

Luka Špoljarić

**WILLIAM OF TYRE AND THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE:
THE CONSTRUCTION AND DECONSTRUCTION
OF AN IMAGE**

MA Thesis in Medieval Studies

Central European University

Budapest

May 2008

**WILLIAM OF TYRE AND THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE:
THE CONSTRUCTION AND DECONSTRUCTION
OF AN IMAGE**

by

Luka Špoljarić

(Croatia)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the Master of Arts degree in Medieval Studies

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU

Chair, Examination Committee

Thesis Supervisor

Examiner

Examiner

Budapest
May 2008

**WILLIAM OF TYRE AND THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE:
THE CONSTRUCTION AND DECONSTRUCTION
OF AN IMAGE**

by
Luka Špoljarić
(Croatia)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the Master of Arts degree in Medieval Studies
Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU

External Supervisor

I, the undersigned, **Luka Špoljarić**, candidate for the MA degree in Medieval Studies declare herewith that the present thesis is exclusively my own work, based on my research and only such external information as properly credited in notes and bibliography. I declare that no unidentified and illegitimate use was made of the work of others, and no part of the thesis infringes on any person's or institution's copyright. I also declare that no part of the thesis has been submitted in this form to any other institution of higher education for an academic degree.

Budapest, 26 May 2008

Signature

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
ABBREVIATIONS	vi
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. WILLIAM OF TYRE AND HIS TIME	5
III. CONSTRUCTING THE IMAGE	12
THE EMPERORS	12
TREACHERY OF THE GREEKS	27
EFFEMINACY OF THE GREEKS	42
IV. THE IMAGE SHATTERED	51
V. CONCLUSIONS	57
BIBLIOGRAPHY	61

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis is dedicated to my parents, Petar and Vlasta, whose loving support and encouragement made it possible.

There are two people who have greatly contributed to my work: my supervisor, József Laszlovszky, for whose guidance, advice and patient reading of my numerous drafts I can only be ever so grateful; and Niels Gaul, who always offered constructive criticisms and never lacked words of encouragement. I would also like to express my gratitude to all the professors whose courses I have attended during this academic year, for they have made this program challenging but at the same time interesting. I want to express my gratitude to Peter Edbury, who, more than two years ago, sent his book on William of Tyre to an overzealous under-graduate student from Croatia. It was only right that this student focused on an aspect of William's work in his MA Thesis. Thanks go to my colleagues, whom as the academic year passed by I had come to cherish as friends. Once we part ways, it will be those long talks during midnight coffee breaks that I will miss the most. My friends from home also deserve a mention, for their support in the first weeks of the academic year meant the world to me. Finally, I want to thank my younger brother Matej, who has always been there, online, whether I needed information from books home or a simple cheer.

ABBREVIATIONS

- ODB *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*. Ed. Alexander P. Kazhdan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- OLD *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- PL *Patrologia cursus completus, series latina*, 221 vols. Comp. J.-P. Migne. Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1844-64.
- WT Willelmus Tyrensis Archiepiscopus. *Chronicon*, 2 vols. Ed. Robert B. C. Huygens. Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Medieualis 63, 63A. Turnhout: Brepols, 1986.

I. INTRODUCTION

The twelfth century represents a period of growing estrangement between the Latin west and the Greek east. The First Crusade, launched by the papacy ideally in order to help the Eastern Christians against Islam, in fact widened the gap between the two spheres.¹ The Crusaders on their way through the Byzantine Empire encountered a culture, very much different from their own. The actions of the Byzantine emperor Alexios I (r. 1081–1118) first in Constantinople and then at Antioch contributed greatly to the Western resentment of the Greeks, which in the course of the century continually grew.² Thus, the Second Crusade and, above all, the 1182 massacre of the Latins in Constantinople, acted as main catalysts for the events that would eventually lead to the sack of Constantinople in 1204.³

William (ca. 1130–ca. 1185), the archbishop of Tyre, a man of this world of growing tensions, was writing his work, a history of the First Crusade and the Crusader states probably entitled *Historia Ierosolymitana*,⁴ from ca. 1170 until 1184. He was a native of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, which remained from the late 1150s

¹ There is a new detailed study on the whole period of the Crusades, spanning from eleventh to fifteenth century, by Christopher Tyerman, *God's War: A New History of the Crusades* (London: Penguin Books, 2007), which replaced Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 3 vols. (London: Penguin Books, 1990-1991), an authority in the field for the last 50 years.

² On the problem of the twelfth-century growing cultural tensions, see Krijnie N. Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople: The West and Byzantium 962–1204, Cultural and Political Relations* (Leiden: Brill, 1996); Bunna Ebels-Hoving, “Byzantium in Latin Eyes before 1204: Some Remarks on the Thesis of Growing Animosity,” in *The Latin Empire: Some Contributions*, ed. Krijnie N. Ciggaar and Victoria D. van Aalst, 21-32 (Kaastel Hernen: A. A. Bredius Foundation, 1990).

³ For the sack of Constantinople, cf. Michael Angold, *The Fourth Crusade: Event and Context* (New York: Longman, 2003).

⁴ This is the title that Peter W. Edbury and John G. Rowe suggested in their work on William of Tyre, arguing that it is a possible title of two incipits of two English manuscripts of William's work: Peter W. Edbury and John G. Rowe, *William of Tyre: Historian of the Latin East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 1. When Robert B. C. Huygens made a critical edition of William's work, he chose *Chronicon* as the title instead. I will following Edbury and Rowe regularly use the shorthand title *Historia*.

until 1182 almost continuously under the patronage the Byzantine emperors.⁵ As a supporter of this policy, William tried to present the empire and its emperor Manuel I Komnenos (r. 1143–1180) in a good light.⁶ However, at the same time, like many of his contemporaries he did not strove to present the Greeks in a good light. Being depicted as treacherous and effeminate, they figured as inferior to the Latins.⁷ These epithets appear throughout William’s work, but they, it will be shown, hide different strategies in different episodes, depending on the particular context of the event.

The question this thesis seeks to answer is how William’s views of the empire were reconciled with the views of the Greeks he chose to introduce to his text. It proceeds in three steps by analyzing: (1) the images of the Komnenian emperors in the work; (2) those episodes in which the *treachery* of the Greeks is referred to; and (3) episodes in which the *effeminacy* of the Greeks is evoked. Only the Komnenian emperors will be analyzed, since it is only they who figured prominently in William’s work. Finally, since William recorded some events after the 1182 massacre as well, the evolution in the image of the Greeks and the empire will be addressed in a separate, short chapter.

This approach can be justified, since previous historical studies concentrated on different aspects of the *Historia*, and the questions posed here were not analyzed in detail. There are two previous studies that have dealt with William’s attitude towards, and depiction of, the Byzantine Empire. First, the topic was touched upon by Peter Edbury and John Rowe some twenty years ago, as part of their seminal study of

⁵ For the history of the Kingdom of Jerusalem from the 1170s until the fall of Jerusalem in 1187, see Bernard Hamilton, *The Leper King and his Heirs: Baldwin IV and the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

⁶ For a detailed study of the Byzantine Empire during the reign of Manuel, see Paul Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos 1143–1180* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

⁷ In this thesis I use the term “Latin” in the meaning William used it, designating all the people of Western medieval cultures, regardless of their ethnic background.

William's life and work.⁸ The main contribution of the authors lies in analyzing William's views on five different topics: the royal dynasty of Jerusalem, the relations between the church and the state, the papacy, the war against the Muslims, and finally the Byzantine Empire. Furthermore, they have provided an overview of William's life and work and analyzed his treatment of his sources. It should be stated that their work figures today as essential to anyone interested in William of Tyre and the message he strove to convey to his audience. As for their analysis of William's attitude towards the Byzantine Empire, the authors have opted for a linear approach to the work, taking into consideration nearly all the episodes in which the empire appears in the narrative. Their approach helped much to illuminate particular historical episodes; however, some details regarding William's general attitude towards the Byzantine Empire can be added. More recently, Bernard Hamilton has returned to the question.⁹ Even though he adopted the same linear approach as Edbury and Rowe in the greater part of his short article, it can be stated that his main contribution lies in discussing William's views on the Orthodox Church.

Although these studies have identified the main historical issues in the context of William's work, the complexity of the *Historia* allows approaching it from different perspectives. As has been stated, there seems to be a contradiction between the positive image of Manuel in different parts of the work, and the general negative image of the Greeks. Therefore, a detailed discussion of the aforementioned questions can shed light on William's changing attitudes in the whole narrative. It is not the task of this study to analyze the problem of the "image of the other" in William's work in

⁸ Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*. William's attitude towards the Byzantine Empire is analyzed in the pages 130-150.

⁹ Bernard Hamilton, "William of Tyre and the Byzantine Empire," in *Porphyrogenita: Essays on the History and Literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in Honour of Julian Chrysostomides*, ed. Charalambos Dendrinos, Jonathan Harris, Eirene Harvalia-Crook and Judith Herrin, 219-233 (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2003).

general, but to contribute to our understanding of how a particular, multi-layered image of the Byzantine Empire was created in the work of a key twelfth-century Crusader historiographer.

II. WILLIAM OF TYRE AND HIS TIME

The knowledge about the life and work of William, archbishop of Tyre, comes mainly from what he himself recorded in the *Historia*. In this respect, the discovery of the lost autobiographical chapter by Robert Huygens has done much to shed light on William's early life, especially his twenty year long sojourn in the West, where he was attending schools of France and Italy.¹⁰

A third generation Frankish settler of the Holy Land, a *polain*,¹¹ William was born sometime around 1130 in Jerusalem. It can be assumed that he had some elementary education, wherefore it is possible that he attended the cathedral school attached to the Church of the Holy Sepulcher,¹² around which the population of Jerusalem concentrated after the conquest of the city.¹³ As for his background, little is known. He was probably of a burgess stock (*burgensis*), a class of settlers of free standing who belonged neither to the nobles nor to the Italian communes.¹⁴ Even

¹⁰ Robert B. C. Huygens, "Guillaume de Tyr étudiant. Un chapitre (XIX, 12) de son 'Histoire' retrouvé," *Latomus* XXI (1962): 811-829.

¹¹ The word *polain* (*pullanus*) derived from the word *pullus* (the young of an animal) and was used to designate the settlers of the Holy Land at least of the second generation. See Ruth Morgan, "The Old French Continuation of the Chronicle of William Archbishop of Tyre to 1232," (D. Phil thesis) cited in Ralph H. C. Davis, "William of Tyre," in *Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages*, ed. Derek Baker (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1973): 75.

¹² Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, 13-14. For information about the intellectual life of the Frankish Jerusalem, see Adrian J. Boas, *Jerusalem in the Time of the Crusades: Society, Landscape and Art in the Holy City under Frankish Rule* (New York: Routledge, 2001), 34.

¹³ Joshua Prawer, *Crusader Institutions* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 90; idem, *Crusaders' Kingdom: European Colonialism in the Middle Ages* (London: Phoenix Press, 2001), 80.

¹⁴ In the Kingdom of Jerusalem, unlike in Europe, the term *burgensis* had no connection with the *burgus*. The settlements of the burgesses grew around fortified places, and the term thus simply indicated the new and free standing of the settlers. Among them a class of semi-patricians soon became discernible, which rose to prominence either by accumulation of wealth or by royal, seigniorial or church administration. William can probably be numbered amongst these. For more about the burgess class of the Frankish society of the East, see Prawer, *Crusaders' Kingdom*, 76-85.

though the Italian or French origins of his family are a subject of speculation, it is clear that he only thought of Jerusalem as his home.

Around 1146 William set for Western Europe in order to pursue higher education. Ten years of studying liberal arts and six of studying theology in Paris and Orléans, followed by the four years spent in Bologna mastering both canon and civil law equipped him for the tasks he was later to face.¹⁵ However, three years upon his arrival to France, the Second Crusade, led by the French and the German king and organized in a response to the fall of Edessa in 1144, ended in a complete failure under the walls of Damascus. William was thus bound to experience at first hand the resentment that the returning Crusaders felt towards the Jerusalemites and the Byzantines, whose treachery was seen as the reason for the failure.¹⁶ The knowledge about the Western attitude towards the Latin East was to have an impact on his work.

William returned to the Holy Land in 1165, whereupon he received a prebend in the cathedral of Acre.¹⁷ King Amalric (r. 1163–1174) soon took him under his wings, and the king's patronage in 1167 secured him the archdeaconry of Tyre. Although at first wary of the Byzantine influence, Amalric soon embraced the patronage of the Emperor Manuel, which his brother and predecessor Baldwin III (r. 1143–1163) maintained during the last five years of his reign.¹⁸ For it was clear that if he did not react, the weak and faction-torn Fatimid Caliphate in Cairo would soon fall

¹⁵ William lists numerous *magistri* whose lectures he had been attending there. For the names of these teachers and short notes about them, see Huygens, "Guillaume de Tyr étudiant." It should be noted that Edbury and Rowe question his knowledge of the canon law. See Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, 15.

¹⁶ Tyerman, *God's War*, 336. For William's awareness of the failure of the Second Crusade as the reason for the indifference of the West, see WT 17.6.

¹⁷ Prebend is a portion of cathedral revenues set aside to support the clergy.

¹⁸ In 1158 Baldwin III married an imperial niece, Theodora, and received from the emperor an enormous dowry of 100,000 *hyperpyra*. The alliance was thus concluded by which Manuel committed to support the Kingdom of Jerusalem. Cf. Magdalino, *Empire of Manuel I*, 69-70.

as prey to Nur al-Din, *atabeg* of Aleppo and Mosul.¹⁹ Thus Amalric looked to Manuel to gain an additional leverage, and soon a Byzantine-Frankish joint expedition was planned which aimed at securing Egypt for Christianity; William, sent by Amalric to Manuel, was the one who successfully negotiated it. The expedition ended in a failure, which ultimately allowed Saladin, the commander of Nur al-Din's army, to conquer Egypt. Nevertheless, Amalric, under pressure from both east (Nur al-Din) and south (Saladin), in 1171 decided to make a stronger commitment to Manuel, acting as a reliable Byzantine satellite until the end of his reign.²⁰ During this time William enjoyed great confidence with the king, and as a result his career flourished. Thus in 1170 Amalric appointed him tutor to his son and successor, the future King Baldwin IV (1174–1185).²¹

However, things soon changed as Amalric unexpectedly died in 1174. The kingdom was left under the rule of a thirteen-year old king, Baldwin IV, who was already suspected to be suffering from leprosy.²² At this point Raymond III of Tripoli (r. 1152–1187), took over the regency and gave William further pushes in his career. Thus as a result of his patronage, by the end of 1174 William was appointed chancellor of the kingdom, while the title of the archdeacon of Nazareth was probably also bestowed on him at that time.²³ Final promotion followed soon, when in 1175 he was elected archbishop of Tyre.²⁴ At the same time Byzantine influence over the

¹⁹ Fatimid Caliphs of Egypt belonged to the Shia, while Nur al-Din to the Sunni denomination of Islam. This prevented their cooperation against the Franks.

²⁰ Magdalino, *Empire of Manuel I*, 75; Hamilton, *Leper King*, 66.

²¹ WT 21.1.

²² Hamilton, *Leper King*, 38.

²³ Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, 18.

²⁴ WT 21.8. Appointing a chancellor of a kingdom to a bishopric was a standard practice in many western European states. Cf. Bernard Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States: The Secular Church* (London: Variorum, 1980), 118.

kingdom continued,²⁵ and in 1177 a new joint expedition against the Egypt was proposed but never realized. William, a staunch supporter of the Constantinopolitan-Jerusalemite alliance, condemned Philip, count of Flanders who came to the East with a large army, as the one responsible.²⁶

As archbishop of Tyre, William, his writings suggest, devoted himself to church affairs.²⁷ From 1178 until 1180 he was absent from the kingdom attending first the Third Lateran Council in Rome and later visiting Constantinople, apparently also on church business.²⁸ Upon his return Amalric of Nesle (r. 1157–1180), the old patriarch of Jerusalem, died, and the position fell vacant. William competed for the place with Heraclius, the archbishop of Caesarea, but lost; this point signified a reverse in his career.²⁹ Soon, however, a great setback occurred in the relations with the Byzantine Empire as well. In 1180 Manuel Komnenos died and was succeeded by his eleven-year-old son Alexios II (r. 1180–1183). The regency, formed under the young emperor's mother, Mary of Antioch, maintained close links with Jerusalem, and the alliance was renewed.³⁰ However, after an 1182 uprising in Constantinople, anti-Latin orientated Andronikos (regent 1182–1183; r. 1183–1185) came to power and spurred the Constantinopolitan mob to massacre all the Latins of the city.³¹ Ever since 1158, the Crusader states have relied on the help of the empire; now this period

²⁵ For an overview of the Byzantine-Jerusalemite relations between 1174 and 1182, see Bernard Hamilton, "Manuel I Comnenus and Baldwin IV of Jerusalem," in *Kathegetria: Essays Presented to Joan Hussey for Her 80th Birthday*, ed. Julian Chrysostomides, 353-375 (Camberley: Porphyrogenitus, 1988).

²⁶ For a detailed overview of the whole episode, see Hamilton, *Leper King*, 127-131.

²⁷ Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, 20.

²⁸ WT 22.4: William says that the visit was "very useful to us and to our church" (*nobis et ecclesie nostre perutilem*). However, Hamilton suggests that the main reason behind William's visit to Constantinople was the restoration of the Byzantine protectorate over the Kingdom of Jerusalem, suspended after the failure of the proposed joint expedition against Egypt in 1177. Cf. Hamilton, *Leper King*, 149.

²⁹ For a detailed study on the election, see Peter W. Edbury and John G. Rowe, "William of Tyre and the Patriarchal Election of 1180," *The English Historical Review* Vol. 93, No. 366 (Jan., 1978): 1-25.

³⁰ Hamilton, *Leper King*, 160.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 173-174.

came to an end. The events were bound to have an impact on the image of the empire and the Greeks in William's work.

After 1182 not much is known about his activities, and it is a debated issue when in fact did he die. There is no need to address here all the problems concerning his death, since the account of the 1182 massacre represents the final episode where the Byzantine Empire appears, while William continued to write until 1184. The date of his death is certain, 29 September, while it is debated whether the year is 1184, 1185 or 1186.³²

William has authored three works altogether. Besides *Historia*, he informs us that he has written the account of the decrees of the Third Lateran Council and a history of the Muslim world, titled *Gesta orientalium principum*. These are now considered definitely lost,³³ and the *Historia* remains his only surviving work.

The structure of the work reveals two easily discernible parts: the first (books 1–8) recounts the First Crusade, offering a brief introduction going back to the conquest of Jerusalem by Omar (r. 634–644), second caliph after Muhammad; the second (books 9–23) describes the fortunes of the Eastern Latins upon the conquest of the Holy Land and Syria. The second part was further divided in the way that the reign of each king was allotted two books, with the exception of Godfrey of Bouillon (r. 1099–1110) who received one and Baldwin III three. Furthermore, the reign of

³² For problems in establishing the date William's death, see Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, 22; Hamilton, *Leper King*, 199-201.

³³ One can quote here Robert Huygens: "Speaking about William of Tyre, I may mention that we know for certain he wrote two more works, in particular a History of Oriental Rulers, both of which seem to be definitely lost. And when I say so, I do hope you'll believe me when I stress that, following the example of many others, I've really looked for it." Robert B. C. Huygens "Looking for Manuscripts ... and Then?" *Essays in Medieval Studies* 4 (1997): 1.

King Baldwin IV is also described in three books, but the last one, the final one of the work, consists only of a single chapter accompanied by a prologue.

William worked on his *opus magnum* from about 1170 until his death, and in such a large work, composed over a long period of time, inconsistencies were bound to occur.³⁴ These inconsistencies show that, upon his return to Jerusalem in 1180, William made extensive revisions to his work, reworking the first book and introducing sections dealing with ecclesiastical affairs and possibly even topographical descriptions of the cities.³⁵ It is important to note the year, since this excludes any serious tempering with the earlier part of the work after the 1182 massacre of the Latins, which undoubtedly changed his views of the Byzantine Empire. From 1181 he continued his narrative until the end recording events which belong either to the early or to the later part of 1184.

When presenting an account of his own generation William used his own experiences as well as the memories of others. In narrating prior events, however, he relied on oral traditions and written sources, making use of Albert of Aachen,³⁶ Raymond of Aguilers, Fulcher of Chartres, Baldric of Dol and the anonymous *Gesta Francorum*.³⁷ Even though William approached these with a critical eye, he molded them to his own views on more than one occasion, some of which will be discussed in the course of the thesis.

³⁴ Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, 26.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 27-29.

³⁶ Albert first set out to write the account of the First Crusade in six books, culminating in the liberation of Jerusalem. It is probable that he circulated this version first and only at a later date decided to continue his work with another six books covering the period from 1099 to 1119. Today only the manuscripts that hold the final redaction of the work, comprising twelve books, are extant. One of the arguments for the theory of two redactions, however, is the fact that William of Tyre uses Albert as a source, but only up to the sixth book. See Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, ed. and tr. Susan B. Edgington (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007), xxiv.

³⁷ Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, 45-46.

Regardless of the patronage he enjoyed from King Amalric, William's goal was not simply to write an encomium of the ruling dynasty. The kings were generally presented favorable, but none was infallible. Even if he indicated that he had started writing at Amalric's suggestion, this may be nothing more than a medieval literary convention,³⁸ and it is more probable that "the insistent love for the *patria*" was what made him write.³⁹ William knew very well the Western indifference of the predicaments of the Latin East. The intention was thus to present a favorable image of his homeland to his intended audience, amongst which figured both the westerners and his compatriots. By recounting the history of the Latin East he aimed to reinvigorate its people, at the time when Saladin's unification of the surrounding Muslim lands casted a shadow over their future. Furthermore, he was on an apologetic mission, explaining and justifying his *patria* to the western audience.

William's life and career, his educational background and the network of contacts influenced him in creating a multi-layered and idiosyncratic image of the Byzantine Empire in his work. However, at the same time, the dramatic events of the last years of his life forced him to re-consider the image he had created. A thorough analysis of the different elements of his work therefore can shed light on this complex issue, and even more on the methods of work he has used in creating this image for his audience.

³⁸ David W. T. C. Vessey, "William of Tyre and the Art of Historiography," *Mediaeval Studies* 35 (1973): 438.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 440. Vessey suggested that by evoking his *patria* William referred to both the Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Holy Land as the homeland of all the Christians. WT Prologue: *urgentissimus instat amor patrie*. In this thesis I have relied on the only available English translation of William's work: William archbishop of Tyre, *The History of Deeds Done beyond the Sea*, 2 vols., tr. Emily A. Babcock and August C. Krey (New York: Columbia University Press, 1943). However, where necessary, I made interventions.

III. CONSTRUCTING THE IMAGE

THE EMPERORS

As outlined in the introduction, the first step of the analysis is to examine the images of each of the three Komnenian emperors, whose reigns took up almost the entire time-span that the *Historia* deals with. It has been underlined that as a staunch supporter of Manuel's policy, William in his work strove to find a place for the empire. The Latins were the legitimate and, through the First Crusade, divinely approved defenders of the Holy Land, and, as such, the successors of the Byzantine Empire, which was now supposed to play a new role – to support the Crusader states in the war against the infidel. Manuel, acting as a protector of the Crusader states without asserting direct control, complied with this idea. Still, the archbishop of Tyre was not writing only about the contemporary period, when everything went well between the two sides; Manuel's predecessors did not always show sympathy for the Latins.

ALEXIOS

Of the three Komnenian emperors, Alexios, without a doubt, came to be regarded as the worst. William presented him to his audience as “a wicked and a crafty man,”⁴⁰ and in the course of the whole second book he strove to portray a perfidious Greek

⁴⁰ WT 2.5: *vir nequam et subdolus*.

traitor, whose words when dealing with the leaders of the Princes' Crusade "did not come from the sincerity and good faith;" rather Alexios chose to play them "with his usual trickery."⁴¹ All the animosity William felt towards Alexios is reflected in the emperor's obit in the work. The audience was to remember Alexios as "the worst persecutor of the Latins."⁴² Unlike the following emperor John (r. 1118–1143), whose portrait showed complexity, Alexios was to remain forever encapsulated in the image of the arch-nemesis of the Latins. In constructing this image, repeated accusations of treachery and frequently emphasized Greekness mattered the most. The second book played a key role in this, and accordingly it will be brought under the scope of the analysis in the following subchapter. Yet, there is some ambiguity in his image, which has to be addressed before proceeding to analyze the images of other two emperors.

Namely, both of the previous studies on this subject interpret as inconsistency the fact that William presented Alexios as acting treacherously towards the Princes' Crusade, while kindly treating the People's Crusade.⁴³ Still, a close examination of the episodes where Alexios appears in the first book of the *Historia*, in which the failure of the People's Crusade is presented, shows that in fact there was no inconsistency. In the course of this book the emperor was referred to on twelve occasions.⁴⁴ However, not once was he addressed by name. William indeed portrayed

⁴¹ WT 2.12: *Quod autem maturius ducis exercitum transfretare persuasionibus suis compulerat, non de fidei sinceritate processit, sed fraude solita ducem circumvenit, ne aliis advenientibus eius copie possent admisceri.* The term "Princes' Crusade" designates the second wave of the First Crusade, as opposed to the first wave, often called the "People's Crusade," comprising bands of peasants and lowly knights led by the charismatic figure of Peter the Hermit. Armies of the Princes' Crusade set out from Europe in the late 1096. These were: the Lorrainer army under Godfrey of Bouillon, duke of Lower Lorraine; army of northern French under Robert II, count of Flanders, and Robert, duke of Normandy; army of the Sicilian Normans under Bohemund of Taranto; and finally, Provençal army under Raymond, count of Toulouse. For an overview of the progress of both the People's and Princes' Crusades to Constantinople, see Tyerman, *God's War*, 92-122.

⁴² WT 12.5: *Alexius, Latinorum maximus persecutor.*

⁴³ Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, 132; Hamilton, "William of Tyre and the Byzantine Empire," 221.

⁴⁴ Two times in 1.18, five in 1.22, once in 1.23, once in 1.24, and three times in 1.26.

“the lord emperor” favorably, but he did not state which emperor at any time. Even though it is evident to the modern day scholar that it is Alexios who was reigning at that time, it was not necessarily evident to William’s contemporary or near-contemporary reader.

Comparing William to the Albert of Aachen,⁴⁵ his source for the account of the People’s Crusade,⁴⁶ suggests this to be a deliberate act.⁴⁷ The episode when Alexios enters the story in Albert’s work is most revealing, for it is in the same episode that he enters the story in William’s *Historia*. It describes the journey of Walter, lord of Boissy Sans Avoir, and his band of knights, the first Crusaders to reach Constantinople. Albert described it in a single chapter – chapter which William lifted as a whole, following the narrative faithfully but paraphrasing.⁴⁸ At least, he did so until the last part, the arrival at Constantinople. There, Walter pleaded to the emperor for lodging space to shelter his army, and, according to Albert, “the lord emperor, *Alexios by name* (emphasis mine), graciously responded and granted everything he sought.”⁴⁹ William, although meticulously following Albert up to this point, was quite reticent in saying that “the emperor granted that to him.”⁵⁰ William kept Alexios’ name to himself and continued to do so, eleven times more referring to him simply as “the emperor.” Thus in the end the whole first book stood silent about the emperor’s identity. This was not an act of simply omitting a name from a sentence, but, instead, a conscious and deliberate attempt at erasing Alexios from a

⁴⁵ Albert, canon of the church of Aachen wrote a history of the First Crusade based on oral testimonies of the Crusaders returning home, probably those of Godfrey of Bouillon.

⁴⁶ Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, 47.

⁴⁷ For Albert’s account of the People’s Crusade, see Albert of Aachen, *Historia*, 8-45.

⁴⁸ In Albert’s work the passage in question is 1.6, while in William’s 1.18. William is faithfully following Albert in describing Walter’s passage through Hungary, Zemun, Belgrade and Niš.

⁴⁹ Albert of Aachen, *Historia*, 12-13: *a domno imperatore Alexi nomine benigne et de omnibus petenti responsum et concessum est.*

⁵⁰ WT 1.18: *quod ei concessit imperator.*

historical episode in which he figured highly. It was only the second book that unveiled Alexios to the audience for the first time in the *Historia*. “At this time a wicked and a crafty man, Alexios, surnamed Komnenos, was ruling over the Greek Empire,” William wrote on this occasion.⁵¹ Moreover, not at any point of his work did the archbishop of Tyre refer to Alexios’ treatment of the People’s Crusade again.

It can be assumed that William, although keen to include Albert of Aachen’s detailed account of the People’s Crusade, did not want to follow Albert in presenting Alexios in a favorable light. Thus by avoiding mentioning Alexios by name, he tried to influence the reader to form a picture of the emperor without taking this episode into consideration. Here William was bound to Albert, and he did not invert his account altogether but rather chose to mold it to his own purposes. Interestingly it was not the only time. Edbury and Rowe have already noted how again in the first book, William added a touch of his rhetoric to the Albert’s account of Peter the Hermit’s visit to Jerusalem and meeting with the patriarch.⁵² In William’s account, the patriarch spoke of the weakness of the Greeks, from whom nothing could now be expected. Albert made no mention of this point. This was purely William building the image of the Latins as the successors of the Byzantine Empire in defending the Holy Land.⁵³ These two examples reveal much about William’s treatment of the sources. On occasions where they did not suit his argument, he respected them enough to resort to finer methods of reshaping, and the subtlety with which he tweaked Albert’s work in these two episodes reveals all the finesse of his propaganda.

⁵¹ WT 2.5: *Preerat autem per idem tempus Grecorum imperio vir nequam et subdolos Alexius nomine, agnomine dictus Connino.*

⁵² Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, 131-132.

⁵³ For Albert’s account of Peter the Hermit’s visit to Jerusalem, see Albert of Aachen, *Historia*, 2-7; for William’s account of the episode, see WT 1.11-12.

JOHN

As for Alexios' son John, there is no doubt that William wanted to present him in a good light, even though "he also was not entirely sincere towards the Eastern Latins."⁵⁴ John only came into the picture with the accounts of his two expeditions to Cilicia and Northern Syria, territories under the rule of the prince of Antioch.⁵⁵ In the *Historia* these events take up the end of the fourteenth and one third of the fifteenth book.⁵⁶

William was not dispassionate in his account of the campaigns. While he thought of John's actions against Antioch as unjust, during the joint Latin-Byzantine siege of a Muslim city of Shaizar, he portrayed him in a favorable light to say the least:

The emperor, a man of great courage, pressed on the assault with glowing zeal and promised rewards for victory. Thus he kindled the enthusiasm of the young, ever eager for glory, for the strife and the combats of war. Protected by the breastplate and girdled with the sword, his head covered with a golden helmet, he mingled with the ranks and cheered now these now those, with words of encouragement. Again, like a man of the people, he roused their valor by his example and fought valiantly, that he might render others more courageous for the fray. Thus did this man of lofty spirit move about without ceasing among the troops. From the first hour of the day even unto the latest he endured the heat of the battle. He gave himself no rest – not even to

⁵⁴ WT 12.5: *Iohannes, filius eius ... qui etiam non omnino sincerus erga Latinos Orientales extitit.* Unlike his father, John was mentioned by his given name from the start.

⁵⁵ First expedition took place in 1137 and according to the sources there was more than one motive behind it. Still, the prevailing one was probably John's ambition to assert Byzantine claims to the regions. In a matter of months Cilicia was part of the empire once more, while Raymond (r. 1136–1149), prince of Antioch, managed to negotiate with John an agreement, by which he was supposed to cede Antioch to him and receive compensation in the Muslim cities they then set out to conquer together. Regardless of their failure to do so, the emperor persevered in his claims on Antioch, but due to the upheaval of the Latins in the city, in the end chose to withdraw to Constantinople. A second expedition ensued in 1142, with John determined to have Antioch at any price. In the end he was not to have it his way. He died next year in Cilicia as a result of a hunting accident. Cf. Ralph-Johannes Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States 1096-1204* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 96-141.

⁵⁶ For William's account of John expeditions to Cilicia and Syria, see WT, 14.24, 30 and 15.1-5, 19-23.

take food. For either he was admonishing those who served the engines to take better and more frequent aim or he was inspiring courage in those who were engaged in the thick of the combat. He restored the strength of the fighters by successive relays of men and substituted fresh troops for those who were exhausted.⁵⁷

The whole passage reveals two elements by which William wanted his readers to perceive John. First of all, unlike Alexios, he was presented with full imperial dignity, conspicuous in battle by the eminence of his armor. Second, a detailed description of John's actions on the battlefield was meant to awe the audience of his courage, vigor and ability to inspire respect from his troops, qualities that were – and still are for that matter – essential in any field-commander. No legendary leader of the First Crusade and no Latin leader whatsoever provoked this kind of admiration from William, and the reason behind these rhetorical flourishes lies in the nature of this campaign. For this was the first and the only time that a Byzantine Emperor in person led a serious joint expedition against the Muslims,⁵⁸ and in this respect John mirrored the ideal that William envisaged, and for which he believed an emperor should strive.⁵⁹ In the end the blame for the ultimate failure of this expedition was placed entirely on the prince of Antioch and the count of Edessa, whose dissolute behavior led the emperor to raise the siege.

⁵⁷ WT 15.1: *Urgebat dominus imperator, sicut vir erat magnanimus, studio fervente propositum et propositis braviis adolescentium glorie cupidos ad certamina et congressus accendebat animos, lorica quoque indutus et accinctus gladio, casside caput tectus aurea, mediis inmixtus agminibus nunc hos, nunc illos sermonibus hortatur congruis, nunc exemplo tanquam unus e popularibus provocat et instat viriliter, ut alios ad instandum reddat animosiores. Sic igitur vir egregia animositate insignis sine intermissione discurrens, estus belli a prima diei hora usque ad novissimam sustinens nichil sibi quietis ut vel cibum sumeret indulgebat, sed aut hos qui machinis deservebant ut frequentius aut directius iacularentur ammonerat, aut his qui in conflictibus desudabant addebat animos, per vicarias successiones vires reparans et pro deficientibus recentes subrogans et integris conatibus validos.*

⁵⁸ In the winter of 1158-59 Manuel marched to Cilicia and Syria leading a great army. In terms of the war against the Muslims this campaign did not achieve anything, since Manuel allowed himself to be bought off by Nur al-Din with the release of Christian prisoners. For a detailed assessment of the expedition, see Magdalino, *Empire of Manuel I*, 67-72.

⁵⁹ Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, 140

Even on his deathbed, by refusing to let his hand be severed so that his life could have been saved, he was presented as befitting an emperor. Furthermore, “as a provident and intelligent man,” he proclaimed his younger son Manuel as the successor to the throne, even though it meant “to go against the laws of mankind, which rightfully make the elder more important.”⁶⁰ He was a noble emperor, worthy of his position, who although acting against the Latins was in the end “far more humane than his father had been, and, according to his worth, was far more acceptable to our people.”⁶¹ The image of John, chiseled with the *topos* of *fortitudo et sapientia* and clothed with the imperial dignity, differed greatly from that of Alexios, the treacherous Greek.⁶² John incorporated Cilicia to the empire and indeed he tried to do the same with Antioch, but there were no accusations of treachery or Latin-hatred brought against the Greeks. John’s expedition against the infidel and the fact that Antioch ultimately stayed in Latin hands, left maneuvering space for William’s rhetoric.

MANUEL

The image of Manuel Komnenos differs greatly from that of his predecessors, The reason, as has been already underlined, is that unlike his father, did not try to subjugate them to direct imperial control. Because of this he stood high in the eyes of

⁶⁰ WT 15.23: *tanquam vir providus et discretus ... legibus humanitatis, que primogenitum merito faciunt potioem, videbimur contraire*. Throughout his work, William emphasized hereditary rights in succession and was regularly ill-disposed towards usurpers. Here however he took a different approach. Manuel, even if not the eldest son, was presented as the right choice due to his ability, military circumstances and God’s will. It is interesting that when Baldwin II (r. 1118–1131) was crowned king, William was indignant that the rights of Eustace, who was the brother of Baldwin I (r. 1100–1118), have been passed over. Yet with Manuel’s accession, John showed his providence by designating Manuel to be his heir. For William’s views on legitimate rule and usurpers, see Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, 65-70.

⁶¹ WT 12.5: *patre multo humanior, et meritis exigentibus, populo nostro patre longe acceptior*.

⁶² About the development of the *topos* of *sapientia et fortitudo* from Antiquity to Middle Ages, see Ernst Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), 173-179.

William, whose opinion was furthermore influenced by his personal knowledge of the emperor. Manuel was fond of using the Byzantine ceremonial for all it was worth, and this clearly made an impression on William during his mission to Constantinople in the winter of 1179-80:⁶³

Indeed, if we tried to describe in detail the circus games in the hippodrome and the wonders of the various spectacles solemnly performed for the people on those occasions; the imperial vestments, and the weight and number of jewels and pearls adorning the garments which the emperor wore; the golden furnishings of the palace, the vast amount of silverware and the costly embroidered hangings; if we tried to convey in words the number of courtiers and household servants, the magnificence of the wedding festivities, the great generosity of the emperor and the largesse bestowed by him on his own people and on visitors, we should lack words to express these things even were we to write a separate book about them.⁶⁴

However, it was already Manuel's first appearance in the *Historia* that was meant to instruct the reader in the way he was supposed to perceive him. The argument proposed here is that William consistently sought to portray Manuel not as a Greek, but rather as "one of us." Thus, commenting on John's doubts in choosing his successor between Manuel and Isaac, William noted how "Manuel, the younger son ... stood high in the esteem and favor of the entire army, particularly with the Latins."⁶⁵ The emphasis on the Latins as Manuel's most ardent supporters was supposed to herald the coming of a new emperor who was mindful of the Crusader

⁶³ It is instructive to quote Michael Angold, *The Byzantine Empire 1025-1204: A Political History* (London: Longman, 1992), 206: "The image of Byzantium fascinated the West. Its fairy-tale quality made it the background for the *romans d'antiquité*, then in vogue in the courts of France. The ceremonial of the Byzantine court was much admired in the West, and its robes of honour were copied in the courts of Jerusalem, Palermo and Venice." For more about the Byzantine ceremonial during the Komnenoi, see Magdalino, *Empire of Manuel I*, 237-248.

⁶⁴ WT 22.4: *Verum si ludos circenses, quos cives illius urbis ipodromos vocant, et variorum gloriam spectaculorum populo per illos dies cum sollempnitate exhibitam, si imperialem circa vestes et proprii corporis indumenta in lapidibus preciosis et margaritarum pondere et numero excellentiam, si palatii suppellectilem auream, argenteam, numero et pondere infinitam, si velorum ad ornatum dependentium precium, si famulorum et curialium numerositatem scripto comprehendere temptemus, si apparatus nuptiarum magnificentiam, si effusam in omnes tam suos quam externos immense liberalitatis munificentiam per singula velimus prosequi, immensitate materie sermo subcumberet, etiam si specialis ad hoc deputaretur tractatus.*

⁶⁵ WT 15.23: *Manuel, iunior filius ... universi exercitus et maxime Latinorum favore et preconiis extollebatur.*

states. This was not an exception. “He passed over his Greeklings as soft and effeminate and entrusted important affairs of the state to the Latins alone,” William wrote after Manuel’s death, emphasizing the difference between Manuel and the rest of the Greeks.⁶⁶

During Manuel’s campaign to Syria in 1159, the emperor received King Baldwin III of Jerusalem and treated him in an honorable fashion. Later, on a hunting trip the king fell from his horse and broke his arm. The emperor tended to him personally, while “his nobles and kinsmen were indignant and amazed that, unmindful of his imperial majesty and negligent of his supreme dignity, he presented himself in this way like a caring servant.”⁶⁷ As previous studies have argued, for William this act represented the ideal in the Constantinopolitan-Jerusalemite relations, where the emperor was supporting the Eastern Latins and not trying to replace them.⁶⁸ Indeed this was most probably so, but recently Alexandru Anca’s research has focused on another aspect of this episode, namely that Manuel’s actions were a part of his self-representation.⁶⁹ The emperor, by presenting himself as a healer, sought to imitate Christ, and, judging by William’s comments, succeeded in making an impression in foreign diplomacy. But if Anca’s interpretation is accepted, an additional question arises. Namely, if this indeed was an imperial ritual, why did the archbishop of Tyre write about the consternation of Manuel’s nobles and kinsmen, who would have been

⁶⁶ WT 22.11: *neglectis Greculis suis tanquam viris mollibus et effeminatis ... solis Latinis grandia committeret negocia.*

⁶⁷ WT 18.25: *ut cum indignatione stuperent et mirarentur eius principes et consanguinei quod maiestatis oblitus imperatorie et augustalem negligens dignitatem regi se exhiberet ita devotum et familiarem.*

⁶⁸ Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, 143; Hamilton, “William of Tyre and the Byzantine Empire,” 225.

⁶⁹ Alexandru Anca, “Der heilende Herrscher: Manuel I. Komnenos als Arzt,” (Abstract) in *Workshop: Interaction in Word and Image: Personal Relations in Medieval Sources* (Vienna: 2007) (<http://www.univie.ac.at/amicitia/Abstracts.pdf>; last accessed: 26/05/2008)

expected to participate in it?⁷⁰ The answer could very well be that once more William seized the opportunity to emphasize the difference between Manuel and the rest of the Greeks. Once more it was emphasized that Manuel is pro-Latin, unlike the other Greeks.

However, the Second Crusade presented an episode where seemingly William approached Manuel in the same manner as he approached Alexios, accusing him and the Greeks of treachery. According to the research plan stated in the introduction this episode will be analyzed thoroughly in the following subchapter. For now let it be stated that, in the end, William's opinion of Manuel was unchanged by this episode. He never referred to it again, but portrayed Manuel as an emperor inclined to the Latins and "the most generous among all the rulers in the world," who in the end "gave back his soul to the heaven."⁷¹

ADDITIONAL DEVICES IN CONSTRUCTING IMAGES

Two more issues can be analyzed when discussing the way William constructed the images of the emperors: first, his attempt to reshape the Western perceptions of Byzantium through history; second, his use of terminology when addressing a Byzantine Emperor.

First, the already discussed second book of the *Historia*, devoted to the advancement of the Princes' Crusade through the Byzantine territory, has to be subjected to the investigation again. Godfrey of Bouillon's army is in the focus here

⁷⁰ Although William specified that Manuel "entrusted important matters of the state to the Latins alone," the Greek nobles and the kinsmen were named here as the entourage. It comes as no surprise since when the emperors faced western leaders they were attended most conspicuously by their kinsmen and not by ranks of office holders. Jonathan Shepard and Simon Franklin eds., *Byzantine Diplomacy: Papers from the Twenty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1992), 56.

⁷¹ WT 22.5: *omnium principum terre munificentissimus ... animam celo reddidit.*

as the first one to be presented entering the Byzantine territory and William uses this opportunity to present the Byzantine Empire to his readers:

The misery of the Greeks and the weakness of their empire are easily conjectured from the state of these places, which were once rich provinces filled with all kinds of desirable commodities. For when the rule of Latin rulers of Constantinople ceased, the empire, because of its sins, fell into the power of Greeks under Nikephoros I. Immediately the barbarous people, confident in the weakness of the Greeks, stormed into their provinces and began to treat the inhabitants of the region as they wanted to.⁷²

The three elements of this passage are easily separated and sequenced in the following order: (1) the displacement of the Latin rulers of Constantinople and the accession of the Greek ones, starting with Nikephoros I (r. 802–811); (2) “barbarian” incursions into provinces, taking advantage of the Greek weakness; and (3) the misery of the empire as opposed to its glorious past. They are artfully combined to convey an impression of the empire of Constantinople, the fortunes of which were tied to the classification of the emperors as Greek or Latin. However, by emphasizing this difference between the Greek and Latin rulers, the message may have been used to offer to the audience the key for understanding the Komnenian emperors and through them their empire and its status *vis-à-vis* the Western Christendom. Only a “Latin” emperor, that is to say an emperor constructing a pro-Latin policy, “entrusting important affairs of the state to the Latins alone,”⁷³ was able to guarantee good prospects of the empire. The message thus aimed to give credence to Manuel’s “Latin” policy, which was to be vigorously supported by the archbishop of Tyre in the

⁷² WT 2.4: *Conicere est ex his locis, que aliquando uberiores et omnimodis commoditatibus referte fuerunt provincie, quanta sit Grecorum miseria et eorum debilitas imperii. Nam postquam, deficientibus apud Constantinopolim Latinis principibus, in eorum potestatem sub primo Nicheforo, peccatis exigentibus, descendit imperium, statim barbære nationes, de Grecorum inbecillitate confise, in eorum provincias irruentes pro arbitrio suo regionis ceperunt tractare habitatores.*

⁷³ WT 22.11: *solis Latinis grandia committeret negocia.*

later part of his work. At the same time it aimed at rejecting the rule of Alexios as a rule of a Greek emperor, which brought only ill fortune to the empire.

As Edbury and Rowe were observant to notice, emphasizing Nikephoros I as the first “Greek” ruler probably aims to coincide with the coronation of Charles the Great, thus hinting at the idea of the *translatio imperii*.⁷⁴ Analyzed in this context, differentiating between the “Latin” and “Greek” rulers of Constantinople is, as far as it can be ascertained, completely original.⁷⁵ Otto (1114–1158), bishop of Freising and a participant of the Second Crusade, thought that already Constantine’s move signified the transfer of power to the Greeks,⁷⁶ who in turn lost it to Charles the Great because the rule over their empire “passed in no honorable fashion into the hands of a woman,” Empress Irene (r. 797–802).⁷⁷ Aimery of Limoges (r. 1140–1193), Latin patriarch of Antioch fluent in Greek and Latin, wrote to the famed theologian Hugh Etherian (1115–1182) about his interest in the history of Byzantium “from the time when their [Greek] emperors separated from the Roman Empire.”⁷⁸ Still even earlier Rodulfus Glaber (985–1047), a Cluniac monk who wrote a history covering the period from 900 to 1044, contrasted Rome, the head of the *Universa Latinitas*, to Constantinople, “separate capital of the Greeks and other peoples who live in the

⁷⁴ Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, 132. According to this idea, the power proceeded from the Babylonians to the Medes and Persians, then to the Macedonians and after them to the Romans. For the use of the idea as a device of propaganda, see Jacques Le Goff, *Medieval Civilization 400–1500* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998), 171–172.

⁷⁵ See Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, 93–101; Marie Tanner, *The Last Descendant of Aeneas: The Hapsburgs and the Mythic Image of the Emperor* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 41.

⁷⁶ Otto bishop of Freising, *The Two Cities*, tr. Charles Christopher Mierow (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 283.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 352: *quod in manus faminae non digne devenerat*.

⁷⁸ See *Rescriptum Aimerici ad Hugonem*, published as an appendix to Hugo Eterianus, *De haeresibus quas Graeci in Latinos devolvunt libri tres sive quod Spiritus Sanctus ex utroque Patre scilicet et Filio, procedat. Contra Graecos*, PL 202, comp. J.-P. Migne (Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1855), col. 232A: *ex illo tempore quo imperatores eorum a Romano divisi sunt imperio, usque ad nostra tempora*.

eastern lands beyond the sea.”⁷⁹ Constantinople was not perceived as Latin; it was as a Greek city, the capital of the Greek Empire ever since the time of Constantine. As such it was situated outside the world of Western Christianity, which perceived itself as Latin. William responded by reshaping this view, creating an image of a city which indeed had a Latin history. The very prominence he gave to this passage should not be taken lightly as well. It is the very first description of the empire in the narrative. What immediately follows is the already discussed unveiling of the Emperor Alexios, succeeded in turn by the account of the topographical features of Constantinople.⁸⁰ Thus the idea, seen in the context of these sequenced passages, in a sense represents the “official” introduction of the Byzantine Empire into the narrative. The idiosyncratic character of the message plus the prominent place William allotted to it should be enough of a reason not to discard it lightly.

The second issue that draws attention is the question of terminology. In constructing the image of the evil and treacherous Alexios, on one occasion William had Bohemund, the leader of the Norman army, refer to him as “the wicked prince of the Greeks.”⁸¹ In fact the Byzantine emperor styled himself as the “emperor of the Romans” (*Basileus kai autokrator ton Rhomaion*),⁸² while for William and his Western audience the German king held the title of the Roman emperor.⁸³ In the West, it seems, the Byzantine emperor was interchangeably titled as “emperor of the Greeks” (*imperator Grecorum*) or as “Constantinopolitan emperor” (*imperator*

⁷⁹ Rodulfus Glaber, *Opera*, eds. and trs. John France, Neithard Bulst and Paul Reynolds (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 30-31: *Constantinopolis tam Grecorum speciale caput in transmarinis partibus quam ceterorum*.

⁸⁰ For Alexios, see WT 2.5, while for Constantinople, see WT 2.7.

⁸¹ WT 2.10: *impium Grecorum principem*.

⁸² ODB 235, 264.

⁸³ For William referring to the Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV (1099–1125) as the “Roman Emperor” (*Romanorum imperator*), see WT 13.19.

Constantinopolitanus),⁸⁴ while William regularly used the latter title. However, on three instances where he aimed to show an emperor in a negative light, he referred to him as the emperor or even prince of the Greeks, which can suggest that he considered this title more offensive to the imperial dignity. Twice he labeled Alexios in this way,⁸⁵ and it is only during his reign that Byzantium was referred to as the empire or the kingdom of the Greeks.⁸⁶ William, who was on two occasions an envoy to Constantinople, knew very well the importance of terminology in addressing the emperor. When reporting on the trials and tribulations of the German army during the Second Crusade, at one instance he commented:

They [the Greeks] take it ill that their [German] king calls himself the emperor of the Romans. For thereby he seems to detract too much from the prestige of their own emperor, whom they themselves call monarch, that is, the one who rules supreme over all and therefore is the only emperor of the Romans.⁸⁷

Thus, while addressing Alexios as the “emperor of the Greeks,” possibly he tried, as he himself had put it, “to detract ... from the prestige of their emperor.” The third instance where he did so confirms this. Just a few lines before the quoted passage, while informing his audience of the probability that Manuel betrayed the Second Crusade, he referred to the emperor in the same way. Unlike his Western contemporaries William did not think of Constantinople as a Greek city *par excellence*, but a capital where the Latin rulers did once reside. Therefore, it is possible that for William, given his views of Constantinople as a city with Latin history, the title of “Constantinopolitan emperor” did not provoke such negativity as the exclusive “emperor of the Greeks.”

⁸⁴ Magdalino, *Empire of Manuel I*, 86.

⁸⁵ WT 2.10, 7.16.

⁸⁶ WT 2.4, 2.5.

⁸⁷ WT 16.21: *Molestē siquidem ferunt quod eorum rex Romanorum se dicit imperatorem: in hoc enim suo nimium detrahi videtur imperatori, quem ipsi monarcham, id est singulariter principari omnibus dicunt tanquam Romanorum unicum et solum imperatorem.*

When looking at the images of the three emperors, an opposition between Manuel and Alexios immediately becomes apparent. Manuel's reign brought Byzantine support to the Crusader states, while Alexios consistently acted against them. Thus, it has been argued, Alexios represented a typical Greek and figured as an antithesis to Manuel, who was molded into "one of us" figure, a "Latin." In this way, John, an emperor of who waged war against the infidel but also held designs on Antioch, posed a kind of a stepping stone between Manuel and Alexios. The opposition between Alexios and Manuel was emphasized with other rhetorical devices. First, it seems that William had an intention to reshape the popular view of the empire's past in order to make the present more acceptable to his readers. Constantinople, according to him, had a Latin history. It aimed at contrasting Alexios' Greek empire to Manuel's "pro-Latin" one. Second, William used two titles to address the emperor, the "Constantinopolitan emperor" and the "emperor of the Greeks," and his use of these shows that he saw the latter in a more negative light.

TREACHERY OF THE GREEKS

There are two episodes in the *Historia* that tell of the treachery of the Greeks: the First Crusade (including the Crusade of 1101) and the Second Crusade. This comes as no surprise since, as Krijnie Ciggaar aptly put it, in the twelfth century the *fallatia Grecorum* became an established *topos* in Crusade chronicles.⁸⁸ As the following pages will show, the chroniclers of the First Crusade, Crusade of 1101 and the Second Crusade regularly spoke of the perfidious Greeks. However, the fact that William accused Manuel of treachery seemingly contradicts his image in the work. This problem can only be elucidated when compared to the accusations of treachery in the First Crusade. But to understand the image of the treacherous Greeks in William's work, it is useful to reflect on its origins.

ORIGINS OF THE IMAGE

A growing estrangement between East and West in the twelfth century, which ultimately resulted in the 1204 sack of Constantinople, is as a highly debated issue in modern scholarship. It was already popularized by the late Sir Steven Runciman in his *History of the Crusades* that the First Crusade represented a classic case of the clash of civilizations.⁸⁹ The theory nevertheless soon received revisions, with historians seeking deeper roots of the negative images of the Greeks. In this respect the research done by Michael Renschler, and lately, Krijnie Ciggaar, has done much to demonstrate the presence of these images in the eleventh and even tenth century,

⁸⁸ Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, 78-79.

⁸⁹ Runciman, *History of the Crusades*.

when Latin historians frequently spoke of *Grecia callida, fraudulens* or *mendax*.⁹⁰ Even though Jonathan Harris had recently again confined the research to the twelfth century and shifted the focus to the conflicting ideologies of the Byzantine Empire and the Crusaders,⁹¹ it is quite clear that the presence of a negative image facilitated the estrangement which finally led to the sack of Constantinople in 1204. Thus, the overview presented here follows the main points of Harris' argument, but complements it by looking also at the deeper roots of the image.

Even though the negativity surrounding the image of the Greeks was present earlier, the First Crusade remains the crucial point in the deterioration of the intercultural relations. Whereas the Crusaders thought of themselves as soldiers of God on a divine mission to help the Eastern Christians and liberate Jerusalem from the Muslims, Emperor Alexios saw in them potential mercenaries to be used against the Turks in Asia Minor, but also a threat to the security of Constantinople.⁹² Hoping to harness the strength of these troops to his aims, Alexios sought to extract oaths from their leaders.⁹³ The policy he applied was characterized by threats and rewards: offering numerous gifts and kind words, but also resorting to military force. For the Byzantines there was nothing unusual about that. The tactics of the Byzantine Emperors when dealing with "barbarians" were infinitely flexible. As Anna Komnene, Alexios' daughter and panegyrist, succinctly put it: "sometimes when the

⁹⁰ Michael Rentschler, "Griechische Kultur und Byzanz im Urteil westlicher Autoren des 10. Jahrhunderts," *Saeculum* 29 (1978): 324-355; idem, "Griechische Kultur und Byzanz im Urteil westlicher Autoren des 11. Jahrhunderts," *Saeculum* 31 (1980): 112-155; Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*. The article by Herbert Hunger, "Graeculus perfidus/Italos itamos: Il senso dell'alterità nei rapporti greco-romani ed italo-bizantini," (Rome: Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di Archeologia, 1986) was ordered through the Interlibrary Loan, but did not arrive before the deadline for the submission of the thesis.

⁹¹ Jonathan Harris, *Byzantium and the Crusades* (London: Hambledon and London, 2003).

⁹² *Ibid.*, 32.

⁹³ On oaths in Byzantium, see Nicolas Svoronos, "Le serment de fidélité à l'empereur byzantin et sa signification constitutionnelle," *Revue des Études Byzantines* 9 (1951): 106-142.

chance offers itself, an enemy can be beaten by fraud.”⁹⁴ For the Byzantines this kind of attitude was, as Jonathan Harris has argued, “almost a measure of sophistication, a mark of superiority over the uneducated and uncultured.”⁹⁵ Thus it comes as no surprise that the Crusaders were disgruntled by the treatment they received in Constantinople. Even Albert of Aachen, generally well disposed towards the Byzantines,⁹⁶ wrote about “the tricks and poisoned garments of the emperor, and his deceitful words.”⁹⁷ Still, nearly all the leaders eventually complied with emperor’s wishes and swore oaths of fealty. Frictions did not end at the walls of Constantinople however, and further misunderstandings were to come at the siege of Antioch, where Alexios, deterred by the possible onslaught of the Turks, failed to come to help the Crusaders. Alexios’ actions at Constantinople and Antioch worked for Bohemund of Taranto, a Norman and one of the Crusade leaders, who long had ambitions of carving a principality for himself in the Balkans. In order to realize these ambitions Bohemund toured Italy and France in 1106, accusing the emperor of treachery. This propaganda, together with the success of the *Gesta Francorum*, a work which recorded the First Crusade from the Norman perspective, finally led to an overwhelmingly negative image of the Byzantines in Western chronicles.⁹⁸

Here Harris’ argument falls short however, because the fact that these accusations found fertile ground in the West was largely due to the presence of age-old negative stereotypes of the Greeks. Alexios’ actions were accepted as typically Greek, based on the attestations found in the works of previous tenth- and eleventh-century authors and, more importantly, Classical authors. Cicero and Juvenal, among

⁹⁴ Anna Comnena, *The Alexiad*, tr. E. R. A. Sewter (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1982), 477.

⁹⁵ Harris, *Byzantium and the Crusades*, 31.

⁹⁶ Albert of Aachen, *Historia*, xxxiii.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 74-75: *versutias et venenatas vestes ipsius imperatoris ac verba dolosa*.

⁹⁸ Harris, *Byzantium and the Crusades*, 89.

others, grumbled on and on about the perfidy, inconsistency, and effeminacy of the “Greeklings” (*Graeculi*).⁹⁹ Confrontations with the Byzantines thus enlivened the ancient stereotypes, and Classical literature in turn gave credence to the claims of the Westerners. The *fallatia Grecorum* became a *topos*, and referring to it meant evoking “wisdom so universal as to be instantly recognizable.”¹⁰⁰ William’s *Historia* offers a perfect example of this:

Nevertheless, when they [the Crusade leaders] presented themselves before him [Alexios], he gave them kind answers and showered them abundantly with gifts, in order that he might more readily deceive them. Thus he upheld the custom of his nation, of whom it is said “I fear the Greeks, even when they bear gifts.”¹⁰¹

The famous line from Vergil’s *Aeneid* condemning the deceitful sack of Troy by the Greeks was simply confirmed in the new cultural context. William of course knew its origin,¹⁰² and thus by repeating it he aimed to give his views a sign of confirmation. Interestingly, knowledge of this particular line was not even restricted to the cultured elite. According to Odo of Deuil (1110–1162), chaplain to Louis VII and participant in the Second Crusade, “the proverb ‘I fear the Greeks, even when they bear gifts’ has always been well-known, even among certain laymen.”¹⁰³ Thus even if it was a case of conflicting ideologies during the First Crusade, as proposed by Jonathan Harris, the strife between East and West indeed had deeper roots. Still, the main concern here is

⁹⁹ For an overview of the Roman negative attitudes towards the Greeks, see Benjamina Isaac, *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 381–405.

¹⁰⁰ Ruth Morse, *Truth and Convention in the Middle Ages: Rhetoric, Representation and Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 68.

¹⁰¹ WT 11.6: *presentibus tamen et coram positis benigna dabat responsa et munera largiebatur, ut eo falleret commodius, Grecorum observans morem, de quibus dicitur: “timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.”*

¹⁰² When retelling the story of abduction of Queen Theodora, wife of then late King Baldwin III, by Andronikos Komnenos, William remarked that this proved the words of Vergil: “I fear the Greeks, even when they bear gifts.” See, WT 20.2.

¹⁰³ Odo of Deuil, *The Journey of Louis VII to the East*, ed. and tr. Virginia Gingerick Berry (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1948), 26–27: *Semper tamen etiam inter quosdam laicos istud proverbium notum fuit, “timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.”*

in what way William portrayed Byzantine actions during the First and the Second Crusade.

THE FIRST CRUSADE

As the previous subchapter has shown, the image of Alexios in the *Historia* is that of a treacherous Greek and “the worst persecutor of Latins.”¹⁰⁴ William constructed this image through the accounts of the First Crusade and the Crusade of 1101. It was the second book of the *Historia* that played the key role however, and therefore it is this book that will be subjected to the analysis. There, William presented the leaders of the Princes’ Crusade coming one by one to Constantinople, where their armies, provoked by Alexios’ schemes, grew restive and resorted to violence. Direct confrontations were ultimately put to an end once the leaders took oaths of fealty and were transferred to Asia Minor. The following pages will show how William greatly heightened the invective against Alexios found in his sources by consistently repeating certain motifs and accusations of treachery. Moreover, Jonathan Shepard has pointed out that eye-witness accounts had very little to say about Constantinople or Greeks in general and that they solely based their attacks on Alexios.¹⁰⁵ As it will be shown, this is not the case in the *Historia*. First, however, a summary of the book is required.

Of the five leaders, Godfrey of Bouillon was the first to be presented. William, with some minor digressions, recounted the Byzantine adventures of Godfrey and the

¹⁰⁴ WT 12.5: *Alexius, Latinorum maximus persecutor*.

¹⁰⁵ Jonathan Shepard, “Cross-Purposes: Alexius Comnenus and the First Crusade,” in *The First Crusade: Origins and Impact*, ed. Jonathan Phillips (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 107.

Lorrainer army in chapters 4 to 12 (pp. 165–177). Immediately following, the chapters 13 to 15 (pp. 177–181) describe the passage of Bohemund of Taranto and the Norman contingent. A short account of Robert of Flanders’ travel comes next in chapter 16 (pp. 181–182), followed by a more detailed description of the travels of Raymond of Toulouse and the Provençal army in chapters 17 to 22 (pp. 182–191). The last to arrive was Robert of Normandy, whose journey is briefly presented in chapter 23 (pp. 191–192). The very last chapter, 24 (pp. 193–194), marks the formation of the unified Christian army on the Asian shore of the Bosphorus, and the introduction of a new villain to the story, Tatikios (*Tatinus* according to William), Alexios’ right-hand man. What immediately becomes evident from the organization of the material is that Godfrey, Bohemund and Raymond (ca. 23 pp. altogether) are the ones that hold the most prominent places, while Robert of Flanders and Robert of Normandy (ca. 2 pp. altogether), due to the lack of detail, fade into the background. It is the accounts of the first three that William colored with his rhetoric, most of all by emphasizing the Greekness and three recurrent motifs: (1) the contrast between Alexios’ kind words and his hidden intentions; (2) his secret actions against the Crusaders; and (3) his deep-seated hatred towards the Latins.

First, it becomes evident that every time Alexios approached the Crusaders benignly, he in fact did so with a hidden agenda. Thus when Godfrey’s troops were encamped before the walls of Constantinople, “the emperor’s messenger came requesting with pacifying words (*verbis pacificis*), yet with hidden guile (*dolus*) that they lead the troops across the bridge which is next to the palace called Blachernae.”¹⁰⁶ “Although by his words the emperor seemed to be in sympathy with

¹⁰⁶ WT 2.6: *affuit imperatoris nuntius, monens verbis pacificis et tamen in dolo ut, ponte transito qui est iuxta palatium quod appellatur Blaquernas, legiones suas transferant.* 2.14: *Hec imperatoris verba,*

the pilgrims, yet his real intent was entirely different.”¹⁰⁷ Fighting soon broke out but the parties set their differences aside in the end. However even after reconciled, Alexios’ persuasive words, which “induced the duke [Godfrey] to conduct his army across the sea sooner than he intended, did not proceed from sincerity and good faith.”¹⁰⁸ The approach of the emperor, this “crafty man, thoroughly skilled in concealing and hiding his purpose,”¹⁰⁹ towards Bohemund was the same. The messenger was commanded by the emperor to “address him with words of peace, subtly concealing the real guile beneath, and to make every effort to deceive him.”¹¹⁰ Flattering words were not lacking and, William emphasized again, although they “seemed to contain much kindness, they were imbued with poison.”¹¹¹ Raymond’s experiences fell nothing short of these. First, he was “assailed with flattering words of persuasion and strongly urged to take an oath of fealty,”¹¹² but once he declined, his troops were attacked. It was the malicious intent of the emperor that William was highlighting to his public, thus providing proof to his accusations of treachery.

And it was not long that the emperor took concrete steps of actions, which his minions were supposed to carry out secretly (*clam/occulte*), at times even during the night (*de nocte*), as William duly emphasized. Again, all three leaders experienced this trickery. Alexios “secretly sent archers”¹¹³ against Godfrey, “covertly prepared

etsi in superficie multam videbantur habere humanitatem, intrinsecus tamen virus occultabant admixtum.

¹⁰⁷ WT 2.6: *His autem etsi verbo compati videretur imperator, longe tamen alia mens eius erat et eo tota eius properabat intentio.*

¹⁰⁸ WT 2.12: *Quod autem maturius ducis exercitum transfretare persuasionibus suis compulerat, non de fidei sinceritate processit.*

¹⁰⁹ WT 2.13: *sicut vir erat subdolos, potens simulare et dissimulare propositum.*

¹¹⁰ WT. 2.13: *verbis pacificis ei loquutus est in dolo, temptans si quo modo eum posset decipere.*

¹¹¹ WT 2.14: *etsi in superficie multam videbantur habere humanitatem, intrinsecus tamen virus occultabant admixtum.*

¹¹² WT 2.19: *blandis persuasionibus et multa instantia pulsatus ut imperatori fidelitatem et iuramentum ... exhiberet.*

¹¹³ WT 2.7: *[Imperator] misit occulte sagittarios.*

ambushes”¹¹⁴ for Bohemund and again “secretly ordered the chiefs of his legions to make a sudden attack on count [Raymond’s] forces.”¹¹⁵ Frequent repetition of highly suggestive terms, such as “secretly” and “at night”¹¹⁶ thus aimed to give support to the explicit accusations of treachery which followed.

Alexios’ motives were the final touch to William’s rhetoric, which he chose to present to his audience for the first time through the correspondence between Godfrey and Bohemund in chapter 10. The emperor’s alleged purpose was to “deceive and, in every way possible, pursue even to death every Latin nation.”¹¹⁷ But from the “wicked prince of the Greeks” nothing else could have been expected; both Godfrey and Bohemund were well aware “that the crafty race of the Greeks always desires to pursue our [Latin] people with inexorable hatred.”¹¹⁸ Interestingly, Albert of Aachen, William’s source for this episode, makes no mention of this hatred,¹¹⁹ nor do the other eye-witness accounts, as has been pointed out already. Instead it was William’s rhetoric that colored this episode, all for the purpose of constructing an image of the treacherous Emperor Alexios, personification of all the Greeks. In the final chapters William wrote how

more and more, day by day, the trickery of the Greeks and the treachery of the emperor were revealed. There was now no one of the leaders to whom it was not plain, in fact clearer than the sun at midday,

¹¹⁴ WT 2.13: *imperator occulte ei parat insidias.*

¹¹⁵ WT 2.19: [Imperator] *clam praecipit legionum suarum primiceriis ut repente in exercitum comitis irruentes, modis quibus possent, molestare attentarent.*

¹¹⁶ There are four more examples when William pointed at the secrecy of Alexios’ actions: 2.13: [Imperator] *primiceriis exercituum suorum ... clam precipit ... ut, si forte eis conveniens daretur occasio et ita opportunitas se offerret, nocte vel interdiu, clam sive aliter exercitum procedentem temptarent fatigare*; 2.14: *Irruit clam exercitus imperatoris in castra Boamundi*; 2.20: *Comitis absentis clam a Grecis impugnatur exercitus*; 2.20: *Igitur qui imperatoris mandatum susceperant, centuriones, et quinquagenarii, et numeris militaribus prepositi, regiam exequentes iussionem, premonitis agminibus clam et de nocte in domini comitis irruunt expeditiones* (emphasis mine).

¹¹⁷ WT 2.10: *semper fallere et omnem Latinorum nationem usque ad mortem modis omnibus persequi.*

¹¹⁸ WT 2.10: *impium Graecorum principem*; 2.10: *quod odio inexorabili Graecorum astutiae populum semper nostrum persequi ardentissime studuerunt.*

¹¹⁹ Albert of Aachen, *Historia*, 82-83.

that Alexios was pursuing our people with intense hatred and that he detested the whole Latin race.¹²⁰

Thus the emperor's intentions and actions all resulted from his deep-seated hatred toward the Latins – hatred that William explicitly attributed as common to all the Greeks. Alexios became a true villain.

Constant reiteration of these motifs went hand-in-hand with explicit accusations of treachery. The title of the sixth chapter already informed the reader how “by the emperor's trickery [Godfrey's] army is removed to a more confined space.”¹²¹ Although Albert, William's source, did not see the emperor's request as trickery,¹²² for the archbishop of Tyre the ensuing attack of the emperor's troops constituted proof. This episode stands as a perfect example of William's approach to Alexios throughout the second book. The emperor's actions repeatedly bear the mark of trickery (*fraus/circumventio*). Appearing altogether eleven times evenly dispersed, the variations of the phrase *imperatoris fraus* in a sense determine the whole book,¹²³ and combined with the motifs discussed give the individual adventures of the leaders a distinct sameness. Be they Godfrey's, Raymond's or Bohemund's experiences, the reader was only meant to remember the similarities between the events of a series

¹²⁰ WT 2.22: *cotidie magis ac magis Grecorum dolus et fraus imperatoris detegebatur, ita ut iam nemo esset de principibus, cui non esse manifestum et luce clarius quanto odium populum persequeretur nostrum et omne Latinorum genus haberet invisum.*

¹²¹ WT 2.6: *fraude imperatoris ducis transfertur exercitus ad locum angustiore.*

¹²² Albert of Aachen, *Historia*, 77-78.

¹²³ Besides the previously quoted example, there are ten more. WT 2.9: *Fraudem imperatoris et suorum compertam habentes*; 2.12: **[imperator] fraude solita ducem circumvenit**; 2.14: **quicquid eis imperator loquebatur, fraus erat et circumventio**; 2.19: *Imperator fraudulenter precipit, ut in eius irruatur exercitum*; 2.19: **Quodque [imperator] principibus quasi liberaliter contulerat nec liberalitatis erat, nec gratie, sed timoris desperati et fraudulente versutie**; 2.19: *nequam illorum [Grecorum] principis fraus et circumventio pertinax*; 2.20: *imperatoris fraudem apertissimam notam facit*; 2.20: *fraus imperatoris detegebatur*; 2.21: **Quicquid autem [imperator] loquebatur, dolus erat et circumventio**; 2.23: **[Tatinus] ab eo [imperatore] versa vice commentorum et fraudis per frequentes internuntios formam recipiens** (emphasis mine).

and ignore the differences.¹²⁴ Thus, Alexios and the Greeks become the ones who occupy the center of the reader's attention, while particular experiences of the Crusade leaders who successively pass through Constantinople become blurred. A mental image of the episode becomes formed, marked by Alexios' treachery against the Crusader leaders and Greek hatred of the Latins.

Once the Crusaders crossed the Bosphorus the invective subsided and the second book was to remain the peak of the anti-Greek sentiments until the end of the work. Still, even though the Crusaders left the vicinity of Constantinople, William made it clear that Alexios still strove to thwart them from reaching their goal. The emperor offered them a guide, his confidant Tatikios, "a wicked and treacherous man whose slit nostrils were sign of his evil mind."¹²⁵ Alexios greatly relied on his "malice and unscrupulous duplicity."¹²⁶ In return, Tatikios "was receiving from his master, through frequent messengers who went back and forth between them, outlines of plans directing his nefarious schemes."¹²⁷ Alexios thus passed the torch to his abominable henchman, who now became the one who presented danger for the Crusaders, although not nearly as Alexios did. It was the Turks who were the main enemy now. What is the most interesting in this final chapter of the book however, is the connection William made between Tatikios' slit nostrils and his "evil mind." Indeed, William knew his physical description from the contemporary chronicles of the First Crusade, but he was the one who made the link with his inner qualities. By doing so he took his place in the long list of authors who in the course of invective

¹²⁴ Mieke Bal, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002), 111-112.

¹²⁵ WT 2.24: *vir nequam et perfidus, narens habens mutilas in signum mentis perverse.*

¹²⁶ WT 2.24: *de eius malicia et perplexa dolositate plurimum presumebat imperator.*

¹²⁷ WT 2.24: *ab eo versa vice commentorum et fraudis per frequentes internuntios formam recipiens.*

used physiognomy, theory that a person's outer appearance gives insights into his personality.¹²⁸

As Edbury and Rowe have already noted, all of William's sources, including the *Gesta Francorum*, fall short of the anti-Greek sentiment found in the *Historia*.¹²⁹ Detailed analysis provided here has shown that the reason lies in the constant repetition of Alexios' sinister motives, malicious intent and surreptitious actions. The weaving of these motifs into his account thus allowed William to shout: "Treachery!" throughout the book. This invective however had two targets: Alexios, the emperor, and the Greeks whom he represented. Why William emphasized the image of the treacherous Greek can be fully appreciated only when compared to the other episode where the image appears – the Second Crusade.

THE SECOND CRUSADE

In 1144 Edessa, the oldest Crusader state, fell to the Turks. The news caused great consternation in the West, and as a result a new Crusade was called by Pope Eugene III (r. 1145–1153). Unlike the First Crusade, this expedition was led by kings, Louis VII of France (r. 1137–1180) and Conrad III of Germany (r. 1138–1152). Both chose the route through the Byzantine Empire, but upon reaching Asia Minor both suffered catastrophic defeats. Louis and Conrad gathered the remnants of their armies and

¹²⁸ In antiquity, physiognomy was popular both with Greek and Latin writers, among them Aristotle, Galen, Pompeius Trogus, Aulus Gellius, and even Christian authors like Origen and Clement of Alexandria. "The concept remained popular in the Middle Ages and afterwards. Basically, physical and mental characteristics are always grouped into correlating types. This presumed discipline was very popular, both among medical authors, notably the highly influential Galen, and among orators and historians." Cf. Isaac, *Invention of Racism*, 149-162.

¹²⁹ Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, 134.

eventually reached the Holy Land, where they undertook an unsuccessful siege of Damascus. The whole expedition was thus a complete failure.¹³⁰

Odo of Deuil wrote an account of the Second Crusade characterized by its virulent anti-Byzantine bias. Frequent accusations of treachery and heresy against the Greeks permeated his work, even to the point of saying that the emperor colluded with the Turks in order to destroy the Christian forces.¹³¹ Even if Odo's writings betray him as an extreme xenophobe, in the West the failure of the Second Crusade was at least partly attributed to the duplicity and treachery of the Greeks and their emperor.¹³² Having studied in France for twenty years, William was certainly aware of this and composed the episode with this in mind.

At first glance, William's account of the Second Crusade presents a return to the anti-Greek invective found in the second book of his work. When analyzed closely, however, it becomes clear that: (1) Manuel is not made into a villain like Alexios; and (2) the whole episode falls short of the anti-Greek sentiment found in the account of the First Crusade. As it was shown, William based his vilification of Alexios and the Greeks on consistently repeated accusations of treachery spanning over ca. 23 pages, with more attacks appearing later in the text as well. The treachery of the Greeks in the Second Crusade is referred to in two chapters that take up altogether three pages.

On these three pages, the guides which Manuel provided for the Crusaders are the ones who take the spotlight:

¹³⁰ For a detailed overview of the Second Crusade, see Tyerman, *God's War*, 268-338. For a thorough analysis of the contemporary sources, see Giles Constable, "The Second Crusade as Seen by Contemporaries," *Traditio* 9 (1953), 213-279.

¹³¹ Odo of Deuil, *The Journey of Louis VII to the East*, 68-71. Cf. Jonathan Phillips, "Odo of Deuil's *De projectione Ludovici VII in Orientem* as a Source for the Second Crusade," in *The Experience of Crusading, volume 1: Western Approaches*, eds. Marcus Bull and Norman Housley, 80-95 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

¹³² Harris, *Byzantium and the Crusades*, 100.

The Greeks [guides], led by the malice inherent in the Greek race and also by their customary hatred of the Christians, acted treacherously. Either commanded by their master or because bribed by the Turks, they purposely led the legions through unfrequented routes and drew them into places which offered the enemy favorable opportunities to attack and overcome the credulous people.”¹³³

The uncertainty about attributing the blame to Manuel is evident, especially when compared with Tatikios in the First Crusade, who “was receiving from his master ... outlines of plans directing his nefarious schemes.” Even though in the following chapter William confirmed that “it was common talk, and not far from being plausible, that these perilous wanderings were devised with the knowledge and at the command of the Greek emperor,”¹³⁴ it is clear that this accusation is completely void of rhetoric. The guides are the ones who become vilified; these “sons of Belial,” as William calls them, first led the German army astray and then “hastened to the army of the King of France in order to add to their wickedness and heap crime upon crime.”¹³⁵

It is clear that the anti-Greek sentiment is present in William’s account of the Second Crusade, however it is also clear that Manuel is not the one who is attacked. William mentioned that the accusations directed at him are “not far from being plausible,” but no more than that. As he himself related, “it was common talk” that Manuel was responsible for the catastrophe which befell the Crusader troops in Asia Minor. Thus, it can be assumed that William had to address this issue for the sake of his audience. His intention was not to vilify Manuel, but rather to deflect the

¹³³ WT 16.20: *Verum Greci, innata usi malicia et consueto in nostros ducti odio, sive de mandato domini sui sive hostium corrupti pecunia studiose et ex industria per devia ceperunt trahere legiones et in ea introducere loca, quibus populum simplicem maior fieret hostibus opprimendi et expugnandi copia et longe amplior ministraretur oportunitas.*

¹³⁴ WT 16.21: *Dicebantur publice, nec a verisimili multum abhorrebat, quod de conscientia et mandato imperatoris Grecorum, constructa fuerunt hec tam periculosa molimina.*

¹³⁵ WT 16.21: *Illi autem, ut prolongarent iniquitatem sibi et peccatum peccato adderent, viri Belial, ad regis Francorum ... properant exercitum.*

accusations of treachery to the guides, who were in fact the ones representing the “malice inherent in the Greek race.”

To understand William’s accusation of Manuel better, a parallel should be drawn with the account of the siege of Damascus, because of which the Jerusalemites also stood accused of treachery. William, although writing his work as an *apologia* for the Latin East, commented:

The pilgrim princes therefore took counsel with one another. All too clearly they now perceived treachery of those [Eastern Latin lords] to whose loyalty they had entrusted their lives and interests, and abhorred the perfidy by which they have been deceived. ... Henceforward, as long as they remained in the Orient and, indeed, after that they looked askance on all the ways of our leaders.¹³⁶

The archbishop of Tyre thus did not keep silent over an unpleasant episode in the history of his own kingdom. Again, it was necessary to address it for the sake of the audience, which he wished to be appreciative after reading his whole work. It was the same with Manuel, a friend of the Latins and “the most generous among all the rulers in the world.” His probable treachery during the Second Crusade was indeed an inglorious episode which would be blurred once set against a larger picture.

When comparing the Constantinopolitan episode of the First Crusade with the Second Crusade, it becomes apparent that while the former served William in constructing an image of Alexios, the treacherous Greek emperor, the personification of all the Greeks, the latter episode was conditioned by the expectations of his audience. William colored the second book with his rhetoric by frequently repeating motifs that evoked accusations of treachery set against Alexios and the Greeks whom he

¹³⁶ WT 17.6: *Colloquentes itaque peregrini principes adinvicem videntes que manifestam illorum, quorum fidei animas suas et negocia commiserant, maliciam, scientes quod non proficerent redeundum esse decernunt, fraudes eorum qui eos seduxerant detestantes. ... Qui deinceps non solum quamdiu in Oriente moram egerunt nostrorum principum vias omnes suspectas habebant.*

represented. Edbury and Rowe have interpreted this as a rhetorical strategy that aimed at emphasizing the valor of the Crusaders.¹³⁷ It can be added that this strategy worked on one more level; it highlighted the contrast between Alexios as a typical treacherous Greek and Manuel, the pro-Latin emperor. This becomes apparent when William's account of the Second Crusade is taken into consideration. Whereas the accusations of treachery during the First Crusade proved essential in constructing Alexios' image, the Second Crusade did not leave any marks on Manuel.

¹³⁷ Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, 135.

EFFEMINACY OF THE GREEKS

Even if William was constructing a positive image of Manuel's empire, he clearly set its boundaries. He had done so by referring to the military effeminacy of the Greeks. Altogether on five occasions, he evoked this image by using two words, *effeminati* and *molles*.¹³⁸ Three of these appear in the material leading up to the breaking point in 1182, and will be analyzed here, while the other two come up in the account of the massacre of Latins and will thus be addressed accordingly in the following chapter. As for the meanings of the words used, while the Oxford Latin Dictionary translates *effeminatus* as "imitating a woman in appearance or behavior, effeminate" and "untypical, unworthy of a man, womanish, unmanly," *mollis* is defined as "soft, tender (as typical of women; also of emasculated men)."¹³⁹ The way that William used them shows that he treated them as synonymous.

Unlike the responses of the Crusaders to what they saw as the treachery of the Greeks, responses to their alleged effeminacy had not attracted the interest of the scholars so far. Thus it becomes necessary to offer here some possible answers to the problem in order to elucidate the use of the effeminacy as a rhetorical device.

ORIGINS OF THE IMAGE

When analyzing William's pre-1182 writings, the contexts where the effeminacy was referred to indicate that the image held a military connotation; namely, William emphasized the strength and valor of the Latins, to which he contrasted the

¹³⁸ William did so in the following chapters: 2.4, 15.1, 17.17, 22.11, and 22.12.

¹³⁹ OLD, 588; 1127-1128.

effeminacy of the Greeks, expressed in their weakness and cowardice. In order to gain an understanding of what evoking this image meant, it is useful to turn to the chroniclers of the First Crusade.

One can start with Albert of Aachen who in constructing the image of the heroic Crusader army at the siege of Nicaea in 1097 set it against the image of the Greeks. He achieved this by having Kiliç Arslan, leader of the Turks whom the Crusaders defeated, utter the following words:

The imperial army is made up of soft and effeminate Greek people, who have been rarely troubled by the exercise of wars, and could be easily overcome by the strength of hard men, and, once overcome, decapitated.¹⁴⁰

Therefore, in his eyes, the effeminate Greeks do not pose a threat for the Turkish armies. It is a different case, however, with the Crusaders:

But these men whose names, strength, and warfare and talents you have learnt from the letters, and against whom it is difficult to wage war – know that they are very courageous men, knowledgeable about the wonderful ways of horses, and they cannot be frightened away by fear of death in battle or by any sort of weapons.¹⁴¹

It is clear that in Albert's view the effeminate nature of the Greeks comes from their alleged inexperience in martial activities. They represent the antitype of the Crusader knights, who thus epitomize manliness – they are strong, courageous in the face of death and, furthermore, have knowledge “about the wonderful ways of horses.” Thus, in addition to being weak and cowardly, the Greeks are not skilled in horseback riding – a characteristic which further contributes to their effeminacy. As such, the Greeks

¹⁴⁰ Albert of Aachen, *Historia*, 254-255: *Imperatoris exercitus gens Graecorum mollis et effeminata, bellorumque exercitiis raro vexata, facile in virtute robustorum potuit superari, superata decollari.*

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 254-257: *Hos vero quorum nomina, et virtutes et bella et industrias litterarum noticia didicistis, et adversum quos difficile est bellum committere, scitote viros fortissimos, miro equorum volumine doctos, in prelio non morte, non aliquo genere armorum posse absterreri.*

struck the Crusaders as contrary to the ideal of the mounted knight, a masculine figure *par excellence*, arising in the West at that time.¹⁴²

There were other characteristics of the Byzantine army that could have provoked a response. The anonymous Norman author of the *Gesta Francorum* recorded how “wretched Emperor Alexios” used Turcoples and Pechenegs as mercenaries to fight his battles.¹⁴³ Whereas Pechenegs were nomadic people, remnants of which were incorporated into the Byzantine army after their catastrophic defeat in the Battle of Lebonion against the empire in 1091,¹⁴⁴ Turcoples were Seljuq Turks turned Greeks recruited from Asia Minor, their very name (*Tourkopouloi*, lit. “Sons of the Turks”) testifying to their origin.¹⁴⁵ Archer units also had their place in the Byzantine army, a fact which did not go unnoticed by the Crusaders. The Greeks were perceived as “skilled with bow and arrow” – an observation undoubtedly originating from a Crusader veteran, penned by Albert of Aachen.¹⁴⁶ It is even more revealing to read Odo of Deuil, who in the middle of the story of a German-Greek skirmish makes a small digression. “Then, taking up their bows – you see, these are their weapons – they [Greeks] went forth again,” he wrote.¹⁴⁷ It was a condescending remark, aimed at provoking indignation from the reader. If one takes into consideration the fact that the Lateran Councils of 1139 and

¹⁴² For the mounted knight as the ideal of manliness, see Matthew Bennett, “Military Masculinity in England and Northern France c. 1050-c. 1225,” in *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. Dawn M. Hadley, 71-88 (London: Longman, 1998).

¹⁴³ *The Deeds of the Franks and Other Pilgrims to Jerusalem*, ed. Rosalind Hill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), 6: *Et cum putarent exire fiducialiter quo uellent, iniquus imperator Alexius imperauit Turcopolis et Pinzinacis inuadere illos et occidere.*

¹⁴⁴ ODB, 1613.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 2100.

¹⁴⁶ Albert of Aachen, *Historia*, 310-311: *Danaosque arcu doctos et sagitta.*

¹⁴⁷ Odo of Deuil, *The Journey of Louis VII to the East*, 42-43: *Tunc sumptis arcubus (haec enim sunt arma eorum), denuo exeunt.*

1215 banned, although ultimately unsuccessfully, archery directed at Christians,¹⁴⁸ a discrepancy becomes apparent. Whereas in the Byzantine army archers had their place, in the world of Western Christendom the use of these units, which killed others without exposing themselves to danger, was considered unjust and dishonorable – at least ideally.

Thus while the use of mercenaries could have been interpreted as a cowardly act avoiding fighting one's own battles, the use of archer units was perceived as a dishonorable tactic. If one adds the crudeness of the Greeks in horseback riding, a contrast arose between this image and the ideal of manliness – the mounted knights fighting their own battles honorably in close combat. The image of the Greeks became its antitype – the image of weak, cowardly and dishonorable people fighting through proxies, and, thus ultimately, effeminate.

EFFEMINACY AS A RHETORICAL DEVICE

The archbishop of Tyre made use of this image of the effeminate, unwarlike Greek, by opposing it to the image of the manly Latins as divinely approved rulers of the Holy Land. From the very beginning of his narrative he was building up to this point, and the first time that William labeled the Greeks as effeminate, he was narrating the passage of Crusader armies through the empire's European provinces. He presented his readers an image of the empire in a miserable state, and attributing it to the cessation of Latin rule over Constantinople he further noted that the effeminacy of the

¹⁴⁸ See Rosemary Ascherl, "The Technology of Chivalry," in *The Study of Chivalry: Resources and Approaches*, eds. Howell Chickering and Thomas H. Seiler (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1988), 276.

Greeks had led to the loss of the empire's European provinces.¹⁴⁹ Simply connecting the Greek rule with the misery of the empire was not enough. William felt he had to pinpoint the effeminacy of the Greeks during the rule of the Greek emperors as the reason for the subsequent downfall of the empire's fortunes. The aim was to show the inability of the Greeks to resist the Muslims and other barbarians and thus to legitimize the First Crusade, which in turn established Latins as the protectors of the Holy Land.

This thought is continuously present in the *Historia*. During John's and Manuel's reign the empire regained its strength and the image became one of William's rhetorical devices used to limit the ambitions that the empire held on the Crusader territory. The audience was presented with a scheme in which the Byzantine Empire played the part of an ally in the wars against the Muslims – but only of an ally. So when a Byzantine Emperor challenged the Latin rule over Antioch and Northern Syria, he stepped over the line that William had drawn for him. On two occasions one finds this to be the case, and in both William used the effeminacy of the Greeks as a counter-argument to the emperor's claims. Regardless of the person of the emperor, his people were simply not manly enough to preserve Antioch, “that noble and splendid mistress of many provinces, the first seat of the prince of the apostles.”¹⁵⁰

Again John's expeditions to Northern Syria have to be analyzed. Thus, in the year 1137 the emperor, a “man of great courage,” a “man of the people,” came to Northern Syria with an army of “people summoned from all tribes and tongues, with a

¹⁴⁹ WT 2.4: *Erant et alie in eodem tractu provincie, Achaia, Thessalia, Macedonia et Tracie tres, que pari cum aliis involute sunt calamitate. Nec solum has predictas provincias sua Greci amiserant mollicie.*

¹⁵⁰ WT 1.9: *nobilis et eximia provinciarum multarum moderatrix et princeps civitas, principis apostolorum sedes prima.*

countless number of cavalry and a vast array of chariots and four-wheeled carts.”¹⁵¹ The goal was to subdue Cilicia and Antioch to his rule. Soon Cilicia was incorporated into the empire, while Raymond, prince of Antioch, was confronted with the request to let the Byzantine garrison inside the citadel of his city and to accept Byzantine suzerainty. Commenting on these demands set forth by the emperor William took the opportunity to use the effeminacy for the second time in his work:

For it seemed a very harsh and serious matter that the city, which our nation had acquired at such peril and which had been restored to the Christian faith at the expense of precious blood of fortunate princes, should fall into the hands of the effeminate Greeks.¹⁵²

Unmanly Greeks, therefore, would not be able to defend Antioch. Their effeminacy here is juxtaposed with the “precious blood of fortunate princes,” by which the archbishop of Tyre recounted the valor of the first crusaders who besieged the city for eight months. Furthermore, William concludes that since the Greeks had lost the city on more than one occasion because of their weakness (*per ignaviam*), they were sure to lose it again.¹⁵³ The fact that at the end of the previous book one finds John coming with a vast army to Northern Syria, and that even two chapters prior to the one discussed here he is described as a magnificent war leader, fighting among his soldiers against the infidel during the siege of Shaizar, may point to William’s inconsistency. However, as it had been discussed, John in this way presented both an ideal in which the emperor was supposed to act towards the Crusader states and its opposite. Thus, while the audience was presented with an image of the emperor fighting valiantly against the Muslims, through effeminacy William set the empire’s

¹⁵¹ WT 14.24: *convocatis de universis imperii finibus populis, tribubus et linguis, in multitudine curruum et quadrigarum et inauditis copiis equitum congregatis in Syriam descendere maturabat.*

¹⁵² WT 15.3: *Durum enim videbatur et grave nimis, quod civitas tanto nostre gentis acquisita periculo, tantoque sanguinis felicium principum dispendio christiane fidei restituta, que tantarum semper fuerat caput et moderatrix provinciarum, in manus effeminati Grecorum populi descenderet.*

¹⁵³ WT 15.20.

limitations in relation to the Crusader states. The archbishop of Tyre took the image of the effeminate Greek from the contemporary chronicles of the First Crusade and, with his quill, put it into the service of his propaganda.

And he was soon to corroborate his argument, not missing the opportunity to label the Greeks as effeminate aiming at their military incapability, for the third and final time. In 1150, Emperor Manuel bought from Beatrice, the widowed countess of Edessa, the fortresses in her possession.¹⁵⁴

The news reached Nur al-Din that the people of Edessa, in despair of retaining the land, had surrendered their fortresses to the Greeks, soft and effeminate people, and that the king marched there to conduct the people away.¹⁵⁵

Nur al-Din now perceived that the land of the count was left without the aid of the Latins. Accordingly, taking advantage of the softness of the Greeks to whose charge it had been resigned, he began to trouble it sorely.¹⁵⁶

The proof was thus provided for William's argument, and by stressing the effeminacy of the Greeks two times in the same chapter, it is clear that he tried to make the most of it. Moreover, by grouping both *molles* and *effeminati* in the rhetorical figure of *synonymia*, William, vigorous in emphasizing the need of preserving the entirety of the Crusader territory, sought to give his message emotional force.¹⁵⁷ Even though at that time Antioch was no longer a stumbling block in relations, William saw an opportunity to justify the Latin guardianship of the Holy Land and Northern Syria and to define once more the position of the empire in relation to the Crusader states. The empire had been tested, but it had failed to

¹⁵⁴ Edessa fell to Nur al-Din's forces in 1144. However, fortresses in the western part of the county were still in the Latin hands at that time. Cf. Magdalino, *Empire of Manuel I*, 66.

¹⁵⁵ WT 17.17: *Audiens itaque Noradinus quod rex ad educendum populum ingressus fuerat et quod de conservanda regione omnino desperantes Grecis, viris effeminatis et mollibus, opida resignaverat.*

¹⁵⁶ WT 17.17: *Videns igitur Noradinus terram comitis Latinorum auxilio destitutam, de Grecorum mollicie, quibus commissa erat, presumens, frequentibus irruptionibus et quas Greci non satis supportare noverant, eam cepit aggravare.*

¹⁵⁷ For more about *synonymia*, see Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 292-295.

preserve the places for Christianity. The effeminacy of the Greek people was the reason behind it.

William's use of the effeminacy as a rhetorical device can be further clarified by analyzing situations where it could have very well been used, but still was not. This was the case when the empire fought the infidel but lost. In the autumn of 1169, Byzantine army and navy together with the forces of King Amalric undertook a joint expedition against the Fatimid Egypt, laying siege to Damietta. William reported how even though the expedition failed, "their [Greek] commander *megaducas* and all the other fought manly and boldly in the battle array."¹⁵⁸ The most striking is that William characterized the actions of the Greeks on the battlefield as "manly" (*viriliter*). The contradiction between this example and the ones already discussed clearly shows that William used effeminacy simply a rhetorical device used to define the Latins as the rulers of the Holy Land. Here it was the Byzantine-Jerusalemite expedition against the infidel that was presented, outcome of a policy which William ardently supported. In 1176 Manuel mounted a great campaign, a Crusade in fact, against the "the monstrous race of the Turks and their wicked leader, sultan of Konya."¹⁵⁹ Manuel's aim was to "extend the Christian name,"¹⁶⁰ but in the end he suffered a great defeat at Myriokephalon. Again, William did not attribute the loss to Greek unmanliness; rather, by finding the reason for such a massacre in "our sins," he defined the whole of Christianity – both Western and Eastern – as "us." Manuel's imperial army, acting in its own sphere, fought the Muslims as a Christian army. The

¹⁵⁸ WT 16.20: *Eorum tamen magistratus megaducas et alii viriliter et satis strenue, quotiens opus erat, in acie decertabant*; ODB, 1330: "Megaducas" or *megas doux* is the title of the commander of the Byzantine fleet; On this occasion Andronikos Kontostephanos was the one who was in charge. Cf. Magdalino, *Empire of Manuel I*, 74.

¹⁵⁹ WT 21.11: *contra inmanissimam Turcorum gentem et impium eorum ducem, Yconii soldanum*. About Manuel's campaign against Konya and its Crusade character, see Magdalino, *Empire of Manuel I*, 95-98 and Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusades*, 211-215.

¹⁶⁰ WT 21.11: *pro ampliando christiano nomine*.

Crusader states were not challenged in their rule over the Holy Land, and there was no need to bring in the effeminacy as a rhetorical device.

As the first part aimed to show, the effeminacy of the Greeks as seen in the military context originated from the time of the First Crusade, when the Byzantine tactics and unit types impressed the Crusaders as contrary to knightly ideals and thus unmanly. In William's view it was the manliness of the Latins that gave them additional leverage over the Greeks in their claims over the Holy Land. Jerusalem was in close relations with the Byzantine Empire until 1182, and indeed William, as a supporter of this policy, tried to present a favorable picture of the empire to his Western audience. However, because of the Byzantine claims for crusader territory in the past and the protectorate of the empire over the kingdom during the most of his career, there was a need to keep a certain distance between the Crusader states and the Byzantine Empire. William achieved this distance by evoking military effeminacy where reporting on the events when the rule of the Crusader states has been challenged by the empire. However, when the Greeks fought beside the Latins against the infidel, they fought as a Christian army. Thus it becomes obvious that William's use of the effeminacy did not reflect an ideological consistency but rather a pragmatic ambivalence.

IV. THE IMAGE SHATTERED

This meticulously constructed image of the empire suddenly broke to pieces in 1182 with the massacre of Latins in Constantinople. As it has been stated in the introduction, William undertook the last significant revisions of his work in 1181. Therefore, this final appearance of the Byzantine Empire in the *Historia*, reflects an image different than in the previous part of the work. Now, as the following pages will show, William, utterly disappointed, presented it the empire in an extremely negative light. In what was to be the last mention of the Greeks in his work, he started by informing his audience that “an important change concerning the empire had occurred in Constantinople”¹⁶¹ – a change which he went on to elaborate further in the subsequent four chapters.¹⁶²

Emperor Manuel died in 1180 and his eleven-year-old son, Alexios II (r. 1180–1183), succeeded him on the throne. A regency was formed under his mother, Mary of Antioch, who continued Manuel’s pro-Latin policy.¹⁶³ Still, without a strong ruler on the throne trouble soon followed. The conspirators, led by Andronikos I Komnenos, seized power and with help of Greeks of Constantinople “rushed to the quarter of the city occupied by the Latins and put to sword the remnants of the people who had been either unwilling or unable to flee with the others.”¹⁶⁴ But first William explained how it came to this point. As he saw it, the Greeks were indignant that:

¹⁶¹ WT 22.11: *apud Constantinopolim grandis circa imperium facta est permutatio.*

¹⁶² WT 22.11-14.

¹⁶³ Hamilton, *Lepor King*, 160.

¹⁶⁴ WT 22.13: *una cum civibus in eam urbis partem, quam nostri incolebant, irruentes residuum populi, qui aliis abeuntibus aut noluerant, aut non poterant exire, desevientibus gladiis peremerunt.*

during the reign of the aforementioned emperor [Manuel], beloved of God, the Latins had found great favor with him – a reward well deserved because of their loyalty and valor. The emperor, a generous man of incomparable energy, relied so implicitly on their fidelity and ability that he passed over his Greeklings as soft and effeminate and entrusted important affairs to the Latins alone.¹⁶⁵

Here, William again referred to the effeminacy of the Greeks, but unlike at previous occasions this time it did not occur in the military context. Here the effeminacy presented an obstacle for the Greeks to be entrusted with important affairs of state, and as William saw it, it was Manuel's preference for a Latin administration that inspired anti-Latin sentiments among the Greeks. This passage does not reveal what William meant by labeling the Greeks as effeminate in this context. However, a glance at the next chapter can offer some answers. There, pointing to the *protosebastos* Alexios, Manuel's nephew, as the *éminence grise* of the empire before Andronikos came to power, William offered a brief character sketch:

Although, like all Greeks, he was extremely effeminate and completely given over to the lustful sins of flesh, he was avaricious and sparing of the imperial treasure, as if he had earned it himself by the sweat of his brow.¹⁶⁶

Alexios' lustfulness thus went hand in hand with his effeminacy, traits which were ascribed by William to the entire Greek people. Unlike before when effeminacy was referred to only in a military context, here the label clearly indicates a way of life. Neither passage is particularly revealing, but comparative material can offer much in elucidating the image.

¹⁶⁵ WT 22.11: *Regnante enim deo amabili predicto imperatore, merito fidei et strenuitatis sue tantam Latinus populus apud eum reppererat gratiam, ut neglectis Greculis suis tanquam viris mollibus et effeminatis, ipse vir magnanimus et strenuitate incomparabilis solis Latinis grandia committeret negocia, de eorum fide merito presumens et viribus.*

¹⁶⁶ WT 22.12: *licet Grecorum more mollis esset supra modum et carnis curam toto studio in inmundis perficere satageret desideriiis, avarus tamen erat et thesauris parcebat imperialibus, tanquam si eos proprio sudore comportasset.*

For the Greeks were not the only ones William labeled as effeminate. In this sense the Fatimid Egyptians also figured, and looking at the occasions where he labeled them as such can shed light on the image itself. The archbishop of Tyre wrote about the Egyptians as “soft and effeminate, devoted for a long time to pleasures, lacking experience in military training,”¹⁶⁷ and also as “weakened by a long period of peace.”¹⁶⁸ In his view, these traits were a direct result of the “immense wealth of Egypt, marvelous abundance of all good things and of each individual commodity.”¹⁶⁹ The opulence of the kingdom was manifested on the highest level; the description of the caliph’s “magnificent palace” received a separate chapter in the *Historia*.¹⁷⁰ These causes that William lists as contributing to the effeminacy of the Egyptians applied to the Greeks as well. One can again turn back to William’s description of his visit to Constantinople.¹⁷¹ Another interesting parallel between the Egyptians and the Greeks becomes apparent when William mentions the presence of eunuchs in the caliph’s palace.¹⁷² For already Fulcher of Chartres had believed that “about twenty thousand eunuchs were always living there [in Constantinople].”¹⁷³ It is this kind of evidence that led Shaun Tougher to argue that “the use and prevalence of eunuchs within the Byzantine Empire may even have contributed to the western perception that this empire and its people were essentially effeminate.”¹⁷⁴ But this perception of the

¹⁶⁷ WT 20.7: *virī molles et effeminati, deliciis a multo retro tempore dediti, rerum militarium expertes.*

¹⁶⁸ WT 19.13: *populum deliciis deditum, rei militaris expertem, longa quiete dissolutum.*

¹⁶⁹ WT 19.13: *innumerabiles Egypti divitias, bonorum omnium et singularum commoditatum copias admirabiles.*

¹⁷⁰ WT 19.18.

¹⁷¹ WT 22.4.

¹⁷² WT 19.18.

¹⁷³ Fulcher of Chartres, *A History of The Expedition to Jerusalem 1095–1127*, tr. Frances Rita Ryan (New York: Norton, 1973), 79.

¹⁷⁴ Shaun F. Tougher, “Images of Effeminate Men: the Case of Byzantine Eunuchs,” in *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. Dawn M. Hadley, 89-100 (London: Longman, 1998). On Byzantine eunuchs in general, see Kathryn M. Ringrose, *The Perfect Servant: Eunuchs and the Social Construction of Gender Byzantium* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003); Liz James, ed., *Women, Men and*

effeminacy of the Greeks, just as it is the case with their perfidy, shows earlier origins. Liutprand, bishop of Cremona and an envoy of the Holy Roman Emperor Otto II to Constantinople in 968, was contrasting Italians, Saxons, Franks, Bavarians and Suebs to the Greeks, that “womanish effeminates with their long sleeves and women’s headgear, liars, eunuchs and cowards.”¹⁷⁵ Even though William most probably did not read the bishop of Cremona’s work, it shows the presence of this stereotypical image in Western culture even in the tenth century. Again, all these writers sought confirmation in the Classical authors, for just as some Roman authors thought of the Greeks as faithless and treacherous, they also labeled them effeminate and soft.¹⁷⁶

Thus the opulence of the Byzantine Empire, which William did not fail to mention on more than one occasion and which the emperors themselves were striving to show,¹⁷⁷ came to be considered as the reason that its people, by enjoying this life of luxury and carnal pleasures, gave way to sin. Therefore, it is clear that, unlike before 1182, the label of effeminacy now carried a moral indictment in itself. In addition, on both occasions William amplified the image: the first time through the use of *synonymia*, while the second by introducing the relative *supra modum*.

Eunuchs: Gender in Byzantium (New York: Routledge, 1997); and Shaun F. Tougher, ed., *Eunuchs in Antiquity and Beyond* (Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2002).

¹⁷⁵ Liudprand of Cremona, *Relatio de Legatione Constantinopolitana*, ed. and tr. Brian Scott (London: Bristol Classical Press, 1993), 20: *Quod cum fieret, quinque mihi pretiosissimas purpuras abstulerunt, indignos vos omnesque Italos, Saxones, Francos, Baoarios, Suevos, immo cunctas nationes huiusmodi veste ornatos incedere iudicantes. Quod quam indecorum quamque contumeliosum est molles, effeminatos, manicatos, tiaratos, teristratos, mendaces, neutros, desides purpuratos incedere.* For a study on Liudprand of Cremona, see Jon N. Sutherland, *Liudprand of Cremona, Bishop, Diplomat, Historian: Studies of the Man and His Age* (Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull’Alto Medioevo, 1988).

¹⁷⁶ Isaac, *Invention of Racism*, 406

¹⁷⁷ Niketas Choniates (ca. 1155–1216), famed Byzantine historian, wrote how the German embassy at the court of Isaac II Angelos (r. 1185–1195; 1203–1204) looked indignantly upon emperor’s fine clothes and pearls, thinking of them as befitting a woman. See, Magdalino, *Empire of Manuel I*, 13.

The full strength of William's message however, can only be seen when taking into consideration the fact that for the very first time in the *Historia* he labeled the Greeks heretics just a few lines later:

The Greek nobles, especially the near kindred of the emperor [Manuel], and the rest of the people as well, naturally conceived an insatiable hatred towards us, and this was increased by the difference between our sacraments, and those of their church, which furnished an additional incentive to their jealousy. For they, having separated insolently from the church of Rome, in their boundless arrogance looked upon everyone who did not follow their foolish traditions as heretic. It was they themselves, on the contrary, who deserved the name of heretics, because they had created or followed new and pernicious beliefs contrary to the Roman church and the faith of the apostles Peter and Paul *against which the gates of hell shall not prevail* (Matth. 16:18).¹⁷⁸

Again there is a clear distinction between Manuel, the benefactor of the Latins on one side, and his Greek kindred and the rest of the people on the other side. The ascension of the anti-Latin oriented Andronikos, along with the subsequent massacre of the Latins in Constantinople was bound to provoke a reaction from William. It was this “nest of vipers,” this morally corrupt, heretic and perfidious Greek nation that “evilily requited its guests like a serpent in the bosom or a mouse in the wardrobe.”¹⁷⁹ There was no turning back. The positive image of the empire, which William had been painstakingly constructing in his work, suddenly shattered into pieces.

The massacre left William disillusioned of his pro-Byzantine policy, and his aim was no longer to show his readers simply that the effeminate Greeks were not strong

¹⁷⁸ WT 22.11: *Unde Grecorum nobiles et maxime eius consanguinei, sed et reliquis populus odium insatiabile adversus nostros conceperant accedente etiam ad indignationis cumulum et odiorum fomitem et incentivum ministrante sacramentorum inter nos et eos differentia. Arrogantes enim supra modum et a Romana ecclesia per insolentiam separati, hereticum omnem eum reputant qui frivolas non sequitur traditiones, cum ipsi magis hereticorum sibi nomen adaptent, dum contra Romanam ecclesiam et apostolorum Petri et Pauli fidem, adversus quam porte inferi non possunt prevalere, novas et pestilentes opiniones aut gignunt aut sequuntur.*

¹⁷⁹ WT 22.13: *Sic ergo impius Grecorum populus et genimina viperarum more serpentis in gremio et muris in pera ... male remuneraverunt hospites suos.*

enough soldiers to protect the Holy Land for Christianity or that they acted treacherously against the Latins. This time the goal was to situate the Byzantine Empire and the Greeks outside the Christian world. William was confirmed in his view that the Greeks held a deep-seated hatred towards the Latins and, without a ruler like Manuel on the throne, there was no room for compromise. The heresy of their beliefs, which he may have been willing to overlook in the past, now came to the fore. Thus, it was only the final episode where the Byzantine Empire appeared in the *Historia* which represented a development in the image William wished to portray.

V. CONCLUSIONS

William of Tyre did not portray the Greeks in a favorable light. As in the works of many of his contemporaries, they came to be presented as treacherous and effeminate. However, in his writings he showed himself as a strong supporter of the emperor Manuel, and the Byzantine Empire indeed held a place in his worldview. This thesis showed in what way William reconciled these two seemingly opposite images.

The first part of the thesis analyzed the images of the three Komnenian emperors (Alexios, John and Manuel) appearing in the *Historia*. First, Alexios came to be presented as the worst – a treacherous Greek, arch-nemesis of the Latins. It was argued that by manipulating his sources William even went so far as to erase him completely from the account of the People's Crusade. Thus, what the previous studies noted as inconsistency in William's approach, was in fact a sort of *damnatio memoriae*. While retelling the episode in which his sources presented Alexios as acting kindly towards the People's Crusade, he followed them but in the end chose to withhold information about the identity of the emperor. It was a rhetorical strategy that aimed at influencing the audience to form an image of Alexios without taking this episode into consideration. As for John, it is clear that William wanted to present a positive image, even though he criticized the emperor for trying to annex Antioch to his empire. The archbishop of Tyre shaped John according to the *topos* of *fortitudo et sapientia*, thus constructing an image his audience would appreciate. As such John stood in the middle between Alexios, the treacherous Greek, and Manuel, who was presented as a Latin favorite. It was shown how William emphasized the difference

between Manuel and the other Greeks and sought to portray him as “one of us.” He even went so far as to offer an idiosyncratic view of the history of Byzantium, by differentiating between the Latin and Greek rulers of the empire. It was argued that this message aimed to denounce Alexios and the Greeks as the ones who brought ill fortune to the empire, while at the same time give credence to Manuel’s pro-Latin policy.

The following subchapter has shown how this difference in the portraits of Alexios and Manuel reflected in William’s accounts of the First and the Second Crusade, where the “official versions” of the events spoke of the treachery of the Greeks. Thus, while William heaped accusations on Alexios during the First Crusade, Manuel’s image was left largely unscratched after the Second Crusade. In William’s account of the First Crusade it was the second book that played a key role in these accusations, and therefore it is this book that came under the scope of the analysis. It was shown how there, narrating the passage of the Crusaders through Constantinople, William regularly repeated the deception hiding behind Alexios’ kind words, the surreptitiousness of his actions and the immense hatred that he and the rest of the Greeks felt towards the Latins. These motifs were foundations on which the explicit accusations of treachery rested. It was a rhetorical strategy that worked on two levels: (1) contrasting the treacherous Alexios and his Greeks to the valiant and noble Crusaders; (2) contrasting the treacherous Greek Alexios with Manuel, a pro-Latin emperor. It comes as no surprise that narrating the catastrophe which befell the Second Crusade in Asia Minor – a catastrophe for which Manuel stood accused in the eyes of the West – was bound to bring William discomfort. He indeed noted the treachery of the Greeks, but it was the guides who took the spotlight and he noted a possibility that Manuel was responsible for it; this was far from the repeated

accusations of Odo of Deuil and far from his own treatment of Alexios Komnenos who had been in the similar position. It was argued that the archbishop of Tyre was bound by the common knowledge about the episode and thus forced to address it. In addition, the subchapter has reflected on William's use of physiognomy in the course of his invective.

Although William strove to present a favorable image of Manuel's and John's empire, he still needed to make a clear distinction between it and the Crusader states. The Byzantine emperors held claims to the Holy Land and especially to Northern Syria. It was argued that in response to these claims William used the military effeminacy of the Greeks to emphasize their ineptitude to rule over the Holy Land. Thus, as William saw it, it was the manliness of the Latins that gave them credentials stronger than the Greek ones. He referred to it only when the emperors tried to assert their claims, not when the Greeks battled against the infidel and lost. Then they were presented as Christians fighting in a manly way. Thus his view of the effeminacy of the Greeks did not reflect ideological consistency, but rather a pragmatic ambivalence.

However, the image of the empire he was patiently constructing suddenly shattered with the 1182 massacre of the Latins in Constantinople, and the final chapter of the present thesis reflected on this development in William's views. Before, it was an empire of treacherous effeminates, which, because of Manuel and John, indeed held a place in the world. Now, it was argued, William again referred to the Greeks as effeminate, but this time the label aimed at their moral corruption. Furthermore, this moral effeminacy was used side by side with charges of heresy. The empire became a realm of heretics and moral degenerates, and thus lost its place in the Christian world.

Offering a new vantage point on the image of the Byzantine Empire in the William of Tyre's *Historia*, this thesis for the first time suggested an approach in analyzing the images of the emperors and of the Greeks separately. Dealing with this voluminous narrative as a whole indeed proved to be challenging, but thus more rewarding in the end. However, more work still awaits, and here I would stress the need for a more thorough comparative approach to William of Tyre, especially in the context of other twelfth-century historiographers of similar intellectual background. Otto bishop of Freising, as well an author of a grand work who studied in Paris, figures as a possible start. Thus not only their works become prospect of a comparative analysis, but their lives and careers as well. In the end, what remains certain is that there is still much that the *Historia* can offer. By no means has it unraveled all of its secrets.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Anna Comnena. *The Alexiad*. Tr. Edgar R. A. Sewter. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1982.
- Albert of Aachen. *Historia Ierosolimitana*. Ed. and tr. Susan B. Edgington. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007.
- The Deeds of the Franks and Other Pilgrims to Jerusalem*. Ed. Rosalind Hill. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.
- Fulcher of Chartres. *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem, 1095–1127*. Tr. Frances Rita Ryan. New York: Norton, 1973.
- Hugo Eterianus, *De haeresibus quas Graeci in Latinos devolvunt libri tres sive quod Spiritus Sanctus ex utroque Patre scilicet et Filio procedat, contra Graecos*. Patrologia cursus completus, series latina 202. Comp. J.-P. Migne. Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1855.
- Liudprand of Cremona. *Relatio de Legatione Constantinopolitana*. Ed. and tr. Brian Scott. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1993.
- Odo of Deuil. *The Journey of Louis VII to the East*. Ed. and tr. Virginia Gingerick Berry. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1948.
- Otto bishop of Freising. *The Two Cities. A Chronicle of Universal History to the Year 1146 A.D.* Tr. Charles Christopher Mierow. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.
- Rodulfus Glaber. *Opera*. Eds. and trs. John France, Neithard Bulst and Paul Reynolds. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Willelmus Tyrensis Archiepiscopus. *Chronicon*, 2 vols. Ed. Robert B. C. Huygens. Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Medievalis 63, 63A. Turnhout: Brepols, 1986.
- William archbishop of Tyre. *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, 2 vols. Tr. Emily A. Babcock and August C. Krey. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943.

SECONDARY LITERATURE

- Anca, Alexandru. "Der heilende Herrscher: Manuel I. Komnenos als Arzt." (Abstract) in Workshop: *Interaction in Word and Image: Personal Relations in Medieval Sources*. Vienna: 2007. (<http://www.univie.ac.at/amicitia/Abstracts.pdf>; last accessed: 26/05/2008)
- Angold, Michael. *The Byzantine Empire 1025–1204: A Political History*. London: Longman, 1992.
- _____. *The Fourth Crusade: Event and Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Ascherl, Rosemary. "The Technology of Chivalry." In *The Study of Chivalry: Resources and Approaches*, eds. Howell Chickering and Thomas H. Seiler, 263-312. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1988.
- Bal, Mieke. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.
- Bennett, Matthew. "Military Masculinity in England and Northern France c. 1050-c. 1225." In *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. Dawn M. Hadley, 71-88. London: Longman, 1998.
- Boas, Adrian J. *Jerusalem in the Time of the Crusades: Society, Landscape and Art in the Holy City under Frankish Rule*. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Ciggaar, Krijnie N. *Western Travellers to Constantinople: The West and Byzantium 962–1204, Cultural and Political Relations*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996.
- Constable, Giles. "The Second Crusade as Seen by Contemporaries." *Traditio* 9 (1953), 213-279.
- Curtius, Ernst Robert. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973.
- Davis, Ralph H. C. "William of Tyre." In *Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages*, ed. Derek Baker, 64-76. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1973.
- Ebels-Hoving, Bunna. "Byzantium in Latin Eyes before 1204: Some Remarks on the Thesis of Growing Animosity." In *The Latin Empire: Some Contributions*, ed. Krijnie N. Ciggaar and Victoria D. van Aalst, 21-32. Kaastel Hernen: A. A. Bredius Foundation, 1990.
- Edbury, Peter W., and John G. Rowe. *William of Tyre: Historian of the Latin East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

- _____. "William of Tyre and the Patriarchal Election of 1180." *The English Historical Review* Vol. 93, No. 366 (Jan., 1978): 1-25.
- Hamilton, Bernard. *The Latin Church in the Crusader States: The Secular Church*. London: Variorum, 1980.
- _____. *The Leper King and his Heirs: Baldwin IV and the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- _____. "Manuel I Comnenus and Baldwin IV of Jerusalem." In *Kathegetria: Essays Presented to Joan Hussey for Her 80th Birthday*, ed. Julian Chrysostomides, 353-375. Camberley: Porphyrogenitus, 1988.
- _____. "William of Tyre and the Byzantine Empire." In *Porphyrogenita: Essays on the History and Literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in Honour of Julian Chrysostomides*, ed. Charalambos Dendrinos, Jonathan Harris, Eirene Harvalia-Crook and Judith Herrin, 219-233. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2003.
- Harris, Jonathan. *Byzantium and the Crusades*. London: Hambledon and London, 2003.
- Huygens, Robert B. C. "Guillaume de Tyr étudiant: Un chapitre (XIX, 12) de son 'Histoire' retrouvé." *Latomus* XXI (1962): 811-829.
- _____. "Looking for Manuscripts ... and Then?" *Essays in Medieval Studies* 4 (1997): 1-17.
- Isaac, Benjamin. *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- James, Liz, ed. *Women, Men and Eunuchs: Gender in Byzantium*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Kazhdan, Alexander P., ed. *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Lausberg, Heinrich. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Le Goff, Jacques. *Medieval Civilization 400-1500*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998.
- Lilie, Ralph-Johannes. *Byzantium and the Crusader States 1096-1204*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Magdalino, Paul. *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos 1143-1180*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Morse, Ruth. *Truth and Convention in the Middle Ages: Rhetoric, Representation and Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Oxford Latin Dictionary. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Phillips, Jonathan. "Odo of Deuil's 'De profectone Ludovici VII in Orientem' as a Source for the Second Crusade." In *The Experience of Crusading*, vol. 1: Western Approaches, eds. Marcus Bull and Norman Housley, 80-95. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Praver, Joshua. *The Crusaders' Kingdom: European Colonialism in the Middle Ages*. London: Phoenix Press, 2001.

_____. *Crusader Institutions*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Rentschler, Michael. "Griechische Kultur und Byzanz im Urteil westlicher Autoren des 10. Jahrhunderts." *Saeculum* 29 (1978): 324-355.

_____. "Griechische Kultur und Byzanz im Urteil westlicher Autoren des 11. Jahrhunderts." *Saeculum* 31 (1980): 112-155.

Ringrose, Kathryn M. *The Perfect Servant: Eunuchs and the Social Construction of Gender Byzantium*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Runciman, Steven. *A History of the Crusades*, 3 vols. London: Penguin Books, 1990-91.

Shepard, Jonathan, and Simon Franklin, eds. *Byzantine Diplomacy: Papers from the Twenty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge March 1990*. Aldershot: Variorum, 1992.

Shepard, Jonathan. "Cross-Purposes: Alexius Comnenus and the First Crusade." In *The First Crusade: Origins and Impact*, ed. Jonathan Phillips, 107-129. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997.

Sutherland, Jon N. *Liudprand of Cremona, Bishop, Diplomat, Historian: Studies of the Man and His Age*. Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1988.

Svoronos, Nicolas. "Le serment de fidélité à l'empereur byzantin et sa signification constitutionnelle." *Revue des Études Byzantines* 9 (1951): 106-142.

Tanner, Marie. *The Last Descendant of Aeneas: the Hapsburgs and the Mythic Image of the Emperor*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

Tougher, Shaun F. "Images of Effeminate Men: the Case of Byzantine Eunuchs." In *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. Dawn M. Hadley, 89-100. London: Longman, 1998.

Tougher, Shaun F., ed. *Eunuchs in Antiquity and Beyond*. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2002.

Tyreman, Christopher. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*. London: Penguin Books, 2007.

Vessey, David W. T. C. "William of Tyre and the Art of Historiography." *Mediaeval Studies* 35 (1973): 433-455.