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Abstract

The military Orders have long been an object of great interest to historians, hence the plethora of studies on them, and various aspects of their roles and exploits. They have inspired debate and controversy from the years of their foundations to the present day. Yet the question of their masculinity remains unexplored, despite the range and volume of writing on them. This study argues that their masculinity was central to both their success and to their later fall. It thus aims to fill a gap in research by exploring a crucial aspect of what made these knights unique, and a focus of widespread support, using the evidence they left behind and the views of their contemporaries.

Using Bernard of Clairvaux's interpretation of their unique, hybrid brand of masculinity as a starting point, this project explores the formation and development of a specific gendered form of identity for members of these Orders. Their masculinity was governed by many factors and altered as these organisations grew, with no one overarching identity for all members. While many academics have studied the achievements and importance of the military Orders in the broader context of the crusades, this thesis focuses upon their function and lifestyle. It delves into the make-up of their membership, perceived identity and how this was put into practice as well as the factors that affected each. The knights of the Orders were the central figures, responsible for their success and growth by bridging the secular and clerical worlds. Focusing on their masculinity allows us to better understand the role and importance of the military Orders.
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Introduction

Originating in the Holy Lands, the military Orders inspired substantial discussion within historical and other writings from their own times into the modern day. From their initial formations in the decades after the end of the First Crusade, they were a subject of interest and at times controversy within supposedly factual, historical accounts in Europe. The concept of the military Orders derived from the oaths taken by a band of crusader knights to protect pilgrims travelling around the Latin East in 1119. They would become the Order of the Knights Templar. The Hospitaller Order started life as a Jerusalem hospital before taking up military service after 1119. The Teutonic Order was founded in 1190 allowing temporary participation in religiously inspired warfare mostly away from the Holy Land. The study of military Orders spans ideas of warfare, religion and identity, as well as diverging into popular culture. Debate and controversy has dogged the Orders right from their very inception as seen in the contrasting writings of Bernard of Clairvaux and Matthew Paris who each took opposing views on the Templars whilst writing within 50 years of one another. Whilst some Orders, such as the Knights Hospitaller, have endured in various forms to the present day, the Orders undoubtedly experienced a high point during the Crusading era of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It was during this period that they were established as powerful property owners, financial juggernauts and trained fighting forces throughout Europe, the Middle East and even Africa, although these were not their original purposes. Their institutions touched all forms of life, from monarchs to lowly tenants, whilst their work made a huge impact on the fight against opponents of the Catholic Church both through the use of arms and preaching. Today, they are often seen as powerful but somewhat flawed institutions that spanned the entirety of Europe. The military Orders were primarily religious organisations dedicated to military action; a meeting point between the violent, secular world and the Church. This is what made them controversial and what

has made their identity so distinct. Whilst the Orders had many roles and ranks, the military knight was the most integral and will be the main focus of this analysis.

Within the historiography, there are different trends of thought concerning the military Orders, with specific areas of focus depending on independent approach and methodology. According to Helen Nicholson there are ‘only a few good histories’ of the various Orders, and most significantly the Templars, written before 1970. Anything before the 1970s can generally be summed up as traditionalist. This is because such studies do not delve into the Orders as anything other than military institutions within the timeline of the crusades. There is also little analysis within them of their collaboration between each other or with the Church, with a focus instead on the European princes they served with. These pre 1970s works including E.J. King, as well as Jonathan Riley-Smith’s older work, portray the Orders as mere accomplices to the main events analysed in the crusades. Spiritual factors and economic/pastoral efforts are excluded from traditionalist studies, and more recently Paula Pinto Costa et al suggest these were in fact crucial to their role. Thus traditionalist studies are conceptually limited, but still very useful sources of information about the nature and exploits of the Orders.

Whilst warfare was integral to the idea of a military order, it is important to look into the other functions and roles of the Orders within society to get a more balanced view of them as institutions. Revisionism is therefore the development of the study of the Orders. This development has seen the Orders considered for events and achievements outside of military prowess. Revisionist historians look into Orders’ wider work and status in more detail or with a specific focus, rather than presenting a sweeping longue durée account of their military achievements as a backdrop to the crusades more generally. Revisionist work on the Orders has increased in the last decade or so with

---


10 Ibid. p. 200.


Riley-Smith. The Feudal Nobility and the Kingdom of Jerusalem 1174-1277. p. 222.


Nicholson and Emanuel Buttigieg in particular delving deeper into these institutions. Enrique Rodriguez-Picavea shows that these more recent studies tend to focus on individual or local branches of various Orders or on distinct ideas relating to their work for example; economics, piety or diplomacy to name but a few. Therefore there is also a sub-group within the revisionist trend of thought that delves into the micro-history of the Orders and their roles (micro-revisionism perhaps), whilst revisionism more generally focuses on broader studies that include more than just the martial role of the various Orders. Myra Miranda Bom’s study of women in the Orders and Nicholas Coureas’ work on Order agriculture and estate management can be included within this strand. Historians now think more about the ideas and ethos underpinning the Orders, including issues of knighthood, chivalry and spirituality.

The fields of chivalry and knighthood inform an understanding of military Order masculinity as they tap into revisionist ideas surrounding the importance of models of medieval warrior classes. They were also influenced by the same reforms towards the noble warrior man. Kaeuper’s work on chivalric ideologies can be explicitly related to the Order knighthood as well as the secular version. Religion plays a key part in the creation of each of these ideals and the relations to the Church influence their action and conduct. Whilst tension existed between the secular knights and their Order counterparts, both were influenced by codes of conduct, with the Laws of the military Orders remarkably similar to the secular codes of chivalry albeit with greater religious overtones. Richard Kaeuper’s study of the Knights of the Garter and Sterns’ analysis of the Teutonic Order, show that both organisations had common ideas surrounding masculine conduct. Likewise the oaths of the Hospitaller Order compiled by King, show similarity with the monastic oaths studied by Katherine

18 Ibid. p. 37.
Allen Smith with both vowing ‘poverty, chastity and obedience’. The crusade campaigns brought these two movements, both in transition, together with a need for collaboration. Whilst debate occurred over which the greater warrior class was, both played influential roles in the campaigns and governments of the Christian forces. Whilst on the surface these two bodies of knighthood may seem incompatible, as Desmond Seward and Natasha Hodgson have each suggested, they shared ideals and core principles that were each inspired by religious reform and their own interpretations of fair warfare or chivalry.

This study also draws on analyses of medieval masculinity, something that has rarely been applied to the military Orders. Medieval society was based on patriarchy, whereby according to Ruth Mazo Karras, masculinity had to be acquired rather than being automatically given. Taking a social constructionist approach, social status and vocation allowed a man to take on or project a form of masculinity. Competition between these accepted medieval constructs of manhood including clerical, knight and layman have been seen by Jo Ann McNamara to have existed, with each form competing for superiority. Masculinity in the medieval era is an area of research that suggests that there were two opposing models within contemporary debate; the Church and the warrior class. Before the period of chivalric knighthood, masculinity was seen through contrasting ideals by the two largest institutions of the time. On one hand was the accepted ideal of masculine power that could be manifested through physical strength and war. This had been proven by conquerors and monarchies who were backed by military strength. Opposing this was the burgeoning Church backed idea of religious masculinity whereby piety, restraint and chastity were seen as ideals above that of the warrior class. As McNamara suggests, ‘the masculine gender is fragile’ in the medieval era, with vast changes to ideals in the years leading up to the First Crusade. The crusade era was therefore the battleground of what constituted masculinity both spiritually and physically.

---

24 McNamara. The Herrenfrage: The Restructuring of the Gender System. 3-30, p. 3
Masculinity that is defined by physical strength is traditionally seen by scholars as being the oldest form of masculinity. In relation to the crusades, military leaders such as Richard the Lionheart and even Genghis Khan can be seen to epitomise crusade spirit and masculine qualities, while ‘martial virtue’ according to Matthew Bennett was key to interpreting masculinity on crusade. However, physical prowess is not now viewed by historians as the sole defining feature of medieval masculinity. Different forms of medieval masculinity have been put forward that were affected by the social and economic status of men. Knightly ideals on both sides of the crusade battleground represented strong leadership and valour as seen by the admiration of Saladin by Western writers. Brutality and fame gained from conquests were key events recorded by crusading chroniclers, and in the context of masculinity were cornerstones in traditional views of what made a man according to Karras. The crusades were therefore a challenging test for masculinity with the need for brutality but also being inspired by religious fervour, a tension discussed by Andrew Holt. Both qualities were needed in order to defend the Holy Land, but also to fulfil the spiritual requirements named by the Papacy.

However, recent study has drawn on the development of clerical masculinity to debate varying ideals of medieval masculinity. Originating from the First Lateran Council in 1123 where the rules and enforcement of clerical celibacy began, Holt has seen this movement as starting to build the cult of clerical masculinity as the superior male form. This is exactly the period at which the main Orders were founded, suggesting the importance of a study of Order masculinity to gender ideas more generally. Revisionist study accepts the idea that the Catholic Church’s way of life was under threat due to the popularity of traditional masculine behaviour and that clerical masculinity was the justification of their way of life. The importance of spiritual qualities and the control of one’s own body and mind was therefore an undoubtedly key development for men who chose the religious

---

30 Holt. Between Warrior and Priest: The Creation of a New Masculine Identity during the Crusades. 185-203, p. 186.
32 Holt. Between Warrior and Priest: The Creation of a New Masculine Identity during the Crusades. 185-203, p. 188.
way of life.\textsuperscript{34} Seen as an alternative to being attributed with feminine qualities by society, this so-called clerical gender has seen its importance rise in revisionist debate. Competing superiority of masculinity is an integral part of understanding the relationship between masculine forms. The attempts to promote clerical masculinity by curtailing the prevalence of sexually practicing members of the Church in the Lateran Council of 1123, despite the subsequent unpopularity of the rulings, illustrates this tension.\textsuperscript{35}

The study of military Orders allows us to see a combination of these various ideals within masculinity, yet there is little specific work on the topic outside of Holt’s article. This would suggest that within revisionist historiography there is a place to discuss the positioning and identity of these unique bodies that encompassed both ends of the masculine spectrum. Without a study of the military Orders, medieval masculinity lacks an opportunity to study unique Church and princely backed institutions that were founded in the midst of medieval gender reform led by the Church. Likewise, without studying medieval masculinity, the study of military Orders lacks a gender dimension to their understanding, as the Orders occupied a distinct place between two ideals of the masculine form. Therefore, the study of the military Orders fits perfectly within debates of medieval masculinity as they existed as a combination of these two opposing ideals. Like the relationship between Church and state, the military Orders and masculinity need each other to support further understanding of each.

The aim of this thesis is therefore to explore what influenced the masculinity of the military Orders and the different forms it took as a result. This begs a number of questions. Specifically: was there one overarching masculine identity or were there several that depended on different factors? Did it depend on the specific Order? Did masculinity change over time? Was masculinity affected by the role individuals played within an Order? Did the age at which men joined or the year affect their masculinity? What were the perceived masculinities of the Orders and can we ascertain how the Orders viewed their own masculine identities?

These questions will be considered by examining the evidence the Orders and other commentators left behind. The experiences of individual members will also be analysed to give a more precise review of Order accomplishments, identity and masculinity. These texts, some of which written by the Orders themselves to regulate and record their work, contrasts at times the work of clerics analysing their wider role. There was no universal understanding of them by chroniclers but instead


\textsuperscript{35} Ibid. p. 127
a spectrum of thoughts and theories about their practices. Controversial organisations, they received both negative and positive acclaim. Ideas about masculinity can be derived from these texts. From the founding accounts of the Orders, to their laws and practices, their development and peak of power in the thirteenth century, to the Trial of the Templars, there are many key sources that outline the masculinity and work of the various military Orders. The Orders formed a unique masculinity that has continued to be developed and debated throughout their existences.
Creating an Identity

Bernard of Clairvaux

When considering the masculinity of the military Orders, the first place to look is the circumstances of their foundations. These give clear insight into their original aims and purposes, which underpinned the framework subsequently put in place for members. Each of the major Orders were founded with specific intentions in specific regions. These helped create a distinct identity which included masculine characteristics. While the Orders themselves developed in ways not anticipated at their first foundation, the formations of the Orders, often commemorated in later writing, are indications of their ideals and aspirations. The writings on the foundations of the Templar Order will be the focus of this chapter, as much of their ethos was imitated by the other Orders through their own foundations.

The military Orders based originally in the Holy Land, (Templars and Hospitallers) were established after the success of the First Crusade in 1095, yet before the Second in 1147, while Jerusalem still remained in Christian hands. The Second Crusade was called by Pope Eugeniuse III in response to the loss of Edessa to increasingly powerful and unified threats to the Latin Kingdoms. The calling of the Second Crusade has been seen by Tyerman to be based on the same motivations and fears that helped create the military Orders; a need to guard the gains of the First Crusade and protect the pilgrims who journeyed there. Yet as suggested by Alan Murray, the Teutonics were founded as a response to new pilgrimage routes through Eastern Europe by land and the new direction of Crusading against non-Catholics rather than just Muslim forces. This can be supported by their later formation in 1190 and their campaigns against pagans and non-Catholic Christians. The Orders were each initially independent of the Church and secular rulers, set up to support the Crusader Kingdoms by small forces of men. While they would later gain the patronage and support of the Papacy as well as rulers and all other areas of society throughout Europe, their humble beginnings influenced their creed and the ambition of each individual Order. The twelfth century was a period of Order formation, and whilst other, specialised Orders would be founded throughout the Christian world up until the fourteenth century, the intentions of these early Orders are crucial to the creation of an Order identity and masculinity.

38 Ibid.
Undoubtedly the Knights Templar are the Order with the most written about their foundation. However, it is exclusively written in the years after their inception rather than at the time. The earliest of these accounts was written around a decade after their initial formation, at a time when the Order had started to grow in influence and number. Despite this, the history of their foundation suggests to us the original intentions and template for this form of military devotion. Founded by Hugh de Payens in 1119 and endorsed by the Papacy around 1129 at the Council of Troyes, the Templars initially protected pilgrims in the Holy Lands from dangers on their journeys. Bernard of Clairvaux in his ‘In Praise of the New Knighthood’, was one of the first writers to discuss the Templars in their early years, the circumstances of which is today still shrouded in uncertainty. However, Bernard’s work does give crucial insight, although its background also raises questions, into the original masculinity of the pioneers of the military Order movement.

Bernard of Clairvaux was the leading supporter of the Knights Templar. A Cistercian monk, his ‘In Praise of the New Knighthood’, was an influential piece of propaganda for the Templars and the validation of their new identity. But, the purpose of the piece is crucial to its understanding. As a retaliation to perceived criticism of the Templars, from inside and outside the Church, as well as promoting the recruitment and patronage of the group, it is undeniably skewed to impress potential allies of the Order. It also serves to validate the concerns of the Templars’ current members as to the righteousness of their unique way of life, in a time of debate surrounding religious masculinity. Written in roughly the same period as Hugh de Payens toured Europe seeking the patronage of the ruling elite from 1128, Bernard’s work was likely been to have been an influential tool both on this tour and by promoting the Order within the Church. Bernard himself was present at the Council of Troyes, and was an influential supporter of the group within the Church. Despite his status as a monk, Bernard was of noble birth and his father had served on crusade, while he himself was a prominent reformer of the Cistercian Order, respected by the Papacy and European monarchs. This linked him to both the crusading spirit and vocation, as well as the level of society the Orders sought to recruit from. He was therefore a prime sympathiser to Templar ambition and lifestyle. As a Cistercian and reformer, he was supportive of monastic reform with an emphasis on personal piety.

39 Forey. The Emergence of the Military Order in the Twelfth Century. 175-195, p. 179.
and spiritual superiority. According to Bernard, de Payens requested him specifically to write this ‘sermon of encouragement’, ‘on three separate occasions’, proposing that Bernard himself was seen as a crucial player within the high politics of Europe, benefiting the Templars’ success. While Bernard claimed that his writing skills were inadequate for a vocation so highly favoured by God, this only serves to promote the righteousness of the Order to those who read it. A piece written for both members of the Church in order to legitimise this mutation of the monastic way of life, as well as for potential secular supporters; be it princes for their patronage or noble sons as prospective recruits, Bernard targeted many different audiences with varying intentions with this work. This effort sought to establish a superior identity for the Order.

It is in this document that the ground breaking aspects of the lifestyle of the Templars are described and promoted, many of which were imitated by other Orders. A step above from the secular knights who dominated the imagery of medieval Europe, the military Orders were put forward by Bernard as a fusion between monasticism and warrior. The secular, knightly warrior class in 1129 was only in its infancy, having only really become an identity in the previous century, representing mounted warrior knights. Yet according to Bernard it was already beginning to stray from the proto-chivalric and pious ideals that the movement had sought to fulfil originally, which were incidentally similar to the key aspects of Order knighthood. The comparison between the way of life of Templar knights and their secular brothers-in-arms serves as the first point of distinction between them and therefore constitutes the creation of a distinctive Templar masculinity. One chapter specifically addresses the concerns Bernard had regarding the ‘Secular Knighthood’, claiming the superiority of the Templar’s new way of life in comparison to the vain secular warrior men. Blasting the ‘cloth hangings’ for armour, the ‘silks’ for horses and the ‘gold, silver and jewels’ among the sins of ‘pomp, with shameful madness and shameless rashness’, secular knights are degraded as weak mentally and physically. Effeminate traits are utilised by Bernard to degrade the mainly Norman secular knighthood, disparaging the appearance of knights in comparison to Order warriors, ‘[you] wear

---

your hair like a woman... [with] tender, delicate hands’ to drive home the idea that they were not true knights. The traditional knighthood is described as a way of life that was ‘frivolous and lacks seriousness’ and that their appearance and tools are not fit for a military purpose but are ‘women’s baubles’. These feminine visuals support Bernard’s claims that the secular knighthood had become too obsessed with appearance and glory rather than the ‘three things essential to any warrior; a knight should be energetic, strong and vigilant ... ready to strike’. They also detract from the masculinity of the secular knights by associating feminine characteristics to their actions and appearance. This femininity is crucial to understanding the basis of Order masculinity, as the Templars purportedly added true piety and adherence of a uniformed monastic appearance, playing into the debate regarding religious masculinity in the previous centuries. The warrior classes and Church leaders had regarded monks as a separate gender to normal men. Yet the two sides debated whether they were superior to ordinary men by fighting spiritual battles rather than earthly ones, or whether they were ‘unmanly’ because they were forbidden from masculine activities of sex and fighting. Here Bernard draws on this debate by suggesting that the Templars were the best of both worlds and therefore superior. He also maintains that while military action is definitely masculine, it needs to be untainted by vanity and practiced in a way akin to religion in order to be truly masculine and superior. The Templars are portrayed as part of the same vocation as monks, unsurprisingly, given Bernard’s own identity, which creates a space for them above normal warriors.

This rhetoric should not be taken as evidence that secular knights really had become weak and effeminate, but it is powerful in setting the Templars up as pure and holy, yet inherently masculine. The ornate trappings and glory that were lambasted by Bernard and the Church more widely were crucial aspects of practising secular masculinity for the knighthood. Yet these possessions, almost exclusively funded by the spoils of war against fellow Christians, detracted from a man’s character and outwardly manliness. While physical strength has always been stereotypical masculine behaviour, Bernard emphasises that the appearance of a man affects his ability to perform his masculine duties. It is an extension to Church debates surrounding the superior masculine form, while also promoting a newly Church backed military force. By adorning themselves in riches and taking care of their appearance in a so called womanly way, secular knighthood loses aspects of their

---

52 Ibid. p. 218-9.
53 Ibid. p. 218.
54 Ibid. p. 218.
masculinity as the lines are blurred between male and female. It was seen to be feminine to take care of your appearance, with the Templars simply dressed and ‘never well groomed’. The Templar knights, with disregard for earthly materials and fashion, are therefore portrayed as more masculine. Biblical teachings show that vanity, seen as a feminine quality, is sinful and Bernard argues that this reduces their effectiveness in battle and makes them lesser men. According to Bom and Michael Evans, women were seen as unsuited to both monastic and warrior roles in the medieval era. Armour and weapons are chosen by the Templars for practical use rather than as a requirement of a lifestyle. The secular knights, therefore serve as a comparison to the Templar’s image and purpose, their effeminate and boastful ways justification for the Templars’ new, and simple way of life. The Templars are shown to offer a truly masculine and righteous way of serving in the crusades. Importantly Bernard was writing in a time of debate surrounding the legality of fighting fellow Christians and the fears from the Church of the intentions of those serving on crusade. These fears of the secular knighthood fighting for material gain and glory would be highlighted prominently as an excuse for future failures in the Holy Land. They are also alluded to by Bernard by making these desires feminine.

‘In Praise of the New Knighthood’ shows that Bernard’s ideas of the Templars, and therefore of their masculinity, is based on a response to the secular knighthood. The Templars are rough and modest masculine men, while the secular knighthood are frivolous and womanly pretenders. But it is important to note that the piece is a reaction to criticism of the Order, as Avner Falk suggests, and also to Bernard’s own perceived criticism of the secular knighthood as a vocation. At the time of writing, Templar numbers were still small. These small numbers called into question the survival of the Order, supported by Hugh’s tour around the same time. By legitimising the idea of a warrior monk, Bernard responded to these criticisms by putting across this positive impression of the Templars to an uneasy audience. However, the chivalric movement was itself promoting a similar reform within the secular knighthood, including the aspects of modesty and fighting for righteous causes. Secular knighthood was not the feminine and greedy, yet plundering force the Church and Bernard suggested. The illusion, drawn from real fears within the Church and widespread public confidence, was maintained by Bernard’s portrayal of the Templars.

---

60 Bom. Women in the Military Orders of the Crusades. p. 11.
61 Holt. Between Warrior and Priest: The Creation of a New Masculine Identity during the Crusades. 185-203, p. 187.
opinion of the roaming, warrior knight served to contrast with the Templars, rather than being an accurate depiction of all secular knights. Elements of monasticism such as poverty, chastity and obedience, are strongly tied to Bernard’s version of the original Templars, setting them up not only as unique to the military lifestyle but also that of the monastic way of life. These contrasting physical images between the secular knighthood and the Templars, show us that each side could be distinguished by their appearance, with Bernard evaluating the significance of these differences to his audience. The prestige and riches of the secular men are seen as womanly add-ons in comparison to the ‘truly holy and safe’ vocation of the Templars whose outward appearance was to mirror the internal purity of their cause.65 The uniform of the Templars; a white mantle emblazoned with a red cross, serves as a powerful representation of their idea of masculinity, a fighting force devoted to the cause of God and not glory.66 Described as Miles Christi, a term that had been applied to monks before the crusades, Bernard shows the Templars as unique to anything else of the time, fighting physical and spiritual wars, a double front and superior to other warriors.67

This damning report of secular knights came in the aftermath of the First Crusade, which may seem surprising as the campaign had been wholly fought by secular knights and ordinary people. Europe had also yet to experience catastrophic defeats in the Holy Land that would occur in later years and be blamed on the lack of piety of those fighting. The Templars are set up as an alternative calling to the opposing vocations of knighthood and monasticism, with the best qualities taken from each. Piety is strongly promoted by Bernard and this has powerful connotations for the Templars’ distinctive masculinity. ‘Voluntary poverty’, ‘chastity’ and ‘obedience [to God]’ are the cornerstones of monasticism, yet are equally highly important to the Templars according to Bernard, supporting claims that the Order, and therefore its masculinity was divinely and monastically inspired.68 Living separated from society ‘without their wives and children’, and avoiding all ‘excess in food and clothing’, the members of the Templars borrow heavily from monastic life, adding them onto traditional knighthood.69 Bernard goes on justify this military service by suggesting that piety can be expressed through violent activity ‘if the combatant’s cause was good’ in addition to adherence to monastic lifestyles.70 However he condemns fighting for money and therefore the basic nature of the livelihood of secular knights, ‘O knights, what is this error so stupendous,… to fight at such great cost

69 Ibid. p. 222-223
70 Ibid. p. 218.
and effort, with no rewards other than those of death or crime?’.71 Templars by comparison are not
tainted by these accusations, but instead are ‘marked by a large degree of glory’, as ‘the knight of Christ kills in safety [of his soul] and dies in greater safety’.72 This supports Constantinos Georgiou’s contention that the Church was beginning to accept that war was essential to the power of the Church, and rather than condemning it, they could use it towards their own aims.73 The Templars and later, other Orders, were a means of controlling the military classes and directing their aim to match Church ambitions. By painting the cause of the Order as holy, there would have been greater support for this way of life from the young men of the noble classes of Europe, rather than having them seen as unmanly monks or heretical warriors. For Steven Kruger, to be seen as pious was to be seen as lacking masculinity in certain periods of this era.74 Therefore by creating a unique outlet for militaristic action with religious validation, the Orders became an attractive prospect to those trained militarily from birth. A combination of piety and warrior instincts, the scholarship by Bernard plays into the fears of medieval nobles, trained for war from birth, regarding their entry into heaven.75 With the Templars a prospective profession for life alongside that of the secular knighthood, the religious benefits are selling points to a ‘higher calling’, one that is both superior religiously and also more masculine, ‘their aim is to instil fear, not admiration’.76 Secular knighthood and Templar knights were direct competitors for recruits from the same pool of men, of patronage from the same Lords and loyal to the same Church. The tie of the Orders to the Church was essential to their appeal and obviously highlighted as part of their identity to allow men with warrior training, yet religiously devoted, to make use of their skills and piety. Their families would not see them as unmanly clerics, but as superior pious warriors.

People in Europe at this time, especially prospective noble recruits, would have been unsure of what the day to day life of a Knight Templar involved, as the Order had not yet received its later patronage and numbers.77 Bernard creates an idealised yet crucial first interpretation of this, blowing away the norm of secular knighthood in an attempt to recruit to the cause. Templars are portrayed by him as ‘fighting indefatigably a double fight against flesh and blood as well as against the immaterial forces

71 Ibid. p. 218.
72 Ibid. p. 219.
75 Aird. Robert Curthose Duke of Normandy (c. 1050-1134). p. 56.
76 Liber ad milites Templi de laude novae militae. Barber, M. & Bate, K. The Templars, p. 223.
of evil in the skies’.\textsuperscript{78} This twin campaign and threat to the members of the Order is central throughout Bernard’s text and symbolises that the Templars not only fight the physical wars of secular knights but that they also contend with the temptations of the flesh and mind; the spiritual battleground of the men of God. This dual purpose is the basis of their masculinity and also the reason for their perceived superiority. A Templar cannot exist if he has not ‘clothed his body with the breastplate of iron and his mind with the breastplate of faith’.\textsuperscript{79}

Masculinity had been debated by scholars within the Church and by warrior men in the previous centuries. The debate whether monastic masculinity and its suppression of desires and disregard for earthly possessions, appearance or glory was superior to the ostentatious and stereotypically masculine warrior ideal had been inconclusive, with each side believing theirs the superior.\textsuperscript{80} Yet the Church relied on warriors to defend its land and power, while expanding their reach.\textsuperscript{81} Likewise, the secular warriors needed the Church’s blessing for their campaigns and reassurance of their entry into heaven. The Templars were revolutionary and their masculinity stepped into this divide, providing a means to an end for both sides and a potential solution to the debate surrounding masculinity. Bernard claims to be ‘in doubt as to whether they ought to be called knights or monks... of course I were to call them both names’, a bridge between the two sides.\textsuperscript{82} Fighting with ‘a single heart [and] a single soul’, they are portrayed as a brotherhood and one superior to secular armies by going beyond the wider requirements of an army by repairing their own armour and praying together.\textsuperscript{83} While traditional armies had gambling and ‘actors, magicians, storytellers, lewd songs and plays’ within their camps, the Templars are without these ‘vanities... [and] madness’.\textsuperscript{84} This too inspired local rulers to offer support as these armies would not pillage or cause trouble when on campaign. Rather than fighting for money, the Templars are not mercenaries, but rather a means to an end for Christendom as a whole, an alternative fighting force un tarnished by material desires. A new form of armed force embodying a new masculinity.

Bernard’s work was revolutionary for the Order itself and also for the debate surrounding medieval masculinity. Its importance can be reflected in other contemporary writings on the Templars and in
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scholarship today regarding the origins of the military Order movement. Whilst modern scholars argue about the precise nature of the hybrid warrior-monk state of the Templars, this shows a clear attempt to gain new recruits and that Bernard used ideologies of masculinity to go about this.

Other Writers

Despite Bernard’s clear admiration for the Templars, other chroniclers did not share his positive opinion. Other accounts were written in the years after Bernard wrote and strongly criticise both the various Orders themselves and Bernard’s ideas surrounding their identity. Matthew Paris and William of Tyre show that there was no one view of the Templars, despite the Papacy endorsing each of the Orders very soon after their foundations. All three were members of religious orders, with different statuses and roles, yet Matthew and William wrote in opposition to what would seem to be the Church’s official rhetoric surrounding the Orders after their formations. Despite this, the works of both men add to our understanding of the Templar masculine identity as it was seen at the time. They also serve to show just how divisive the Templars and by relation, the other Orders, were for medieval society right from their very starts as they sought to form a common identity, a trend that would continue throughout their respective existences.

William of Tyre was not impressed by the work of the Templars when writing after 1170. Writing on the foundation of the Templars, Tyre criticised the wealth of and land owned by the Order by suggesting they were comparable to Kings or even competitors with the Church for tithes. A noted chronicler, born and based in the Christian States in the East, he offers an interpretation of the Knights Templar from the land where they operated. In his ‘History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea’ William suggests that while their original intentions were pure and admirable, the growth of the Order was the catalyst for corrupting the nature of the group. William confirms Bernard’s approach of the Templars being monastically inspired, made from ‘certain noble men of knightly rank, religious men, devoted to God’ who ‘promised to live in perpetuity as regular canons, without possessions, under vows of chastity and obedience’.85 Therefore religious piety and monasticism can be shown to be key to Templar masculinity even in contrasting reports of their abilities. Hugh de Payens is also venerated by William, suggesting that he himself was crucial to the initial success of Templar life in terms of religion and warfare, integral as their founder by forming a balance between them for his men to follow. The Church gave the Templars ‘a rule for the knights and assign[ing]

them a white habit’ alluding to the fact that the Church’s influence was key to forming their original identity.’\textsuperscript{86} This was key as without the support of the Papacy, unauthorised Orders ran the risk of being accused of heresy while Papal backing allowed growth and prestige. Written years after Bernard, William shows the rapid development of the Order from humble and religious beginnings to their later powerful standing where ‘there is not a province in the Christian possessions both here and overseas’ where they do not have interests.\textsuperscript{87} Arguably, the vastly successful support of Bernard and the Papacy can be blamed for this growth. Templars are later blamed for failing to defend the East through their own ‘neglect of humility’.\textsuperscript{88} A confidant to the rulers of Jerusalem and Archbishop of Tyre, William’s negative views go against the initial support of the Templars from the Papacy. But as Lord points out, this makes his chronicle useful as it shows a variety of responses to the Templars at different stages in their development.\textsuperscript{89} ‘Proud, arrogant and unreasonably wealthy’, William is attributed by Lord as having been suspicious of the intentions of the Templars in the Kingdom of Jerusalem and wary of competition for his role as advisor to monarchs.\textsuperscript{90} As this was written far later than Bernard’s piece, William’s views on the Templars’ foundation were influenced by their later growth and actions, rather than the unsupported and small Templar Order that Bernard wrote of. Although William is unique in giving us the circumstances of the Templars’ foundation and subsequent sequence of events in their development. As men, the Order knights are portrayed not as manly heroes from the battles of the flesh and mind as Bernard claimed, but with attributes similar to the noble classes they originated from, whose ‘wealth is equal to the treasures of kings’.\textsuperscript{91} Religion is key to their identity, especially their foundation, but this piety is shown by William to have been sidelined as other interests took the Templars’ attentions. The Templars and other Orders were so rich because they were popular, suggesting that William’s views were not representative of general opinion. However, the fact that their lack of piety was seen as a fault supports an argument that religiosity and monasticism were crucial to the creation of their identity, and therefore masculinity, as chroniclers expected them to uphold the values attributed to them from their very beginnings.

A two-phased history, the Templars are shown to fall in terms of success and morals as they grew from a small and defined band to powerful magnates. The difference between the knightly members
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and the associate brothers are also highlighted by William and implied to be a negative diversion for the Order as at Bernard’s time of writing, there were only knights. While knights clearly required an entourage to allow them to work, the gaining of other types of members including squires and servants made the Templars seem like secular knights again. The religious ideals of the group were implied to have been dropped to the wayside as the various Orders grew financially powerful while they are described as being simply ‘exceedingly troublesome’ to governments, while also being vain and lazy. Here, Templars mirror Bernard’s interpretations of the secular knighthood, thereby implying that vanity and sloth were stereotypically used to describe the antithesis of masculinity, while there was a close relationship between these created masculinities.

Matthew Paris wrote about the Knights Templar but also Hospitallers and Teutonics too. The Hospitallers originated as primarily care givers and this is seen from their initial establishment as a hospital for pilgrims in 1099. They would only later perform military functions alongside monastic tendencies to mirror the Templars, making them unique in comparison to the other Orders. Their Papal Bull of confirmation in 1113 confirmed the ability of the Order to collect ‘tithes of your produce wheresoever collected’. Likewise the tradition for patronage was confirmed from their very origins with Paschal II confirming that ‘the donations... which pious princes have made... from taxes... shall be held confirmed’. The Teutonics in comparison were the youngest of the three ‘main’ Orders, founded in 1190. All three Orders would be endorsed by the Papacy, yet their origins and later working lives were distinct.

Similar to William of Tyre, Matthew was not convinced that these warriors upheld the values Bernard of Clairvaux espoused. In his ‘Chronica Majora’, Matthew gives great detail of the sinful pride within and the jealousy between the various Orders over patronage and land that developed from their foundations. Their wealth was seen as unreasonable, much like Tyre’s approach, while the focus of the Orders are seen to be vague, ‘roaming the countryside for infidels’. An English monk, unlike Tyre or Clairvaux he was not present to key events of Order history or living in the Holy Land. His chronicle was a history of events up to 1253. But, Matthew is useful to show a different viewpoint regarding the Orders. As Europe wide organisations, Matthew shows how far their activities spread in the world and highlights the key themes that people were beginning to see regarding the identity of the different Orders. Matthew and William are useful comparisons to
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Bernard of Clairvaux to show the spectrum of views on the Orders. The competition between the Orders with the Church over wealth and power, as well as the rivalry between clerical and Order masculinity over what was meant to be the superior form of masculinity motivated these views. As the Orders became more powerful, they were more dangerous to the Church through their holdings and wealth as well as the popularity of their knights. However this popularity and support of the Orders is not reflected in the writings of these chroniclers as people clearly continued donating to them. The status of the crusades also influenced the viewpoints of these writers. Matthew and William linked the gluttony of the Orders to successive failures to defend the Christian states. Bernard wrote after the success of the First Crusade when optimism was higher for future endeavours; inspired by a small and pious Templar Order.

In terms of writing specifically on the foundation of the Templars, there are also other mentions of this in contemporary sources. The charter by the Bishop of Noyons to the Templars in around 1130 shows his support of the vocation of the Templars while suggesting that the group are ‘repair[ing] the lost order’ of knighthood itself. Writing to ‘all fighting religiously under him [de Payens], ... may you faithfully persevere in the life of the religious order you have entered’, Noyons declares the Order a third kind of order within Church life alongside ‘the order of prayers, ... and of workers.’ This implies that Order lifestyle as a whole was unique. Supporting the idea of a hybrid masculinity, the notions of religion and warfare combining to form a superior identity are suggested as an explanation for the Bishop’s gift to the Templars. An early example of patronage towards the Orders more generally, ties to the Church were crucial to all Orders’ origins. Their masculinity relied and based itself upon perceptions of religiosity. Without the support of the Church, the Orders would not have had the religious emphasis they did, nor would their foundations have been recorded in such quantity. However, individual churchmen giving gifts is a testament to perceptions that the Templars were worthy of support in their own right.

Simon of St. Bertin however, places greater emphasis on the religious aspects of the Orders with the military side only used in ‘necessity’. The Templars are portrayed in more straightforwardly monastic terms: ‘they would renounce the world, give up personal goods, free themselves to pursue purity, and lead a communal life wearing a poor habit, only using arms to defend the land against

98 Ibid.
the attacks of the insurgent pagans when necessity demanded'.

Written around 1135-7, St. Bertin offers an interpretation of Templar foundation and their life more generally, that is skewed in favour of monastic masculinity, unsurprising as a monk himself. Religion, whilst crucial to interpretation of original Order lifestyle, could be seen with different emphasis within Church based writing. There was therefore no universal view of Order masculinity even within supportive texts on their foundations. Although religious and monastic elements are deemed crucial by all to the creation of an identity. While these each hint that the Orders, specifically the Templars, are unique hybrids of monasticism and warriors, writers such as St. Bertin see the religious aspects of the masculinity as overwhelming other themes. Otto, Bishop of Freising, follows on from this, suggesting in his 1147 Chronicon that while ‘they bear arms against the enemies of Christ’s cross’ they ‘might appear to be in life and lifestyle not knights but monks’. This emphasis derived from Otto’s own experience among the leadership of the Second Crusade where the secular Christian armies were decimated. The differing locations for individual Order franchises might have influenced the writer’s views on the importance of monasticism to masculinity, as knights based in Europe would have had greater emphasis on religious practice than the knights fighting in the war zones of the East.

Anselm, Bishop of Havelburg develops this idea and follows Clairvaux’s interpretation of Templar life. In his 1145 account of religious Order life to Pope Eugenius III, Anselm promotes the idea of Templars having two spheres to their lives. This account backed the Templars and implored the Papacy to endorse the Order in greater patronage. Anselm suggests that there is a ‘peaceful’ and ‘obedient’, almost monastic ‘home’ life whereby members give up possessions. This supports traditional monastic views of masculinity. However, there is also an ‘out of doors’ calling where they are ‘strenuous warriors’ and ‘undaunted by the clash and attack of battle’. This part of the account aligns itself with ideas surrounding secular knighthood and chivalry. This interpretation implies that there were two sides to Order life rather than one unique, hybrid state created. Order knighthood, and therefore their masculinity according to Anselm is twofold, with contrasting roles at different times rather than one hybrid approach whereby members fulfil both sides simultaneously.
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Another positive interpretation of the foundation of the Templars is by Ernoul and Bernard the Treasurer sometime after 1187. Suggesting that ‘good knights’ swore to join the Order, they claim that the Templars filled a demand for security, despite both the authors’ and potential members’ reservations to bear arms ‘although this country has need of that’.¹⁰⁶ This insinuates that members were reluctant warriors, with greater emphasis on religious devotion. However, it also supports the idea that all Order members were trained in preparation for war, but that their original objective was religious purity, that they were noble born knights concerned with their entry into Heaven. The Templar’s proximity to and support of the monarchy of Jerusalem is also implied, which develops their perceived masculinity where it can be seen as less monkish and more stately. Ultimately, religion is seen as the crucial motivation for recruits to have joined the early Order.

There is no single view of the masculinity of the members of the military Orders. While Bernard of Clairvaux’s ‘New Knighthood’ model was undoubtedly the most influential, it also highlights just how differing opinions of the Orders were within the Church, when compared to other accounts. Without question, monastic influence was crucial to the Church’s understanding and promotion of Templar life to those in Europe as either potential recruits or patrons. Connection to a religious lifestyle validated the worthiness of their vocation. It also justified their uncomfortable new identity to a medieval audience. Although in terms of masculinity, secular writers would debate whether these aspects made the men more masculine or were simply a different and separate form of it. Military functions were also key to Order lifestyle, but the extent to which they were willing warriors is debated. Warrior skills were the original and defining requirement of knights of the military Orders. However, living a monastic lifestyle was put above military action for these men by Church writers. Order knights, regardless of Order, needed to have the skills required to defend Christian people and faith in the Holy Land, yet were also required to live a type of monastic lifestyle. Both types of masculinity were used to create an Order identity, yet the importance of each was debated. These separate and contrasting requirements show that original Order knights had to juggle opposing ideals of masculinity to fulfil the two objectives of their existence. Hybrid masculinity, as espoused by Bernard of Clairvaux, allowed these men to juggle their opposing roles. While they may have changed or adapted in later years, the military Orders created a lifestyle to fill the role of both warrior and monk, depending on circumstances.

Adhering to and putting into practice an Identity

Whilst the foundations of the military Orders clearly showed an attempt to create and develop a new brand of masculinity, did the day to day reality of life as an Order brother match these aspirations? The military Orders matched their religious and military counterparts of the time by formulating distinct and wide reaching rules to consolidate their lifestyle and regulate their conduct. These rules and regulations provide insight into how these men were required to live and how their brand of masculinity was both supposed to be put into practice and enforced. Rather than idealised theories put forward by those writing on their foundations, attempts were made to consolidate these new lifestyles and legislate the masculinity of the Orders. This is something they have in common with the monastic Orders too. Whilst we are able to identify how the Orders were supposed to act, we need to consider their actual conduct too. Each of the Orders worked towards creating a uniformity of masculinity throughout their membership, training men into their new identity. Emulating the ideals set out by Bernard of Clairvaux, the Orders each attempted to ensure the creation of a brotherhood of pious knights, with superior masculinity put into practice.

Templar Rules

The attempt to legislate the masculine identity of Order members can be expressed through their rules and regulations. The Templars were the first to legislate their ideals and roles for members. The Latin Rule and the French Rule developed the common identity of Templar members and cemented ideas of what their own masculinity should aspire to be. The first of these was the Latin Rule of 1129. It established a set of rules for members of the Order, created by the founder Hugh de Payens and ratified by the Council of Troyes of the same year. Ideas of the Order as a religious institution are put forward from the very prologue, describing themselves as having taken up a ‘holy way of life’. This was influenced by the promise of support from the Papacy, as Forey indicates that it was important to emphasise the religious nature of the group so as to gain Papal support. However, the military side of the Order is not ignored, with practices for ‘knighthood’ and the ‘observance of this chivalric order’.

There was clear attempt to include religious masculinity within Templar identity. Monastic elements are embedded within the rules.Clauses banning members from owning private property, the
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compulsory study of Scriptures for all members, rules for food and fasting, communal ways of life and the banning of receiving gifts feature prominently.\textsuperscript{110} The requirement for the Order to engage in acts of charity is also laid out. Caring for the sick and the old become key roles for the knights, aligning their masculinity with yet more shared aspects of knighthood and monasticism, those of charity and protection of others.\textsuperscript{111} Over time, this role was as taken up by other ranks within the Order. The importance of non-military work can be supported by Theresa Vann and Donald Kagay’s research of Hospitalier piety, proving that all of the Orders set aside a percentage of their revenue to support charitable functions and hospitals as well as participate themselves.\textsuperscript{112} Charitable work played an important role for each of the Orders from their inceptions, proven by its inclusion in these early Templar rules. A requirement for brothers to have ‘consideration for [pilgrims or fellow knights’] … infirmities’ and to ‘support with piety and affection’, the aged both within and outside the Order is crucial to their role.\textsuperscript{113} Their presence within the regulations also serves to strengthen the connection between monastic ideals and the masculine mind-set of Order knights. Connected to these religious ideals of compassion and charity are rules associated with the appearance and identity of the Order. These included hair, beards, clothes and weaponry with an emphasis on the simple and a focus on the colour white to represent ‘pure chastity’.\textsuperscript{114} The way in which the knights eat and live, ‘communally’ and in accordance to Biblical teachings on fasting, sets precedents for the men to forge bonds between each other in a religious manner in all aspects of their lives.\textsuperscript{115} Intriguingly the food rules are set up so that the men could follow religious teachings on fasting yet provide flexibility to allow men to ‘draw sustenance from another [dish]’, to allow them to fight effectively.\textsuperscript{116} Here, we can see an amalgamation between the warrior intentions of the Order and the monastic ideals imposed within the rules at the Council of Troyes.\textsuperscript{117}

Religion in this respect was something theoretical and to be perceived about Templar Order members to begin with, seemingly taking precedence over every act they made and influencing every aspect of their masculinity above other factors. Bernard of Clairvaux’s ‘New Knighthood’ was based on his interactions with the Order stemming from his own appearance at the Council of Troyes. Therefore his writing on the masculinity and foundation of the Order was seen through a lens of Church influence and participation in Order law making. It is undeniable that the Templars
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and other Orders placed great importance on the religious aspects of their identity and masculinity from their very formation. Nonetheless, through the Latin Rule and Bernard’s ‘New Knighthood’, we see the importance of the Church’s role in defining Templar activity within Christendom. The extent to which these rules came from within the Order or were suggested from outside can be debated. The Latin Rules endorse the ideas set out by Bernard and cement the monastic inspired characteristics as part of Templar law. The structures of both follow the same themes, with a history of the Templars followed by rules surrounding appearance, weapons, faith and brotherhood. Both drive home the holiness of the calling and the similarities to monastic livelihood and masculinity. They espouse ideal knighthood whilst also putting forward that secular knighthood was inferior to Order identity. According to Malcom Barber and Keith Bates, de Payens claimed the Templars had already been following these rules informally since their foundation.\footnote{Ibid. p. 31.} However, these laws were apparently drafted after ‘extensive discussion among the ecclesiastics and seculars present’.\footnote{Ibid. p. 31.} This could hint that the Church did in fact have a prominent voice and influence in shaping the ecclesiastical aspects of the Order by prioritising the monastic masculinity within the lifestyle. Regardless, it shows a clear intent to legislate and enforce masculine ideals on members, with monastic elements key.

However, despite these influences, military work is still crucial to this version of Order life, with provisions made to prepare for war and the requirement that ‘the lion should always be attacked’, when members are faced with the enemy.\footnote{Ibid. p. 44-47.} Women are explicitly banned, while chastity is imposed throughout, with the banning of sexual relations or familiarity with a ‘widow, … young girl, … married woman, … a sister’ or any other family member.\footnote{Ibid. p. 49 & 54.} These rules show the complexity of the Templars and Orders more generally, with the warrior life at times incompatible with monastic ideals, yet both walks of life crucial to their identity. Perfect knighthood through combat is exhorted alongside a monastic pure life, offering an ‘upgrade’ on both secular and monastic manhood through these rules. The breadth of religiously inspired rules suggest that originally there had not been as much emphasis placed on those ideas. The Rules ensured that they became enshrined within legislation and adhered to by members officially.

The French Rules of 1165 built on from these Latin Rules with an emphasis on the military side of the Order, which Barber and Bates claim was seen as inadequately provisioned for in the original Rules.\footnote{Ibid. p. 67-72.} Monastic and religious ideals had been over provided for, they were not realistic or
common place in practice for members. Therefore although religion was crucial to masculinity, the French Rules were more balanced in terms of realistic practices and principles. Here, the practicalities of Templar work on campaign are laid out, ranging from how to march, set up camp, attack the enemy and how to work with other Orders. A more practical rather than theoretical regulation of actual Templar military masculinity, it was more applicable to the everyday work of the knightly members. The Latin Rules had not concerned themselves with practicalities, rather an idyllic interpretation of Templar masculinity skewed firmly towards monasticism or the clerical/administrative members. The French Rules addressed this imbalance and filled a hole in the original regulations by treating Templar concerns of how they were meant to fulfil their vocation as knights. Surrender was not an option as ‘no brother should leave the field to return to the garrison, ... for if he leaves he will be expelled from the house for ever’. However, despite this, the French Rule also sets out further detail on the religious and charitable lives the members of the Order had to follow. The French Rules added further regulations to the previously standardised practises regarding religion, especially regarding fasting and prayer. Religious services are set out and acts are described that would be punishable by expulsion from the Order if carried out, including simony and the removal of a brother’s habit. This supports the idea that Templar life and masculinity was layered, with religion and warfare equally valued within their day to day lives. No one aspect could outweigh the other; both were enshrined in rules to ensure obedience to each.

The French Rules offer more of a working guide to the realities of life in the Templars as they became established. Written in the vernacular of the majority of knights in the Templar Order, French, it was directed for wider and more practical member use, rather than just the clerical members of the Order as the Latin Rules imply. Knights in the field would find them more relevant than the overly religious Latin Rules and would also provide them with practical warfare advice rather monastic regulations. While the Latin Rules show the importance of religion to the practice of masculinity, other than the law regarding defending oneself from attack, all other rules favour making the lifestyle as pious as possible. There are no specific provisions for their original intentions of defending pilgrims and Christendom. However, as the Latin Laws were written during the Council
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of Troyes, it is doubtful that the Pope and clerical writers would have had practical experience in aspects of warfare!

While the religious Latin Rules are critical to understanding how the Templars enforced the spiritual and charitable side of their lifestyle, the French Rules show the practices of the militaristic aspects of the life. Both combine to paint a full picture of the, at times, contrasting masculinity of the Templar knight. The French Rule also has legislation for punishments for errant brothers, something the Latin Rule does not cover. This could imply that the Latin Rules regarding behaviour were not being adhered to, that there would always be regulation from their own hierarchy or from the Church.

With reasons ranging from 'simony' to having impure thoughts and not upholding the monastic regulations, it appears that religious misconduct was the greatest punishable offence within Order life.¹²⁷ Monasticism was crucial to ideas of Order masculinity, yet according to Barber and Bates, these clauses within the Rules were specifically encoded to combat malpractice regarding religious elements of the lifestyle.¹²⁸ Consequently, while a lifestyle emulating monastic qualities and standards was exhorted, the reality was different. Identity was balanced between warrior instincts and religious piety despite Templar or Church attempts to swing the balance.

Written in a period of greater Order campaigning as well as Order holdings, the French Rules were legislated in response to changes to Templar life. Campaigning rules forge a militaristic hierarchy within the Order, with Knights following the rules of the Master and squires under the tutelage of the knights.¹²⁹ This ranking system equates with the secular equivalent within hegemonic masculinity and shows a different side of Order life away from Papal influence and a development from being small bands of knights. When seen in a military context, Order masculinity mirrors that of the secular knight in practice. Unlike secular knights, the way in which the Templars march, dole rations, water horses, the formations they fight in and charge are all laid out in great detail - a guidebook for commanders wherever the Templars fought.¹³⁰ Inflexible, Templar militarism was governed by specific codes of conduct which both hampered individual creativity and provided a framework for all franchises to follow. Typical secular warrior masculinity comes through in these Rules, although inflexible in approach.

In terms of the rules of the Templars, perceived identity and masculinity was formed from regulations they set out for themselves. However, with Orders spread throughout Christendom, localised branches could adapt to allow specific caveats of identity. The Catalan Rule of Templars as
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seen in the surrender of Gaston Castle in 1268 contains elements missing from the traditional Rules. In this version, the Templars are more militaristic with rules preventing the surrender of Order property to infidels, declaring that ‘whoever abandons a march castle without the permission of the Master… cannot remain in the house’.

The Templars here are described as preparing to defend their holdings before leaving ‘without the castle being besieged or attacked’. Attacking the weakness of these knights in these Rules goes against the monastic values and superiority of masculinity espoused within the original Rule of the Templars, with the Catalan branch of the Order viewing itself as a security organisation. These regulations are in the same vein as the French Rules, with abhorrence of surrender a shared and crucial aspect of Order militarism. The idea of surrender or retreat can be seen as unmanly or feminine in a Crusading context. Templar knights had to show courage and traditional masculinity, something akin to secular knighthood and these ideals are prominent throughout the multiplicity of Rules although interpreted in differing ways. Opportunity for martyrdom is prominent throughout Order text, including the ‘New Knighthood’. It was considered better to die through God’s work and ‘lay down your life for your brothers’ than to dismiss your oaths and abandon the cause symbolically by leaving the battlefield. By preventing Templars from retreating, their warrior identity would be amplified as any fight was until victory or death. This memorialised Order fighting spirit throughout Christendom as well as having the Orders viewed by Muslim forces as the best example of Christian fighters. The systematic execution of members of any military Order after the Battle of Hattin whilst secular knights were ransomed supports this, with Jonathan Phillips describing the Hospitalers and Templars as the ‘bitterest enemies of Islam’.

A fiercely militaristic identity and superior masculine state were formed and practiced through these specific campaigning rules.

The letter by ‘Hugh the Sinner’ is crucial regarding the reality of life in a military Order as there is debate over who Hugh actually is. He was either the founder of the Templars, Hugh de Payens, or the theologian Hugh of St. Victor. If Hugh de Payens, the implications are huge as it would suggest that the Church’s position within the Templars and their promotion of religious ideals had gone too far for the Templars’ founder. Hugh had supposedly been instrumental in formulating the Latin Rules of the Order despite the Rules being exclusively written by Church clerics and angled to favour the
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practice of monastic ideals of manhood. Yet this letter could be Hugh fighting back at clerical impositions on his Order’s identity. The validity of the Latin Rules and the ‘New Knighthood’ could be called into question. Writing in opposition to monastic life and instead promoting the lifestyle of the military Orders, this unknown Hugh writes to the Knights Templar using Biblical knowledge to justify a more active and worldly method of living religiously. Another recruitment piece, according to Nicholson it dates between 1120 and 1135; in the period of Clairvaux’s own exhortation. The Church at this time was defending the idea of living a secluded religious life. This letter promotes the idea of acceptable fighting and upholds traditional masculinity by physical strength if it is directed in a religious manner. It also answers criticisms of the Templars’ way of life, reassuring members of the validity of the vocation. Whilst the Church promoted the idea of the battlefield of the mind, Hugh states ‘You should not avoid physical activity, but mental confusion’, going on to claim that it is the Devil who ‘tells the knights of Christ to lay down their weapons, not to wage wars’. This letter is therefore supportive of the Order’s masculinity and can relate to the wider arguments of masculinity within the medieval era. Promoting the importance of physical action, it suggests that the Order intended to position itself towards the warrior end of the spectrum rather than the monastic.

Hospitaller Rules

The Hospitaller Order originated from the Hospice of the same name in Jerusalem that was founded around 600 A.D., and as such the original rules and statutes of the Order are primarily concerned with religious and behavioural procedures. The date of these original rules are unknown, but according to King can be placed at any point from the Papal Bull of confirmation in 1113 through to the confirmation of the rules during the Papal reign of Eugenius III between 1145 and 1153. The original rules, drawn up by Raymond du Puy, were solely religious in aim, despite Raymond’s persistence in creating and promoting the militaristic side of the Order from 1123. Raymond du Puy was the first and most significant of the Hospitallers’ military and religious heroes, combining the two ideals and celebrated for this at his death in 1160. Further statutes and rules were added

---

137 Holt. Between Warrior and Priest: The Creation of a New Masculine Identity during the Crusades. 185-203, p. 190.
140 Ibid. p. 2.
141 Ibid. p. 3.
142 Ibid. p. 3.
by subsequent Masters of the Order, but they too focused on regulating the lifestyle rather than military side of the Hospitallers. Unlike the Teutonics or Templars, the Hospitallers had no one or two main sets of Rules but rather new statutes made at every Chapter-General meeting as agreed by the Grandmaster. Therefore rules reflected a Master’s personal concerns and more up to date developments of Order life. As the Order developed or responded to individual concerns or campaigns, the Hospitallers were able to enforce new statutes rather than being held by those created in the years of their foundations.

The first Statutes of the Hospitaller Rules, as confirmed by Raymond, legislate the monastic elements of chastity, poverty and obedience as central to the Hospitaller way of life. However, knights are not the only section of the Order whom the rules concern, as clerical elements are regulated in terms of behaviour and work. The way in which clerical Hospitallers preached and travelled is regulated which confirm the centrality of monasticism to the Order as Hospitaller preachers and clerics must ‘go to make collections’, as well as having the community provide sustenance for them, forcing them ‘demand no other thing’ and travel ‘light’. This mirrors that of the Church clergy when travelling. As with the other Orders, rules are created to enforce clothing and food practices, with the banning of ‘coloured cloth’ and not eating ‘more than twice in the day’, creating a commonality throughout the Order through their practices and therefore identity. Fornication is banned too, but oddly if this is done ‘in secret’, the brethren shall do ‘his penance in secret’, while if he is discovered, he shall be ‘severely beaten and flogged… in the sight of all by his Master’. This suggests that Hospitallers did not want to advertise any failings, but if a knight was commonly known to have digressed, he would be publicly condemned. Behaviour becomes centralised by the Order, with wayward brethren to be ‘sent to us [at the capital house] on foot… and we will correct him’. The religious elements of the Order have precedence in regulating behaviour and moulding it in a spiritual way. With the Hospitallers, private property is banned, with those found to have concealed any will have ‘that money tied around his neck…, led naked through the Hospital of Jerusalem… and beaten severely by another brother. Uniformity in spirit is built alongside an outward uniformity as like the other Orders, a uniform and symbol of the Order were to be prominent on ‘their breasts’, to ‘guard and defend the soul’.149
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The updated Statutes in the reign of Alfonso of Portugal as Hospitaller leader follow this religious trend, but with different emphases. Alfonso of Portugal was elected leader of the Hospitallers in 1202 but uniquely was not a member of the Order when chosen as Grandmaster. However he had proven himself as a great Christian warrior in the Reconquista; a practical knightly appointment for the Order. His rule was strict and put the Order on the path towards greater behavioural regulation which was taken up by Revel in later years. His autocratic secular style was at odds with lifelong knights and he resigned in response to dissatisfaction with his attempts at legislative reform, dying shortly after. Unlike other Orders, the method of electing a new ruler was confirmed during his reign. The seal of the Order was to be given to the brother ‘most loyal and the most respected’ until a Chapter-General be called. A commander is then elected who subsequently chooses a ‘brother priest,…knight, and… sergeant’ who work with the commander to elect a Master, taking into consideration all areas and ranks of the Order. However, in terms of food, disparity between the ranks is evident. Sergeants are fed differently to knights, despite knights being forced to share among themselves with no preferential treatment. Communal work and individual decision making is promoted throughout the Order, giving a sense of it being a brotherhood in theory but with specific hierarchies in practice. Likewise the ability to become a knight is regulated, with only those ‘sons of gentlemen’, ‘may be knights in the House, when they come to the age of chivalry’, with everyone limited within the Order to ‘that same service which he was accustomed to do in secular life’. Novitiate is not provided for, nor the specific age in which a member may join. While simplicity in behaviour and equipment is promoted, practicality is also acknowledged so that all food and clothing ‘should be sufficiently good’, meaning the quality of their equipment does not hamper their work.

Hugh de Revel’s many Statutes followed on from Alfonso’s greater regulation in terms of practices and work. Hugh de Revel was an English Grand Master of Hospitallers between 1258 and 1277. He was the most proficient of the Hospitaller Masters in terms on legislating new rules and statutes. Through his term as Master he passed 104 new statutes, setting them on the path to greater regulation and alignment with monastic principles alongside their military work. The theoretical response to the capture of a Grandmaster is highlighted, hinting at the military practices of the
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Order without fully exploring their role as the French Rule did for the Templars. Likewise the rules regarding plunder gained ‘on raids’ is detailed, with all resultant profit going to ‘the Treasury [of the Order]’, while slaves must be retained by the Order ‘unless he be an old or sickly slave’, further shedding indirect light on the military action of the Hospitallers. However, the slaves must not be ‘baptized without a special license of the Master’, seemingly at odds with the religious intentions of the Order. There are no regulations on how to march, fight etc, but these indirect statutes hint at the actively militaristic duties of the Hospitallers. The disparity between ranks is amplified by these later statutes, as ‘no Master Sergeant nor Master Crossbowman shall eat’, at the table with knights, with no one ‘unless he be born of a legitimate marriage, shall be a knight in the House unless he be the son of a Count or ... someone higher’. While the rules apply to the entire Hospitaller Order, they promote hierarchy between the ranks regardless of branch of work within the Order be it military or clerical. Clothing remains key, with an option to provide clothes for oneself if they match House rules, as well as the banning of ‘ornamentation’ or ‘gilded’ weapons, referring back to the simplistic and monastic elements of the Order. All aspects of work must be ‘necessary’ rather than ornamental. Most of the statutes regard complaints or ‘offences’, promoting a monastic sense of idealism with behaviour rather than practical advice, including the banning of gambling or the drinking of beer.

The subsequent Statutes by Nicholas le Lorgne detail punishments and crimes within Hospitaller life for the first time, rather than just ideals on the ways in which they must live. This could imply that offending brothers needed punishing, that the regulations of previous statutes regarding behaviour were not being followed. Desertion, surrender, heresy and sodomy equate to the most serious of crimes to the Hospitallers, which would be punished by expulsion from the Order and for them to ‘lose their habit’. The personal lives of the brothers are further regulated by bans on dogs under William de Villaret and ‘hunting and hawking’ under Revel while lower ranking Order members under the rank of ‘banneret’ are forbidden from becoming Godfathers. This is not to say that these indiscretions were rampant. The Hospitallers regulated themselves in response to new
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concerns and queries, to put into practice an adaptable identity following on from the trend of foundation lore.

Despite the lack of provisions for military activity, the training for battle was key to Hospitaller life according to King. He confirms that military members of the Order had three or more afternoons of ‘gymnastics, wrestling, drill, exercises in arms, and shooting with cross-bow’ a week, proving the importance of military action to the Order.\footnote{Ibid. p. 145.} Therefore while military action was not enshrined in statutes as the behavioural practices and aesthetic rules were, it remained a key part of Hospitaller life, albeit one open to individual interpretation.

**Teutonic Rules**

The Rules of the Teutonics were late additions to the organisation of the Order, only written to avoid complaints from the Papacy and to confirm their independence from both the Templar and Hospitaller Orders.\footnote{Sterns. The Statutes of the Teutonic Knights: A Study of Religious Chivalry. p. 41.} They recorded what the Order claimed to be doing already rather than the Order being formed by the rules. According to Indrikis Sterns, until the mid-thirteenth century the Teutonics followed the rules of the Templar Order ‘in regard to clerics and knights’, but the Hospitallers ‘in the case of the poor and the sick’, with members able to join temporarily.\footnote{Ibid. p. 41.} Whilst these older Orders undertook both military and care giving vocations, the Templars were seen as more clerical and warrior based, while the Hospitallers closer resembled communal and charitable work. These emphases can be seen in the make-up of their respective rules. Unlike the Templar and Hospitaller Orders, the rules of the Teutonics cannot be pinned to a specific author.\footnote{Ibid. p. 47.} Whilst the Hospitaller and Templar Rules were written in both Latin and French (although not at the same time in some cases), the Teutonics also wrote their rules in German and Dutch, aligning them to the primary area of work and recruitment to the Order.\footnote{Ibid. p. 51.} These vernacular versions allowed all areas of Order life to access the rules and reflect the Bavarian and Nordic appeal of the Teutonics.

The structure of the Rules follows that of the Templar Order almost wholly. Agreeing with Bernard of Clairvaux’s interpretation of Order life, the Teutonics start by proclaiming themselves ‘a heavenly and ... earthly knighthood’, ‘graced with many honourable members’, specifically ‘knights and chosen fighters’.\footnote{Ibid. p. 203-4.} Alongside these warriors ‘are also priests who play a worthy and useful role’, as well as providing for the spiritual needs of the Order and community, who also ‘care for and protect
both the healthy and the sick’. Immediately both sides of Teutonic action are highlighted and praised. As with both the Hospitallers and Templars, specific mention is made of members swearing oaths of ‘poverty, chastity and obedience’ - the cornerstones of monastic masculinity and lifestyle.

Unlike the other Orders, personal property is allowed if its use is devoted to the promotion of the Teutonics. Similarly, a Teutonic ‘may also possess in perpetual right, people’, signifying a part of their unique status as secular rulers in the Baltics but also their work as managers of land and estates. This places Teutonic knights within the hierarchy of the feudal system as well as extending their influence and work into the secular world.

While the establishment on hospitals is a key part of their more practical devotional work, emphasis is placed on religious conduct and behaviour for Teutonic members like Order knights more generally. Ranging from religious services, fasting and clothing whereby ‘outer garments shall be of a sober hue’, identical to any other brother, religion is central to their identity. Simplicity is key, while practicality is also ensured with pains taken to equip ‘the brethren in so religious and seemly a fashion... [as well as being] the right size’. Likewise, hair must be shaved specifically in a ‘regular and clerical manner’, emphasising that ‘they can be recognised as religious from the front as well as the back as religious’. Eating too is legislated not for military practicality but for spiritual improvement, with specific Bible readings and fastings to be followed. Likewise sleeping arrangements strive to ensure that all is ‘proper for [the] religious’ - communally and fully clothed. Unsurprisingly, hunting with ‘hounds and hawking’ is banned although Teutonics may accompany hunters ‘for defence and protection against evil men’, while the ‘harry[ing of] wolves, lynxes, bears and lions, without hounds... to destroy them, not as a pastime’ is allowed. Shooting birds for practice is also permitted. These rules allow a grey area to be formed in Teutonic practices, a blend between the religious idealism of the Rules and militaristic action.

Knightly conduct does eventually play into the Teutonic Rules, only after the religious and behavioural ideals were first covered. Accepting that ‘this order is specially founded for knights fighting the enemies of the Cross’, ‘it is necessary likewise to oppose the enemy with different weapons in different ways, so we [The Order] leave to the decision of the superior among the
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brethren the things which pertain to knights, horses, arms, attendants and other things ... for battle'. 184 This allows adaptability and strengthens their military options and practices. However, simplicity regarding ornaments and armour are also promoted, matching other Order rules. Rank and the centrality of the Order Master is promoted, with ‘whatever the wiser part of the brethren shall decide after discussion, the Master or his deputies shall put into effect’, angling at a type of democratic process within the Teutonics, while ‘small matters they may decide themselves’. 185 While the Templars are rigidly bound by the French Rules regarding military activities, decisions are flexible for the Teutonics and Hospitallers with regards to military work. Decisions are left to those qualified to make them rather than clerical sections of the Order, allowing flexibility and adaptability. The multinational interests of the Order are alluded to, with methods of travelling prescribed whereby ‘inns and places they know are of bad repute’ are banned, to ‘strive to show people, by examples of good deeds and useful words, that God is with and within them [as an Order]’. 186 By the same regard, ‘because of weariness from arms or the road, [members may] be excused in the morning from Matins and from the Hours’, as well as ‘those who are engaged in necessary business of the house’, allowing a more practical approach to the religious life similar to the French Rules of the Templars. 187 Chastity remains key to the Orders, especially the Teutonics who are ‘forbidden... to kiss even their own mothers and sisters’, as well as ‘avoid talking in suspect places and at suspect times with women and, above all, with maidens, and kissing women, which is an open indication of unchastity and worldly love’. 188

Entering the Teutonic Order is regulated by the Rules. A ‘suitable probation’ is necessary for prospective recruits who must also ‘learn the hardships to be undergone in this Order’. 189 Age limits are placed on recruits, with ‘no child be given the habit or received into this order before he has reached his fourteenth year’ although they may be cared for by the Order until this age and choose to join. 190 Women are banned in the traditional sense of Teutonic membership but ‘since there are some services for the sick in the hospitals and also for the livestock which are better performed by women than by men, therefore, it is permitted to receive women as sister aids for such services’, only if they are housed separately. 191 Likewise ‘since this Order may have need of more people, we permit the reception, as domestics, into this Order, of lay people, married or single, who submit
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their bodies and property to the direction of the brethren’, thereby allowing lay participation in Order life.\textsuperscript{192} These rules acknowledge wider Teutonic work as secular rulers and managers of lands or estates, confirming lay or temporary participation alongside the lifelong knightly or clerical vocations.

**Qualifications and Training**

The training that prospective knights undertook to join these elite brotherhoods is the logical next step to show how the Orders imprinted on the identity of members. Alan Forey studied this aspect of Order life specifically in relation to the Templars, however Buttigieg also sheds light on the traditions of the Hospitallers.\textsuperscript{193} Each of these Orders had unique practices and training procedures that impacted the way in which masculinity was imprinted on novitiates from the outset of their careers. Likewise, the Teutonics were also distinct in terms of their recruitment processes. Little evidence of the actual novitiates survive from any of the Orders today, we can only get a sense of what it involved from writings within the Order.\textsuperscript{194} According to Forey, the Templars were the first of the Orders to make defined provisions for the recruitment process of novitiates, followed by the Teutonics.\textsuperscript{195} This happened very early on in their existence, with Nicholas Morton claiming that all Order recruitment was slow in their initial years.\textsuperscript{196} This would have made it easier for defined novitiate programs to be developed to enable complete assimilation into Order life and secure the future of the lifestyle. The provisions for training support the idea that Order membership was not only a career but a way of life for those who joined, directing their masculinity from the very start.

A precise knowledge of familial background and history was a prerequisite for all potential knights in any of the Orders.\textsuperscript{197} The military aspects of the lifestyle required recruits to have had arms training in their youth- a noble born tradition.\textsuperscript{198} By definition these men would have reached maturity and gained these warrior skills, so this part of their identity was already formed. Deeper knowledge of religious ideas and learning was also beneficial to the monastic elements of the life, with noble men typically taught the basics alongside their military training.\textsuperscript{199} Whilst Order knights are portrayed by

---

\textsuperscript{192} Ibid. p. 235-6.


\textsuperscript{194} Forey. Novitiate and Instruction in the Military Orders during the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries. 1-17, p. 1.


\textsuperscript{196} Morton, N. The Medieval Military Orders 1120-1314. p. 96.

\textsuperscript{197} Forey. Novitiate and Instruction in the Military Orders during the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries. 1-17, p. 16.

\textsuperscript{198} Ibid. p. 10.

Bernard as humble, poor and pure, there were restrictions placed on membership to prevent non
nobles from attaining knighthood within the Order.\textsuperscript{200} Men had to be born free to join, with noble
familial history a must to attain knighthood, much like the secular version.\textsuperscript{201} Bernard described the
Order knights as having had disregard for personal glory and appearance, but as a higher calling,
men of lower status would not have been suitable or adequately trained for the lifestyle. Therefore
masculinity and membership itself of the military Orders depended on noble backgrounds and their
specific ideals of masculinity. Both secular knighthood and Order knights stemmed from the same
childhood imprinting of masculinity. The noble taught arms, etiquette and religious learning from
their childhoods was a crucial requirement, as well as costly in terms of finance and time, for
prospective Order knights. According to Forey, a prospective knight’s family had to make a gift to the
individual Order to enrol a son.\textsuperscript{202} Therefore, yet another barrier for men outside of the upper
classes to join the Orders as knights. These traits and religious directives existed in the secular
knighthood too. Women, like lower class men, were excluded from attaining knighthood. However,
both lower class men and women will be discussed in more detail in later chapters to explain their
wider role in shaping Order masculinity.

The noviciate itself, once a man had proven his noble lineage and his experience of this trained form
of masculinity, sought to impose the individual Orders’ ideals and identity on the recruit. The actual
act of joining the Order, once the training had been passed, matched that of a monastic institution.
Prospective members had to swear the monastic oaths of obedience, chastity and poverty,
relinquishing all claims to personal property and items as well as promising to serve the Order as
commanded.\textsuperscript{203} Riley-Smith argues that this was a key requirement from the very start for the
Orders.\textsuperscript{204} The very act of joining the Orders mirrors that of their monastic brethren. This supports
ideas of a monastically influenced masculinity fused onto a knightly identity. This form of entry into
each of the Orders shows that they set themselves up as religious vocations. Training lasted for a
year, with Forey suggesting that it was to test the ‘suitability’ of a potential recruit to the unique
lifestyle rather than training in terms of learning.\textsuperscript{205} The noble backgrounds of these men would have
already prepared them for the religious devotion and military training the Orders required. Men of
all ages joined the various Orders, from second sons not expected to inherit yet trained for war, to
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widowed older noble men. Different motivations also brought these men into the Orders, from the ability to take part in warfare to religious piety. The adhesive quality joining these men of different countries, ages and experiences together in Order life was their noble masculinity. Regardless of Order or location, Order knights could bond over their secular upbringing, with the novitiate adding monastic qualities to their warrior based and socially superior, secular identities. A man had to be technically unmarried too, but as Nicholson implies, if a recruit brought land or money into the Order certain aspects of the lifestyle and training could be ignored! Married men whose wives also took religious vows could join, as well as widowers. Gilbert de Lacy, a knight who served militarily under the Empress Matilda, was an example of a man who joined the Orders in later life as a knight. A prominent warrior in England as well as a Baron by title, in 1158/9 he resigned his title and lands to his eldest son and joined the Templar Order. Travelling to Jerusalem after a couple of years in Temple Houses in mainland Europe, he became preceptor in Jerusalem and was one of the military leaders of the Templars against Nur ad Din in 1163 before his death later that year.

A peculiarity of the Teutonics by comparison was the ability for nobles to join the Order as temporary knights. These temporary ‘guests’ were still defined as Order knights, yet only joined in campaigning seasons to gain experience in war and have the opportunity to be a part of the Crusading movement, proving their chivalry. They fought and lived alongside full time members, yet the Teutonics were already unique as secular rulers in Eastern Europe as well as a military Order. This ability to temporarily be part of the Order lifestyle, in which men were supposed to follow the rules and actions of their permanent brothers is an intriguing development of Order masculinity. Temporary membership still supports traditional beliefs of Order masculinity, as the men still had to uphold monastic elements of lifestyle no matter how long they were affiliated to the group. Celibacy, obedience to Order leadership, as well as fighting for the common religious cause rather than personal glory was still essential. Henry Bolingbroke, later Henry IV of England, was a notable temporary member of the Teutonic Order, taking thirty two knights and chartering two ships.
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to undertake a campaign in Lithuania in 1390.\(^{213}\) Whilst his campaign involved little military success, he was later accredited to have ‘spoken warmly’ of his experience alongside the permanent Teutonic Order and supported their efforts when King.\(^{214}\) By taking a large retinue of not only knights but a full household befitting a major noble, the cost of the campaign was said to be £4,000 paid for by Henry’s father John of Gaunt. Here, the practical benefits of Order membership for noble sons can be seen, showing an inexperienced Henry campaigning tactics, warfare and chivalry despite the fact that they only captured a minor fort whilst abroad.\(^{215}\)

Likewise, Jean de Grailly, a prominent Gascon knight who served the English crown through the Hundred Years War and a founding member of the chivalric Order of the Garter, also fought temporarily as a Teutonic between 1357 and 1358.\(^{216}\) Called to serve at the behest of the Grandmaster himself, Jean was an experienced warrior, having fought alongside the Black Prince Edward of England. Therefore, whilst both Henry and Jean were warriors, they were at different points in their respective military careers. There was an established trend for both of these paths to be undertaken by English gentry in particular, with Thomas Beauchamp, Miles Stapelton and nine of the original members of the Garter joining the Teutonics as part of annual *Pressenreisen* campaigns.\(^{217}\) Chivalry and Order knighthood went hand in hand in terms of ideals, aims and campaigning. Many of these knights also served in the Reconquista including Henry of Lancaster who first fought for the Christian forces in Iberia in 1343 before later serving in Prussia in 1351.\(^{218}\) From Dukes like Henry of Lancaster to Earls such as Beauchamp, future Kings and simple knights like de Grailly, all areas of knighthood entered temporary service of the Orders, primarily the Teutonics, to either forge a career or prove their chivalry and piety. Beauchamp was in his late forties when he fought in Lithuania, needing Papal dispensation to fight for the Order in 1364 where legend claims he captured the King of the Lithuanians in battle- proving his piety and promoting his chivalry.\(^{219}\)
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The Hospitallers on the other hand had no novitiate and the reasons for this are unclear, yet their masculinity was also imprinted through the process of joining their Order. Like the Teutonics and Templars, knighthood was reserved for noble heritage so as to make use of training in religion and warfare. Boys could be entered by parents as pages between the ages of twelve and fifteen or as minors when below twelve. The Order itself had a clerical structure according to Buttigieg which helped endorse the promotion of the Order’s ideas of masculinity from joining rather than through a novitiate. While there was no formal training, monasticism was crucial to the Hospitallers and therefore their masculinity, possibly more so than other Orders. The motto ‘serve the Poor and Defend the Faith’ perfectly summarised their ideals, with their lifestyle and masculine identity imprinted immediately from the oaths to join. The Hospitallers also valued appearance as a way of integrating members into the Order similar to other Orders. The ideals of the Hospitaller Order were shown through their physical appearance. The religious connotations of simple woollen uniforms assimilated members into aspects of the lifestyle of the Order rather than through training.

Visitations were another key example of wider Order procedure to ensure that they adhered to central Order principles of practice and identity. They also show the creeping involvement of clerical judgement on individual Order holdings. The practice of visiting a specific Order house and checking for misdemeanours can be integral to understanding the intentions of their identity and therefore their masculinity. The fact that these controlled and influential visits took place, shows that despite the regulations the Orders created, there were localised discrepancies and more pragmatic interpretations of the life. Specifically addressing concerns over religious conduct, visitations show the differences between houses, especially between the Western ones and those based in war zones in the East. Here, different emphases can be seen regarding role and conduct of the men. Supporting the fears that were put forward through Hugh the Sinners’ letter regarding a monastic influence on Order life, Forey argues that Order visitations stemmed from the tradition of monastic visitations.

The Order of Santiago is the first of the military Orders to have adopted the visitation state, originating in their Papal Bull of confirmation in 1175, put in place so that the Order may ‘correct themselves’. This, and the idea that provincial heads of the major Orders were responsible for the
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conduct of the branches within their jurisdiction, paint the Order lifestyle as methodically regulated to ensure uniformity. Undoubtedly religion and its practice was integral to Order life, but the actual masculinity of the Order knight can be seen as more of a balance between the contrasting masculine identities of faith and arms. The Templar clause allowing substitution of meals in fasting periods means that rigidly following monastic practices would have been impractical as well as detrimental to the cause. This rule shows that these regulations were to be emulated and disseminated to the populace to give a greater impression of Order values, rather than to be adhered to rigidly. On the other hand, visitations infer that the Orders had vested interests in maintaining this version of the lifestyle.

Collaboration between Orders support notions of there being a common Order masculinity through their similar lifestyles and laws. The 1305 report of James of Molay, the Templar Master, collaborating with Fulk of Villaret, the Hospitalier Master, to Clement V on the possibility of the Orders joining together shows that there was a common lifestyle and identity between the Orders. This is despite James pouring cold water on the idea. The fact this was seen as a plausible option can argue that Order identity was seen at the time as applicable to any of the Orders, that there was a common identity between them.

Laws and lifestyles of the military Orders directly influenced the creation of a common Order identity for the knights who joined. Forging a masculine identity using experiences before joining, as well as through the lifestyle that was imprinted throughout their time in the Order, men regardless of Order built common traits and beliefs. Whilst there were discrepancies and different ways of doing this between the various Orders, there is no doubting that being a part of the military Order movement encapsulated the same distinct masculinity. At times these traits followed the descriptions of Bernard of Clairvaux’s ‘New Knighthood’, but this can be viewed as something to emulate rather than the reality. The necessity for active warfare means that in practice, the balance between faith and arms was more equal as seen from the wider laws and lifestyle. Regardless of Order, Church influence can continue to be seen as crucial for all the Orders, particularly the establishment of this Order masculinity. The codification of the rules and regulations of the Order lifestyle shows the development of the Orders as growing organisations and the attempt to bring all members together under one creed. These intentions may not have been totally successful in practice but show that there was a common Order identity attempting to be formed, one that borrowed ideas and practices
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from both monasticism and secular knighthood. The rules and lifestyles aimed to bring about the idea of pious, superior knights into reality.
Developments of Identity

Whilst the military Orders, especially the Templars, aspired to emulate the ideals espoused by Bernard of Clairvaux in his ‘New Knighthood’, they were not always able to put these ideas into practice. There was, however, clear intent from each Order to create and adhere to a set masculine identity, with some differences between each Order. However, the masculinity of these military Order members influenced by the impact of the growth of the movement, with developments to their masculinity occurring. As the Orders grew in size and power, they diverged in terms of aim and action. No longer small bands of monastic warriors, from the dawn of the thirteenth century they evolved, developing their role within Christendom and the individual men’s identity, in addition to their unique way of life. While each Order developed differently, there was still a common masculinity between them. The ways in which they developed their common identity, and the degree to which this impacted on their masculinity will be discussed here.

The military Orders all developed great riches and power through a system of patronage, beginning from the Bulls of endorsement each received from the Papacy after their foundations. A turning point for this increase in power was the turn of the thirteenth century, with the commencement of ‘economic exploitation’. From this time onwards, it is possible to see a clear change in motive and action within the military Orders both in the Holy Land and in Europe as a whole. This issue of wealth was also a concern for monastic orders at the time. Diverging from their roots as monastic warriors, they took up new tasks and roles within Christendom that provide evidence of a shift in identities away from the ideals of their rules and foundations. From small bands of wandering protectors of pilgrims, the support of the Church, as well as secular rulers and everyday families directly influenced the practices of the different Orders and allowed for them to develop new aspects of their identity.

All of the major military Orders gained the patronage of both the Church and the laity in varying forms. A common form of patronage was the acquisition of land or money, either through taxes/tithes or through donations or wills. As the Orders were portrayed from their very inceptions as the most holy and superior fighting force for the defence of the Christian faith, their appeal is obvious to benefactors. The monastic elements espoused in their conduct and lore also aided the practice of patronage. Members supposedly had no wealth or methods of funding themselves,
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relying in theory on the support of others to provide for them, often relinquishing money and property to the Order on entry. As seen in the Templar Latin Rules, the owning of personal property and the receiving of gifts (the gifts ‘shall [be] taken to the master or seneschal’), are banned, with members as well as the Order itself having ‘renounced numerous riches and subjugated ...[themselves] to voluntary poverty’. 231 The pre-mentioned charter from the Bishop of Noyons in 1130 is an early example of the Orders becoming self-sufficient financially through gifts from either the Church or the laity. The charter provides clear evidence that this financial support was a result of the holy and superior nature of Order members and their vocation. 232

Secular rulers throughout Europe endorsed the Orders and their perceived brand of superior religious devotion with donations of lands, tithes and cash. As seen from the grants of a deserted villa by Alfonso VII of Castille in 1146 and the benefits given by Garcia Ramirez of Navarre in 1134, secular rulers treated the Orders in the same manner as the Church with regard to patronage. 233 This can be seen through the bequeathing of the rights and jurisdiction of Navarre’s Villa Vitula, with the connected tithes paid by the community to the Templars, as well as the deserted Villa Sicca for the Order to ‘possess it freely and for all time’. 234 Masculine identity and the function of these men cannot help but be affected by this relationship with secular powers and the growing interests of the Orders. These estates required management through a different set of skills to the traditional pious Order knight. Major landowners away from the frontiers in the East, each Order had conflicted interests regarding their purpose. Clerics and clergmen began to form a key part of Order work. As landholdings increased for the Orders, there was a development to adapt to their new vocations with a rise in number of clerks, clergemen and managers of land. The Hospitallers were prominent in the service of English kings, with Robert Hales, Sir John Langstrother and Stephen Fulbourn each serving the crown in judicial and financial matters. Hales originally entered the Order at a young age, travelling to Rhodes to join, before later becoming Prior of the Hospitallers in England. 235 In 1365 he was one of one hundred knights to fight with Pierre I of Cyprus to take Alexandria, before moving into the administrative field within the Order. 236 He claimed superiority over the Scottish Hospitaller
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preceptor, similar to the position the kings of England claimed over other British rulers.²³⁷ A secular councillor alongside his work as a Hospitaller leader, in the reign of Richard II he combined these two occupations, becoming an active councillor in matters of finance and high politics.²³⁸ Unfortunately for him, after personally loaning the government 1000 marks and overseeing the unpopular Poll Tax as Treasurer of the Exchequer, he was killed in the Peasants Revolt of 1381.²³⁹

Stephen Fulbourn also served as Treasurer for the English throne alongside his work as Deputy of the Hospitallers in England but unlike Hales, was a cleric. Gaining the Archbishopric of Tuam at the behest of Edward I in 1286, Fulbourn was used as the symbol of English power in Ireland. Raising sums for Edward’s campaigns and named Justiciar of Ireland by the King, he also travelled on campaign with the armies themselves.²⁴⁰ A prominent financial advisor, he audited the taxes of 1273 and oversaw the Jewish Tax of 1274.²⁴¹ However, unpopularity with secular nobles saw him charged with bribery and profiteering, where he was found to owe the King £33,000.²⁴² This was negotiated down to £4,000 with his resignation as Treasurer in 1284.²⁴³

Like both Hales and Fulbourn, Sir John Langstrother was not from a noble family but was relatively wealthy. He too joined the Order as a young man. Prior of the Hospitallers, unlike the aforementioned members, he never originally served in a military capacity. Twenty years of administrative and financial duties for both Order and government brought him prominence with both the Grandmaster and Richard Neville.²⁴⁴ A councillor for Edward IV and unanimous choice as leader of the English Hospital Order, he was later made Treasurer of the Exchequer by Richard Neville.²⁴⁵ Locked in the Tower of London in 1470 when the tables turned on Neville, he was reappointed by the Lancastrians when Henry VI was restored to the throne.²⁴⁶ However political fragility saw the clerk present at the battle of Tewkesbury in 1471 where the Lancastrians were defeated and despite his position within the Hospitaller Order, tried and executed as a traitor by Edward IV after the battle.
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Support for Orders stemmed from all areas of society. The support of Orders throughout Europe from ordinary families influenced Order masculinity, because individual Order houses offered benefits to supporter families. In Jochen Schenk’s scholarship, Orders offered spiritual sustenance for families in return for financial support. The opportunity to be buried on consecrated Order land alongside Order knights exploited the spiritual vocation of the Order as part of a new, ruthless business sense. Clearly a sign of an adaptation to Order identity and masculinity, the Orders made use of their religious superiority to increase revenue as a development to their work. A third side to Order masculinity was formed alongside the original religious and militaristic intentions; that of secular business and financial interests. This new branch of identity became more prominent as the Orders grew and can be seen within any of the Orders.

This patronage brought great power and new roles for each of the Orders. Governmental influence as well as the practical exploitation of the newly found financial wealth of the Orders helped them grow and develop as institutions, away from their original intentions. Aspects of the functions of members both individually and as an overall collective were altered as a result of this. Peter Lock and Riley-Smith each imply that the Orders became more business-like, with less focus on religious practices and warfare, but an emphasis on their new roles. Considered by Rodriguez-Picavea to have been the earliest banking organisations in Europe, each of the military Orders can provide evidence that their changing roles developed their identity and masculinity. Providing loans to secular rulers, troops for campaigns and as a banking organisation for crusaders both individually and collectively, the military Orders propelled themselves to the upper echelons of European power. Nicholson states that they rose to this position because the military Orders were seen to be ‘trustworthy and superior to other men available’. This was believed because of the religious ideals that the Orders were supposed to uphold. These ideas had been disseminated around Europe, creating a legendary status for the Order lifestyle as the greatest of Christian vocations. This can be supported by the decree by Pope Honorius III in 1220, allowing the Templars to gather taxes to fund
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Here, the original religious masculine identity can be shown alongside the new business and financial characteristics. Honorius ceded control of the process to the Templars to ‘avoid all suspicion’ of malpractice, with the Hospitaliters, Templars and the Teutonics ‘at Jerusalem’, shown to have gathered funds to support a Christian army in the east. As part of the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, the Templars and Hospitaliters are specifically confirmed as being in charge of Crusading finance, with the Church handing over control, ‘we assign … [them to] faithfully distribute for the needs and uses of the aforesaid land [Holy Land], … the masters of the Templars and Hospitaliters’. The Orders were used most specifically in the thirteenth century by the Church and secular rulers, as the treasurers of the crusades and also at the forefront of crusade planning and recruiting. Honorius III continues in his aforementioned decree in 1220, claiming that with the ‘brothers of the Temple and the Hospital, [the Church does] not have intermediaries in whom it might seem we could have greater trust’. The financial and legal immunities afforded the Orders, stemmed from these religious perceptions of their organisations. The Hospitallers and Templars put these developments to their identity into practice, personally raising taxes in Hungary for the Fifth Crusade totalling ‘one thousand seven hundred and eleven silver marks’. The Teutonics are likewise seen in this letter as gathering taxes within their jurisdiction for the intended Crusading force, including ‘six hundred [silver marks] from the tax collected in France’. As Order knights were manly, they would not have been seen as tempted by such riches and misuse them for their own purposes. These suggest that the Orders adapted to become fully functioning and successful financial organisations, although whether this was a positive direction for their masculinity to take is debated.

Within Matthew Paris’ chronicle, the Papal Orders of 1236 shows that the Templars were ‘commissioned to absolve crusaders whom he [Templar Master Thomas] chose,… on receiving money from them … that he could spend advantageously for the promotion of the cause of the Holy

---
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However, as previously shown, Matthew was no supporter of the Orders. Through his work, the developing identity of the Orders is badly received, with their enhanced business skills on display in a wholly negative light with ‘insatiable greediness ... [they] endeavoured to drain... [the public’]s purses by so many devices.’ These traits were specifically unmanly as knights gave in to worldly temptations. The ‘Agreement between the Templars and the Hospitallers over their respective rights in the Crusader states’ of 1179 show that rivalry existed between the Orders and that economic security and prosperity became crucial to identity. With lists of grievances between the Orders, they are more businesses than religious Orders and that the persuasion of Baldwin IV and Prince Bohemund was needed to bring an end to the hostility between these supposed allies. Competition over patronage, martial success and recruitment created competing identities. Military Order members made use of their religious origins, while developing their wider roles towards pseudo business and governmental figures- forever changing the balance of their identity and masculinities. Knights remained active, but the clerical and administrative men within the Orders came to the fore. Order masculinity was further implicated by the changing direction of their work as they also strived to be loan brokers and banks to the individual crusader. These show that the Order lifestyle was going against the Christian values they originated from. The loan of money with interest was as an unchristian practice, going against Biblical teachings. Yet the loan by the Templars to Robert of Artois in 1281, the cousin of Philip III of France, shows that this was a common practice for the Orders. 

Here, the proceeds of income from the Counts’ township in Domfort-en-Passais, ‘and all their appurtenances, ie. reeveship, woods, waters ...’ are given to the Templar Order ‘until by this continuous payment of the said rents, proceeds and income from the said properties .... the same treasurer shall have received in full and thus recover the above-mentioned loan.’ This loan of 1578 livres, alongside the deposit of jewels by James I of Aragon in 1240 to the Templars for a loan, shows a development from a religiously militaristic practice to a financial conglomerate.

The legal documents highlighted here, both the acknowledgement of the loan and the confirmation that James of Aragon had received back all of the jewels he had previously deposited, are startlingly
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different to the ideals founded in the laws of the Orders or through their foundations. In Cyprus, Coureas provides evidence that the Hospitallers were the largest landowners in the diocese of Limassol in 1313, while the sale of the island to the Templars by Richard I in 1191 for 100,000 bezants shows that they were enabled to become secular rulers themselves as well as prominent land magnates. However, the ‘heavy handed’ nature of the Order as rulers in Cyprus is attributed by Phillips as the reason for the return of the island to Richard, supporting notions of a change in direction of Order work from protection to economic gain. Similarly, the position of the Teutonics as secular rulers in the Baltics from the 1220s onwards and having the prerogative to launch crusades there have implications for the knights’ masculinity and identity, straying back towards secular noble manhood. Likewise Hubert Houben highlights a ‘flair’ for business skills by the Teutonics with the exporting of war horses and vegetables from properties in Sicily and Palermo, while Coureas shows that the Hospitallers were able to finance themselves through their properties in the event of loss of patronage. Finance and income for Orders was necessary for them to fulfil their functions, it was only the extent to which they each pursued these avenues that opened each of them up to criticism and debates on masculinity.

As landowners, the Orders each represented powerful institutions within Christian Europe, able to exert great financial and geopolitical power. This translated into governmental influence throughout Christendom for Barber and explicitly developed the masculinity of all Order members. Diplomatic power, wielded by each of the Orders, adds a new dimension to Order masculinity. The military Orders both benefited from and advised governmental policy in the East. The involvement and even rivalry of the Orders directly impacted politics at the highest level in the Latin East. With the Templars aligning with Philip II of France behind Conrad of Montferrat and the Hospitallers with Richard I of England and Guy of Lusignan regarding the kingship of Jerusalem, Orders influenced important political decisions. Likewise, Laura Whatley’s work on the Crusading intentions of Henry
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III of England prove that Order political influence was not confined to the Middle East.\textsuperscript{273} The distribution of relics as a means of crusade recruitment to secular rulers was a crucial part of Order political movements, as seen by the rivalry between Henry III and Louis IX through the work of the Hospitallers and Templars.\textsuperscript{274} Intellectual ability was therefore promoted within Order life to allow knights to drum up support for Crusading whilst also being able to engage in high politics with secular bodies. Anthony Luttrell specifically supports notions that these diplomatic abilities were crucial to Order work throughout Christendom and the fact they were used by rulers in the West (France, England) as well as in the East (Jerusalem, Byzantium) highlight the importance and success of this new avenue of masculinity.\textsuperscript{275}

Whilst Order knights may have been monastic warriors, they developed as organisations to address and advise the intellectual and political powerhouses of the time. They developed over their lifetime the political nous needed to parley with the highest echelons of the secular and religious worlds. No longer were they all simple warrior monks, the secular noble skills learnt in childhood were utilised by their Orders to propel them to the highest positions in the Christian political world. Military advice, although not always taken as seen from the Battle of Mansurah in 1250, can be grouped alongside diplomatic activity, finance and providing travel to the East, to show the development of the Orders as a political body with profitable business arms.\textsuperscript{276} Individually, the masculinity of the knights picked up these attributes, taking them away from the simple and humble ideals of their foundations and into a new age of Order dominance and individual ability. With individual Order knights the companions of Kings throughout Christendom, as well as named by the Pope as treasurers or recruiters to the crusades, masculinity was open to individuality in order to rise both within the Order and society as a whole. Brotherhood took a backseat in favour of individual influence and collective financial gain. Discussion rages regarding whether this change was a passive or aggressive action instigated by the Orders.\textsuperscript{277} Noble birth remained key to a version of Order masculinity, in order to correspond with and gain the patronage of political powers, but knighthood was no longer the only vocation within the Orders. Innovation and enterprise were new traits applicable to an Order member in the thirteenth century, super ceding the religious and military characteristics of old.
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However, crucially in relation to masculinity and identity, this period of Order growth also altered the actual make-up of Order members. Whilst Bernard of Clairvaux and the Latin Rules of the Templars show the Order as specifically for noble born men taking monastic oaths for life, the reality has been proven to have been different. Each Order had differing interpretations on the role of women to Order life, and this can provide discussion regarding developments to Order masculinity. While the Templars outright banned sisters systematically as shown from their foundations and laws, Bom’s scholarship sheds light on the provisions made by Hospitallers as well as Teutonics and other minor houses for female participation. These so called ‘half-sisters’ had serious implications to Order masculinity as monastic manhood saw interaction with women as dangerous, as a threat to celibacy as well as the notion of a superior masculine identity. If Order knights are to be considered monastic warriors, the involvement of women went against Church teachings on gender positions as well as the entire basis of the Orders as espoused by Bernard of Clairvaux and his idea of religious devotion through arms. Therefore Order identity was dominantly that of a pious knight, but with a side that seemingly went against their very ideals regarding women, as well as lay and part time members. These women associates still had to obey monastic vows of obedience and chastity according to Bom, aligning with traditional views on Order identity, yet their gender undeniably has implications to wider Order character. While these women were not involved in fighting unlike some women who journeyed on crusade, their work matched typical ideas surrounding their gender at the time, focusing on care giving and work a mother would do in the home. Food preparation, clothing repairs and nursing all played key roles in Order life, yet for some Orders like the Hospitallers, these roles were undertaken by women as well as lower ranking men, having huge implications when viewing Order identity as a whole. These worries surrounding women also applied to the monastic movement too but evidently did not stop women from wanting to join.
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Likewise, as argued by Morton and Schenk, while Order knights were the most visible and arguably important position within their institutions, the reality was the employment and recruitment of various trades within an Order house to run the estates and prepare for campaigns.\textsuperscript{284} Sergeants too were involved in fighting, yet were separate in status and origins to the knights they served, who were commanders. These lower ranking men at arms, in addition to farmhands, lawyers, blacksmiths, shipwrights etc. as well as ‘confrates’ and ‘consorores’, lay men and women of partial association to the Orders, were crucial to overall Order work and therefore contribute to Order masculinity and identity.\textsuperscript{285} These confrates and consorores still had to uphold the values of the Orders, including piety.\textsuperscript{286} Yet the ability for these areas of society so distinctly different in upbringing, education and employment to commit to the Order lifestyle clearly shows a development in Order identity.\textsuperscript{287} Military Orders were more than just noble born knights. As multinational businesses and political bodies, they encompassed whole areas of society, while their estates involved all manner of professions who could either swear to take part in the lifestyle or were paid to work for them.\textsuperscript{288} As previously shown, even the knights themselves were not typical in their masculinity and nature, with political knowledge and financial ability required for the developing roles of the Orders. Order knights needed a support team to be able to fulfil their role. Families too were involved in Order lifestyle, ranging from the donations to the Order, sponsoring a child’s entry, as well as the aforementioned lay membership.\textsuperscript{289} Whole areas of society and members of both genders developed the fibre of Order identity in the centuries after their foundations. However it is still important to recognise that military activity and care giving hospitality, including hospitals and the care of lepers, remained key work for all Orders despite these new activities.\textsuperscript{290}

Militaristic campaigns subsided in importance to the Orders compared to financial services and estate management, despite the ever increasing funds and recruits to the groups. From the Third Crusade onwards, Papal involvement in crusades decreased, with secular rulers taking more control to organise, fund and lead the campaigns. This idea of secular control of Crusading can be seen through Richard I of England, Louis IX of France and the diversion of the Fourth Crusade to
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Constantinople in particular. Likewise the Orders themselves are seen by Costa as having been under the influence of secular rulers more, especially after the loss of Acre in 1291. While Rodriguez-Picavea indicates that the Orders were crucial to Crusading propaganda for secular rulers, especially in the early Reconquista, the scholarship by Whatley states that Orders were only companions in active Crusading by the thirteenth century, preferring political influence to the active campaigns outlined in the French Rules of the Templars. Portrayed by Matthew Paris as putting financial gain above religious service, Nicholson exposes the reality of the groups recruiting mercenaries to fight while supposed knights worked on politics and finance, with mercenaries in the Hospitallers outnumbering their knights. As outlined by Lock, military campaigns, especially in the Aegean focused on ‘economic exploitation’, rather than religious ideals, feeding into perceived criticisms of the Orders which will be discussed in the next chapter. These prominent criticisms, ranging from Paris’ chronicle, to rulers of Europe complaining that the Orders were ‘proud, arrogant and unreasonably wealthy’, support this adapting identity for the Orders as organisations as well as of the members themselves. Christopher Tyerman’s evidence of Order members being employed as bankers or ambassadors for the rulers of Europe prove that they strayed from militaristic activities. However Nicholson confirms that Orders did still engage in military campaigns, even after the Fall of Acre. Knights remained key but within the rhetoric of the Orders they were sidelined by new developments in their identity. The Hospitallers and Templars campaigned in Ireland at the behest of the English crown, lead by Stephen Fulbourne and William FitzRoger in 1285, but this was alongside state troops and mercenaries. Despite the new developments to identity and function, it is important to note that the Hospitallers and Teutonics would continue to be militarily active in various forms until the 1800s.
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There was a logical development of identity within each of the Orders as their interests and work became more diverse. These changes deviated from Hugh de Payens’ original hybrid masculinity. However, the reality of Order expansion was the changing roles of members, the development of other lay roles within the Order system and the recruitment of those outside of the usual classes to Order life. Although this change does seem to have taken a rather aggressive and cynical form at times, especially regarding finance. The Orders may have originated as militaristic monks, but as other interests and holdings grew, it is undeniable that, rightly or wrongly, other aspects of masculinity were developed to fulfil these new roles. With less focus on religious devotion, and instead an emphasis placed on secular talents of politics, finance and controlling land, Orders stepped away from the religious world and back towards the secular. Powerful magnates and advisors, their roles changed whether based in the East or West. The fact that this occurred in the midst of failing Crusading campaigns, was condemning to interpretations of their character. No longer a simple band of roaming knights, it is incorrect to believe that this would have remained the case as wealth and numbers grew, but it is nonetheless important to acknowledge these changes and the implications they had for the masculinity of the military Orders. Knights remained the face of the organisations but in the background there was an undeniable and critical development of other ranks and roles with their own forms of identity. These men and women provided a support team for the work of the knights and were crucial to this expansion and secular success.
Attacks on and decline of Masculine Identity

The loss of Acre in 1291 signified the beginning of the end of the Crusading movement in the East as well as the dominance of the various military Orders.\textsuperscript{300} The arguable decline in status of the military Orders in terms of standing and assets was linked to changing perceptions towards their identities and therefore the masculinity of members. The changes to Order masculinity through their new roles and positions were viewed as negative developments when seen in the context of the failures of the Crusading movement as a whole. Culminating in the trial and outlawing of the Templar Order in 1307, at the behest of the King of France, the Templars were targeted through perceptions of their identity and manhood. The Teutonics and Hospitallers also experienced a decline in power and authority from this period but their decline lasted centuries. Significantly all of these falls derived from criticisms of their function and masculinity; an attack on their superior brand of manhood.

The loss of the last foothold in what were the Latin Kingdoms through Acre in 1291 was a humiliating defeat for all of Christianity and one felt throughout Europe.\textsuperscript{301} The loss had a phenomenal impact on perceptions of the military Orders as they lost not only their original bases, but the battle that defined them as militaristic, religious organisations and their purpose of existence.\textsuperscript{302} Their supposedly superior masculine status was no longer unassailable. It also called into question their power, riches and roles within the European political world. Still running estates and houses in the West, without Eastern military presences, the need for patronage and gifts was questioned. These organisations had been the epitome of Christian warfare and the supposed highest form of military devotion, yet Christian holdings in the East had been eradicated in the centuries after the First Crusade. As seen from contemporary chronicles, the powers and riches of the Orders were primarily blamed for their defeats by corrupting their original identity, giving into temptation and becoming unmanly.\textsuperscript{303} Straying from their simple beginnings into the political powerhouses with secular interests discussed in the previous chapter, corruption and other immoralities of both spirit and body were called into question for all the Orders and their members. These accusations and the wider decline of the Orders have intriguing impacts on their masculinity as well as on perceptions of them in later centuries.
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However, the loss of Acre should not be seen as the definitive end point of Order action, as the Orders each continued to use their prerogative to plan prospective campaigns. Despite the riches and new roles of the Orders, a remnant of their original function remained, if only in theory rather than practice. Fulk of Villaret, Master of the Hospitallers in 1305 outlined a plan for the Orders to collaborate to regain the Holy Land in a representation of their original masculinity and role, in an era where there was damnation of Order character. Despite the accusations against them and their undeniable wealth, it cannot be claimed that the Orders were totally negligent or forgetful of their founding ideals. Here, the Orders remained at the forefront of crusade planning and theoretically if the plan had been followed, a military presence on the campaign. The Orders stood ready but needed a united backing from the West to retake lands. While the Third through to Seventh Crusades were instigated primarily by secular rulers and supported in terms of transport, finance and arms by the various Orders, in 1305 we can see an attempt by each of the Orders themselves to drum up support to regain the Holy Land. Traditionally the Orders were permanent fixtures in the war zones of Christendom, supported by those on crusade rather than the other way round. Fulk outlines his plans in 1305 for a successful recapture of the East while also suggesting that the campaign be led by religious men, with ‘secular knight[s] …placed alongside him’ to support.304 By 1305, the Orders might have lost some of their religious practices and were more militaristic by having to request clerics to lead a campaign. The military advice given to the Pope proves that the Hospitallers had fully developed into militaristic forces alongside the Templars, away from their pastoral efforts of the past. Interestingly, Fulk calls for the Pope to ‘order the kings and princes of the world through his nuncios and letters, that they should not permit any hindrance to be created in their lordships against the people of the houses of the Temple, the Teutonic Knights and ourselves; and that we should be able to export from their lands the arms, money and other things belonging to ourselves, which are necessary for the equipping of the passage’.305 Criticisms from the wider population towards the developing identity of the Orders therefore did exist, with secular rulers aiming to disrupt the work of the Orders in the years immediately preceding the fall of the Templars. This can be further supported by Fulk’s claim that to fund the new crusade the Pope ‘should decree that all prelates and churchmen, religious and others, irrespective of dignity, office and status, are to pay a tenth towards the passage from all their revenues and benefices, with the exception of the Temple, Hospital and Teutonic Knights’.306 This letter shows that the Orders remained active militaristic institutions throughout their lifetimes, with militarism the central aspect
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of their identity. Although they became organisations with wide reaching interests, knighthood remained central to their purpose despite success bringing changes to their movement and identity.

Templar James of Molay’s adjoining reports, also in 1305, concern a potential unification of the various Orders under one grouping as well as develop the potential plans for the recapture of the Holy Land. Orders therefore retained their militaristic practices despite falling perceptions of their work and masculinity. Whilst James’ plan differs in strategy to Fulk’s, it still shows that in the years preceding the downfall of the Templars and after the loss of the Holy Land, the military Orders were each still prepared for military activity in the East. This is despite arguments regarding their military effectiveness. Despite the changes to Order masculinity and their wider roles, there was still desire from each of the Orders regarding ‘mounting a large, all-embracing expedition to destroy the infidels and to restore the blood-spattered Holy Land of Christ’.  

Military tactics are discussed including the transport of soldiers, while James proves that the Orders had become the confidents of the highest offices of Christendom by telling the Pope, ‘I will advise you in secret as to my views if you so wish… I will not give it here as it is not to be put in writing’. However, once again financial interests cause controversy as James implies the various Orders were in competition with the Venetians and Genoese over trading and ship faring, ‘I advise … to ban the Genoese, the Venetians and the Pisans… from ferrying… any goods since these bring too much wealth to them’, while protecting ‘the religious order’s possessions’ from any harm. This supports Matthew Paris’ interpretation of financial interests being at the forefront of Order work and therefore key to their masculinity as well as criticisms of it. However by continuing to plan military action with genuine piety, involving the ‘honour of… all Christendom’, one cannot claim that the monastic warrior form of masculinity had been replaced wholly by secular business mind-sets. However, as previously shown, cooperation between the Orders was not universal and this contributed to perceptions of them.

Nevertheless, the 1307 French trial of the Templars ultimately provides evidence that the Templars were seen to have fatally strayed from their original identity, with their expanding roles and wealth making them targets. Masculinity lay at the heart of accusations against them. These accusations,
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involving the immorality of their souls and actions, questions how much their masculinity changed over time and whether the accusations were testaments to their character or politically inspired tools to bring about their downfall. According to William Burgwinkle, the Templars had become a target of Phillip IV for their economic assets and for the debts the French crown owed the Templar Order.\footnote{Burgwinkle.  Sodomy, Masculinity, and Law in Medieval Literature: France and England, 1050-1230.  p. 52.} Accusations of greed and lack of military success were implicitly a critique of Templar manliness; that they had failed to live up to expectations of their status. It is these accusations made during the trial that hold the greatest implications for Order masculinity as a whole after the fall of the Crusading kingdoms. Sodomy, idolatry and satanic rituals were among the most serious of charges and crucially all have implications for perceived masculinity.\footnote{Nicholson.  History Explorer: The Knights Templar. 82-85, p. 85.} These were explicit charges of deviancy from religiosity and masculinity, with records surviving from the Trial to showcase their importance to both masculinity at the time and perceptions of Templar character that can also be applied to other Orders. Other than Karras, there has been little discussion of the gendered implications of these accusations.\footnote{Mazo Karras, R.  (2006). Knighthood, Compulsory Heterosexuality, and Sodomy.  In M. Kuefler (ed.) The Boswell Thesis: Essays on Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality.  Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 273-286, p. 273.} The aforementioned James of Molay remained Master of the Templars at the time of their fall, yet he remained undeniably in favour and close relations with the Papacy. Indeed in the letter by Clement V to Philip IV in August 1307, despite Order failings and loss of prestige, the Papacy initially found the accusations ‘totally incredible and impossible’, yet ‘since then we [the Church] have heard several strange and unheard-of rumours about them [the Templars], … [we] are obliged to harbour doubts’.\footnote{Vitae Paparum Avenionensium, ed. Baluze, new edn Mollat, vol. 3, p. 60. cited and reproduced in Barber, M. & Bate, K.  (2002). The Templars.  Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 243.} Starting their existence as the most superior of masculine identities, the Templars are contrastingly shown in their orders for arrest in 1307 to be ‘wolves in sheep’s clothing’.\footnote{Le Dossier, ed. Lizerand, no. ii, pp. 16-25. cited and reproduced in Barber, M. & Bate, K.  (2002). The Templars.  Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 245-8.} Their existence and practices ‘vilely insulting our religious faith’- an ‘unclean tribe’ and an example of the worst kind of masculinity.\footnote{Ibid. p. 245-8.} Religion and its malpractice was the chief tool against the Templars, alongside unnatural masculinity, accusations of effeminate behaviour and appropriation of ill-gotten financial/land-based interests.

The depositions of arrested Templar members showcase the ways in which Templar masculinity was attacked as well and their responses to the charges. Whilst not chronological in terms of the fall of the Templars, it is crucial in my methodology to view the accusations and words of the Templars themselves before considering political implications, as they are more pertinent to understanding
masculinity. Entry into the Order diverged over time, with Geoffrey of Charney, James of Molay and Hugh of Pairaud all admitting to a change from the previous monastically inspired entry to Templar life. All had entered the Order at a young age and were prominent members by 1307. James in particular was incredibly old by medieval standards at the Trial having been born in 1243, although all remain relatively unknown figures before the Trials. No longer involving the monastically inspired oaths and training, instead the ‘reception’ into the Templars is, claimed under torture to have involved ‘deny[ing] Christ’, to ‘spit on [the image of Christ]’ and ‘kiss[ing] the receiver or being kissed by him… on the mouth’. It is implied that the Order partook in ‘statutes and secrets’, with unmanly and heretical rites including ‘kiss[ing] him [the receptor] at the bottom of the dorsal spine, on the navel and on the mouth’, that knights were told if ‘any heat of nature were to incite them to break their chastity, he gave them permission to relieve the pressure with their other brothers’. Indeed it is claimed by Geoffrey that ‘it was better to have sex between brothers of the Order than to assuage their lust with women’. Heretical implications of sodomy and satanic rituals, these admissions of guilt directly affected perceptions of their manhood. Medieval beliefs on homosexuality placed sodomites as a separate gender, with those guilty of the offence requiring a ‘demotion in society’, acting as a contrast to superior, heroic masculinity. Here, the status of Templars as the most superior masculine form is attacked, by instead painting them as not even feminine but unnatural. Worshipping a head with ‘four feet, two at the front, under the face, and two from behind’, the Templars are portrayed as unchristian and cult like in organisation. Each deposition ends with the claim that these statements were made freely, without ‘threats, fear of torture or imprisonment… [purely] for the salvation of his soul’. However, as shown by the First Deposition of James of Molay at the Papal Commission at Paris in 1309, two years after his supposed admission of the rituals of entry into the Order, ‘he thought it very surprising if the Roman Church desired to proceed to the destruction of the said Order’. At this time, he is described in the records as having ‘made the sign of the cross’ when faced with a reading of the commissions’ evidence, being ‘greatly astonished by what was contained’ and that he was willing to ‘abide by the depositions’ and that ‘the truth… should be known’. Sexual relations were impossible to totally
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ban, as evidenced by instances within the monastic and clerical society as a whole. Homosexual relations could also easily occur in situations both Order and monastic in lifestyle. The depositions of these Templar knights allegedly admits to a widespread acceptance of these practices. This allows them to be painted as going against masculine behaviour as well as playing into heretical implications of sodomy. Not only unchristian by denying Christ and worshipping grotesque idols, Templars are portrayed as the worst form of manhood— one that abandons God and one that goes against sexual conduct of the time.

However in Ponsard of Gizy’s deposition, these ‘gross enormities… were all false’ and borne out of ‘threat or fear of death’, made under torture which he claims to have been subjected to. ‘He continued to be tortured’ and feared ‘his imprisonment would be harsher because he had appeared in defence of the said Order’. The fact the depositions and arrests were made public says more about the intentions of the trial than the reality of the practices. The main result was the blackening of identity of the Order lifestyle, specifically the Templars, taking them away from the ideals of both monastic and knightly masculinity. Sodomites were seen as demonic by medieval people, and these charges challenged Templar superiority.

The political implications of the downfall, including Philip IV’s questions to the masters of theology in Paris in 1308, develop the background to these accusations. Here Templar masculinity, and therefore threats to Orders as a whole, are related to in specific gender terms. These seven queries are put forward by the man who conducted the downfall of the Templars and treat the knights as if already condemned when in fact the process was complicated and drawn out. The new vocations of the Templars are debated, ‘it was essentially a college of knights, not of clerks’, as well as what to do concerning the wealth of the Templars, that it ‘should be confiscated for the profit of the prince in whose jurisdiction they are situated, or … [to] the Church’. Here, political motivations shine through but nonetheless verify that the wealth and new characteristics of the Templars had made them unpopular; that it was through their supposedly superior manhood that they were attacked.

The Episcopal inquiry at Clermont in 1309 further enshrines ideas surrounding perceived Templar masculinity at the Orders’ death, with fifteen articles of items regarding supposed Templar heresy.
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Each article purports to show the crimes of sodomy, heresy and idolatry in simple terms, painting the men’s masculinity as part of the sodomite class- not manly but the polar opposite of the chivalric, knight.\textsuperscript{332} By tarnishing the social status of the Order, they were unworthy of their place among the elite of Europe, while the supposed confessions to some of the crimes adds an air of credibility to accusations. According to Karras and supported by the laws of the Order, celibacy was taken seriously by the various Orders, but while sexual relations were inevitable at points, accusations were uncommon until the call for trial.\textsuperscript{333} However, the sodomy accusations were implied to be consensual by the Inquiry, that ‘those being received into the brotherhood were told they could have sex together...they were allowed to do this...this was not a sin’, with Karras claiming they were instead put forward as mandatory as an initiation at other points in the trial.\textsuperscript{334} The supposed superiority of general Order masculinity, better than both religious and knightly, was torn down through the trial of the Templars.\textsuperscript{335} This struggle between competing masculine identities, the lack of military success and religious observance, as well as social deviances were the greatest faults of the Templars.\textsuperscript{336} The seeming acceptance of charges by many of the accused including Bertrant of Sartiges and, after toing and froing, James of Molay, suggest that the Templars did not expect the total abolishment of the Order but merely a punishment from the Church for quickly accepting charges.\textsuperscript{337} As noted from Philip’s questions, the idea of jurisdiction over the trial was a sticking point and the Papacy was pushed into action by the French crown.\textsuperscript{338} The trial and confessions therefore have to be taken with caution. Yet the charges surrounding masculinity show us that the Templars were not really put on trial for the accuracy of their denunciations, but were attacked through masculinity to challenge their superiority over other men.

The defence of the Order corroborates the political element of the accusations claiming ‘that outside the kingdom of France no brother of the Temple can be found in whatever country on earth who
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tells or has told these lies’, that they originated in France ‘because those who told them were corrupted by fear, persuasion or bribery’. Not all trials ended as the French one did, meaning that their character and the involvement of secular powers in their downfall was not systematic. There was a supplication to the Papacy by the Templars to ensure a just trial and a willingness to hand ‘over to the power of the Church’, ‘all brothers... who have abandoned [the Order]... and are living dishonourable lives’. These claims prove the Templars retained their religiosity and obedience to the Church in favour of the narcissistic and greedy personas they allegedly gained over the years.

Nevertheless the suppression of the Templars through the 1312 Papal Vox in excelso blames the sins and therefore the deviation from superior manhood as the cause of the Templars’ downfall, ‘they have sinned deeply as in the days of Gibeah... for who ever heard of such infamy’.

For Karras, the complaints against the Teutonics in the years after the fall of the Templars expose the political and masculine nature of the Templars’ fall, that identity and gender warfare was used by the French crown to bring about the Templars’ downfall. As explained by Karras, when the Polish crown complained to the Pope in 1321 and 1339 regarding the Teutonic occupation of the Christian Pomerelia, there was a focus on the rapes of women and murder rather than accusations of sodomy and idolatry. Mere years after the downfall of the Templars, it was not the masculinity of the Teutonics that was targeted but a manifestation of the excesses of secular knighthood. This can be crucial as the Teutonics were secular rulers in the Baltics, here behaving as secular knights in an anti-chivalric way rather than an un-masculine one. Breaking the ‘peace and truce of God’, they were set out as poor Christians in a traditional masculine sense rather than having the superior Order masculinity attacked.

The Hospitallers and their later position also adds to arguments surrounding Order masculinity. Benefitfitting from the fall of the Templars in the Papal Ad providam of 1309, the entirety of the Templars’ holdings and assets were transferred to their rival Order. The Hospitallers are exemplified as ‘athletes of the Lord’, whose ‘worship is fervent, works of piety and mercy are
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practised with great earnestness... [and are] fearless warriors’. The traditional masculine identity of Order knights is espoused for the Hospitallers who by all accounts were equally invested in business, financial and political interests. With military aims ‘to crush the enemies of the faith’, Bernard of Clairvaux’s ideals are seen to live on in the Templars’ rival Order. This suggests that despite controversy and envy of their powers, the Orders strived to, or at least appeared willing to, uphold their previous ideals and act as superior pious knights. Yet in the Hospitaller letter to Louis X in 1316, they write off Templar loans to the crown ‘hereby quit[ing] in law, abandon and grant all that is received and raised... from the former assets of the Temple... to the benefit of the said King Philip’. The Hospitallers, admittedly under political pressure to do so, were stepping back from financial and political services to focus more on their supposed primary goal- that of the defence of Christendom.

The fall of the Templars and the reduction of influence, power and role of the Orders more widely saw specific attacks on their brand of masculinity as well as perceived failings or diversions from the movement. The fall of the Holy Land was the beginning of the end of the Order movement, they failed to live up to the hype surrounding their superior form of masculinity and the holiness of their work. Shocking tactics were utilised by Philip to justify his actions and motivations, having to persuade supporters of the Templars of their misplaced faith. With the death of the Crusading movement in the East at least, the questioning of the Order lifestyle and the criticism of their manhood began. Stuck between new business and financial avenues of success and the failings of their knightly class, masculinity was stuck between polar ideals, targeted by rivals. No longer infallible and mythical in superiority, it was through gender dimensions that they were discredited and made an example of.
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Conclusion

Interpretations of Identity and Continuation

Both the Teutonics and Hospitallers remained as Orders with lordship over territories with the support of the Papacy, in the Baltics and the islands of Rhodes and Malta respectively, after the end of the crusades to the East. Both Orders survive in some form today although their roles, names and powers have changed drastically. In terms of masculinity, the period directly after the traditional crusading era and the fall of the Templars brought about new perceptions for overall Order masculinity. Primarily religious organisations in the modern world, their masculinity altered and developed throughout their existences, even if the crusades were long finished.

Despite developments to function and identity, the original work of the Orders continued after the crusades. Guillaume Caoursin was a French knight and Hospitaller in Rhodes. His account of the Ottoman siege of Hospitaller Rhodes in 1480, shows that his Order continued their original work by defending Christendom, with the Hospitallers the final line of defence for Christian Europe at this point. Therefore their pious knighthood way of life continued in the Mediterranean and was celebrated. Despite the change in location, the Orders had already fought on many diverse and extensive campaigns throughout their existences away from the Holy Land including North Africa, the Baltics, Iberia and Ireland.\(^{348}\) The work of the Hospitallers in Rhodes and Malta is significant for masculinity as they combined secular ruling and other business interests with traditional monastic warfare in a time after the Crusading movement. Knights were at the forefront of the Order. Clerics and clerks simply assisted the knights, who are portrayed as central to the Hospitallers. In Kagay and Vann’s translation of the chronicle, which in its day was a ‘bestseller’, the invading Turks are said to be unable to ‘match by force the military excellence of the Rhodian knights [Hospitallers]’.\(^{349}\) Military action previously prevalent to Order identity and masculinity therefore persevered after the Fall of Acre. Despite a Hospitaller vice-chancellor writing this account, Vann and Kagay point out that the Turks had launched three previous unsuccessful raiding parties to Rhodes, proving that the knightly ranks of the Order retained their status as great warriors.\(^{350}\) The ingenuity of the Rhodian commanders within the Hospitallers are lauded, equals to the greatest of Order legends like Raymond du Puy, while those who opposed them are described in religious terms, as deviants and


\(^{349}\) Ibid p. 89

\(^{350}\) Ibid p. 87
‘apostates... who approved the schemes of evil men’. But crucially, the secular skills of the Order are promoted as working in harmony with the ‘divinely inspired’ militarism of old, that in times of war, clerical and administrative members were less valued than the knightly. The Hospitallers made use of these skills, ‘fortified and extended the older parts of the city’, ‘stockpiled grain... and copious supplies of provisions’, as well as ‘summon knights of the Order and mercenary soldiers to defend the city’. The success of the Hospitallers, after consecutive failings by various Orders and secular powers with Muslim forces in the Levant, paints a positive picture of the work of the military Orders and the monastic militarism of their origins. While the island would fall in 1522 to Muslim forces, the Hospitallers remained secular rulers in their own right in the Mediterranean until the Napoleonic wars, retaining the requirements of noble birth, being unmarried, free of debt and bearing arms for the Order to become a knight until the 1800s. This was because of the islands’ strategic importance and the religious function they served as an Order. They also continued to serve militarily in the defence of Greece in the time of the siege of Rhodes and later in the Reconquista until the fall of Granada in 1492, alongside minor Orders. The Teutonics also remained secular rulers after the fall of the Latin East, with a peak of controlled territory at the dawn of the 15th century stretching from the Nordic states, Prussia and the Baltics through either occupation or patronage of lands. They also retained financial interests in mainland Europe alongside the Hospitallers, showing that their financial, clerical and political ranks remained active alongside their knightly brethren. Today however, both the Hospitallers and Teutonics are symbolic religious organisations still under the authority of the Papacy. This transition occurred after their respective loss of secular authority in their lands. For the Teutonics this occurred by the 16th century after defeats in the Polish-Teutonic Wars and Germany’s Reformation Civil Wars, completed by Napoleon’s occupation of Europe. Here, the knightly class within the military Orders as a whole was replaced by the clerical and administrative remnants in a reversal of their respective Orders’ development. The Templars might have persevered into modern day, in the form of the Freemasons, although this strays into fantasy.
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The portrayal of military Order knights in literature throughout Europe give insight into public perceptions of these institutions from the middle ages to the modern day. Order knights found themselves written into narratives, impacting perceptions of their masculinity through the differing ways in which they were portrayed. These portrayals, fictional though they may be, shed light on perceptions of Order life by contemporary writers and therefore of the wider public. The fact Order knights featured prevalently in romance literature can be down to their seemingly religious personas. Nicholson claims that the purity espoused by Order lifestyle was transplanted into literature, allowing knights to be promoted as the protectors of lovers or heroic warriors.360 These interpretations aided the belief of Order knights being the most holy and superior of warriors, hence their popularity as recipients of donations. The extreme lengths Philip IV went to to discredit the Templars can be down to these positive representations. Consistently good portrayals in epics and romances have solidified their status as a heroic vocation despite the fall of the Templars in 1307 and the loss of the Holy Land, as literature legitimised the lifestyle.361

The first portrayal of the Order knight in these genres was between 1175 and 1200 in ‘Raoul de Cambrai’ a heroic poem where a hero battles evil overlords and the Order lifestyle is seen as a penance for those who do evil.362 Order lifestyle more generally was later portrayed as a seclusion from the world in a spiritual sense with ‘L’Escoufle’ and ‘La Chastelaine de Vergi’ depicting the Order knight as holy and separate to normal society.363 As saintly protectors of lovers, ‘The Templiese’ specifically portrays the Templars as these pure and spiritual guardians of innocence, developing ideas of a superior knighthood untainted by lust.364 Ideas of being protectors of the weak and in love are developed by later fiction including ‘Bueve de Hantone’, where the Order knights help fugitives, run hospitals and bury the dead, promoting the charitable sides of the Order movement.365 Active military participation is not a requirement in these texts, although they do undertake this work in ‘L’Escoufle’, as spirituality is promoted but warfare only implied.366 Spirituality and warfare can however combine in literature, with the Templars seen as guardians of the Holy Grail, especially in later literature that has continued into modern day.

The end of the crusades did not mark the end of the Hospitallers or Teutonics as military and devotional organisations. However it is undeniable that despite their popularity through literary,

361 Ibid. p. 2-11.
362 Ibid. p. 35.
363 Ibid. p. 43.
364 Ibid. p. 49.
365 Ibid. p. 64-7.
366 Ibid. p. 76.
artistic and other means of representation, they experienced a decline as knights as well as the effectiveness of other roles from this time onwards. Knights were the stereotypical representation of military Order life, but in reality once the crusades and other religious wars ended and Christian warfare became more secular, the need for this representation of masculinity dried up. Ironically the clerical and administrative sections of the various Orders, considered crucial but inferior to the knightly representation of masculinity, were the remnants of the Order membership.

Analysing the masculinity of members of the Military Orders

The Templars, Hospitallers and Teutonics each developed and shared aspects of a distinctive masculine identity throughout their respective lifetimes. The men, and at times women, who joined these military Orders of all ranks and areas of society experienced varying lifestyles within these Orders. Orders had a shared identity, but also aspects of individuality between them. These were not necessarily contradictory but defining an overall masculinity for these groups of society is complex. While their rules and functions were generally similar, their beliefs on women, membership and military activity differed. Broadly the masculinity of the members can be divided between the different Orders to which they belonged, the period in which they were members, and the role they themselves played within that Order.

The Orders followed relatively similar laws and statutes, although they were expressed in different ways. Religious practice trumped military practicality in most instances, proving an attempt for greater observance of the religious way of life, or at least a desire to be perceived as having the same qualities. This was despite warfare playing a key role throughout their existences, although at times underappreciated. The model of monastic masculinity espoused by Bernard of Clairvaux when viewing the Templars is therefore crucial to the masculinity of the other Orders too. Training and location made slight differences but generally the Orders can be grouped together in intent, although each of the major ones had certain individual qualities that allow them to be viewed as separate. Despite all the Orders partaking in warfare, politics, finance, charitable works, land management and secular leadership, the Templars’ masculinity was seen as the most inclined to warfare, the Hospitallers’ for charitable works and the Teutonics’ as secular rulers and for temporary membership.

Each of these Orders started in similar fashions; small bands of knights or in the case of the Hospitallers, as a hospital that developed a military arm. Through patronage and the development of their interests through financial and personnel growth, the masculinity of the various Orders developed and grew throughout their existences. Whilst clerics, clerks, ambassadors and workers have all joined the Orders in various forms and therefore altered the overall perception of
masculinity, knights remained key to Order life. Their role changed little, only facing more competition with the success of other Order interests and in the face of both criticism to the diversification of Order lifestyle and the failures of the crusades. Defence of Christendom was always the aim of the Orders, but the movement into other areas of expertise, as well as their transformation into the financial and political juggernauts they became were only by-products of this attempt, albeit one condemned by rivals. Military action remaining at the forefront of their work, despite their seeming success and omnipotence in politics, finance and land owning. However the masculinity of all the Orders developed to provide for more of a balance between militarism and secular interests. This was inspired by the success of the new functions of the Orders to expand their organisations and influence, compared with the failures of the military side as time progressed. The period in which a person joined an Order was also key to their masculinity as well as to an extent, the age at which they joined. From humble, knight only origins, to the symbolically religious but militaristically impotent reality in today’s world, with periods of global influence and secular ruling in between, there was no one identity for Order members throughout their existences.

Perceptions of Orders also allow understanding of the various ideas that their masculinity encompassed. They fluctuate from romantic portrayals of Order knights to conspiratorial interpretations culminating from the fall of the Templars, persevering into modern media. The most trustworthy of men and superior of warriors at the height of their powers, perceptions of greed and the unmanliness of knights was used to justify the attacks on the Orders as they grew in riches and power. Different identities and interpretations of masculinity existed throughout their lifetimes.

Overall, despite movements into other fields of work and fluctuating perceptions from the public, the military knight remained central to Order identity and image, the one constant throughout their lifetime. The monastic warrior interpretation that made the Order knight, regardless of Order, unique in comparison to the secular version, was responsible for their popularity, success and growth. The religious orientation of the lifestyle drew praise, patronage and created a legendary standing throughout the known world. Outwardly to their supporters, to fellow members not of the knightly class and enemies both religious and secular, the military Order knight was the most crucial masculine identity within the Orders. It represented the original aims and intentions of the Order as well as the superior connotations they persuaded the world of. This is what made them unique and what has made them the source of debate for centuries as well as responsible for their success in other pursuits.

The knight was the key figure within the military Order, with other ranks and vocations merely a support team for the at times, underappreciated yet undeniably central figures. Regardless of other
Order practices, the military knights remained at the forefront of Order work until the loss of their secular control in the Napoleonic wars. Whether the reality of the monastically inspired knighthood matched their rules, training and self-serving image is debatable. However, there was enough reality in these monastic elements to take accusations of malpractice and corruption, as well as the charges towards the Templars by the French crown, with a pinch of salt. Undoubtedly there were those who did not uphold the values espoused by the Orders throughout Europe. Yet the Orders combined religion and knighthood to create a common identity in the form of a ‘New Knighthood’. Unique and successful in wide ranging fields, the precursors to banks and multinational organisations of the medieval era, the military Orders were built on the identity and legend of the Order knight. Despite failing in their role to defend the Latin East, this masculinity, respected and accountable to the secular world, allowed for a transition to other frontlines of Christianity. When considering the masculinity of the military Orders, the ‘New Knighthood’ of the Order knight, is the most crucial and useful interpretation to explain their appeal, success and developments. Further research could develop ideas on the women of the military Orders as well as the ranks outside of the knightly class, but the centrality of Order knights to their institutions in undeniable. The Orders forged a unique brand of masculinity and developed it, with the support of the Church and secular powers. They withstood attacks and criticism, adapting depending on the situation. Their masculine identity depended on circumstances, not just theories and ideals. Without the simple, monastic warrior knight, and its superior form of masculinity between the secular and religious worlds, the military Orders would have remained chained to either of these opposing spheres, never making it past the footnotes of the history of Christian Europe.
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