

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/151847/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Buck, Andrew D. 2019. William of Tyre, femininity, and the problem of the Antiochene Princesses. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 70 (4) , pp. 731-749. 10.1017/s0022046919000629

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s0022046919000629>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



William of Tyre, Femininity, and the Problem of the Antiochene Princesses

Dr Andrew D. Buck

Queen Mary University of London

andrewdbuck1987@googlemail.com

Abstract: This article examines the representation of women and femininity in Archbishop William of Tyre's *Chronicon*. It considers how his text was shaped by contemporary Western ideas of gender, and how this impacted upon his presentation of the women, especially Queen Melisende of Jerusalem and three Antiochene princesses, Alice, Constance, and Sybil. It argues that in doing so, we can raise important questions regarding his use for empirical reconstruction by revealing the nuanced ways in which, in pursuit of broader narrative goals, he utilised gender as a tool to both praise and discredit.

William of Tyre, Femininity, and the Problem of the Antiochene Princesses

The *Chronicon* of Archbishop William of Tyre (d.c.1184) is of paramount importance to the study of the four Latin Christian polities created in the Near East as a result of the First Crusade (1095–9): the kingdom of Jerusalem, the principality of Antioch, and the counties of Edessa and Tripoli. Born in Jerusalem c.1130, William departed for Western Europe around 1146 to pursue an education in the schools of Paris, Orleans, and Bologna, before returning home in 1165. Upon his arrival, he quickly built a career in the Jerusalemite church through King Amalric of Jerusalem's patronage, rising to the position of archbishop of Tyre in 1175. He also acted as chancellor of the kingdom of Jerusalem (1174–84), royal diplomat to the West and Byzantium, and tutor to Amalric's son and heir, the future King Baldwin IV, the 'Leper King'.¹ Alongside these responsibilities, William was a keen writer, gathering historical materials on the Latin East upon his return and composing at least two now-lost works – a history of Islam and an account of the Third Lateran Council – as well as his *magnum opus*, the *Chronicon*. The latter, written during the 1170s and 1180s, initially at Amalric's behest, charts the Latin East's development down to William's own time and is the only historical source internal to *Outremer* to cover the crucial years 1127–84.² It has therefore had a significant bearing on modern scholarship of the Latin East for this period and, unsurprisingly, has been subjected to significant academic scrutiny. Thus, alongside Peter Edbury and John Rowe's 1988 biography, in which the *Chronicon* is considered an attempt to promote the kingdom of Jerusalem's legitimacy and provoke renewed Western crusading efforts, scholars have also examined William's views of Islam and Byzantium, as well as his interest in legal and political structures.³

Nevertheless, despite much excellent work, the *Chronicon*'s complexity and sophistication ensures there is still significant scope for re-evaluation of its content. There is a particular need to re-integrate William's *Chronicon* within the wider literary developments that took place in Latin Christendom during the twelfth century, from which he – along with other Eastern writers, such as Fulcher of Chartres – is frequently omitted. This is despite William's education in the West, especially Paris, where many of the more prominent historical authors of his time were also trained, and the fact that his text enjoyed a long and influential after-life.⁴ Indeed, alongside the several surviving

manuscripts of the *Chronicon*, it was also used by a number of Western authors, including Matthew Paris and Marino Sanudo Tosello, translated into Old French, and transmitted through several vernacular continuations.⁵ One of the most important, yet least explored, areas to warrant deeper discussion is William's presentation of women. For, while several authors have used his text empirically to reconstruct the lives and actions of women in the Latin East, few have considered them from a literary perspective, with the prominent exceptions of Thomas Asbridge, who has pointed to the problems of his presentation of Princess Alice of Antioch (d.c.1149); Deborah Gerish, who has examined the narrative role played by Queen Melisende of Jerusalem (d.1161) and her sisters; and Natasha Hodgson, who has explored various episodes from William's text against the broader presentation of women in 'crusade' narratives.⁶ Consequently, this article offers a focused examination of the ways in which William *represented* both femininity and acts of female agency by exploring the characteristics he associated with the women who appeared in his text and, most especially, his presentation of three Antiochene princesses: Alice, Constance (d.c.1164), and Sybil (*fl.* late-twelfth century). It will be argued that such an investigation can not only enable a deeper understanding of William and his work, in particular by addressing the potential ways in which the specific political pressures of *Outremer*, as well as Jerusalem's spiritual significance, might have impacted upon his approach; but, by contextualising the *Chronicon* within the broader corpus of historical narratives composed by authors in the Medieval West, it can also provide greater texture to our understanding of the gendered frameworks within which medieval ecclesiastical writers operated and the extent to which William's text can be relied upon as a source for empirical reconstruction.

William, women, and femininity

As an ecclesiastical author of the twelfth century, William of Tyre was not only the product of a patriarchal society, he also inhabited a world of religious reform and extensive theological debate.⁷ Drawing on classical texts, scripture, as well as the works of the Church Fathers and later canonists, the clerical writers of Latin Christendom in this period could tap into broad conversations relating to social ideals, including issues of gender and sexuality.⁸ It is of no surprise, therefore, that William followed

several traditional patterns in describing women and female agency. For a start, in line with canonists like Isidore of Seville, he was conventional in utilising *mulier* and *femina* to designate women.⁹ More significantly, on those occasions when William wrote approvingly of a woman standing in to rule in place of a man, either through death, disaster in battle, or extended absence, she was said to have transcended the bounds of her sex. Thus, Beatrice, the wife of Count Joscelin II of Edessa who governed the county after her husband was captured by Nur al-Din of Aleppo in 1150, was described as a ‘modest women, sober and God-fearing’, one who surpassed ‘womanly strength’ (*vires ... femineas*).¹⁰ The primary exemplar, however, is Queen Melisende of Jerusalem, who from 1131–43 co-ruled with her husband, Fulk V of Anjou, and later acted as regent for, and co-ruler with, her son, Baldwin III (d.1163). Of Melisende as regent, William said that she was ‘a most prudent woman, having much experience in almost all worldly affairs, clearly transcending the nature of her female sex, so that she could put her hand to strong things, and strive to emulate the glory of the most magnificent princes, and follow in their endeavours without false steps’.¹¹ The importance William attached to this characterisation of Melisende is indicated by the fact that he offered similar comments on two further occasions during her regency, as well as details of her effective governance and leadership (albeit through proxies in the case of military matters).¹² The wider context for this is that Melisende’s efforts to retain a guiding influence over Baldwin III caused conflict within the kingdom, tantamount to civil war. Yet, alongside his positive portrayal of the queen’s actions, William even suggested that the period of co-rule was not one of dangerous civil conflict, rather of largely peaceful co-operation between mother and son. Though William accepted that there were those who considered it unseemly for a king ‘to always hang from his mother’s teat’, episodes of civil strife were blamed on evil men, who led the young and pliable Baldwin astray, or the haughty actions of the queen’s supporters, above all the constable, Manasses of Hierges.¹³ Gerish has convincingly argued that William’s coverage of these events was carefully crafted in order to promote the notion that the Jerusalemite ruling house had always acted to maintain the unity of the kingdom and, by extension, *Outremer*.¹⁴ None the less, the implications this episode has for our understanding of William’s attitudes towards such acts of female agency deserves further comment.

Importantly, this emphasis on transcending the feminine sex places William in line with Western writers who praised the political activities of powerful women. For example, detailing the actions of Queen Mathilda of England (d.1152), wife of King Stephen, during the anarchy, the author of the *Gesta Stephani* wrote that she was ‘a woman of subtlety and a man’s resolution’, and ‘forgetting the weakness of her sex and a woman’s softness, bore herself with the valour of a man’.¹⁵ Interestingly, William’s account of Melisende’s reign, with its focus on transcending sex, governing, and defending the land through personally appointed proxies, also closely mirrors the ways in which ecclesiastical authors detailed the political activities of biblical widows, whose status was seen as more religiously meritorious than that of a wife. The most famous of these was the Old Testament Deborah, who ruled Israel in the Book of Judges, of whom St Ambrose (d.397) wrote that ‘not being restrained by the weakness of her sex, she undertook to perform the duties of a man’, as a widow (*vidua*) ‘she governed the people, led armies, chose generals, made military decisions, and had charge of triumphs’.¹⁶ However, in contrast to certain Western authors who profiled women who exhibited ‘manly’ authority, William did not deploy the term *virago*.¹⁷ Though this is not necessarily uncommon, it could signify that, despite his general approval of Melisende, and the fact that female succession was accepted practice in the Latin East (due to the short life span of its male inhabitants), William’s authorial aim of promoting the legitimacy of Jerusalem’s ruling house – already made problematic by the fact that it sat within Christ’s own patrimony – meant he could not *fully* endorse female rule.¹⁸ In this respect, it is probably also significant that, while Melisende was praised for her actions as a widow, William’s coverage of moments when she was afforded agency during Fulk’s reign are more ambiguous. For instance, when detailing a civil war between Fulk and Count Hugh of Jaffa (d.1134), likely resulting from the king’s efforts to supplant the *in situ* nobility with newcomers, William noted that there were rumours, of which there were ‘many proofs’ (*multa ... argumenta*), that the relationship between the queen and the count was ‘too familiar’ (*familiaria nimis*) and that this had aroused in Fulk ‘a husband’s jealousy’ (*maritali zelo*).¹⁹ William was careful not to imply any act of sexual misconduct, but his account nevertheless cast doubt over the queen’s actions and tapped into gendered tropes (explored below) associated with devious women. Regarding the rebellion’s aftermath, during which Fulk was forced to show far greater deference to his wife, William then described the king’s status as ‘uxorious’

(*uxorius*).²⁰ While this has sometimes been read as a positive, for it portrayed Fulk respecting the royal house and nobility, and Melisende as a unifying force, William's use of the gendered trope of the hen-pecked husband indicates some ambiguity.²¹ Moreover, while he praised Beatrice of Edessa for her manful actions, he also decried the fact that Frankish sin had caused the county – like the principality of Antioch (discussed below) – to be 'ruled by the commands of women'.²² Consequently, although William could draw on biblical precedents and established narrative frameworks to depict a widow ruling in the land of Israel, there is reason to believe his broader attitudes towards female political agency are less clear-cut and more complex than has yet been recognised, with William seemingly equivocating over female rulership, however 'manly' female protagonists like Beatrice and Melisende might appear. Importantly, this challenges Gerish's view that William 'evinced no ambivalence whatsoever about Melisende'.²³

Yet, the ability to exercise masculine power was not the only criterion against which William evaluated women. For example, he considered some to be valuable sources of historical information. When discussing the provenance of his information regarding the divorce of King Amalric from his first wife, Agnes of Courtney, on grounds of consanguinity, William noted that he gained the truth from Stephany of Courtney (*fl.* mid-twelfth century), who was abbess of the Church of St. Mary the Major in Jerusalem, daughter of Count Joscelin I of Edessa, niece of Prince Roger of Antioch, and Agnes' aunt. William emphasised that she was 'a religious and noble woman, by birth and behaviour', and that although 'greatly advanced in years' (*natu grandevam*), 'she retained a strong memory of these matters'.²⁴ Given her wisdom, noble birth, age, and religiosity, Stephany was considered a respectable and reliable eye-witness, which mirrors the ways in which male oral testimony was often legitimised in Western Europe.²⁵ Furthermore, nobility of birth and character, as well as strength of faith, were all frequent means by which William – and medieval authors more broadly – judged a woman's worth.²⁶ As such, in addition to being God-fearing, Beatrice of Edessa was described as 'noble in person but also noble by habit'.²⁷ This also echoed descriptions of several other women, including two of King Baldwin I of Jerusalem's wives, Godehilde and Adelaide of Sicily; Constance of France, who was wife to Bohemond of Taranto, prince of Antioch; the Jerusalemite noblewoman, Helvis of Ramla; Countess

Sybil of Flanders; and King Louis VII of France's second wife, Constance of Castile, mistakenly called Maria.²⁸

By contrast, William was highly critical of women who failed to live up to these behavioural expectations. For instance, William specifically referred to the *more femineo*, or the female manner, in describing those women who either manipulated men into following their wishes or obstinately refused male direction.²⁹ Importantly, this also tapped into William's aforementioned coverage of sexuality. Thus, an unnamed wife of the Jerusalemite nobleman, Renier Brus, was said to have contravened 'the manner of noble matrons' by engaging in sexual relations with her captors after being taken hostage by the Muslim ruler of Damascus in the early 1130s.³⁰ Likewise, in William's account of Louis VII's stay at Antioch during the Second Crusade in 1148, we find reference to the French king's wife, Eleanor of Aquitaine, having sparked up an inappropriate relationship with her uncle, the Antiochene prince, Raymond of Poitiers. William denounced her as a 'foolish woman' (*mulier imprudens*) because 'against the laws of royal dignity, she had disregarded her husband by forgetting the faith of the marital bed'.³¹ In accusing Eleanor of sexual misconduct, William not only mirrored similar discussions of her sexual deviancy by other medieval authors, including those similarly educated in Paris, like Walter Map and Gerald of Wales, he also deployed a typical narrative device for discrediting women.³² Indeed, as Theresa Earenfight has noted, the transgression of the 'cultural imperative of the marital debt' struck at a core social function expected of women in medieval Europe – the production of children – and was deeply imbued with biblical precedence through the figure of Eve.³³ Thus, when another twelfth-century dynastic chronicler, Abbot Suger of St Denis, sought to discredit Bertrada of Montfort (d.1117), the proverbial 'wicked step-mother' of his protagonist, King Louis VI of France, he alluded to her use of 'allurements' (*illecebris*) and her 'great skill in that amazing artifice of women who have become accustomed to boldly trample upon and unjustly harass their husbands'.³⁴ By contrast, and as a means to further demonstrate the Western influences and frameworks within which the *Chronicon* can be viewed, Suger described Louis' sister, Constance of France, upon whom William also looked approvingly, as 'very noble ... courteous in her manners, [and] charming in character'.³⁵ That William was willing to use sexual fidelity as a means to defame certain women, but, as we have seen with

Melisende, could also selectively side-step such accusations, demonstrates both his similarity to Western contemporaries who considered there to be specifically feminine behaviours, and that many of these were worthy of censure, but also how his pro-Jerusalem tendencies influenced the tone and texture of his narrative.

Despite William's clear interest in the expected (and enacted) behavioural traits of his female protagonists, and the quite lengthy physical descriptions he offered of male leaders (including his comment that King Amalric 'was excessively fat, so that he had breasts like those of a woman hanging as far as his waist'), he was far less forthcoming when it came to physical descriptions of women.³⁶ He came close to profiling Queen Melisende, if only indirectly, when noting that Baldwin III 'was handsome, with a very fine appearance and a highly coloured complexion signifying his natural vigour; in this regard, clearly, he resembled his mother in his features', as well as his comment that Baldwin was 'moderate of flesh' (*carnositatis media*), which made him unlike the corpulent Amalric or his 'thin' (*macilentus*) mother.³⁷ However, William's failure here to profile Melisende with the same depth as he did the kings of Jerusalem is perhaps another indication that he did not necessarily consider her to be on a par with her male counterparts. There is in fact only one woman for whom William did offer a physical description. Of Theodora Komnena (1158–63), the Byzantine bride of Baldwin III, William said that she was 'of particularly striking attractiveness, elegant of face and the whole condition of her person was favourable to look at'.³⁸ In doing so, William did not stray particularly far from Western conventions, for many ecclesiastical authors commented on a woman's beauty (most often using *pulcher* or *species*), and some also placed women in sexualised situations, for example the accounts of the 'Virgin Martyrs', in which those like SS Agnes, Catherine, and Agatha faced violence for resisting the advances of men. Yet such descriptions rarely – if ever – exceeded comments on the woman's face.³⁹ Since Theodora was present in the kingdom of Jerusalem upon William's return to the East in 1165, holding the major port city of Acre as her dower following Baldwin's death in 1163, it seems likely that William had seen her himself and was obviously rather taken with her.⁴⁰

While it would be misleading to argue that William was overly concerned with the actions of women, as his text was principally designed to showcase the deeds – for good and for ill – of men, it is

nevertheless evident that he was interested in gender roles and expectations. Therefore, an examination into the frameworks within which William worked when detailing the activities and behavioural traits of women suggests that he was influenced both by contemporary models prevalent in Western Europe and the unique pressures of a secular kingdom in the Holy Land. When the *Chronicon* is read closely, it can also be noted that the actions of certain powerful women at times conflicted with William's overarching narrative strategies. This can be seen through the underlying tensions of his coverage of the career of Queen Melisende and, as will be further demonstrated below, as regards three Antiochene princesses whose activities served to challenge and undermine the primacy and royal integrity of the Jerusalemite throne. By identifying and accounting for such narrative tension, moreover, we can gain important new insights into William's authorial motives and the influences these had over the composition of his text.

William and the princesses of Antioch

We begin with Alice, the second daughter of King Baldwin II of Jerusalem who married Prince Bohemond II of Antioch, the son of the principality's founder, Bohemond of Taranto, in 1126, and whom William dealt with primarily through the medium of character assassination – which is made all the more prominent given that his is the sole narrative source to detail her life.⁴¹ Thus, when the Antiochene prince was ambushed and killed in 1130 – a disaster which left the principality devoid of military and political leadership, as his only heir was an infant daughter, Constance – into the political void, so William argued, stepped Alice.⁴² Moreover, when Baldwin II then came to Antioch, having earlier served as its regent (1119–26), the city gates were locked to him, and apparently it took the support of a monk, Peter Latinator, and a burgess, William of Aversa, to allow the king entry. So desperate was she for power, William reported, Alice even dispatched an envoy to Zengi, the Muslim *atabeg* of Mosul and Aleppo, to offer him an alliance, which might have come to fruition had Baldwin not intercepted the messenger and had him tortured and executed. Nevertheless, the king now forgave Alice, who was expelled to her dower lands, the coastal cities of Latakia and Jabala, where she built a powerful independent lordship over the following years.⁴³

Describing Alice's actions, William said that Alice was 'driven by a wicked spirit' and 'malice' (*maliciam*), propping up her tyranny (*tyrannidem*) by acting against her father, the will of the people, and the best interests of her own daughter; indeed, it took 'God-fearing men, who thought little of the recklessness of a mad woman' to oppose her.⁴⁴ Alice's evil intentions were also stressed when William moved onto detailing an elite cabal of the northern states, led by Counts Pons of Tripoli and Joscelin II of Edessa, who sought to oppose Jerusalemite supremacy following Fulk's succession in 1131/2. Here, William characterised Alice as 'a sly woman beyond measure and exceedingly wicked', one who had again acted against the wishes of the principality's leading men, who opposed her 'wicked' (*impiis*) behaviour in favour of supporting Fulk.⁴⁵ This assault on Alice's reputation continued during his coverage of negotiations carried out by Antioch's nobles over who would marry Constance, with an envoy sent to offer her to Raymond of Poitiers kept secret from Alice because she was an 'exceedingly wicked woman' who might seek to oppose the union.⁴⁶ Of particular interest is William's change of tack when detailing how, in either late 1135 or early 1136, Alice again moved on Antioch, securing control of the city and her daughter. When Raymond then arrived in northern Syria to marry the eight-year-old Constance in mid-1136, he was reportedly met with a complex situation. Yet, unlike before, William acknowledged that Alice had the support of certain nobles and even refrained from personally insulting her nature or intentions.⁴⁷ She did not completely escape the archbishop's scorn, however. William detailed how Alice was prevented from opposing the marriage by Antioch's patriarch, Ralph of Domfront, another of William's 'crafty' (*subdolos*) protagonists, who reportedly used the situation to extract an oath of obedience from Raymond. As such, Ralph duped Alice into thinking that it was she who was to be married instead, with William claiming that 'this exceedingly gullible woman was deceived by false hope'.⁴⁸ Realising this, Alice is said to have retired to Latakia and Jabala, as can be traced through the charters, although William's comment that from then on she pursued Raymond with 'inexorable hatred' (*inexorabili odio*) cannot.⁴⁹ Thus, while William was not uncritical of Alice here, there is a clear move away from vitriolic notions of malicious intent.

William's account of Alice's career is problematic on several counts. Firstly, as Asbridge has demonstrated, while the princess was presented as acting against the principality's major players before

1136, those who opposed her were of minor significance, with the notable silence of the patriarch, Bernard of Valence (d.1135), and the nobility suggesting their support for the princess, or at least a willingness to use her actions to renegotiate the terms of Jerusalem's influence within Antioch, which experienced a significant shift after 1130.⁵⁰ It is even possible that William afforded Alice a far more prominent role in these events than she actually had, using her to deflect attention away from the role of the patriarch and nobility and thus any sense that anti-Jerusalem dissent was more widespread. In this regard, it is significant that William deployed several gendered barbs, portraying Alice as disobedient and driven by greed, lust, impiety, and wickedness: the archetypal dangerous woman.⁵¹ As Hodgson has pointed out, she was also a bad mother – another deeply gendered criticism.⁵² Rather than a shift in the political dynamics of *Outremer*, then, this was depicted as another instance of female deviancy, disobedience, and lack of restraint. Likewise, as notions of an alliance with Zengi are not substantiated by Arabic sources (although this could be explained by the suggestion that the envoy never reached the Muslim ruler), Asbridge is likely correct that William also hoped to discredit Alice as an irreligious traitor – which again carried gendered overtones given the author's emphasis on faith and noble conduct as key markers of praiseworthy femininity.⁵³ It is of interest, however, that Alice was never accused of being forgetful of her sex, a frequent means by which ecclesiastical authors could criticise powerful women.⁵⁴ In all instances, therefore, William clearly offered a narrative of Alice's career replete with gendered criticisms and designed to present the kingdom and its rulers in the best possible light. This authorial aim almost certainly explains his change in tone regarding 1136, for he commented that Fulk's lack of intervention was due to Alice's sister, Queen Melisende, who convinced her husband not to get involved.⁵⁵ This not only dovetails with his aforementioned belief in the king's uxorious status after Hugh of Jaffa's rebellion, it also demonstrates that the figure whose reputation William was most concerned with at this moment was Fulk. Once again, moreover, as the wife of a Jerusalemite king, Melisende was far less immune from moments of indirect criticism. Likewise, William's reluctance to imply any attempt by Alice at entering the masculine sphere as a widow could relate to his depiction of Melisende, who, as we saw earlier, was praised for doing so. For fear of creating narrative inconsistencies which might bring the actions of Jerusalemite rulers into question, William thus had to carefully modulate both his presentation of events and his use of gendered language.

The desire to protect the kingdom's reputation also lay behind William's treatment of Constance, about whom we know very little until Raymond of Poitiers' death at the battle of Inab in 1149, at which point she emerged as the independent ruler of the principality with the support of Antioch's patriarch, Aimery of Limoges (c.1141–93).⁵⁶ However, her effective role in governance is largely ignored by William, beyond his aforementioned lament that Antioch and Edessa were 'ruled by the commands of women'.⁵⁷ The context for this is Constance's steadfast opposition to Baldwin III's efforts to influence the affairs of the principality. Thus, when the king called a council at Tripoli in 1152 and sought to impose a new husband on Constance with the support of Queen Melisende and her sister, Hodierna of Tripoli, the princess refused to marry any of suitors. Instead, she wed the infamous Western knight, Renaud of Châtillon, a figure whom William held in deep disregard for his role in the Jerusalemite factionalism of his own time.⁵⁸ In detailing these events, William again used gendered barbs to dismiss this act of female agency. As such, Constance opposed Baldwin in 'the female way' (*more femineo*), and 'fearing the chains of marriage, and preferring the unbound life, she paid little attention to that which might help her people'.⁵⁹ In this, it was said, she was driven by 'matters of the flesh' (*carnis curam*).⁶⁰ By dismissing Constance's actions as the result of a typically female lack of sexual restraint, the archbishop effectively deflected attention away from the limitations of royal influence.⁶¹ William developed this theme further in his account of Constance's marriage to Renaud, commenting that it was 'not without much astonishment that so distinguished, powerful, and illustrious a woman, and [formerly] wife to such an excellent man, would deign to marry, as it were, a common soldier'.⁶² The accusation, left unsaid, is that she was once again driven by concerns other than political sense. Avoiding any notion that Constance had attempted to transcend her sex, William instead portrayed the princess, like her mother, being driven by distinctly feminine impulses. Moreover, that this passage also implied that the princess' social standing was linked to that of her husband, even though she was the true dynastic heiress, raises further questions regarding William's attitudes towards female political agency and, more broadly, the legitimacy of Melisende's actions in the kingdom, for she too carried the bloodline of the ruling house of a 'crusader' state into a marriage with a Western husband. This helps to further reveal the tensions William faced in reconciling his patriarchal upbringing with his desire to protect and promote the reputation of the Jerusalemite throne.

There are further signs that William carefully managed his narrative to present Jerusalem in the best possible light in his treatment of Renaud's capture by Nur al-Din in November 1161, which again saw Constance emerge as leader because her son by Raymond, Bohemond III (d.1201), was not yet old enough to rule. William's portrayal of Constance here stands in marked opposition to her actual influence over governance, which had only increased over the course of Renaud's time as prince-regent. Thus, the archbishop recorded that Baldwin III came north to settle matters in Antioch after Renaud's capture, noting that the king placed Patriarch Aimery in charge before departing for Jerusalem 'having established the lady princess with honourable expenses', again implying her material focus.⁶³ Moreover, when Constance then secretly negotiated a marriage alliance between her daughter, Maria, and Manuel Komnenos, now Byzantine emperor, in 1161–2, despite the latter earlier offering Baldwin III the chance to lead negotiations, William again protected the king. Indeed, given that Baldwin had championed Melisende of Tripoli as an imperial spouse, perhaps to limit Byzantine influence in the principality, this was deeply embarrassing. William therefore blamed this on the Greeks, whose treachery was a regular trope for Latin authors of this period.⁶⁴ They were also criticised for their prevarication and for mistreating Melisende by shamefully demanding to examine 'the disposition of the secret parts of the body' (thus doubting her sexual continence). Baldwin, on the other hand, was presented as handling his frustration with dignity and care for his orphaned cousin, Maria.⁶⁵

Of primary interest here, though, is William's coverage – or, rather, lack thereof – of Bohemond III's succession to the princely throne in late 1163/early 1164. When the prince finally came of age in 1163, it appears that Constance, with the apparent collusion of the principality's major nobles, was unwilling to hand over the reins of power, causing Bohemond to rebel and expel his mother from Antioch. This is primarily detailed in two independent Syriac accounts, the contemporary world chronicle of the Jacobite Patriarch, Michael the Syrian, and the anonymous thirteenth-century *1234 Chronicle*.⁶⁶ It is also corroborated by documentary sources issued by Bohemond. Firstly, in a letter sent to Louis VII of France in 1162, in which he called on the French king to provide aid, Bohemond described himself simply as 'the son of Raymond, former prince of Antioch'.⁶⁷ Moreover, he issued two charters in 1163 in which he claimed dominion (*dominium*) over the princess' dower lands of

Latakia and Jabala – which could either indicate the start of hostilities through the capture of vital economic ports, or that Constance had placed her son there to gain important experience of governance (which he perhaps felt he did not need).⁶⁸ However, William was remarkably silent on this, offering little in the way of comment on Bohemond's accession. Indeed, the only hint that Renaud's capture had seen a new prince come to power appears in William's account of the aforementioned marriage negotiations with Manuel Komnenos. In the emperor's letter to Baldwin III, which William purports to have copied faithfully and must pre-date Bohemond's accession, the emperor noted his willingness to marry either Melisende of Tripoli, or Maria, the sister of 'the magnificent man, the prince of Antioch'.⁶⁹ Given that Bohemond was described as prince when he next appeared in William's text, just before a disastrous battle against Nur al-Din near to Artah in 1164, there is a clear sense that the archbishop had simply bypassed any notion of a troubled succession.⁷⁰

While this lacuna is possibly the result of William still being in the West when these events unfolded, his fastidious approach to collecting materials for the rest of the period suggests a more deliberate reason for his silence. Bohemond's troubled succession, in which he vied with his mother for political dominance, raised awkward parallels with Melisende's relationship with Baldwin III. As already noted, William went to great lengths to cast the kingdom and its rulers in a positive light, excusing both the king and his mother for their dispute and presenting the period as one of largely peaceful co-operation broken only by the actions of others. When William came to reconcile his narrative of Jerusalemite events with the similar actions of an Antiochene princess who had frequently undermined the kingdom's authority, was – at least by his presentation – overly driven by material and sexual concerns, and was related by marriage and birth to two of his most hated protagonists, he encountered distinct problems of continuity. Faced with detailing Bohemond III's succession, and either criticising a woman for actions he had earlier praised in another context, and so risk damaging Jerusalemite prestige, or praising Constance as he had Melisende, and thus undermine his broader portrayal of the princess' character, William instead chose a third option: to pretend that these events had simply not happened. Significantly, this view challenges, or least muddies the waters of, Hodgson's belief that 'William clearly considered the rule of an experienced regent preferable to that of an untried

youth', for it suggests that the archbishop's authorial motives behind the discussion of female regency were tied instead to protecting the reputation of Jerusalem.⁷¹ It also brings into question the extent to which historians can rely on the *Chronicon* as a source for empirical reconstruction.

Of our three princesses, Sybil is the least evidenced, yet what details we have from William's text can still help to demonstrate how his views on gender intersected with his Jerusalem-focused narrative strategies. It is likely that Sybil came from within the ranks of the Antiochene nobility, although the first of her handful of appearances in the historical record relates to when, in late 1180 or early 1181, she became Bohemond III's third wife following his hasty – and not entirely legal – divorce from one of Manuel Komnenos' seemingly endless supplies of nieces, Theodora Komnena (not to be confused with the wife of Baldwin III). In response, the nobles and the patriarch reacted angrily, not least because of the uncanonical nature of the union but also because this breach with Byzantium came at a time when, despite Manuel's death in September 1180, the prince's sister, Maria, was empress-regent. It also contravened long-held aristocratic rights of discussion over diplomatic activities and marriages. Civil war thus erupted, and it took an extended period of negotiation (probably up to early 1182) supported by a Jerusalemite delegation for peace to return; a peace bought at the expense of the expulsion of several of Bohemond III's closest advisors and Sybil's reduced status in governance.⁷²

Of these events, William decried that Bohemond III had married 'a certain Sybil who, so it was said, practised sorcery'; an act he also described as 'madness' (*insaniam*), albeit without alluding to the deeper political roots behind the aristocratic reaction.⁷³ For medieval authors, accusations of witchcraft were a powerful way to discredit women, imbued as it was with ideas of impiety, deviancy, and deviousness.⁷⁴ As such, William was able to criticise Bohemond's moral character by implying that behind these actions lay the manipulations of a dangerous woman. This also taps into William's broader coverage of the rebellion; as I have argued elsewhere, these events – in which a morally compromised ruler was defeated by a noble faction who then influenced the composition of the central household – raised important parallels with the situation in Jerusalem during Baldwin IV's reign.⁷⁵ Indeed, with Baldwin unable to sire children due to his leprosy, and often too ill to rule on his own, the kingdom was subject to infighting and factionalism (which William himself became embroiled in), as noble groups

sought to exert influence over the royal court – a conflict which did little to advertise the strength of the Jerusalemite throne.⁷⁶ Similarly, although leprosy was a disease seen to reflect severe moral failings, William sought to combat any sense that this might raise questions over the ruling house by praising Baldwin's martial qualities and rulership.⁷⁷ Consequently, to prevent events in Antioch from drawing unwanted attention to problems in Jerusalem, William seemingly did two things: firstly, he deployed a deeply gendered criticism of Sybil to emphasise her moral failings, perhaps implying that she led Bohemond astray; and secondly, rather than recognising that the prince was forced to accept the expulsion of some of his closest advisors (which charter and other narrative evidence suggests is the reality), he instead noted that it was Bohemond who had actively exiled figures for supporting the nobles.⁷⁸ William's narrative of the rebellion thus offered the portrait of a leader who, despite his moral failings, was able to control his principality forcefully; which certainly chimes with his largely positive portrayal of Baldwin IV. Like Alice and Constance, therefore, Sybil's character was used as a vehicle through which William pursued his broader authorial aim of preserving and promoting the reputation of the kingdom of Jerusalem.

What is clear, therefore, is that the activities of these princesses – who either proved willing, and able, to enter the 'masculine space' of rulership, and thus act independently of Jerusalemite influence, or brought sharp relief on the political and moral fractures which occurred in the kingdom of Jerusalem – threatened to undermine William's narrative aim of promoting Jerusalem's supremacy in the Latin East. How he dealt with the Antiochene princesses thus offers a valuable window into his authorial strategies, his attitudes towards gender, and the challenges of utilising the *Chronicon* for empirical reconstruction.

Conclusion

This article has sought to demonstrate, through its examination of William of Tyre's approach to women, femininity, and female agency, the importance of understanding the gendered frameworks in which twelfth-century historical writers operated. For William, this is especially true in relation to his

coverage of acts of female political agency which challenged the power and reputation of the kingdom of Jerusalem and its ruling house. In his efforts to emphasise the legitimacy and supremacy of Jerusalem, therefore, he praised a powerful queen like Melisende for her ability to transcend her sex, albeit only when she became a widow – a status imbued with more religious (and, importantly, biblical) precedence and significance – and with an underlying sense that even then she was not necessarily on a par with her male counterparts. Conversely, in order to deflect any potential criticism away from Jerusalem’s rulers, William discredited those women who drew negative attention on the kingdom by deploying common female-gendered tropes, including deviousness, impiety, witchcraft, sexual incontinence, and a focus on the material world. This is especially true of three Antiochene princesses, Alice, Constance, and Sybil. At times, however, even character defamation was not enough, with William seemingly suppressing or altering details to ensure that his broader Jerusalem-focused narrative arcs were undamaged. In short, Antioch’s independent and powerful princesses posed a distinct problem to William of Tyre. By identifying this, historians are not only challenged to think more carefully about deploying the *Chronicon* as a source for empirical reconstruction, but it also becomes evident that an analysis of the ways in which William approached this problem offers important new insights into the author and his text. Furthermore, by reintegrating William into the broader processes of historical writing in medieval Christendom, these findings can also contribute to historiographical understanding of how male ecclesiastical authors conceptualised and dealt with the deeds of women who transcended social expectations and the implications this has for reconstructing the realities of the past.

WT = William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, Turnhout 1986; *Deeds* = S. Edgington and H. Nicholson (eds), *Deeds done beyond the sea: essays on William of Tyre, Cyprus and the military orders presented to Peter Edbury*, Farnham 2014; *PL* = *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J.-P. Migne; *RHGF* = *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, 24 vols, Paris 1738–1904.

A version of this article was presented to the Leeds International Medieval Congress. I would like to thank the audience for their comments, and to express my sincerest gratitude to Susan Edgington, Cath Hanley, Eleanor Janega, Katherine Lewis, Matthew Mesley, Danielle Park, Thomas Smith, and Stephen Spencer for their invaluable advice.

-
- ¹ P. Edbury and J. Rowe, *William of Tyre: historian of the Latin East*, Cambridge 1988, 13–22; H. E. Mayer, ‘Guillaume de Tyr à l’école’, *Mémoires de l’Académie des sciences, arts et belles-lettres de Dijon* 127 (1988), 257–65.
- ² Edbury and Rowe, *William*, 23–31; A. V. Murray, ‘William of Tyre and the origin of the Turks: on the sources of the *Gesta Orientalium Principum*’, in M. Balard, B. Z. Kedar, and J. Riley-Smith (eds), *Dei gesta per Francos: Etudes sur les croisades dédiés à Jean Richard*, Aldershot 2001, 217–29; B. Z. Kedar, ‘Some new light on the composition process of William of Tyre’s *Historia*’, in *Deeds*, 3–12.
- ³ Edbury and Rowe, *William*, 61–166; R. C. Schwinges, *Kreuzzugsideologie und Toleranz: Studien zu Wilhelm von Tyrus*, Stuttgart 1977; C. Kostick, ‘William of Tyre, Livy, and the vocabulary of class’, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 65:3 (2004), 353–68; M. Tessera, ‘*Prudentes homines...qui sensus habebant magis exercitos*: a preliminary inquiry in William of Tyre’s vocabulary of power’, *Crusades* 1 (2002), 63–71; B. Hamilton, ‘William of Tyre and the Byzantine Empire’, in C. Dendrinos, J. Harris *et al.* (eds), *Porphyrogenita: essays on the history and literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in honour of Julian Chrysostomides*, Aldershot 2003, 219–33; J. Rubin, ‘The debate on twelfth-century Frankish feudalism: additional evidence from William of Tyre’s *Chronicon*’, *Crusades* 8 (2009), 53–62; N. Morton, ‘Perceptions of Islam in William of Tyre’s *Historia*’, in *Deeds*, 13–24; T. Asbridge, ‘William of Tyre and the first rulers of the Latin Principality of Antioch’, in *Deeds*, 35–42.
- ⁴ On the writing of history in this period, see e.g., G. Spiegel, *The past as text: the theory and practice of medieval historiography*, London 1997; M. Staunton, *The historians of Angevin England*, Oxford 2017. For an accessible entry point into the educational climate of Paris and northern France in this era, and its influence over another contemporary writer, see C. Giraud and C. Mews, ‘John of Salisbury and the schools of the 12th century’, in C. Grellard and F. Lachaud (eds), *A companion to John of Salisbury*, Leiden 2015, 31–62.
- ⁵ R. B. C. Huygens, ‘La tradition manuscrite de Guillaume de Tyr’, *Studi medievali* 5 (1964), 281–373; H. Nicholson, ‘Re-translating William of Tyre: The origins of the Templars and Hospitallers according to London, British Library additional manuscript 5444, fols 242v-248r’, in *Deeds*, 53–69; P. Edbury, ‘New Perspectives on the Old French Continuations of William of Tyre’, *Crusades* 9 (2010), 107–14; M. Issa, *La version latine et l’adaptation française de l’Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum de Guillaume de Tyr, livres IX–XVIII*, Turnhout 2010; P. Handyside, *The Old French William of Tyre*, Leiden 2015.
- ⁶ T. Asbridge, ‘Alice of Antioch: a case study of female power in the twelfth century’, in P. Edbury and J. Phillips, *The experience of crusading vol. 2: defining the crusader kingdom*, Cambridge 2003, 29–47; D. Gerish,

‘Royal daughters of Jerusalem and the demands of holy war’, *Leidschrift: Historisch Tijdschrift* 27:3 (2012), 89–112; N. Hodgson, *Women, crusading and the Holy Land in historical narrative*, Woodbridge 2007, passim.

⁷ R. N. Swanson, *The twelfth-century renaissance*, Manchester 1999, especially 103–51, 188–206.

⁸ For a good introduction to several key texts which influenced medieval conceptions of femininity and womanhood, see A. Blamires, *Woman defamed and woman defended: an anthology of medieval texts*, Oxford 1992. See also A. Bernau, ‘Medieval Antifeminism’, in L. McAvoy and D. Watt (eds), *The history of British women’s writing, 700–1500 volume 1*, Basingstoke 2015, 72–82.

⁹ Isidore of Seville, *Isidori Hispalensis episcopi etymologiarum sive originum*, ed. W. M. Lindsay, 2 vols, Oxford 1911, i, 457–8.

¹⁰ ‘mulier pudica, sobria et timens deum’: WT, 781–2.

¹¹ ‘mulier prudentissima, plenam pene in omnibus secularibus negociis habens experientiam, sexus feminei plane vincens conditionem, ita ut manum mitteret ad fortia et optimorum principum niteretur emulari et eorum studia passu non inferiore sectari’: WT, 717. On the events of Melisende’s life and political career, see H. E. Mayer, ‘Studies in honour of Queen Melisende’, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 26 (1972), 93–182.

¹² WT, 720, 761, 777, 850–1.

¹³ ‘semper ad matris ubera dependere’: WT, 717–18, 777–80.

¹⁴ Gerish, ‘Royal Daughters’, 101–12. See also Hodgson, *Women*, 181–8.

¹⁵ ‘astuti pectoris virilisque constantiae femina’, ‘sexusque fragilitatis femineaeque mollitiei oblita, viriliter sese et virtuose continere’: *Gesta Stephani*, ed. and trans. K. Potter, Oxford 1976, 122, 126. See also K. LoPrete, ‘Gendering viragos: medieval perceptions of powerful women’, in C. Meek and C. Lawless (eds), *Studies on medieval and early modern women 4: victims or viragos?*, Dublin 2005, 17–38; L. Wilkinson, ‘Women as sheriffs in early thirteenth century England’, in A. Jobson (ed.), *English government in the thirteenth century*, Woodbridge, 2004, 111–24 (especially 114)

¹⁶ ‘nec sexus infirmitate revocata, munia virorum obeunda suscepit’, ‘populos regit ... ducit exercitus ... duces eligit ... bella disponit, mandat triumphos’: St Ambrose, ‘Liber de viduis’, *PL*, xvi.260–3 (here 262). See also Hodgson, *Women*, 198–9; Bernau, ‘Medieval antifeminism’, 74.

¹⁷ LoPrete, ‘Gendering viragos’, 17–38; K. Fenton, *Gender, nation and conquest in the works of William of Malmesbury*, Woodbridge 2008, 50–2.

¹⁸ On female succession, see B. Hamilton, ‘Women in the crusader states: the queens of Jerusalem (1100–1190)’, in D. Baker and R. Hill (eds), *Medieval women*, Cambridge 1978, 143–74 (here 143). On the issue of the

conflict over whether to allow a secular ruler in the Holy City, as well as William's views of this, see Edbury and Rowe, *William*, 61–108; S. John, 'The papacy and the establishment of the kingdoms of Jerusalem, Sicily and Portugal: twelfth-century papal political thought on incipient kingship', this JOURNAL 68:2 (2017), 223–59 (especially 230–5).

¹⁹ WT, 651–6. See also H. E. Mayer, 'Angevins versus Normans: the new men of King Fulk of Jerusalem', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 133:1 (1989), 1–25; Mayer, 'Studies', 110; Hodgson, *Women*, 134–5.

²⁰ WT, 656. See also M. Sauer, *Gender in medieval culture*, London 2015, 63.

²¹ Gerish, 'Royal daughters', 105–8; Hodgson, *Women*, 185.

²² 'femineo regebatur imperio': WT, 775.

²³ Gerish, 'Royal daughters', 102.

²⁴ 'religiosam et nobilem carne et moribus feminam', 'sed memoriter hec retinentem': WT, 869. See also B. Hamilton, 'The titular nobility of the Latin East: the case of Agnes of Courtenay', in P. Edbury (ed.), *Crusade and Settlement*, Cardiff 1985, 197–203.

²⁵ E. van Houts, *Memory and gender in medieval Europe 900–1200*, Basingstoke 1999, 22–6.

²⁶ Sauer, *Gender*, 107; P. Stafford, 'The portrayal of royal women in England, mid-tenth to mid-twelfth centuries', in J. C. Parsons (ed.) *Medieval Queenship*, Stroud 1994, 143–68.

²⁷ 'nobilem corpore, sed moribus nobiliorem': WT, 775.

²⁸ WT, 453, 541–3, 613, 770, 778, 781–2.

²⁹ WT, 638, 795–6. See also Hodgson, *Women*, 123.

³⁰ 'matronarum more nobilium': WT, 656.

³¹ 'contra regiam dignitatem legem negligens maritalem, thori coniugalis fide oblita': WT, 754–5.

³² M. Evans, *Inventing Eleanor: The medieval and post-medieval image of Eleanor of Aquitaine*, London 2014, 21–8.

³³ T. Earenfight, *Queenship in medieval Europe*, New York 2013, 7, 23. See also Fenton, *Gender*, 108–9; Sauer, *Gender*, 107.

³⁴ 'eruditissima illius admirandi muliebris artificii, quo consueverunt audaces suis etiam lascessitos injuriis maritos suppeditare': Suger of St Denis, *Vie de Louis le Gros*, ed. and trans. H. Waquet, Paris, 2007, 122–3.

³⁵ 'nobilissimam ... moribus facetam, personal elegantem': Suger, *Vie*, 46.

-
- ³⁶ ‘Pinguis erat super modum, ita ut more femineo mamillas haberet cingulotenus prominentes’: WT, 868. See also Edbury and Rowe, *William*, 71–2.
- ³⁷ ‘fuit sane facie decorus elegantissima, colore vivido et innatum designante vigorem, a quibus plane in ea parte matrem referens’: WT, 715.
- ³⁸ ‘forme venustate singulariter conspicua, vultus elegantia et totius corporis habitudine intuentibus favorabilis’: WT, 843.
- ³⁹ See for example the descriptions of beautiful women found in Suger, *Vie*, 46; William of Poitiers, *Gesta Guillelmi*, ed. and trans. R. H. C. Davis and M. Chibnall, Oxford 1998, 62–4; William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, ed. and trans. R. A. B. Mynors, completed by R. M. Thompson and M. Winterbottom, 2 vols, Oxford 1998–9, I, 754–8; Gerald of Wales, *De principis instructione*, ed. and trans. R. Bartlett, Oxford 2018, 688; Dudo of St Quentin, *De moribus actis primorum Normanniae ducum*, ed. J. Lair, Caen 1865, 166–7, 185–6, 264, 289. For the Virgin Martyrs, see Jacobus de Voragine, *Legenda aurea vulgo historia Lombardica dicta*, ed. T. H. Graesse, Bratislava 1845, 113–16, 170–3, 789–96.
- ⁴⁰ M. Barber, *The Crusader States*, New Haven 2012, 212; Hodgson, *Women*, 218; *Die Urkunden der lateinischen Könige von Jerusalem*, ed. H. E. Mayer and J. Richard, 4 vols, Hannover 2010, i, 497–9.
- ⁴¹ On these events, see T. Asbridge, *The creation of the principality of Antioch, 1098–1130*, Woodbridge 2000, 81–9, 125–7, 143–6; Asbridge, ‘Alice’, 29–47; A. D. Buck, *The principality of Antioch and its frontiers in the twelfth century*, Woodbridge 2017, 69–73, 89, 96–7, 130–43, 191–2, 221–6.
- ⁴² WT, 623–4.
- ⁴³ WT, 623–5.
- ⁴⁴ ‘nequam agitata spiritu’, ‘viri deum timentes, insanientis femine contempnentes proterviam’: WT, 623–4.
- ⁴⁵ ‘mulier callida supra modum et maliciosa nimis’: WT, 634–6.
- ⁴⁶ ‘mulier maliciosa nimis’: WT, 640–1.
- ⁴⁷ WT, 657–9.
- ⁴⁸ ‘credulamque nimis hac vana spe deludebat’: WT, 658.
- ⁴⁹ WT, 659.
- ⁵⁰ Asbridge, ‘Alice’, 33–4; Buck, *Principality*, 221–31.
- ⁵¹ Sauer, *Gender*, 48–50, 107.
- ⁵² Hodgson, *Women*, 154–96 (especially 181–2).
- ⁵³ Asbridge, ‘Alice’, 34–6.

⁵⁴ See, for example, the *Gesta Stephani*. Indeed, while its author praised Queen Mathilda's masculine characteristics, of Stephen's opponent, the Empress Mathilda, it was said that she 'put on an extremely arrogant demeanour instead of the modest gait and bearing proper to the gentle sex', and that in moments of anger, 'every trace of a woman's gentleness was removed from her face' ('illa statim elatissimum summi fastus induere supercilium nec iam humilem feminae mansuetudinis notum vel incessum', 'totam muliebris mansuetudinis eversa faciam': *Gesta Stephani*, 118, 122).

⁵⁵ WT, 658.

⁵⁶ On Constance and her career, see Buck, *Principality*, 64, 69–85, 91, 95, 102–5, 132, 141, 181, 191–2, 198, 201, 208–12, 221–9, 235; A. V. Murray, 'Constance, princess of Antioch (1130–1164): ancestry, marriages and family', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 38 (2015), 81–96.

⁵⁷ 'femineo regebatur imperio': WT, 775.

⁵⁸ P. Edbury, 'Propaganda and faction in the kingdom of Jerusalem: the background to Hattin', in M. Shatzmiller (ed.), *Crusaders and Muslims in twelfth-century Syria*, Leiden 1993, 172–89.

⁵⁹ 'vincula timens coniugalia solutamque ac liberam vitam preponens, non multum attendebat quid populo expediret': WT, 786.

⁶⁰ WT, 786.

⁶¹ Sauer, *Gender*, 107–15.

⁶² 'non sine multorum admiratione quod tam preclara, potens et illustris femina et tam excellentis uxor viri quasi gregario nubere dignaretur': WT, 796.

⁶³ 'commissa honestisque sumptibus domine principisse constitutis': WT, 854–5.

⁶⁴ M. Carrier, 'L'image des Byzantins et les systèmes de représentation selon les chroniqueurs occidentaux des croisades 1096–1291', unpubl. PhD diss, Paris - Sorbonne 2006, passim but especially 68–96.

⁶⁵ 'de occultarum corporis partium dispositione': WT, 855–7.

⁶⁶ Michael the Syrian, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, patriarche jacobite d'Antioche (1166–1199)*, ed. and trans. J.-B. Chabot, 4 vols, Paris 1916–20, iii, 324; *Anonymi auctoris Chronicon ad A. C. 1234 pertinens*, ed. and trans. J.-B. Chabot, A. Abouna, and J.-M. Fiey, 2 vols, Leuven 1916–74, i, 119.

⁶⁷ 'Raimundi quondam Antiochiaie principis filius': Louis VII, 'Epistolae', *RHGF*, xvi, 27–8.

⁶⁸ *Cartulaire général de l'ordre des hospitaliers de S. Jean de Jérusalem (1100–1300)*, ed. J. Delaville Le Roulx, 4 vols, Paris 1894–1906, i, no. 311; *Memorie storico-diplomatiche dell'antica città e ducato di Amalfi*, ed. M. Camera, Salerno 1876, 202. See also Buck, *Principality*, 80–4.

⁶⁹ ‘magnifici viri Antiocheni principis’: WT, 855. It should be noted that this letter survives only in William’s account. Moreover, because Greek authors who described Manuel’s negotiations over the marriage, like Constantine Manasses, John Kinnamos, and Niketas Choniates, detailed Maria only in terms of her being the daughter of Raymond of Poitiers, not the sister of Bohemond III, it is possible that, even if William did have access to a real letter, he doctored its content for the *Chronicon* to suit his authorial purposes. For Greek source coverage, see W. Aerts, ‘A Byzantine Traveller to One of the Crusader States’, in K. Ciggaar and H. Teule (eds), *East and West in the Crusader States: Context-Contacts-Confrontations III*, Leuven 2003, 165–221 (172–219); John Kinnamos, *Epitome: Rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis Gestarum*, ed. A. Meineke, Bonn 1836, 210–11; Niketas Choniates, *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, ed. J. L. van Dieten, Berlin 1975, 115–16. See also Buck, *Principality*, 209–12; C. Gastgeber, ‘Schreiben der byzantinischen Kaiserkanzlei in der Kreuzzugsgeschichte des Wilhelm von Tyrus’, *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 63 (2013), 91–106.

⁷⁰ WT, 874–5.

⁷¹ Hodgson, *Women*, 185.

⁷² On Sybil and the events detailed below, see H. E. Mayer, *Varia Antiochena: Studien zum Kreuzfahrerfürstentum Antiochia im 12. Und frühen 13. Jahrhundert*, Hannover 1993, 162–83; A. D. Buck, ‘The noble rebellion at Antioch, 1180–1182: a case study in medieval frontier politics’, *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 60 (2016), 93–122; A. D. Buck, ‘Dynasty and diaspora in the Latin East: the case of the Sourdevals’, *Journal of Medieval History* 44:2 (2018), 151–69 (especially 164–7).

⁷³ ‘quandam Sibillam, maleficiis utentem ut dicitur’: WT, 1012–14.

⁷⁴ Fenton, *Gender*, 33–4, 52; L. Stokes ‘Toward the witch craze’, in J. Bennett and R. Karras (eds), *The Oxford handbook of women and gender in medieval Europe*, Oxford, 2013, 577–89.

⁷⁵ Buck, ‘Noble rebellion’, 114–16.

⁷⁶ For Baldwin’s reign see B. Hamilton, *The Leper King and his heirs: Baldwin IV and the crusader kingdom of Jerusalem*, Cambridge 2005.

⁷⁷ Edbury and Rowe, *William*, 62–5; S. Brody, *The disease of the soul: leprosy in medieval literature*, Ithaca NY 1974, 132–46.

⁷⁸ WT, 1012–14; Buck, ‘Noble rebellion’, 93–112.