



# University of HUDDERSFIELD

## University of Huddersfield Repository

Callaghan, Leanne

The crisis years of Antioch 1130- 1136; a discussion into the portrayal of Alice of Antioch

### Original Citation

Callaghan, Leanne (2018) The crisis years of Antioch 1130- 1136; a discussion into the portrayal of Alice of Antioch. Masters thesis, University of Huddersfield.

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/34794/>

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

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

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

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

# The crisis years of Antioch 1130- 1136; a discussion into the portrayal of Alice of Antioch

Leanne Callaghan

**Ax501- MA by research (Music, Humanities and Media) FT**

The University of Huddersfield

June 2018

Total word count excluding footnotes and bibliography: 26, 261

## Contents

Page 3 - Introduction

Page 11 - Historiography

Page 23 - Medieval attitudes regarding women

Page 33 - Contemporary examples of women

Page 48 - The history of Antioch

Page 61 - The Rulers of Antioch 1098- 1131: Bohemond I- Bohemond II

Page 89 - Alice of Antioch

Page 106 - Conclusion

Page 110 - Bibliography

## Introduction

This thesis is concerned with discussing the levels of crisis in Antioch after the death of Bohemond II (1126-1130) and the attempt to seize power by his widow Alice as well as the representation of female rulers in general. The account of Alice's rule of Antioch will rely on William of Tyre's chronicle *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea* as it is the only known contemporary source to discuss Alice in any depth. Within this chronicle Alice is portrayed as having a negative impact upon Antioch therefore I will consider the levels of crisis the principality suffered between 1130 and 1136 in contrast to earlier rulers of Antioch. I aim to provide an overview of Alice's actions and subsequently compare them to previous rulers of Antioch. In order to give Alice's action context I will also use contemporary comparisons of female rule; these examples will include Alice's sister Melisende (1131-1161) queen of Jerusalem and other medieval queens and noblewomen.

I will analyse the extent to which female rule was accepted in the twelfth century and any reasons why it may not have been accepted by the male nobility, the church and the population at large. This is to gauge whether William of Tyre's negative portrayal was simply a literary tactic employed at the time against women based on their gender or if Alice was indeed the rebel she has been recorded as. I will discuss Melisende's rule of Jerusalem and William's favourable portrayal of her in which she is described as 'transcending the nature of the female sex' thus becoming an exceptional ruler.

As this thesis will primarily rely on a *History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea* this chapter aims to introduce its author William of Tyre and discuss the purpose behind the composition of his chronicle. Additional points will include William's patron, the period in which the chronicle was written, William's personal life and any significant experiences and/ or biases. These are important areas to consider as they may have influenced William's portrayal of Alice. I intend on concluding this chapter by giving a brief overview of Alice, who will be analysed in greater detail in further chapters.

William of Tyre was not of noble birth; he was born in Jerusalem in 1130; a significant year as Bohemond II died unexpectedly thus reportedly triggering a succession crisis within Antioch. The catalyst to the crisis is reported to have been a dispute between Alice and her father regarding the regency of Antioch.

In his youth William had trained at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and remained in Jerusalem until 1145 after which he travelled to Europe training in both Theology and Canon law.<sup>1</sup> William returned to the Holy Land twenty years later in 1165 and henceforth enjoyed a hasty elevation through the political ranks; first being appointed as ambassador to the Byzantine Empire then undertaking the position of Canon of the Cathedral of Acre, Archdeacon of Tyre Cathedral, tutor to the future Baldwin IV (1174-1185) and as Chancellor and Archbishop of Tyre.<sup>2</sup> William's most influential appointment was that of tutor to King Amalric's (1163- 1174) son Baldwin, this placed William in close proximity to the inner

---

<sup>1</sup> Graham A. Loud & J. W. Cox, 'The 'Lost' Autobiographical Chapter of William of Tyre's Chronicle (Book XIX.12)' in A. V. Murray (ed.), *The Crusades: An Encyclopaedia*, (Santa Barbara, 2006), vol. 4, Appendix: Texts and Document 4, pp. 1305–1308

<sup>2</sup> Allan V. Murray, *The Crusades: An Encyclopaedia* (Santa Barbara, 2006), p. 1281

workings of the royal household where William would have been privy to a wealth of vital knowledge for the composition of his chronicle, particularly the latter chapters.<sup>3</sup>

William claimed that his chronicle was commissioned by Amalric with the purpose of recording the history of the kingdom of Jerusalem and the first crusade. His chronicle was written between 1167 and 1184 with Amalric's death occurring during its compilation.<sup>4</sup>After Amalric's death Raymond of Tripoli acted as regent of Jerusalem for two years in place of Baldwin IV who at the time was a minor.

Throughout Raymond's regency William enjoyed a good relationship with him and it was Raymond who promoted William to the post of Archbishop of Tyre.<sup>5</sup>Baldwin IV ascended the throne of Jerusalem aged fifteen despite the fact that he was a leper; a condition which had the potential to weaken Jerusalem's political standing. The latter two years of William's life are difficult to determine as there are few written sources by or regarding him suggesting William's involvement in political affairs were minimal and it is believed he died in 1186.

William's chronicle is a vast piece of writing; in its modern form the chronicle is split into two volumes and contains twenty three chapters with a history spanning almost one hundred years from the first crusade in 1095 until 1184. Despite William living less than one hundred years after the first crusade it was considered a distant period which was revered and considered a time of legendary heroics. It is evident in William's work that he sought to

---

<sup>3</sup> Peter W. Edbury & John Gordon Rowe, *William of Tyre: Historian of the Latin East*, (Cambridge, 1988), p. 15-16

<sup>4</sup> Benjamin Z. Kedar, 'Some New Insight on the Composition Process of William Of Tyre's *Historia*' in S. Edington & H. J. Nicholson (ed.), *Deeds Done Beyond the Sea; Essays on William of Tyre, Cyprus and the Military Orders Presented to Peter Edbury*, (Surry, 2014), pp. 5

<sup>5</sup> Peter W. Edbury & John Gordon Rowe, *William of Tyre: Historian of the Latin East*, (Cambridge, 1988), p. 19

justify the first crusade through a combination of myth, emphasis on Christian conquest, highlighting the bravery the crusaders displayed in battles and emphasising the greatness of its leaders. Emphasis on these leaders was key to William's work; their deeds and legacy became associated with their decedents, particularly William's patron Amalric and Baldwin.<sup>6</sup>

As William was born long after many of the events in his chronicle and was absent from the east for twenty years between 1145 and 1165, he was not a contemporary eyewitness to much of what he wrote about. It is believed that the sources for much of his information were contemporary first crusade chronicles such as that of Fulcher of Chartres and Walter the Chancellor as well as personally conducted interviews with eyewitnesses. William was able to write about his own memories of events after his return to the east in 1165.<sup>7</sup>

William was ardently in support of the Jerusalemite royal family due to his position as court historian and his claim the chronicle was written at the behest of King Amalric. If true this would raise it above the status of many other chronicles' of the time, validating it and give an official nature to his work however it is possible this may simply be a typical type of medieval topos by way of wishing to preserve the history of the Latin east for posterity.

The purpose of William's chronicle was to glorify Jerusalem, the crusader states and its leaders and defend the rule of Baldwin IV. It was commissioned to obtain aid from the west

---

<sup>6</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *God's War*, (London, 2006), p. 213

<sup>7</sup> Hans Mayer, *The Succession to Baldwin II of Jerusalem : The English Impact on the East*, *Dumbarton Oak Papers*, Vol. 39, (1985), pp. 97-98

Sarah Lambert, 'Image of a Queen: Melisende and Her Heirs in the Illustrated Chronicles of the Kingdom of Jerusalem' in J. Dresvina (ed.), *Authority and Gender in Medieval and Renaissance Chronicles: Papers Delivered at the Cambridge International Chronicles Symposium, 2012* (Cambridge, 2012), pp. 1

as Jerusalem's position became precarious; there were threats from Muslim forces and the Byzantines had renewed their campaign to re-take Antioch.<sup>8</sup> There must have been a degree of truth in William's claim or Amalric must have had some knowledge of Williams work as it is remarkably detailed regarding events prior to William's return in 1165 as well as events William had no involvement in, such as his description of the invasion of Egypt in 1167.<sup>9</sup> William played no part in this battle and so he must have been told details of events directly from Amalric or by those who had been involved in events for him to write such a detailed account.<sup>10</sup>

The motivation behind the composition of his chronicle was for William to portray the crusades in a positive light, to celebrate the heroes of the first crusade and to provide a stage to defend Baldwin IV; as a leper king questions regarding his suitability to efficiently govern Jerusalem may have arisen during his reign. This could explain why such emphasis was placed upon the heroics of the first crusade; to emphasise the King's lineage and to defend his legitimacy to rule.<sup>11</sup>

This commendation is in contrast to William's writing regarding Alice, who at best is depicted as manipulative. It could be argued that as Alice had no direct connection to the rule of Jerusalem there was no need for William to emphasise any positive role she played in Antioch or commend her for overcoming the limitations of her sex; he could simply refer to her in the usual derogatory manner common in writing regarding women at that time.

---

<sup>8</sup> Nicholas Morton, 'William of Tyre's Attitude Towards Islam: Some Historiographical Reflections' in S. Edington, & H. J. Nicholson (ed.), *Deeds Done Beyond the Sea; Essays on William of Tyre, Cyprus and the Military Orders Presented to Peter Edbury*, (Surry, 2014), pp. 13

<sup>9</sup> Peter W. Edbury & John Gordon Rowe, *William of Tyre: Historian of the Latin East*, (Cambridge, 1988), p. 28-31

<sup>10</sup> Bernard Hamilton, 'The Old French Translation of William of Tyre as an Historical Source' in P. Edbury & J. Philips (ed.), *The Experience of Crusading Vol 2: Defending the Crusader Kingdom*, (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 100

<sup>11</sup> Peter Edbury, 'Chronicles of Crusade William of Tyre', *History Today*, 38.6, (1988), pp. 27-28



Until the late twentieth century William's work was well respected; from the onset his work had been widely circulated amongst the western nobility and as a chronicler his work was regarded as accurate and trustworthy. However recent historians such as Edbury and Hamilton have questioned William's level of accuracy; Edbury for example has argued that William often confused the dates of a monarch's reign and often gave the incorrect sequence of events which could cause concern for William's credibility as a historian.<sup>12</sup> He has also queried William's claim that he wrote his chronicle on Amalric's request; arguing that this may simply have been a literary device employed by William in order to record a 'credible' version of events.<sup>13</sup> Hamilton has also questioned William as a historical source of the Latin east; he asserts that William is sometimes incorrect in his writing; an example being that he incorrectly dated the death of Pope Alexander III, (1159- 1181) causing Hamilton to question whether William can be trusted.<sup>14</sup> This death was a significant event during William's lifetime moreover during the compilation of his chronicle; it is therefore puzzling as to why William got such an important fact wrong. Regardless of these mistakes I feel that as the only known chronicle to discuss Antioch between 1130- 1136 William is a valuable source, although caution must be issued and the reader must be prepared to question his writing.

William was uncomplimentary of Alice, describing her throughout his work as devious and disruptive; a stark contrast to her sister Melisende. This may suggest his account of events

---

<sup>12</sup> Peter W. Edbury & John Gordon Rowe, *William of Tyre: Historian of the Latin East*, (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 26  
Natasha Hodgson, *Women Crusading and the Holy Land*, (Suffolk, 2007), p. 64

<sup>13</sup> Peter Edbury, 'Chronicles of Crusade William of Tyre', *History Today*, 38.6, (1988), pp. 24

<sup>14</sup> Bernard Hamilton, 'Women in the Crusader States: The Queens of Jerusalem (1100-1190) in D. Baker (ed.), *Studies in Church History: Medieval Women*, (Cambridge, 1978), pp. 145

Bernard Hamilton, 'The Old French Translation of William of Tyre as an Historical Source,' in P. Edbury & J. Philips (ed.), *The Experience of Crusading 2: Defending the Crusader Kingdom*, (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 94

within Antioch during Alice's reign were accurate as he shows he is not being favourable to Baldwin II's daughters based solely on their lineage.<sup>15</sup> Alice was the second daughter of Baldwin II and wife to Bohemond II the heir to Antioch. The two were married in 1126 in fulfilment of an agreement Baldwin II made upon undertaking the regency of Antioch after the Field of Blood.

After Bohemond's death in 1130 Baldwin's intention was to once again assume the regency of Antioch which he had held prior to the arrival of Bohemond. According to William Alice allegedly sought the regency for herself with the intention of disinheriting the rightful heir, her two-year-old daughter Constance. In order to hold on to power Alice refused Baldwin entry to the city of Antioch by barring the gates and by attempting to forge an allegiance with the Muslim general Zengi. In defiance of Alice the nobles of Antioch were said to have opened the gates to Baldwin causing Alice to flee and lock herself in the citadel from where she begged the mercy of her father. Baldwin forgave his daughter but exiled her to her dower lands. Baldwin soon left Antioch after the exile of Alice and at this point he named Joscelin I as regent for Constance. After Joscelin's death in 1131 Alice set her sights on Antioch ignoring Constance's claim.<sup>16</sup>

It is important to keep in mind that William is the only known contemporary source for this sequence of events; therefore we must question why this alleged crisis was not more widely written about by the Frankish sources. Many historians still agree with William's portrayal of Alice; Boase claims that Alice was a passionate and ambitious woman which enforces medieval stereotypes regarding women. Throughout the medieval period adjectives such as 'ambitious' and 'passionate' were frequently used in a negative context to describe women.

---

<sup>15</sup> Natasha Hodgson, *Women Crusading and the Holy Land*, (Suffolk, 2007), p. 185

<sup>16</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades, Volume 2: The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (Cambridge, 1952), p. 176-184

In order to analyse the level of crisis within Antioch between 1130- 1136 these types of stereotypes must be ignored and it is the actions of Alice and of previous rulers which must be analysed.<sup>17</sup>

As mentioned William's chronicle is more favourable towards Melisende than Alice; positivity towards women in this time was unusual which makes his portrayal of Melisende an interesting subject. It is probable that William's attitude towards Melisende was because Baldwin II had named Melisende as his successor and queen of Jerusalem. Despite her gender Melisende was of equal rank to her husband Fulk and did not have to be portrayed in the usual submissive style. In contrast Alice had not been named as the heir of Antioch; she had acted contrary to her father's wish by standing in his way of assuming the regency and had usurped the throne.<sup>18</sup>

This chapter has given a brief introduction to William and from it we can see that he was not rigid in his writing; he did have the capacity to recognise the achievements of women and we know that until recently William was a well-respected Historian. The fact William has started to be queried adds more depth to this study.

---

<sup>17</sup> Thomas Sherrer Ross Boase, *Kingdoms and Strongholds of the Crusaders*, (London,1971), p. 73

<sup>18</sup> Natasha Hodgson, *Women Crusading and the Holy Land*, (Suffolk,2007), p. 134

## Historiography

Traditionally the concept of 'monarchy' is that it was a position ordained by God and exclusively held by males from which females were excluded. Throughout history there has been little study into the roles played by women in relation to monarchy. This continued until the latter half of the twentieth century when the impact of the crusades on society and the role played by women began to be studied more in-depth.

Modern challenges to the traditional idea of absolute male authority have been put forward by the likes of Earenfight who has argued that a woman's role within the medieval court was equally as important as males. Furthermore the queen were able to exert power through her traditional role as an intercessor which gave her considerably more power than had been considered and in some cases this enabled her to rival the power of the king.<sup>19</sup>

The idea of male dominance was prominent for such a vast amount of time because historians tended to focus on military and religious events which were focused on males. Much of the primary evidence indicates that the idea of women exerting power independent of a male was inconceivable to the majority of chroniclers in the twelfth century.<sup>20</sup> However most of this writing was produced by male ecclesiastical leaders who found the topic of women uninteresting and so made little attempt to write about them or their history.<sup>21</sup> Any writing from the twelfth century which does exist regarding women is

---

<sup>19</sup> Theresa Earenfight, *Queenship in Medieval Europe*, (Hampshire, 2013), p. 6

<sup>20</sup> Lois L. Huneycutt, 'Female Succession and the Language of Power' in J. Carmi Parson (ed.), *Medieval Queenship*, (Gloucestershire, 1994), pp. 12

<sup>21</sup> Helen Jewell, *Women in Medieval England*, (Manchester, 1996), p. 2

heavily concerned with the perceptions of women through the lens of biblical stereotypes and classical imagery; this led to many women being vilified based purely on these stereotypes, however not all writing contained these attitudes nor were all works negative portrayals of women.<sup>22</sup>

Orderic Vitalis for instance wrote about women as a companion and help mate for their husband indicating that some writers considered it permissible for a queen to assist and help the king, however it was imperative she did not attempt to rule over him. An example of a queen who was able to accomplish this balance was Queen Matilda the wife of Henry I of England (1100-1135) whom in several cases acted as a regent in her husband's absence. Furthermore she used her position to act as an intercessor between Henry and the Archbishop Anselm to whom she frequently wrote to for advice.

After her death Matilda was described by her subjects as 'Matilda the good queen'.<sup>23</sup> Despite his acceptance that women could assist men Orderic did not agree that women were suitable to take the throne or reference the possibility of them doing so. In his work Orderic did not refer to queens' such Matilda of England or Melisende as ruling in their own right which suggests he may not have agreed with it.<sup>24</sup>

In the Latin east a woman could in theory rule; a broad ideology regarding female rule stipulated that a woman could govern efficiently if she was able to obtain masculine characteristics and chroniclers such as Bernard of Clairvaux accepted this was possible. This suggests that females were not considered suitable to rule if they displayed their natural

---

Marcus Bull, *Thinking Medieval; an Introduction to the Study of the Middle Ages*, (Hampshire, 2005), p. 77

<sup>22</sup> Natasha Hodgson, *Women, Crusading and the Holy Land in Historical Narrative*, (Suffolk, 2007), p. 1-12

<sup>23</sup> Lois L. Huneycutt, *Matilda of Scotland: A Study in Medieval Queenship*, (Suffolk, 2003), p.76

<sup>24</sup> Lois L. Huneycutt, 'Female Succession and the Language of Power' in J. Carmi Parson, (ed.), *Medieval Queenship*, (Gloucestershire, 1994), pp. 194

feminine characteristics, therefore a woman would have to 'change' in order to govern unlike a male. An example of such medieval attitudes regarding female transition is evident in Bernard's counsel to Melisende in the wake of the death of her husband Fulk (1131-1143). Bernard advised that 'although a woman, you must act as a man.'<sup>25</sup>This advice indicates that secular power was most definitely considered a masculine position; in order to rule successfully a queen must overcome the constraints of her sex. In addition to this requirement it was imperative that a queen held a strong, legitimate claim to power in order to rule unchallenged; this is evident in William of Tyre's acceptance that Melisende ruled Jerusalem by hereditary right as she was appointed its heir by her father, Baldwin II (1118-1131).<sup>26</sup>

Nineteenth century attitudes towards medieval marriage were of the opinion that women lost their identity upon marriage; Pollock and Maitland have argued that during the middle ages women were dominated by their husbands. Any property she held became subject to her husband's authority for which he was free to use as he saw fit. Additionally, if a woman brought any form of landed dowry into a marriage it would be relinquished to her husband causing her to lose power.<sup>27</sup>This had more impact on the nobility than the peasant class who would bring little to no property into a marriage; this in turn raises the question of whether noble women held less power within their marriage compared to their peasant counterparts.

---

<sup>25</sup> Lois L. Huneycutt, 'Female Succession and the Language of Power' in J. Carmi Parson, (ed.), *Medieval Queenship*, (Gloucestershire, 1994), pp. 199

<sup>26</sup>Lois L. Huneycutt, 'Female Succession and the Language of Power' in J. Carmi Parson, (ed.), *Medieval Queenship*, (Gloucestershire, 1994), pp. 198-9

<sup>27</sup> Frederick Pollock & Frederic William Maitland, *The History Of English Law Before The Time Of Edward I* (Vol 1), (New Jersey, 2008) pp. 400

The idea of less powerful women has been corroborated by Stuard who argues that prior to the twelfth century queens' generally had jurisdiction over their inheritance. However by the twelfth century many queens' no longer held authority over their inheritance and that control passed to their husband. Stuard acknowledges that in the twelfth century a queen may have had some power to influence the king and that on occasions she was allowed to act as regent which suggests that despite losing some power a queen was still an influential figure.<sup>28</sup>

Earenfight adds to this; recently suggesting that prior to the twentieth century queens' had not been deemed worthy of study as an independent entity and any historical study involving them was a recreational pastime of educated, gentile women.<sup>29</sup> She has argued that it was the feminist movement in the 1960s which was the beginning of the serious study of women, with the topic gaining prominence in the 1980s and 1990s. Earenfight has also argued that a medieval queen held indirect and passive powers within the court which if exercised in the correct context could be as equally powerful as the king.

She states that a queen was able to exercise this power in several ways; through her roles as a wife, mother and as a religious patron.<sup>30</sup> In addition Stafford has argued that it was not until the late twentieth century that serious attention was given to the idea of queenship or the notion of a queen with a separate identity from her husband.

Like Erenfight, Stafford has argued that before the 1990s there was limited interest in powerful women such as noble women, abbesses, saints and queens. These were not

---

<sup>28</sup> Susan Stuard, 'The Dominion of Gender: How Women Fared in the High Middle Ages' in R. Bridenthal, S. M. Stuard & M. E. Wiesener (ed.), *Becoming Visible: Women in European History* (Boston, 1998), pp. 140-141

<sup>29</sup> Theresa Earenfight, *Queenship in Medieval Europe*, (Hampshire, 2013), p. 2

<sup>30</sup> Theresa Earenfight, *Queenship in Medieval Europe*, (Hampshire, 2013), p. 2-15

figures that were studied to the same standard as their male counterpart and usually the only purpose of studying them was to depict them as moral guides in the lives of men.

Stafford states that women became viewed in a more misogynistic way in the twelfth century and that these views were more severe than they had been previously considered.

Stafford states that in the medieval period a queen was at the centre of authority and it was her proximity to the king which left her open to scrutiny; her actions were closely observed and if a king was deemed to be unsuccessful then she would often be blamed. A wife was often seen as a person of suspicion and mistrust due to biblical ideas; she was had the potential for adultery and blurring the line succession. As a mother however, women were viewed in a more favourable light; she was believed to possess an innate instinct to protect her children and also their inheritance.<sup>31</sup>

Shahar has argued that during the medieval period the law prevented women from governing the kingdom; she could not hold a political office or serve in the military. These roles were specific to that of a king; particularly the necessity for military participation. Due to this prevention and inability to act in a masculine way governance for women was exceptionally difficult; Shahar's view is contrary to Bernard of Clairvaux who believed it was possible for women to obtain masculine qualities.<sup>32</sup>

Wolf disagrees with Shahar; he maintains that in the medieval period it was acceptable for a queen to reign, in his work he discusses the different rights of a queen regnant and a queen consort; for a distinction between the two to be necessary there must have been some

---

<sup>31</sup> Pauline Stafford, 'The Portrayal of Royal Women in England, Mid Tenth to Mid Twelfth Centuries' in J. Carmi Parson (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (Gloucestershire, 1994), pp. 1-6, 156

<sup>32</sup> Shulamith Shahar, *The Fourth Estate: A History of Women in the Middle Ages*, (London, 1983), p. 11 & 127



examples of women who ruled by birthright rather than obtaining these rights through marriage. He acknowledges that there were women who displayed traits of effective governance in times of crisis such as a minor king's tenure or during the absence of her husband in times of war. Wolf's work has shown that in Europe between 1100 and 1600 around twenty queens reined; therefore it was possible for a queen to rule in her own stead in exceptional circumstances. These principals apply to most countries within the middle age except for the Holy Roman Empire and France.<sup>33</sup>

Historians such as Maier believe that during the crusades women were regarded as physically weak which prevented them from participating in crusading tasks; however gender roles were flexible and could change due to circumstances. Maier states that by undertaking a masculine role woman could shed their femininity; in cases such as Melisende this was positive though a woman who completely discarded her femininity faced criticism.

Maier argues that male absence within the Latin east was common due to frequent crusading obligations and death; these absences pushed women to the forefront of responsibility where they dealt with finance and property but were never in charge.<sup>34</sup>

Hodgson adds to this arguing that during the medieval period male dominance was high; written chronicles tended to focus on gender stereotypes and therefore were written in an unfavourable way towards women. These attitudes ranged from moderate disdain to more extreme examples of hostility. In chronicles such as the *Gesta Francorum* the focus on

---

<sup>33</sup> Armin Wolf, 'Reigning Queens in Medieval Europe: Where, When and Why' in J. Carmi Parson (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (Gloucestershire, 1994), pp. 109

<sup>34</sup> Christoph T. Maier, 'The Roles of Women in the Crusade Movement: A Survey', *Journal of Medieval History* 30/1 (2004), pp. 68-81

women is limited to the roles they played during battle; be it bringing food or by standing on the sidelines shouting encouragement to the crusaders. Robert of Rheims however gave a moderately hostile account in which he described how Pope Urban II (1088-1099) referred to women as a 'hindrance,' while more extreme accounts such as sermons by Jacques of Vitry and Eudes of Chateauroux portray women as preventing men from going on crusade. However due to their religious agenda these sources may not be useful in portraying the everyday roles women played in the holy land.<sup>35</sup>

The motivations and consequences of the crusades has been a widely debated topic for almost one thousand years. The debate as to the reasons why the crusades occurred has frequently changed over time and has a habit of reflecting events within each period of history. The motivation behind the crusades were originally reported as one of religious ideals and re-conquest and has subsequently progressed to ideas of colonialism and expansion, the harmony the crusades brought to east and progressing to the study of the effects the crusades had on the daily lives of those who settled in the east. Regarding the historiography of crusading, there has been a constant interest in the subject with books being published since the eleventh century; the first accounts being written by those who participated in them.<sup>36</sup>

Between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries most crusade chronicles were not intended to be read by the population at large; many were written in monastic houses as a way of

---

<sup>35</sup> Natasha Hodgson, *Women Crusading and the Holy Land*, (Suffolk, 2007), p. 3-6, 41,44-45, 62

<sup>36</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *The Debate on the Crusades*, (Manchester, 2011), p. 1

indicating how God favoured the Christians and as a way of enforcing parables of worship and virtuous living. William's chronicle deviated from this trend by emphasising the glory of the crusades in an attempt to gain western reinforcements. William was an anomaly compared to earlier *Gestas'* which tended to be relatively short and usually contained a religious undertone. William's was the first scholarly history of the crusades as it spanned almost one hundred years and combined the history of previous chronicles and eye witness testimony's. The quality of William's chronicle became so renowned that by the fourteenth century it had become the standard for crusading history.<sup>37</sup>

By the thirteenth century the history of crusades had gained an element of romance and the feel of an epic fable thanks to the likes of the Norman poet Ambroise.<sup>38</sup>The notion of the Chivalric code was fully developed and widespread throughout Europe by this time and the ideas of virtuous knights defending Christendom appealed to the population.

Both the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries saw a major shift in the perception of the crusades; the introduction of the printing press in the fifteenth century made written texts easier to purchase which led to the publication of some crusade chronicles such as the work of Robert the Monk and William of Tyre.<sup>39</sup>In Western Europe interest in the crusades grew due to an awareness of the threat the Ottoman Turks posed to Christendom, this was brought to popular attention due to the work of Richard Knolles in 1603 with his book entitled *A General History of the Turks to the Present Year*.<sup>40</sup>

By the seventeenth century enlightenment ideas were starting to come to fruition which effected crusader historiography; the crusades began to be interpreted through ideals of

---

<sup>37</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *The Debate on the Crusades*, (Manchester, 2011), p. 16-17

<sup>38</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *The Debate on the Crusades*, (Manchester, 2011), p. 12

<sup>39</sup> Peter Lock, *The Routledge Companion to the Crusades*, (London, 2006), p. 258

<sup>40</sup> Peter Lock, *The Routledge Companion to the Crusades*, (London, 2006), p. 257

the period with historians beginning to reject the commonly held justification for the crusades as religion.<sup>41</sup> These premature enlightenment ideas set in motion a shift in position from the crusades being seen as a time of heroes and Christian endeavour to a primitive time of superstition and barbarity which was unworthy of study.<sup>42</sup> Seventeenth century crusader history was dominated by French scholars with history used as a way of glorifying Louis XIV (1643-1715).<sup>43</sup>

The Eighteenth century saw the beginning of large scale European colonialism after the French revolution and Napoleonic wars; it was during this period that histories of the crusades began to be linked to ideas of Christian expansion rather than of re-conquest.<sup>44</sup> This was a time when intellectuals and historians viewed the crusades not as a historical study but as a case study for debate about the progression of civilisation and religion.<sup>45</sup>

The eighteenth century saw historians start to develop a sense of historical integrity though it was in this period that a negative approach to the Byzantine Empire began to be taken.<sup>46</sup> The mid eighteenth century saw the first of the Arabic texts becoming translated, which gave a different dimension and viewpoint to the study of the crusades; although no known Muslim history surrounding the Latin presence in the Levant is thought to have been written.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *The Debate on the Crusades*, (Manchester, 2011), p. 4

<sup>42</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *The Debate on the Crusades*, (Manchester, 2011), p. 50  
Jonathan Philips, *Holy Warriors*, (London, 2009), p. XX

<sup>43</sup> Peter Lock, *The Routledge Companion to the Crusades*, (London, 2006), p. 258

<sup>44</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *The Debate on the Crusades*, (Manchester, 2011), p. 52

<sup>45</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *The Debate on the Crusades*, (Manchester, 2011), p. 67

<sup>46</sup> Peter Lock, *The Routledge Companion to the Crusades*, (London, 2006), p. 259

<sup>47</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *The Debate on the Crusades*, (Manchester, 2011), p. 70  
Alex Mallet, *Medieval Muslim Historians and the Franks in the Levant*, (Leiden, 2014), p. 5

The Napoleonic wars saw military action in areas historically associated with crusading activity which increased the interest in learning about the history of these locations.<sup>48</sup>The nineteenth and twentieth century ideas surrounding crusading and settlement considered ideas such economic expansion, wars of conquest and colonialism.<sup>49</sup>The subject of settlement in the east was one which was dominated by French and Francophile historians who began an early debate of the effect the western settlements had in the Levant. This strand of study included works by the likes of Dodu and Groussed who argued that the settlement of western people in the east had a positive effect and they were benevolent to the indigenous people and claiming that the Franks blended in culturally with them. These arguments may be slightly idealistic as they coincide with the time when ideas of French nationalism were becoming popular.<sup>50</sup>

The mid twentieth century saw the growth of serious crusade academics with many historians specialising in them and the most influential books were published by Erdmans and Runciman.<sup>51</sup>Historians of this time supported numerous theories relating to the crusades; Praver for instance asserted that the crusades were evidence of medieval colonialism; Runciman maintained a pro-Byzantine stance with Mayer arguing from a traditional standpoint that the crusades were simply an expedition to liberate and defend the holy land. The mid twentieth century saw the creation of Israel in 1948 which has been

---

<sup>48</sup> Peter Lock, *The Routledge Companion to the Crusades*, (London, 2006), p. 261

<sup>49</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *The Debate on the Crusades*, (Manchester, 2011), p. 5

<sup>50</sup> Andrew Jotischy, *Crusading and the Crusader States*, (Harlow, 2004), p. 16

<sup>51</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *The Debate on the Crusades*, (Manchester, 2011), p. 182

linked to ideas of colonialism and raised the question of whether this was a modern form of 'crusade'.<sup>52</sup>

Prior to the millennium historians were limited in their knowledge of how those who settled in the east lived, however there has been significant development in crusading historiography with progress made in understanding the environment of the Levant. Jotischky has stated that we now have far more knowledge as to how the early eastern settlers lived their day to day life than we did twenty years ago.<sup>53</sup>

Modern historiography into the settlement of the Levant is dominated by studies surrounding Jerusalem; this has led to some distorted ideas regarding the Frankish east with Antioch, Edessa and Tripoli assumed to have been governed the same as Jerusalem. In regards to Antioch in particular, there had never been a detailed study of the principality prior to Asbridge in the year 2000; the last major work on northern Syria as a whole was conducted by Cahen in the 1930 which gave no focused account of Antioch.<sup>54</sup> Since Cahen's study historians' understanding of the east has changed dramatically; however there are still few publications regarding Antioch. While biographies focusing on Bohemond I and Tancred by Yeodale and Nicholson have been written they are rather narrative, some brief research had been conducted into the early history of Antioch by Douglas and Allen which again is a basic narrative regarding its formation.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *The Debate on the Crusades*, (Manchester, 2011), p. 172

<sup>53</sup> Andrew Jotischky, *Crusading and the Crusader States*, (Harlow, 2004), p. 5

<sup>54</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 2

<sup>55</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 3

To conclude, it is evident that there has been a change in perception regarding the role and status of women in the medieval period between the nineteenth century and the present day. I believe that the modern debate has more relevance as it far more considerate and inclusive of a woman's place in society compared to the classical argument which in contrast does little to consider the roles which women played within society, nor does it accept that a queen held significant power. From the twelfth century onwards women were said to have lost power and if so this makes Alice's case all the more compelling; in a time when queens were portrayed as being under the control of men Alice appeared to transcend her traditionally accepted role in a period of male domination.

As mentioned, most contemporary written works were written by those who had little to no contact with women and were based upon biblical stereotypes; this suggests many contemporary works were unrealistic and the reliability of them must be considered. It could be argued that as an archbishop William of Tyre's agenda was to write from an ecclesiastical angle as his intention for writing was to promote the expansion of Christianity within the holy land.

The tone of his work however is a secular interpretation of history which places little emphasis on God, suggesting the intended audience were the nobility rather than church men. William did have contact with some of the subjects he wrote about within his chronicle; given these factors the question of whether he was a more reliable writer than others of the time could be raised.

## Chapter 1

### Medieval attitudes regarding women

Any piece of academic work concerning women is difficult to conduct as there are few sources centred on women in comparison to those concerning men. The few sources that are accessible are less informative than those concerning the deeds of men; they tend to emphasise the negative characteristics of their subjects which are reinforced by the Bible.<sup>56</sup> Medieval ideas originated within the hierarchy of the church and so opinions regarding women were filtrated downwards into society from the upper tiers of the church.<sup>57</sup>

It is imperative that modern audiences do not to judge medieval women by today's standards as it was a time when assumptions about gender roles varied from our own; when reading about them we must not impose modern standards regarding medieval women's roles.<sup>58</sup> Crucially there are very few contemporary sources written by women from the twelfth and thirteenth century, a rare example is the *Alexiad* written by Anna Comnena and even this distorts the issue of gender.<sup>59</sup> Furthermore very few women of this time could read so we must question who these sources were intended to be read by. As most of the sources were written in Latin of which few men outside the church could read it suggests a predominantly religious audience.

---

<sup>56</sup> Lois L. Huneycutt, 'Female Succession and the Language of Power' in J. Carmi Parson, (ed.), *Medieval Queenship*, (Gloucestershire, 1994), pp. 191

<sup>57</sup> Eileen Power, *Medieval Women*, (London, 1975), p. 10

<sup>58</sup> Lois L. Huneycutt, 'Female Succession and the Language of Power' in J. Carmi Parson, (ed.), *Medieval Queenship*, (Gloucestershire, 1994), pp. 186

<sup>59</sup> Peter Frankopan, 'Perception & Projection of Prejudice: Anna Comnena, the *Alexiad* and the First Crusade' in S. B. Edington & S. Lambert (ed.), *Gendering the Crusades*, (Cardiff, 2001), pp. 68



This minuet pool of sources led to a distorted representation of women throughout history in which they are judged through the ideals of males who were actively encouraged by the church to shun women.<sup>60</sup>The fact that women had little opportunity to record their opinions and experiences makes it difficult for modern historians to determine how representative the views within these ecclesiastical works were of society at large.<sup>61</sup>

Many Chronicles written in the medieval period originated from a monastic house and when reading them the reader must be aware that the ideas expressed regarding women were written by celibate men who had little contact with women; therefore they give an unrepresentative and biased account.<sup>62</sup>However not all chroniclers had limited experience of women; a few such as Bernard of Clairvaux and William of Tyre lived alongside women and they tended to write more positive accounts of women and their achievements. This suggests a distinct difference of opinion between more religious and secular clerics; it is therefore possible that society had a more liberal opinion of women.

As there is a small and limited source base of chronicles this presents a number of problems; as mentioned many of the authors would have had little experience of the outside world and so would often simply report rumours and gossip in their work.<sup>63</sup>It is worth stating that some chroniclers such as William of Tyre conducted interviews for parts of their work which in theory made them more trustworthy than others.<sup>64</sup>Secondly, many chronicles were

---

<sup>60</sup> Alcuin Blamires (ed.), *Woman Defamed and Woman Defended*, (Oxford, 1992), pp. 4

<sup>61</sup> Helen Jewell, *Women in Medieval England*, (Manchester, 1996), p.1

<sup>62</sup> Eileen Power, *Medieval Women*, (London, 1975), p. 9

<sup>63</sup> Natasha Hodgson, *Women, Crusading and the Holy Land*, (Suffolk, 2007), p. 9

<sup>64</sup> Theresa Earenfight, *Queenship in Medieval Europe*, (Hampshire, 2013), p. 3  
Helen Jewell, *Women in Medieval England*, (Manchester, 1996), p. 8

heavily influenced by biblical texts in which women were intensely criticised, this scrutiny would therefore be deemed as normal to the clerics. To reiterate, these chronicles cannot be taken at face value; the information within them were usually intended for other clerics and the reader must consider the motivation behind the writing.

In the Medieval period there were very clear gender expectations; both men and women were expected to conform to the physical and psychological traits ascribed to their gender.<sup>65</sup>For instance women in the medieval period were expected to devote themselves to their family and home, fulfilling all domestic tasks and not engage in activities outside of the home. Furthermore, women seldom held positions of authority within medieval society as they were believed to be mentally incapable of holding public office and only did so if there was no suitable male authority.<sup>66</sup>Women at large were not considered worthy of being listened to by men unless they spoke the language of charters and public pronouncements; a talent which very few women had the mental capacity for.<sup>67</sup>

As women were physically inferior to men they were deemed unsuitable of participating in military action which was an important chivalric obligation in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.<sup>68</sup>If women received praise from a medieval author it was emphasised that this was because they possessed male characteristics, while their feminine traits were generally ignored, this is clearly seen in William of Tyres' commendation of Melisende.<sup>69</sup>Despite his

---

<sup>65</sup> Natasha Hodgson, *Women, Crusading and the Holy Land*, (Suffolk, 2007), p. 14

<sup>66</sup> Natasha Hodgson, *Women, Crusading and the Holy Land*, (Suffolk, 2007), p. 63

Shulamith Shahar, *The Fourth Estate: A History of Women in the Middle Ages*, (London, 1983), p. 3

<sup>67</sup> Theresa Earenfight, *Queenship in Medieval Europe*, (Hampshire, 2013), p. 4

<sup>68</sup> Natasha Hodgson, *Women, Crusading and the Holy Land*, (Suffolk, 2007), p. 49

<sup>69</sup> Shulamith Shahar, *The Fourth Estate: A History of Women in the Middle Ages*, (London, 1983), p. 169

favourable portrayal of Melisende William was not at all a feminist; he was explicit in his writing that it was unnatural for females to rule and was only appropriate if there was no alternative. While more liberal than some clerics of the time, his writing indicates that he still upheld some attitudes regarding gender common to the church.<sup>70</sup>

The stereotypes and traits ascribed to women in the medieval period were predominantly based around events within the Old Testament and particularly the book of Genesis which contains the creation myth of Adam and Eve. It is from this myth that attitudes regarding women originated from; primarily the seduction of Eve by the snake.<sup>71</sup>As Eve gave in to temptation by eating the fruit she tempted Adam and women became associated with weakness and sinful thoughts.<sup>72</sup>A fear of female sexuality was prevalent within the church where it was common belief that women embodied sexuality; they were regarded as insatiable and craving sexual gratification from males.<sup>73</sup>

In Genesis it is stated that Adam had no helper and in response to this God removed a rib from Adam and moulded it into a woman; this gives the impression that the bible's attitude towards women was that they had the sole purpose of assisting men by being a helpmate while never gaining dominance over him.<sup>74</sup>This attitude was widespread until the early modern period with the creation myth remaining in the public eye throughout the centuries and expanded on multiple times. This is particularly evident in the *Golden Legend* which was first known to have been distributed in the late thirteenth century and the content of the text emphasised that a woman's function was to assist men. Eve was also condemned much

---

<sup>70</sup> Natasha Hodgson, *Women, Crusading and the Holy Land*, (Suffolk, 2007), p. 213

<sup>71</sup> Angela. M. Lucas, *Women in the Middle Ages: Religion, Marriage and Letters*, (Sussex, 1984), p. 3

<sup>72</sup> Alcuin Blamires (ed.), *Woman Defamed and Woman Defended*, (Oxford, 1992), pp. 4

<sup>73</sup> Vern Bullough & James Brundage, *Handbook of Medieval Sexuality*, (Oxon, 2000), p. 82

<sup>74</sup> Genesis 2:4-23

more in this text than in earlier Genesis passages; the overlying theme of the *Golden Legend* is that women were not to be trusted as they tempted men. The text is explicit that it was Eve who was responsible for their expulsion from paradise due to her weakness; suggesting that over a three-hundred-year period it became common to mistrust women and a culture of blaming them for all transgressions grew.<sup>75</sup>

As men were thought to have been created in God's image in comparison to women the idea that women should be subservient to men became more prevalent over time. Women were not able to rule or have authority over men. To some clergy men such as Thomas Aquinas the order of the creation myth was implicit; as males were the first to be created this indicated their superiority over women who were created as an afterthought.<sup>76</sup>

Historiography regarding attitudes towards women pre-dates the ideas expressed within the Bible; in ancient Greek medical texts and poems such as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* it is evident that women were regarded as deformed, defective and incomplete versions of males. Due to physiological issues such as menstruation females were unable to reach the physical perfection of their male counterparts as their bodies were inferior.<sup>77</sup>In addition women were regarded as inferior based on Galen's theory of the four humours; this states that the human body was formed by black bile, yellow bile, phlegm and blood and a balance of these humours was needed for a person to be healthy; however men and women had a different composition of these humours to each other.<sup>78</sup>Therefore these biological differences resulted in different temperaments; women for example were on the cold and

---

<sup>75</sup> William Caxton, (Trans), 'The Golden Legend' (1483)

<sup>76</sup> Angela M. Lucas, *Women in the Middle Ages: Religion, Marriage and Letters*, (Sussex, 1984), p. 6

<sup>77</sup> Alcuin Blamires (ed.), *Woman Defamed and Woman Defended*, (Oxford, 1992), pp. 2

<sup>78</sup> *The Four Humours*, Melvin Bragg, BBC Radio, In Our Time, (Broadcast 20 December 2007)

wet spectrum of the humours, thus making them emotional, irrational and ultimately unable to hold authority.<sup>79</sup>

These attitudes must have had some influence as the level of recorded public activity carried out by women decreased throughout the medieval period and it is likely that this was imposed by the church. Evidence for this assertion can be found within Harlihy's work which indicates that throughout Europe between the sixth and thirteenth centuries the influence of Christianity grew in exact correlation with the position of women decreasing<sup>80</sup>This suggests that the growth of the church had a negative impact on the authority of medieval women compared to their Anglo-Saxon counterparts.

Stafford's work also corroborates this theory; she states that the growth of Catholicism throughout the medieval period placed imposing restrictions upon the authority of women. Furthermore Stafford is of the opinion that the Norman conquest of Britain exacerbated the restrictions placed upon women in England, specifically upon the introduction of Salic law which prohibits female succession.<sup>81</sup>The most compelling evidence of this is regarding the restrictions placed upon heiresses; prior to the invasion of 1066 upper-class Anglo-Saxon women had experienced relative freedom.<sup>82</sup>The Normans brought a strict feudal society which stated that everyone was indebted to a superior person and they must be prepared to provide military service to this superior if it was required. As women were prevented from providing military service this greatly weakened their standing and may have

---

<sup>79</sup> Jacqueline Eales, *Women in Early Modern England, 1500- 1700*, (London, 1998), p. 3

<sup>80</sup> David Harlihy, 'Women in Continental Europe 700-1200' in S. M. Stuard (ed.), *Women in Medieval Society*, (Philadelphia, 1976), pp. 9-15

<sup>81</sup> Armin Wolf, 'Reigning Queens in Medieval Europe: Where, When and Why' in J. Carmi Parson (ed), *Medieval Queenship* (Gloucestershire, 1994), pp. 169

<sup>82</sup> Shulamith Shahar, *The Fourth Estate: A History of Women in the Middle Ages*, (London, 1983), p. 146

contributed to their exclusion from this period of history; the exception in this new society were peasant women who were still able to work on the land of their baron.<sup>83</sup>

However, Stuard's work suggests that while the position of noble women did diminish at this time life became better for the majority of women around the thirteenth century.<sup>84</sup> Stafford disagrees with this view; she states there was no increase of women's position post conquest arguing that on the cusp of the Norman invasion noble women in England held approximately five percent of land, while it was just eight individual women who held land.<sup>85</sup>

Stafford raises an important issue in that she queries how we should judge the status of women; should it be it through the land they held or the authority of her family. She indicates that prior to the Norman invasion there was a large amount of royal interference regarding the marriage of noble women; this infers some women were not free to marry as they pleased.<sup>86</sup> Furthermore women were successfully appointed as heiresses to land both before and after the conquest but in neither period was an heiress free from the control and manipulation of her family<sup>87</sup>

Regardless of the status and rank of women after the Norman invasion her position in marriage remained much the same; upon entering into a union woman was regarded as property to be used as her husband wished.<sup>88</sup> It is important to note that the outlined case study is of England and therefore it cannot be wholly inclusive of Europe's attitude towards

---

<sup>83</sup> Angela. M. Lucas, *Women in the Middle Ages: Religion, Marriage and Letters*, (Sussex, 1984), p. 83-84

Bernard Hamilton, 'Women in the Crusader States: The Queens of Jerusalem (1100-1190) in D. Baker (ed.), *Studies in Church History: Medieval Women*, (Cambridge, 1978), pp. 143

<sup>84</sup> Susan Stuard, 'The Dominion of Gender: How Women Fared in the High Middle Ages' in R. Bridenthal, S. M. Stuard & M. E. Wiesener, M. E (ed.), *Becoming Visible: Women in European History* (Boston, 1998), pp. 145

<sup>85</sup> Pauline Stafford, 'Women and the Norman Conquest' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4, (221-249), pp. 226

<sup>86</sup> Pauline Stafford, 'Women and the Norman Conquest' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4, (221-249), pp. 233

<sup>87</sup> Pauline Stafford, 'Women and the Norman Conquest' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4, (221-249), pp. 236

<sup>88</sup> Angela. M. Lucas, *Women in the Middle Ages: Religion, Marriage and Letters*, (Sussex, 1984), p. 88

women throughout the medieval period. I chose to include it as it is relevant because France and England was where many key crusader figures originated from and therefore their customs and ideas would inevitably have filtered to the Latin east.

Despite this, laws in the Latin east regarding women were far less rigid than in Europe and until the 1160s marriage laws and the position of women were relatively fluid. Even though laws were not as ridged in the east a wife was still regarded as being under the authority of her husband.<sup>89</sup>In both the west and the east if a male heir was absent or lacking the eldest daughter could theoretically assume the rights which a son could; up to and including inheritance of the crown however it was highly unusual for a female to gain control without controversy as was the case of Matilda of England.<sup>90</sup>

These factors resulted in many heiresses choosing to transmit their claim to their husbands rather than challenge for power. However once an heiress died their husband no longer held claim over their estate and their claim would be lost, which is evident in the case of Guy of Lusignan, King of Jerusalem (1186-1192) after death of his wife Sibylla (1186-1190).<sup>91</sup>

Outremer in the twelfth century experienced the constant threat of invasion or war, due to this male life expectancy was much shorter than females.<sup>92</sup>Because of the high loss of life the status of woman in the Latin east was inevitably different to that in the west; out of necessity women in the crusader states inherited fiefs more frequently, they experienced

---

<sup>89</sup> Jonathan Phillips, *Holy Warriors*, (London, 2009), p. 50

Sylvia Shein, 'Women in Medieval Colonial Society: The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem in the Twelfth Century,' in S. B. Edington, & S. Lambert (ed.), *Gendering the Crusades*, (Cardiff, 2001), pp. 141

<sup>90</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades, Volume 2: The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (Cambridge, 1952), p. 190

<sup>91</sup>Sylvia Shein, 'Women in Medieval Colonial Society: The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem in the Twelfth Century,' in S. B. Edington, & S. Lambert (ed.), *Gendering the Crusades*, (Cardiff, 2001), pp. 144-145

<sup>92</sup> Bernard Hamilton, 'Women in the Crusader States: The Queens of Jerusalem (1100-1190) in D. Baker (ed.), *Studies in Church History: Medieval Women*, (Cambridge, 1978), pp. 143

better legal rights and held higher positions than their counterparts in England and France.<sup>93</sup>For example heiresses in the east were not required to relinquish control of their fief upon marriage to their husband, she was however required to select a male who was able to act in her place should she be required to provide military service.<sup>94</sup>Despite the east allowing women some freedom they were still generally excluded from participation in public office; although some fiefs did stipulate the inclusion of a position within public office. This position was sometimes delegated to a suitable candidate who would govern in their place and other times the woman chose to hold and rule them.<sup>95</sup>

With the exception of Salic law, there was no official law which excluded female rule in the medieval period; merely a preference for males as they were considered stronger and more intelligent.<sup>96</sup>Although unusual there were occasions when women assumed positions of power in the east, queen Melisende for example ruled Jerusalem both alongside her husband and individually. Females who ruled by their own merit were often referred to as a female king or simply a female monarch. If the sources wrote about female rulers they were described as ruling in a kingly fashion, therefore a woman was only able to rule if she was able to move past her gender and act as a male would.<sup>97</sup>

In summary, the tenth and eleventh centuries allowed more flexibility regarding women and settlement in the east in the twelfth century mirrored this. It appears that the Norman invasion of 1066 placed constraints on English noble women as prior to the invasion noble

---

<sup>93</sup> Sylvia Shein, 'Women in Medieval Colonial Society: The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem in the Twelfth Century,' in S. B. Edington, & S. Lambert (ed.), *Gendering the Crusades*, (Cardiff, 2001), pp. 140

<sup>94</sup> Shulamith Shahar, *The Fourth Estate: A History of Women in the Middle Ages*, (London, 1983), p. 145-146

<sup>95</sup> Shulamith Shahar, *The Fourth Estate: A History of Women in the Middle Ages*, (London, 1983), p. 13

<sup>96</sup> Theresa Earenfight, *Queenship in Medieval Europe*, (Hampshire,2013), p. 3,

<sup>97</sup> Theresa Earenfight, *Queenship in Medieval Europe*, (Hampshire,2013), p. 6



women had more rights regarding their property and control of military units.<sup>98</sup> However prior the twelfth century fiefs were widely associated with the provision of military service of which women were excluded from and prevented from holding. Turbulent wars in the east greatly bolstered female hereditary claims of fiefs in the absence of a suitable male heir.<sup>99</sup>

It was acceptable in certain circumstances for a female to hold power or to act as a regent for her child until they came of age but they were required to relinquish this power at such a time.<sup>100</sup> This was due to the fact that a queen's primary purpose was to produce an heir and protect her child's interest; to do this a queen was regarded as successful. As the most important mother during the medieval period, the Virgin Mary was regarded as a role model for women of the time, although her virginal status posed an impossible ideal for the majority of women of the medieval period.<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>98</sup> Susan Stuard, 'The Dominion of Gender: How Women Fared in the High Middle Ages' in R. Bridenthal, S. M. Stuard & M. E. Wiesener, M. E. (ed.), *Becoming Visible: Women in European History* (Boston, 1998), pp. 131

<sup>99</sup> Shulamith Shahar, *The Fourth Estate: A History of Women in the Middle Ages*, (London, 1983), p. 127,

<sup>100</sup> Helen Jewell, *Women in Medieval England*, (Manchester, 1996), p. 133

<sup>101</sup> Natasha Hodgson, *Women, Crusading and the Holy Land*, (Suffolk, 2007), p. 154

Angela. M. Lucas, *Women in the Middle Ages: Religion, Marriage and Letters*, (Sussex, 1984), p. 18

## Chapter 2

### Contemporary examples of women

Alice's story was unusual for the period however her position was not unique; several contemporary women throughout Europe and the Latin east are known to have ruled or fought for power during the medieval period. The intention of this chapter is to explore how these women were represented within the sources. The rationale behind this is to spot any correlation between how these women were represented and how William of Tyre portrayed Alice and assess the accuracy of his description.

#### Adela

Adela of Blois was an enigma of her time; contemporaries who wrote about her were favourable and described her as being superior in rank to her husband Stephen due to her position within the English royal family; she was the daughter of William the Conqueror (1066-1087) and Matilda of Flanders and mother to king Stephen (1135-1154). As the daughter and mother of a king Adela came from higher ranking stock than her husband whose only significant claim was as Count of the small French territory of Blois. Her position therefore could have influenced contemporaries to write positively about Adela as women of high status were permitted to assume power under the right circumstances.<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup>Kimberley LoPrete, 'Adela of Blois: Familial Alliances and Female Lordship.' in T. Evergates (ed.), *Aristocratic Women in Medieval France*, (Philadelphia, 1999), pp. 15

Kimberley LoPrete, *Adela of Blois: Countess and Lord (1067-1137)*, (Dublin, 2007), p. 25-26

Kimberley LoPrete, *Adela of Blois: Countess and Lord (1067-1137)*, (Dublin, 2007), p. 74

Adela publicly acted alongside her husband as well as exercising independent authority; one area of lordship Adela was unable to fulfil was the provision of military service however knights acted for her.<sup>103</sup> Throughout her marriage Adela was often separated from her husband for long time periods due to his commitment to the first crusade (1096-1098) to which Adela was the main financial investor.<sup>104</sup> Adela assumed the position of regent during Stephen's absence and was regarded as having done this well; Orderic Vitalis described her as a "wise and spirited woman".<sup>105</sup> During Stephen's absence Adela swore an oath to defend the church in both her own name and in Stephen's, the Bishop Ivo was explicit that Adela's oath was as valid as Stephen's. This suggests that contemporaries acknowledged it was permissible for women to share the same level of lordship as their husband.<sup>106</sup>

Despite the solemn crusade vow Count Stephen abandoned the first crusade in 1098 and returned home. Adela was unhappy with this; she chastised him and was able to persuade him to return to the Holy Land.<sup>107</sup> The nature of this persuasion was reportedly while the pair were sharing a marital bed and allegedly between 'conjugal caresses'.<sup>108</sup> It is impossible to know the validity of this claim due to its intimate nature; it is likely it was a tactic used by Orderic due to medieval perceptions of women as lustful, thus corroborating male fears of women using their sexuality to achieve their own ends. Regardless of whether Adela used her sexuality or not the fact Stephen listened to his wife and returned to the east shortly after the encounter with her indicates that Stephen valued her opinion and suggests she had authority within their marriage.

---

<sup>103</sup> Kimberley LoPrete, *Adela of Blois: Countess and Lord (1067-1137)*, (Dublin, 2007), p. 111, 239

<sup>104</sup> Kimberley LoPrete, *Adela of Blois: Countess and Lord (1067-1137)*, (Dublin, 2007), p. 96

<sup>105</sup> Kimberley LoPrete, 'Adela of Blois: Familial Alliances and Female Lordship.' in T. Evergates (ed.), *Aristocratic Women in Medieval France*, (Philadelphia, 1999), pp. 15

<sup>106</sup> Kimberley LoPrete, *Adela of Blois: Countess and Lord (1067-1137)*, (Dublin, 2007), p. 77

<sup>107</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Crusades; The War for the Holy Land*, (London, 2010), p. 65

<sup>108</sup> Susan M. Johns, *Noblewomen, Aristocracy and Power in the Twelfth Century*, (Manchester, 2000) p. 16

Stephen was killed in 1102 shortly after he returned to the crusade, at this point Stephen's son Thibaud was proclaimed as minor heir as he was not yet of age. Adela acted as regent for her son until 1120 despite Thibaud coming of age prior to this, Adela later acted alongside her son as co-ruler of Blois where she issued charters with independent authority. Thibaud did not marry until after retirement of his mother and it has been suggested his status as a bachelor gave Adela the opportunity to gain power and influence which would have been difficult had Thibaud taken a wife.<sup>109</sup>

### **Melisende**

Melisende is the most comparable of all these women to Alice; she ruled Jerusalem at the same time as Alice and was also her sister. In his writing William makes it clear he regarded female rule as unnatural although he praised Melisende for her ability of 'transcending the nature of the female sex and equalling the achievements of men'.

Melisende became the first female ruler of the Kingdom of Jerusalem in 1131 after the death of her father and although she had a hereditary claim it was determined that in order for her to reign efficiently she needed a husband to assist her and to produce an heir; it was decided by the nobility and her father that she would marry Fulk of Anjou.<sup>110</sup> Melisende was crowned joint monarch alongside Fulk in 1131 and their infant son and future king Baldwin III with the three forming a triumvirate rule.

---

<sup>109</sup>Kimberley LoPrete, 'Adela of Blois as Mother and Countess,' in J. Carmi Parsons, & B. Wheeler, *Medieval Mothering*, (New York, 1999), pp. 322

<sup>110</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *God's War*, London, 2006), p. 207

Hans Mayer, *The Succession to Baldwin II of Jerusalem : The English Impact on the East*, *Dumbarton Oak Papers*, Vol. 39, (1985), pp. 142

Initially it is believed that Fulk acted in the conventional manor and was the dominant spouse however Melisende soon overcame the limitations of her gender; three years into her reign she was able to gain a position of favour with a large proportion of the nobility after Fulk attempted to push her from power. It is believed Fulk had always intended to rule independent of his wife and wished to promote the men he had brought from France into positions of power which Melisende objected to.<sup>111</sup>In response Fulk accused his wife of infidelity with her cousin Hugh of Jaffa, causing Hugh to rebel against the king in 1134 and causing a division between the nobility.<sup>112</sup>William of Tyre's work contains no such accusation against Melisende; therefore it is likely that Fulk's accusation was an unsuccessful political manoeuvre to gain control.

Hugh's rebellion was successful; Fulk was forced to back down and allow his wife to share power once more. Although Hugh's rebellion was technically treason his sentence was three years in exile; a phenomenally lenient sentence for such a crime. This lenience definitely indicates Melisende's involvement in the sentencing and her return to authority.<sup>113</sup>While departing for exile Hugh was the victim of an assassination of which Fulk was believed to be the instigator of; the perpetrator stated the attack was conducted to gain Fulk's favour and although never charged for the murder Fulk's reputation suffered a monumental blow. Melisende was incensed at Hugh's death; it is reported that for several months Fulk's men lived in fear of reprisals and even Fulk himself allegedly feared for his life.<sup>114</sup>After the two reconciled it is reported that Fulk never again took 'any measures without her knowledge

---

<sup>111</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *God's War*, London, 2006), p.208

<sup>112</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *God's War*, London, 2006), p.206  
Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2*, P.g, 191

<sup>113</sup> Allan V. Murray, *The Crusades: An Encyclopaedia* (Santa Barbara, 2006), p.665

<sup>114</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades, Volume 2: The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (Cambridge, 1952), p. 193

Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 76

and assistance.<sup>115</sup>In the aftermath of Hugh's death Melisende was able to play a greater role in political issues which challenges ideas that women were not equal to men at the time.<sup>116</sup>

Fulk died unexpectedly in 1143 afterwards Melisende was re-crowned alongside her son Baldwin III, at this point Baldwin was thirteen and not of legal age to rule independently and so Melisende continued to rule independently. Baldwin was virtually excluded from any significant decision making for eight years; during this period he was heavily involved in the military.<sup>117</sup>Melisende held great power; she was ruling Jerusalem by herself with minimal help from males and she refused to re-marry.<sup>118</sup>During her rule Melisende overcame the obstacle of not being able to engage in battle by appointing Manasses of Hierges to act on her behalf. This appointment was received positively by the nobles as it ensured a strong protector for Jerusalem.<sup>119</sup>Melisende believed she was debuting Manasses's might by sending her army to fight in Edessa in 1144, despite the presence of her army Edessa fell which was a great loss to the Latin kingdoms. Melisende acted accordingly in its aftermath; she asked for help from the west which resulted in the call of the second crusade. William did not put any blame onto Melisende for loss of Edessa nor for the failure of the second crusade in 1148.<sup>120</sup>

By 1150 Baldwin III was well within the legal age to assume independent power and it is said he was 'urged by some to remove his mother from control, as he was of age he should not

---

<sup>115</sup> Jonathan Phillips, *Holy Warriors*, (London, 2009), p. 64-69

<sup>116</sup> Jonathan Phillips, *Holy Warriors*, (London, 2009), p. 53

Natasha Hodgson, *Women, Crusading and the Holy Land*, (Suffolk, 2007), p. 135

<sup>117</sup> Hans Meyer, 'Studies in The History Of Queen Melisende of Jerusalem,' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 26, (1972), pp. 113

<sup>118</sup> Natasha Hodgson, *Women, Crusading and the Holy Land*, (Suffolk, 2007), p. 213

<sup>119</sup> Jonathan Phillips, 'The Latin East, 1098-1291,' in J. Riley-Smith (ed.), *A History of the Crusades*, (Oxford, 1999), pp. 120

<sup>120</sup> Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 88

be subject to the will of a woman.<sup>121</sup>Baldwin reacted to this by demanding to receive his birthright and be crowned as sole monarch of Jerusalem which subsequently caused division within the kingdom as Melisende received the majority of support from the barons.

Melisende attempted to pacify Baldwin by offering him control of her lands in Acer and Tyre on the agreement she would keep Jerusalem and Nablus.<sup>122</sup>This did not suffice; in response Baldwin launched an attack on his mother's lands which caused Melisende to submit to her son and allowed Baldwin to gain control of Jerusalem.

After the civil war Melisende went into official retirement however Baldwin permitted her to retain a small amount of power in 1152, suggesting he must have valued his mother's experience and opinion.<sup>123</sup>Melisende was content in this role until her death in 1161 after which William appears melancholy; eulogising her in his work and commending her strong rule of the kingdom.<sup>124</sup>William laments that 'for thirty years and more, during the lifetime of her husband as well as afterwards in the reign of her son, Melisende had governed the kingdoms with strength surpassing that of most women. Her rule had been wise and judicious.'<sup>125</sup>

## **Matilda**

Matilda of England was the first female to be designated as heir of England by a king prior to his death, her contention of the throne after her cousin's usurpation and the civil war which

---

<sup>121</sup> Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 205

<sup>122</sup> Hans Meyer, 'Studies in The History Of Queen Melisende of Jerusalem,' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 26, (1972), pp. 95  
Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 205

<sup>123</sup> Hans Meyer, 'Studies in The History Of Queen Melisende of Jerusalem,' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 26, (1972), pp. 174

<sup>124</sup> Natasha Hodgson, *Women, Crusading and the Holy Land*, (Suffolk, 2007), p. 135

<sup>125</sup> Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 283

followed had strong support from some English nobles. England in the early twelfth century did not experience hereditary passage of the crown to the most appropriate male; it was the king's choice who would take the crown next and so there were few legal limitations standing in the way of Matilda taking the throne. Henry I was a legitimate and well established king and the country was stable; whomever Henry appointed as successor would have been accepted.<sup>126</sup> Henry could have appointed a close male relative such as Stephen who himself had a valid claim to the throne courtesy of mother.<sup>127</sup> Despite this he chose Matilda; it is probable he chose his daughter over his nephew based on her experience in governance after her successful rule of her husband's Italian territories aged just sixteen.<sup>128</sup>

After she was designated as heir by her father the baronage of England were required to swear an oath of allegiance to her on two occasions; once in 1126 and in 1131.<sup>129</sup> It is highly likely Henry had not expected a straightforward transition of power to his daughter after his death hence the necessity for these oaths. Her cousin Stephen himself pledged allegiance to Matilda; he later 'tried God's patience by seizing the throne of England'.<sup>130</sup> As in the case of Alice war erupted over her claim to the throne, although Matilda acted based on her own interest rather than her child's.

Unlike many women of the time Matilda did not step aside and allow Stephen to take the throne without a fight; Matilda challenged her cousin for a number of years with the

---

<sup>126</sup> Helen Castor, *She-Wolves: The Women Who Ruled England Before Elizabeth*, (New York, 2012), p. 21  
Marjorie Chibnall, *The Empress Matilda*, (Oxford, 1991), p. 5

<sup>127</sup> Dan Jones, *The Plantagenets*, (London, 2012), p. 14

<sup>128</sup> Helen Castor, *She-Wolves: The Women Who Ruled England Before Elizabeth*, (New York, 2012), p. 61

<sup>129</sup> Henry A. Cronne, *The Reign of Stephen: Anarchy in England 1135-54*, (London, 1970), p. 28

Helen Castor, *She-Wolves: The Women Who Ruled England Before Elizabeth*, (New York, 2012), p. 49

<sup>130</sup> Diana Greenway, (Trans), *Henry of Huntingdon, The History of the English People 1000-1135*, (Oxford, 2002), p. 66



support of many important nobles resulting in a lengthy civil war. After years of internal strife it is un-doubtable Matilda realised she could not take the throne in her own name; she changed tactic and began to fight for her son's right to take the throne which suggests that contemporary accounts were incorrect when they accused Matilda of being arrogant and acting in her own interest.<sup>131</sup>

Matilda eventually compromised with Stephen who agreed his nephew would be his heir, in doing this Matilda transmitted her own rights to her son. After taking the throne Henry II (1133- 1189) rewarded Matilda's efforts by appointing her as his royal deputy in periods of absence.<sup>132</sup> Henry II's succession was received well by Pro-Stephen chronicles such as the *Gesta Stephani* which indicates that Matilda was seen as an important link in the transmission of power.<sup>133</sup>

It is puzzling how Stephen was able to take the throne; Matilda had a strong claim and pledges of allegiance from the English nobles. It is probable that England's historic absence of a female heir aroused fear amongst the barons that she would transmit her authority to a foreign husband.<sup>134</sup> These fears were justified as her husband was from Anjou and an enemy; therefore he was not to be trusted.<sup>135</sup> Matilda was heavily pregnant and in France when her father died and so the journey would have been difficult to undertake, it is possible that her absence rather than her gender caused the barons to seek out alternate leadership to which Stephen acted upon.<sup>136</sup>

---

<sup>131</sup> Helen Castor, *She-Wolves: The Women Who Ruled England Before Elizabeth*, (New York, 2012), p. 113

<sup>132</sup> Theresa Earenfight, *Queenship in Medieval Europe*, (Hampshire, 2013), p. 3

Helen Castor, *She-Wolves: The Women Who Ruled England Before Elizabeth*, (New York, 2012), p. 122

<sup>133</sup> Henry A. Cronne, *The Reign of Stephen: Anarchy in England 1135-54*, (London, 1970), p. 64

<sup>134</sup> Henry A. Cronne, *The Reign of Stephen: Anarchy in England 1135-54*, (London, 1970), p. 88

<sup>135</sup> Helen Castor, *She-Wolves: The Women Who Ruled England Before Elizabeth*, (New York, 2012), p. 73

<sup>136</sup> Helen Castor, *She-Wolves: The Women Who Ruled England Before Elizabeth*, (New York, 2012), p. 73

Matilda's one hope of overthrowing Stephen was her royal lineage; this was taken seriously by many as she had support from the clergy and men willing to fight her cause.<sup>137</sup> One example of this support is from the Bishop Ulger who argued Matilda's case at the second Lateran council of 1139 to which Pope Innocent made no judgement.<sup>138</sup> Matilda acted as a queen throughout the civil war despite never being coroneted; she regularly issued charters in which she referred to herself as 'Empress'.<sup>139</sup>

As with most women Matilda's downfall was that her gender placed limitations on her; the most pressing was her inability to fight in battle.<sup>140</sup> This was evident to many of the barons who did not support Matilda when she arrived in England, presumably they did not wish to invest in a claimant who was unable to fight for themselves.<sup>141</sup> Matilda's husband and half brother acted on her behalf throughout the civil war while Stephen was able to be present in battle which gave him an advantage.<sup>142</sup>

Matilda has received mixed opinions from chroniclers; the *Gesta Stephani* criticises her for her inability to fulfil gender expectations as women were not seen as able to take power if they remained constrained to their gender, John of Salisbury is implicit that the only way women could take power is they shed it.<sup>143</sup> The *Gesta* was written in the mid twelfth century

---

<sup>137</sup> Henry A. Cronne, *The Reign of Stephen: Anarchy in England 1135-54*, (London, 1970), p. 46

Helen Castor, *She-Wolves: The Women Who Ruled England Before Elizabeth*, (New York, 2012), p. 84

<sup>138</sup> Helen Castor, *She-Wolves: The Women Who Ruled England Before Elizabeth*, (New York, 2012), p. 84

<sup>139</sup> Theresa Earenfight, *Queenship in Medieval Europe*, (Hampshire, 2013), p. 134

<sup>140</sup> Helen Castor, *She-Wolves: The Women Who Ruled England Before Elizabeth*, (New York, 2012), p. 64

Marjorie Chibnall, *The Empress Matilda*, (Oxford, 1991), p. 1

<sup>141</sup> Dan Jones, *The Plantagenets*, (London, 2012), p. 17

<sup>142</sup> Helen Castor, *She-Wolves: The Women Who Ruled England Before Elizabeth*, (New York, 2012), p. 84-93

<sup>143</sup> Lois L. Huneycutt, 'Female Succession and the Language of Power' in J. Carmi Parson, (ed.), *Medieval Queenship*, (Gloucestershire, 1994), pp. 196

Pauline Stafford, 'The Portrayal of Royal Women in England, Mid Tenth to Mid Twelfth Centuries' in J. Carmi Parson (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (Gloucestershire, 1994) pp. 158

Marjorie Chibnall, *The Empress Matilda*, (Oxford, 1991), p. 197

and the author is thought to be a cleric in close proximity to Stephen throughout the civil war.<sup>144</sup> After Matilda's son came to the throne her reception became more favourable; Henry of Huntingdon referred to Matilda as 'King Henry's daughter' several times in his work as well as the 'Empress'. Henry is clear that Stephen usurped the throne and that Matilda was accepted by most of the country as the rightful ruler though she became arrogant which alienated her from her subjects:

*'God's judgement on the King having been carried out, he was taken to the Empress and put into Bristol castle as a prisoner. The empress was received as lady by all the English nation, except for the men of Kent. But she was lifted up to an insufferable arrogance.'*<sup>145</sup>

William of Malmesbury described Matilda as a virago which suggests she transcended her gender. The monk Gilbert Foliot implies that Matilda was justified in challenging the usurpation by Stephen; as designated heir she was fulfilling the wishes of her father.<sup>146</sup> Bernard of Clairvaux was a supporter of Matilda and likewise Melisende, he disliked Stephen and as the head of the Cistercian order his support would have been valuable to Matilda.

### **Eleanor of Aquitaine**

On a superficial level it could be argued that Eleanor of Aquitaine was a conventional queen; she gave birth to many children and brought a large inheritance to her marriage to Henry II and was said to have been a great beauty. However, she was unconventional in many ways; she was married twice to two different kings and it was Eleanor who initiated the divorce

---

<sup>144</sup> Ralph H. C Davis, 'The Authorship of the *Gesta Stephan*,' *English Historical Review*, (77), 303, (1962), pp. 209

<sup>145</sup> Diana Greenway, (Trans), *Henry of Huntingdon, The History of the English People 1000-1135*, (Oxford, 2002), p. 69-81

<sup>146</sup> Helen Castor, *She-Wolves: The Women Who Ruled England Before Elizabeth*, (New York, 2012), p. 99-100

from her first husband king Louis (1137- 1180.) This was usually initiated by the husband and so the petition was rejected by the Pope.<sup>147</sup>Eleanor regularly challenged Henry both personally and politically and acted alongside her sons in several rebellions against him.<sup>148</sup>

During her first marriage Eleanor was present on the second crusade and took the unusual step of personally leading on behalf of Aquitaine. It was at this point that Eleanor's sexuality was used against her and rumours surfaced that while in the holy land Eleanor had engaged in a sexual relationship with her uncle, Raymond of Antioch (1136-1149.) This tactic was also used during her second marriage when she was said to have had an affair with her father in law Geoffrey, Count of Anjou. William has suggested that it was Eleanor's infidelity which lead to her first divorce while modern historians disagree, stating it was Eleanor's inability to produce a male heir which led to Louis feeling passive towards any divorce as he wished to avoid a civil war like that England.<sup>149</sup>

After her second marriage Eleanor shared governance of England with Henry on several occasions although she did not play any significant political role until 1167 when she departed England to take control of her inheritance in Poitiers. While in France Eleanor headed the Christmas courts with her son Richard by her side, which may be why she faced no resistance.<sup>150</sup>After her departure Eleanor and Henry experience a breakdown in their marriage; their sons were engaged in numerous revolts against Henry with some chroniclers such as Roger of Hoveden blaming Eleanor, stating she rallied her sons' into action. Roger would have been biased as he was a royal clerk and would have been in favour of Henry.<sup>151</sup>It

---

<sup>147</sup> Marion Meade, *Eleanor of Aquitaine: A Biography*, (London, 2002), p. 106-122

<sup>148</sup> Helen Castor, *She-Wolves: The Women Who Ruled England Before Elizabeth*, (New York, 2012), p. 131-51

<sup>149</sup> Marjorie Chibnall, *The Empress Matilda*, (Oxford, 1991), p. 155

Natasha Hodgson, *Women, Crusading and the Holy Land*, (Suffolk, 2007), p. 140

<sup>150</sup> Edith Ennen, *The Medieval Woman*, (Oxford, 1989), p. 40

Helen Castor, *She-Wolves: The Women Who Ruled England Before Elizabeth*, (New York, 2012), p. 160-168

<sup>151</sup> Frank Barlow, 'Roger of Howden', *The English Historical Review*, 65, 256, (1950), pp. 359

is highly likely that Roger's claims were unsubstantiated due to the fact Eleanor was imprisoned from 1173 until 1189 and had little contact with her children; during which time they were engaged in several rebellions against their father.<sup>152</sup>

Richard I (1189- 1199) was crowned king of England after his father's death at which point he gave Eleanor the power to do as she wished within England; she ruled in his absence and issued charter in her own name.<sup>153</sup>This in all but name made Eleanor a king; however this new found power challenged no political preconceptions as the source of it was under the authority of her son. She received no negative reception from chroniclers based on her authority as she was presumably viewed as acting in the interests of Richard.<sup>154</sup>

Eleanor's main source of power was the duchy of Aquitaine; she also gained power through both marriages which was unusual as she had authority in her own right. Despite the fact she had power Eleanor had less official authority than the likes of Matilda.<sup>155</sup>Eleanor did not receive widely positive praise from the chroniclers; Bernard of Clairvaux for instance suggested she was impatient and interfering during her marriage to Louis while William laid the blame for the slaughter at Mount Cadmos on Eleanor and her ladies as their baggage trains blocked an exit route.<sup>156</sup>

### **Berenguela of Castile**

---

<sup>152</sup> Roger of Hoveden, *The Last Days and Death of Henry II, 1189*

<sup>153</sup> Edith Ennen, *The Medieval Woman*, (Oxford, 1989), p. 140

<sup>154</sup> Helen Castor, *She-Wolves: The Women Who Ruled England Before Elizabeth*, (New York, 2012), p. 192-193

<sup>155</sup> Susan Stuard, 'The Dominion of Gender: How Women Fared in the High Middle Ages,' in R Bridenthal, S Stuard, & M.E. Wiesener, (ed.) *Becoming Visible: Women in European History*, (Boston, 1998), pp. 141

Theresa Earenfight, *Queenship in Medieval Europe*, (Hampshire, 2013), p. 137

<sup>156</sup> Conor Kostik, 'Eleanor of Aquitaine and the Women of the Second Crusade,' in C. Kostic (ed.), *Medieval Italy, Medieval and Early Modern Women: Essays in Honour of Christine Meek*, (Dublin, 2010), pp. 198

Eleanor of Aquitaine was the grandmother of Berenguela of Castile (1217) and like her grandmother was a woman of power, unlike Eleanor however she was celebrated for experiencing a successful reign.<sup>157</sup> Castile accepted the option of multi gendered rule; it did not insist on a male ruler nor was there any objection to female rule with the only concern being that women may lose her power to a foreign husband. Berenguela held a hereditary claim to Castile which was more important than her gender but in order to rule efficiently she was required to have a husband to assist her in ruling.<sup>158</sup>

Berenguela was queen consort of Leon from 1197 until 1204 during which time she was the dominant partner in her marriage; she co-signed around eighty percent of her husband's diplomas which was an unusual action of the time.<sup>159</sup> Berenguela and her husband divorced in 1204 at which point played no further part in the affairs of Leon. She returned to Castile and acted as regent for her younger brother in the wake of their father's death, Berenguela went on to rule Castile independently after the death of her brother. This was a position Berenguela undertook for several months eventually giving the throne to her son Ferdinand (1217-1252) but she remained as advisor to him; she was a strong political force in Castile due to the relationship with her son.<sup>160</sup> Berenguela continued to fight her ex-husband for her son's right to succeed to the throne of Leon; she played a larger part in this than her son and thus being the major protagonist in the eventual unification of Castile- Leon.<sup>161</sup>

---

<sup>157</sup> Janna Bianchi, *The Queen's Hand; Power and Authority in the Reign of Berenguela of Castile*, (Pennsylvania, 2012), p. 1

<sup>158</sup> Janna Bianchi, *The Queen's Hand; Power and Authority in the Reign of Berenguela of Castile*, (Pennsylvania, 2012), p. 3-4, 18

<sup>159</sup> Janna Bianchi, *The Queen's Hand; Power and Authority in the Reign of Berenguela of Castile*, (Pennsylvania, 2012), p. 38, 48

<sup>160</sup> Janna Bianchi, *The Queen's Hand; Power and Authority in the Reign of Berenguela of Castile*, (Pennsylvania, 2012), p. 2

<sup>161</sup> Janna Bianchi, *The Queen's Hand; Power and Authority in the Reign of Berenguela of Castile*, (Pennsylvania, 2012), p. 206

## **Blanche**

The end of the medieval period saw a wider acceptance of female rule due to several strong women fighting for their rights throughout this time. The last case study is that of Blanche (1425- 1441) who became heir to the kingdom of Navarre upon the death of her elder sister. The daughters of Navarre had legitimate rights if they had no brothers or if their brother had died; in this situation the eldest daughter would assume the position of heir. A princess would take precedent over any close male relatives such as a nephew or uncle as royal status superseded gender. Blanche was not the first female ruler of Navarre; she came from a line of females who had ruled in their own right back to 1274.<sup>162</sup>

Blanche was a competent ruler for Navarre as she had gained experience in governing a kingdom during her marriage to Martin of Sicily (1392- 1409). During this time Blanche acted as queen Lieutenant in the absence of her husband on two occasions.<sup>163</sup> Blanche conceived only one child with Martin, a son who died within his first year. Martin died in 1408 and due to the death of her son she had no legal claim to his lands however, her capable governance during her marriage and Martin's official stipulation led to her assuming the position of viceroy of Sicily with the authority to govern on behalf of the king.

Blanche became queen regent of Navarre after the death of her father but unlike the other women her succession in 1425 was uncontested and experienced little resistance. This smooth transition has been attributed to the fact that King Carlos made the course of

---

<sup>162</sup> Elena Woodacre, 'Blanca, Queen of Sicily and Queen of Navaree: Conecting the Pyrenees and the Mediterranean Via an Aragonese Alliance,' in E. Woodacre (ed.), *Queenhip in the Mediterranean: Negotiating the Role of the Queen in the Medieval and Early Modern Eras*, (New York, 2013), pp. 208

<sup>163</sup> Elena Woodacre, 'Blanca, Queen of Sicily and Queen of Navaree: Conecting the Pyrenees and the Mediterranean Via an Aragonese Alliance,' in E. Woodacre (ed.), *Queenhip in the Mediterranean: Negotiating the Role of the Queen in the Medieval and Early Modern Eras*, (New York, 2013), pp. 212

succession clear to all.<sup>164</sup>Blanche remained queen for sixteen years until her death in 1441 at which point her husband John became sole ruler.<sup>165</sup>Blanche was remembered favourably by contemporaries, which may be due to her capable governance of Sicily and because female rule was accepted more widely than the earlier case studies by this time.

It is evident that there were many similarities between the women within this chapter; this indicates that their circumstances were not unique to each other or to the case of Alice who will be discussed later, therefore William was not writing his accounts of Alice with no point of comparison. On occasions women were accepted as able to wield power under the correct circumstance, therefore William was not writing under the opinion that all women should be excluded from power. William must have used his discretion in individual circumstances to determine if that woman was suitable to rule or not.

---

<sup>164</sup> Elena Woodacre, 'Blanca, Queen of Sicily and Queen of Navaree: Conecting the Pyrenees and the Mediterranean Via an Aragonese Alliance,' in E. Woodacre (ed.), *Queenship in the Mediterranean: Negotiating the Role of the Queen in the Medieval and Early Modern Eras*, (New York, 2013), pp. 218

<sup>165</sup> Armin Wolf, 'Reigning Queens in Medieval Europe: Where, When and Why' in J. Carmi Parson (ed.), *Medieval Queenship*, (Gloucestershire, 1994), pp. 171



## Chapter 3

### The history of Antioch

Antioch was established 1400 years prior to the crusade movement, during its existence it became one of the most important settlements in Christendom; ranking alongside Alexandria, Constantinople and Rome in greatness.<sup>166</sup> According to ancient tradition the church of Antioch was said to have been created by Saint Peter whom was appointed as the first bishop and for the next millennia the bishopric of Antioch was a position of high importance within Christendom.<sup>167</sup> Antioch had previously been held by the Byzantines but had been taken by the Seljuk Turks in 1084 and though the liberation of Antioch was not the focus of the crusades it could be argued that the capture of Antioch was essential in regaining Jerusalem due to its proximity to several ports.<sup>168</sup>

The Byzantine Emperor Alexius I (1081-1118) saw his chance to recapture his old territory in the late 1090s after the death of several Muslim leaders such as Malik Shah, (1072- 1092) Sultan of Baghdad. The quick succession of these deaths led to a series of succession crisis' within Syria and Palestine, a temporary disintegration of several Muslim empires and a severe weakness caused by faction which prevented the new rulers Ridwan of Aleppo (1095-1113) and Duqaq of Damascus (1095-1104) from exercising any significant authority.<sup>169</sup> It was this disunity and Muslim in-fighting which encouraged the emperor

---

<sup>166</sup> Malcolm Billings, *The Cross and the Crescent: A History of the Crusades*, (London, 1987), p. 46

<sup>167</sup> C. David Jones, *The Apostles of Jesus Christ: Thirteen Men Who Turned the World Upside Down*, (Indiana, 2010), p. 92

<sup>168</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *God's War*, London, 2006), p. 135

<sup>169</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *God's War*, London, 2006), p. 128

Carole Hillenbrand, *The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives*, (Edinburgh, 1999), p. 20

Christopher Tyerman, *The Crusades: A Very Short Introduction*, (Oxford, 2004), p. 21

Bernard Hamilton, *The Crusades*, (Gloucestershire, 1998), p. 1

Alexius to send envoys to the west requesting military aid in order to regain lost territory within the holy land.

The bulk of the first crusade departed France in late 1086 with no European kings being present in the crusade army and so leadership was entrusted to the senior French nobility with the army being divided into four; the leaders being Hugh of Vermandos, Raymond of Toulouse, Bohemond of Taranto and Godfrey of Bouillon.<sup>170</sup> Prior to their arrival in the Levant the Christian army arrived at the gates of Constantinople where they were met with hostility by the emperor due to its size. The emperor was suspicious of the army due to previous tension with leaders such as Bohemond I (1098-1111).

It is said the leaders were obliged to swear an oath of fealty to Alexius; the exact terms surrounding the oath taken by the crusaders have long been debated however once the princes had formally agreed to become his vassals Alexius gave the crusaders camp sites and transport across the Bosphorus, though it is believed Raymond of Toulouse did not agree to become a vassal of Alexius.<sup>171</sup>

It is agreed by both western and Greek sources that the crusader oath to Alexius stipulated they were to return all re-conquered lands to the Byzantines and they were to accept Alexius as overlord for any lands not previously held the Byzantines.<sup>172</sup> In return for these lands the Byzantines would provide military assistance to the crusaders although many western chronicles suggest that Byzantium played little to no part in military activities

---

<sup>170</sup> Jonathan Philips, *Holy Warriors*, (London, 2009), p. 11

<sup>171</sup> Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Ideal of Crusading*, (London, 2003), p. 38

Malcolm Billings, *The Cross and the Crescent: A History of the Crusades*, (London, 1987), p. 38

Carole Sweetenham (Trans), *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade, Historia Iherosolimitana*, (Hants, 2003), p. 93

<sup>172</sup> Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 7

D. S. Richards, (Trans), *The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athir for the Crusading Period from al-Kamil fi'l-Ta'rikh Subtitle: Part 1, Years 491-541/1097-1146: the Coming of the Franks and the Muslim Response*, (Ashgate, 2010), p. 14

during the campaign. On the eve of the capture of Antioch Stephen of Blois deserted the siege and is said to have met the Byzantine army as they marched towards Antioch, he is believed to have persuaded the Byzantines that it was too risky to progress towards Antioch as the city was almost certainly lost.<sup>173</sup> Based on this information they turned back; in doing so breaking their oath which has led many to assert that by abandoning the crusaders in the face of defeat Alexius did not fulfilled his part of the oath, thus he surrendered his claim to Antioch.<sup>174</sup>

Ultimately the crusaders were successful in taking Antioch and despite not coming to the aid of the crusaders the Byzantines regarded Bohemond's seizure of Antioch as a violation of his oath to the Emperor while in turn the Crusaders regarded Alexius's refusal to aid them as treason towards the Christian faith.<sup>175</sup> Based on Stephen of Blois's information and the Byzantine decision not to intervene in the siege of Antioch it is debatable whether there was a plot by Bohemond to gain legitimate control of Antioch or if there was simply a surprising turn of events in the crusaders favour.

It was Bohemond's decision to keep Antioch rather than return it to the Byzantines which set in motion half a century of conflict between Antioch and Byzantium and in the aftermath of Bohemond's betrayal a deep rift with the Byzantine Empire was formed; the Byzantines regarded Antioch as their territory and had every intention of retaking it.<sup>176</sup> Despite the wish of subsequent Emperors' after the capture of Antioch in 1098 the Byzantines were never in a strong enough position to pose a serious challenge to the principality of Antioch; from

---

<sup>173</sup> Malcolm Billings, *The Cross and the Crescent: A History of the Crusades*, (London, 1987), p. 50

<sup>174</sup> Andrew Jotischy, *Crusading and the Crusader States*, (Harlow, 2004), p. 57-59

<sup>175</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 1: The First Crusade and the Foundations of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*, (London, 1990), p. 240

Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 23

<sup>176</sup> Jonathan Harris, *Byzantium and the Crusades*, (London, 2003), p. 75

Allan V. Murray, *The Crusades: An Encyclopaedia*, (Santa Barbara, 2006), p. 65

John France, *The Crusades and the Expansion of Catholic Christendom 1000-1714*, (Oxon, 2005), p. 102

1098 until the 1130's the Byzantines became involved in long, arduous wars with the Venetians, Hungarians and the Turks but by the 1130's the Byzantines were in a strong enough position to retake Antioch.<sup>177</sup>

The capture of Antioch and Edessa by the Franks was unexpected; Edessa was the first of the Latin states to be established in 1097 and with its capture a Latin presence within the Levant was created which was to last almost 200 years.<sup>178</sup> The principality of Antioch was first established by Bohemond I after the city of Antioch was captured in June 1098 however Bohemond had little involvement in the expansion of Antioch. It was under the regency of Tancred that vast areas were amalgamated into the principality and Antioch experienced aggressive leadership under Roger of Salerno with a serious setback befalling the principality after the Field of Blood in 1119, stability was experienced under Baldwin II and a brief revival of power occurred under Bohemond II.<sup>179</sup>

Between 1104-1106 the crusaders had almost reached the full extent of their lands; with the exception of the addition of Tyre which was captured in 1124 and Ascalon in 1153.<sup>180</sup> The first generation of settlers to the east inherited a disjointed patchwork of poorly resourced towns and cities, a deficit in manpower which was never entirely sufficient and an

---

<sup>177</sup> Jonathan Harris, *Byzantium and the Crusades*, (London, 2003), p. 81

<sup>178</sup> Jonathan Phillips, 'The Latin East, 1098-1291,' in J. Riley-Smith (ed.), *A History of the Crusades*, (Oxford, 1999), pp. 111  
Nora Berend, 'The Expansion of Latin Christendom,' in D. Power (ed.), *The Central Middle Ages: 950- 1320*, (Oxford, 2006), pp. 200

<sup>179</sup> Thomas Asbridge, 'The Impact of Islam and Byzantium Upon the Crusader Community at Antioch,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th Series, Vol. 9, (1999), pp. 305

<sup>180</sup> Jonathan Philips, *Holy Warriors*, (London, 2009), p. 28  
Jonathan Philips, *The Crusades 1095- 1197*, (Harlow, 2002), p. 27

area of economic depression.<sup>181</sup>Once the Franks had established their settlements it became evident Antioch was the strongest and most important of the four Latin states in terms of its military functions and demographically.<sup>182</sup>It was in these early days that Antioch experienced its heyday of expansion over a six year period; despite this expansion the early years of Antioch were turbulent and unstable. From the start of the Latin occupation the principality faced attacks from potential enemies and it was during this period that three successive princes died fighting the Muslims, making it different from the other Latin states.<sup>183</sup>

The crusader states were all continuously at war therefore Edessa acted as a buffer state protecting the others, particularly the eastern flank of Antioch.<sup>184</sup>In the early years Antioch was the richest of the crusader states due to its fertile land and abundance of crops which contributed to an active rivalry between Antioch and Jerusalem throughout the early twelfth century; however Antioch's wealth was significantly reduced over the latter half a century with Jerusalem becoming the dominant state.<sup>185</sup>

Despite popular opinion Jerusalem had no direct authority over any of the crusader states but in times of difficulty they could appeal to the king of Jerusalem for aid, this aid was most

---

<sup>181</sup> Hans Mayer, *The Crusades*, (Oxford, 1972), p. 69

Christopher Tyerman, *God's War*, (London, 2006), p. 179

Bernard Hamilton, *The Crusades*, (Gloucestershire, 1998), p. 13

Thomas Asbridge, *The Crusades: The War for the Holy Land*, (London, 2010), p. 115

<sup>182</sup> Andrew Jotischy, *Crusading and the Crusader States*, (Harlow, 2004), p. 70

Harold. S. Fink, 'The Foundations of the Latin States 1099- 1118,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), p. 372

<sup>183</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 1

Jonathan Phillips, 'The Latin East, 1098-1291,' in J. Riley-Smith (ed.), *A History of the Crusades*, (Oxford, 1999), pp. 31

Peter W. Edbury, 'The Assised d'Atioch law and Custom in the Principality of Antioch,' in K. J. Stringer & A. Jotischky (ed.), *Norman Expansion Connections, Continuities and Contrasts*, (Surrey, 2013), pp. 242

<sup>184</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *God's War*, (London, 2006), p. 86

Bernard Hamilton, *The Crusades*, (Gloucestershire, 1998), p. 29

Hans Mayer, *The Crusades*, (Oxford, 1972), p. 53

<sup>185</sup> Chris Gravett & David Nicolle, *The Normans: Warrior Knights and Their Castles*, (Oxford, 2006), p. 67

Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 40

Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades, Volume 2: The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (Cambridge, 1952), p. 6

frequently called upon by Antioch as there was a constant need for the kings of Jerusalem to rescue Antioch from succession crisis'.<sup>186</sup> Each state was autonomous and had its own system of government, for example Antioch had a different political, economic and defence system to Jerusalem and Tripoli. All states agreed that there was a need for male rule; Jerusalem was more liberal with its acceptance of female rule while the nobility of Antioch actively opposed female regencies.<sup>187</sup>

Despite its importance Antioch's geographical position placed it in a more vulnerable position than other Latin states as it was in close vicinity to centres of Muslim population such as Aleppo and Shazar as well as warring Muslim powers such as the Danishmendids, Seljuk's and the Atebegs of northern Syria.<sup>188</sup>

The distance from the other Latin states to Antioch isolated the principality and placed it in a weak position; it was 360 miles to Jerusalem and 160 miles to Edessa which meant there could be no immediate military aid if the principality was threatened.<sup>189</sup> The importance of Antioch ultimately declined during Latin rule due to several factors such as the disaster of the Field of Blood, minor heir's, a new found Muslim unity and female rule.<sup>190</sup> Due to its location Antioch was the most exposed of the crusader states to Byzantine influence, an

---

<sup>186</sup> John France, *The Crusades and the Expansion of Catholic Christendom 1000-1714*, (Oxon, 2005), p. 115

Christopher Tyerman, *God's War*, London, 2006), p. 189

<sup>187</sup> Jonathan Philips, *Defenders of the Holy Land: Relations between the Latin East and the West 1119-1187*, (Oxfordshire, 1996), p. 47

Thomas Asbridge, *The Crusades; The War for the Holy Land*, (London, 2010), p. 172

Chris Gravett & David Nicolle, *The Normans: Warrior Knights and Their Castles*, (Oxford, 2006), p. 67

Bernard Hamilton, *The Crusades*, (Gloucestershire, 1998), p. 23

John France, *The Crusades and the Expansion of Catholic Christendom 1000-1714*, (Oxon, 2005), p. 15

<sup>188</sup> Andrew Jotischy, *Crusading and the Crusader States*, (Harlow, 2004), p. 68

<sup>189</sup> Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 18

Harold. S. Fink, 'The Foundations of the Latin States 1099- 1118,' in M.W. Baldwin & K.M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), p. 369

<sup>190</sup> Chris Gravett & David Nicolle, *The Normans: Warrior Knights and Their Castles*, (Oxford, 2006), p. 67

influence which was not felt with significance until after the marriage of Constance of Antioch in 1136.<sup>191</sup>

A high percentage of the principality's population were indigenous Christians and Muslims which placed Antioch in constant threat of internal instability as well as external threats from its Muslim neighbours, though Runciman has argued that these differences made it easy for the Franks to control the population.<sup>192</sup>

After taking Antioch Bohemond faced many internal and external challenges which would threaten his tenure as lord of Antioch; contrary to what many believe in the early days of the principality the chief threat was not from Muslims but from the Byzantines; there was little initial Muslim response to first crusade.<sup>193</sup> At the time of the capture of Antioch northern Syria was an area of turbulent political activity; Muslim disunity and in-fighting facilitated the creation of the principality of Antioch and allowed its rulers to gain power through diplomatic manoeuvring and gain a long standing foothold in the east.<sup>194</sup>

The Franks in Outremer were fortunate that at the time of the first crusade the Seljuk Empire was divided by succession disputes therefore they were not confronted by the full

---

<sup>191</sup> Ralph-Johannes Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States 1096-1204*, (Oxford, 1993), p. 247

<sup>192</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 2  
Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades, Volume 2: The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (Cambridge, 1952), p. 9

<sup>193</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Crusades; The War for the Holy Land*, (London, 2010), p. 1  
Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades, Volume 2: The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (Cambridge, 1952), p. 9

<sup>194</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 48  
Christopher Tyerman, *God's War*, London, 2006), p. 128

might of Seljuk power only by Aleppo and Damascus, unlike during the time of Alice when Zengi began to unify the Muslims.<sup>195</sup>

After Antioch was taken by the crusaders in June 1098 there was a delay of approximately six months before progression towards Jerusalem, during this time the leaders took what they could of the surrounding area in a piecemeal fashion. In the months prior to continuing their pilgrimage to Jerusalem Anselm of Ribemont and Stephen of Blois reported that the crusaders captured many local Muslim held towns and forts.<sup>196</sup> After the capture of Jerusalem very few crusaders stayed in the east; only around 300 knights are believed to have remained in Jerusalem and presumably a smaller number settled in Antioch with the bulk of the army returning to the west.<sup>197</sup>

This suggests there was no large scale plan to colonise the east and that the principality of Antioch's early formation was born out of events of the first crusade and its aftermath rather than a concise plan by Bohemond I and the other crusade lords.<sup>198</sup> This disproves modern arguments regarding colonial expansion in the east; instead it seems to suggest opportunistic expansion.<sup>199</sup> While the evidence indicates there was no initial plan for Bohemond to obtain Antioch many non-Norman crusaders felt that he was more concerned with gaining a fief than fulfilling his crusade vows and capturing Jerusalem.<sup>200</sup>

---

<sup>195</sup> Allan V. Murray, (Santa Barbara, 2015), p. 33

<sup>196</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 24

<sup>197</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 1: The First Crusade and the Foundations of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*, (London, 1990), p. 368

Jonathan Philips, *Holy Warriors*, (London, 2009), p. 27

<sup>198</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 6

<sup>199</sup> Andrew Jotischy, *Crusading and the Crusader States*, (Harlow, 2004), p. 68

<sup>200</sup> Chris Gravett & David Nicolle, *The Normans: Warrior Knights and Their Castles*, (Oxford, 2006), p. 66



After gaining control of Antioch there was an initial dispute over lordship of Antioch with both Raymond and Bohemond claiming parts of Antioch for themselves, to which Raymond eventually conceded defeat to Bohemond.<sup>201</sup> Raymond and Bohemond's dispute over possession of Antioch caused disgust amongst the ordinary crusaders and there was an early threat of revolt within Antioch and as a result of this threat Raymond's base of Ma'arrat-an-Nu'man was destroyed by the crusaders.<sup>202</sup> After conceding defeat Raymond led a series of campaigns into the Summaq plateau in the autumn of 1098 to establish an independent enclave to threaten Bohemond's control of Antioch.<sup>203</sup>

By December 1098 Bohemond had abandoned his pilgrimage to Jerusalem and returned to Antioch, around the same time Raymond was offering money by way of a bribe in order to be accepted as lord of Antioch. By early January 1099 Bohemond had driven the provincials and the last of Raymond's men from their positions within Antioch, according to Albert of Aachen Raymond returned to Ma'arrat in January 1099 after realising he could not take Antioch, at which point Bohemond seized the opportunity to finally gain sole leadership over Antioch.<sup>204 205</sup>

The general history of Antioch under Latin leadership can be summarised as a rapid rise in power and size in just a decade and then a speedy decline after the field of blood; in just two years the principality consisted of the city of Antioch, the port of St Simeon, Artah,

---

<sup>201</sup> Emily Albu, 'Antioch and the Normans' in K. Hurlock & P. Oldfield (ed.), *Crusading and Pilgrimage in the Norman World*, (Suffolk, 2015), p. 171

Peter Lock, *The Routledge Companion to the Crusades*, (London, 2006), p. 23

<sup>202</sup> Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Ideal of Crusading*, (London, 2003), p. 59

<sup>203</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Crusades; The War for the Holy Land*, (London, 2010), p. 84

<sup>204</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 129

<sup>205</sup> Hans Mayer, *The Crusades*, (Oxford, 1972), p. 58

Peter Lock, *The Routledge Companion to the Crusades*, (London, 2006), p. 24, 141

Rosalind Hill (Ed), *Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, (London, 1962), p. 80- 84

Alexandretta, Tarsus, Mamistra and Albarq with many other areas being added until around 1109.<sup>206</sup> Throughout the Latin occupation until 1291 there were numerous Muslim and Christian truces; particular evidence of this is seen in 1108 when Tancred and Ridwan fought together in a civil war against Edessa and troops from Monsul. This demonstrates how divided the Muslims were; they were prepared to join the crusaders and unite against each other rather than fight in a united Muslim force and recapture their land.<sup>207</sup> The position of the crusader states were therefore closely affected by the disunity of Muslim neighbours which lasted until approximately 1130 and it was this disunity that made the first crusade successful.<sup>208</sup>

Between 1110 and 1120 Antioch faced attacks from Aleppo although these the attacks were of little consequence to Antioch; Aleppo was weak after the death of Ridwan in 1113 which was in contrast to Antioch who was growing in power and could rely on its powerful Latin neighbours particularly Jerusalem; Antioch owed its survival to Jerusalem having repeatedly depended on intervention from its princes to prevent the principality from succumbing to interference.<sup>209</sup>

The decline of the Latin hold on Antioch came in 1119; territory was initially lost but by 1123 the Latin's had regained most of this territory.<sup>210</sup> Between the Field of Blood and the fall of

---

<sup>206</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 46

<sup>207</sup> Jonathan Philips, *Holy Warriors*, (London, 2009), p. 15

Amin Maalouf, *The Crusades Through Arab Eyes*, (London, 2004), p. 72

<sup>208</sup> R. C. Smail, *The Crusaders in Syria and the Holy Land*, (Southampton, 1973), p. 14

Christopher Tyerman, *The Crusades: A Very Short Introduction*, (Oxford, 2004), p. 111

<sup>209</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *Gods War*, (London, 2006), p. 195

Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 49

R. C. Smail, *The Crusaders in Syria and the Holy Land*, (Southampton, 1973), p. 19

<sup>210</sup> John France, *The Crusades and the Expansion of Catholic Christendom 1000-1714*, (Oxon, 2005), p.118

Edessa in 1145 Antioch suffered revived attacks from the Byzantines and the threat of Zengi as well as an internal succession crisis.<sup>211</sup>

In the wake of the Field of Blood a political vacuum was created and Antioch had to periodically rely on aid provided by Jerusalem in order to be able to protect its frontiers from the Muslim threat which was dominated by a constant struggle between Antioch and Aleppo from 1120 until 1126.<sup>212</sup>

Regardless of how stable any kingdom was prior to the death of its ruler, the death of a king without a clearly designated heir is a threat to its stability, the lack of consistent and present male leaders in Antioch after Roger of Salerno's death left the principality open to attempted Byzantine claims of suzerainty.<sup>213</sup>

The Latin's faced a further setback to their ambitions of holding Aleppo when they failed to take the city in 1125 which ultimately opened the way for Zengi.<sup>214</sup> Zengi rose to power in 1127 around Mosul and Aleppo although at this time he paid little attention to the Franks instead concentrating his attacks on local Muslim rulers with his focus on consolidating the gains he made and then later he turned his attention onto the Latin settlements.<sup>215</sup>

Zengi's rise was a major turning point in the fate of the Franks; his major focus was to expand the Muslim empire and he introduced a sense of cohesion to the Arab world which was unseen during the first crusade, this cohesion was to the detriment of the Franks in the

---

<sup>211</sup> Andrew Jotischy, *Crusading and the Crusader States*, (Harlow, 2004), p. 77

<sup>212</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 89

<sup>213</sup> Andrew Jotischy, *Crusading and the Crusader States*, (Harlow, 2004), p. 70- 74

Robert L. Nicholson, 'The Growth of the Latin States 1118- 1144,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), pp. 414

<sup>214</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *Gods War*, (London, 2006), p. 187

<sup>215</sup> Robert L. Nicholson, 'The Growth of the Latin States 1118- 1144,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), pp. 429

Hans Mayer, *The Crusades*, (Oxford, 1972), p. 84

1130's and beyond.<sup>216</sup>The first serious threat from Zengi came in 1128 after he captured Aleppo and was well placed to threaten the crusader states, after this Antioch became the focus of Muslim re-conquest until the 1170s.<sup>217</sup>

Bohemond II's return to Antioch was seen as a brief revival of prestige to Antioch; he fought well against the Muslims but met an untimely death in 1130, leaving a two year old female heir and plunging Antioch into political chaos as the succession of Antioch was a highly complex affair; there was a preference for a male heir while Alice was content with staking her claim as the principalities ruler.<sup>218</sup>To add to this chaos there was a loosening of ties with Jerusalem after Baldwin II's death in 1130 and renewed attempts by Alice to seize power.<sup>219</sup>Alice is reported to have attempted to forge an alliance with Zengi as well as betroth her daughter Constance to the Byzantine prince, however Constance was married to Raynald of Chatillon without her mother's knowledge and it was this marriage which revived the embittered emperor's assault on Antioch and once again forced it to accept byzantine suzerainty in 1137.<sup>220</sup>

This chapter has demonstrated the fact that from the beginning of the Latin occupation Antioch was in a precarious position; the most relevant of these is the fact there was

---

<sup>216</sup> Amin Maalouf, *The Crusades Through Arab Eyes*, (London, 2004), p. 115

*The Crusades: A Time Watch Guide by Thomas Asbridge*. Television programme, BBC 4, (London, broadcast 3 February 2016)

R. C. Smail, *The Crusaders in Syria and the Holy Land*, (Southampton, 1973), p. 19

<sup>217</sup> Allan V. Murray, *The Crusades: An Encyclopaedia*, (Santa Barbara, 2006), p. 74

Bernard Hamilton, *The Crusades*, (Gloucestershire, 1998), p. 29

<sup>218</sup> Philips, *Defenders of the Holy Land: Relations between the Latin East and the West 1119-1187*, p. 44

<sup>219</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *Gods War*, (London, 2006), p. 188

<sup>220</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *Gods War*, (London, 2006), p. 188

Robert L. Nicholson, 'The Growth of the Latin States 1118- 1144,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), pp. 439

instability amongst nobles which will be discussed in further detail in the next chapter. This lack of cohesion caused months of confusion as to the future of leadership within Antioch; if it's enemies had been stronger there was a serious chance this lack of cohesion could have cost the crusaders Antioch. I believe the initial success of the crusades was only possible due to Muslim disunity in northern Syria and the preoccupation of the Byzantines. That being said the crusaders did establish a strong foothold in the east and were able to hold power for two centuries. I do believe the strength and power of Antioch has been overestimated in the early twelfth century in contrast to the weakness of its Muslim neighbours; as discussed only a small percentage of knights stayed in the east thus there was a serious lack of manpower but due to the fact there was no real threat until the time of Alice; it appeared the crusaders were stronger than they actually were.

## **Chapter 4**

### **The Rulers of Antioch; 1098- 1131**

#### **Bohemond I- Bohemond II**

This chapter will provide an in-depth analysis of the leaders of Antioch from 1098 until Alice's claim to power in 1131. It will discuss princes and regents of the principality and aims to provide a discussion on their achievements, success, tribulations and the legacy they left on Antioch. This chapter is essential as it will provide a basis of analysis regarding Alice's ascension to the throne of Antioch. It will demonstrate any challenges to the principality and discuss how these leaders governed. Ultimately this chapter will contribute to the overall question of whether Antioch experienced a cataclysmic crisis under Alice or if the levels of crisis were consistent throughout the Franks rule of Antioch. I intend to discuss the contrast of opinions regarding these leaders to that of opinions regarding Alice to determine if she received such harsh criticism due to her gender or her actions.

#### **Bohemond I, (1098- 1112)**

Bohemond I has been portrayed throughout history as a legendary crusade figure due to his representation in contemporary chronicles such as the *Gesta Francorum* and the *Alexiad* and was considered to be 'the most formidable of the franks' by the Muslims.<sup>221</sup> The prospect of material gains were a motivating factor in Bohemond focusing his energy on

---

<sup>221</sup>Amin Maalouf, *The Crusades Through Arab Eyes*, (London, 2004), p. 59

Antioch and the pilgrimage to retake the holy land gave Bohemond the sanction he needed to take Antioch, in doing so he used religion to his advantage.<sup>222</sup>

Bohemond had the backing of his followers to take Antioch as it had been agreed prior to the siege that if he was able to orchestrate the surrender of the city they would accept him as the rightful prince.<sup>223</sup> Most of the nobles and other leaders were happy to accept this deal except for Raymond of Toulouse.<sup>224</sup>

After capturing Antioch Bohemond immediately made the decision to keep the city which caused controversy, placing him in a position of conflict with both the emperor and Raymond of Toulouse.<sup>225</sup> Raymond of Toulouse hated Bohemond and he believed the retention of Antioch contravened Bohemond's oath to the emperor and that Antioch was still rightfully that of Alexius and should be returned to him.<sup>226</sup>

Unlike most of the other nobles Raymond had not sworn an oath to Alexius and was not bound to return Antioch to him, it could simply be that he was jealous and wanted Antioch rather than a sense of loyalty to the Emperor.<sup>227</sup> Due to their disagreement control of the city was initially split between Bohemond and Raymond with each controlling a different area within the city.<sup>228</sup>

In regard to fulfilling his crusade vows Bohemond left Antioch for a short period of time to progress to Jerusalem, however he turned back at Latakia as he believed it would be

---

<sup>222</sup> Malcolm Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 56

Allan V. Murray, *The Crusades: An Encyclopaedia*, (Santa Barbara, 2006), p. 72

<sup>223</sup> Ralph of Caen, *The Gesta Tancredi*, (Trans) B. S. Bachrach & D. S. Bachrach, (Surrey, 2010), p. 90

<sup>224</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 34  
Rober Levine (Trans), *Gesta Dei Per Francos*, (Woodbridge, 1997), p. 91

<sup>225</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 1

<sup>226</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 129

<sup>227</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 1: The First Crusade and the Foundations of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*, (London, 1990), p. 230

<sup>228</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 36

dangerous to leave Antioch exposed to an attack from the Byzantine emperor.<sup>229</sup> It is possible there was a real danger however it is more likely that this was an excuse as Bohemond wished to return to Antioch to consolidate his gain as a challenge from Alexius would require a considerable army to fend off an attack. Due to his reluctance to depart for Jerusalem many non-Normans felt Bohemond was more interested in gaining a fief than fulfilling his crusader vows of conquering Jerusalem, which he failed to do as he did not participate in the capture of Jerusalem.<sup>230</sup>

After returning to Antioch and managing to finally rid the city of Raymond of Toulouse and his men in early 1099 Bohemond ruled unopposed for three years.<sup>231</sup> Despite managing to rid himself of a Christian enemy Bohemond faced attacks from the beginning of his reign as Antioch was simultaneously attacked by Aleppo and Byzantium, though they were a limited threat to the principality.<sup>232</sup>

The little of what is known of Bohemond's activities in the Levant before he was captured suggest he was not attempting to expand the frontier; he was merely conducting raids on Muslim territory, with the exception of his failed attempt to capture Latakia in the summer of 1099. Latakia was a strategic link to Cyprus however Bohemond was forced to abandon this campaign.<sup>233</sup> Bohemond I is credited as the founder of the principality of Antioch however he actually had little impact on the principality as he spent little time there due to

---

<sup>229</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 1: The First Crusade and the Foundations of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*, (London, 1990), p. 328

<sup>230</sup> Chris Gravett & David Nicolle, *The Normans: Warrior Knights and Their Castles*, (Oxford, 2006), p. 66  
Harold S. Fink, 'The Foundations of the Latin States 1099- 1118,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), p. 374

<sup>231</sup> Hans Mayer, *The Crusades*, (Oxford, 1972), p. 59  
Edward Peters, (Trans), *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulchers of Chartres and Other Source Material*, (Philadelphia, 1998), p. 85

<sup>232</sup> Bernard Hamilton, *The Crusades*, (Gloucestershire, 1998), p. 17

<sup>233</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 43, 50



his capture by the Danishment Emir between 1100- 1003.<sup>234</sup>In the aftermath of his capture Antioch remained leaderless or without an army for several months which Antioch's neighbours did not take advantage of, this demonstrates their weakness and a time when Byzantium's prestige was low.<sup>235</sup>Bohemond's incarceration lasted for three years but due to Antioch's strength in comparison to its neighbours his capture was not a disaster for the principality<sup>236</sup>

Bohemond was released in 1103 and both he and the principality was in a strong position due to the conquests made by Tancred, on his return Bohemond found his lands were under some pressure from the Byzantines.<sup>237</sup>Bohemond had no difficulty in reclaiming Antioch from Tancred after his release from captivity and he celebrated his freedom by launching several campaigns against his neighbours, this offensive included a coalition of Antioch and Edessen forces which raided Syria and Aleppo successfully.<sup>238</sup>After raiding Aleppo the Frank's then advanced to Harran successfully taking the town of Beisarfut, Marash and Albislo in 1104, after which the Franks felt secure.<sup>239</sup>However they were forced to capitulate in their attempt to seize Kafarlatha as they were expelled by a local tribe, afterwards Ridwan felt pressured and sought to negotiate a truce with Antioch.<sup>240</sup>

---

<sup>234</sup> Harold. S. Fink, 'The Foundations of the Latin States 1099- 1118,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), p. 377

<sup>235</sup> Ralph-Johannes Lillie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States 1096-1204*, (Oxford, 1993), p. 71  
Amin Maalouf, *The Crusades Through Arab Eyes*, (London, 2004), p. 68

<sup>236</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 51

<sup>237</sup> John France, *The Crusades and the Expansion of Catholic Christendom 1000-1714*, (Oxon, 2005), p. 102

Harold. S. Fink, 'The Foundations of the Latin States 1099- 1118,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), p. 388

<sup>238</sup> Steven Runciman, *S, A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 39

Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 130

<sup>239</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 40

<sup>240</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 53

Upon reaching Harran Baldwin and Bohemond argued over which standard should be raised above the wall in the event of their victory which delayed and contributed to their downfall, additionally Bohemond and Raymond's strained relationship and lack of co-operation contributed heavily to the crusader defeat.<sup>241</sup> According to William of Tyre the battle of Harran was disastrous as the united Edessen and Antiochene army suffered heavy defeat. The battle resulted in a serious crisis for the principality as it was the first loss with significant consequences; damage to the military prestige of Antioch.<sup>242</sup> As well as losing prestige and being a personal humiliation to Bohemond Antioch was weakened in the aftermath of the battle in regards to territorial losses with it estimated that the area controlled by Antioch was reduced by almost 60%, although most of this territory was recovered within a decade.<sup>243</sup>

These losses were various and included territory in strategic areas such as the Ruj Valley and Jabala-as-Summaq to the south east of Antioch as well as Tarus, Mamistra and Adana who regained independence.<sup>244</sup> Byzantium was finally able to capitalise on the weakness of Antioch by recovering Cilicia and recovering parts of Latakia.<sup>245</sup> In the autumn of 1104 Bohemond held a council of vassals to discuss the dangers surrounding them such as the fact the Byzantines had taken these lands, he felt the need to obtain reinforcement from

---

<sup>241</sup>Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 45

L. N. Chleirgh, 'Gesta Normannorum Normans in the Latin Chronicles of the First Crusade,' in K. J. Stringer & A. Jotischky (ed.), *A Norman Expansion Connections, Continuities and Contrasts*, (Surrey, 2013), pp. 186

<sup>242</sup>Ralph-Johannes Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States 1096-1204*, (Oxford, 1993), p. 73

Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 82

<sup>243</sup>Jonathan Philips, *The Crusades 1095- 1197*, (Harlow, 2002), p. 29

Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 110

Amin Maalouf, *The Crusades Through Arab Eyes*, (London, 2004), p. 71

<sup>244</sup>Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 55, 58

<sup>245</sup>Hans Mayer, *The Crusades*, (Oxford, 1972), p. 72

Ralph-Johannes Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States 1096-1204*, (Oxford, 1993), p. 72

the west.<sup>246</sup> He made the decision to return west in late 1104 with Tancred once again acting as regent, Bohemond never returned to Antioch.<sup>247</sup>

After his release from capture in 1103 Bohemond owed a lot of money as he had paid a significant ransom; due to this on his return to the west Bohemond stripped Antioch of its wealth in order to pay for reinforcements which left the principality extremely vulnerable.<sup>248</sup> The events of the first crusade saw his social position improve dramatically; he returned to the west and married Constance, daughter of Philip I of Spain (1059-1108), the fact he was given such a high profile bride proves he was regarded as important in the west.<sup>249</sup>

After building a significant army Bohemond attempted to return to the east in 1107 with the intention of attacking Alexius. He was unsuccessful and Alexius and a coalition of Venetians successfully defeated Bohemond and his troops.<sup>250</sup> In the wake of defeat Bohemond was forced to submit to the treaty of Devol which stipulated he must acknowledge Byzantine suzerainty over Antioch and was to govern Antioch as a vassal, relinquishing his claims to lands in Cilicia and Laodicea.<sup>251</sup> Bohemond was once again humiliated and never recovered from his surrender to the Byzantines; he died in 1111 leaving an infant heir Bohemond II.

---

<sup>246</sup> Jonathan Philips, *The Second Crusade: Extending the Frontiers of Christendom*, (Hampshire, 2010), p. 5

<sup>247</sup> Allan V. Murray, *The Crusades: An Encyclopaedia*, (Santa Barbara, 2006), p. 74

Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 46

Hans Mayer, *The Crusades*, (Oxford, 1972), p. 72

Thomas Asbridge, 'William of Tyre and The First Rulers of the Principality of Antioch,' in S. Edington & H. J. Nicholson (ed.), *Deeds Done Beyond the Sea; Essays on William of Tyre, Cyprus and the Military Orders Presented to Peter Edbury*, (Surry, 2014), p. 35

<sup>248</sup> Harold S. Fink, 'The Foundations of the Latin States 1099- 1118,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), p. 390

<sup>249</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 1: The First Crusade and the Foundations of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*, (London, 1990), p. 373

Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Ideal of Crusading*, (London, 2003), p. 137

<sup>250</sup> Warren Treadgold, *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*, (California, 1997), p. 626

<sup>251</sup> Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 83

Peter Lock, *The Routledge Companion to the Crusades*, (London, 2006), p. 24, 30

On the whole Bohemond I was a weak leader for Antioch; it is evident that Bohemond's retention of Antioch was the major driving force behind decades of tension between Byzantium and Antioch. His ego contributed to the loss of the significant battle of Harran as well as causing friction with other crusade leaders. Bohemond was often absent from Antioch due to capture and campaigns in the west. The weakness of his enemies was the main reason Bohemond was able to gain such a foothold in the principality and why he was remembered favourably. He led several failed military campaigns and was lucky that these failures were not capitalised on by his enemies, with the exception of the treaty of Devol.

Bohemond was unsuccessful in his crusader vows and may not have embarked on the crusade entirely for religious reasons. As he was frequently captured or absent and he cost Antioch financially. The principality had the potential to have experienced a crisis during his leadership if it had not been for the regency of Tancred as well as the weakness of his neighbours. One way in which Bohemond was successful was that he left a legitimate heir, however Bohemond II was too young on his father's death and resided in the west therefore he had to rely on regents in his place.

#### Tancred, Regent (1100), (1105-1112)

Tancred was arguably the real founder of the principality of Antioch adding vast amounts of territory during his short reign; he was possibly its most capable ruler with him holding a remarkably good track record of crusader victories in the Levant. Tancred was the nephew

of Bohemond and he was intended to rule until Bohemond was released.<sup>252</sup> During Tancred's first period as regent he showed signs of wielding considerable authority although he played little role in securing Bohemond's release from captivity.<sup>253</sup> While Bohemond was in captivity Tancred took full advantage of the situation by consolidating the principality at the expense of the emperor Alexius.<sup>254</sup>

Tancred's personality has been described as warlike; he had a drive for battle and was an active participant of the first crusade.<sup>255</sup> These traits served him well during his time as regent as he followed a successful policy of territorial expansion through military conquest and negotiated the surrender of large areas of territory.<sup>256</sup> During his regency Tancred had two major periods of success; the recapture of Cilicia and the recapture of Tarsus, Ardana, Mamista and the capture of Latakia which forged an important link between Syria and the west.<sup>257</sup> Tancred reinforced an alliance with the Genoese; despite all of his achievements he was unpopular among his men<sup>258</sup>

In the early years of the principality Bohemond I and the Baldwin had experienced a close relationship; however there was no such relationship between Tancred and Baldwin which was strained at best and often openly hostile.<sup>259</sup> Tancred was too powerful a neighbour for

---

<sup>252</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 136  
Harold. S. Fink, 'The Foundations of the Latin States 1099- 1118,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), p. 144

<sup>253</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 52, 135

<sup>254</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 30

<sup>255</sup> Hans Mayer, *The Crusades*, (Oxford, 1972), p. 70

<sup>256</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 47

<sup>257</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 5 2

Ralph of Caen, *The Gesta Tancredi*, (Trans) B. S. Bachrach & D. S. Bachrach, (Surrey, 2010), p. 168

<sup>258</sup> Allan V. Murray, *The Crusades: An Encyclopaedia*, (Santa Barbara, 2006), p. 145

Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 81

<sup>259</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 108  
Allan V. Murray, *The Crusades: An Encyclopaedia*, (Santa Barbara, 2006), p. 135

Baldwin of Edessa and in an act similar to Bohemond's expulsion of Raymond of Toulouse's men, Tancred's first internal act as regent of Antioch was to expel all of the partisans of Baldwin of Le Bourg which caused further divisions between Edessa and Antioch and prevented Tancred from obtaining help from Baldwin in the future.<sup>260</sup>

As well as turning against his fellow crusaders after accepting the regency in 1101 Tancred also turned against the Greeks.<sup>261</sup> Byzantine pressure in Cilicia had prevented Bohemond expanding Antioch's frontiers and his attempt at taking Latakia had been blocked prior to his capture. This failure allowed Tancred the opportunity to expand Antioch as he wished; he had no intention of submitting to the Byzantines as he considered the oath sworn to them in regard to the return of Antioch as taken under duress from Bohemond.<sup>262</sup> His actions after assuming power suggest his main focus was to repel the Byzantines and to establish control of strategic Mediterranean ports in northern Syria.<sup>263</sup>

Within 18 months Tancred had expanded the frontiers of Antioch; by 1103 he had reclaimed lands in Maristra, Adana, Taurus and Latakia, though he failed to take Jabala in 1101<sup>264</sup>

Ralph of Caen states that upon the release of Bohemond in 1103 he had to relinquish all lands 'he had gained by his own effort' within the principality to Bohemond.<sup>265</sup>

---

<sup>260</sup> Harold. S. Fink, 'The Foundations of the Latin States 1099- 1118,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), pp. 71

<sup>261</sup> Ralph- Johannes Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States 1096-1204*, (Oxford, 1993), p. 70

<sup>262</sup> Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 83

<sup>263</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p 52

<sup>264</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 34

Peter Lock, *The Routledge Companion to the Crusades*, (London, 2006), p. 26-27

Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 78

Harold. S. Fink, 'The Foundations of the Latin States 1099- 1118,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), pp. 387

<sup>265</sup> Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 81

Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 53

The start of Tancred's second regency was far more precarious than his first; he returned to power in 1105 when Antioch seemed in its death throes due to the humiliation the army had suffered 6 months prior at the battle of Harran and it was financially crippled due to Bohemond. Between 1104 and 1108/9 Tancred was in effect ruler of two of the Latin states and was in an extraordinarily powerful position.<sup>266</sup>

During this period Tancred made efforts to meddle in the affairs of Jerusalem and ensured that Antioch was the dominant Latin power in the east, he made challenges to the position of the king of Jerusalem Baldwin I as he was head of the Latin rulers.<sup>267</sup>Tancred brought Antioch back from the brink after the battle of Harran as he restored stability and security to the principality. After he became regent for the second time he embarked on an ambitious expansion plan; it is due to this he received positive public opinion.<sup>268</sup>

Tancred's territorial expansion plan was much larger than that of his first regency; between 1106 and 1112 he focused on defending the principality and sought to develop a more aggressive military policy in order to gain control of key fortified sites on frontiers with enemies.<sup>269</sup>In 1105 Antioch faced a serious threat when Artah expelled its Latin garrison and allied with Ridwan of Aleppo, in retaliation he issued a call for all Christian men in the area to assist him; both Albert of Achen and Ibn- al Qalansi agree that many men responded to this call and quickly assembled.<sup>270</sup>

---

<sup>266</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 32

<sup>267</sup> Thomas Asbridge, 'The Significance Causes of the Field of Blood' *Journal of Medieval History*, 1997, Vol 23, 4 pp. 306

Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 35

<sup>268</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Crusades; The War for the Holy Land*, (London, 2010), p. 137

Thomas Asbridge, 'The Significance Causes of the Field of Blood' *Journal of Medieval History*, 1997, Vol 23, 4 pp. 306

<sup>269</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 59

<sup>270</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 57

Due to the assistance he received he was able to march out and recover the town in which he was victorious and successfully reoccupied Artah.<sup>271</sup>The battle of Artah was a major setback for Aleppo and a decisive victory for Tancred as the principality avoided the type of crisis seen after the battle of Harran; Artah paved the way for Tancred to make further conquests to the east of Antioch.<sup>272</sup>Tancred's expansion augmented the wealth and influence of Antioch; he was successful in recovering Cilicia, he incorporated the Ruj Valley and Jabala as Summaq, he occupied parts of Latakia, Beriyas, Sarmin, Tell Aghdi and briefly Jubail.<sup>273</sup>Tancred's Antioch dominated northern Syria and was strong enough to withstand Muslim invasions from Mawdud of Munsut between 1110 and 1113.<sup>274</sup>

Tancred reached the height of his power around 1108; he had been the ruler of Antioch and regent of Edessa for four years after Bohemond had returned to the west with Baldwin and Joscelin of Courtenay still being held in captivity. This left Tancred without a Christian rival in northern Syria and the conflict between the fractious Muslims allowed Tancred to take advantage and capture Muslim territory, it was during this time that power was said to have had a negative effect on Tancred and he became arrogant, distrusted and disliked.<sup>275</sup>

In regards to the Treaty of Devol Tancred did not consider himself subject to its conditions and therefore had no intention of following its stipulations ultimately rejected it.<sup>276</sup>Tancred

---

<sup>271</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 52

Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 57

<sup>272</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 59

<sup>273</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Crusades; The War for the Holy Land*, (London, 2010), p. 148

<sup>274</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *Gods War*, (London, 2006), p. 190

<sup>275</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 54, 107

<sup>276</sup> Ralph- Johannes Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States 1096-1204*, (Oxford, 1993), p. 80

Andrew Jotischy, *Crusading and the Crusader States*, (Harlow, 2004), p. 69

Jonathan Philips, *The Crusades 1095- 1197*, (Harlow, 2002), p. 30



had had a tumultuous relationship with the Byzantines since his stay in Constantinople prior to the capture of Antioch and he had attempted to evade pledging an oath to Alexius then.<sup>277</sup> At the time of his rejection of the treaty of Devol he had few men and little money but decided to take offensive anyway.<sup>278</sup> This is possibly due to the fact Alexius was too busy fighting the Seljuk's to enforce the treaty but if it had been carried out it would have meant an end to Tancred's power which would have been potentially devastating for crusaders.<sup>279</sup> Tancred's rejection of the treaty had little response from the Byzantines and Tancred was able to carry on much the same as he had prior to it.

Baldwin of Le Bourg was finally released from captivity in late 1108 at which point he returned to Edessa, however Tancred refused to hand the city back to him. This ultimately led to an invasion and eventual civil war by Baldwin and Joscelin. This issue escalated in early 1109 with a coalition of troops from Monsul and Edessa fighting against Ridwan in coalition with Tancred.<sup>280</sup> Tancred was able to demonstrate Antioch's strength and resolve against the troops during the revolt although he had to eventually concede defeat and return Edessa to Baldwin.<sup>281</sup>

The later part of his regency saw a change in the position of Tancred; during the early years he had faced threats to his position such as having to relinquish power on the return of Bohemond however after the death of Bohemond in 1111 he may have exercised the

---

Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 137

E. R. A. Sewter, (Trans), *The Alexiad of Anna Comnena*, (Suffolk, 1969), p. 438

<sup>277</sup> Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 7

<sup>278</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 51

<sup>279</sup> Hans Mayer, *The Crusades*, (Oxford, 1972), p. 72

<sup>280</sup> Harold. S. Fink, 'The Foundations of the Latin States 1099- 1118,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), p. 394

<sup>281</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 67, 112

authority of a prince in his own right.<sup>282</sup>It was in this latter period that Tancred made many of his most significant conquests on the eastern frontier; these included al Atharib in 1110 and Zardana in 1111, both of which were a blow to Aleppo.<sup>283</sup>Ridwan became desperate for a truce with Antioch in the aftermath of these defeats and a truce was agreed in late 1110-11.<sup>284</sup>Thanks to Tancred's zest for war Antioch was a strong state on his death in 1112 both in terms of its military capability and its wealth.<sup>285</sup>After Tancred's death there was little the Byzantines could do to recover Antioch as Roger of Salerno continued many of Tancred's policies.<sup>286</sup>

It is evident the Tancred was a capable ruler who left Antioch in a much stronger position than when he came to power. Thanks to Tancred, links between Syria and the west were forged and alliances were made. He followed a successful expansion plan and amalgamated vast areas of land under the principality; Artah was a particularly big success as it opened up the east further to the crusaders. Tancred had a good military record with the Latin's experiencing few losses under him, he was not captured by the enemy unlike many other leaders and he was successful in restoring Antioch after Harran despite having a depleted army and little wealth. Antioch became a dominant force under Tancred's leadership and he effectively ruled two of the Latin states.

---

<sup>282</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 65

<sup>283</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 65

<sup>284</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 118

Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 66

<sup>285</sup> Hans Mayer, *The Crusades*, (Oxford, 1972), p. 76

<sup>286</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 137

Like Bohemond, Tancred had somewhat of an ego; he had a strained relationship with Baldwin of Le Bourg which was the cause of many of Tancred's problems. His actions towards Baldwin soured their relationship and prevented Edessa from assisting Antioch. It was Tancred's reluctance to return Edessa which caused civil war between the two states and a further deterioration in relations.

He was dismissive of the Byzantines and did not acknowledge the treaty of Devol, he was lucky that the Byzantines were preoccupied with fighting the Turks or he may have experienced serious consequences for this. As he was regent for two of the Latin states power consumed him and he became unpopular with his men.

#### Roger of Salerno, Regent, (1112-1119)

After Tancred's death Bohemond II was still a minor and absent from Antioch. It is difficult to determine how Bohemond's claims were regarded but an area in a constant state of war needed an adult male and so Tancred passed the regency to his nephew Roger of Salerno who ruled Antioch from 1113 until 1119. He continued Tancred's policy of expansion but unlike Tancred Roger's reign is not remembered for widespread expansion, rather the calamity of the Field of Blood.<sup>287</sup> Instead of pursuing wide spread expansion Roger seems to have been content subduing Muslim neighbours and placing them under indirect military pressure and receiving tribute payment from them.

---

<sup>287</sup> John France, *The Crusades and the Expansion of Catholic Christendom 1000-1714*, (Oxon, 2005), p. 117  
Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 137

During Roger's reign there was little to no threat from the Byzantines and gains could have been made in the east and in the south if Roger had pursued them.<sup>288</sup>In his early rule Roger focused on strengthening relations with the count of Edessa and he displayed admirable qualities of leadership in Antioch and surrounding towns.<sup>289</sup>Throughout his reign Roger was constantly at war with his Muslim neighbours, though there was no considerable threat to Antioch until 1115. During his reign Roger faced crisis from a series of earthquakes between 1114 and 1115 which destroyed numerous fortifications within the principality and had to be rebuilt, this could potentially have allowed easier access to Antioch for the enemies if Roger had not taken such care to rebuild them.<sup>290</sup>

The Franks had wished to capture Aleppo since the first crusade; they had besieged the city in 1098 though this campaign was unsuccessful and since then there had been several small raiding campaigns. After the death of Ridwan in 1113 Aleppo became torn by faction and Roger was able to take parts of its territory, Aleppo in all but name became a tributary of Antioch.<sup>291</sup>There was a short period of peace between the crusader states and Aleppo, it may eventually have been incorporated into the principality if Muslim disunity had continued and if Roger, Baldwin II and Pons of Tripoli had formed a coalition they could have posed a serious threat and perhaps taken Aleppo.<sup>292</sup>Instead they mirrored the factious nature of the Muslim states, acting in their own interest which ultimately led to the

---

<sup>288</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 69

<sup>289</sup> Allan V. Murray, *The Crusades: An Encyclopaedia*, (Santa Barbara, 2006), p. 1045

Peter Lock, *The Routledge Companion to the Crusades*, (London, 2006), p. 250

Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 123

<sup>290</sup> Allan V. Murray, *The Crusades: An Encyclopaedia*, (Santa Barbara, 2006), p. 1045

Thomas Asbridge & Susan Edginton, (Trans) *Walter the Chancellor's the Antiochene Wars*, (Hampshire, 1998), p. 84

<sup>291</sup> Bernard Hamilton, *The Crusades*, (Gloucestershire, 1998), p. 19

<sup>292</sup> Andrew Jotischy, *Crusading and the Crusader States*, (Harlow, 2004), p. 69

downfall of Roger; the crusaders had not learned the lessons of the Muslims and therefore suffered their fate in defeat.

The First real military threat to principality came in 1115 when Bursuq ibn Bursuq engaged Roger in the battle of Tell Daish however he was defeated with the help of his fellow Franks along with the forces of Il-Ghazi-ibn and Tughtegin. Roger had marched out in battle initially alarmed by Il-Ghazi and Tughtegin and he had departed Antioch expecting to engage in military action against them, instead he received an alliance.<sup>293</sup>The victory led to a high point in Roger's reign and Antioch was considered a formidable political and military force which allowed Roger to place immense pressure on Aleppo.<sup>294</sup>

Between 1115 and 1119 Roger made some important conquests south of Antioch, like Tancred Roger took advantage of political situation of Aleppo and gained castles and treaties.<sup>295</sup>In 1119 governance of Aleppo was given to Il-Ghazi whom after enduring years of Antiochene expansion and demands for tribute proceeded to move to the offensive and formed an alliance with Damascus in order to regain territorial losses, until then Aleppo had generally attacked only when the Franks were distracted or weak.<sup>296</sup>In particular it was the capture of Azaz the previous year which forced Il- Ghazi to act in response to the expansion of Antioch; his intention was to push back the Latin frontier<sup>297</sup>

---

<sup>293</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 70

<sup>294</sup> Allan V. Murray, *The Crusades: An Encyclopaedia*, (Santa Barbara, 2006), p. 1045

<sup>295</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 73

<sup>296</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 49  
Bernard Hamilton, *The Crusades*, (Gloucestershire, 1998), p. 19

Thomas Asbridge, *The Crusades; The War for the Holy Land*, (London, 2010), p. 163

<sup>297</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 75

In June 1119 Il-Ghazi invaded Antioch, it is reported the Artoqid army was 40,000 men strong and it was on this report that Roger was urged to appeal to Baldwin II and Pons of Tripoli for reinforcements; Roger was subsequently advised by Baldwin to act on the defensive until he arrived however Roger decided not to wait for the promised reinforcements from Jerusalem and Tripoli but instead decided to engage with the Muslim army; this foolish act is the most serious example of Roger putting Antioch in danger.<sup>298</sup>

Acting on his decision to meet Il-Ghazi he led whole army of Antioch across the iron bridge and camped in front of fort of Tel-Aqibrin.<sup>299</sup> Il-Ghazi was quickly informed of Roger's movement and he was urged to act.<sup>300</sup> On 29<sup>th</sup> of June Roger allowed his army to become encircled by Il-Ghazi's troops and a fierce battle followed, the scene was carnage with sections of the army deserting, captured or killed. Roger himself was slain which resulted in the principality being left virtually defenceless. According to Mayer the battle created a sense of calamity throughout the Latin east as a whole. After the Field of Blood Antioch called for help from the west which was its only appeal except for Bohemond's plea in 1100.<sup>301</sup> According to Walter the Chancellor Roger's decision to act was influenced by his barons who were motivated by attacks on their land and wished for a quick resolution.<sup>302</sup> It is evident that Roger was easily swayed and was prepared to go to dangerous lengths to appease his barons; this suggests weak leadership.

---

<sup>298</sup> Hans Mayer, *The Crusades*, (Oxford, 1972), p. 78

Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 148

Thomas Asbridge & Susan Edginton, (Trans) *Walter the Chancellor's the Antiochene Wars*, (Hampshire, 1998), p. 112

<sup>299</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 149

<sup>300</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 149

<sup>301</sup> Jonathan Philips, *Defenders of the Holy Land: Relations Between the Latin East and the West 1119-1187*, (Oxfordshire, 1996), p. 2

<sup>302</sup> Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 122

The Field of Blood caused the Franks to lose much of the security they had gained; it triggered the biggest emergency to date for Antioch as it left the principality open to conquest.<sup>303</sup> Il-Ghazi did not capitalise on his defeat; no attempt was made on the city of Antioch itself despite it being defended only by the citizens, although it would be difficult to hold even if he had taken it.<sup>304</sup> Both Walter the chancellor and Ibn-al-Qalanisi expressed shock in their writing that Il-Ghazi did not attack Antioch after their victory<sup>305</sup>

Walter the Chancellor was a contemporary eyewitness of Roger of Salerno's regency and latter sections of his chronicle the *Bella Antiochena* were written at the time of the Field of Blood, a time when the principality was particularly vulnerable.<sup>306</sup>

Il-Ghazi failed to attack any key fortifications within the principality immediately after Field of Blood, according to Mathew of Edessa Il-Ghazi did proceed to terrorise the principality by taking Artah and with some raiding around city of Antioch and the port of St Simeon. It is probable that areas such as al-Athrib and Zardana were too strongly guarded to be a target of Il-Ghazi.<sup>307</sup> In retrospect the crusaders were lucky that more damage was not inflicted as they could have been decimated; Il-Ghazi may have been in a position to take Antioch if he had been more alert instead of retreating to Aleppo which ended any direct danger to the principality.<sup>308</sup>

---

<sup>303</sup> Jonathan Philips, *The Second Crusade: Extending the Frontiers of Christendom*, (Hampshire, 2010), p. 11

<sup>304</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 79

Allan V. Murray, *The Crusades: An Encyclopaedia*, (Santa Barbara, 2006), p. 1046

Robert L. Nicholson, 'The Growth of the Latin States 1118- 1144,' in M. W. Baldwin & K.M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), pp. 413

Harold. S. Fink, 'The Foundations of the Latin States 1099- 1118,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), pp. 405

Paul M. Cobb, *The Race for Paradise: An Islamic History of the Crusades*, (Oxford, 2014), p. 123

<sup>305</sup> Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 128

<sup>306</sup> Thomas Asbridge, 'The Impact of Islam and Byzantium Upon the Crusader Community at Antioch,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th series, Vol. 9, (1999), p. 309

<sup>307</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 76-77

Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 123

<sup>308</sup> Thomas Asbridge, 'The Significance Causes of the Field of Blood' *Journal of Medieval History*, 1997, Vol 23, 4, pp. 303

Despite the fact more could have been taken after the Field of Blood it was still a territorial disaster for Antioch; the size of principality reduced dramatically however many of the territorial losses were temporary. It is fortunate that the Franks were only attacked by Muslims and not also by the Byzantines as it was in the wake of like Harran; in contrast to the aftermath of the battle Harran of Antioch failed to recover quickly from losses incurred after Rogers's death.<sup>309</sup>

Rogers's death was a shock to the Franks; prior to the Field of Blood no Latin ruler had fallen in battle. Antioch was placed in an extremely vulnerable position as there were few Frankish defenders as most of the knights of Antioch had fallen in battle. Roger's death sparked a succession crisis within Antioch as he had died childless and so the principality temporarily depended on the leadership of senior clergy Until Baldwin II was able to assume the regency.<sup>310</sup> Antioch was characterised by uncertainties and chaos after 1119 but Rainald Masoir built up a strong lordship in the south principality and acted as regent when Baldwin was absent and also after his death in 1131.<sup>311</sup>

Despite being in a stronger position than the Franks the Muslims were still weak after their victory, evidence is seen in the decreasing Muslim threat after Il-Ghazi's death in 1123 which temporarily eased the Muslim threat until the rise of Zengi in 1128. Furthermore there was a lack of Muslim offensive action towards Antioch in the wake of Baldwin II's capture in 1123.<sup>312</sup>

---

Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 155

<sup>309</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 81

<sup>310</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Crusades; The War for the Holy Land*, (London, 2010), p. 166

Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 124

<sup>311</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *Gods War*, (London, 2006), p. 191

<sup>312</sup> Bernard Hamilton, *The Crusades*, (Gloucestershire, 1998), p. 19-20



Roger began his reign well; he initially displayed good leadership qualities and was able to strengthen relations with Edessa. Although he did not make many territorial gains he was able to ensure a high profile victory in 1115 after which Antioch was a force to be reckoned with. Roger was able to gain a short lived truce with Aleppo and due to this he was able to expand the wealth of Antioch. Roger did not experience any significant pressure from Byzantium during his reign.

However Roger's actions brought serious crisis to Antioch which would have serious repercussions until the reign of Alice and beyond. Roger almost took Aleppo in 1113 after many years of skirmishes with the city's leaders; Roger and the other Latin leaders failed to act in a coalition, if they had taken Aleppo they could have seriously reduced the threat of the Muslims and prevented a united Muslim force which ultimately could have prevented the Field of Blood as well as the addition of an important city to their territory. His failure to listen to Baldwin's advice resulted in most of the nobility of Antioch being killed at the Field of Blood which put Antioch in unnecessary danger. Due to Roger's rash decision Antioch lost a lot of territory after the battle and it was unable to recover them quickly. Roger cost the principality dearly however he does not receive overly negative criticism from any sources for doing so.

### Baldwin II, Regent, (1119- 1126), (1131)

---

Robert L. Nicholson, 'The Growth of the Latin States 1118- 1144,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), pp. 414

Malcolm Billings, M, *The Cross and the Crescent: A History of the Crusades*, (London, 1987), p. 81

After Roger's death Antioch had no permanent ruler within the principality, it was around a month after the Field of Blood that Baldwin II and Pons of Tripoli arrived in Antioch. On arrival they were greeted with the news of some significant frontier losses for Antioch; the Field of Blood had exposed the Latin's' vulnerability which in turn was exacerbated by the Seljuk's' constant attacks on the principality during the reign of Baldwin II.<sup>313</sup> After the death of Ridwan Roger of Salerno had been able to seize large parts of Aleppen territory though in the aftermath of the Field of Blood Aleppo regained most of what it had lost.

Baldwin II came to Antioch at a time of crisis for the principality; he was an able candidate as he was the current king of Jerusalem and had previously been count of Edessa. When Baldwin arrived in Antioch his first action was to establish authority within the principality; he met with the nobles to discuss its future governance with Bohemond being just eleven years old and residing in Italy.<sup>314</sup> It was decided by unanimous decision that Baldwin would govern until Bohemond came of age and that he would then marry Baldwin's daughter Alice.<sup>315</sup> After negotiating terms with the nobles Baldwin set about replenishing Antioch's depleted defences with the help of Roger's widow.<sup>316</sup>

It was lucky Il-Ghazi did not capitalise on his victory as this allowed Baldwin time to push his troops back.<sup>317</sup> Thanks to this and the leadership of Baldwin II the Aleppens were unable to push further into Antioch, it was the intervention of Baldwin II which inevitably saved

---

<sup>313</sup> Andrew Jotischy, *Crusading and the Crusader States*, (Harlow, 2004), p. 76

Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 77

<sup>314</sup> Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 125

<sup>315</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 152

<sup>316</sup> Robert L. Nicholson, 'The Growth of the Latin States 1118- 1144,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), pp. 413

<sup>317</sup> Hans Mayer, *The Crusades*, (Oxford, 1972), p. 79

Antioch after the Field of Blood; Baldwin's arrival and quick action ensured its survival.<sup>318</sup> Similar to Tancred assuming the regency of Edessa and Antioch in 1104 Baldwin became both king of Jerusalem and regent of Antioch; in effect he ruled all of Latin east thus wielding enormous control over the principality which reduced its individual power. Mathew of Edessa was of the opinion that Baldwin's conduct in defending Antioch was testament to his integrity, though soon after Baldwin was required to return to Jerusalem for his coronation at which point Bernard the Patriarch was left in a position of power to administer Antioch.<sup>319</sup>

From the beginning of his reign Baldwin II was simultaneously attacked by Aleppo and Byzantium and so much of the first half of Baldwin's reign was concerned with the defence of the principality of Antioch; he was forced to return to Antioch 1120 as Il-Ghazi had begun to raid Antiochene territory, although a truce between the two was eventually agreed.<sup>320</sup> Baldwin led several campaigns on behalf of Antioch between 1120 and 1123 and it was during a campaign in 1123 in which Baldwin was captured by Muslim forces, at which point Patriarch Bernard again acted as an authority figure within Antioch.<sup>321</sup> After Baldwin was released in 1124 he laid siege to Aleppo, this campaign failed forcing Baldwin and his

---

<sup>318</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Crusades; The War for the Holy Land*, (London, 2010), p. 166

Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 125

Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 155

<sup>319</sup> Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 150

Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 154

<sup>320</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 158-9

<sup>321</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 162

Allan V. Murray, *The Crusades: An Encyclopaedia*, (Santa Barbara, 2006), p. 135

Bernard Hamilton, *The Crusades*, (Gloucestershire, 1998), p. 17

troops back to Antioch and a new Muslim offensive being launched against the principality.<sup>322</sup>

Under Baldwin Antioch suffered as it did not having consistent leadership as Baldwin had to spilt his attention between Antioch and Jerusalem, its fortunes deteriorated further during Baldwin's incarceration between 1123 and 1124.<sup>323</sup> 1125 was a significant year for the crusaders; they marched out and fought the Seljuk forces at the battle of Azaz, despite having a significantly smaller army the crusaders were victorious and were able to reclaim much of the territory lost after the Field of Blood, resulting in Baldwin being regarded as a formidable enemy by the Muslims.<sup>324</sup> Despite this victory Antioch and Edessa once again became engaged in fights between themselves, once again they had the opportunity to take Aleppo and again they failed to do so. It is significant they did not take Aleppo as this would have prevented the rise of Zengi in 1128 and the eventual unification of the Muslim troops. However the future was impossible to predict and Baldwin was regarded as a successful regent of Antioch due to recapturing land and replenishing the wealth of Antioch, this opinion was before the ascension of Zengi and the capture of Edessa in 1144.<sup>325</sup>

When Bohemond II came to Antioch in 1126 it is likely that Baldwin was glad to be free of Antioch and its constant need for defence. Baldwin is said to have welcomed Bohemond with every mark of honour and promptly handed over the principality to him.<sup>326</sup> It is certain that Baldwin would have hoped the arrival of Bohemond and his marriage to Alice in early

---

<sup>322</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 87

Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 22

<sup>323</sup> Thomas Asbridge, 'The Significance Causes of the Field of Blood' *Journal of Medieval History*, 1997, Vol 23, 4 pp. 306

<sup>324</sup> Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 151

<sup>325</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 81

Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 9

<sup>326</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 176

1127 would stabilize the government and provide the principality with the military leadership it had lacked since Roger of Salerno.<sup>327</sup>

Acting as regent of Antioch and king of Jerusalem came at a cost for Baldwin; questions began to arise in Jerusalem questioning his commitment to the city. It was Baldwin's preoccupation with Antioch's affairs which appears to have caused resentment among Jerusalem's nobility; there was even a possible faction who were said to have wished to see him replaced.<sup>328</sup> This resentment grew enormously between 1119- 1126 as Baldwin spent more and more time protecting the vulnerable principality of Antioch; it is estimated Baldwin spent less than 40% of his time in Jerusalem.<sup>329</sup> Tughtegin believed that Baldwin's undertaking of the dual role of king of Jerusalem and regent of Antioch prevented him from ruling either state efficiently.<sup>330</sup>

The survival of Antioch is evidently thanks to Baldwin's arrival to the principality and his subsequent defence of it throughout his regency. He was able to successfully push Il-Ghazi's forces back and prevent any further territorial losses as well as assist Antioch in regaining its wealth. Baldwin tirelessly campaigned on Antioch's behalf and was able to retrieve most of the territory which was lost after the Field of Blood.

Despite his contributions Baldwin plunged Antioch into a crisis unbeknown to the principality at the time; the crusaders failure to take Aleppo could have prevented the rise

---

<sup>327</sup> Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 152

<sup>328</sup> Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 151

<sup>329</sup> Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 137

<sup>330</sup> Robert L. Nicholson, 'The Growth of the Latin States 1118- 1144,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), pp. 416

of Zengi, the implications of which were experienced during the reign of Bohemond II, Alice and beyond. This was mainly due to in-fighting between Antioch and Edessa; a lesson learned neither from the Muslims nor the case of Tancred and Baldwin. Aleppo could have been taken in 1124 which would have prevented a Muslim offensive against Antioch and allowed more time for the Christians to consolidate their gains. Baldwin drastically weakened Antioch's standing due to his position of king of Jerusalem and regent of Antioch; Jerusalem was ultimately his priority and he would therefore not wish for the principality to become more powerful than Jerusalem. It was this joint tenure which prevented either state from having constant leadership and the splitting of time between the two was bad for both of them.

### Bohemond II, (1126- 1131)

Bohemond's arrival to Antioch was welcomed and he was instantly a popular ruler; initially it appeared that Antioch's golden years were set to be repeated as Bohemond had the ambition of restoring all the lands his principality had ever held as well as incorporating new lands into the principality.<sup>331</sup> In the opinion of William of Tyre Bohemond made a promising start; he launched a campaign to recapture Kafartab in 1127 which was successful and after this there were some skirmishes against Shaizar. Despite his early success Bohemond did not recapture Albara or establish full authority over Jabal as- Summaq after its loss during the Field of Blood although he did make attempts to push forces out of Jabal as- Summaq.<sup>332</sup>

---

<sup>331</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 182

Bernard Hamilton, *The Crusades*, (Gloucestershire, 1998), p. 20

<sup>332</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 89  
Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 151

With the exception of Kafartab, 1127 was a peaceful year for the principality as there is little documentation which suggests no significant Muslim or Byzantine aggression towards the principality.<sup>333</sup> Despite his assertion that Bohemond made a promising start William ignored the fact that Bohemond let failed to capture Aleppo in late 1126, continuing the trend of previous leaders.<sup>334</sup>

Peace did not last long; Joscelin and Bohemond became engaged in disputes over Antioch, while Bohemond was campaigning in Cilicia Joscelin summoned Turkish forces and together they ravaged the principality, war ultimately broke out between them but eventually the two reconciled.<sup>335</sup> The conflict between Joscelin and Bohemond was the catalyst which allowed Zengi to secure rule over Mosul in 1127 and Aleppo in 1228, thus uniting the two cities and gaining the support of Mahmud II (1118-1131) Sultan of Baghdad.

Continuing his offensive against the Muslims Bohemond marched towards Anazahus in Cilicia in February 1130 to fight against the Danishmend Emir Gazi Gümüshtigin.

Bohemond's army was massacred and Bohemond himself was killed during the battle, his death was a disaster for Antioch as he was an effective soldier and it led to prolonged succession crisis.<sup>336</sup> On his death hereditary right to Antioch passed to his two year old daughter Constance however Alice assumed the regency and it was at this time rumours began to circulate that she did not wish to rule as regent but as sovereign.<sup>337</sup> Aleppo

---

<sup>333</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 176

<sup>334</sup> Hans Mayer, *The Crusades*, (Oxford, 1972), p. 84

<sup>335</sup> Robert L. Nicholson, 'The Growth of the Latin States 1118- 1144,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), pp. 428

Allan V. Murray, *The Crusades: An Encyclopaedia*, (Santa Barbara, 2006), p. 177

Peter Lock, *The Routledge Companion to the Crusades*, (London, 2006), p. 39

Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 34

<sup>336</sup> John France, *The Crusades and the Expansion of Catholic Christendom 1000-1714*, (Oxon, 2005), p. 118

<sup>337</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 183

capitalised on the death of Bohemond and attacked Ma'rrat Mesrin and Al-Athrib, Zengi sought to reassert Muslim authority over eastern frontier of the principality and besieged al-Athrib in spring 1130<sup>338</sup>

Little else is known of Bohemond's reign other than it was marked by the renewal of Antiochene aggression, Alice therefore came to power in a time of renewed aggression with Aleppo which was caused by her husband. Antioch was ill equipped to deal with this aggression as there was no suitable male available to continue with Bohemond's offensive.<sup>339</sup>

Bohemond II was both a strength and a weakness for Antioch; he was ambitious and crafty, ironically this is how Alice has been described by William of Tyre however as a male Bohemond has been remembered more favourably by history.<sup>340</sup> He temporarily revived the position of Antioch to a strong principality; he regained territory and had the ambition to expand further however his early death prevented this.

Bohemond allowed a third chance to capture Aleppo go by and it was this failure which had the most profound effect on the principality due to the rise of Zengi. Once again preoccupation with fights between Edessa and Antioch hindered the crusader effort and allowed the unification of Mosul and Aleppo. Bohemond's untimely death resulted in a catastrophe for the principality in the form of a succession crisis, the most important question from this event is thus; was Alice acting in what she thought was best for her

---

<sup>338</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 90

<sup>339</sup> Allan V. Murray, *The Crusades: An Encyclopaedia*, (Santa Barbara, 2006), p. 177

Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 89

<sup>340</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 1: The First Crusade and the Foundations of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*, (London, 1990, p. 372



daughter or as William of Tyre has portrayed was she a rebellious, vindictive woman who acted in her own self interest and brought the principality into chaos.

## Chapter 5

### Alice of Antioch

No known contemporary sources were written during the time of Alice's reign, little is known of Antioch during this period and the only account we have of Alice is William's but it is unknown which sources he used to write his account of Alice.<sup>341</sup> Thanks to William's portrayal of her Alice has been remembered by history as a ruthless woman who went to disgraceful lengths to seize power.<sup>342</sup> She had personal and political ambitions, the intent to disinherit her daughter and was none-conforming to gender roles; both as a daughter and as a mother.<sup>343</sup>

In William's account Alice is notorious for seizing control of Antioch for which she had no legal claim to and for defying her father by barring his entry from Antioch. In Williams account it is Alice's actions which are blamed for leading to a series of disputes among the Franks.<sup>344</sup> Alice was portrayed in a less positive light than her sister Melisende; in contrast to Melisende Alice was depicted by William as devious, disruptive and set out to bring Antioch under her 'tyrannical will.'<sup>345</sup>

---

<sup>341</sup> Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 145

<sup>342</sup> Hans Mayer, *The Crusades*, (Oxford, 1972), p. 84

<sup>343</sup> Jonathan Philips, *Defenders of the Holy Land: Relations Between the Latin East and the West 1119-1187*, (Oxfordshire, 1996), p. 45

<sup>344</sup> Jonathan Philips, *Defenders of the Holy Land: Relations Between the Latin East and the West 1119-1187*, (Oxfordshire, 1996), p. 44

<sup>345</sup> Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 45

Alice had always been destined to forge an alliance between Jerusalem and Antioch however she was simply to be a consort; unlike Melisende in Jerusalem Alice had no hereditary claim to Antioch as Baldwin II was only the regent of the principality after Roger of Salerno's death. It was a role Baldwin had always intended to end once the legitimate heir Bohemond II was of age to claim.<sup>346</sup>Baldwin was eager to return to Jerusalem upon the arrival of Bohemond however he also wished to keep Antioch closely tied and less powerful than Jerusalem thus the marriage between Bohemond and Alice was instrumental in facilitating this.<sup>347</sup>Alice's marriage would have been a typical dynastic marriage similar to those in the west; Alice had no say and it was necessary for the political manoeuvring of her family.

William's writing is full of praise for Bohemond II; he placed high regard on his reign of Antioch while Alice was barely mentioned in William's work except for a small passage acknowledging the two were wed.<sup>348</sup>During her marriage Alice is not reported as playing any significant role; it appears she acted in the expected way as wife and queen during these years. Alice was not included in the address clause of her husband or on the witness list and there is little official trace of Alice until Baldwin's death which gives the impression of her appearing onto the political scene from nowhere in the aftermath of Bohemond's death.<sup>349</sup>As there is little mention of Alice while Bohemond was alive we must surmise that Alice was not attempting to take power or attempting to dominate her husband as was

---

<sup>346</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 1, 81

<sup>347</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 127

<sup>348</sup> Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 143

<sup>349</sup> Thomas Asbridge, 'Alice of Antioch: A Case Study of Female Power in the Twelfth Century' in P. Edbury & J. Philips (ed.), *The Experience of Crusading 2: Defending the Crusader Kingdom*, (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 31

evident in the case of Adela of Bloise; Alice only attempted to take power in order to act as regent for her daughter.

Alice became the focus of Williams work after the death of her husband; within it she is depicted as a figure of carnage in Antioch due to her attempt on three separate occasions to take power.<sup>350</sup> William depicts Bohemond's death as disaster for Antioch; he states that 'Bohemond had the potential to be a great king, his death devastated the people.'<sup>351</sup> On his death Bohemond left no male heir merely an infant daughter, Antioch required suitable male leadership during this period and it could be argued that Alice had failed to provide this. However, Bohemond died just four years into their marriage and so it is highly probable the two would have had more children if he had lived, with a son likely born eventually.<sup>352</sup>

As Constance was just two this would ensure a long regency; the appointed regent would have to be a strong individual. Under normal circumstances a mother would be permitted to act as regent until her child came of age, Alice however did not wait for Baldwin to announce this and instead took the initiative to act on behalf of her daughter.<sup>353</sup> William states that Alice's claim was opposed by most of the local magnates and so she sought support from her Muslim neighbours.<sup>354</sup> Her 'wicked plan' was to approaching Zengi and agree a truce which would free Antioch of the Muslim threat and allow Alice to take Antioch

---

<sup>350</sup> Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 152

<sup>351</sup> Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 43

<sup>352</sup> Thomas Asbridge, 'Alice of Antioch: A Case Study of Female Power in the Twelfth Century' in P. Edbury & J. Philips (ed.), *The Experience of Crusading 2: Defending the Crusader Kingdom*, (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 32

<sup>353</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 182- 183

<sup>354</sup> Jonathan Philips, 'The Latin East 1098-1291' in J. Riley- Smith (ed.), *A History of the Crusades*, (Oxford, 1999), pp. 120

and disinherit her daughter, this alliance was deeply unpopular with the nobility of Antioch.<sup>355</sup>

Antioch had been weak since the Field of Blood due to a combination of territorial loss, depletion in its wealth, losing prestige to Jerusalem and multiple failures to take the Muslim stronghold of Aleppo which would have eradicated a powerful Muslim threat. In the 1130s Antioch was under serious threat of invasion therefore a man was needed to act as regent to defend it; Alice was unsuitable to engage in military action which may be why her regency was met with trepidation rather than the broad rational of her being a woman.<sup>356</sup>

William himself outlines the importance of a male regent after the death of Bohemond stating that 'again they renewed their lamentations, complaining that without the help of a prince they were in danger of falling prey to their enemy.'<sup>357</sup> This suggests that he would not have approved of Alice regardless of her actions; his disapproval was based solely on her gender.

Antioch placed great emphasis on military strength and the ability to lead in battle; it was usually a role reserved for males therefore a dangerous power vacuum was created if the

---

<sup>355</sup> Jonathan Philips, *Defenders of the Holy Land: Relations Between the Latin East and the West 1119-1187*, (Oxfordshire, 1996), p. 48

Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 44

<sup>356</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 183

Jonathan Philips, *Defenders of the Holy Land: Relations Between the Latin East and the West 1119-1187*, (Oxfordshire, 1996), p. 47

<sup>357</sup> Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 44

principality's authority depended on a woman or infant heir. This power vacuum resulted in perceived military weakness and in turn possible political turmoil.<sup>358</sup>

Due to this Baldwin intended to make himself regent of Antioch, from William's work it is evident Alice was unaware of her father's intention;

*'As soon as his daughter learned of her husband's death and in fact before she was aware of her father's intention to come to Antioch, an evil spirit led her to conceive a wicked plan.'*<sup>359</sup>

It is probable Alice was acting how she felt best for her daughter and Antioch; she recognised the threat from the growing Muslim unity and wished to protect Constance's claim. Furthermore, Melisende received no criticism from William for actively preventing her son taking the throne whereas Alice was trying to protect Constance's; therefore William is unbalanced in this representation.

Williams's depiction of Alice as calculated in approaching Zengi to ensure her personal position is puzzling and raises several questions; firstly, how did she have time to concoct all these plans after Bohemond's death but have no knowledge that her father was planning to come to Antioch to assume the regency. Moreover, how did she plan on keeping power if most of the nobles opposed her, as stated by William.

Secondly, if Alice did send letters to Zengi then why have no copies of them been recorded or why is there no mention of Alice approaching Zengi in the Muslim sources. Even though the messenger was said to have been caught, interrogated and confessed to the plot there

---

<sup>358</sup> Jonathan Philips, *Defenders of the Holy Land: Relations Between the Latin East and the West 1119-1187*, (Oxfordshire, 1996), p. 19

<sup>359</sup> Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 44

are no reports in other crusader sources which shows the circumstances of William's claim is questionable; did the messenger confess under torture or did this event happen at all.<sup>360</sup>

Thirdly, there had been several instances of the Franks making alliances with the Muslims and given the fact Antioch was facing increased pressure from Zengi why would this have been a bad thing as he went on to invade the principality in 1130 with a truce agreed in late 1130 or early 1131.<sup>361</sup>

Lastly, if the accusation of Alice attempting to forge a personal alliance is true it must be questioned why she did not try and contact him again prior to his invasion later invasion of Antioch or once she had been banished to her dower lands.

William's description of Alice's power struggle centred on Alice's intention of making herself ruler of Antioch. Despite William's claim she was 'determined to disinherit her daughter and keep the principality for herself,' it is unclear if Alice did intend on disinheriting Constance or if she intended to rule as regent as William was the only one who suggested Alice's intention was to disinherit Constance.<sup>362</sup> If William's account of Alice is true then she was simply a usurper who acted in a way contrary to the interests of her daughter. Despite William's claim he provided no tangible example of how Alice did this; she did not send her daughter away as Melisende had, at this point she did she proclaim herself as queen or issues charters as other women such as Adela and Matilda had, therefore William's accusation is unsubstantiated.

---

<sup>360</sup> Robert L. Nicholson, 'The Growth of the Latin States 1118- 1144,' in M. W. Baldwin & K.M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), pp. 431

<sup>361</sup> Robert L. Nicholson, 'The Growth of the Latin States 1118- 1144,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), pp. 433

<sup>362</sup> Thomas Asbridge, 'Alice of Antioch: A Case Study of Female Power in the Twelfth Century' in P. Edbury & J. Philips (ed.), *The Experience of Crusading 2: Defending the Crusader Kingdom*, (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 32  
Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 44

The laws of Antioch were clear that a widow was permitted to take control of the lands of a minor heir until they came of age; therefore Alice's challenge was legitimate as has been discussed in the cases of several women in earlier chapters, therefore it is unlikely that Alice's gender alone would have prevented her from taking power.<sup>363</sup> Historians such as Cahen have argued that despite any formal legal restraints on female rule the powerful men of Antioch opposed female regencies due to the influence of French Salic law and Tancred structuring the principality under Norman values.<sup>364</sup>

The only claim William can provide which casts a shadow on Alice is that Baldwin was initially barred entry to Antioch by Alice on his arrival. As women were unable to engage in fighting or military action the systematic barricade of Antioch suggests a large military force working for Alice which infers moderate support from some of the powerful men of the city. William believed she did this by bribing soldiers and citizens to ensure their support as she had few followers from 'the great men' or from population at large.<sup>365</sup> In his work William depicted Alice as a defiant daughter and more importantly defiant of the monarchy whose word equated to a command from god; it is highly likely that as archbishop this action would have incensed William the most.

---

<sup>363</sup> Thomas Asbridge, 'Alice of Antioch: A Case Study of Female Power in the Twelfth Century' in P. Edbury & J. Philips (ed.), *The Experience of Crusading 2: Defending the Crusader Kingdom*, (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 32

<sup>364</sup> Natasha Hodgson, *Women, Crusading and the Holy Land*, (Suffolk, 2007), p. 182

<sup>365</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 184

Thomas Asbridge, 'Alice of Antioch: A Case Study of Female Power in the Twelfth Century' in P. Edbury & J. Philips (ed.), *The Experience of Crusading 2: Defending the Crusader Kingdom*, (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 29

Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 45

Thomas Asbridge, 'Alice of Antioch: A Case Study of Female Power in the Twelfth Century' in P. Edbury & J. Philips (ed.), *The Experience of Crusading 2: Defending the Crusader Kingdom*, (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 33



Once again William gave a harsh depiction of Alice however he is unable to provide evidence of how Alice could have taken control of Antioch and crucially how she managed to bar entrance to her father. It must be questioned how she was able to bribe people on such a large scale; Antioch had steadily lost wealth after the Field of Blood and the reinforcements needed to fortify the city against Baldwin would have cost Alice immensely. This claim is also contrary to William's earlier assertion that Alice did not know of her father's plan to take the regency; how would she have been able to bar entry to him if she did not know he was coming. As was discussed in the reliability of William's writing I feel that William's contradiction of events proves he misrepresented Alice and the sequence of events in this case.

William's writing is contrary to Maalouf who argues that on hearing of her husband's death Alice had support from the Armenian, Greek and Syrian population of Antioch.<sup>366</sup>This may suggest there was a faction of nobles in place within Antioch which was intent on removing Alice.<sup>367</sup>The nobility could overturn her legal position as regent; if Alice had broken the nobility she could have successfully taken Antioch.<sup>368</sup>

Despite allegation of bribery Alice did not maintain her support and the gates were open to Baldwin, Alice fled to the citadel and eventually begged her father for forgiveness who subsequently exiled Alice to her dower lands of Latakia and Jabala.<sup>369</sup>Alice was still regarded

---

<sup>366</sup> Amin Maalouf, *The Crusades Through Arab Eyes*, (London, 2004), p. 115

<sup>367</sup> Jonathan Philips, *Defenders of the Holy Land: Relations Between the Latin East and the West 1119-1187*, (Oxfordshire, 1996), p. 48

<sup>368</sup> Jonathan Philips, *Defenders of the Holy Land: Relations Between the Latin East and the West 1119-1187*, (Oxfordshire, 1996), p. 47

<sup>369</sup> Robert L. Nicholson, 'The Growth of the Latin States 1118- 1144,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), pp. 431

Natasha Hodgson, *Women, Crusading and the Holy Land*, (Suffolk, 2007), p. 68

as a threat to Antioch and so an oath was sworn by the nobles to ensure Antioch remained safe for Constance as Baldwin reportedly ‘feared the wicked malice of his own daughter.’<sup>370</sup>

It is unlikely that Baldwin would have feared a challenge from Alice if she did not have moderate support; one woman alone posed little threat to Baldwin and the might of Jerusalem. The fact he required an oath to be sworn indicates that Alice had more support than William accepts. In the case of Matilda, an oath was reportedly sworn twice to ensure loyalty to her; the requirement of an oath to be sworn to Constance must have demonstrated Baldwin’s concern over the loyalty of the nobility.

In the wake of Alice’s initial bid for power the Antiochenes’ are believed to have held a council and asked for Baldwin’s assistance in this matter. It was their intention that Baldwin formally undertake the regency of Antioch and William believes this was because Baldwin feared Antioch ‘would be the victim of a calamity’.<sup>371</sup> On Baldwin’s departure Joscelin was named as the official regent of Antioch in place of Alice’s young daughter.

Despite the fact Alice was removed from the position of regent and sent into exile the nature of this could have been misunderstood by William; it was not because of her actions but her gender and this confusion may have contributed to his negative depiction of Alice; ultimately, she may have been a victim of events and circumstances.<sup>372</sup>

---

<sup>370</sup> Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 45

<sup>371</sup> Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 44

<sup>372</sup> Jonathan Philips, *Defenders of the Holy Land: Relations Between the Latin East and the West 1119-1187*, (Oxfordshire, 1996), p. 47

After she had been banished to her dowager lands Alice referred to herself as the princess of Antioch and she issued charters from Latakia, at this point William may have been justified in some of his depictions of Alice as scheming and wishing to take Antioch. The fact Alice could do this may be an indication that Alice had support from a significant amount of Antiochene nobles; something William did not admit to in his work. Furthermore, the fact Alice was not disposed of her lands during exile allowed Alice to maintain a powerful position; it is possible Baldwin intended that Alice was banished from Antioch as a form of punishment much like Hugh of Jaffa who was banished from Jerusalem for three years in 1134; it could have been that Alice would have been permitted to return to Antioch later.<sup>373</sup>

Alice's situation in Latakia is like Melisende's attempt at maintain power during the civil war between herself and Baldwin III (1143-1163); during this time Melisende also issued charters and gathered powerful nobles around her and was able to maintain important allies, of which William is not critical but in fact commended her as a politician; again, demonstrating a negative imbalance towards Alice.<sup>374</sup>

Alice's second attempt at taking power came after the death of Baldwin in 1131; she challenged Baldwin's authority as feudal lord by reviving her attempt to claim the regency of Antioch with the support of Pons of Tripoli and Joscelin II, though William believed it was her plan to act as queen rather than regent, of which he has little proof.<sup>375</sup>In his work

---

<sup>373</sup> Thomas Asbridge, 'Alice of Antioch: A Case Study of Female Power in the Twelfth Century' in P. Edbury & J. Philips (ed.), *The Experience of Crusading 2: Defending the Crusader Kingdom*, (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 36

<sup>374</sup> Thomas Asbridge, 'Alice of Antioch: A Case Study of Female Power in the Twelfth Century' in P. Edbury & J. Philips (ed.), *The Experience of Crusading 2: Defending the Crusader Kingdom*, (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 39- 42

<sup>375</sup> Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 54

Robert L. Nicholson, 'The Growth of the Latin States 1118- 1144,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), pp. 433

William mealy states that; 'on the death of her father, Alice thought that a favourable time to carry out her original plan had come.'<sup>376</sup>This would presumably include Alice again using bribery to buy support however William is unclear as to how Alice had the means to do this. Furthermore, an attempt to regain the regency would have been valid after the death Baldwin as Joscelin died soon after and his son refused to be installed as regent in place of his father thus leaving Antioch without a leader.<sup>377</sup>During this period William again emphasised Alice's intent to take Antioch for herself and how the citizens were said to have launched an appeal to Fulk who had recently been crowned as co-king of Jerusalem. Fulk had the support from most of the population of Antioch due to the nature of Alice who was a 'vindictive and wily woman.'<sup>378</sup>As overlord it was Fulk's responsibility to protect the interest of Constance; Fulk and Alice's supporter Pons fought over the issue of Alice's right to assume the regency. Alice's attempt eventually failed at which point Raynald Masoir was installed as regent.<sup>379</sup>

The most likely reason Fulk was accepted so readily by the citizens of Antioch was not hatred towards Alice but because Zengi and his forces had recently renewed their campaign to siege to the land surrounding Antioch; this is a fact recorded in William's chronicle.<sup>380</sup>This would have caused fear in the citizens and the need for a strong military force to aid Antioch which was supplied by Fulk.

---

<sup>376</sup>Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 54

<sup>377</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956), p. 188

<sup>378</sup> Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 53

Robert L. Nicholson, 'The Growth of the Latin States 1118- 1144,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), pp. 434

<sup>379</sup> Natasha Hodgson, *Women Crusading and the Holy Land*, (Suffolk, 2007), p. 68

<sup>380</sup> Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 56

The army of Jerusalem were successful in dispelling the Muslim force which was again recorded by William who reported that henceforth Fulk gained the support of the people of Antioch.<sup>381</sup> Again Alice's position had been cast in shadow; not due to her actions but her inability to adequately defend Antioch. This is unfair as other leaders such as Bohemond I and Roger had put the principality directly at risk based on their own actions and received little criticism within the sources.

After her second attempt to take power Alice again retreated to her dower lands and by 1132 she had amassed a powerful range of allies but was not yet in a position to attempt an attack on Antioch.<sup>382</sup> During this period Alice became somewhat of a rallying point for dissatisfied nobles; her strongest supporters were said to be Pons of Tripoli II, Joscelin and William of Saone whom according to William Alice bribed in order for their support, in reality Alice was probably the least powerful of all of her allies and there was no plot to take Antioch.<sup>383</sup>

Alice was said to have also attracted those who were specifically dissatisfied with Fulk's rule such as her cousin Hugh of Jaffa, some charters indicate that Hugh visited Alice during his conflict with Fulk and it possible he may have been attempting to enlist her support; the most likely explanation is that there were plots to assist Melisende rather than taking Antioch.<sup>384</sup> If this is the case it could offer an explanation as to why William was critical of

---

<sup>381</sup> Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 57

<sup>382</sup> Jonathan Philips, *Defenders of the Holy Land: Relations Between the Latin East and the West 1119-1187*, (Oxfordshire, 1996), p. 46

<sup>383</sup> Jonathan Philips, *Defenders of the Holy Land: Relations Between the Latin East and the West 1119-1187*, (Oxfordshire, 1996), p. 45

Peter Lock, *The Routledge Companion to the Crusades*, (London, 2006), p. 41

<sup>384</sup> Jonathan Phillips, *Holy Warriors*, (London, 2009), p. 61

Alice; his main concern was Jerusalem and its rulers therefore a coup against Fulk would have greatly compromised the standing of Jerusalem.

After the death of Hugh it is evident that Fulk's power diminished; this is seen after Melisende ordered her husband to keep out of Antioch's affairs. The fact Melisende had regained power would explain why Alice and her allies made no attack on Jerusalem.<sup>385</sup>The possibility of plots from Alice and her allies may explain William's sour attitude towards Alice and his unsubstantiated accusations regarding Antioch; he did not trust her.

Alice's final attempt at power came in 1135; in William's opinion she once again disobeyed Baldwin orders to stay in her dower lands and not to attempt to elevate herself to role of sovereign<sup>386</sup>It was the death of the patriarch Bernard which facilitated Alice's final return; Rudolph of Domfrat succeeded him at which point he opened negotiations with Alice who saw her opportunity to return to Antioch, the two formed an alliance and power was shared between them.<sup>387</sup>This is contrary to William's portrayal of Alice; she did not plot nor did force her way into Antioch furthermore in his writing William accused Alice of arriving in Antioch and 'once again taking everything under her sway' which is obviously untrue.<sup>388</sup>

She was approach and offered power which disproves William's earlier assertions that Alice had no support from the citizens of Antioch; furthermore, if she had caused such a terrible situation in Antioch previously it is imperative to question why she would be invited back.

---

<sup>385</sup> Jonathan Phillips, *Holy Warriors*, (London, 2009), p. 69

<sup>386</sup> Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 78

<sup>387</sup> Hans Mayer, *The Crusades*, (Oxford, 1972), p. 90

<sup>388</sup> Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 78

The fact that Rudolph formed an alliance indicates that she must have demonstrated good leadership and a rapport with her subjects at some point.

On her return to Antioch Alice assumed an active role in the governance of the principality and at this time Alice appealed to Melisende for support which was met with approval, as the two Latin states had always been closely linked and shared a special relationship it is unlikely that Melisende would have agreed to help if there were the possibility of repercussions which would require Jerusalem to intervene.<sup>389</sup> It is possible that Melisende's wish of high positions for her sisters and her new-found influence with Fulk persuaded him to stay out of the business of Antioch at this time but it is likely he would have acted if there was a serious situation in Antioch.<sup>390</sup>

Alice aimed to consolidate her rule of Antioch by gaining the support of the Byzantine emperor John by proposing the marriage of Constance to the emperor's son Manuel, given the Byzantines threat to Antioch at this time this may have been a prudent decision by Alice.<sup>391</sup> Despite the gender of their princess the Antiochene baronage appeared consistently loyal to Constance and they rejected the offers made to Byzantium by Alice.<sup>392</sup> This was due to the fact that neither the nobles of Antioch nor Fulk wanted a Greek alliance; presumably as this would greatly hamper their own power and fortune, therefore negativity towards Alice for instigating this is understandable.

After Alice's offer Antioch was faced with a dilemma regarding the marriage of Constance; an alternative marriage would further incense the Greeks but to proceed would damage

---

<sup>389</sup> John France, *The Crusades and the Expansion of Catholic Christendom 1000-1714*, (Oxon, 2005), p. 123

<sup>390</sup> Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 156

<sup>391</sup> Robert L. Nicholson, 'The Growth of the Latin States 1118- 1144,' in M. W. Baldwin & K. M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969), pp. 436

<sup>392</sup> Christopher Tyerman, *Gods War*, (London, 2006), p. 191

their own position. The threat from the Muslim army was growing therefore the principality desperately needed a male leader; Constance was far too young to be married in 1135 as she was six years below the lowest accepted age of marriage, although a betrothal could be permitted.<sup>393</sup>

Without Alice's knowledge it was decided that Raymond of Poitiers would marry Constance as it was believed Alice could interrupt this process, again it is questionable how she would be able to do this without significant support.<sup>394</sup> Alice was initially informed that Raymond had come to Antioch to negotiate her own marriage, which she was happy to accept.<sup>395</sup> While Alice knew a husband would strengthen her position as leader of Antioch she must have been aware based on marriage custom in the twelfth century and from observing Melisende's marriage to Fulk that she would be required to cede any power she had to her husband. However she was happy to proceed; in my opinion this proves Alice was not the power-hungry usurper William has portrayed her as; she was acting in a way would she thought would protect her daughter's claim until she was old enough to rule.

Alice did not realise she had been deceived by the nobles until after a secret marriage between Raymond and Constance had taken place in 1136; at this point Alice gave up her attempt at power and left Antioch realising that Raymond was in a legitimate position to rule.<sup>396</sup> Alice is thought to have died sometime around 1136 far away from Antioch and received no further inclusion by William, in contrast to Melisende who he eulogised.

---

<sup>393</sup> Andrew Jotischy, *Crusading and the Crusader States*, (Harlow, 2004), p. 76

<sup>394</sup> Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 59

<sup>395</sup> Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 78

<sup>396</sup> Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012), p. 168

Emily Atwater Babcock & August Kray, (Trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (Vol 2), (New York, 1976), p. 79



The fact that Alice attempted no further power grabs after her daughter's marriage suggests that she was not driven solely by the desire to hold Antioch, her intent was not to disinherit Constance nor was she a bad leader; she was content that her daughter's position was secure which is contrary to the entirety of William's work.

It is evident that in many respects Alice was a woman who was typical of the time; she found herself in a position where she was seen simply as a bargaining chip to be exchanged by her family to forge an alliance. Under normal circumstances Alice's claim to the regency would not have been strange. The fact that Alice had no son and heir was important; combined with the fact that her husband at such a young age and Antioch's weak position in the years since the Field of Blood were the main factors in Alice's struggle to gain power. It was not Alice herself who caused crisis within Antioch rather the fact she chose to launch attempts at power at difficult times within Antioch. If she was a rebellious, power hungry woman Alice would have been vying for power while her husband was alive, likewise she would have continued scheming after Raymond and Constance were married; neither of which she did. Therefore, this suggests that William's portrayal of Alice was incorrect; furthermore she made only three attempts at power all of which appear in the genuine interest of her daughter. Unlike Melisende Alice had no hereditary claim to Antioch, she understood the necessity in ceasing her power grabs but also when she was justified in launching a claim; namely at times when Antioch experienced a change in circumstance, such as the death of her father.

Due to lack of sources is impossible to determine whether Alice acted out of genuine concern as a parent or out of selfish actions to gain control of Antioch. One thing that is

clear is that Alice's support has been underestimated; it is evident she suffered due to circumstance, mainly the position Antioch had been in since the previous decade and her inability as a woman to defend the principality in terms of military action.

I feel that William has grossly distorted his representation of Alice; he provides little evidence for his accusations and throughout his work he frequently condemned Alice for actions which were not as damaging as previous rulers had demonstrated. I feel that William generally demonstrated the typical attitude of twelfth century ecclesiastical men towards women for the fact Alice dared to act outside of her expected gender role without the clear permission to do so.

## Conclusion

To conclude, it is evident that there were several examples of women maintaining power independent of men during throughout the medieval period. Women were able to be appointed as heiresses to lands and kingdoms if a male was absent and so Alice's claim was legally justified. Even though women could hold power this study shows the role men played in assisting in the running of government was important; most of the cases in which women had trouble are those in which there was no male to assist her, therefore the fact Alice did not appoint a suitable male to act for her made it impossible for her to succeed.

William's portrayal of Alice is an intriguing case; this thesis has discussed how he was critical of Alice while also being favourable of Melisende, this is despite the two demonstrating similar characteristics; both for example at times acted contrary to their children's rights.

William's portrayal of Alice is unfair in comparison to Melisende; she engaged in civil war and was portrayed well whereas Alice received criticism for trying to act as a regent for her daughter. William was not in favour of female rule therefore his portrayal of Melisende is more surprising than that of Alice; he was merely acting in the usual manor regarding Alice as he had no need to glorify her unlike Melisende whose lineage was in her favour.

Alice's claim to Antioch was relatively weak in comparison to other women who ruled in the medieval period; she was simply the wife of its ruler and mother to its heir, a strong claim was required therefore in is not unexpected she was portrayed negatively.

Despite Alice's reputation as a power-hungry usurper her attempts to take power were only conducted at a time of existing crisis within Antioch; this proves she was not driven by the need to take power or cause chaos within the principality. If Alice had not approached Zengi it is possible that she may have been accepted as the regent of Antioch, in allegedly contacting the Muslims she may have shown she was untrustworthy. As has been highlighted Antioch was structured under Norman values including Salic law which would have resulted in Alice finding it difficult to assert her authority in the principality in comparison to the other Latin states, again this could have contributed to William's disapproval of Alice.

Despite her portrayal I believe that Alice was not a figure of crisis for Antioch; it was not her actions that were harmful rather the time in which she attempted to take power; ultimately, she was a victim of circumstance. She had not produced a male heir and the threat of invasion from a newly unified Muslim coalition required an experienced military commander. It is evident that the principality had suffered far greater crisis under other leaders; unfortunately, by the time Alice came to power the principality was in a weaker position due to events such as the Field of Blood and repeated failures to take Aleppo. This study has indicated the effects previous leaders had had on the principality; Bohemond I was a weak ruler, he was often absent and had an inflated ego which caused dispute with Raymond of Toulouse which negatively affected the principality. Furthermore he set in motion a conflict with Byzantines who by 1130 were back in a strong position and able to challenge Antioch. Tancred was evidently a strong leader; he expanded the principality and increased its wealth and stability. He oversaw the decisive victory of Artah but like

Bohemond his ego caused problems with leaders such as Baldwin. Roger's is the reign which I feel caused the biggest crisis for Antioch and caused ramifications into the reign of Alice; his decision to listen to his barons and his poor military skills led to the Field of Blood which left Antioch defenceless, led to territorial losses and caused a power vacuum. These leaders were lucky that their neighbours were in a weaker position than themselves and is possibly why they have not received harsher critique for their actions; William instead has portrayed Tancred as a hero and Bohemond I and Tancred as perfect crusaders with Ralph of Caen noting that Bohemond and Tancred were worthy of merit.<sup>397</sup> On multiple occasions Aleppo failed to be taken which could have prevented rise of Zengi and the start of the unification of the Muslim's at the onset of Alice's reign.

There are no mentions of Alice in the Muslim sources although they seldom mention women.<sup>398</sup> Surely if she was such a figure of crisis one of them would have said something; Ibn al Athir for example was extremely knowledgeable of the Franks and of Antioch, in his chronicle he lists numerous battles and their outcome as well as his opinions of the Frankish rulers however there is no mention of Alice within it. Likewise Usama Ibn Munqidh mentions Bohemond II, Tancred, Baldwin and Roger within his writing but Alice is absent.<sup>399</sup>

Bohemond II was initially viewed as a positive leader for Antioch, he made early gains and was popular however he was ambitious and crafty which is how Alice is described, it could be that William did not wish to attribute this characteristics to Bohemond who, like

---

<sup>397</sup> Ralph of Caen, *The Gesta Tancredi*, (Trans) B. S. Bachrach & D. S. Bachrach, Surrey, 2010), p. 10

<sup>398</sup> Bernard Hamilton, 'Women in the Crusader States: The Queens of Jerusalem (1100-1190)' in D. Baker (ed.), *Studies in Church History: Medieval Women*, (Cambridge, 1978), pp. 143

<sup>399</sup> Paul M. Cobb, P, (Trans) Usama Ibn Munqidh, *The Book of Contemplation: Islam and The Crusades*, (London, 2008), p. 76,77,94,131

Melisende transmitted the lineage of the first crusade and so is writing in the tradition of the medieval period in which a husband's reputation impacted the queen; ultimately he shifted Bohemond's failings on to his wife.

To surmise; Alice was far from the worst of Antioch's rulers, all of whom have received far less critical reviews than her; she acted in a way that would have normally been deemed appropriate under different circumstances. This suggests that it was indeed her gender and the fact she dared try to take power that caused William to write such a scathing report of Alice rather than her actions.

## **Bibliography**

### **Secondary Sources**

1. Albu, E. 'Antioch and the Normans,' in (Ed), Hurlock, K, & Oldfield, P, *Crusading and Pilgrimage in the Norman World*, (Suffolk, 2015)
2. Asbridge, T. 'Alice of Antioch: A Case Study of Female Power in the Twelfth Century,' in (Ed), Edbury, P, & Philips, J, *The Experience of Crusading 2: Defining the Crusader Kingdom*, (Cambridge, 2003)
3. Asbridge, T. 'The Impact of Islam and Byzantium Upon the Crusader Community at Antioch,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th series, Vol. 9, (1999)
4. Asbridge, T. 'The Significance Causes of the Field of Blood' *Journal of Medieval History*, 1997, Vol 23, 4
5. Asbridge, T. *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch 1098-1130*, (Woodbridge, 2000)
6. *The Crusades: A Time Watch Guide by Thomas Asbridge*, Television programme, BBC 4, (London, broadcast 3 February 2016)
7. Asbridge, T. *The Crusades; The War for the Holy Land*, (London, 2010)
8. Asbridge, T. 'William of Tyre and The First Rulers of the Principality of Antioch,' in (ed.) Edington, S. & Nicholson, H. J, *Deeds Done Beyond the Sea; Essays on William of Tyre, Cyprus and the Military Orders Presented to Peter Edbury*, (Surry, 2014)
9. Barber, M. *The Crusader States*, (Cornwall, 2012)
10. Barlow, F. 'Roger of Howden,' *The English Historical Review*, 65, 256, (1950)
11. Berend, N. 'The Expansion of Latin Christendom', (ed.) Power, D, *The Central Middle Ages: 950- 1320*, (Oxford, 2006)
12. Bianchi, J. *The Queen's Hand; Power and Authority in the Reign of Berenguela of Castile*, (Pennsylvania, 2012)
13. Billings, M. *The Cross and the Crescent: A History of the Crusades*, (London, 1987)
14. Blamires, A. (ed.) *Woman Defamed and Woman Defended*, (Oxford, 1992)
15. Boase, T. S. R, *Kingdoms and Strongholds of the Crusaders*, (London, 1971)
16. Bragg, M. *The Four Humours*, In Our Time, BBC Radio, (2007)
17. Bull, M. *Thinking Medieval an Introduction to the Study of the Middle Ages*, (Hampshire, 2005)
18. Bullough, V. and Brundage, J. *Handbook of Medieval Sexuality*, (Oxon, 2000)
19. Castor, H. *She Wolves: The Women who Ruled England Before Elizabeth*, (New York, 2012)
20. Chibnall, M. *The Empress Matilda*, (Oxford, 1991)
21. Chleirgh, L. N. 'Gesta Normannorum Normans in the Latin chronicles of the First Crusade,' in (ed.) Stringer, K. J, & Jotischky, A, *Norman Exansion Connections, Continuities and Contrasts*, (Surrey, 2013)
22. Cobb, P. M, *The Race for Paradise: An Islamic History of the Crusades*, (Oxford, 2014)
23. Cronne, H. A. *The Reign of Stephen: Anarchy in England 1135-54*, (London, 1970)

24. Davis, R. H. C 'The Authorship of the *Gesta Stephani*' *English Historical Review*, (77) 303 (1962)
25. Eales, J. *Women in Early Modern England, 1500- 1700*, (London, 1998)
26. Earenfight, T, *Queenship in Medieval Europe*, (Hampshire, 2013)
27. Edbury P. W. & J. G. Rowe, *William of Tyre: Historian of the Latin East*, (Cambridge, 1988)
28. Edbury, P. 'Chronicles of Crusade: William of Tyre', *History Today*, 38.6, (1988)
29. Edbury, P.W. 'The Assised d'Atioch Law and Custom in the Principality of Antioch,' (ed.) Stringer, K. J & Jotischky, A. *Norman Exansion Connections, Continuities and Contrasts*, (Surrey, 2013)
30. Ennen, E. *The Medieval Woman*, (Oxford, 1989)
31. Fink, H. S. 'The Foundations of the Latin States 1099- 1118,' in (ed.) Baldwin, M. W. & Setton, K. M. *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969)
32. France, J. *The Crusades and the Expansion of Catholic Chrisendom 1000-1714*, (Oxon, 2005)
33. Frankopan, P. 'Perception & Projection of Prejudice: Anna Comnena, the Alexiad and the First Crusade' in (ed.) S. B Edington, & S. Lambert. *Gendering the Crusades*, (Cardiff, 2001)
34. Gravett, C. & Nicolle, D. *The Normans: Warrior Knights and Their Castles*, (Oxford, 2006)
35. Hamilton, B. 'Women in the Crusader States: The Queens of Jerusalem (1100-1190)' in (ed.) D. Baker. *Studies in Church History: Medieval Women*, (Cambridge, 1978)
36. Hamilton, B 'The Old French Translation of William of Tyre as an Historical Source,' in (ed.) P. Edbury, and Philips, J. *The Experience of Crusading 2: Defending the Crusader Kingdom*, (Cambridge, 2003)
37. Hamilton, B, *The Crusades*, (Gloucestershire, 1998)
38. Harlihy, D. 'Women in Continental Europe 700-1200' in (ed.) S. M. Stuard, *Women in Medieval Society*, (Philadelphia, 1976)
39. Harris, J. *Byzantium and the Crusades*, (London, 2003)
40. Hillenbrand, C. *The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives*, (Edinburgh, 1999)
41. Hodgson, N. *Women, Crusading and the Holy Land in Historical Narrative*, (Suffolk, 2007)
42. Huneycutt, L.L. 'Female Succession and the Language of Power' in (ed.) J. Carmi Parson *Medieval Queenship* (Gloucestershire, 1994)
43. Huneycutt, L.L. *Matilda of Scotland: A Study in Medieval Queenship*, (Sufolk, 2003)
44. Jewell, H. *Women in Medieval England*, (Manchester, 1996)
45. Johns, S. M. *Noblewomen, Aristocracy and Power in the Twelfth Century*, (Manchester, 2003),
46. Jones, D, C., *The Apostles of Jesus Christ: Thirteen Men Who Turned the World Upside Down*, (Indiana, 2010)
47. Jones, D. *The Plantagents*, (London, 2012)
48. Jotischy, A., *Crusading and the Crusader States*, (Harlow, 2004)
49. Kedar, B. Z. 'Some New Insight on the Composition Process of William Of Tyre's Historia' in (ed.) S. B. Edington & H. J. Nicholson, *Deeds Done Beyond the Sea; Essays*



- on William of Tyre, Cyprus and the Military Orders Presented to Peter Edbury*, (Surry, 2014)
50. Kostik, C. 'Elenor of Aquitaine and the Women of the Second Crusade,' in (ed.) Kostic, C. *Medieval Italy, Medieval and Early Modern Women: Essays in Honour of Christine Meek*, (Dublin, 2010)
  51. Lambert, S. 'Image of a Queen: Melisende and Her Heirs in the Illustrated Chronicles of the Kingdom of Jerusalem', in (ed.) J. Dresvina, *Authority and Gender in Medieval and Renaissance Chronicles: Papers delivered at the Cambridge International Chronicles Symposium, 2012* (Cambridge, 2012)
  52. Lilie, R. J. *Byzantium and the Crusader States 1096-1204*, (Oxford, 1993)
  53. Lock, P. *The Routledge Companion to the Crusades*, (London, 2006)
  54. LoPrete, K. A. 'Adela of Blois as Mother and Countessm' in (ed.) J. Carmi Parsons & B. Wheeler, *Medieval Mothering*, (New York, 1999)
  55. LoPrete, K. A. 'Adela of Blois: Familial Alliances and Female Lordship,' in (ed.) T. Evergates, *Aristocratic Women in Medieval France*, (Philadelphia, 1999)
  56. LoPrete, K. A. *Adela of Blois: Countess and Lord (1067-1137)*, (Dublin, 2007)
  57. Loud G. A. & Cox, J. W 'The 'Lost' Autobiographical Chapter of William of Tyre's Chronicle (Book XIX.12).' *The Crusades: An Encyclopedia*, in (ed.), A. V. Murray (Santa Barbara, 2006), Vol. 4, Appendix: Texts and Document 4
  58. Lucas, A. M. *Women in the Middle Ages: Religion, Marriage and Letters*, (Sussex, 1984)
  59. Maalouf, A, *The Crusades Through Arab Eyes*, (London, 2004)
  60. Maier, C.T. 'The Roles of Women in the Crusade Movement: A Survey,' *Journal of Medieval History* 30/1 (2004)
  61. Mallet, A, *Medieval Muslim Historians and the Franks in the Levant*, (Leiden, 2014)
  62. Mayer, H. The Succession to Baldwin II of Jerusalem : The English Impact on the East, *Dumbarton Oak Papers*, Vol. 39,' (1985)
  63. Meyer, H. *The Crusades*, (Oxford, 1972)
  64. Meade, M. *Eleanor of Aquitaine: A Biography*, (London, 2002)
  65. Meyer, H. 'Studies in The History Of Queen Melisende of Jerusalem' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 26 (1972)
  66. Morton, N. 'William of Tyre's Attitude Towards Islam: Some Historiographical Reflections' in (ed.) S. Edington, H. J. & Nicholson, *Deeds Done Beyond the Sea; Essays on William of Tyre, Cyprus and the Military Orders Presented to Peter Edbury*, (Surry, 2014)
  67. Murray, A. *The Crusades to the Holy Land, the Essential Reference Guide*, (Santa Barbra, 2015)
  68. Murray, A. *The Crusades: An Encyclopaedia*, (Santa Barbara, 2006)
  69. Nichlson, R. L. 'The Growth of the Latin States 1118- 1144,' in (Ed) Baldwin, M. W. & Setton, K. M. *A History of the Crusade Vol 1, The First One Hundred Years*, (London, 1969)
  70. Philips, J. 'The Latin East 1098-1291' in (Ed) Riley- Smith, J, *A History of the Crusades*, (Oxford, 1999)
  71. Philips, J, *Defenders of the Holy Land: Relations Between the Latin East and the West 1119-1187*, (Oxfordshire, 1996)
  72. Philips, J. *The Crusades 1095- 1197*, (Harlow, 2002)

73. Philips, J. *The Second Crusade: Extending the Frontiers of Christendom*, (Hampshire, 2010)
74. Phillips, J. *Holy Warriors: A Modern History of the Crusades*, (London, 2010)
75. Pollock, F. & Maitland, F. W. *The History Of English Law Before The Time Of Edward I* (Vol 1), (New Jersey, 2008)
76. Power, E. *Medieval Women*, (London, 1975)
77. Riley-Smith, J. *The First Crusade and the Ideal of Crusading*, (London, 2003)
78. Runciman, S. *A History of the Crusades Vol 1: The First Crusade and the Foundations of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*, (London, 1990)
79. Runciman, S. *A History of the Crusades Vol 2: The Rulers of Jerusalem The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100-1187*, (London, 1956)
80. Shahar, S. *The Fourth Estate: A History of Women in the Middle Ages*, (London, 1983)
81. Shein, S. 'Women in Medieval Colonial Society: The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem in the Twelfth Century,' in (ed.), S. B. Edington & S. Lambert, *Gendering the Crusades* (Cardiff, 2001)
82. Smail, R. C. *The Crusaders in Syria and the Holy Land*, (Southampton, 1973)
83. Stafford, P. 'The portrayal of royal women in England, Mid Tenth to Mid Twelfth Centuries in' (ed.), J. Carmi Parson, *Medieval Queenship*, (Gloucestershire, 1994)
84. Stafford, P. 'Women and the Norman Conquest,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4, (221-249)
85. Stuard S. M. 'The Dominion of Gender: How Women Fared in the High Middle Ages,' in (ed.), R. Bridenthal, S. M. Stuard, M.E. & Wiesener, *Becoming Visible: Women in European History*, (Boston, 1998)
86. Treadgold, W. *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*, (California, 1997),
87. Tyerman, C. *God's War*, (London, 2006)
88. Tyerman, C. *The Crusades: A Very Short Introduction*, (Oxford, 2004)
89. Tyerman, C. *The Debate on the Crusades*, (Manchester, 2011)
90. Wolf, A. 'Reigning Queens in Medieval Europe: Where, When and Why,' in (ed.) J. Carmi Parson, *Medieval Queenship*, (Gloucestershire, 1994)
91. Woodacre, E. 'Blanca, Queen of Sicily and Queen of Navaree: Conecting the Pyrenees and the Mediteranean Via an Aragonese Alliance,' in (ed.) E. Woodacre. *Queenship in the Mediterranean: Negotiating the Role of the Queen in the Medieval and Early Modern Eras*, (New York, 2013)

### Primary Sources

1. Asbridge, T. & Edginton, S. (Trans) *Walter the Chancellor's the Antiochene Wars*, (Hampshire, 1998),
2. Atwater Babcock, E. & Kray, E. A. (trans) *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea* (Vol 2), (New York, 1976)

3. William Caxton, 'The Golden Legend' Fordham's Medieval Source book, (1483) - <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/basis/goldenlegend/GoldenLegend-Volume1.htm#Adam>- ( Accessed 12 November 2014)
4. Cobb, P. (Trans) *Usama Ibn Munqidh, The Book of Contemplation: Islam and The Crusades*, (London, 2008),
5. Genesis 2:4-23
6. Greenway, D. (Trans) *Henry of Huntingdon, The History of the English People 1000-1135*, (Oxford, 2002)
7. Hill, R. (Trans), *Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, (London, 1962)
8. Levine, R. (Trans), *Gesta Dei Per Francos*, (Woodbridge, 1997)
9. Peters, E. (Trans), *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulchers of Chartes and Other Source Material*, (Philadelphia, 1998)
10. Ralph of Caen. *The Gesta Tancredi*, (Trans) Bachrach, B. S & Bachrach, D. S, (Surrey, 2010)
11. Richards, L. D. S. (Trans), *The chronicle of Ibn al-Athir for the Crusading Period from al-Kamil fi'l-Ta'rikh Subtitle: Part 1, Years 491-541/1097-1146 : the Coming of the Franks and the Muslim Response*, (Ashgate, 2010)
12. Roger of Hoveden 'The Last Days and Death of Henry II' (1189), Fordham's Medieval Sourcebook- <http://legacy.fordham.edu/Halsall/source/1189hoveden.asp>- (Accessed 20 January 2015)
13. Sewter, E. R. A. *The Alexiad of Anna Comnena*. (Suffolk, 1969)
14. Sweetenham, C. (Trans), *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, *Historia Iherosolimitana* (Hants, 2003)