RHETORICIZING EFFEMINACY IN TWELFTH-CENTURY OUTREMER: WILLIAM OF TYRE AND THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE

Luka Špoljarić

Albert, a canon of St Mary's in Aachen, spent the early years of the twelfth century waiting agog for news from the Holy Land and penning them down. Even though miles away from the subject of his inquiry, he was keen to compose a history of the First Crusade and the first generation of Latin settlement in the Levant. In this work, as he came to report on the Crusader army at the siege of Nicaea in 1097, Albert decided to set its qualities against those of the Byzantines, or rather, "the Greeks," as he and his contemporaries called them. He achieved this juxtaposition by having Kiliç Arslan, the Seljuq sultan of Rum (r. 1092-1107), whom the Crusaders had just defeated, proclaim 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.[1]

But, Albert continued, the Turkish foe spoke of the Crusaders as being quite the opposite:

> 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.[2]

---

[1] This article is based on the parts of my MA Thesis, "William of Tyre and the Byzantine Empire: The Construction and Deconstruction of an Image" (Budapest: Central European University, 2008). I would like to express my gratitude to professors József Laszlovszky and Niels Gaul for their advice and help during my research. Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, ed. and tr. Susan B. Edgington (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007) (hereafter: 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.*

[2] Albert of Aachen, *Historia*, 254–257: *Hos vero quorum nomina, et virtutes et bella et industrias litterarum*

Albert's classification of the entire Greek people as essentially effeminate was not an isolated case; the notion had been present in Latin literature long before the Crusades resuscitated it. Classical Roman authors had often written condescendingly of what they saw as Greek unmanliness,[3] and it is in precisely these writings that the Crusade chroniclers saw confirmation for their own views of contemporary Byzantines.[4]

William of Tyre and the *Outremer*

Yet, this article does not deal with the whole body of Crusade literature. It rather strives to elucidate the rhetorical employment of the said *topos* in a specific work – the *Historia Ierosolymitana*, written by William the archbishop of Tyre (*ca.* 1130–1186),[5] a historian from the Crusader states or, as they were commonly referred to in the West, the *Outremer*, the lands on the other side of the sea.[6] While other Crusade

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.

[3] For a discussion of the Roman stereotypes of the Greeks, see Benjamin Isaac, *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 381–405.

[4] For example, Crusade chroniclers often evoked the famous line from Virgil's *Aeneid* "I fear the Greeks even when they bear gifts" when they reported on the treachery of the Byzantines. According to Odo of Deuil (1110–1162), a participant in the Second Crusade, "the proverb," as he calls it, was even known among some laymen; see Odo of Deuil, *The Journey of Louis VII to the East*, ed. and tr. Virginia Gingerick Berry (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1948), 26–27.

[5] The original title of the work is not known; *Historia Ierosolymitana* was suggested by Peter Edbury and John Rowe in their work on William of Tyre, arguing that it is a possible title based on the incipits of two English manuscripts; see Peter W. Edbury and John G. Rowe, *William of Tyre: Historian of the Latin East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990) (hereafter: Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*), 1. When Robert B. C. Huygens made a critical edition of William's work, he opted for *Chronicon* as the title instead: Willelmus Tyrensis Archiepiscopus, *Chronicon*, 2 vols., ed. Robert B. C. Huygens, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Medievalis 63, 63A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1986) (hereafter: WT). In this article, following the example of Edbury and Rowe, I will use the shorthand title *Historia*. It should also be noted that the study of these two authors is still a standard reference work for William's life and work.

[6] Other studies have dealt with William's depiction of the Byzantine Empire; first, the topic was touched upon by Edbury and Rowe (*William of Tyre*: 130–150); they discussed nearly all the episodes in which the empire appears in the narrative. Next, Bernard Hamilton returned to the question and his main contribution lies in discussing William's views on the Orthodox Church, see 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 (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2003), 219–233. More recently, Marc Carrier has focused on Crusader perceptions of the Byzantines, see Marc Carrier, "L'image des Byzantins et les systèmes de représentation selon les chroniqueurs occidentaux des croisades 1096–1261," (PhD dissertation, Université

chronicles are written from what one might tentatively call a "Western European" perspective, the *Historia* records the view of an intellectual of the highest calibre who had been born and raised in the *Outremer*.[7] For even though William saw himself and his kingdom as part of the whole of Latin Christendom, in some respects his work is characterized by a different sensitivity. Furthermore, he was also a chancellor of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, a person thoroughly savvy on the intricacies of Levantine politics. This becomes all too evident when reading his history of the First Crusade and the Crusader states founded subsequently, on which he was working from ca. 1170 until 1184.[8] At that time the Crusader states were in dire straits, with Nur ad-Din (r. 1146–1174), the ruler of Northern Syria, gradually outmanoeuvring Amalric, king of Jerusalem (r. 1163–1174), for the possession of Egypt. The situation was indeed serious since there was no significant help from the rulers of Western Europe; because of the disenchantment with the Crusading movement following the failure of the Second Crusade. William thus looked to exploit his knowledge and skills to fashion a sympathetic image of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, one which would provoke a response and help from his targeted audience in the West in this time of need.[9]

It is the ambivalent political relationship between Jerusalem and Constantinople that will be considered here, however.[10] On the one hand, the ties were close. The

---

Paris I–Panthéon Sorbonne, 2006) (hereafter: Carrier, "L'image des Byzantins"). Carrier analyzes the image of the effeminate Greek on pp. 77–96, but without discussing how it served William's rhetoric specifically. Finally, in this context I would like to mention Savvas Neocleous' recent PhD dissertation, "Imagining the Byzantines: Latin Perceptions, Representations and Memory c. 1095–c. 1230" (Dublin: Trinity College, 2009).

[7] William was born in Jerusalem ca. 1130 and studied liberal arts, theology, and civil law in the schools of Paris, Orléans and Bologna from ca. 1146 to 1165. For a more in-depth account of his life and career, see Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, 13–22.

[8] It is important to note that William made major revisions to his work in 1181, after which, being up-to-date, he continued the narrative until the events occurring in the year 1184. This excludes the possibility that following the 1182 Constantinopolitan massacre of Latins he changed earlier parts of the work, see Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, 27–29. Also, *Historia* is not the only work William wrote. He authored two more works, both of which are now considered lost: *Gesta orientalium principum* and an account of the decrees of the Third Lateran Council of 1179, in which he participated.

[9] Having studied in France and Italy in the period following the Second Crusade, William was bound to have experienced at first hand the resentment that the returning crusaders felt towards the Latins of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, whose treachery was seen as one of the reasons for the campaign's ultimate failure. For his own testimony, see WT 17.6.

[10] 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)(hereafter: Hamilton, *Leper King*); also 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 (Camberley: Porphyrogenitus, 1988), 353–375. The best study on

Byzantine Emperor Manuel I Komnenos (r. 1143–1180) abandoned the policy of his predecessors who had sought to establish their rule over the Crusader states through military expeditions; his father, John II (r. 1118–1143), had envisaged this in 1137, as had his grandfather Alexios I (r. 1081–1118) in 1108. Manuel was rather looking to affirm himself as an overlord, emphasizing the ceremonial recognition of his authority and offering financial and military help to the Crusader states, which in turn, as Nur ad-Din was growing in strength, welcomed this policy.[11] Established finally in 1158, the alliance between the two continued without major interruptions for a quarter of a century, until 1182.[12] William fully endorsed this policy in his work, presenting Manuel as the most glorious of earthly rulers.[13] Threatened by Nur ad-Din, the Crusader states were, in his view, supposed to turn to the Byzantine emperor, who commanded more prestige, wealth, and military power than any other monarch in the region. On the other hand, Manuel's grip over the *Outremer*, even if asserted with subtlety, grew stronger over the years and became a delicate diplomatic matter for Jerusalem, ultimately reflecting on William's work. Two episodes illustrate this point. First, when in 1164 Bohemund III, prince of Antioch (r. 1163–1201), was captured by Nur ad-Din, he had no choice but to turn to Manuel for help in raising the money for his ransom. The emperor agreed, but made it conditional on the prince accepting the reinstitution of a Greek patriarch in Antioch.[14] Bohemund agreed and the following year Athanasios I Manasses (r. 1157–1170) was installed in the cathedral in place of the Latin Patriarch Aimery of Limoges (r. 1140–1193).

---

the Byzantine Empire during the reign of Manuel is still that by Paul Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos 1143–1180* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) (hereafter: Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I*).

[11] See Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I*, 69. Here one can mention Manuel's entrance into Antioch in 1158 and the visit of King Amalric to Constantinople in 1171. On both of these occasions, Manuel used elaborate staging to stress imperial supremacy over the Crusader states.

[12] Manuel drew the Kingdom of Jerusalem into the imperial orbit through an alliance strengthened by marriage between King Baldwin III (r. 1143–1163) and an imperial niece, Theodora; see Magdalino, *Empire of Manuel*, 69–70.

[13] I have analyzed William's rhetorical strategy in constructing the images of Manuel, John, and Alexios Komnenoi in another article, see Luka Špoljarić, "Byzantium Remodelled: The Komnenian Emperors in William of Tyre's *Historia*," in *From Holy War to Peaceful Cohabitation*, ed. Zsolt Hunyadi and József Laszlovszky (Budapest: CEU Press, forthcoming)(hereafter: Špoljarić, "Byzantium Remodelled").

[14] Once they had set up their states in the aftermath of the First Crusade, the Latins did not choose to establish new bishoprics, but rather to expel the Greek Orthodox bishops from their sees, installing people from their own ranks instead. For more on this issue, see Bernard Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States: The Secular Church* (London: Variorum Publications, 1980) (hereafter: Hamilton, *Latin Church*).

Byzantine influence over the Crusader states on both occasions continued to grow even stronger, and in 1169 Manuel sponsored a new cycle of wall mosaics in the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem, accompanied by a prominent dedicatory inscription and an imperial portrait in the sanctuary of the church. This commission did not pass unnoticed among scholars, since the emperor effectively reclaimed the honor of the protector of the Holy Places from the kings of Jerusalem.[15] Still, the emperor acted with the consent of the Crusader states; it was a price King Amalric conceded to pay in exchange for Manuel's support of his expeditions to Egypt. Now, turning to William, it may seem surprising at first that, given the political implications of these two events, neither of them is mentioned in his work. The reason is that Manuel's actions, even if in agreement with the Crusader states, did not fit the picture the archbishop of Tyre wanted to present to the West. As this article will argue, this silence constituted a part of the same rhetorical strategy as the evocation of Greek effeminacy, a strategy that was employed in order to uphold the Latins as the legitimate and, through the First Crusade, divinely approved defenders of the Holy Land.[16]

Defending the Right to the Holy Land

William referred to the Greeks as effeminate people using the words *effeminati* and *molles* in three key instances: (1) upon the entrance of the Crusader army into the Byzantine territory during the First Crusade; (2) during John II's insistence on annexing Antioch; and (3) following the fall of Byzantine fortresses that were once part of the County of Edessa to Nur ad-Din.[17] In these instances effeminacy evoked a purely military connotation. For the sake of clarity it is useful to turn to the

[15] The program also had a greater political and theological significance, an "ecumenical twist" as Christopher MacEvitt put it, claiming for Manuel also the role of Constantine's successor as arbiter of Christianity. For more on the wall mosaics and their political-theological implications, see Christopher MacEvitt, *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East: Rough Tolerance* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008) (hereafter: MacEvitt, *Rough Tolerance*), 157–179, and Lucy-Anne Hunt, "Art and Colonialism: The Mosaics of the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem (1169) and the Problem of 'Crusader' Art," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 45 (1991): 69–85.

[16] In this article the term "Latin" is used with the meaning that William used it, designating all the people of Western medieval cultures, regardless of their ethnic background. In the same way, the term "Greek" reflects William's usage in addressing the Greek-speaking population of the Byzantine Empire.

[17] WT 2.4.; WT 15.1.; WT 17.17.

research of Marc Carrier, which has shown that the perceived military effeminacy of the Greeks was constructed as an antithesis to the ideal of a knight fighting battles in manly hand-to-hand combat. The Greeks were often accused by the chroniclers of employing mercenaries to fight their battles and using units of archers, which caused damage without exposing themselves to danger.[18]

William labelled the Greeks as effeminate for the first time in the second book of his work. As he was recounting the passage of Crusader armies through the empire's European provinces, he "officially" introduced the empire into his narrative and painted a rather gloomy picture while at it. He offered a unique view of its history by evoking the idea of the *translatio imperii*,[19] and pointing at Nikepohoros I (r. 802–811) as the first Greek emperor in Constantinople, whose ascension to the throne had brought the felicitous rule of the Latin emperors to an end. He concluded that it was the effeminacy of the Greeks that had led to the loss of the empire's European provinces.[20] This episode complemented the one in the first book, where Peter the Hermit, legendary leader of the People's Crusade, met the patriarch of Jerusalem, who complained to him about the weakness of the Greeks and their inability to come to the aid of the Christians in the Holy Land.[21] William, writing at the time when Manuel strove to reclaim the role of the protector of the Holy Places, reacted by stressing in these key instances of the narrative the inability of the effeminate Greeks to resist the Muslims at the eastern borders and the barbarians at the western borders. In this way he sought to legitimize the First Crusade, which had established the Latins as protectors of the Holy Land, defenders of the most sacred places of Christianity.

This rhetorical strategy did not change as William continued to narrate the events which occured as the empire regained its strength. As cooperation against the infidel became a possibility, the audience was presented with a scheme in which the Byzantine Empire played the part of an ally – but only of an ally. So when a

[18] For more on the notion of the military effeminacy of the Greeks, see Carrier, "L'image des Byzantins," 78–83.

[19] According to this idea, based on Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the four successive kingdoms mentioned in the Book of Daniel, power proceeded from the Babylonians to the Medes and the Persians, then to the Macedonians and after them to the Romans. For later variations of the concept of the *translatio imperii*, see Krijnie N. Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople: The West and Byzantium 962–1204 Cultural and Political Relations* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 93–101.

[20] 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.*

[21] WT 1.11. Albert of Aachen, William's source for the episode, made no mention of it; see Albert of Aachen, *Historia*, 4–7.

Byzantine emperor challenged the Latin rule over Antioch and Northern Syria, he over-stepped the line William had drawn for him. Regardless of the fact that John and Manuel came to be presented rather favorably due to their involvement in the wars against the Muslims, it was because of their effeminate people that they were not to be entrusted with the defence of any part of the Crusader – held territory, muchless Antioch, "that noble and splendid mistress of many provinces, the first seat of the prince of the apostles."[22]

First, John's expeditions to Northern Syria have to be noted. In the year 1137 the emperor, this "man of great courage,"[23] came with an army of "people summoned from all tribes and tongues, with a countless number of cavalry and a vast array of chariots and four-wheeled carts."[24] 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 Byzantines garrison the citadel inside his city and accept imperial suzerainty. Commenting on these demands set forth by the emperor, William took the opportunity to employ the rhetorical device of 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.[25]

Unmanly Greeks, therefore, would not be able to defend Antioch in the face of Muslim attacks. Their effeminacy was juxtaposed with the "precious blood of fortunate princes," by which the archbishop of Tyre evoked the valour of the army of the First Crusade who had besieged the city for eight months. Furthermore, William concluded that since the Greeks had lost the city on more than one occasion because of their weakness, they were sure to lose it again.[26] Well aware

---

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

[23] WT 15.1: *dominus imperator, sicut vir erat magnanimus.*

[24] 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.*

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

[26] WT 15.20.

of the contested legitimacy of Crusader rule over Antioch in the face of Byzantine claims, he chose to employ the rhetoric of effeminacy as a counter-argument. Thus, the imagined innate physical deficiencies of the Greeks here took precedence over their legal claims. Yet, 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 presently he is described as a magnificent war leader, fighting side-by-side with the Crusaders against the infidel during the siege of Shaizar, may point to William's inconsistency. Presented in this way, however, John epitomized both the ideal way 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, by rhetoricizing effeminacy William defined the empire's limitations in relation to the Crusader states.

And he was soon to corroborate his argument, not missing the opportunity to label the Greeks as effeminate by aiming at their military incapability for the third and final time. In 1150, Emperor Manuel bought from Beatrice, the dowager countess of Edessa, the fortresses in her possession.[27] Soon,

> the news reached Nur ad-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 [Baldwin III] marched there to conduct the people away.[28]

> Nur ad-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.[29]

As the Greek inability to defend the Holy Land and Northem Syria was thus proven, William decided to make the most of it. The importance of this particular event

[27] Edessa fell to Nur ad-Din's forces in 1144. However, fortresses in the western part of the county were still in Latin hands at that time; see Magdalino, *Empire of Manuel I*, 66.

[28] 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.*

[29] 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.*

for his argument can be seen in his eagerness to stress the effeminacy of the Greeks twice in the same chapter. Moreover, by grouping both *molles* and *effeminati* in the rhetorical figure of *synonymia*, William, vigorous in emphasizing the need to preserve the entirety of the Crusader territory, sought to give his message emotional force.[30]

Considering these three episodes together, it can be concluded that the rhetoric of effeminacy was employed in a climactic structure: (1) to underline the empire's inability to defend its territories against the Muslims and barbarians and thus to legitimize the First Crusade; (2) to reject the claims of the reinvigorated empire to parts of the Crusader territory; and (3) as a final proof when the Greeks immediately lost the Crusader fortresses that had been entrusted to them. The fact that William introduced effeminacy so lely in these instances reveals that while writing on the events of the past he developed a well-defined strategy in response to the growing influence of Manuel Komnenos in the Crusader States. It is important to note that it was never used against Manuel directly, who was rather fashioned into a "one of us" type of figure, different from the people he ruled.[31] However, even if that was the case, William deemed it necessary to check his subtle ambitions in the Holy Land. He made sure to point out that the Greeks had been tested in the past, but that they failed to preserve the territory for Christianity in the face of Muslim attack. They were simply not manly enough. The archbishop of Tyre adopted the *topos* of the effeminate Greek from the previous Crusade chronicles and, with his quill, put it into the service of his own propaganda.

Still, William's use of effeminacy as a rhetorical device can be further clarified by analyzing situations where it could well have been used, but was not. This was the case when the empire fought the infidel but lost. In 1176 Manuel mounted a great campaign, a Crusade in fact, against the "the monstrous race of the Turks and their wicked leader, the sultan of Konya."[32] As William portrayed it, Manuel's

---

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

[31] In three key instances of the narrative William highlighted Manuel's connection to the Latins and difference from the Greeks: 1) as Manuel ascends the throne (WT 15.23); 2) during his 1159 campaign in Syria (WT 18.25); and 3) during the 1182 massacre of the Latins in Constantinople (WT 22.11). See more in Špoljarić, "Byzantium Remodelled;" but also Carrier, "L'image des Byzantins," 339, who reached the same conclusion.

[32] WT 21.11: *contra inmanissimam Turcorum gentem et impium eorum ducem, Yconii soldanum.* For Manuel's campaign against Konya and its Crusade character, see Magdalino, *Empire of Manuel I*, 95–98; also see Ralph-Johannes Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States 1096–1204* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993) (hereafter: Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States*), 211–215.

aim was to "extend the Christian name,"[33] but in the end he suffered a great defeat at Myriokephalon. Here the archbishop of Tyre 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 Crusader states were not challenged in their rule over the Holy Land and there was no need to employ effeminacy as a rhetorical device. But another, even more telling, example can be adduced. In the autumn of 1169, the Byzantine army and navy, together with the forces of King Amalric, undertook a joint expedition against Fatimid Egypt, laying siege to Damietta. William reports how, even though the expedition failed, "their [Greek] commander *megaducas* and all the other fought *manly* and *boldly* [emphasis mine] in the battle array."[34] The way that William characterized the actions of the Greeks on the battlefield as "manly" (*viriliter*) – thus using an adverb formed from a stem (*vir*) semantically opposite to the one (*femina*) he ascribed to their nature in previous instances – is striking. It clearly points to the fact that William used effeminacy simply as a rhetorical device. Here it was the Byzantine-Jerusalemite expedition against the infidel that was presented, an outcome of a policy which William ardently supported, with little need to evoke effeminacy. William's writings, therefore, do not show an ideological consistency on his part, a firm belief in the Greek natural deficiencies, but rather a pragmatic ambivalence.

Epilogue: A Turn towards Moral Judgement

The period of cooperation between the empire and the Kingdom of Jerusalem did not last for the entire period that William was working on the *Historia*. The final episode that featured the Byzantine Empire retold the 1182 massacre of the Latins in Constantinople, the very event that signified the break in political ties. Consequently, it reflected on the way William chose to present "the Greeks," and, as will be shown, even referring to effeminacy was used for a different effect.

[33] WT 21.11: *pro ampliando christiano nomine.*

[34] WT 16.20: *Eorum tamen magistratus megaducas et alii viriliter et satis strenue, quotiens opus erat, in acie decertabant.* "Megaducas" or *megas doux* was the title of the commander of the Byzantine fleet and on this occasion Andronikos Kontostephanos was the one in charge; see Magdalino, *Empire of Manuel I*, 74.

William informed his audience that "an important change concerning the empire had occurred in Constantinople"[35] – a change which he went on to elaborate further in the four subsequent chapters.[36] Emperor Manuel had died in 1180 and his eleven-year-old son, Alexios II (r. 1180–1183), succeeded him on the throne. A regency was formed under the boy's mother, Mary of Antioch, who continued Manuel's policy of alliance with the Crusader states.[37] An opposing party led by Andronikos Komnenos seized power in 1182, however, and with help from the Greeks of Constantinople "rushed to the quarter of the city occupied by our people and put to sword the remnants of them who had been either unwilling or unable to flee with the others."[38]

Prior to narrating the massacre, however, William sought to give an account of what had happened in Constantinople following Manuel's death. He pointed at *protosebastos* Alexios, Manuel's nephew, as the *éminence grise* in the empire and offered a brief character sketch:

> Although, like all Greeks, he was extremely effeminate and completely given over to the lustful sins of the flesh, he was avaricious and sparing of the imperial treasure, as if he had earned it himself by the sweat of his brow.[39]

---

[35] WT 22.11: *apud Constantinopolim grandis circa imperium facta est permutatio.*

[36] WT 22.11–14.

[37] Bernard Hamilton inferred this from the statement of Eustathios of Thessalonike (*ca.* 1115–1195/6), who, writing on Andronikos' seizure of power, commented that Bohemund III, Prince of Antioch, and Baldwin IV, King of Jerusalem (r. 1174–1185) "owed genuine friendship and help after Manuel's death to his unjustly treated son Alexios," see Hamilton, *Leper King*, 160, quoting Eustathios of Thessaloniki, *The Capture of Thessaloniki*, tr. John R. Melville Jones (Canberra: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1988), 57.

[38] 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.* For more about the 1182 massacre, see Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States*, 224–229, and Charles M. Brand, *Byzantium Confronts the West 1180–1204* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), 40–43. Brand saw the event as "a landmark in the developing hostility of East and West" (p. 41), which would ultimately lead to the sack of Constantinople in 1204.

[39] WT 22.12: *licet Grecorum more mollis esset supra modum et carnis curam toto studio in inmundis perficere satageret desideriis, avarus tamen erat et thesauris parcebat imperialibus, tanquam si eos proprio sudore comportasset.* The Byzantines also had something to say about *protosebastos* Alexios in this respect; the Byzantine historian Niketas Choniates (ca. 1155–1216) characterized him as "unmanly;" see *O City of Byzantium: Annals of Niketas Choniates*, tr. Harry J. Magoulias (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1984)(hereafter: *O City of Byzantium*), 137.

Here Alexios' lustfulness went hand in hand with his effeminacy, two traits that were William ascribed to the entire Greek people. Unlike before, when effeminacy had been referred to only in specific military contexts, here the label indicated a judgment of a way of life, used in order to reject not only Alexios, but *all* the Greeks as morally decadent. To understand the meaning behind effeminacy used in this context, it is useful to draw on Marc Carrier's work again.[40] As he argued, it was the opulence of the Byzantine Empire – which William did not fail to mention on more than one occasion,[41] and which the emperors themselves were striving to show[42] – that came to be considered as the reason that its people, by enjoying this life of luxury and carnal pleasures, became effeminate and gave way to sin. And it is precisely the sins of the Greeks that William now chose to highlight, as for the very first time in the *Historia* he had labelled the Greeks heretics just few lines before:

> 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 cannot prevail* (Matt. 16:18).[43]

[40] For more on effeminacy as a sign of moral decadence, see Carrier, "L'image des Byzantins," 83–89.

[41] The best example is William's description of his visit to Constantinople in 1179/80, see WT 22.4. The archbishop's discussion on the Fatimid Egyptians, whose effeminacy was explicitly connected to the wealth and pleasures they enjoyed, presents an interesting parallel, see WT 19.13.

[42] For example, Niketas Choniates 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 *O City of Byzantium*, 262.

[43] WT 22.11: *Unde Grecorum nobiles et maxime eius consanguinei, sed et reliquus populus odium insaciabile adversus nostros conceperantm 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.*

Here one can clearly see the line William drew between Manuel, the benefactor of the Latins on one side, and his Greek kindred along with the rest of the people on the other. The ascension to power of the group concentrated around the anti-Latin-oriented Andronikos, along with the subsequent massacre of the Latins in Constantinople was bound to provoke a reaction from him. Thus, in its final appearance in the *Historia* the empire was firmly placed outside the world of Christendom and, yet again, the archbishop of Tyre chose to evoke the effeminacy of the Greeks. However, there was no longer a need to employ a subtle rhetorical strategy aimed at stressing the legitimacy of Latin rule over the Holy Land in the face of the claims of an imperial patron. Instead, calling to the reader's mind the moral corruption of the Greeks, it acted as a further indictment for the accusation of heresy.[44] Indeed, much had changed since the days when it was the whole of Christianity that had suffered at Myriokephalon.

[44] William here targeted the Greeks of the Byzantine Empire and not the Eastern Christian population of the Crusader states, which in fact rarely earned a mention in his work and was not an object of religious categorization – the sole exception being the Maronites, whom he mentioned only when discussing their ecclesiastical union with Rome. For a study of Latin attitudes towards the Eastern Christians in the Crusader states, see MacEvitt, *Rough Tolerance*. On the relations between the Latin Church and the Eastern Churches in the Crusader states, see Hamilton, *Latin Church*, 159–211.