other remarkable individuals, were celebrated as heroes throughout Western Europe for their deeds on crusade. This group of nobles included Bohemond of Taranto, Raymond of Saint-Gilles, Robert of Normandy, Robert of Flanders, Stephen of Blois and Hugh Magnus. But, according to contemporary accounts, it was Godfrey who stood out amongst these distinctive heroes, and was elected by his peers on 22 July 1099 to govern and protect the newly founded Christian kingdom of Jerusalem.²

Following his untimely death in July 1100, twelfth-century chroniclers eulogized Godfrey, praising his character: Guibert of Nogent noted that Godfrey was known for 'his remarkable humility and modesty, worthy to be imitated by monks,' describing him as, 'slender, relatively tall, eloquent, and even-tempered, he had made himself known for his strength in battle on the Lord's expedition.'³ Robert the Monk, whose First Crusade narrative was the most popular of the genre, declared Godfrey to be 'handsome, of lordly bearing, eloquent, of distinguished character, and so lenient with his soldiers as to give the impression of being a monk rather than a soldier,' but in the heat of battle, 'his courage became abundantly

¹ WT, p. 393

² Godfrey though was not necessarily deemed the 'obvious' choice at the time but the focus of this dissertation is on how this event was represented rather than what 'actually happened'.

³ GN, p. 137, p. 121

evident and like a roaring lion he feared the attack of no man.⁴ In the 1170s William of Tyre's epitaph evinced Godfrey's kingship abilities and characteristics:

[Godfrey] was a man of deep religious character, devout and God fearing, merciful and just. Serious and steadfast in word, he shunned all evil ways. He scorned the vanity of the world, a trait rare at his time of life, and especially in one belonging to the military profession. He was constant in prayer, assiduous in good works, and noted for his liberality. Gracious and affable, kind and forbearing, he showed himself in all ways commendable and pleasing to God. He was tall of stature, not extremely so, but still taller than the average man. He was strong beyond compare, with solidly built limbs and stalwart chest. His features were pleasing, his beard and hair of medium blond. In use of arms and in the practice of military tactics him, in judgement of all, without peer.⁵

In addition to having a standout physicality that would have benefitted a warrior, Godfrey had additional characteristics that set him apart from other men. This is quite remarkable considering he was neither born nor raised to be king, but had in fact risen to the position by the merit of his actions and leadership. Godfrey's embodiment of kingly masculinity as depicted in the twelfth-century narratives of the First Crusade will be the focus of this study. This original approach to his representation gives us a vital insight into the mind-set of the writers and their audiences. It also suggests something of the self-perception of the martial elite who went to wage Holy War in the unknown.

*

Godfrey was born around 1060, the second son of the Eustace II count of Boulogne. His elder brother Eustace III inherited the dynastic lands, whilst Godfrey inherited the title of duke of Lower Lotharingia from his uncle Godfrey the Hunchback, the estranged husband of Matilda of Tuscany.⁶ Godfrey was a staunch ally of Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV, and fought alongside him during the Investiture Controversy of the 1080s.⁷ The duchy Godfrey ruled was not politically stable and in fact it was not guaranteed to be inheritable, as the Holy Roman Emperor effectively appointed the duke as Matilda had contested Godfrey's claim to it. This meant that Godfrey's territory was not worth much and therefore going on

⁴ RM, pp. 83-4

⁵ WT, p. 387

⁶ Thomas Asbridge, T.S., *The First Crusade: A New History*, (London, 2004), p.62

⁷ *ibid.*, p.61

crusade offered the opportunity to find a different source of wealth or land.⁸ He was joined on crusade by his elder brother, Eustace and also his younger brother Baldwin, later to become King Baldwin I of Jerusalem.

Godfrey's success and subsequent reputation meant he was written about extensively for centuries beyond his death, and was proclaimed one of the Nine Worthies in the early fourteenth-century. These were figures who epitomised chivalric ideals such as military leadership and heroic masculinity from the ancients to the present, including Arthur and Charlemagne from the Christian period. Godfrey's inclusion ahead of any other contemporary demonstrated the esteem with which he was held at that time.⁹ However, Godfrey's legendary status during the medieval period has been questioned by modern historians who argue that his recorded achievements and reputation are more exaggeration than fact.

Steven Runciman's significant and highly influential tome on the First Crusade, published as part of a trilogy from 1951-54, began this revision.¹⁰ He acknowledged Godfrey's medieval reputation claiming he 'appears in later legend as the perfect Christian knight, the peerless hero of the whole Crusading epic.' However, he advocated that 'a scrupulous study of history must modify the verdict'. Runciman summed Godfrey up as being 'indifferent as a soldier, and as a personality he was overshadowed by his younger brother, Baldwin.'¹¹ Runciman continued: 'he had not been a very efficient duke; and his behaviour at Constantinople had shown him to possess the suspicious obstinacy of a weak and unintelligent man.'¹² Runciman judged, rather grudgingly, that '[Godfrey's] chief asset was that his piety corresponded with the piety of the average Crusader.'¹³ Runciman was a well-known pro-Byzantinist who used Anna Comnena's *Alexiad* and the *Gesta Francorum* as the main sources for his work. These two narratives are not the most well-informed when it

⁸ Alan Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: a dynastic history 1099-1125*, (Oxford, 2000), p. 20; Heather Tanner, *Families, Friends and Allies Boulogne and Politics in Northern France and England, c. 879-1160*, (Leiden, 2004), p. 138

⁹ Maurice Keen, *Chivalry*, (New Haven, 2005), p.123

¹⁰ Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Volume I: The First Crusade and the Foundation of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*, (Cambridge, 1951)

¹¹ *ibid.*, pp. 145-6

¹² *ibid.*, pp. 291-2

¹³ *ibid.*, pp. 292-3

comes to Godfrey's actions and characteristics, and this helps to explain Runciman's attitude towards him.

Runciman's work remained influential and opinions of Godfrey's reputation followed his assessment for a long time. Most academic work on Godfrey tended to focus on the exact nature of his title gained in Jerusalem or the background of his family and his army, rather than on his character and individual exploits.¹⁴ However, since the early 2000s an increased interest in the crusades led to the publication of many new and comprehensive accounts. Thomas Asbridge began this deluge with his 2004 book about the First Crusade.¹⁵ This was soon followed by Christopher Tyerman's *God's War* in 2007 and Jonathan Phillips' *Holy Warriors*, in 2010.¹⁶ These three offer differing views of Godfrey. Tyerman comments that Godfrey was, 'far from the selfless hero of chivalric legend he later appeared,' and has even questioned Godfrey's sexuality, suggesting that the fact he never married may have been due to sexual preference.¹⁷ Asbridge echoes Runciman's contention that Godfrey had no experience of military command, neither was he known to have a reputation of piety, but he does acknowledge Godfrey as champion of the crusading ideal.¹⁸ Phillips, on the other hand, rather than taking a revisionist approach, advocates the same view as the medieval chroniclers, describing Godfrey as being deeply religious and a fearless soldier, thus making him the 'model of a holy warrior.'¹⁹ Most recently Simon John asserts that Godfrey was not the stand-out character of the First Crusade that his later representation suggests. He argues that although Godfrey was elected ruler of the Kingdom of Jerusalem this 'did not automatically cause his reputation to transcend those of the other celebrated crusaders in the eyes of contemporaries.'²⁰ Instead he asserts: 'it was not until the early thirteenth century, when traditions which connected the story of the mythical warrior known as the

¹⁴ Jonathan Riley-Smith, 'The title of Godfrey of Bouillon', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, vol. 52, (1979), pp. 83-6; John France, 'The Election and Title of Godfrey De Bouillon', *Canadian Journal of History XVIII*, (1983), pp. 321-330; Alan Murray, 'The Title of Godfrey of Bouillon as Ruler of Jerusalem', *Collegium Medievale 3* (1990), pp. 163-178; Murray, *Crusader Kingdom*; Alan Murray, 'The Army of Godfrey of Bouillon, 1096-1099: Structure and Dynamics of a Contingent on the First Crusade,' *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, 70, (1992), pp. 301-329

¹⁵ Asbridge, *First Crusade*,

¹⁶ Christopher Tyerman, *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, (London, 2007); Jonathan Phillips, *Holy Warriors: A Modern History of the Crusades*, (London, 2010)

¹⁷ Tyerman, *God's War*, pp. 108-9

¹⁸ Asbridge, *First Crusade*, p. 62; p. 332

¹⁹ Phillips, *Holy Warriors*, p. 11

²⁰ Simon John, 'Godfrey of Bouillon and the Swan Knight', in Simon John and Nicholas Morton (eds.), *Crusading and warfare in the Middle Ages: realities and representations*, (Farnham, 2014), pp. 129-130

Swan Knight to the history of Godfrey's family were firmly established, that his reputation began to surpass those of men like Bohemond and Raymond of Toulouse.²¹ John even claims, 'there is a case to be made that in some contexts other participants of the crusade were remembered more favourably than Godfrey.'²²

This dissertation aims to overturn the modern, less positive revisions of Godfrey's character and the contention that the twelfth-century chronicles do not single him out as an exceptional individual. It contends that if these First Crusade accounts are read from a gendered perspective, focussing on issues of masculinity, it becomes apparent that they identify Godfrey as being an exemplar of manly virtues, and thus the stand out character and apex male of the crusade. Thus, according to the chroniclers, when it came to the election that appointed him ruler of Jerusalem he was the *only* real choice amongst the leaders. The election was in itself a highly unusual occurrence in the medieval period and is thus revealing of contemporary standards of kingship. In previous work on Godfrey the election is usually only discussed in 'technical' terms relating to his title (as noted above), or else with respect to the practical considerations governing his appointment.²³ The question of how the fact of Godfrey's election shaped his depiction in the chronicle narratives has received far less attention. It will be shown here that, according to these accounts, Godfrey was the only member of the crusade's leadership depicted as having no flaws to his character and that this was because he was the embodiment of masculinity, both with respect to his warrior accomplishments and his morality. These qualities were shown to underpin his achievements on crusade and also to justify his election. This approach also helps us to uncover contemporary perceptions of the relationship between twelfth-century kingship, and ideals of masculinity and to consider how they incorporated the new phenomenon of crusading. This, in turn enables the presentation of new insights into the nature, experience and representation of crusading more widely. The ideals and traits that will be discussed concerning Godfrey's masculinity comprise his leadership and achievements as a warrior. Added to this are his monk-like characteristics, such as his piety, chastity and spirituality. This will allow us to see how Godfrey became a new creation, a hybrid of warrior and monk, and also to understand how this would set the standard for the new ideology of crusading.

²¹ *ibid.*, pp. 129-130

²² *ibid.*, p. 131

²³ See footnote 13

Chapter 1

Methodology

Immediately after the capture of Jerusalem on 15 July 1099 the process of immortalising the warriors involved began. The success of the First Crusade was considered such an incredible event that, according to some, it could only have been achieved with God's direct intervention.²⁴ Therefore to celebrate such an event numerous people (almost all professional religious men) wrote accounts of it, leaving us with a larger corpus of texts describing the First Crusade than survive for any other event of the Middle Ages. Writing about the First Crusade has been described by Matthew Kempshall as a very appropriate opportunity for historiographical digression, because for the first time in centuries a military event on an epic scale like those found in the classics presented itself to a modern audience, and it could be compared to other ancient military campaigns led by Agamemnon, Alexander the Great, Vespasian and Titus.²⁵ This was important because historical writing in the medieval period used as a model and reference point works by classical writers from the antique period.²⁶ Such comparisons served to enhance the status of the crusade and crusaders.

A second source upon which many clerics drew to write about the crusade was Books 1 and 2 Maccabees from the Bible. This military narrative described deeds of bravery in a war that saw the recapture of Jerusalem by Judas Maccabeus.²⁷ It was an event so strikingly similar to the First Crusade that it was mentioned in many of the crusade chronicles because it proved divine intervention in the crusade. In both cases the functions of commemoration and didacticism were clearly the intentions of the writers.²⁸ The Bible and the classics were long-standing models for medieval writers, especially when it came to depicting heroic deeds.²⁹ Praising and commemorating the deeds of individuals provided a model for

²⁴ GN, p. 21

²⁵ Matthew Kempshall, *Rhetoric and the writing of history 400-1500*, (Manchester, 2011), p. 256

²⁶ *ibid.*, p. 35

²⁷ *ibid.*, p. 56

²⁸ *ibid.*, p. 56

²⁹ Chris Given-Wilson, *Chronicles The Writing of History in Medieval England*, (London, 2004), p. 110

imitation to their audience; Kempshall states that 'an exemplum should be considered a better means of instruction than a precept'.³⁰ That is why Godfrey is portrayed in such a positive light in the narratives. The medieval chroniclers present him as being just such an exemplum: an ideal crusader who should be emulated. Crusade chronicles provided an excellent means for medieval writers to impart instructions on how ideal masculinity should be performed, because chroniclers, like nearly all the great historians of warfare since classical times, believed that 'war was the ultimate proving-ground of a man's character' as Chris Given-Wilson puts it.³¹ Therefore the crusade narratives offer us the best insight into ideas of warrior masculinity current in twelfth-century in Western Europe, but have rarely been employed as a source for these.

*

Godfrey was universally praised in the early twelfth-century narratives of the First Crusade even though he was not the central protagonist in most of them. For instance, he is not focus of the anonymous *Gesta Francorum*, or of works by Raymond of Aguilers, Fulcher of Chartres, and Peter Tudebode, all of whom participated in the First Crusade. Most of the information we have comes from Albert of Aachen's account which he compiled from returning crusaders, as he did not participate himself. For this reason historians have tended to neglect the more detailed accounts of Godfrey because knowledge of his deeds is not first hand or eyewitness based. Additionally, Godfrey's short tenure in charge of Jerusalem means there is a relative paucity of information about him compared to the other crusaders, like Bohemond, who was the focus of the *Gesta Francorum* and lived longer.³² All of this has been central to the modern revisionist approach of suggesting that much of what the sources say about Godfrey was more myth than reality.³³

Until fairly recently historians have approached these First Crusade chronicles by stripping away 'the rhetorical amplification and legendary accretion' in an attempt to form an 'accurate' construction of the past.³⁴ However, Justin Lake notes that there has recently

³⁰ Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 537

³¹ Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, pp.110-111

³² Kenneth Baxter Wolf, 'Crusade and narrative: Bohemond and the Gesta Francorum', *Journal of Medieval History*, 17, (1991), pp. 207-216

³³ See above pp. 8-10

³⁴ Justin Lake, 'Current Approaches to Medieval Historiography', *History Compass*, 13, (2015), p. 89

been a change in scholarship from mining texts for historical data, to instead using them to focus on understanding 'medieval histories in their own literary, social, and political contexts'.³⁵ This is the approach adopted by this dissertation as it allows us to use all sources that comment on Godfrey without having to question how strictly accurate or reliable they are. The nature of the sources makes attempting to find the 'real' Godfrey a futile task. And, in any case, it is the constructed Godfrey who is far more interesting and useful when considering ideas of kingship and masculinity. Rather than approaching these narratives in terms of inaccuracies it is much more fruitful to analyse them for what they can tell us about eleventh and twelfth-century ideologies and practices, especially in relation to ideas of gender and religion, and the roles these played in creating men's social identities.

Ruth Mazo Karras's has defined masculinity thus, stating that it refers not 'to the male body, whose biological and anatomical features remain relatively constant among different men and over time but refers to the meanings that society puts on a person with a male body, which do change over time'.³⁶ Ideas of masculinity or manliness are therefore socially constructed and tell us what individual societies value in a man. Different cultures and societies thus can have different ideals of manliness and these can also change over time, in response to both events and ideas. A very good example comes from the eleventh and twelfth centuries when masculine identity was evolving for both the clergy and the martial elite. Priests were having to come to terms with the new identity of being celibate, which was forced on them from the papacy. This meant they were no longer able to marry and procreate, and McNamara influentially raised the question: 'can one be a man without deploying the most obvious biological attributes of manhood?'³⁷ The clerical class responded by championing their own ideas of masculinity, focussed around spiritual battle against the world and the flesh and claimed this as superiority to lay masculinity.³⁸ Meanwhile the same period saw the development of the mounted knight and his crucial use in the theatre of war

³⁵ *ibid.*, p. 89

³⁶ Ruth Mazo Karras, *From Boys to Men Formations of Masculinity in Late Medieval Europe*, (Philadelphia, 2003), p. 3

³⁷ Jo Ann McNamara, 'The Herrenfrage: The Restructuring of the Gender System, 1050-1150', in Clare Lees (ed.), *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages*, (Minneapolis, 1994), p. 5

³⁸ See Pat Cullum and Katherine Lewis, (eds.), *Religious men and masculine identity in the Middle Ages*, (Woodbridge, 2013), for essays discussing this issue in greater depth.

led to the development of the ethos of chivalry amongst men of a certain social standing.³⁹ This development in warfare thus brought about a new lifestyle governed by an ethical code which had gendered homosocial implications for relations among high status men. Being the ideal, chivalrous man, necessitated the display of qualities such as strength, bravery and aggression - but to be properly masculine these had to be tempered with other characteristics such as prudence, mercy and piety.⁴⁰ Clerical and kingly masculinity, while being different in some essentials, also shared many characteristics, such as moral strength, restraint, religious knowledge and reasoned judgement. These two examples both reveal changes in the way men were expected to act, providing what Hadley terms, 'a necessary corrective to the premise that masculinity is universal, unchanging and unquestioned.'⁴¹ Both the development of clerical celibacy and of chivalry influenced how the chroniclers of the First Crusade (mostly celibate clerics themselves) understood and projected ideal masculinity. They did so as part of a wider moral and didactic project, common to contemporary chroniclers, of providing readers with examples of good and bad conduct, which they should use to pattern their own behaviour.⁴² Their narratives also shed light on how the warriors who made up part of their audiences understood what constituted correct masculine behaviour.

Kirsten Fenton has published on gender, nation and conquest in the works of William of Malmesbury, a twelfth-century Benedictine monk who wrote various works of history and hagiography, and is considered to be one of the most important English historians of the twelfth-century. Fenton identified the following traits and characteristics as being what William considered ideal masculinity.⁴³ Regarding violence (which is relevant to the twelfth-century due to the centrality of war but also the evolving socio-cultural constructs of chivalry) William believed that it must be expressed in a controlled manner. This is demonstrated through ideals such as restraint, honour, advice, battlefield leadership, and vengeance.⁴⁴ In the late eleventh and twelfth-century the most obvious displays of manliness occurred on the battlefield. This is established in narratives using the Latin words

³⁹ Keen, *Chivalry*, pp. 26-7

⁴⁰ Karras, *From Boys to Men*, pp. 24-5; Katherine Lewis, *Kingship and masculinity in late Medieval England*, (London, 2013), p. 2

⁴¹ D.M. Hadley, 'Introduction: Medieval Masculinities', in D.M. Hadley (ed.), *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, (London, 1999), p. 2

⁴² Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 537

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

⁴⁴ *ibid.*, p. 35

virtus and *virili* to describe abilities and behaviour such as courage, bravery, strength and honour, whilst also suggesting moral excellence and ideal masculinity.⁴⁵ *Vir* is an important word that applied to male behaviour and can be seen as an ideal men must live up to in order to be considered the embodiment of masculinity. It will be shown that Godfrey embodies virility in these terms, demonstrating his suitability to be king. Control and restraint was further emphasised in regards to emotions, specifically ones that could induce anger. Uncontrolled anger could have unbridled and unacceptable results.⁴⁶ Fenton concluded that Malmesbury's ideals 'have been partly inherited from his knowledge of classical and patristic works.'⁴⁷ Fenton's analysis of masculinity in William of Malmesbury is broadly applicable to the analysis of crusade narratives, as most of the authors shared his vocation and outlook. Additionally, their intended audience was also similar to that for Malmesbury's work: clerics and the aristocratic martial class.

This dissertation uses masculinity as tool of analysis, partly because it is currently underused as a methodology in relation to the crusades. Previous work on masculinity in the First Crusade comes from articles published recently by Andrew Holt and Natasha Hodgson.⁴⁸ Holt has written about the development by clerical writers of a new masculine identity which saw the knightly class adopt the virtues that defined clerical masculinity. This created the holy warrior hybrid that was essential for undertaking the new concept of crusading. Holt defines this new form of manhood as encompassing a man who 'was to become a chaste and humble warrior, who did not celebrate his manly deeds through boasting of his achievements, but instead gave the credit to God. The traditional arrogance of the aristocratic knight, with his ostentatious dress and display of bravado would never be acceptable in wars waged for the cross.'⁴⁹ However, in looking at the ideal which clerics wished to promote from their writings Holt does not look at examples of the warrior in action, and in fact downplays this aspect of a crusader's identity. In focusing on Godfrey this

⁴⁵ *ibid.*, pp.43-4

⁴⁶ *ibid.*, p. 36

⁴⁷ *ibid.*, p. 42

⁴⁸ Andrew Holt, 'Between Warrior and Priest: The Creation of a New Masculine Identity during the Crusades,' in Jennifer Thibodeaux (ed.), *Negotiating Clerical Identities: Priests, Monks and Masculinity in the Middle Ages*, (Basingstoke, 2010), pp.185-203; Natasha Hodgson, 'Normans and Competing Masculinities on Crusade', in Kathryn Hurlock & Paul Oldfield (eds.), *Crusading and Pilgrimage in the Norman World*, (Woodbridge, 2015), pp. 195-214

⁴⁹ Holt, 'Between Warrior and Priest', pp. 185-6

dissertation contends that examples of Godfrey in battle were crucial to establishing him as the epitome of both masculinity and kingship.

Hodgson has more recently published work which takes issue with Holt's identification of 'the ideal crusader'. She notes that there is not a single ideal to be found, because crusaders comprised various people from all backgrounds, differing in 'age, social status, career dress, character, wealth, family relationships and occasionally gens'.⁵⁰ 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 the crusade, with the aim of establishing how crusaders more broadly fit into the contemporary spectrum of medieval maleness'.⁵¹ Similarly this study also concentrates on a single form of crusading masculinity by looking at kingship, rather than trying to suggest one type of masculinity which was a 'fit' for all crusaders.

This dissertation contends that ideals of masculinity are absolutely central to the depiction of Godfrey in contemporary narratives. These ideals provide authors with the means to demonstrate his success as a warrior leader, and justify his selection as ruler of Jerusalem. Kingship was not just a type of masculinity, it was undoubtedly the zenith of masculinity in the medieval period. This is because it encompassed a variety of roles: warrior, leader, judge, all overlaid by exemplary piety. Being a king meant to lead by example, and therefore a king must act in a way other men could emulate. Demonstrating manliness was essential for a king, indeed those who have been perceived as 'bad' or 'weak' kings have had their gender questioned, for perceived unmanliness.⁵² This dissertation will show that the crusades narratives used the framework of kingly masculinity to depict Godfrey; he was the hegemonic male and everyone else on crusade ranked below him on the spectrum of masculinity. This approach draws on R.W. Connell's definition of hegemonic masculinity in reference to apex males who, within any given society, embody the 'most honoured way of being a man... [and] it required all other men to position themselves in relation it'.⁵³ Connell also states that 'men who received the benefits of patriarchy without enacting a strong

⁵⁰ Hodgson, 'Normans and Competing Masculinities', p. 202

⁵¹ *ibid.*, pp. 196-7

⁵² Lewis, *Kingship*, p. 4. Lewis cites the English kings Edward II, Richard II and Henry IV as falling into this category.

⁵³ R.W. Connell, and James Messerschmidt, 'Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept', *Gender and Society*, Vol. 19, No. 6, (2005), p. 832

version of masculine dominance could be regarded as showing a complicit masculinity'.⁵⁴ As we shall see, this fits Godfrey perfectly, as he is shown to achieve hegemonic leadership through masculine traits considered to be desirable by those subordinate to him. Thus Godfrey's hierarchical position was achieved through cultural consent and not a 'simple domination based on force'.⁵⁵ Although in order to maintain their hegemonic position, leaders like Godfrey had to provide regular demonstrations of their manly prowess as any diversion from this may have led to them losing power. Indeed, more broadly manliness was created and assessed relative to other men in this period; competition between men was therefore an important means of establishing superior masculinity.⁵⁶ Hegemonic masculinity, as portrayed by the chroniclers, is also seen to be the means by which crusade leaders (as especially Godfrey) were enabled to achieve great feats, such as moving a large amount of people through hostile territory, a completely new innovation in 1096. Hegemonic masculinity therefore also had a religious dimension because it was the quality which gave the leaders the abilities necessary to successfully wage holy war and take Jerusalem. Portrayals of hegemonic masculinity as exemplified by Godfrey were intended to establish him as superior to all other men, but his qualities could also be imitated, to a lesser degree, by knights and lords more broadly, and this was also a vital part of their function, as we shall see.

There has been relatively little work on intersections between kingship and masculinity in the Middle Ages. Though there are some studies whose findings are applicable and can be used as a basis for this analysis's methodology. Katherine Lewis has written about medieval kingship and masculinity and although her work focuses on Kings Henry V and VI of England, the standards and ideals of medieval kingship remained broadly constant between the twelfth and fifteenth-century. So many of her conclusions are applicable to the representations of Godfrey, for example Lewis notes that Henry V borrowed a copy of a First Crusade chronicle from a relative, and it was probably William of Tyre's narrative.⁵⁷ Therefore the qualities such as crusading and kingship touted in the twelfth-century were still ideals to be upheld in the fifteenth-century. Examples of ideal masculinity in kings never became redundant and were always useful in instructing would-be kings, as Lewis concludes

⁵⁴ *ibid.*, p. 832

⁵⁵ *ibid.*, p. 846

⁵⁶ Lewis, *Kingship*, p. 7

⁵⁷ *ibid.*, pp. 18-19

'the successful performance of kingship was predicated on the ability to embody and display widely recognized qualities of ideal manhood'.⁵⁸

The writers of the crusade narratives not only wished to celebrate the deeds of the heroes of the First Crusade but also impart knowledge and wisdom for the future crusaders who constituted their audience. And in some cases encourage them to actively follow examples of these heroes to come to the rescue of the Holy Land. Therefore the didactic nature of the texts is important because ideal masculine behaviour is essential for the potential crusader to complete his pilgrimage successfully. This dissertation therefore identifies and analyses the key exemplary masculine characteristics which Godfrey of Bouillon was shown to embody. It will also look at the use of negative examples by which the audience was shown behaviour which was the antithesis of ideal masculinity. This was used to tell them how not to act whilst on crusade.

Sources

The basis of this study is a number of twelfth-century narratives written to celebrate the deeds of those who went on the First Crusade. As already noted they were modelled on classical writings and the Bible. In addition, some of the later narratives constituted elaborated versions of the earlier accounts (especially of the *Gesta Francorum*). All but one of the texts was written in Latin, denoting their intended audience as being either other clerics or the nobility as Latin was the language of education and intellect. Whereas the Old French used by the *Chanson d'Antioche* meant it would have reached a far wider audience.⁵⁹ The Latin texts are mainly in the form of prose, though some are verse; Ralph of Caen even combines the two. The use of prose is seen as appropriate to the serious discourse of history, whilst writing in verse tended to be of the romance genre and its primary intention was to entertain, which, again, suggests a wider audience.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ Lewis, *Kingship*, p. 257; Other notable works using masculinity as methodological tool of analysis in regards to kingship include: Christopher Fletcher, *Richard II: Manhood, Youth, and Politics 1377-99*, (Oxford, 2008) and William Aird, *Robert Curthose, Duke of Normandy*, (Woodbridge, 2008)

⁵⁹ Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, p. 141

⁶⁰ *ibid.*, p. 142

Many crusade historians have favoured texts written by those with first-hand knowledge of the First Crusade over those written by non-participants. Such historians have often tried to reconstruct an 'accurate' account of events on crusade from the texts, and this approach has also formed their opinions of certain characters, especially Godfrey.⁶¹ However, this dissertation is concerned instead with twelfth-century ideas about kingship, gender and gaining an insight into the authors' own ideas and standards, within their socio-cultural settings. As Hodgson argues there is not a uniform opinion amongst all these writers, whilst to some extent they share influences, both social and literary they still had unique perspectives based on personal agendas, patronage, and intended purpose for writing.⁶² Therefore, for the purposes of this dissertation, all twelfth-century account of the First Crusade are as equal in worth as others for their information. Following is a brief introduction to the texts which form the corpus for this dissertation, to provide definition for the analysis texts composed from 1101 to 1184 have been considered

The anonymously written *Gesta Francorum*, Peter Tudebode's *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, Raymond of Aguilers', *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem* and Fulcher of Chartres' *Historia Hierosolymitana*, were all compositions by participants of the First Crusade. But they were all written from differing perspectives as the authors were in the armies of different leaders. The *Gesta Francorum* is believed to have been written by an Italian-Norman in the army of Bohemond of Taranto, and was the first to be completed probably in 1101.⁶³ Because of this it is seen as being the standard account of the First Crusade, and is often used by historians as such.⁶⁴ Tudebode's work is so similar to the *Gesta Francorum* that it is widely considered to be a direct copy of it, however, his text is more expansive than the *Gesta* making it more useful for ideas regarding Godfrey.⁶⁵ Tudebode identifies himself as a Poitevin priest, but there is no known date for his work.⁶⁶

⁶¹ See note on Runicman who used *Gesta* and *Alexiad* for his views on Godfrey

⁶² Natasha Hodgson, *Women, Crusading and the Holy Land in Historical Narrative*, (Woodbridge, 2007), p. 26

⁶³ Colin Morris, 'The *Gesta Francorum* as Narrative History', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 19, (1993), p. 56; Wolf, 'Crusade and narrative', pp. 207-8

⁶⁴ John France, "The Use of the Anonymous *Gesta Francorum* in the Early Twelfth-Century Sources for the First Crusade," in Alan V. Murray, ed., *From Clermont to Jerusalem: The Crusades and Crusader Societies, 1095–1500* (Turnhout, 1998), p. 29

⁶⁵ Thomas Asbridge, *The Crusades: The War for the Holy Land*, (London, 2012), pp. 108-9

⁶⁶ Jay Rubenstein, 'What is the *Gesta Francorum*, and who was Peter Tudebode?', *Revue Mabillon*, Volume 16, (2005), p. 189

Raymond of Aguilers was chaplain to the crusade leader Raymond of Saint-Gilles. Raymond completed his work by 1105 but because he was chiefly concerned with his leader, Godfrey was rarely mentioned in detail until the siege of Antioch in 1098. However, his narrative offers insight into Godfrey's election not given by others.⁶⁷ Fulcher was initially a member of Count Stephen of Blois' army from northern France, he later joined Baldwin of Boulogne's entourage which diverted from Antioch to Edessa, becoming Baldwin's chaplain. This meant he missed the capture of Antioch and Jerusalem. He finished writing his account in 1105 living in Jerusalem, whilst Baldwin reigned as king.⁶⁸

The crusade narratives written by non-participants are as follows: Albert of Aachen's *Historia Iherosolimitana*, which narrates the crusade from the perspective of those in Godfrey's army and is the most detailed account of the pilgrimage. Written in the first years of the twelfth-century it was based on the stories of returning pilgrims, thus making it independent from other chronicles.⁶⁹ Although influential upon William of Tyre, it is not considered by modern historians to be the same league as the accounts written by the participants. This is due to Albert's indiscriminate approach to his sources. However it is a vital source for evaluating how people reacted to events and what they felt about the crusade, making it essential for the ideas discussed in this dissertation.⁷⁰ Guibert of Nogent's *Gesta Dei Per Francos*, and Robert the Monk's *Historia Iherosolimitana* are both re-writes of the *Gesta Francorum* which they believed did not pay enough attention to God's role in the crusade's success.⁷¹ Guibert completed his work by 1109 and in addition to using the *Gesta* he also recounted stories from returning crusaders. He wrote with the intention of stressing that the crusade was God's work, and that those involved were God's instruments. Robert's account survives in an unusually large amount of manuscripts, totalling 84 copies from between the twelfth and sixteenth centuries, this makes it very likely that it was the most widely read First Crusade narrative during the twelfth-century.⁷²

⁶⁷ Christopher Tyerman, *Chronicles of the First Crusade*, (London, 2011), pp. xxii-iii

⁶⁸ *ibid.*, p. xxii

⁶⁹ Elizabeth Hallam (ed.), *Chronicles of the Crusades: Eye-witness Accounts of the Wars between Christianity and Islam*, (Godalming, 1997), p. 61

⁷⁰ Yuval Noah Harari, 'Eyewitnessing in Accounts of the First Crusade: The *Gesta Francorum* and Other Contemporary Narratives', *Crusades 3* (August 2004), p. 98

⁷¹ Simon John, 'Historical Truth and the Miraculous Past: The Use of Oral Evidence in Twelfth-Century Latin Historical Writing on the First Crusade', *English Historical Review* Vol. CXXX, No. 543, (2015), p. 271

⁷² Damien Kempf and Marcus Bull (eds.), *The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk*, (Woodbridge, 2013), p. xlii

It was probably written to celebrate Bohemond's post-Crusade victory tour of Europe in 1104 in which he tried to recruit for an attack on the Byzantine Emperor. Robert's work is more entertaining compared to other narratives; there is increased violence, probably because his audience was the knightly elite. Its popularity suggests it reflected the society of its audience and their feelings about the crusade, making it indispensable for this dissertation.

Ralph of Caen's *Gesta Tancredi* chiefly deals with the exploits of Tancred of Hauteville, Bohemond of Taranto's nephew. Ralph went to the East in 1107 and served under Tancred until his death, dating the chronicle to between 1112 and 1118.⁷³ Ralph's proximity to two of the crusade's main leaders placed him extremely well to write a history quite independent of any other account, and it should not just be regarded as a eulogy of Tancred.⁷⁴ For this analysis it is useful as it champions ideas of masculinity through the emerging concept of the holy warrior, as demonstrated in Tancred's often violent actions. *The Historia vie Hierosolimitane of Gilo of Paris* is a composition of two authors written in the first decade of the twelfth-century.⁷⁵ The first is Gilo of Paris and the second an anonymous author known as the Charleville Poet. This dual authorship gives an interesting perspective as Gilo portrayed Bohemond as the hero of the First Crusade, whereas the Charleville Poet was an ardent supporter of Godfrey, as seen by changing the accepted chronology to further Godfrey's reputation.⁷⁶ This has led to Marcus Bull claiming that this 'is valuable evidence both for how the commemoration of a process as memory-worthy as the First Crusade was a fluid quantity for some years after the event, and for the importance of individual figures around whom memory could be fashioned'.⁷⁷

The *Chanson d'Antioche* is the only non-Latin text used in this work. Written in Old French in the last quarter of the twelfth-century, it is a verse account concentrating mainly on events up until the extraordinary defeat of Emir Kerbogha's army in June 1098 at Antioch. As a secular source its value is the insight it gives into north eastern French arms-bearers'

⁷³ Natasha Hodgson, 'Reinventing Normans as Crusaders? Ralph of Caen's *Gesta Tancredi*', *Anglo-Norman Studies* XXX, (Woodbridge, 2008), p. 117

⁷⁴ *ibid.*, pp. 117-8

⁷⁵ GP, p. xxiv

⁷⁶ GP, p. xiii; Peter Orth, 'Gilo of Paris (d. after 1139)', in Alan Murray (ed.), *The Crusades An Encyclopedia*, (Oxford, 2006), p. 533; GP, pp. xiv-xv

⁷⁷ Marcus Bull, 'The *Historia Vie Hierosolimitane* of Gilo of Paris', *History*, 85, 277, (2000), p.123

mentality.⁷⁸ This epic poem's primary purpose was to entertain audiences with heroic deeds of the First Crusade and inspire them, probably to recruit for the Third Crusade.⁷⁹ Godfrey is the hero of the verse, although all the leaders have enhanced reputations compared to their depiction in the earlier texts. This suggests they were modelled to contemporary expectations of knighthood, making their examples more relevant to the changing ideas of masculinity during the twelfth-century.

William of Tyre's *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum* was begun in the 1170s and is considered the most important text relating to twelfth-century Jerusalem Crusader Kingdom.⁸⁰ William's account of the First Crusade is based on many of the texts above including Albert of Aachen, Raymond of Aguilers, Fulcher of Chartres and the *Gesta Francorum*.⁸¹ What makes William's work especially valuable for this analysis his own added Eastern perspective; this is the only surviving narrative written by someone born and raised in the Kingdom of Jerusalem and who also worked at the royal court. Godfrey's victory and establishment of a dynasty enhanced his reputation in William's work and led to his presentation as the ultimate holy warrior within it. The text was influential throughout Europe, being translated into French, and as noted above in relation to Henry V, was read into the fifteenth century and beyond. Therefore it was essential to maintaining Godfrey's esteemed reputation throughout the Middle Ages.

⁷⁸ CA, p. 60

⁷⁹ Susan Edgington, 'Chanson d'Antioche', in Murray, *Encyclopedia*, pp. 235-6; CA, p. 87

⁸⁰ Alan Murray, 'William of Tyre (d. 1186)', in Murray, *Encyclopedia*, pp. 1281-2

⁸¹ Peter Edbury and John Gordon Rowe, *William of Tyre Historian of the Latin East*, (Cambridge, 2008), pp.45-6

Chapter 2

The Election of Godfrey

On 22 July 1099 seven days after the capture of Jerusalem by the Christian armies which was the culmination of a three-and-half year long armed pilgrimage from Western Europe to the Holy Land, Godfrey was chosen from amongst his peers to rule this city considered to be Christendom's most preeminent. When the multitudes had set off in 1096 they had no idea how the pilgrimage would pan out, they had no idea if they would survive to see the Holy Sepulchre and complete their pilgrimage vows. There was certainly no plan for what the crusaders would do when it came to ruling and administering Jerusalem should they capture and wrestle it from its Muslim occupiers. However, with their successful campaign and bringing Jerusalem under Christian rule they were not going to let such a possession fall out of their grasp so easily, the crusaders had gone through untold hardships, which included wars, famine and diseases to gain Jerusalem.⁸² They knew it needed an effective leadership in order to remain a Christian possession and with many high ranking nobles to choose a leader from amongst, it was decided an election would be the best way of providing someone who was up to the task.

The fact Godfrey won this election over others has engendered debate and analysis from historians due to the fact that our knowledge of the crusade comes from narratives written by those who champion other leaders, such as Bohemond of Taranto and Raymond of Saint-Gilles, and extol their virtues on the crusade. There is no account written directly by someone who was a participant in Godfrey's army and consequently his actions remain more elusive. Therefore we have an election result which tells us who the nobility wanted to be in charge, or at least thought the best candidate, but we lack any knowledge of their reasoning. This gap in our knowledge has been filled in by the narrative writers, however since this was done after the event, modern scholars have instead offered their own

⁸² Phillips, *Holy Warriors*, pp. 25-7

theories as to why they believe Godfrey won the election rather than accepting the reasons given in the narratives.

Runciman disagreed with the crusaders choice in the election, believing Godfrey was not qualified for the role, the main reason being, 'his behaviour at Constantinople had shown him to possess the suspicious obstinacy of a weak and unintelligent man'.⁸³ Basing his assumptions on anti-Frankish sources it is no wonder he came to this conclusion, but Runciman then tried to be objective by suggesting Godfrey was chosen because the other crusaders saw 'him to be a gallant and godly man and a devoted servant of their cause'.⁸⁴ This suggests that it was Godfrey's religiosity above other considerations which was the chief quality he had. Alan Murray said Godfrey was chosen because 'he had antagonized fewer of the other leaders in the course of the crusade; he had not laid himself open to cupidity by attempting to seize cities and lands in the way that Bohemond and Raymond had done,' added to this the 'fact that his troops had made the first breakthrough into Jerusalem, and that he was the first of the princes to enter the city, must have been fresh in the minds of the electors and the army in general'.⁸⁵ Phillips agreed with the notion of Godfrey's action during the siege but has also suggested that Raymond of Saint-Gilles' 'abrasive personality' saw Godfrey being the preferred candidate.⁸⁶ Jon France also suggests Godfrey's temperate behaviour saw him being crowned, although he made a ridiculous claim, to be overturned in this analysis, that Godfrey 'offended nobody in the course of an undistinguished career on the crusade'.⁸⁷ Maybe Godfrey was the most genteel amongst the crusaders and won the vote by being the least disliked, but the chroniclers were unlikely to use this a method of championing him.

Murray's and Phillips' thoughts about Godfrey's role in the conquest of Jerusalem have been taken further by Asbridge who claimed it was due to Godfrey being the 'chief architect of the crusader's victory,' which ensured his election victory.⁸⁸ It was undoubtedly true in the sense that it was Godfrey's military nous outside Jerusalem, by disassembling a siege engine and re-assembling it in another position to the surprise of the Muslim defenders, was

⁸³ Runciman, *Crusades*, pp. 291-2

⁸⁴ *ibid*, pp. 291-2

⁸⁵ Murray, *Crusader Kingdom*, pp. 68-9

⁸⁶ Phillips, *Holy Warriors*, p. 27

⁸⁷ France, 'The Election and Title', p. 321

⁸⁸ Asbridge, *The Crusades*, p. 103

an important factor for consideration in the election.⁸⁹ However, the crusade had been three long years and Godfrey's glorious moment at the end, although significant, cannot lead to him being called the chief architect of the victory. Raymond's financial support, and even if the narrative writers did not wish to admit it, but Emperor Alexius's support in the form of money, and military aid was also vital. All the leading nobles on the crusade were important in some aspect of the long journey they had undertaken and all contributed to various victories along the way. Asbridge has even suggested that Godfrey could have legitimately claimed Jerusalem as right of conquest.⁹⁰ This is quite credible but probably not taken into account by the leadership due to more important factors involved in ruling the kingdom, such as ensuring its future security.

All the above ideas from modern historians would have undoubtedly played some part in why Godfrey won the election, but interestingly these are not the key factors that are mentioned by the twelfth-century chroniclers, who stress other qualities and reasons behind choosing Godfrey. The election featured in every written account, which is unsurprising, but what is intriguing is that the reports vary on a spectrum ranging from a mere two lines to several pages of full blown panegyric. The participants' accounts were short and straight to the point. The *Gesta Francorum* recorded, 'on the eighth day after the city was taken they chose Duke Godfrey as its ruler, so that he might fight against the pagans and protect the Christians.'⁹¹ Tudebode's version was almost word for word the same.⁹² These statements gave no reasons as to why Godfrey was chosen, or what qualified him to hold such an exalted position. Fulcher of Chartres remedied this by telling us: 'all the people of the Lord's army in the Holy City chose Godfrey prince of the realm because of the nobility of his character, military skill, patient conduct, no less than for his elegance of manners.'⁹³ Unremarkably Godfrey's role as ruler was defined as being protector of Christians. Since it was a newly conquered territory, holding on to it would be of utmost importance. These accounts showed no dispute or dissension regarding Godfrey's selection, probably because they supported it. However, Raymond of Aguiler's report exposed that another candidate had originally been considered:

⁸⁹ Phillips, *Holy Warriors*, p. 24

⁹⁰ Asbridge, *First Crusade*, p. 321

⁹¹ *GF*, pp. 92-3

⁹² *PT*, p. 120

⁹³ *FC*, p. 124

Disdainful of our advice and protest, the princes encouraged Raymond of Saint Gilles to accept the kingship; but he confessed that he shuddered at the name of the king in Jerusalem. However he said that he would not stand in the way of its acceptance by another. So they elected Godfrey and gave him the Holy Sepulchre... The counts of Normandy and Flanders favoured Godfrey as well as almost all of Raymond's entourage. Raymond's men thought that the count would return to Languedoc as soon as he lost the tower of David. This was not the only opposition of the Provençal's to Raymond, because earlier they spread malicious lies to block his election as king.⁹⁴

Raymond blamed the homesickness of Raymond of Saint-Gilles' men for thwarting his chance to rule. However the text gave none of Raymond's credentials that made him ideal to rule in order to convince us the wrong choice was made, which is striking given the fact it was written by his own chaplain and chief adulator.

Guibert of Nogent used Raymond's version of events, rather than the *Gesta's* which had been his main source for the rest of his account. But he spun it to portray Raymond and Godfrey both look honourable, writing:

...on the eighth day after the taking of the city, they made an offer to the count of Saint-Gilles, because of his excellence, but he, although mindful of his high position, refused to take on such an onerous task, for good reason (he was an old man, who had only one eye, but was famous for his remarkable feats of arms and for his energy). Finally, they approached Duke Godfrey and, at the urgent insistence of everyone, the labour rather than the honour of this task was imposed upon him, for he would have to battle unremittingly against the great strength of the gentiles, and to show good will towards neighbouring Christians.⁹⁵

Guibert stresses that Godfrey did not actively seek out the position but instead it was imposed upon him, almost as if it was divinely determined. To be elected leader of a fledgling state would not be a reward in any worldly sense, in comparison to established kingdoms such as France or England, it would be a strenuous vocation, just like the previous three years of the crusade had been. For this reason Guibert justified the choice of Godfrey because he had the following qualities, he was: 'Slender, relatively tall, eloquent, and even tempered, he had made himself known for his strength in battle on the Lord's expedition'.⁹⁶ To be ruler in this land surrounded by enemies would require a warrior in peak physical condition. This is what qualified Godfrey in Guibert's eyes, whilst Raymond himself acknowledged that his age disqualified him.

⁹⁴ RA, p. 130

⁹⁵ GN, p. 121

⁹⁶ *ibid.*, p. 121

In a long preamble to his reporting of the election Albert of Aachen depicted Godfrey as acting in a kingly fashion throughout the crusade, making him the unquestionable choice to rule:

[When] he was leader and prince of the despairing army, all the adverse condition were turned into favourable ones. And there was nothing to stand in their way, no difficulty to harm them, except where wickedness was found in criminals and lawbreakers. And when wickedness was found, vengeance was pursued in accordance with the true justice of God, by which the great army was also sanctified, and after the sons were punished in this way, now by hunger, now by the sword, at last they were happy and cleansed of filth, and, fulfilling their blessed desire with their leader and prince, they were worthy to enter the city of Jerusalem, they worshipped at the lords sepulchre and, taking possession of the ramparts of god's favour and will, they made Godfrey ruler of the city and commander of the people.⁹⁷

This described the hardship of completing the pilgrimage, and the ordeals they had to bypass in order to accomplish their crusading vows, but it also stressed Godfrey's role and how without his presence they would not have achieved it in the manner that they did. It is a good description of Godfrey balancing the role of both king and cleric. He acted as a judge and warrior whilst demonstrating piety because, as Albert stressed, one had to be worthy to enter Jerusalem and be in God's favour. Only Godfrey out of all the other leaders had all these characteristics, others had shown some, but all of them were needed in order to be considered a king.

William of Tyre focussed on Godfrey's piety as the defining factor which demonstrated his worthiness to rule. Writing at least seventy years after the event he recounted how Godfrey was selected,

The electors had taken an oath to divulge both the virtues and faults of their masters if asked. When Godfrey's men were asked what was Godfrey's biggest fault they were recorded as saying 'that when he once entered a church he could not be induced to leave, even after the celebration of the divine office was concluded. He continued to question the priests and others cognizant of such matters as to the meaning of each image and picture until his companions, whose interests were different, were excessively bored. Moreover, because of this habit of his, the viands which had been prepared for a fixed and suitable hour were, when finally eaten, overdone and tasteless as the result of the long delay. On hearing this complaint, the electors exclaimed, 'happy the man who possesses these characteristics, to whom that is ascribed as a

⁹⁷ AA, p. 232

fault which others would boast of as a virtue!’ after carefully considering all aspects of the matter, the electors, unanimously agreed upon the duke as their choice.⁹⁸

Godfrey’s piety and religious conviction demonstrated his worthiness to be king above all his other attributes, and in a classic style, William twisted the story to show a perceived negative trait actually being a positive one. William was telling the audience that any form of enthusiasm or interest in furthering religious knowledge should never be deemed negative.

The chroniclers therefore listed the kingly qualities that exuded hegemonic masculinity which they believed qualified Godfrey to rule and described him throughout their work as the superior leader, soldier, and Christian. This differs from the more practical theories given by modern historians which would have undoubtedly have played a significant part. The reasons why the chroniclers instead chose to convey Godfrey’s kingly masculinity as being his main attribute for being the leader, or effectively king, of Jerusalem could have been an attempt by them to hide their anxiety and concerns over the unique situation in the twelfth-century in which a medieval king was made through a group of nobles choosing one of their own to hold an office usually divinely appointed. Therefore the chroniclers knowing this end result would portray Godfrey as acting as a king throughout their narratives in order that the audience of their narratives would accept such a monumental action because his portrayal in their texts suggests that there was no other choice for the position, but Godfrey alone.

This dissertation will now give examples of Godfrey acting in a kingly masculinity manner by showing how, up to the point of his election, he demonstrated the requirements of this form of masculinity which encompassed being a leader, warrior, and a model of piety. All of which gives an insight into the ideals from chroniclers about twelfth-century kingly masculinity and offers an analysis not yet undertaken in relation to these sources and Godfrey.

⁹⁸ WT, p .382

Chapter 3

The Leader

Leadership is the first quality of kingly masculinity to be discussed as this is the most important one presented by the chroniclers and the quality which Godfrey was ultimately seen to exercise to a much higher degree than his fellow nobles, hence his election as ruler of Jerusalem. The following will give select examples of Godfrey's leadership in action whilst also providing episodes of poor leadership from other high ranking crusaders. The requirements of medieval leadership was the exercise of justice, piety, and wisdom.⁹⁹ We can also gain an insight into the contemporary expectations people had of their leaders in the twelfth-century by looking at the coronation oaths of kings from that period. For example, Richard I of England swore in 1189 to 'keep peace, honour and duty towards God and holy church and her customs all the days of his life. ... Exercise right justice and equity among the people committed to his charge. ... Annul any evil laws and customs that might have been introduced into the realm, and make good laws and keep them without fraud or evil intent'¹⁰⁰ This would have been a typical oath throughout kingdoms of Western Europe during the period and the ideas contained within it would have also been applicable to nobles ranking below the king, for example lords, dukes, and counts. They were all expected to act in this way, to protect their dependents and deliver justice, all of which was accomplished by employing their wisdom to situations that would occur. This was achieved through the art of self-mastery, the foundation of both medieval kingship and masculinity.¹⁰¹

One method used by the chroniclers to emphasise Godfrey's leadership qualities was to contrast them with others, and the first example comes from the reports about Peter the Hermit's People's Crusade. This was a large group of people who, following Pope Urban II's preaching of the armed pilgrimage to liberate the Holy Sepulchre in late 1095, decided to embark for Jerusalem before the official campaign date of summer 1096. They were led by the Peter the Hermit and the expedition ended disastrously with the slaughter of its

⁹⁹ Lewis, *Kingship*, p. 89

¹⁰⁰ Leopold Legg, *English Coronation Records*, (London, 1901), pp. 51-2

¹⁰¹ Lewis, *Kingship*, p. 2

participants at the hands of the Turks after they had crossed the Bosphorus.¹⁰² Their behaviour had been poor; along the way they looted and rioted, they destroyed buildings and committed arson, the cause of this was assigned to their lack of noble leadership.¹⁰³ Nonetheless it gave the narrative writers ammunition to condemn the actions of those who spurned the natural order of society by foregoing princely authority. They would use this example to show the divine favour enjoyed by the other leaders such as Godfrey, as well as his superior abilities.

Guibert of Nogent made a direct comparison between Peter and Godfrey's leadership abilities stating that when Godfrey marched into Hungary, in summer 1096, he was 'in possession of what Peter was unable to obtain: control over his army'.¹⁰⁴ Peter had clearly failed at leadership; being unable to control his followers rendered him powerless. Contrastingly Godfrey is clearly in control of his troops immediately making him superior to Peter, because control of an army is based on those below respecting superiors and consenting to be ruled over. This is known as hegemonic leadership, to which Gilo of Paris elaborated on by comparing Godfrey's army to Peter's, saying, those under Godfrey's command 'learned the value of moderation and good counsel, and the harm caused by rashness and wild frenzy, for those who had been hostile to their predecessors, bringing about their tragic downfall, were now their humble and obedient servants.'¹⁰⁵ Gilo emphasised the masculine traits of moderation and good counsel as being the key to good leadership, and it was this that prevented the mob from turning into a free-for-all. Once Godfrey imposed his leadership, merely because he was a recognised unassailable power, the people became humble and obedient. These writers have portrayed Godfrey exuding hegemonic masculinity, showing him to be the apex male. This engendered effective leadership from Godfrey, whereas Peter failed because he lacked hegemony, induced by his lack of masculine qualities that other males would wish to possess causing his following to disintegrate into an unruly mob.

After ensuring his army and followers remained in good order, Godfrey had to mediate with the King of Hungary. These negotiations in September 1096 are an instructive case when considering how masculine behaviour was demonstrated and portrayed, and how leadership

¹⁰² Tyerman, *God's War*, pp. 94-9

¹⁰³ RM, pp. 84-5

¹⁰⁴ GN, p. 47

¹⁰⁵ GP, p. 53

could be glorified. The story recorded by Albert of Aachen was that the King of Hungary was unwilling to let Godfrey, his army, and all the pilgrims through his land in the autumn of 1096 on their way to Constantinople. This was due to the destruction wrought by those following Peter the Hermit. Negotiations between the king and Godfrey finally led to the king requesting hostages to guarantee good behaviour, as he was unwilling to lose his kingdom to a passing rabble. Albert recorded that upon hearing this 'the duke acceded to the wishes of the king in all things, and did not refuse to give the hostages he sought, making the condition, however, that after this the army of pilgrims - in future as well as now - might pass through his land without any hindrance'.¹⁰⁶ However, the fact that Godfrey gave in to the king's demands was not seen to compromise his leadership or masculinity; he displayed wisdom in his approach to the negotiations, the required quality of medieval leadership, by recognising that furthering the crusade and doing God's work was the most important consideration.¹⁰⁷

Intriguingly and significantly, Albert expanded the story to present Godfrey as superior to his brother Baldwin. The Hungarian king asked that Baldwin be given as a hostage, since, after Godfrey, he was the highest profile member of Godfrey's contingent. Godfrey agreed but Baldwin did not, instead he

began to resist and argue violently until [Godfrey], worried about his irresolution, decided that Baldwin should assume the care of God's army, and he himself would not hesitate to become hostage in his brother's place. At last Baldwin put all the wavering out of his mind and consented to become a hostage and to be sent into exile for the safety of his brothers.¹⁰⁸

Albert's description has Baldwin acting in an unmanly fashion by resisting and arguing violently, thus showing that he was not in command of his emotions. The implication is that Baldwin did not want to 'sit out' part of the campaign and thus lose the opportunity to gain reputation and reward. Whereas Godfrey puts the fortunes of the campaign first and his offer to become hostage apparently shamed Baldwin into agreeing to become one himself. This story showed Godfrey as being an exemplary and that Baldwin followed his instructions, clearly this should be absorbed by the audience as a general model of how to act towards lordly leadership. Other accounts did not mention Baldwin's reaction to being

¹⁰⁶ AA, pp. 45-6

¹⁰⁷ Lewis, *Kingship*, p. 89

¹⁰⁸ AA, p. 46

given hostage; Gilo simply stated that it happened.¹⁰⁹ Albert probably included Baldwin's reaction in order to highlight the difference between the two brothers and the superiority of Godfrey over Baldwin (who was in fact ruling Jerusalem when the text was written). Thus Godfrey was portrayed as a figure of superior masculinity, demonstrating restraint and rationality, whilst Baldwin could not control himself until admonished by his brother's example.

The next test of Godfrey's leadership would be his negotiation with the Byzantine Emperor Alexius in Constantinople at the beginning of 1097. The various crusader armies had all agreed to meet in Constantinople before crossing into Asia as a single army. This concerned the Byzantine Emperor because having such a large army crossing through his land meant trouble was going to occur, especially if they were like the rabble of People's Crusade. Both the crusaders and Byzantines needed each other's help, the crusaders needed supplies and money, the Byzantines needed help repelling the encroaching Muslim forces. However a mutual distrust meant that things did not run smoothly.¹¹⁰ Godfrey had to demonstrate his lordly authority from the start, this was because in terms of masculine hierarchy the Byzantine Emperor was superior to all the Latin princes that met with him in early 1097. Alexius had no superior authority that he must answer to, unlike the crusaders who all either paid homage or swore fealty to a higher power such a king or pope. The writers knew this difference in social status, and so when recording this part of the crusade they presented Godfrey as outfoxing Alexius and even occasionally gaining victories over him. This was done as a method of establishing that Godfrey had the kingly qualities of ruling, even though at that time he a mere duke.

The writers were clearly aware that when dealing with Alexius strong leadership with masculine qualities were needed in order for the crusade leadership to earn the respect of Alexius, which would allow them to gain favourable terms when negotiating with him. They had to appear to be strong, capable and impressive. Fulcher of Chartres makes this clear by showing that Hugh Magnus did not possess these right qualities. Given that Fulcher rarely criticises any of the leaders, this is especially significant. Hugh Magnus was King Philip I of France's brother, making him one of the crusade's most prominent members by rank. His crusade was a disaster as he did not complete his vows and instead of reaching Jerusalem

¹⁰⁹ GP, p.51

¹¹⁰ Tyerman, *God's War*, pp. 96-7

returned to France in 1098.¹¹¹ His failures of leadership began from the outset. Fulcher wrote that en route to Constantinople from France in November 1096 'Hugh landed with his men near Durazzo, a city in Bulgaria, but rashly advancing with a small force was captured there by the citizens and conducted to the emperor at Constantinople.'¹¹² Hugh's rashness was likely the result of a wish to secure an early victory and enhance his reputation, but it had the opposite effect, and he would be kept prisoner until Godfrey of Bouillon arrived in Constantinople to organise his release from captivity. Fulcher identified Hugh's rashness as an impediment to his leadership abilities, and this was an aspect of his flawed masculinity because it signalled a lack of self-control. Godfrey would not make the same mistake.

Alexius and Godfrey met in February 1097, Albert of Aachen used the occasion to present Godfrey's future regality. Upon coming face to face Albert reported Alexius saying to Godfrey, we,

have heard about you that you are a very powerful knight and prince in your land, and a very wise man and completely honest. Because of this I am taking you as my adopted son, and I am putting everything I possess into your power, so that my empire and land can be freed and saved through you from the present and future multitudes.¹¹³

Albert here singles Godfrey out and foreshadows his forthcoming kingship, the *Chanson d'Antioche* also adopted the same method.¹¹⁴ Godfrey's superiority was recognised already by Alexius and later on this would be mirrored in his choice as ruler of Jerusalem.

Godfrey also had to exhibit his leadership skills in order to convince the other leaders of the necessity of pledging an oath to Alexius, a suggestion that had caused consternation amongst the crusade leadership.¹¹⁵ Alexius being of superior rank could invoke this and no doubt did it to protect his interests. Initially Bohemond refused to swear to Alexius but was eventually 'convinced by the duke's good promise and comforting words.'¹¹⁶ Raymond of Saint-Gilles was equally angry at this prospect and considered attacking Alexius, but again Godfrey saved the day, saying 'that it would be unjust for him [Raymond] to fight

¹¹¹ WT, p. 298

¹¹² FC, pp. 72-3

¹¹³ AA, p. 54

¹¹⁴ CA, p. 131

¹¹⁵ Tyerman, *God's War*, pp. 119-120

¹¹⁶ AA, p. 56

Christians.¹¹⁷ Throughout the Constantinople episode Godfrey always adopted the masculine trait of utmost importance in this time: restraint.¹¹⁸ He never responded rashly, unlike Raymond whose first response was to turn to conflict. Rashness, especially when it led to violence, was undesirable, as that was when errors were made, as shown by Hugh Magnus. Godfrey's self-control was also demonstrated by the fact that he prioritised the fortunes of the crusade over any personal considerations or ambitions, unlike both Hugh and Baldwin.

It was at Antioch when Godfrey faced some of the sternest tests of leadership. In October 1097 the Crusader army arrived at Antioch and would remain there until June 1098. The siege of city and the subsequent battle against Emir Kerbogha and his reported quarter million strong army would be the most testing part of the crusade with war and famine decimating the crusader numbers.¹¹⁹ It was here that many reputations were both made and broken amongst the crusade's leadership. Albert of Aachen gave the most detailed account of Godfrey's activities in Antioch. Firstly, Albert said that once Godfrey had recovered from illness he had to carry out tasks that Bohemond was seemingly unable to complete. Albert recorded Godfrey being sent 'into Saracen and Turkish territory to seek out the plunder and spoils which Bohemond had abandoned when he was defeated and fled, so that he might carry back to the famished and weakened people joy from ill fortune. With God's approval this was done.'¹²⁰ Bohemond is shown to have failed at one of the crucial elements of apex masculinity, being a provider to his people.¹²¹ Godfrey's capabilities and seemingly ease at completing the task further demonstrated his own leadership quality, whilst Albert emasculated Bohemond by saying he was defeated and fled.

Godfrey also demonstrated good leadership through persuasion when the starving and demoralized people began to flee from Antioch due to the hardships they were suffering, according to Albert, Godfrey roused the people and other princes with these words,

¹¹⁷ PT, p. 30

¹¹⁸ Fenton, *Gender*, p. 35

¹¹⁹ Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 137

¹²⁰ AA, p. 122

¹²¹ Vern Bullough, 'On being a male in the Middle Ages', in Clare Lees (ed.), *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages*, (Minneapolis, 1994), p. 34

Why do you despair, distrusting God's help in the many difficulties which have happened, and why have you decided through your own failure of faith to desert your brothers, that is to say the lowly crowd of foot soldiers, and make an escape? Stand firm and endure with manly spirit (*virili animo*) all your difficulties for Christ's name, and do not desert your brothers at all in the time of trouble and incur God's wrath, whose favour and mercy do not lack for those who trust in him.¹²²

Here Albert presents Godfrey as being a spiritual leader as well as a secular one. This passage is also interesting because it turns the pilgrimage into a test of manhood. Godfrey's use of the term 'manly spirit' in this address implies that those unable to withstand the torrid conditions were unmanly, as revealed by their cowardly flight from Antioch. Those who bravely remained were true men. Even questioning God's motives is identified by Godfrey as unmasculine because God would not set a test that any real man would be unable to complete. Godfrey was reminding them of this, and also by addressing other princes he was telling them that their actions if not done with manly spirit may engender questions from those they lead. This is a clear example of Godfrey calling for hegemonic masculinity to be maintained in order for the crusade to be successfully completed.

Albert goes on to give another of example of Godfrey demonstrating positive leadership qualities at Antioch. When Peter the Hermit was sent to negotiate with the emir Kerbogha before the Battle of Antioch in June 1098 he came back with the news that Kerbogha wanted war against the Christians. He was confident of victory as he had a substantially larger army than the demoralised Christians, who were suffering from starvation. Peter told Godfrey of the threats made by Kerbogha and Albert wrote: 'Duke Godfrey did not allow him to go on, but drew him aside and warned him to say nothing to anyone about all the things he heard, lest the people should fail through fear and torment and withdraw from war.'¹²³ Here Godfrey recognised the importance of keeping morale high and protecting his people, especially in such a grave situation, this is why he adopted the role of a spiritual adviser, giving him the monk-like qualities which will be discussed later. Leading by example, Godfrey was able to inject manly spirit into his wavering troops, and they overcame their most formidable battlefield test on the crusade, when they miraculously defeated Kerbogha. All these examples came from Albert's work which was based on testimony from members of Godfrey's army and so, arguably, prone to hero worship but

¹²² AA, p. 162

¹²³ *ibid*, p. 167

nevertheless it reveals their expectations of leadership and also suggests how they wished Godfrey's achievements to be remembered.¹²⁴

Not all leaders were as successful as Godfrey at demonstrating good leadership. There was one reported incident in which Raymond's greed actually made him to lose his hegemonic leadership making him the only leader who suffered a revolt from his own people during the pilgrimage. His followers were annoyed at the slow progress they made after the conquest of Antioch in the summer of 1098 and their subsequent delayed arrival at Jerusalem. In fairness to Raymond his actions were probably correct. He wished to wait for reinforcement from Emperor Alexius before besieging Jerusalem.¹²⁵ His followers however had had enough after three years of torture on the road, especially when the end was nearly in sight. William of Tyre wrote:

... [the pilgrims] complained to each other that the leaders were trying to invent excuses for delay and that the main object of the pilgrimage seemed wholly forgotten. Whenever a city was taken, the chiefs at once began to wrangle and fight over the question of its possession. They thereupon held a meeting of their own and decided that as soon as [Raymond] happened to be far away for any reason they would destroy Ma'arrat, that thereafter there might be nothing to hinder the accomplishment of their vows.¹²⁶

Ma'arrat was a city taken by Raymond but to his followers it was an irrelevant place. To them its only purpose was to make Raymond richer, and so eventually the people began to set fire to the city and stated they would launch a coup if they could not continue to Jerusalem. William wrote, 'they implored and besought [Raymond] that he would act as the leader of the children of God in carrying out the pilgrimage on which they had started. If he refused to do this, they threatened to place [some other] soldiers in command of the army to march at their head on the way of the Lord.'¹²⁷ Even Raymond's champion Raymond of Aguilers had to subsequently present Godfrey as being a better leader and more in tune with his people's needs, saying on the matter, 'Raymond broke into tears and began to despise himself and others, but God ignored his feeling in deference to the peoples' will, on the other hand Godfrey, 'very anxious to renew the march, incited the masses'.¹²⁸ Raymond had to apologise and bow to the will of his people, which seriously compromised

¹²⁴ Susan Edgington, 'Albert of Aachen', in Murray, *Encyclopedia*, pp. 25-6

¹²⁵ Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 152

¹²⁶ WT, p. 313

¹²⁷ *ibid*, p. 314

¹²⁸ RA, p. 110

his hegemonic status. This incident highlighted accusations of greed about possessing these captured cities, calling into question the crusader's motivation. People would not blindly follow a leader who was motivated by greed, which was counter to the aims of the crusade. Raymond's inability to grasp this showed his poor judgement, and naturally Godfrey filled the void, further justifying his reputation as an ideal leader and warrior, and ultimately king.

The defeat of Emir Kerbogha's forces signalled a shift in how the crusaders were viewed in areas through which they travelled on the route to Jerusalem. Their projection of invincibility was deemed by even some Muslim rulers as one in which they would like to utilise. Omar of Azaz, a Syrian, called on Godfrey for assistance to aid him against Turkish foes. According to Albert of Aachen the prince asked for Godfrey over other Frankish princes, claiming Omar said the following to Godfrey: 'we have discovered that you are a man and a prince powerful in military strength, and that you are able to offer assistance to those allied by treaty to you, and you cannot be released from your bond of loyalty by any inconstancy. For these reasons we chose you before all others.'¹²⁹ These words demonstrate Godfrey's kingship abilities, first of all his military strength and then his honour and loyalty, making him the perfect ally. Then comes the denunciation of the other leaders, which could be seen as Albert openly questioning their motivations, Bohemond and Raymond were having endless disputes regarding possession of Antioch, and other attempts at accruing wealth and land. Then by having a Muslim acknowledge Godfrey's superior character was a further blow to the others, similar to the singling out Emperor Alexius bestowed upon Godfrey. William of Tyre records that Godfrey agreed to help the Prince of Azaz and after doing so the prince 'knelt on the ground and, with bowed head, returned thanks, first to the duke and then to the other chiefs.... Thus the duke had rendered the desired assistance to his ally, and the matter was happily concluded.'¹³⁰ Godfrey's desire to help any people in trouble or those that request assistance even if they are not Christian was a way of presenting him in a chivalric fashion and one which the writers believed worthy of being mirrored. William's own motives for covering the event was to also stress the need of negotiating with certain Muslims if it was to the benefit of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. Sometimes alliances had to be made to combat a bigger enemy, this was written at the time of the rise of Saladin and would have been in William's mind in the 1170s.

¹²⁹ AA, p. 181

¹³⁰ WT, pp. 303-4

Godfrey's presentation in these narratives may not have been what actually happened but these portrayals of his leadership abilities presented him as the epitome of kingly masculinity, and living up to and even surpassing the expectations held about medieval leadership. This was shown by his rational thinking which was caused by his ability to have a full perspective of events instead of acting in the moment as Baldwin, Hugh, Bohemond and Raymond did. Godfrey maintained order of his followers and ensured discipline which was achieved through being respected by his followers, a demonstration of masculine hegemony. This was reinforced by the failure of hegemonic leadership as shown by Peter the Hermit's rabble who nearly prevented Godfrey's army being allowed through Hungary, and Raymond's own loss of hegemonic leadership. Godfrey was then shown to be the most magnanimous in negotiations and dealings with Emperor Alexius. Godfrey kept up these high standards of leadership during the hardships of Antioch and all the way to Jerusalem in order to be chosen ruler, but he also had to add to it the trait of being a hardy warrior, as this was an especially important component in maintaining and demonstrating hegemonic masculinity.

Chapter 4

The Warrior

In addition to leadership kingly masculinity had to demonstrate effective warrior behaviour. The crusade provided an excellent forum for this, especially given the holiness with which the whole campaign was imbued. Godfrey took advantage of this to demonstrate his prowess which further emphasised why he was the ideal candidate to rule Jerusalem; the new kingdom would need constant military defence if it was to survive.¹³¹ Being a successful warrior required masculine traits such strength and bravery, but also self-control, and wisdom in the form of tactical awareness.¹³² All these attributes had to be displayed, because if a warrior failed in just one aspect it could cost him his entire reputation, and even his life. Along with discussions of Godfrey's ideal warrior behaviour, examples of unmasculine behaviour on the battlefield, such as that demonstrated by William of Hauteville will be analysed. These failures helped establish Godfrey's superiority by comparison, and provided instruction for the audience in outlining which conduct should be imitated, and which eschewed, in order to gain a manly reputation.

Ralph of Caen praised Godfrey's warrior behaviour, writing: Godfrey was 'a man totally devoted to war and to God. He gave up nothing to Hector in fervour, in strength, in will or in spirit. He excelled in arms and was happy.' Ralph continued by claiming that Godfrey was not a lucky fighter but a great military tactician: he 'was not aided by some wary skill or by the fittingness of the place. He was not aided by that art which drives even timid men against the brave. Rather, he drove the enemy force although they were aided by all of these, namely by skill, position and trickery.'¹³³ This suggests one can win a battle because it is fought on familiar territory, so to go into the unknown and defeat an unknown enemy was obviously due to his superiority in the art of war. Keen has acknowledged this as a characteristic of chivalry; Fighting victoriously in foreign lands was deemed to be an

¹³¹ Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 168

¹³² Fenton, *Gender*, p. 35

¹³³ RC, p. 53

essential trait of masculinity in the world of courtly love and can be seen in the popularity of the wandering knight in chivalric literature.¹³⁴

In the late eleventh and twelfth-century the most obvious displays of manliness occurred on the battlefield, and as already established from William of Malmesbury's work this is shown in narratives using the Latin words *virtus* and *virili* as it describes notions such as courage, bravery, strength and honour all of which pertain to moral excellence and ideal masculinity.¹³⁵ Manliness is emphasised in the *Gesta Francorum* which tells of Bohemond sending a message to other leaders before their first encounter against the Turks. He tells them to hurry and come quickly to battle, adding, 'and if they want a fight today, they should come out manfully (*viriliter*)', and so 'Duke Godfrey, who was daring and brave, as well as Hugh Magnus, were the first ones to come along with their armies'.¹³⁶ The manliness required in battle would be to fight in a disciplined and organized manner, and not be bloodlust, rash, or unthinking of others safety, these were the twelfth-century requirements in warfare, which emphasised control.¹³⁷ They were fighting an unknown enemy and could not go into battle ill-disciplined.

Albert of Aachen stressed the word manly in reference to Godfrey and Bohemond in this battle, writing, they 'did not curb their horses but let them have their heads and flew through the midst of the enemy, piercing some with lances, unsaddling others, and all the while urging on their allies, encouraging them with manly exhortations (*virili admonitione*) to slaughter the enemy'.¹³⁸ This was what many of the military elite had been waiting for, to be able fight and indulge in violence without the moral dilemma of breaking Christian law, these ideas were accentuated in the writings of Guibert of Nogent and Ralph of Caen. Guibert wrote, 'God ordained holy wars in our time, so that the knightly order and the erring mob, who, like their ancient pagan models, were engaged in mutual slaughter, might find a new way of earning salvation.'¹³⁹ Whilst Ralph said, that 'because the path of war is the way of man ... there was nothing safer than being in battle.'¹⁴⁰ Ralph also recorded that

¹³⁴ Keen, *Chivalry*, pp.138-9

¹³⁵ Fenton, *Gender*, pp. 43-4

¹³⁶ *GF*, p. 42

¹³⁷ Fenton, *Gender*, p. 42

¹³⁸ *AA*, p. 64

¹³⁹ *GN*, p. 25

¹⁴⁰ *RC*, p. 72

Tancred of Hauteville liked to fight in battles, but because killing fellow Christians was wrong it left him in a dilemma, however 'when Pope Urban's decision granted a remission of all sins to all of the Christians setting forth to fight against the pagans, then finally it was as if the vitality of the previously sleeping man was revived, his powers were roused, his eyes were opened and his boldness set in motion.'¹⁴¹ This clearly informs us that in the twelfth-century those of the warrior classes who trained for war, enjoyed fighting. The problem had been that it was contradictory to Christian laws until now. The invention of the crusade was clearly a blessing to those who indulged in bloodshed as it allowed them to demonstrate their manliness without repercussion.

Godfrey did not just show his warrior characteristics as a leader in battle, he was also presented as performing extraordinary feats of individual bravery, all which pointed towards justification for him being chosen as a king. The first instance occurred in between completing the battle at Dorylaeum in July 1097 and arriving at Antioch in October 1097 when Godfrey was recorded as slaying a giant Turk in half. The story presented Godfrey in a David and Goliath situation but unlike David, Godfrey used his brute force strength to leave everyone, Christian and Muslim awestruck. The tale was a clearly an attempt at showing Godfrey's forthcoming kingship, similar to David in the fact that neither were born to be king but their extraordinary feats of war turned them into kings. Biblical comparisons were the best method of justifying the present situation for twelfth-century writers to their audience, and it furthered the idea of divine intervention in the whole crusading enterprise, thus giving Godfrey divine approval.¹⁴² Gilo of Paris recorded the killing with his usual method of comparing the crusaders to classical heroes, writing:

...the duke, the hope of our men, but disaster and grief for the Turks, slew horses and knights, and the river bore away the corpses. What is not read of Tydeus, nor of Capaneus, what neither Achilles, nor Hector, nor Diomedes could do, the duke did, and his exploit, worthy to be told, is not hidden from us: terrifying the nobles with his massive bulk and his sumptuous equipage, an awe-inspiring Arab whirled his glittering sword about, and carried forward by the rapid flight of his steed, he halted before the duke, thinking he would extinguish this light, and raised his sword high over that unvanquished head to strike. The angry duke took guard, bending back beneath his shield, and then straight away raised his gleaming sword and struck his enemy: he smashed his mouth and head, cut right through the spine and chest. This was the man

¹⁴¹ *ibid*, p. 22

¹⁴² Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 91

laid low, and he fell in two parts, sliced in half ... thus with one blow came about massive defeat.¹⁴³

When Guibert recounted the story he said that it was based on 'reliable, accurate testimony' this told the audience that it was not a metaphorical incident but one that actually occurred.¹⁴⁴ Robert the Monk made clear the importance of this feat when he concluded his report by saying: 'what heart could tell, what voice describe, what hand write, what page be worthy to tell of the deeds of the other princes, who equalled him in all the encounters of battle? The duke's victory shone more than the others because the part of the body cut in two which remained bore witness to his achievements.'¹⁴⁵ The question over whether this event happened is unprovable. Certainly the story does not appear in the narratives produced by the First Crusade's participants such as the *Gesta Francorum*, Peter Tudebode, Raymond of Aguilers and Fulcher of Chartres. However it was recorded in the *Gesta* derivatives that were produced within a decade of the event. Its omission from the earlier chronicles does not mean it did not occur. Little of Godfrey's actions before arriving in Antioch in October 1097 were recorded by them. But regardless of whether it actually happened, it is significant that the episode features in so many second-hand narratives. Many of these are independent of each other which suggests the story had become well known very quickly, and Godfrey's feats of strength were now renowned back in the West. This would have further demonstrated to the audience that he was indeed the rightful choice to rule Jerusalem after its conquest by being such an impressive warrior, and the biblical similarities gave another layer of reinforcement to this idea.

Another story not included in the eyewitness accounts but mentioned in the later narratives involved Godfrey fighting a bear. The only indication that this was based on a real event is Raymond of Aguilers' observation that by the time the crusaders arrived at Antioch in October 1097 Godfrey was unable to fight because he was ill.¹⁴⁶ Raymond though, offered no details of Godfrey's ailment. However, Guibert put forth an explanation which he believed to be an important anecdote, writing,

We think that another of his deeds, no less glorious, and worthy to be told, should be included. On one occasion, a bear of enormous size came out of the bushes...

¹⁴³ GP, pp. 121-3

¹⁴⁴ GN, p. 121

¹⁴⁵ RM, pp. 132-3

¹⁴⁶ RA, p. 33

frightened by the shouting crowd, the bear immediately sought out the woods from which it had emerged, while men were surrounding it, one wretch happened to reach the beast's lair. Leaping forward the bear attacked the rash man, pinned him in his arms, and with his teeth swiftly seized the leg of the man lying there. ... Then the duke, separated from his men, went to help him; when the wretched man weeping with pain and fear, saw him, he called upon the man's noble nature, and urged him to help him. Nor did the duke, whose nature consisted almost entirely of virtue, delay helping him, but he swiftly drew his sword from its scabbard and forcefully struck the head of the beast.¹⁴⁷

Unfortunately the bear continued to wrestle Godfrey and bit him, putting Godfrey out of action for a while, however in typical chivalric behaviour he apologised: 'the duke was now sorry, although too late, for having gone out by himself, since this adventure was costly for his own warriors, and for the entire sacred army.'¹⁴⁸ So it seemed that even though Godfrey took the blame for being out of action, and acted in an unmasculine behaviour by being rash and not thinking clearly, he came out of the situation in a positive light. This was because he was helping someone weaker than himself; William of Tyre explained this when he wrote that Godfrey was 'ever full of sympathy for his brethren, he quickly rushed to the assistance of the sufferer'.¹⁴⁹ As such he demonstrated excellent leadership, providing duty and care to all those under his authority, like a king would and should do.¹⁵⁰

Gilo of Paris gave a slightly different account claiming the bear came across the pilgrims and attacked a foot soldier, no one through fear, was willing to help except for 'the godly duke, ready for anything, ... made haste to go and bring sure aid, even if it meant death'¹⁵¹ Godfrey was again leading by example, as Albert of Aachen put it, 'he was accustomed and ready to help his Christian comrades at all times of misfortune'.¹⁵² Although the man in trouble acted rashly, it was the duty of a superior man to help and protect him. This was also ideal kingship being presented by Albert. Godfrey was superior and therefore must protect those below himself in the social hierarchy.¹⁵³ He was also being a good Christian as claimed by Albert, which again reinforced the reasoning for what they were undertaking, a spiritual pilgrimage. It should also be noted that fighting an animal considered to be

¹⁴⁷ GN, pp. 121-2

¹⁴⁸ *ibid*, pp. 121-2

¹⁴⁹ WT, p. 176

¹⁵⁰ Bullough, 'On being a male', p. 34

¹⁵¹ GP, p. 95

¹⁵² AA, pp. 81-2

¹⁵³ See above note 100

stronger than humans and that poses a deadly threat is nothing original: from the classical world Hercules slayed numerous beasts in his Twelve Labours, whilst Samson was known for his God-given supernatural strength that saw him slaughter a lion, again this is another biblical precedence given to support Godfrey's kingship.¹⁵⁴ Hodgson wrote of the episode that the symbolic nature of the bear in the twelfth-century may have led to the story's inclusion, as it was considered to hold regal connotations in Germanic and Celtic cultures.¹⁵⁵ Hodgson asserts that the defeat of such a terrifying creature would be capitalized on by both authors and audiences who would understand its Christian meaning regardless of the various versions of the story presented.¹⁵⁶ This furthers the notion that Godfrey's kingship was clearly portended in the texts, his reputation was being presented in his exceptional strength and bravery, showing him as the zenith of masculinity which was key for the audience's understanding of why he was chosen to rule.

Throughout the crusade narratives Godfrey's deeds on the battlefield are praised, unsurprisingly, since it was primarily a war. As already discussed in the previous chapter the victory over Kerbogha at the Battle of Antioch on 28 June 1098, was one of the greatest military victories for the crusaders.¹⁵⁷ Defying the odds when so outnumbered was a morale boost that they would take with them all the way to Jerusalem, as to them, it provided proof that God was on their side. Godfrey's behaviour on the battlefield was essential to this. For example, Guibert of Nogent told of Godfrey's inspirational fighting at Antioch, saying, 'Duke Godfrey, the count of Normandy, and Hugh the Great joined forces to attack those who were riding along the shore. These three, together with their men, with the image of the son of God crucified for their sake before their eyes, eagerly plunged into the thick of the melee. When our men saw this, they too drove forward vigorously.'¹⁵⁸ This highlights the exemplary quality of Godfrey and the other leader's actions; inspiring their men to action with their own bravery. Gilo of Paris, emphasised Godfrey's prominence at the Battle of Antioch, and the sheer number of men he killed, writing,

¹⁵⁴ Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 91

¹⁵⁵ Natasha Hodgson, 'Lions, Tigers and Bears: Encounters with Wild animals and Bestial Imagery in the Context of Crusading to the Latin East', *Viator*, 44, (2013), p, 91

¹⁵⁶ *ibid.*, p, 92

¹⁵⁷ See p. 37

¹⁵⁸ GN, p. 100

Godfrey shone forth, flying in front, and he paid no heed to the lifeless bodies, but laid low those he saw throwing spears. With his glittering sword he cut through breastplates and shields in one blow; with it he terrified those pressing on him, and thrust it in front of those who fled. The duke himself could scarcely keep his sword from the slaughter, and many whom he would not have wanted to perish died by his blade: for if he tried to touch any many with just a slight wound his hand, though unaware of it, slew him with a rapid sword thrust.¹⁵⁹

Raymond of Aguilers encapsulated the episode as such: 'Godfrey distinguished himself greatly' at Antioch.¹⁶⁰ Robert the Monk summed up the unexpected victory against Kerbogha thus: 'No tongue can tell or hand write or page contain what the leader of leaders Godfrey achieved that day ... Not one of our men hung back or acted as a coward: there was no room for such behaviour and the enemy, pressed each hard.'¹⁶¹ This linked Godfrey's inspiring achievements and the success of the crusader army; a theme which runs throughout all the texts and which thus showcases the hegemonic nature of Godfrey's masculinity.

Kings and nobles had to lead by example in warfare or their leadership may be open to challenge, as this was the main criteria by which they held hegemonic masculinity in the twelfth-century.¹⁶² Other warriors would not respect nor wish to be near someone who is either cowardly or puts their lives in danger. Godfrey did not fail in this respect. According to Albert of Aachen during the Battle of Dorylaeum in July 1097, 'the duke attacked the motionless enemies, aimed spears at them, and encouraged his allies in a loud voice to approach them steadily. When the Turks and their leader saw the steadiness of Duke Godfrey and his men, and that ... they had not lost heart for war they [the Turks] got ready to ... flee at speed from the mountain top.'¹⁶³ Godfrey's exemplary behaviour disheartened the Turks, it was his steadiness which caused the Turks to run in fear. Steadiness is a positive masculine trait, it means showing no fear and its use here presented Godfrey as being calm, contrary to the negative quality of rashness.¹⁶⁴ Steadiness in battle suggests courage, bravery and by demonstrating this it sets an example to others, whilst making the enemy question itself.

¹⁵⁹ GP, p. 171

¹⁶⁰ RA, p. 43

¹⁶¹ RM, p. 171

¹⁶² Connell and Messerschmidt, 'Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept', p. 832

¹⁶³ AA, p. 76

¹⁶⁴ Fenton, *Gender*, p. 35

At the siege of Jerusalem Godfrey continued to display his martial prowess, with a demonstration of military skill and cunning that was so important to breaking into Jerusalem it could have been the key to his 'crowning'. On 14 July 1099, the day before the crusaders broke into the city, Godfrey erected a siege tower. The Saracens responded by strengthening the walls in front of the tower...

...Godfrey and the counts of Flanders and Normandy now noted Saracen build-up, and consequently throughout the night before the set day of attack shifted their siege weapons, both wattles and towers, to a position between the church of the Blessed Stephen and the valley of Jehoshaphat. Believe me, the disjuncting, transporting over a mile, and erecting of these machines was no small job. The Saracens were thunderstruck next morning at the sight of the changed position of our machines and tents, and, I hasten to add, so were we, the faithful, who saw the hand of the Lord in this.¹⁶⁵

Evidently, Raymond of Aguilers believed this surprise tactic was divinely inspired thus portending Godfrey's future divine appointment as protector of Jerusalem. When the fighting began Godfrey was on the siege tower. The majority of chroniclers all praised his actions: 'our knights were fighting bravely on the siege tower, led by Duke Godfrey.'¹⁶⁶ 'The duke carried out the duties of a general and the hard toil of a brave knight, encouraging those fighting himself, fighting for a twofold kingdom... he fought in the one so he might have life in the other.'¹⁶⁷ 'Duke Godfrey ... battled valiantly on a siege tower.'¹⁶⁸ Robert the Monk presented Godfrey in a humble role claiming that whilst in the siege tower Godfrey was 'not as a soldier but as an archer, [and] the lord guided his hand in the battle and his fingers in the combat so that the arrows he fired pierced right through the chest of the enemies.'¹⁶⁹

Raymond gave prominence to Godfrey's fighting and how it led to the crusaders entry into the city, claiming, that whilst under attack from Greek fire, 'Godfrey lowered the drawbridge which had defended the tower, and as it swung from the middle of the tower it bridged the

¹⁶⁵ RA, p. 125

¹⁶⁶ GF, p. 90

¹⁶⁷ GP, p. 245

¹⁶⁸ PT, p. 118

¹⁶⁹ RM, p. 199

wall, and the crusaders, unafraid and undaunted, poured into the stricken city.¹⁷⁰ These actions alone caused the breach, which again Raymond's presents as being divinely inspired. Anew Godfrey was portrayed as being the bravest amongst all men present. This reinforced his warrior masculinity and proved his martial prowess which in turn established why he was worthy of being ruler of such an eminent city.

Whilst praise for Godfrey as a warrior was exceptional some other crusaders were presented as being unmasculine in their actions, which in the worst circumstance led to death. Albert of Aachen tells us of crusaders who died at Nicaea in May 1097 through improper behaviour. Some died because they were 'excessively rash and daring', 'exerting', 'making careless rush', being 'too impetuous and eager for war'.¹⁷¹ These are mannerism that showed they had crossed the line from bravery to stupidity, their lack of thinking clearly caused their death. These were traits considered to be juvenile and exhibited by those who had not yet reached full-manhood, suggesting a lack of control and letting emotions take over. Rashness was seen as lacking self-mastery and responding to something without thinking through the consequences.¹⁷²

This issue has been discussed in numerous works as it was clearly an important concern in this period and a seemingly required form of didacticism from the narrative writers, Fenton has identified it in the works of Malmesbury, whilst Aird has commented on the fact that Orderic Vitalis made much of Robert of Normandy's youth when discussing his relationship with William the Conqueror, which implied an 'immaturity which impaired his attainment of full adult status'.¹⁷³ Therefore they had not attained manhood because men should not let emotions control their actions. Those who died in Nicaea did so through acting unmanly, probably because they had not reached the maturity required to act in a manly fashion. The writers cannot make this point clearer, and as has been argued by Aird, an individual could not attain manhood by simply growing older during this period, instead this status was conferred by displaying the learned or imposed pattern of behaviour 'appropriate to that society's construction of adult masculinity'.¹⁷⁴ Medieval warfare was not about the heroic

¹⁷⁰ RA, p.127

¹⁷¹ AA, pp. 65-6

¹⁷² William Aird, 'Frustrated Masculinity: the Relationship between William the Conqueror and his Eldest son', in Hadley, *Masculinity*, p. 48

¹⁷³ Fenton, *Gender*, p. 45; Aird, 'Frustrated Masculinity', p. 43

¹⁷⁴ Aird, 'Frustrated Masculinity', p. 43

knight's daring actions changing the outcome of a battle, instead the successful warrior was wise and mature, holding back his forces until the time was right to strike, rather than engage with uncertainty.¹⁷⁵

At the Battle of Dorylaeum in July 1097 William of Hautville perished and the chronicle reports blame a failing in masculinity linked to the rashness of youth for this, a common theme during the medieval period which connected restraint as a virtue of the mature man, whilst impatience and bravado were faults of *iuvenis*.¹⁷⁶ William was Tancred's brother and Bohemond's nephew, making him the highest ranking crusader to die in the campaign. Significantly, accounts of his death constitute his only appearance in the First Crusade narratives. In the *Gesta Francorum*, account of his death there is no criticism of William's actions which saw him slaughtered by the Turks. However, Ralph of Caen and the *Chanson d'Antioche* both assigned the fatality to the unmasculine traits of rashness and reckless behaviour that William demonstrated in battle. Ralph wrote, 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.'¹⁷⁷ Similarly the *Chanson* recorded, 'picture Lord Tancred's brother in battle, a strong knight known as William: he was very young, newly knighted, and unable to contain his impatience to be armed for battle.'¹⁷⁸ Both establish rashness and impatience as causing ill-discipline on the battlefield, which would end only in death, both for the individual but also, potentially, for others around him. The *Chanson* also pointed out that it was William's youth that was the initial cause of his poor decision as it led to him having the wrong motivations. The fact that this version was aimed at a lay military readership helps to explain the emphasis it places on William's unmanly conduct as causing his death. This episode was intended to tell the younger knights hearing the tale that they should follow the example of the older more experienced knights in battle, and not be over-eager to fight. Ralph echoed this sentiment when he wrote that William failed to heed Bohemond's words, which again reinforces Aird's arguments about displaying the correct behaviour 'appropriate to that society's construction of adult masculinity' and not falling into the pitfalls of youth.¹⁷⁹ Thus the episode serves as an illustration to the audience of how a warrior should not behave and

¹⁷⁵ *ibid.*, p. 48

¹⁷⁶ *ibid.*, p. 48

¹⁷⁷ RC, p. 48

¹⁷⁸ CA, pp. 156-7

¹⁷⁹ Aird, 'Frustrated Masculinity', p. 43

is all the more powerful as it relates to a real person, not an invented character, which supports Kempshall's belief that an exemplum is preferable to a precept in medieval writing.¹⁸⁰

Another example of failing masculinity from the Battle of Dorylaeum comes from the reports of how it was caused. According to the *Gesta Francorum* the battle materialized after leaving Nicaea because the large crusader army split and took two separate roads. The split occurred by accident as it was dark and people could not see each other.¹⁸¹ However, going against the version of events offered by the *Gesta Francorum*, the *Chanson d'Antioche* actually identified Bohemond's greed as causing the battle:

Bohemond of Sicily decided to leave the main army and see what land he could conquer with his own forces. But he was to find himself fighting a battle he never expected to fight. Before evening you will see him utterly terrified and unable to hold out any longer even if the prize was all the gold God ever created. Had it not been for the eminent Godfrey, Bohemond would have regretted the consequences every single day of his life and would never have regained his position as long as he lived.¹⁸²

This passage seriously undermines Bohemond's reputation whilst simultaneously bolstering Godfrey's. First of all Bohemond's split is seen as an attempt to acquire land, thus questioning his motivation for undertaking the pilgrimage to Jerusalem by demonstrating that personal acquisition was more important to him than the fortunes of the campaign. Then he found himself in an unexpected battle, suggesting a lack of foresight and unpreparedness. The audience on hearing this would immediately question his ability as a leader. Then when the *chanson* portrayed him as being utterly terrified it called into question his bravery courage, and hence masculinity. After that came the ultimate humiliation of being rescued like a damsel in distress by Godfrey. The *chanson's* author has effectively emasculated Bohemond in a short paragraph by questioning his judgement and motivations. Bohemond's ambition rendered him thoughtless and unmanly, to the extent that he was only saved by Godfrey, who is thus established as the epitome of manhood by contrast.

¹⁸⁰ Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p.537

¹⁸¹ *GF*, p. 18

¹⁸² *CA*, p. 155

Actions deemed unmasculine for a warrior may end in death but the ultimate antithesis of warrior behaviour came in the form of cowardice and although not resulting in death, it would destroy any perpetrator's reputation. Whilst Antioch was the place where Godfrey engendered his apex masculinity by being a formidable warrior, an inspirational leader, and the ideal embodiment of a crusader, it was also as the place where another man lost all credibility. Stephen of Blois's reputation suffered the exact opposite to Godfrey's within the narratives, functioning as an example of supreme cowardice and un-masculine behaviour. The *Gesta Francorum* outlines the episode thus:

Now it happened that, before Antioch was captured, that coward Stephen, count of Chartres, whom all our leaders had elected commander-in-chief, pretended to be very ill, and he went away shamefully to another castle which is called Alexandretta. When we were shut up in the city, lacking help to save us, we waited each day for him to bring us aid. But he having heard that the Turks had surrounded and besieged us, went secretly up a neighbouring mountain which stood near Antioch, and when he saw more tents than he could count he returned in terror, and hastily retreated in flight with his army. When he reached his camp he took all his goods and retraced his steps as fast as he could. Afterwards, when he met the emperor at Philomelium, he asked for a private interview and said, 'I tell you truly that Antioch has been taken, but that citadel has not fallen, and our men are all closely besieged, and I expect that by this time they have been killed by the Turks. Go back therefore, as fast as you can, in case they find you and the men who are following you.'¹⁸³

Stephen's retreat featured in every narrative, demolishing his reputation. His behaviour was truly unmanly, he was in charge of the whole army, which implied that he was the best man of all the leaders. But instead of providing an inspiring example he feigned illness and ran away. He further failed in leadership because he was expected to bring aid to those in his care, but instead told the emperor not to bother as it was a lost cause. Fulcher observed: 'On the day following his departure the city of Antioch was surrendered to the Franks. If he had persevered he would have greatly rejoiced with the rest, for what he did was a disgrace to him.'¹⁸⁴ Again, restraint is shown to be key to good leadership, if only he waited an extra day his reputation would be intact. Fulcher further stated: 'We all grieved ... because he was a very noble man and was mighty in arms.'¹⁸⁵ His actions did not correspond to people's expectation of such a man and were therefore all the more reprehensible. Moreover, as Ralph of Caen described, Stephen set a very bad example which further diminished the power of the crusading army. Whilst recording other runaways Ralph wrote: 'they followed

¹⁸³ *GF*, p. 63

¹⁸⁴ *FC*, p. 97

¹⁸⁵ *ibid.*, p. 97

Count Stephen who ... sought rest in Cilicia. These men who shared a common generation and common manner of life, all hated labour and sought after pleasure. They were fighters. In between wars, however, they were accustomed to luxury.¹⁸⁶ Ralph makes it clear that these men were effeminised by their cowardice and flight.

The *Gesta* recorded that Emperor Alexius called a meeting upon hearing Stephen's report that included Guy, the half-brother of Bohemond, who served in the emperor's army. Guy thought Bohemond was dead due to the hopelessness of the situation portrayed by Stephen. However after much crying and lamentation it dawned on Guy that Stephen's story may be false, 'he controlled himself and said, "Perhaps you believe this cowardly old fool of a knight? I tell you that I have never heard of any knightly deed which he has done. He has retreated shamefully and indecently. Like a scoundrel and a wretch, and whatever the knave says, you may be sure that it is a lie."'"¹⁸⁷ These are strong words which called into question Stephen's whole career, suggesting his knightly status was simply one of social standing and that he had never done anything to warrant the title. Guy questioned on what basis Stephen held power. This was such a controversial statement from the *Gesta*, Kostick suggests the words represented the bitterness of knights involved and their anger towards Stephen led to them questioning his hegemony.¹⁸⁸ The views espoused in the *Gesta* are a perfect example of Connell's opinion of failing hegemonic masculinity: 'men who received the benefits of patriarchy without enacting a strong version of masculine dominance could be regarded as showing a complicit masculinity.'¹⁸⁹ Stephen's leadership position was based on having certain masculine attributes, but once these were called into question so was his leadership. This served as a warning for those reading the accounts of his disgraceful conduct.

The *Chanson* shows how the portrait of a cowardly Stephen was elaborated after almost a century of defamation, containing a number of passages not included in the other narratives. One example regarding the siege of Nicaea in May 1097 is as follows: 'Lord Stephen of Blois was in the lead. But when he saw how vicious things were in the press of battle, he cried: 'Oh God, beautiful Father and Redeemer. I wish I could go and find Tancred

¹⁸⁶ RC, p. 86

¹⁸⁷ GF, p. 65

¹⁸⁸ Conor Kostick, 'Courage and Cowardice on the First Crusade, 1096-1099', *War in History*, vol. 20 no. 1 (2013), p. 38

¹⁸⁹ Connell and Messerschmidt, 'Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept', p. 832

of Apulia. Godfrey of Bouillon must think I am no more than a silly boy to have assigned me to fight the Turks in this ravine. If I hang around any longer, I shall be beyond God's help!' So he flung down the standard, turned his back and fled.¹⁹⁰ Ultimately the *Chanson* summed up Stephens actions by saying he 'failed in his duty to lead the army of God.'¹⁹¹ A complete failure of masculinity and leadership. Stephen was not the only one who ran away but he was the most preeminent, precisely because he was of the highest status. Although he redeemed himself later by dying in action against Muslims in the 1101 crusade, his actions were never truly forgotten.¹⁹² His story was needed by chroniclers because, as already argued about the death of William of Hauteville, a real person's actions provided a more effective lesson than a fictional account.

This chapter has shown Godfrey's martial prowess as described in the narratives along with examples of behaviour to be avoided. The evidence shown clearly does not substantiate Runciman's claim that Godfrey was 'indifferent as a soldier' when in fact he was clearly the apogee of valiancy on the battlefield, which was an essential component of masculine kingship.¹⁹³ The evidence has also shown just how the chroniclers were shaping Godfrey's crusade experience into demonstrable proof of his right to rule Jerusalem.

¹⁹⁰ CA, p. 143, further examples: CA, p. 141, p. 143

¹⁹¹ *ibid.*, p. 144

¹⁹² Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 171

¹⁹³ Runciman, *Crusades*, pp.145-6

Chapter 5

The Pious

So far this analysis has focussed on evincing Godfrey's worthiness as king through examples of his manliness as revealed by his exemplary leadership and his martial ability. However, these alone were not enough to be declared ruler of Jerusalem. The crusade was conceived as a holy war and the ruler of Jerusalem therefore had also to be conspicuously pious, not at least to win divine approval. Piety was a component of kingly masculinity which was needed in order to be considered an effective leader as it was an expectation of the office of medieval kings that in addition to being defenders of their realm, they were also defenders of the church.¹⁹⁴ Added to this is that the first duty of a medieval knight, which all kings were, was to defend the faith of Christ against unbelievers.¹⁹⁵ Going on crusade could therefore be considered their knightly duty. In the twelfth-century narratives Godfrey's reputation for piety was presented as an essential and unquestioned aspect of his character as both man and crusader, and undoubtedly formed part of his successful reputation, whereas some crusaders failed in this respect and were duly admonished in the narratives for their impious behaviour.

The nature of Godfrey's piety manifested in various forms throughout the chronicles. Ralph of Caen described Godfrey as having 'demonstrated more of the qualities of a monk than he did of a soldier', these virtues were: giving charity to the poor, giving mercy to wrongdoers, having humility, clemency, sobriety, justice, and chastity.¹⁹⁶ Guibert of Nogent and Robert the Monk also suggested, respectively, that Godfrey's behaviour should be emulated by monks and that Godfrey gave the 'impression of being a monk rather than a soldier'.¹⁹⁷ Although the chroniclers identified these qualities as monastic, they were also essential components of ideal kingly masculinity. They required restraint and clear thinking; a man who could master his emotions and passions to act for the good of others.¹⁹⁸ Pious

¹⁹⁴ Lewis, *Kingship*, p. 23, See above Richard I coronation oath, Legg, *English Coronation Records*, pp. 51-2

¹⁹⁵ Keen, *Chivalry*, p. 9

¹⁹⁶ RC, p. 36

¹⁹⁷ GN p. 137; RM pp. 83-4

¹⁹⁸ Fenton, *Gender*, p. 36 Fenton writes: 'Part of the developing discourse of chivalry during this period highlighted the importance of controlling violent behaviour and actions.'

behaviour was also important for the audience of these narratives because going on crusade was a new form of salvation on offer to those who undertook it. Some of those who were warriors would have previously had to give up their worldly life and take religious vows in order to receive the absolution of sins that was being offered by Pope Urban II for those who undertook the crusade. This new framework of crusading allowed them to keep their current position of being a fighter, and the ensuing worldly gains that were a by-product of crusading, whilst also offering them salvation.¹⁹⁹ In addition to the traditional pious virtues described by Ralph, Godfrey also demonstrated many non-traditional forms of piety that were formed as a part of the new emerging ideals that had been engendered by the armed pilgrimage which had given birth to the idea of the 'knight of Christ', or the 'fighting monk'.²⁰⁰ It will then be shown how Godfrey's piety was elaborated by William of Tyre, adding to the legend of Godfrey's character than previous portrayals.

Representations of Godfrey acting piously began with his motivation for joining the crusade. On Godfrey leaving his homeland, Gilo of Paris wrote: 'He made peace with all those at enmity with him, left all his possession for the peace of Christ, and struck out on his way, following Christ who called him on.'²⁰¹ Clearly the crusade was a higher calling and more important than any domestic responsibilities and conflict with his enemies at home; there were more important enemies in the east that needed to be defeated. Gilo stated Godfrey 'had undertaken these journeys for the honour of the Holy Sepulchre, and in the hope of seeing the holy places.'²⁰² This was undeniably pious behaviour. However, these two examples were hardly unique to Godfrey, thousands went on the crusade and all of them, including the other leaders, could claim these virtues as being among their motivations.²⁰³

Therefore to engender Godfrey's pious exceptionalism, especially compared to the other leaders, Albert of Aachen created a dialogue between Godfrey and Bohemond in which Godfrey was shown as being on crusade for the right reasons whilst Bohemond apparently acted only in his own self-interest. This occurred whilst Godfrey was on his way to Constantinople and Bohemond heard the news of how the crusade armies were proceeding.

¹⁹⁹ Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the idea of crusading*, (London, 2003), pp. 26-7

²⁰⁰ Holt, 'Between Warrior and Priest', p. 186

²⁰¹ GP, pp. 13-15

²⁰² *ibid.*, p. 57

²⁰³ See Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade*, Chapter 2 'The response of the lay people' pp. 31-57 for various reasons given for going on crusade by its participants.

Bohemond contacted Godfrey telling him not to go to Constantinople but to wait for his own arrival, they then could ally and attack Emperor Alexius together. Godfrey responded to Bohemond's request by saying that he had not left everything behind 'for the sake of profit or for the destruction of Christians, but had embarked on the journey to Jerusalem in the name of Christ, and he wished to complete the journey and fulfil the intentions of the emperor, if he could recover and keep his favour and goodwill'.²⁰⁴ Albert presented Godfrey as superior to Bohemond because Godfrey had no interest in worldly goods or riches whilst Godfrey's piety also manifested in his unwillingness to fight other Christians. By comparison Bohemond was clearly engaging in the crusade for the wrong reasons, and may not have comprehended Godfrey's own motivations. Albert tells us that upon hearing these words from Godfrey, Bohemond's messengers 'understood the duke's meaning and his reply'.²⁰⁵ To make matters worse Bohemond was nonchalant at the idea of attacking other Christians to get what he wanted. It is not surprising that Albert of Aachen, as Godfrey's chief adulator, took this approach towards Bohemond, but it is quite telling that William of Tyre would later chose to include it in his work since he was often positive about Bohemond and his achievements on the crusade.²⁰⁶ This incident, occurring early on in the narratives was another signpost of Godfrey's forthcoming kingship, establishing a case for his superiority and election.

The new holy warrior form of piety can be described as acts of religiosity that could not be performed by the clergy because of the vows they had taken. They were also conceived within this new framework of armed pilgrimage. This meant these acts were restricted to those who were allowed to fight, making it a form of lay piety, or more specific in Godfrey's case, knightly piety. Knightly piety was not new at this point but it needed to be further shaped and developed by the chroniclers into a form they thought better for society, which they did through their narratives, eventually to what Holt believes was a new form 'of manliness of Christian warriors that challenged long-held secular notions of warrior masculinity'.²⁰⁷ Guibert of Nogent, gave an example of this, suggesting, Godfrey 'said that he wanted to go to Jerusalem not as a simple pilgrim, as others had done, but forcefully, with a large army, if he could raise one'.²⁰⁸ Gilo had reported Godfrey as wanting to be a

²⁰⁴ AA, p. 53

²⁰⁵ *ibid*, p. 53

²⁰⁶ WT, p. 130

²⁰⁷ Holt, 'Between Warrior and Priest', p. 197

²⁰⁸ GN, p. 47

simple pilgrim, but Guibert showed that Godfrey was being pious by the fact he wanted to make the pilgrimage in this new method of taking an army with him, taking heed of Pope Urban's call for soldiers to go to the East. This was a completely new idea in the late eleventh-century before the crusade had been initiated, and Guibert was now trying to lay the foundations that this must be the future of pilgrimaging by encouraging people to listen and act upon papal appeals.²⁰⁹

Another example of this new model of piety was the portrayal of Godfrey as a theological leader in addition to being a military one. Albert of Aachen presented this when conditions were deteriorating badly at Antioch in 1098 and numerous desertions had taken place. In a successful attempt to raise morale Godfrey gave a speech more worthy to have been from a high ranking cleric, such as the papal legate on crusade Adhemar of Le Puy. Godfrey said to the other princes,

Why do you despair, distrusting God's help in the many difficulties which have happened, and why have you decided through your own failure of faith to desert your brothers, that is to say the lowly crowd of foot soldiers, and make an escape? Stand firm and endure with manly spirit (*virili animo*) all your difficulties for Christ's name, and do not desert your brothers at all in the time of trouble and incur God's wrath, whose favour and mercy do not lack for those who trust in him.²¹⁰

This was an example of a being holy warrior as he had to raise morale amongst his fellow fighters using religious themes rather than the glory of war or riches as a way of motivating his men. The need for calling for manly spirit also would have sounded better coming from a warrior rather than a bishop, because a warrior would know more about this feeling than a cleric. However, it should be noted that Mesley has written about how Adhemar of Le Puy was often presented as leading in battle despite his religious office, depending on which chronicler is believed, although this could not have been an acceptable solution for the majority of chronicle writers and a path which they no doubt would not want to promote, clerics should not fight, that role belonged to the warrior.²¹¹ Nonetheless, Albert's intention was clearly didactic in the hope that future leaders would adopt this type of motivating factor for future crusaders, a way of using piety over worldly concerns as inspiration. It would also mean a less of a burden being placed upon the church who lost many of its

²⁰⁹ Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade*, p. 24

²¹⁰ AA, p. 162

²¹¹ Matthew Mesley, 'Episcopal authority and gender in the narratives of the First Crusade', in Cullum and Lewis, *Religious Men*, pp. 94-111

religious leaders whilst on the crusade, Adhemar had died at Antioch in 1098 whilst his successor William, bishop of Orange died after only six months in office.²¹²

Just before the siege of Jerusalem in June 1099 Godfrey demonstrated his piety as a protector of Christians, one of his main roles as ruler in Jerusalem according to the *Gesta*.²¹³

The residents of Bethlehem pleaded for help against looters, then,

after the duke heard the legation with its entreaties and he understood the Christians danger, in that same night he sent ahead about a hundred armoured cavalry chosen from the camp and his own company to help the abandoned faithful of Christ who were congregated in Bethlehem. They rode with haste, in accordance with the command of the most devout and Christian duke.²¹⁴

It is not surprising that he protected the place of Christ's birth before immediately setting out to bring back the place of Christ's death and resurrection into Christian hands. This only reinforced his reputation for piety and ideal kingship.

When the crusaders finally conquered Jerusalem on 15 July 1099 they began to slaughter its inhabitants and undertook looting. The crusaders' entry into Jerusalem has always been controversial because the brutality described by the chroniclers has been taken at face value, but whilst the slaughter was undeniable, various chroniclers portrayed Godfrey's conduct within the city differently. William of Tyre reported:

The duke and those who were with him then united their forces and protected by their shield and helmets, swept hither and thither through the streets and squares of the city with drawn swords. Regardless of age and condition, they laid low, without distinction, every enemy encountered. already the leaders had forced their way by various routes to the centre of the city and wrought unspeakable slaughter as they advanced.²¹⁵

This showed that the violence perpetrated was committed without prejudice, and was probably born of frustration as the climatic closing chapter of the crusade came upon the players, in typical end-of-siege fashion during the period. This account is the generally accepted version of events by present day historians because it was based on Raymond

²¹² Runciman, *Crusades*, p. 290

²¹³ *GF*, pp. 92-3

²¹⁴ *AA*, p. 206

²¹⁵ *WT*, p. 370

Aguiler's report, the only eyewitness chronicler to the events described.²¹⁶ William's version only reported the violence committed by the crusaders, however looting was reported by other writers but interestingly Godfrey was not depicted as taking part. Instead the following is two writers showing him act in completely opposite ways. Firstly Albert of Aachen wrote:

As Tancred turned aside to this temple of the lord... for the sake of greed for the wealth revealed to him, while others were swiftly pursuing fugitives to the fortress of the tower of David, and while all the princes were gazing open-mouthed at the possessions and the turreted buildings, and all the common crowd was making for Solomon's palace and inflicting a massacre with excessive cruelty on the Saracens, Duke Godfrey soon abstained from all slaughter, and, keeping only three of his men with him he took off his hauberk and linen clothes, went out of the walls with bare feet and made a humble procession around the outside of the city.then he presented himself at the sepulchre of Lord Jesus Christ, son of the living God, keeping up steadfastly tears, prayers, and divine praises, and giving thanks to God because he had earned the sight of that which had always been his greatest desire.²¹⁷

Evidently Godfrey was so overcome by piety that he refrained from the slaughter, demonstrating that he was above worldly goods and wealth, but most importantly he kept the masculine trait of restraint prominent in his actions. This pious behaviour showed that only *he* really understood the true meaning of the pilgrimage they had undertaken. His actions were intended to show his supremacy above other leading men, especially the comparison with Tancred's greed, which was on full view and even celebrated in the *Gesta Tancredi*. Albert's reference to the excessive cruelty displayed by the crusaders can be interpreted as unmasculine behaviour, as it clearly presented someone being unrestrained in their actions and overindulging, similar to the material greed that Albert criticised Tancred for focussing on. Greed and excessiveness were both ostensibly unmasculine attributes because they prevented the beholder from thinking clearly, causing poor decision making. Therefore Godfrey was not portrayed in this manner but instead his conduct inside Jerusalem demonstrated his kingly behaviour.

Robert the Monk's depiction of events inside Jerusalem is intriguing because he also reported Godfrey's indifference towards looting but instead showed him as having a penchant for killing with vengeance:

²¹⁶ RA, p. 127

²¹⁷ AA, p. 226

Meanwhile Duke Godfrey had no desire for the citadel, the palace, gold or silver or any kind of spoils. Instead at the head of his franks he was desperate to make the enemy pay for the blood of the servants of god which had been spilt around Jerusalem, and wanted revenge for the insults they heaped on the pilgrims. In no battle had he ever found so many opportunities to kill ... Now he and many thousands of chosen soldiers slashed human bodies from head to abdomen, to the right and the left and both sides.²¹⁸

Although here Godfrey was engaged in violence, similar to Albert's portrayal, it was done piously. Unlike Williams's account of unprejudiced violence, these violent acts were predicated on defending Christian honour from pagan defilement, making it perfectly acceptable. Three different viewpoints regarding the violence have been shown, firstly William of Tyre saw no problem with it; Albert of Aachen disassociated Godfrey from it; and Robert the Monk justified Godfrey taking part as it was in essence a pious act. This demonstrated that there was no singular opinion amongst the twelfth-century clerical writers regarding violence committed in this form of crusading, some felt the need to justify it, others not. The difference in attitude was most probably due to their intended audience. Robert the Monk's work throughout was concerned with entertaining its military and social elite audience. William of Tyre's work was written for instructing kings of Jerusalem how to act, whilst Albert probably had a clerical audience in mind.²¹⁹ It also confirms that we can never know the 'historic' Godfrey as these narratives are all there is for us to make our opinion of him, and since they all adopt various portrayals of character finding and deciding on the 'real' one is simply a matter of opinion.

The narrative writers spun Godfrey's election victory into the conventionally pious trait of humility because he refused to be called king and did not wear a crown. 'Prince' and 'Advocate of the Holy Sepulchre' were the post-conquest titles ascribed to Godfrey after being named ruler in Jerusalem.²²⁰ Guibert decided this characteristic was worthy of emulation, writing, 'his remarkable humility and modesty, worthy to be imitated by monks, added glory to his already exemplary reign, for he would never wear the royal crown in the city of Jerusalem, out of consideration for the fact that the general author of all men's salvation, our lord Jesus Christ, provoked human laughter by wearing a crown of thorns.'²²¹ This example reinforced Godfrey's piety because all subsequent rulers took the title king,

²¹⁸ RM, p. 200

²¹⁹ See Sources above

²²⁰ Phillips, *Holy Warriors*, p. 27

²²¹ GN, p. 137

thus making them inferior to Godfrey in matters of spirituality. This of course neglected the argument about the need for the subsequent rulers to turn the newly acquired lands in the Levant into a constitutional kingdom as a better way of ruling it, rather than making it a religious state held by the church as initially envisioned.²²² However, it did Godfrey no harm, and furthered his legendary status even though he was essentially a king and some did actually use this title in reference to him.²²³

William of Tyre often complimented Godfrey's religious zeal, and tried to give numerous examples of it whenever possible, writing, 'Godfrey was a devout man, whose heart was filled with pious care for all that pertained to the honour of the house of God.'²²⁴ Godfrey demonstrated this when he set out on crusade, having, 'in his train monks from well-regulated cloisters, religious men notable for their holy lives.'²²⁵ Consequently after gaining power in Jerusalem he gave them lands. He also established canons in the main Jerusalem churches and gave them benefices. William's own opinion of Godfrey made it clear why he was writing about him, saying:

Some people not appreciating Godfrey's services, hesitate to place his name in the catalogue of kings; such regard those outward acts which are done in the body as of greater value than those of a faithful spirit pleasing to god. To us he seems not merely a king, but the best of kings, a light and a mirror to others. Truly it ought not to be thought that this faithful prince disdained the gift of consecration and the sacraments of the church but, rather, that he scorned the pomp and vanity of the world to which every creature is prince. It was in a spirit of humility that he declined the crown which would perish, in the hope of attaining hereafter one that would never fade.²²⁶

William has set out the case for Godfrey to be considered a king, and in fact he considered to be the greatest of the Jerusalemite kings by the time he was writing in the 1170s-80s, suggesting he should be a mirror to others. This was helped by the fact of his early death which meant he never had the chance to fail, making him eternally the hegemonic male who never fell into decline. Lewis has given the example of Edward III of England as evidence that hegemonic masculinity is not infinite and that old age can lead to diminished

²²² Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 203

²²³ WT, pp. 391-3

²²⁴ *ibid.*, pp. 391-3

²²⁵ *ibid.*, pp. 391-3

²²⁶ *ibid.*, pp. 391-3

authority as self-mastery is lost, which could alter their reputation.²²⁷ Godfrey would remain a positive example and was used as such by William because there was nothing negative to write about him.

Impiety and sinning were forms of undesirable traits for a king to possess and one of the worst forms of this behaviour manifested by the crusaders was greed. Greed was an undesirable trait which did not fall into the category of ideal masculinity. Greed was presented in the actions of certain crusaders as both an attack on their character and to provide an allegory for the narratives' audience. Episodes of greed could cause arguments which in turn would sometimes lead to violent confrontations that seriously jeopardised the crusade. To the narrative writers these incidents were intolerable; greed should not manifest itself on a holy campaign and therefore certain leaders of the crusade were chastised for displaying this sinful quality. Greed was an unmasculine trait because, as the narratives show, it caused men to act in an irrational fashion, and to give into temptation and lust. The writers went to great lengths to portray those who fell prey to greed in a negative and unmanly fashion. Significantly Godfrey of Bouillon was not one of these. He remained focussed on the end goal of completing his pilgrimage vows and was shown to be above descending into arguments over worldly possession. But Bohemond of Taranto and Raymond of Saint-Gilles were shown to be greedy, and therefore inferior to Godfrey. Thus helped further emphasise Godfrey's status as the best choice to be rule Jerusalem.

Bohemond of Taranto's most contentious episode involving his avarice was his rivalry with Raymond of Saint-Gilles regarding the possession of Antioch. Bohemond claimed that he should have possession of the city because it was his plan that ultimately led to the crusaders conquest of it. Raymond disagreed claiming they should return it to the Byzantine Emperor as they had sworn an oath to return his former possessions. However Albert of Aachen does not agree with Raymond assertion and accused him of being 'always insatiable in his acquisitiveness', he also accuses Bohemond of having 'greed for aggrandizement and acquisition' and as 'persevering exceedingly in his greed'.²²⁸ The narrative writers only took issue with the situation when it affected the crusade directly; although Albert used it to demonstrate Godfrey's and others' magnanimity and justness over both Bohemond and Raymond, writing, 'the rest of the princes, Duke Godfrey, Robert of Flanders, Robert Prince

²²⁷ Lewis, *Kingship*, p.2; p.9

²²⁸ AA, p. 178; p. 245; p. 248

of Normandy, and all those who had laboured no less hard about the city, did not seek at all to rule the city or to bestow on themselves its revenue or tribute'.²²⁹ Bohemond and Raymond's dispute was about greed for power and money which meant they were presented as being flawed crusaders as it caused them to break an oath they swore. This feud was diverting them from the path of rationality which was essential to being an elite warrior leader. According to William of Tyre the quarrel was so bad it led to the siege of Marra being abandoned 'in anger', thus it was also debilitating the progress of the crusade.²³⁰

Bohemond's failure to overcome perceived greed by the chroniclers can be seen when his participation on the crusade ended with him remaining in Antioch and not going on to Jerusalem. When the other leaders were ready to set out in Spring 1099 for the final and most important part of their pilgrimage and capture Jerusalem from Muslim rule, Guibert of Nogent wrote, 'Bohemond, impatient at being separated from his beloved Antioch, left his companions and returned to her.'²³¹ Clearly this was unmanly behaviour from Bohemond as he had surrendered to his urges and therefore abandoned his vow to participate in the liberation of the Holy Sepulchre and bring Jerusalem under Christian rule. This was underlined by Guibert's depiction of Bohemond as a lovesick boy unable to master his lust for Antioch which Guibert feminized to emphasise the point further. He therefore cannot be considered to be the great crusader the *Gesta Francorum* wished us to believe he was, as he stayed in Antioch to ensure he did not lose possession of it, an apex male would not allow a woman to prevent him from setting out what he intended to do. Robert the Monk was also unimpressed by Bohemond's decision not to continue to Jerusalem and actually attacked him by using gendered language, recording the episode: 'Here Bohemond split off from them and the main army of God. He had inherited the highest principles from his French father; but they were tainted by elements of his Apulian mother.'²³² Robert managed to include a slur about ethnicity whilst also accusing him of acting like a woman whereas he thinks Bohemond needs telling that he should act like his father, who was no doubt an example of kingly masculinity in Robert's eyes.

²²⁹ *ibid*, p. 178

²³⁰ WT, p. 312

²³¹ GN, p. 109

²³² RM, p. 191

Raymond of Saint-Gilles's greed was brought to the fore on numerous occasions with Albert of Aachen stating that he was 'always greedy for gold and silver'.²³³ Albert of Aachen believed the discovery of the Holy Lance was a fabrication driven by Raymond's greed. The lance was discovered by Peter Bartholomew at Antioch in June 1098, and although when it was used to inspire victory at the Battle of Antioch questions over its status and authenticity were generally not so vocal.²³⁴ However Raymond's unswaying belief in its authenticity in the face of much scepticism from other leaders led to its discoverer undergoing trial by fire. Peter Bartholomew died from this and Albert firmly concluded that 'the faithful began to hold the lance in less veneration, believing its discovery to owe more to Raymond's greed and activity than to any divine truth.'²³⁵ Raymond's reputation suffered in the eyes of Albert and others because he believed in a relic that was deemed by them to be of dubious nature. This undermined Raymond's standing as far as they were concerned as it put his rationality into question. Ralph of Caen claimed that the discovery by Peter Bartholomew was all an act of 'trickery'.²³⁶ Albert believed that Raymond fabricated the relic for his own greed as many people venerated the lance by offering countless quantities of gold and silver, according to Albert, and this was an even worse form of greed because he had manipulated religious beliefs for his own ends.²³⁷

Religiosity was a key component of Godfrey's leadership and was certainly a desirable trait for kingly masculinity. As already demonstrated the sin of greed played a significant role in the negative portrayal of both Bohemond and Raymond. To Bohemond it led to him coveting Antioch and unfulfilling his crusader vows with the others. To Raymond it caused many of his followers to desert him and instead follow Godfrey. Therefore, although it may seem obvious on a pilgrimage, but leaders had to keep a focus on godly matters, and if they did decide to make decisions based on worldly ideas they would certainly risk their reputations and their leadership would be called into question. Godfrey stayed on the right course and in the end he became a king, and it was the purpose of the narratives to evidence this in clear terms, as Godfrey was not born to be a king but he had kingly properties and any failings would be cause the audience to question his right to be a king.

²³³ AA, p. 197

²³⁴ For more details on Holy Lance issue see Tyerman, *God's War*, pp. 144-5

²³⁵ AA, p. 196

²³⁶ RC, p. 119

²³⁷ AA, p. 166

To the writers, Godfrey's piety was unquestionable and it furthered his reputation. He clearly demonstrated behaviour that could be seen as a traditional form of piety as expressed by the clergy but he fitted also into this new model of half-warrior half-monk, and this was done through deeds of non-traditional lay piety. This included committing violent acts that were forbidden for the clergy to undertake. William of Tyre bolstered Godfrey's piety in his chronicle because he thought there was a lack of religiosity being conducted in his time. Godfrey was the greatest crusader so William amplified his achievements to make the current crop of crusaders remember who they should emulate for the success of their careers and that of the continued existence of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. However, above all the pious behaviour demonstrated by Godfrey furthered his case for being chosen as the ruler of Jerusalem, as it was a key component of ideal kingship.

Conclusion

Godfrey died on 18 July 1100 and was lauded by all the crusade narrative writers. To Ralph of Caen he was a great king and a fearer of God.²³⁸ Guibert of Nogent reaffirmed Godfrey's holy warrior credentials stating: 'his remarkable humility and modesty, worthy to be imitated by monks, added glory to his already exemplary reign, for he would never wear the royal crown in the city of Jerusalem.' Guibert delved further into what made the ideal king and the form of hegemonic masculinity that a king must demonstrate: he must have 'peaceful and modest behaviour, relentless courage', be 'fearlessness in the face of death, which exceeded what might be expected of royal majesty,' have 'great self-control, and an extreme generosity that exceeded their resources.'²³⁹ If those were the twelfth-century expectation of kingship, then Godfrey definitely achieved them all. William of Tyre believed that Godfrey's piety placed him higher than all the subsequent Jerusalem kings, even suggesting that everyone else was unworthy of his mortal presence, declaring:

The kingdom began to grow strong, and during the days of his reign it became well established. Nevertheless, Godfrey reigned only one year. For the sins of men forbade that through the longer ministrations of this great prince the tender plant of Christian dominion should be refreshed and comforted in the face of the tribulations which menaced it. He was snatched away from the midst of men, lest his heart be changed by wickedness.²⁴⁰

These words are incredibly powerful, portraying Godfrey as an incredible martyr-like figure that was simply too glorious in the eyes of God for other people to appreciate. To suggest that a secular ruler had to die young in case he becomes corrupted was an extremely strong statement and unlikely to be found about any other twelfth-century ruler that had died before their time. Godfrey was presented almost saint like by William, far beyond the recognition of earlier writers' portrayals. William undoubtedly did this because Godfrey was the founder of the dynasty to whose descendants he was addressing. Since William said Godfrey should be seen as a mirror this suggested that he may have embellished Godfrey's reputation probably with the failure of the Second Crusade in mind, which had already led to some questioning whether the crusaders still retained God's favour that they believed had given the astonishing victory back in 1099.

²³⁸ RC, p. 157

²³⁹ GN, p. 137

²⁴⁰ WT, pp. 385-6

These narratives accounts played an integral role in the memorialising of the First Crusade and Godfrey, and they undoubtedly helped in him being selected as one of the Nine Worthies of chivalry. Godfrey's inclusion in a triad consisting of King Arthur and Charlemagne was based on his crusade success but also due his constantly evolving character that changed throughout the years becoming more glorious and magnificent as time went on.²⁴¹ This was most likely due to the failures of subsequent crusades to achieve the same successes reached by those on the first. Chivalry and crusading were intertwined; the crusading ethos influenced the code of chivalry, and although Maurice Keen has argued 'we must be careful not to confuse the two or to conflate them', it must be acknowledged that by choosing Godfrey, over any other figure since the time of Charlemagne to be a symbol of chivalric virtue, *clearly* demonstrated how much of an important factor crusading was when placing a man on the scale of chivalry.²⁴²

This gendered reading of a selection of twelfth-century First Crusade narratives by using masculinity as a tool of analysis, has allowed us to see into the ideals of kingly masculinity beheld by the narratives' writers which included ideal leadership, warrior behaviour and overt piety. The accounts written by many who never went on crusade cannot be used to prove what happened on the real crusade but they can be used to tell us how they thought the crusaders should have (or should not have) acted. However, more importantly their shaping of Godfrey in the texts, showed his forthcoming kingship, which has been dismissed by historians who called Godfrey's career a legend, that it should be revised, and that it was not particularly stand out, or even distinguished, viewpoints which are formed from being selective over which sources they use to form their arguments.²⁴³ Nonetheless the deeds and characteristics of Godfrey that has been presented to us in these texts has told of what the ideal masculinity was in the late eleventh and twelfth-century, and what a king should strive to be. This in turn trickled down throughout society because the king should be the apex male that others should strive to emulate and this is a clear example of hegemonic masculinity in action, through narratives as the tool of transmission. Any member of the warrior elite could read or hear these stories being told and know which crusader they

²⁴¹ Keen, *Chivalry*, p. 121

²⁴² *ibid.*, p. 45

²⁴³ Runciman, *Crusades*, pp. 145-6; Tyerman, *God's War*, pp. 108-9; John, 'Swan Knight', pp. 129-30; France, 'The Election', p. 321

should want to be. Therefore historians that have concerned themselves with the factual Godfrey and dismissive of the Godfrey presented in the chronicles are missing the point because the Godfrey in the narratives tells us about a whole society and class of people, whereas digging deep into uncovering the 'real' Godfrey can only tell us about one individual. It is clear which Godfrey has the more scholarly value. In fact the historical Godfrey can never be found as evidenced in this work when comparing differing accounts of his behaviour upon entering Jerusalem. None of the writers were eyewitness to this event but still a narrative had to be created and it is up to the individual to come to their own conclusion about which Godfrey they want to believe in. However, they all chose to represent Godfrey was the ideal of kingly masculinity.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

Albert of Aachen, *History of the Journey to Jerusalem, Volume 1: Books 1-6 The First Crusade 1095-1099*, ed. and trans. by Edgington, S.B., (Farnham, 2013)

Fulcher of Chartres, *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem, 1095-1127*, trans. by Frances Ryan, F.R., ed. by Fink, H.S., (New York, 2011)

Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolimitanorum, ed. and trans. by Hill, R., (London, 1962)
Gilo of Paris, *Historia vie Hierosolimitane*, ed. and trans. by Grocock, C.W., and Siberry, J.E., (Oxford, 1997)

Guibert of Nogent, *The Deeds of God through the Franks*, ed. and trans. by Levine, R., (Teddington, 2008)

Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, ed. and trans. by Hill, J.H., and Hill, L., (Philadelphia, 1974)

Ralph of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi: A History of the Normans on the First Crusade*, ed. and trans. by Bachrach, B.S., and Bachrach, D.S., (Abingdon, 2005)

Raymond of Aguilers, *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem*, ed. and trans. by Hill, J.H., and Hill, L., (Philadelphia, 1968)

Robert the Monk, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, ed. and trans. by Sweetenham, C., (Aldershot, 2006)

The Chanson d'Antioche An Old French Account of the First Crusade, ed. and trans. by Edgington, S.B., and Sweetenham, C., (Farnham, 2011)

The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk, ed. by Kempf, D., and Bull, M., (Woodbridge, 2013)

William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, ed. and trans. by Babcock, E.A., and Krey, A.C., (New York, 1943)

Secondary Sources:

Aird, W. M., 'Frustrated Masculinity: the Relationship between William the Conqueror and his Eldest son', in Hadley, D.M., (ed.), *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, (London, 1999), pp. 39-56

Aird, W. M., *Robert Curthose, Duke of Normandy*, (Woodbridge, 2008)

Asbridge, T.S., *The Crusades: The War for the Holy Land*, (London, 2012)

Asbridge, T.S., *The First Crusade: A New History*, (London, 2004)

Bull, M., 'The *Historia Vie Hierosolimitane* of Gilo of Paris', *History*, 85, 277, (2000), p.123

Bullough, V. L., 'On being a male in the Middle Ages', Lees, C. A., (ed.), *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages*, (Minneapolis, 1994), pp. 31-46

Connell, R.W., and Messerschmidt, J. W., 'Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept', *Gender and Society*, Vol. 19, No. 6, (2005), pp. 829-859

Cullum, P. H and Lewis, K. J. (eds.), *Religious men and masculine identity in the Middle Ages*, (Woodbridge, 2013)

Edbury, P. W., and Rowe, J. G., *William of Tyre Historian of the Latin East*, (Cambridge, 2008)

Edgington, S.B., 'Albert of Aachen', in Murray, A.V., (ed.), *The Crusades An Encyclopedia*, (Oxford, 2006), pp. 25-6

Edgington, S.B., 'Chanson d'Antioche', in Murray, A.V., (ed.), *The Crusades An Encyclopedia*, (Oxford, 2006), pp. 235-6

Fenton, K. A., *Gender, Nation and Conquest in the works of William of Malmesbury*, (Woodbridge, 2008)

Fletcher, C., *Richard II: Manhood, Youth, and Politics 1377-99*, (Oxford, 2008)

France, J., "The Use of the Anonymous *Gesta Francorum* in the Early Twelfth-Century Sources for the First Crusade," in Murray, A.V., (ed.), *From Clermont to Jerusalem: The Crusades and Crusader Societies, 1095-1500* (Turnhout, 1998), pp. 29-42

France, J., 'The Election and Title of Godfrey De Bouillon', *Canadian Journal of History XVIII*, (1983), pp. 321-330

Given-Wilson, C., *Chronicles The Writing of History in Medieval England*, (London, 2004)

Hadley, D.M., 'Introduction: Medieval Masculinities', in Hadley, D.M., (ed.), *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, (London, 1999) pp. 1-18

Hallam, E. M., *Chronicles of the Crusades: Eye-witness Accounts of the Wars between Christianity and Islam*, (Godalming, 1997)

Harari, Y. N., 'Eyewitnessing in Accounts of the First Crusade: The Gesta Francorum and Other Contemporary Narratives', *Crusades* 3 (August 2004), pp. 77-99

Hodgson, N. R., 'Normans and Competing Masculinities on Crusade', in Hurlock, K., & Oldfield, P., (eds.), *Crusading and Pilgrimage in the Norman World*, (Woodbridge, 2015), pp. 195-214

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

Hodgson, N., 'Lions, Tigers and Bears: Encounters with Wild animals and Bestial Imagery in the Context of Crusading to the Latin East', *Viator*, 44, (2013), pp. 65-94

Hodgson, N., 'Reinventing Normans as Crusaders? Ralph of Caen's *Gesta Tancredi*', *Anglo-Norman Studies XXX*, (Woodbridge, 2008), pp. 117-132

Holt, A., 'Between Warrior and Priest: The Creation of a New Masculine Identity during the Crusades,' in Thibodeaux, J., (ed.), *Negotiating Clerical Identities: Priests, Monks and Masculinity in the Middle Ages*, (Basingstoke, 2010), pp.185-203

John, S., 'Godfrey of Bouillon and the Swan Knight', in John, S., and Morton, N., (eds.), *Crusading and warfare in the Middle Ages: realities and representations*, (Farnham, 2014), pp. 129-142

John, S., 'Historical Truth and the Miraculous Past: The Use of Oral Evidence in Twelfth-Century Latin Historical Writing on the First Crusade', *English Historical Review*, 130, (2015), pp. 263-301

Karras, R. M., *From Boys to Men Formations of Masculinity in Late Medieval Europe*, (Philadelphia, 2003)

Keen, M., *Chivalry*, (New Haven, 2005)

Kempshall, M., *Rhetoric and the writing of history 400-1500*, (Manchester, 2011)

Kostick, C., 'Courage and Cowardice on the First Crusade, 1096-1099', *War in History*, vol. 20 no. 1 (2013), pp. 32-49

Lake, J., 'Current Approaches to Medieval Historiography', *History Compass*, 13, (2015), pp. 89-109

Legg, L.G.W., *English Coronation Records*, (London, 1901)

Lewis, K. J., *Kingship and masculinity in late Medieval England*, (London, 2013)

McNamara, J. A., 'The Herrenfrage: The Restructuring of the Gender System, 1050-1150', Lees, C. A., (ed.), *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages*, (Minneapolis, 1994), pp. 3-30

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

Morris, C., 'The Gesta Francorum as Narrative History', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 19, (1993), pp. 55-71

Murray, A.V., 'The Title of Godfrey of Bouillon as Ruler of Jerusalem', *Collegium Mediaevale* 3 (1990), pp. 163-178

Murray, A.V., 'William of Tyre (d. 1186)', in Murray, A.V., (ed.), *The Crusades An Encyclopedia*, (Oxford, 2006), pp. 1281-2

Murray, A.V., *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: a dynastic history 1099-1125*, (Oxford, 2000)

Orth, P., 'Gilo of Paris (d. after 1139)', in Murray, A.V., (ed.), *The Crusades An Encyclopedia*, (Oxford, 2006), p. 533

Phillips, J., *Holy Warriors: A Modern History of the Crusades*, (London, 2010)

Riley-Smith, J., *The First Crusade and the idea of crusading*, (London, 2003)

Riley-Smith, J., 'The title of Godfrey of Bouillon', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, vol. 52, (1979), pp. 83-6

Rubenstein, J., 'What is the Gesta Francorum, and who was Peter Tudebode?', *Revue Mabillon*, Volume 16, (2005), pp. 179-204

Runciman, S., *A History of the Crusades Volume I: The First Crusade and the Foundation of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*, (Cambridge, 1951)

Tanner, H. J., *Families, Friends and Allies Boulogne and Politics in Northern France and England, c. 879–1160*, (Leiden, 2004)

Tyerman, C., *Chronicles of the First Crusade*, (London, 2011)

Tyerman, C., *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, (London, 2007)

Wolf, K. B., 'Crusade and narrative: Bohemond and the Gesta Francorum', *Journal of Medieval History*, 17, (1991), pp. 207-216