

Reputation, authority, and masculine identities in the political culture of the First Crusaders: the career of Arnulf of Chocques.¹

Tutor, chancellor, chaplain, legate, archdeacon and patriarch of Jerusalem: Arnulf of Chocques was an archetype of ecclesiastical social mobility in action. He rose to prominence through a combination of factors: his own scholarly reputation, by cultivating personal relationships with powerful figures, and engaging in profile-raising activities on the First Crusade. His career dominated the establishment of the Latin Church in the East, but it was dogged by scandal - William of Tyre famously recorded Arnulf's nickname as '*Mala Corona*': 'ill-tonsured'.² Contemporary historians struggled to explain Arnulf's political success in the light of polarised opinions about his activities. As a result, Arnulf was often held up against his closest peers to highlight his strengths and failings both as a priest and as a man. This article examines descriptions of Arnulf's relationships through key stages in his career, exploring how notions of clerical masculinity influenced a variety of historical explanations for the extraordinary events in which he featured. Situated at the crux of the political formation of the Latin East, his career provides a focal point for contemporary ideas about reputation, authority and masculine identities, and offers a rare insight into the unique political culture that developed during and after the First Crusade. Drawn from the work of authors memorialising what they saw as a divinely inspired event to suit a variety of religious and political agendas, work which was also aimed at a largely clerical and literate audience, this article cannot lay claim to the discovery of the 'real' Arnulf of Chocques.³ Instead it employs his portrayal as a case study to reveal the central importance of gender when representing clergy in the historical narratives which charted the political processes of crusade and settlement.

Much has already been said about the social, cultural and political milieu of the lay First Crusaders. Their hierarchies, relationships, and organisation have been examined

¹ My thanks to Kathryn Dutton, Susan Edgington and Nick Hayes for their helpful comments, and to the St Andrews Institute for Medieval Studies where I undertook some of the research for this article as Donald Bullough Fellow in 2015-16.

² William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, (ed.) Robert B. C. Huygens (Turnhout, 1986), p. 519. (Henceforth WT).

³ See N. Paul and S. Yeager (ed.), *Remembering the Crusades* (Baltimore 2012).

exhaustively, especially in the contexts of motivation and military effectiveness. The dynastic and social networks of named crusaders have been explored by Murray and Riley-Smith, and most recently Frankopan, Asbridge and Kostick have explored their political and social contexts both within the crusader host and in a wider European setting.⁴ Clerical networks and relationships have not been treated in the same depth, however. Certain key religious individuals have attracted attention: popular preachers like Peter the Hermit; elite papal legates such as Adhémar of le Puy or Daibert of Pisa; chaplains to important leaders like Fulcher of Chartres or Raymond of Aguilers; or visionaries of ambiguous status such as Peter Bartholomew, finder of the Holy Lance at Antioch.⁵ Studies relating to the clergy as a group on crusade have tended to focus on preaching and motivational roles or clerical violence and celibacy, but few to date have made use of gender as a category of analysis.⁶ An important exception is Mesley's article on Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy, which explored how the presentation of Adhémar's masculine characteristics in narratives aimed to create a model for religious leadership on crusade. He stressed the influence of contemporary ecclesiastical reform on the presentation of Adhémar, reinforcing the importance of clerical education and behaviour as gendered issues in the contemporary discourse. Mesley considered Adhémar's portrayal in military contexts, through his preaching (with an emphasis on direct speeches attributed to him), and in his moral leadership and pastoral duties, arguing that portrayals of Adhémar's leadership whether temporal or spiritual were aimed at a clerical audience who needed a religious hero that could also be 'one of the men'.⁷

Gender, combined with other markers such as age, wealth, and social status, forms an integral role in understanding relationships of power in medieval society and its discourse.⁸ Examining

⁴ Alan Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: A Dynastic History 1099-1125* (Oxford, 2000); Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders 1095-1131* (Cambridge, 1997); Peter Frankopan, *The First Crusade: The Call from the East* (London, 2012); Conor Kostick, *The Social Structure of the First Crusade* (Turnhout, 2008); Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade A New History: The roots of conflict between Christianity and Islam* (Oxford, 2004).

⁵ See below n. 45.

⁶ For example James A. Brundage, 'Crusades, clerics and violence: reflections on a canonical theme' in Norman Housely and Marcus Bull (ed.), *The Experience of Crusading: Western Approaches* (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 147-56 and Walter Porges, 'The Clergy, the Poor and the Non-combatants on the First Crusade', *Speculum* 21 (1946), pp. 1-23.

⁷ Matthew Mesley, 'Episcopal authority and gender in the narratives of the First Crusade', in P. H. Cullum and Katherine J. Lewis (ed.), *Religious men and masculine identity in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2013), pp. 94-111.

⁸ Jo Ann McNamara, 'An unresolved syllogism: The search for a Christian gender system', in Jacqueline Murray (ed.), *Conflicted identities and multiple masculinities: Men in the Medieval West* (New York 1999) pp. 1-24. See also Ruth Mazo Karras, *From Boys to Men: Formations of Masculinity in Late Medieval Europe* (Philadelphia, 2003) pp. 1-3. For

points of tension between different men, whether as individuals or in groups, gives a nuanced picture of the stratification of masculine ideals in order to better understand social and political organisation of elites. At the time of the First Crusade, male gender roles were at the heart of a hierarchical power struggle between *regnum* and *ecclesia*.⁹ While noble and secular hegemonic ideals of manhood were increasingly (though not exclusively) identified with a chivalric model which championed martial prowess, largesse, loyalty and service to God, the priest formed an independent elite model tracing back to the origins of the Church. Historians such as Murray have argued that through their devotion to chastity men and women of the clergy might constitute a 'third gender' in medieval society, but others like Karras see the clergy as forming one of a number of variations on the basic binary gender system.¹⁰ Divisions between the secular and religious clergy (priests, monks and nuns) complicated the situation further, though while crusading was at its height, even secular clergy were increasingly encouraged to adopt monastic ideals. While women could become nuns, the priestly role was exclusively male. St Paul's letter to Timothy reaffirmed that preaching was the preserve of men, and was used repeatedly throughout the medieval period to justify the exclusion of women from the priesthood.¹¹ In this all-male and hierarchical environment, priests and the characteristics associated with them came to embody elite masculine ideals which mirrored contemporary secular masculine models out of necessity in order to uphold their status in political society. Monastics could withdraw from the world to focus on God in a spiritually oriented community, but priests and bishops had to assert themselves over secular men in order to perform their given roles and reinforce the word of God. They thus trod a dangerous path which brought them close to corruption. Their gender identity was remoulded along monachistic lines in the eleventh and twelfth centuries as secular clerics faced renewed strictures against clerical marriage and sexual activity, clerical violence and abuses of power.

an examination of gendered political discourse relating to the Investiture Contest see Megan McLaughlin, *Sex, Gender and Episcopal Authority in an Age of Reform, 1000-1122* (Cambridge, 2010).

⁹ See Jo Ann McNamara, 'The *Herrenfrage*: The Restructuring of the Gender System, 1050-1150', in Clare A. Lees, with Thelma Fenster and Jo Ann McNamara (eds), *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages* (Minneapolis, 1994).

¹⁰ Jaqueline Murray, 'One Flesh, Two Sexes, Three Genders?' and Ruth Mazo Karras, 'Thomas Aquinas' Chastity Belt' in Lisa M. Bitel, Felice Lifshitz, (eds) *Gender and Christianity in Medieval Europe: New Perspectives* (Philadelphia, 2008) pp. 34-51 and 52-67.

¹¹ 1 Cor 14 34-35.

As a result, the act of comparing a priest with a peer, whether secular or ecclesiastic, often had gendered implications.

As a concept, crusading had its own role to play in the reform of society by redirecting secular masculine violence against an ecclesiastically sanctioned enemy. Clerics were discouraged from taking the cross without explicit permission, but they were also needed for ministering to and regulating the behaviour of God's army, thus potential conflicts of interest arose. Reform ideals aimed to separate the clergy from the secular world by reaffirming masculine ideals that bypassed or reconfigured sex and violence to chaste and spiritual battles, but the development of crusading necessitated continued clerical involvement in managing real violence and kept them cheek by jowl with soldiers on long campaigns. As armed pilgrims, however, these soldiers were expected to adhere to much higher standards of religious behaviour and spirituality than their ordinary counterparts. Together, the crusaders exported contemporary tensions between secular and clerical masculinities with them on the First Crusade. These were exacerbated by a lack of clear secular leadership among the chief magnates, and the heightened power of those with religious authority while pursuing a Holy War. The new ideal of the crusader already challenged secular norms by asking men to eschew traditional male values of honour, glory, family and friends in order to do God's work. Clerics on crusade faced a similar yet different set of challenges as medieval historians came to evaluate them for posterity. In many respects they were still expected to demonstrate traditional hallmarks of secular male authority figures - leadership, largesse and even bravery. However, they were also measured against standards applied by the largely ecclesiastical and reformist authors of crusade narratives.¹² Social status and education were key factors denoting clerical masculinity, as were eloquence and skill at preaching. Clergy had a paternal role providing moral guidance, hearing confessions, absolving sins and resolving disputes: ultimately preparing the soldiers for battle. Personal reputations were also important - clerics on crusades performed public-facing activities which needed to be reinforced by ideal behaviour, including

¹² For a range of contemporary approaches see J. D. Thibodeaux (ed.), *Negotiating Clerical Identities: Priests, Monks and Masculinity in the Middle Ages*, (Basingstoke 2010) and idem, *The Manly Priest: Clerical Celibacy, Masculinity and Reform in England and Normandy 1066-1300* (Philadelphia, 2015).

abstinence, continence and humility. Sexual transgressions were actively punished, as demonstrated by the whipping of a cleric and a prostitute through the crusader camp.¹³ The clergy also functioned as mediators between men: both among secular leaders and between the leaders and the host at large, acting as administrators, alms-collectors, distributors of charity and messengers. Bearing in mind the predominantly clerical audience of crusade texts, it is easy to see how Adhémar le Puy, a bishop and papally sanctioned legate whose authority and moral credentials were seldom questioned, might easily be converted into a model for a clerical audience to appreciate. Arnulf of Chocques, who lacked some of Adhémar's social advantages and reputation, posed more of an historiographical problem.

Despite Arnulf of Chocques' notoriety and a fascinating career, he has been underrepresented in crusade historiography. He receives cursory attention in biographies of Robert Curthose and some First Crusade histories, being omitted entirely from Frankopan's recent study.¹⁴ Spear has established the Norman environs of Arnulf's early career by examining Anglo-Norman clerical activities throughout the whole period of crusading to the Holy Land.¹⁵ Hamilton has explored Arnulf's place in the wider context of the early establishment of the Latin Church.¹⁶ The most recent published work devoted exclusively to Arnulf is an article of the mid-1950s by Foreville. She focused strongly on his educational background and scientific learning, but finished with Arnulf's possible elevation to the patriarchate in 1099.¹⁷ Most recently, Dondi has reasserted his influential role in establishing liturgical practice in Jerusalem, praising his 'fine political abilities'.¹⁸ It is very surprising, given his subsequent significance, that Arnulf has not yet been the focus of a detailed study in his own right, but the complexities of his presentation in the source material do not lend themselves easily to straightforward biography. This article

¹³ GN, 196.

¹⁴ C.W. David, *Robert Curthose: Duke of Normandy* (Cambridge, 1920), pp. 217-20; William Aird, *Robert 'Curthose': Duke of Normandy* (Woodbridge, 2008), especially at pp. 165-88; Asbridge, *First Crusade* pp. 290, 302, 322-3, 332. John France, *Victory in the East: A military history* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 211, 331, 357 and 360. Frankopan, *First Crusade*. He plays a more significant role in Conor Kostick, *The Siege of Jerusalem: Crusade and Conquest 1099* (London, 2009), and idem, *Social Structure*, passim. but is still overshadowed by other religious figures.

¹⁵ David S. Spear, 'The secular clergy of Normandy and the crusades' in Kathryn Hurlock and Paul Oldfield (ed.), *Crusading and Pilgrimage in the Anglo-Norman World* (Woodbridge, 2015), pp. 81-102.

¹⁶ Bernard Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States: The secular church* (London, 1980), see especially pp. 12-16; 56-8 and 61-4.

¹⁷ Raymonde Foreville, 'Un chef de la Première Croisade: Arnoul Malecouronne', *Bulletin philologique et historique du comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques* (1953-54), pp. 377-90.

¹⁸ Cristina Dondi, *The Liturgy of the Canons Regular of Jerusalem: A study and a catalogue of manuscript sources* (Turnhout, 2004), pp. 49-57.

thus provides a much-needed re-evaluation of Arnulf's full career, and through applying the lens of gender situates it contextually amid developing ideals of masculinity at the time of the First Crusade.

Foreville argued that the First Crusade sources which discussed Arnulf could be divided clearly into three main camps - for, against and ambivalent - but on closer inspection more complex approaches can be ascertained.¹⁹ Those who took a broadly sympathetic view include the anonymous *Gesta Francorum* and histories by Peter Tudebode, Robert the Monk, Baldric of Bourgueil, Ralph of Caen and Albert of Aachen. The latter two provided the most substantial detail about Arnulf's career. Ralph wrote in praise of Tancred, nephew of Bohemond of Taranto, but the single manuscript remaining ends abruptly c.1107-1108.²⁰ Ralph claimed to have been taught by Arnulf and accompanied Bohemond on the anti-Byzantine crusade of 1107-8. He served Tancred while he was regent, then prince, of Antioch before embarking on the *Gesta* between Tancred's death in 1112 and Arnulf's demise in 1118. He ostensibly submitted the work to Arnulf to correct his mistakes, thus original details about Arnulf's activities might have been supplied or at least approved by the man himself, but complexities in the composition of the text make it difficult to ascertain this.²¹ Relatively little is known of Albert of Aachen beyond his geographical provenance. He may have been born c.1080 and his history was completed as early as 1119, with a redaction of the first six books in circulation long before that.²² Godfrey of Bouillon, who had supported Emperor Henry IV in the Investiture Contest and later became ruler of Jerusalem, was the main focus of his text. For Albert, Arnulf played a significant supporting role to his hero, and thus enjoyed a relatively good portrayal though he had reservations about some of Arnulf's actions.

¹⁹ Foreville, 'Arnoul' p. 378. Bull has argued that even seemingly straightforward eyewitness accounts of the First Crusade need to be read as political scripts with sophisticated agendas. Marcus Bull, 'The Eyewitness Accounts of the First Crusade as Political Scripts', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 36 (2010), pp. 23-37.

²⁰ It has been suggested that parts of Ralph's history were later editorial insertions, one possibly as late as 1130, and that Arnulf's role in the text actually reflected changing political influences on Ralph's work. See Ralph of Caen, *Tancredus*, (ed.) Edoardo d'Angelo (Turnhout, 2011), pp. xxxi, xxxv-xxxvii and 131. (Henceforth RC).

²¹ RC p. 5.

²² Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana* (ed. and trans.) Susan Edgington (Oxford, 2007), pp. xxiii-xxv.

Raymond of Aguilers, Guibert of Nogent and William of Tyre were overtly critical of Arnulf but expressed their antipathy in significantly different ways. Chaplain to Raymond of St Gilles and eyewitness to events, Raymond of Aguilers was opposed to Arnulf from the time of the investigation into the controversial discovery of the Holy Lance at Antioch, calling him 'chief of all the doubters'.²³ Guibert and William made use of Raymond's history as well as other sources, but included unique information about Arnulf. A Northern French monk, Guibert was a particularly harsh critic of clerical sins, especially sexual incontinence.²⁴ Arnulf did not feature in the main body of Guibert's First Crusade history, but a substantial section of book seven was given over to Arnulf's career up to c.1108.²⁵ Arnulf was virtually absent from the final edit of the history by Fulcher of Chartres, chaplain to Baldwin of Boulogne on the First Crusade, but Edgington has argued that a lost earlier redaction of 1106, probably used by Guibert and Bartolf of Nangis, provided more information about Arnulf.²⁶ William, archbishop of Tyre's *Chronicon* is one of our most detailed sources for Arnulf's career in the Latin East. Unfortunately he did not provide a physical description of Arnulf underlining his masculine qualities as he did for many of the kings of Jerusalem, but he certainly had plenty to say about his character and behaviour. Though written from a distant perspective between 1170 and 1184, William was close to the centre of royal power in the Levant.²⁷ He made use of Raymond, Guibert, Baldric, Albert, Fulcher and the *Gesta* in other parts of his history, but he largely created his own unflattering vision of Arnulf's character which has perhaps overshadowed evidence from other sources in shaping the patriarch's lasting historical image.²⁸

Social Status and Education

²³ 'capud omnium incredulorum' Raymond D'Aguilers, *Liber*, (ed.) John Hugh Hill and Laurita L. Hill (Paris, 1969), p. 154. (Henceforth RA).

²⁴ Guibert of Nogent, *Dei Gesta Per Francos et cinq autres textes*, (ed.) Robert B. C. Huygens (Turnhout, 1996), pp. 290-91. (Henceforth GN). p. 292.

²⁵ For composition details see Jay Rubenstein, 'Guibert of Nogent, Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres: Three Crusade Chronicles Intersect' in Marcus Bull and Damien Kempf (eds), *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory* (Woodbridge, 2014), pp. 24-37.

²⁶ Bartolf of Nangis, *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem Expugnantium*, in *Receuil des Historiens des Croisades Occidentaux* 5 vols. (Paris, 1841-95), vol. 3 pp. 491-53. (Henceforth BN). Susan Edgington, 'The *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem expugnantium* of "Bartolf of Nangis"', *Crusades* 13 (2014), pp. 21-35.

²⁷ Peter W. Edbury and J.G. Rowe, *William of Tyre, Historian of the Latin East* (Cambridge, 1988), p. 26.

²⁸ Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, p. 45. He only used Albert up to the siege of Jerusalem cf. *ibid.* n. 4

Social status and education were central markers of ecclesiastical 'prowess' and were often linked to perceptions about Arnulf's political career. Arnulf was probably the son of a priest, born in the later 1050s.²⁹ Many contemporaries in similar positions went on to have ecclesiastical careers, but in the climate of eleventh century reforms, sons of priests were increasingly seen as tainted by the sexual sins of their fathers and expected to embrace a chaste monastic life rather than holding secular office. Chocques was in the diocese of Thérouanne, Flanders, yet Arnulf sought a career in Normandy, where attitudes were 'more flexible'.³⁰ As well as teaching Ralph of Caen, Arnulf was a tutor to Cecilia, daughter of William the Conqueror, who was a nun at Holy Trinity in Caen.³¹ Sadly we have no record of theological or educational works written by him to attest to his level of education.³² Spear argues that the unfashionable theological support for sons of the clergy and clerical marriage may have led to the demise of the 'school' at Caen, if it was formalised as such, by c.1100.³³ Arnulf also served as Robert of Normandy's chancellor and chaplain before accompanying him on the First Crusade, which is probably where he gained administrative experience, though significantly he had not yet reached episcopal rank.³⁴ According to Guibert of Nogent, Count Robert had promised Arnulf the next bishopric to fall vacant, so his career was already on the ascendant despite his controversial origins.³⁵

By the time of the First Crusade, Arnulf was of sufficiently high profile to be granted sub-legatine powers by Urban II in 1096.³⁶ He accompanied the First Crusade in the contingent of Bishop Odo of Bayeux. Guibert of Nogent marked the start of Arnulf's rise to prominence on

²⁹ RA p. 154, GN p. 292; WT p. 421. Arnulf received a papal dispensation for this from Pope Paschal II in 1116. See Rudolf Hiestand, *Papsturkunden für Kirchen im Heiligen Lande* (Göttingen, 1985), pp. 124-6, no. 19. (Henceforth *Papsturkunden*).

³⁰ Thibodeaux, *Manly Priest*, p. 68. For the identification of Chocques see D. C. Douglas, 'The Domesday tenant of Hawling', *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* 84 (1965), 28-30.

³¹ GN p. 290; RC p. 5. See Gathagan's article in this volume for a more detailed analysis of her career.

³² Foreville, 'Arnoul', p. 384.

³³ See Raymonde Foreville, 'L'École de Caen au XI^e siècle et les origines normandes de l'Université d'Oxford', *Études médiévales offertes à M. le doyen Augustin Fliche* (Montpellier, 1952), pp. 81-100; David Spear, 'William Bona Anima, Abbot of St. Stephen's, Caen (1070-79)', *The Haskins Society Journal* vol. 1 (1989), pp. 51-60 and idem 'The School of Caen revisited', *The Haskins Society Journal* 4 (1992), pp. 55-66.

³⁴ Dondi, *Liturgy*, p. 51.

³⁵ GN pp. 290-91.

³⁶ Robert-Henri Bautier and Monique Gilles (ed.), *Chronique de Saint-Pierre-le-Vif de Sens* (Paris, 1979), pp. 184-87. Jean Richard, 'Quelques textes sur les premiers temps de l'église Latin de Jérusalem', in *Recueil des Travaux offerts à M. Clovis Brunel*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1955), vol. 2 pp. 420-430.

the crusade with Odo's death in southern Italy in 1097.³⁷ Arnulf inherited most of Odo's personal possessions, and combined with his learning, eloquence and preaching, he began to attract wider notice. He evidently gained enough of a reputation to be referred to as 'most wise' or 'most learned' by a number sources; Baldric of Bourgueil and Ralph of Caen also extolled his expertise in the liberal arts, while Robert the Monk focused on his expertise in divine and human law. Even Arnulf's critics were hard pressed to fault his education. Guibert described him as 'not lacking in dialectical learning, although he had made the least use of grammatical texts.'³⁸ Raymond of Aguilers drew a direct contrast between the education of Peter Bartholomew, visionary and finder of the Holy Lance, and that of Arnulf as a measure of manliness. Some refused to believe Peter because he was an 'unsophisticated man' whereas Arnulf was learned and trusted by many.³⁹ The reputation which education offered therefore impacted on a priest's ability to exert influence over other men. William of Tyre also referred to Arnulf as a learned man, but one of unclean habits and an agitator of scandals, whereas Peter Bartholomew was a simple man with little education.⁴⁰ To his detractors therefore, comparing educated and sophisticated Arnulf to the simple and pious Peter Bartholomew served to reinforce the former's corruption, worldliness and unsuitability for religious leadership.

On the eve of the battle of Antioch, when the starving and impoverished crusaders were besieged by Kerbogha, atabeg of Mosul, Ralph of Caen asserted that Arnulf's education was put to practical use.⁴¹ One of Arnulf's men rushed in during the night to tell him of an auspicious stellar configuration predicting victory for the Franks. Arnulf had been educated in these matters by a learned man, and when his own acute eyes and ears confirmed it, he rushed to persuade the army's leaders to take up arms.⁴² Here Arnulf's trained expertise rendered his interpretation of portents more significant compared to that of the underling who

³⁷ GN 291; Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History*, (ed. and trans.) Marjorie Chibnall, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1969-80), vol. 5 p. 296. (Henceforth OV).

³⁸ 'in dialecticae eruditione non hebes cum minime haberetur ad grammaticae documenta rudis', GN p. 290.

³⁹ '*rustico homini*' RA p. 116.

⁴⁰ WT pp. 366-67.

⁴¹ 27-28 June 1098.

⁴² RC pp. 73-4.

initially reported it, and it was on Arnulf's authority that the leaders were persuaded to act. This story provided Ralph with a useful alternative to the finding of the Holy Lance as an explanation for the leaders' decision to risk a pitched battle outside Antioch.⁴³ Ralph's version, while improbable, highlights the creditable influence that an educated priest was perceived to exert, as opposed to the subversive challenge posed by a visionary like Peter Bartholomew, whose increasingly politicised views about the crusade leadership were discredited because of his social status.⁴⁴

Preaching, performance and pastoral roles

Public speaking was an essential component of clerical masculinity, and having the eloquence to exert authority over other men was crucial in the extreme circumstances faced by First Crusaders. Guibert of Nogent tells us that Arnulf embarked on a deliberate campaign of motivational speeches to bolster his reputation, though in his view this was only possible because of the lack of educated men on crusade.⁴⁵ The high mortality rate of clerics on the First Crusade has been noted by historians, and William of Tyre also lamented poor standards among the clergy after the death of Adhémar le Puy in explaining Arnulf's rise to power.⁴⁶ Details about Arnulf's preaching are frustratingly scarce and reflect the general dearth of information about crusade sermons from this period.⁴⁷ Arnulf himself apparently claimed to play an important motivational role at Nicaea, where he 'encouraged young men and rejuvenated the very old'.⁴⁸ His sermon to crusaders on the Mount of Olives alongside Peter the Hermit is mentioned by a number of chroniclers, but more for its effects than its content. Tudebode tells us that it focused 'on the mercy which God would bestow upon Christians who followed him even to his grave, from which he mounted to Heaven.'⁴⁹ Albert of Aachen

⁴³ Asbridge argues that political factors were the main impetus for the confrontation. Thomas Asbridge 'The Holy Lance of Antioch: Power, Devotion and Memory on the First Crusade', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 33 (2007), pp. 3-36.

⁴⁴ He was described as a servant RA pp. 113-4 possibly a soldier GN p. 221; RA p. 89. William of Tyre called him a cleric of modest learning, WT p. 367.

⁴⁵ GN p. 291.

⁴⁶ WT p. 422. Cf. Hamilton, *Latin Church*, p. 12.

⁴⁷ See Christoph Maier, *Crusade Ideology and Propaganda* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 3-4.

⁴⁸ 'hortante iuvenes, senectus iuvenabatur' RC p. 113.

⁴⁹ PT p. 138 trans. in Peter Tudebode, *Historia De Hierosolymitano Itinere*, (trans.) John Hugh and Laurita L. Hill (Philadelphia, 1974), p. 116.

credited Arnulf with great eloquence and asserted that through this sermon he and Peter helped to allay many disagreements among the army, especially an ongoing feud between Tancred and Raymond of St Gilles over money.⁵⁰ Even Ralph of Caen recognised that Arnulf's oratory skills were not infallible, however. His attempts to prevent the Norman contingent deserting at Antioch only met with partial success.⁵¹

Preaching was also important in the crusade hierarchy for establishing rules and coping with military setbacks. Arnulf seemingly had an important role in disseminating the regulations about capturing property before the army entered Jerusalem in 1099.⁵² At Ascalon, Arnulf's preparations included blessing crusaders with the True Cross and absolving sins, but these also came with a warning to the Christians not to take booty.⁵³ Later, at the siege of Arsuf, Arnulf chastised the army in a sermon for failing to rescue Gerard of Avesnes and a certain Lambert, who had been crucified brutally in front of them.⁵⁴ With the troops on the brink of desertion, Arnulf was drafted in to rally their spirits and took a 'tough love' approach, criticising 'the duke himself and everyone great and small concerning the treachery and hard-heartedness with which they had sinned against their brothers Gerard and Lambert, who were fixed to the mast... he urged everyone in a fatherly manner to confess and make amends... they wept copiously and were encouraged and strengthened in one purpose, the siege of the city.'⁵⁵

For Albert, Arnulf was fulfilling a traditional paternal role suitable to a cleric, and performed an important task by giving both the military leader and troops an opportunity to assuage their guilt publicly for a traumatic event. It also allowed Albert to protect Godfrey's reputation by reaffirming his hero's religious devotion after sacrificing his men. In a similar vein, Ralph of Caen told how Anselm II of Ribemont, a castellan from northern France, was troubled by a dream foretelling his death at Arqah in February 1099. He sought out consolation from a wise

⁵⁰ AA, pp. 412-415.

⁵¹ RC pp. 70-71.

⁵² RC p.115. Cf. Kostick, *Social Structure*, pp. 153-55.

⁵³ See below n. 91.

⁵⁴ 'paterne adhortatus' AA pp. 492-93. Amazingly Gerard survived, later returning to Godfrey's service. AA pp. 506-7. See Murray, *Crusader Kingdom*, p. 199. For Lambert see idem p. 215 and Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 154.

⁵⁵ AA pp. 488-493.

man - Arnulf - and related the vision to him. Arnulf soothed his fear but admonished Anselm to confess his sins, do penance and receive the Eucharist. Thus when a stone dropped from a tower and smashed out his brains, Ralph could write with confidence that Anselm had received his promised reward.⁵⁶ In such anecdotes that were unique to individual authors, the figure of Arnulf exemplified spiritual leadership and moral superiority, placing important leaders of the army in a subordinate position to the Church and reaffirming the need for clerical guidance on crusade.

Another element of Arnulf's public authority involved debate and conflict resolution, though some saw him as an instigator of discord rather than an arbitrator.⁵⁷ The bitter controversy surrounding the Holy Lance and its invention is well attested in sources polarised by the political struggle over Antioch between Bohemond and Raymond of St Gilles.⁵⁸ Most placed Arnulf firmly on the side of the sceptics, though apparently even Adhémar of le Puy had his doubts.⁵⁹ Raymond of Aguilers, who was closely involved in these events, held Arnulf personally accountable for Peter Bartholomew's decision to undergo the ordeal by fire. After investigating and initially accepting the accounts of visions supporting the Lance, he said that Arnulf changed his mind and refused to publicly endorse it, spurring Peter on to prove himself. Asbridge interprets this as a deliberate attempt by Arnulf to discredit Peter in order to elevate himself to a position of power in the army.⁶⁰ However, Ralph of Caen credited Bohemond of Taranto, not Arnulf, with casting suspicion on the Lance, perhaps to add to the legacy of Tancred's uncle, or to distance Arnulf from events. Morris claims that Ralph invented this scenario entirely because the crusaders' letter to Urban II of 11 September 1098 (which probably came from Bohemond's household), made no mention of his doubts, but Bohemond could hardly have raised these in an official joint missive after the success of the Battle of

⁵⁶ RC pp. 90-91.

⁵⁷ For example WT pp. 366-67; 461-2; 484.

⁵⁸ Colin Morris, 'Policy and Visions: The Case of the Holy Lance at Antioch', in J. Gillingham and J. C. Holt (eds) *War and Government in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of J.O. Prestwich*, (Woodbridge, 1984), pp 33-45 and Asbridge 'Holy Lance', pp. 3-36.

⁵⁹ See especially Morris, 'Policy', pp. 44-5 and Asbridge, 'Holy Lance', pp. 5-6 and pp. 21-26.

⁶⁰ Asbridge, *First Crusade*, p. 290.

Antioch.⁶¹ While he did not compare Arnulf to Peter Bartholomew explicitly, Ralph highlighted the latter's poor reputation as an agitator who kept bad company. Arnulf featured in the background as one of a group who challenged the lance, but when Raymond of St Gilles, offended by Bohemond's comments, planned an assassination attempt, it was Arnulf who warned Bohemond, saving his life. When Peter Bartholomew died, a group of Provençal knights then tried to assassinate Arnulf. By reducing Arnulf's role in the trial and focusing on the nefarious activities of Raymond's men, Ralph transformed his role from that of persecutor to victim. He also made Arnulf's vulnerable status as a cleric and a non-combatant on crusade explicit as he had to seek protection from Robert Curthose and the Count of Flanders.⁶²

Rather than basing Arnulf's rise to power on events surrounding the Lance, Ralph included a deathbed speech for Adhémar of Le Puy at Antioch, in which he emphasised the legate's maternal and paternal qualities. In it, Adhémar claimed to have nurtured the army like a mother, and put forward Arnulf as his spiritual heir and dear son. He enjoined Arnulf to heed his warnings as a father, advising him how to be a true minister of Christ and avoid corruption.⁶³ After the army were disillusioned by the discrediting of the lance, Arnulf was charged with creating a replacement totem. Gathering up donations from the army he commissioned a standard - a golden image of Christ modelled on the Israelite tabernacle. Arnulf was the driving force behind the project, and 'turned his listeners in whatever direction he desired,' but he had an important ally. The highest-ranking clergyman was now the bishop of Marturana, a Calabrian who 'was not much better educated than the common folk and hardly well read'. He stood beside Arnulf and gave a blessing after his sermon.⁶⁴ For Ralph, comparing Arnulf with Adhémar and the bishop demonstrated Arnulf's credentials for leadership in terms of clerical masculinity.

⁶¹ Morris 'Policy', pp. 36-38 Cf. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (ed.), *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100*, (Innsbruck, 1901), p. 163 no. 16.

⁶² RC p. 93.

⁶³ RC pp. 81-2. d'Angelo includes this as a later intervention RC p. xxxii. For further details on the use of familial roles in reform ideology, see Megan McLaughlin, *Sex, Gender and Episcopal Authority in an Age of Reform* (Cambridge, 2010) esp. pp.123-59 and 160-218.

⁶⁴ RC p. 93 translated in Ralph of Caen, *The Gesta Tancredi: A History of the Normans on the First Crusade*, (trans.) Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach (Aldershot, 2005), p. 127. Arnulf, Bishop of Marturana accompanied the Norman-Italian contingent and was probably kidnapped before the battle of Ascalon, see below.

Elevation to the patriarchate (1099)

Arnulf was chosen as patriarch by a council of ecclesiastics on 1 August 1099, but his suitability for the post, and by extension his masculine identity as a cleric, was called into question.⁶⁵ The *Gesta Francorum*, Peter Tudebode, and Robert the Monk all accepted Arnulf's election to the position of patriarch without censure.⁶⁶ They emphasised the portentous date - the festival of St. Peter in Chains - representing the liberation of Jerusalem and implicitly linking Arnulf to St Peter. It was also the anniversary of Adhémar of le Puy's death.⁶⁷ Baldric of Bourgueil recognised the need for a patriarch, both for the people and for the king, and was very complimentary about Arnulf's administration of justice and linguistic skills. The crusaders thought no one better was available for the present, and because they were pressed for time and unable to make a decision, they raised Arnulf to the office of bishop. Baldric implied that Arnulf might be reluctant even to accept that honour, but he could offer advice in the meantime.⁶⁸ Orderic Vitalis, who borrowed heavily from Baldric, provided less detail but also said Arnulf was elected to the position of bishop, and later referred to him as 'patriarch-elect'.⁶⁹ Bartolf of Nangis asserted that Arnulf was made patriarch on a provisional and temporary basis until papal ratification occurred, though Fulcher of Chartres' revised account said no patriarch was chosen until they heard from the pope.⁷⁰ Edgington suggests that Fulcher became 'more guarded' on the issue of Arnulf and deliberately 'glossed over' these details in the later recension of his text.⁷¹ Two short pro-Bohemond texts produced at Fleury at some point before 1116 also refer to Arnulf's election. Hugh of Fleury highlighted Arnulf's pastoral skills as a cleric who was sufficiently hard-working and generous; while the anonymous *Narratio Floriacensis* explained that Arnulf was elected by the people for sustaining

⁶⁵ Hamilton, *Latin Church*, p. 12.

⁶⁶ GF p. 479; PT p. 142; BB p. 113. Arnulf's election was also accepted as unanimous in a letter from Archbishop Manassés II of Rheims c. Nov/Dec 1099. *Kreuzzugsbriefe* no. 20 pp. 175-76.

⁶⁷ RM p. 101.

⁶⁸ BB p. 113. I am grateful to Susan Edgington and Steven Biddlecombe for allowing me access to their forthcoming translation of Baldric here.

⁶⁹ 'patriarcham conductus' OV vol. 5 pp. 176-79.

⁷⁰ FC p. 308; BN p. 516.

⁷¹ Edgington, 'The gesta', p. 28.

him in their labours, but without papal ratification, so he assumed care of the Church until the pope saw fit to appoint Daibert, a man of great honesty.⁷²

Following the lead of Raymond of Aguilers, Guibert of Nogent and William of Tyre wrote that Arnulf was wholly unsuitable for the patriarchate because he was the son of a priest, and had no previous episcopal experience. A third charge related to his reputation for sexual incontinence which reinforced reform ideas about clerical masculinity. He had apparently engaged in sexual misconduct on crusade to the extent that lewd songs were sung about him.⁷³ Given the attitudes of Caen scholars towards clerical marriage there may have been some substance to these rumours, though specific details in relation to his activities on crusade are lacking. Arnulf had a niece who was old enough to marry Eustace Grenier, lord of Caesarea and Sidon and one of Baldwin I's most powerful nobles, though Hamilton asserts that lacking other evidence, 'niece' should not be interpreted as a euphemism for a daughter.⁷⁴ During his second term as patriarch, Arnulf was forced to clear his name to Pope Paschal II on the charge of keeping two mistresses, one the wife of a certain Girard, the other a Saracen, and of having a child by one of them.⁷⁵ The consistent attacks on his sexual behaviour, even though they were not upheld, struck to the heart of reform ideals about clerical masculinity and left a lasting impact on Arnulf's image.

Albert of Aachen circumvented the problems posed by the election by asserting that Arnulf was not elected to the patriarchate in 1099, but was appointed as a 'chancellor of the holy Church of Jerusalem, procurator of the holy relics, and keeper of the alms of the faithful' until a suitable person could be found.⁷⁶ The important potential of relics in the political culture of the First Crusade had been attested by the discovery of the Lance, and Arnulf had already attempted to make a new holy object - the golden image. This aspect of Arnulf's role was

⁷² 'clericum satis industrium et benignum' Hugh of Fleury, *Itineris Hierosolymitani compendium*, RHC Occ. vol. 5 pp. 363-67 at p. 367; *Narratio Floriacensis de captis Antiocha et Hierosolyma et obsesso Dyrrachio* RHC Occ. vol. 5 pp. 356-62 at p. 360.

⁷³ RA pp. 153-54; GN, pp. 290-293; WT pp. 421-22.

⁷⁴ Hamilton, *Latin Church*, p. 63 n.2. For Eustace see Murray, *Crusader Kingdom*, pp. 193-95.

⁷⁵ *Papsturkunden* pp. 124-6, no. 19.

⁷⁶ AA pp. 454-55.

secured by the discovery of a piece of the True Cross shortly after his election around 5 August. Interestingly it was Raymond of Aguilers who highlighted that Arnulf deliberately sought the discovery of the Cross, especially as such an event required divine approval, it potentially had the effect of sanctioning his election.⁷⁷ Peter Tudebode asserts that 'pilgrims' found it, while Fulcher of Chartres, Albert of Aachen, and William of Tyre said an indigenous Christian offered it up willingly.⁷⁸ Asbridge asserts that Arnulf was determined to 'eradicate any lingering memory of the Holy Lance and to legitimate the new Latin order in Jerusalem.'⁷⁹ Raymond, however, was critical that Arnulf immediately deprived the eastern Christian clergy of their benefices in the Holy Sepulchre.⁸⁰ Albert attributed the establishment of twenty Latin canons at the Holy Sepulchre and the commissioning of bells to summon the faithful to prayer to the secular leader elected to rule Jerusalem, Duke Godfrey of Bouillon, but given Arnulf's key role in establishing liturgical practices it is likely that he coordinated these initiatives to establish and maintain visible Church authority and to minister to the spiritual needs of the army.⁸¹

Both Raymond and William of Tyre accepted Arnulf's election but resorted to comparisons with peers once more to highlight its irregularities. In Raymond's view, the bishop of Marturana was 'the inciter and director of Arnulf's elevation', which was against the wishes of good clergymen. Arnulf ignored the charges against him, 'berated the good clergy and had himself elevated to the patriarchal seat to the accompaniment of hymns, chants and the great applause of the people.'⁸² William of Tyre went further, asserting that the bishop of Marturana agreed to support him in return for the church of St Mary at Bethlehem, and instigated a message to the princes that the clergy would refuse to ratify their choice of secular leader unless they appointed a patriarch first.⁸³ In contrast to Ralph of Caen's portrayal of the bishop as a poorly educated stooge, William called him a 'wicked and cunning man' for inciting the 'uneducated

⁷⁷ RA p. 154.

⁷⁸ PT p. 145-6; FC p. 312; AA p. 45-51; WT p. 425.

⁷⁹ Asbridge, *First Crusade*, p. 324.

⁸⁰ RA p. 154.

⁸¹ AA pp. 454-55. Dondi, *Liturgy*, pp. 47-57.

⁸² RA p. 154 trans. Hill and Hill p. 131.

⁸³ WT p. 421-22. Bethlehem was not an episcopal seat at the time. Hamilton, *Latin Church*, p. 59.

people'.⁸⁴ He was also 'a man of perverse mind thinking nothing for honour'. He was thus a fitting ally for Arnulf: 'as is the nature of each person, so do they revel in consorting with the same, for according to the old proverb, like is easily joined together with like.'⁸⁵ Duke Robert of Normandy also lent his support and Arnulf was duly elected, but a few days afterwards the bishop of Marturana, an 'instigator of scandals and author of sedition', disappeared after delivering a message - none knew whether he had been captured or killed.⁸⁶ Raymond of Aguilers saw the bishop's demise as his just deserts for claiming Bethlehem fraudulently and as an implicit warning to Arnulf about the improper fulfillment of his office.⁸⁷ In William's view both were justly removed from power - the bishop by his capture, and Arnulf by his deposition.⁸⁸ Guibert simply put Arnulf's later removal from power down to his lack of a pious life.⁸⁹

Most sources followed up accounts of Arnulf's election as patriarch with his role at the battle of Ascalon, carrying the True Cross, preaching and ministering to the troops, and enforcing rules about not taking booty.⁹⁰ Robert the Monk even asserted that the new ruler Godfrey of Bouillon undertook the battle on Arnulf's advice. Arnulf organised a mass at the Holy Sepulchre before their departure, and delegated Peter the Hermit to carry on with liturgy, processions and prayers in their absence.⁹¹ The crusaders successfully defeated al-Afdal's forces in battle on 12 August 1099, thus even Arnulf's critics were hard pressed to find fault with his actions there, though Guibert of Nogent questioned his title as 'so-called' patriarch at every opportunity.⁹² Robert of Normandy gave Arnulf's patriarchate the seal of his approval by gifting him (or the Lord's Sepulchre) with a battle standard won from a wealthy emir during the

⁸⁴ 'vir subdolos et nequam', 'plebem indoctam' WT p. 425.

⁸⁵ 'perverse mentis homo pro nichilo ducens honestatem' and 'qualis quisque est, talium consortio delectatur; pares enim paribus veteri proverbio facile iunguntur.' WT p. 422 Cf. Cicero, *De Senectute* 3,7.

⁸⁶ 'scandalorum fomes, auctor seditionem' WT p. 436. Peter Tudebode also mentions the bishop's capture, without criticism. PT p. 143.

⁸⁷ RA p. 154 . Cf. WT p. 436.

⁸⁸ WT p. 425.

⁸⁹ GN p. 293.

⁹⁰ GF pp. 490-91; GN pp. 295-99; RM pp. 103-04; PT p. 143; AA pp. 456-71 although Godfrey warned the men off plundering at pp. 466-67. Fulcher and William of Malmesbury record the True Cross at Ascalon but not Arnulf. FC pp. 311-18; William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, (ed. and trans.) Roger A. B. Mynors, Rodney M. Thompson and Michael Winterbottom, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1998-9) vol. 1 pp. 678-79 (Henceforth WM). Ralph also made no mention of Arnulf at Ascalon; RC p. 116.

⁹¹ RM p. 103.

⁹² GN p. 294-296; 299.

fighting.⁹³ Following the lead of the *Gesta Francorum*, many of the First Crusade histories closed with the Battle of Ascalon as a high point upon which to end their narratives.⁹⁴

Debate with Tancred

Arnulf was usually measured against other clerics, but there were occasions when comparisons were drawn with secular figures. Ralph of Caen was placed in an impossible position when his ostensible patron Arnulf came into conflict with his hero, Tancred. Interestingly, Ralph did not mention Arnulf's election to the patriarchate in the days after the capture of Jerusalem, focusing instead on a versified account of Tancred's activities.⁹⁵ Tancred had taken the Temple of the Lord, and he stripped it of its considerable wealth to distribute as booty among his men. Once Arnulf was appointed patriarch, however, he petitioned for the return of the loot. The matter was settled a few days before the Battle of Ascalon in a public debate which revealed much about conflicting ideals of secular and clerical masculinity in the context of the crusade.⁹⁶ Ralph's rendition of the argument is highly literate, and while Arnulf had a reputation for eloquence, Tancred's well-composed counter-argument is perhaps too polished for a warrior.

The crux of Arnulf's argument was that any property from the Temple, a sacred place, ought to belong to the Church. These injuries had led him to contemplate the nature of manhood: 'how a man might be separated from man, a benefactor from a thief, and a restorer of liberty from an invader.' First, he acknowledged his reliance on the lordly patronage of the crusade leaders who had raised him up from base origins. Arnulf's show of humility contradicted the reform position on investiture, but was also calculated to manipulate his audience to act in his defence. Tancred's persecution had made a mockery of the leaders' patronage, causing them

⁹³ GF pp. 498-99; PT, p. 148; GN p. 299; AA p. 468-89.

⁹⁴ For example GF, PT, BB, RM, and RA.

⁹⁵ RC p. 116.

⁹⁶ These speeches and other sections of Ralph's work regarding Arnulf were reproduced in the *Hystoria de via et recuperatione Antiochiae atque Ierusalymarum (olim Tudebodis imitatus et continuatus)* (ed.) E. D'Angelo (Firenze, 2009), see pp. xv-xvi and xxx-xxxii.

disgrace and necessitating vengeance. He also made a sly dig at Tancred's family: even his duplicitous grandfather, Robert Guiscard, had treated the Church with respect.⁹⁷

Arnulf's integral role in the success of the crusade was presented in traditionally masculine terms. He spoke of sharing in the labour of the leaders and placing emphasis on the bravery of his actions. Despite dire circumstances at Dorylaeum, 'when we saw death before our eyes, fear did not confuse my mind. I offered no false counsel...'. He highlighted the personal dangers of his role as a messenger: telling how he set off through thousands of the enemy with only one lightly armed companion, 'I evaded countless pursuers. I announced what had happened, I brought back victory, I conquered.' He alluded to roles at Antioch and Marra which he could not discuss further for reasons of time, and also described a dangerous journey in a small boat from Maraclea to Latakia to bring help from Antioch during the siege of Arqah. Although his role was clearly not a fighting one, Arnulf was still keen to establish himself as a decisive and victorious leader, and a tireless champion of the crusader cause.⁹⁸

Tancred's response focused on Arnulf's key characteristics and exposed perceived disparities between secular and clerical masculine ideals on crusade. He also employed a topos of humility, presenting himself as a mere soldier lacking the eloquence of his opponent: 'neither persuasion nor verbal ability has promoted me, but rather my sword and spear', whereas Arnulf had 'all of his strength in his tongue just as a scorpion has in its tail.' He rounded on the patriarch for insulting his family, comparing his illustrious ancestry with Arnulf's low origins: 'This from a man whose family never produced a leader to equal this great leader (Guiscard).' He argued for his right to dispense the booty taken from the church because Arnulf himself had criticised bishops for hoarding wealth, and Tancred put it to use at a time of urgent need in battle on God's behalf. He claimed that Arnulf had told him personally that property would be distributed on a first-come, first-served basis, and Tancred had many witnesses to the fact that he had entered the Temple first. He therefore questioned Arnulf's

⁹⁷ RC p. 112-13; trans. Bachrach and Bachrach p. 149-50.

⁹⁸ RC pp. 113-14; trans. Bachrach and Bachrach, pp. 150-51.

credentials as a judge, referring to him as a slippery snake or Proteus for changing his mind so quickly. Finally, Tancred mocked Arnulf's claims to bravery compared to his own masculine, military example: '...he warned about dangers, he made suggestions for a messenger to be sent, finally he carried a message.' He argued that despite trying to excuse his fears, Arnulf was always heading away from danger, as a coward in flight.⁹⁹

Ralph's portrayal of the debate highlighted the tensions between contemporary ideals of secular and ecclesiastical manhood and leadership, heightened by political uncertainty in the aftermath of the capture of Jerusalem. The leaders, after due consideration, collectively mediated an outcome which met the approval of both Tancred and Arnulf, and Tancred was ordered to pay back 700 marks. While incorporating these bitter and personal criticisms on either side, Ralph struggled to remain even-handed, representing the debate as an heroic struggle between another Hector and Aeneas. Despite their different callings he tried to convey similarities between these two self-made men. 'Both were renowned, both had become powerful from meager beginnings, and both were the subject of jealousy by everyone else...'. Ralph's claim that 'two men who had been at odds were rejoined', however, was not reflected by the events, as Tancred played a key role in Arnulf's deposition.¹⁰⁰

Three Patriarchs and an Archdeacon

When it came to Arnulf's early career in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, it is not surprising that narrative authors most often compared him with his direct competitors for ecclesiastical power. The political reasons for Arnulf's deposition and replacement by Daibert of Pisa, who was installed as patriarch in December 1099, are well known.¹⁰¹ Arriving as a papal legate with a Pisan fleet Daibert forged a bond with Bohemond of Taranto and Tancred. In return for their support Godfrey of Bouillon agreed to offer Daibert the patriarchate, though both Bohemond

⁹⁹ RC pp. 114-16 trans. Bachrach and Bachrach pp. 151-53. d'Angelo asserts that chs 396-400 detailing the last part of Tancred's speech including the section on the distribution of booty, and the resolution decided upon by the leaders were an editorial insertion. RC pp. xxxii, xxxvi and 115-6.

¹⁰⁰ RC p. 116 trans. Bachrach and Bachrach p. 153.

¹⁰¹ See Hamilton, *Latin Church*, pp. 14-17.

and Godfrey had to perform homage to him for their lands. As a result Daibert is often seen as a champion of the reform position.¹⁰² Ralph of Caen presented Arnulf as magnanimously giving way to his rival without opposition, even though he had been elected fairly, as he thought Daibert would have more success in converting the populace.¹⁰³ Guibert of Nogent said that Arnulf was allowed to select his successor to spare him from shame, a very secular measure of masculinity, and that he chose Daibert.¹⁰⁴ Daibert evidently thought well enough of Arnulf to use him as an emissary to German princes and prelates, praising his eloquence and value as an eyewitness to the First Crusade in his letter of May or June 1100.¹⁰⁵ Their subsequent relationship, however was represented as a clash of personalities and clerical values.

After his deposition, Arnulf's official title was usually given as archdeacon of the church of Jerusalem, though Albert of Aachen continued to call him 'chancellor' usually 'of the Holy Sepulchre' and sometimes prelate or keeper of the Lord's Temple. On one occasion he was referred to as chancellor of the king but Mayer has argued against this as an accurate title.¹⁰⁶ In July 1100 Godfrey of Bouillon died and was soon succeeded by his brother Baldwin of Boulogne, to whom Arnulf swiftly transferred his loyalties. Arnulf's ability to collect and distribute alms, key functions for an archdeacon, had been proven on the crusade. One source described him as the *scrinarius* or secretary of Baldwin I's treasury, and the new king certainly paid attention to Arnulf's financial advice.¹⁰⁷ At the siege of Sidon, Albert told how Arnulf advised Baldwin to halt the bombardment of a tower despite imminent success because it would cost over 2000 bezants to rebuild.¹⁰⁸ Church wealth and the distribution of it were as contentious in a crusading context as they were in the reform climate at home. William of Tyre noted how Arnulf was able to procure support against Daibert from the clergy because as archdeacon he was 'exceedingly rich and possessed great power', receiving revenues from the

¹⁰² Michael Matzke, *Daibert von Pisa: Zwischen Pisa, Papst und erstem Kreuzzug* (Sigmaringen, 1998).

¹⁰³ RC p. 118. This too was likely an editorial insertion, see *idem* pp. xxxii and xxxvi.

¹⁰⁴ GN p. 292.

¹⁰⁵ *Kreuzzugsbriefe*, pp. 176-7, no. 21. See also Benjamin Z. Kedar, 'Ein Hilferuf aus Jerusalem vom September 1187', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 35 (1982), pp. 113-14.

¹⁰⁶ AA pp. 452-57; 492-93; 568-69; 656-66; 772-73; 860-61. See pp. 762-63 for chancellor of the king and Hans Eberhard Mayer, *Die Kanzlei der lateinischen Könige von Jerusalem*, 2 vols. (Hannover, 1996), vol. 1 pp. 57-8.

¹⁰⁷ *Chronique de Saint-Pierre-le-Vif*, p. 186.

¹⁰⁸ AA pp. 762-3.

Temple of the Lord and Calvary. For William, Arnulf's wealth and cunning allowed him to sow malice among the clergy and laity alike, abusing his clerical position for his own benefit.¹⁰⁹

The origins of Baldwin I's conflict with Daibert were financial according to Albert of Aachen, because the new patriarch was caught skimping on finances that Baldwin needed to pay troops at Jaffa. Instead, the money subsidised Daibert's luxuriant living, feasting and drinking with the papal legate cardinal-bishop Maurice of Porto. Albert accused Daibert of being 'bound by the chain of his private love' for Maurice and squandering the resources of the faithful.¹¹⁰ He contrasted this with Arnulf's reputation as a distributor of alms and supporter of the military activities of Baldwin I. Conversely Bartolf of Nangis lamented that such a distinguished and remarkable man as Daibert was hated like a wolf, blaming Arnulf and his allies for engineering his eviction.¹¹¹ William of Tyre also presented Daibert as saintly and scholarly, entirely at the mercy of scurrilous rumours spread by the treacherous Arnulf, 'Satan's firstborn, son of perdition', although Skinner indicates that Daibert was a controversial figure even before he came to the Holy Land.¹¹² Murray's work on the Daibertine Letter as a source suggests that even William struggled to maintain Daibert's rosy image.¹¹³ It is possible that William exhibited great antipathy for Arnulf because it allowed him to reflect implicitly on the failings of another much later patriarch - his own rival Eraclius.¹¹⁴ He had beaten William's bid for the office in 1180 and was also accused of sexual misdemeanours and corruption. William seemed unwilling to criticise him openly, thus Arnulf provided a convenient historical exemplar for the damage that could be wrought by a corrupt and self-serving patriarch.¹¹⁵

Daibert was deposed first in 1101 for embezzlement, then for a second time in 1102, though he continued to fight for the patriarchate until his death in 1107. His new rival was Evremar of

¹⁰⁹ WT p. 461.

¹¹⁰ AA pp. 560-61 and 568-75. However, Maurice presided over Daibert's first deposition in 1101. Hamilton, *Latin Church* pp. 54-5.

¹¹¹ BN p. 30.

¹¹² 'primogenitus Sathane, perdicionis filius' WT pp. 461-2; for Daibert see also 484-5; 495. Patricia Skinner, 'From Pisa to Patriarchate: Chapters in the life of (Arch)bishop Daibert', in Patricia Skinner (ed.), *Challenging the Boundaries of Medieval History: the legacy of Timothy Reuter* (Turnhout, 2009), pp. 155-72.

¹¹³ Alan V. Murray, 'Daibert of Pisa, the Domus Godefridi and the Accession of Baldwin I of Jerusalem' in idem (ed.), *From Clermont to Jerusalem: The crusades and crusader societies 1095-1500* (Turnhout, 1998), pp. 81-102.

¹¹⁴ Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, pp. 20-22.

¹¹⁵ Natasha Hodgson, *Women Crusading and the Holy Land in Historical Narrative* (Woodbridge, 2007), p. 153.

Chocques, a compatriot of Arnulf. Once again Arnulf's reputation was key. Guibert of Nogent asserted that Arnulf deliberately engineered the election of this 'simple, illiterate man' who would not oppose him, but Evremar behaved in a religious manner and proved hard to manipulate. Albert of Aachen focused instead on contrasting Evremar with Daibert at the council for his excommunication by papal legate Cardinal Robert of Paris in 1102. It was on the advice of the same cardinal, we are told, that Evremar was elected - 'a man and cleric of good character, an excellent and cheerful distributor of alms.' He went on to serve 'with all religious devotion and good behaviour...acting as a faithful assistant to King Baldwin.'¹¹⁶ Arnulf was mentioned briefly as one of the prelates at the council, and this time Albert too referred to him as archdeacon, suggesting that the title may come as a reward for his support.¹¹⁷ William of Tyre thought Evremar was a simple man of honourable character, but in accepting the patriarchate he was careless and ignorant, a pawn in another of Arnulf's schemes.¹¹⁸

Baldwin I continued to support Evremar while his patriarchate was in dispute, but as soon as Daibert died, the king sent Arnulf to petition Pope Paschal II in Rome for Evremar's deposition on the grounds that he was 'almost useless' as a patriarch.¹¹⁹ Evremar was already at the papal court and forestalled Arnulf's eloquent diatribe directly - according to Albert of Aachen he blocked Arnulf's mouth in the midst of the Roman Church. Evremar was restored to the patriarchate, but Baldwin refused to recognise his legitimacy and Arnulf continued to influence the king against him.¹²⁰ William of Tyre almost passed over this opportunity to attack Arnulf. He told how Paschal sent Gibelin of Arles to Jerusalem in 1108 to investigate Evremar's election, which was deemed invalid because of undue pressure from the king. Evremar was offered the archbishopric of Caesarea in recompense, and the patriarchate was offered to a reluctant Gibelin. However, William claimed that this too was a scheme of Arnulf's, 'so that an old and decrepit man could not survive for a long time in that office.'¹²¹ Albert reluctantly concurred that Gibelin was chosen by Arnulf and the king, but thought that Evremar was

¹¹⁶ AA pp. 658-59.

¹¹⁷ Hamilton, *Latin Church*, p. 56.

¹¹⁸ WT pp. 484-85.

¹¹⁹ 'tamquam inutilem' *Papsturkunden*, pp. 104-7, no. 8.

¹²⁰ AA pp. 772-73.

¹²¹ 'ut homo senex et decrepitus in illa sede diu vivere non posset' WT p. 501.

deposed illegally. The pope allowed it to happen 'because the Jerusalem church was still unformed and fragile', recognising the need for political flexibility while the crusaders established themselves.¹²²

Gibelin's patriarchate was a marked success, largely because his authority went uncontested and he was able to implement significant groundwork.¹²³ Baldwin was full of praise for his intellect and virtuous behaviour.¹²⁴ Gibelin also courted Arnulf's good opinion, including him in major acts and referring to him a dearest friend and son in his will.¹²⁵ The fact that Arnulf was prepared to work alongside Gibelin thus throws some doubt on his reputation as a man seeking personal advancement, unless he was in fact being groomed as a successor. Arnulf's election to the patriarchate was secured almost immediately on Gibelin's death in 1112 by 'king, clergy and people' in Arnulf's own words.¹²⁶ Paschal II appears to have approved until charges of misconduct were brought.

In a subordinate role as archdeacon, Arnulf was variously seen to usurp or hold superiors to account, and to manipulate or act in a supportive, filial role to the patriarch, thus his relationships with Daibert, Evremar and Gibelin all exposed tensions between masculine roles in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. As patriarch himself, Arnulf deployed his authority traditionally, initially using patronage, with beneficiaries including the Hospital of St John and St Mary of the Valley of Josaphat.¹²⁷ However, William of Tyre and his translator both saw Arnulf's reform of the canons of the Holy Sepulchre to the Augustinian rule in 1114 as a misguided initiative.¹²⁸ William criticised Arnulf for changing the order established by the First Crusaders and accused him of introducing regular canons to disguise his sexual misconduct, as his shameful behaviour was well known.¹²⁹ William's Old French translator added that Arnulf replaced the original

¹²² AA pp. 772-73.

¹²³ Hamilton, *Latin Church*, pp. 59-62.

¹²⁴ Hans Eberhard Mayer, *Die Urkunden der lateinischen Könige von Jerusalem*, 4 parts (Hanover, 2010) vol. 1 pp. 159-64 no. 40. (Henceforth *Urkunden*). See also WT p. 513.

¹²⁵ For example see *Urkunden* vol. pp. 171-2, no. 46 and Geneviève Bresc-Bautier, *Le Cartulaire du chapitre du Saint-Sépulcre de Jérusalem*, (Paris, 1984), pp. 85-6, no. 25 .

¹²⁶ 'a rege, clero et populo' *Urkunden* vol. 1 pp. 181-3, no. 55.

¹²⁷ *Urkunden* vol. 1. pp. 176-7 no. 51 and pp. 179-80 no. 53.

¹²⁸ *Urkunden* vol. 1 pp. 181-3, no. 55.

¹²⁹ WT p. 519.

clerks with regular canons because they were 'lesser men' and would not speak out against him in matters of the Church.¹³⁰ In fact, the switch to regular canons was a move towards embracing reform ideas and probably aimed to garner support from the papacy. The changes had been instigated in Gibelin's will, but Dondi asserts that he was acting on the advice of Arnulf who was keen to secure Paschal II's approval for his patriarchate.¹³¹

Arnulf and Baldwin I

Arnulf's influence over King Baldwin I of Jerusalem was yet another bone of contention. Baldwin seemingly relied on Arnulf for ecclesiastical advice, but also turned to him in certain political situations. Baldwin had already noted the importance of archdeacon Arnulf's counsel in raising Bethlehem to the status of a Latin bishopric and enlisted him to represent his case to Paschal II c. 1108.¹³² Albert of Aachen asserted that it was on the new patriarch's advice that Baldwin made a show of wearing his crown in front of Alexius I's Byzantine ambassadors during Easter week 1112 in order to assert his independence. Arnulf continued in his pastoral role to the army, and was present on campaign against Mawdud of Mosul in 1113 when Baldwin was nearly captured, sharing his danger.¹³³ However, Arnulf ruffled more feathers by extending secular patronage to his niece, Emma. He dowered her with Jericho, a very wealthy property of the church of Jerusalem, when she married Eustace Grenier, probably with Baldwin's blessing.¹³⁴

William of Tyre praised Baldwin I's traditional noble male values of largesse, courage and martial experience, but thought he was ruled too far by the advice of the wicked and malicious Arnulf, a man of evil thought and action.¹³⁵ When Baldwin fell out with Daibert, it was because Arnulf had made many accusations and stirred up quarrels between them.¹³⁶ It was Arnulf who

¹³⁰ 'menue genz'. Paulin Paris (ed.), *Guillaume de Tyr et ses continuateurs*, 2. vols (Paris, 1879), vol. 1 pp. 405-06. See Philip Handyside, *The Old French Continuation of William of Tyre*, (Leiden, 2015), pp. 91-3.

¹³¹ Bresc-Bautier, *Cartulaire*, pp. 85-6, no. 25; Dondi, *Liturgy* pp. 56-7.

¹³² *Urkunden* vol. 1 pp. 159-64 no. 40. See also WT p. 513.

¹³³ AA, 835; FC p. 569; WT p. 524.

¹³⁴ See above n. 75.

¹³⁵ WT pp. 454-55.

¹³⁶ WT pp. 461-62; 484-85.

had led Baldwin astray by convincing him to elect Evremar. Perhaps worst of all, he married the king to another woman while his previous wife was still alive.¹³⁷ Baldwin had married the daughter of an Armenian noble in Edessa, but after becoming king of Jerusalem he put her away in the convent of St Anne.¹³⁸ His subsequent marriage to dowager Adelaide of Salerno in 1113 brought a substantial dowry of cash, men, weapons and goods to Baldwin's coffers, along with a Sicilian alliance. William of Tyre portrayed Arnulf as orchestrating the match, deliberately deceiving a noble and honourable matron.¹³⁹ As the officiating priest there was no doubt he was complicit to some extent. However, none of the other sources highlighted Arnulf's role. Fulcher of Chartres barely mentioned the embarrassing circumstances, saying that the king put her aside after an illness. Orderic Vitalis and William of Malmesbury blamed Adelaide herself for seeking the match and its subsequent failure.¹⁴⁰ Albert of Aachen, conversely, heaped lavish praise on Adelaide and described her dowry in great detail. He only mentioned Arnulf in the context of her later divorce from Baldwin.¹⁴¹

In 1115 Bishop Berengar of Orange was sent to Syria to investigate a number of charges that had been brought to the attention of Pope Paschal II by Arnulf's critics, including the ousted Evremar of Chocques. William of Tyre deliberately contrasted Berengar, this 'venerable man, distinguished for his great faith' with Arnulf's unclean life and shocking conduct.¹⁴² The charges included Arnulf's origins as the son of a priest, misappropriation of church lands to dower his niece, accusations of sexual misconduct, and his role in the marriage of Baldwin and Adelaide. He was deposed, but took a delegation with him to Rome to plead his case.¹⁴³ Arnulf was able to swear to his innocence and was granted a dispensation in respect of his birth, but it seems that Paschal's main concern was Baldwin's bigamous marriage.¹⁴⁴ On Arnulf's return to the Holy Land he secured an annulment at a council in Acre, and in 1117 Adelaide returned to

¹³⁷ WT p. 519.

¹³⁸ Hodgson, *Women*, pp. 142-44.

¹³⁹ WT p. 525-26. For political motivations behind Baldwin's dynastic policies see Hans E. Mayer, 'Études sur l'histoire de Baudouin Ier Roi de Jérusalem', in *Mélanges sur L'Histoire du Royaume Latin de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1984), pp. 49-72.

¹⁴⁰ FC p. 601; OV vol. 6 p. 433; and WM vol. 1 p. 689. Hodgson, *Women*, p. 218.

¹⁴¹ AA pp. 842-45; 856-57; 860-63.

¹⁴² 'virum venerabilem et multa religione conspicuum' WT p. 534.

¹⁴³ FC, p. 591; WT pp. 519 and 534.

¹⁴⁴ *Papsturkunden* pp. 124-6, no. 19.

Sicily in shame.¹⁴⁵ William of Tyre returned to lamenting Arnulf's crafty wiles and ability to corrupt through eloquence and bribery to explain his reinstatement. Albert of Aachen, having glossed over Arnulf's role in the initial marriage, presented Arnulf's visit to Rome in 1116 as more of a confirmation of his position as patriarch. On his return, Albert described Arnulf exerting his benign moral influence over the king to repent and divorce Adelaide.

Now in his mid to late fifties, Arnulf's position was finally secure, but William of Tyre tells us that with the pope's blessing in hand he went back to his old lascivious ways.¹⁴⁶ His triumph was short-lived, however, as Baldwin I died in 1118 while on campaign in Egypt. When his body arrived in Jerusalem, according to Albert of Aachen, 'the venerable patriarch was taken ill on account of grief for the death of so great a prince and champion of Christ', highlighting the close relationship the two men had shared for eighteen years.¹⁴⁷ After an illness of three weeks Arnulf died and was buried alongside the other patriarchs. Even in his last days, however, he may have played a significant role in affirming the controversial choice of Baldwin of Bourcq as Baldwin of Boulogne's successor, bypassing the claim of his brother Eustace.¹⁴⁸ William of Tyre laid most of the responsibility at the door of Joscelin of Courtenay, soon to replace Baldwin as Count of Edessa, but he and Arnulf together were the ringleaders - the rest were easily persuaded. William questioned their motivation, but said that thanks to God's approval Baldwin II proved an excellent choice.¹⁴⁹ Even in death, William could not help but compare Arnulf to his successor: Arnulf was a most troublesome man who neglected the sanctity of office, but Warmund, who followed him as patriarch, was a simple, God-fearing man.¹⁵⁰

Conclusion

The complex portrayal of Arnulf's character cannot be simplified in terms of the sources taking sides in the dispute over the Holy Lance or expressing reformist *versus* traditionalist views.

¹⁴⁵ AA p. 862-63.

¹⁴⁶ WT pp. 534-35.

¹⁴⁷ AA pp. 872-73.

¹⁴⁸ AA pp. 870-71. See Mayer, 'Baudouin Ier', pp. 73-91.

¹⁴⁹ WT pp. 549-50.

¹⁵⁰ WT p. 553. Cf AA pp. 874-75 on Warmund's good character.

The composition and dating of texts played a role - while a version of the *Gesta Francorum* may have been in circulation before Arnulf's deposition from the patriarchate in 1099, those who chose to rework it in the first decade of the twelfth century (Guibert of Nogent, Baldric of Bourgeuil and Robert the Monk) were aware that the patriarchate had been scandalously disputed. This posed a problem for presenting a succinct narrative which celebrated the political outcomes of the First Crusade as divinely ordained, which the authors tackled in different ways. Baldric ignored Arnulf save for his election to temporary episcopal status, making it clear that he was the best candidate available; Robert just accepted him without censure, while Guibert took him out of the main narrative and used him as a cautionary tale. Raymond, who also drew from a version of the *Gesta*, was governed by his schema supporting the Lance, but others capitalised on his criticisms of Arnulf for their own agendas. For those chroniclers who looked beyond the First Crusade and incorporated early settlement, Arnulf's continued high profile in the politics of the Latin Kingdom saw him cast again in different lights. Albert of Aachen, who had championed Arnulf against Daibert of Pisa, continued to defend him, though even he worried about the legality of Evremar of Chocques's treatment. Conversely Arnulf became William of Tyre's '*bête noire*' and a cautionary exemplar of toxic relations between *regnum* and *sacerdotum*, while Fulcher of Chartres tried to erase his historical impact as far as possible.¹⁵¹ Ralph of Caen sought to present a flattering portrayal of the well-educated tutor he knew, but had to balance this image against the conflicts with his main protagonists, Bohemond and Tancred. All of these sources, however, sought at some level to define Arnulf's character as a priest and a man by measuring him against his peers, balanced against a subtext of contemporary ideals about masculine behaviour in a hierarchical social environment. The Protean nature of Arnulf's representation highlights the different expectations of clerics on campaign in the East and shows how different masculine identities were conflicting and interacting in the intensive and changeable political climate at the upper echelons of the crusading army. His actual experience owed much to the unique political culture of the First Crusade, but just as secular First Crusaders became heroes and failures, providing models of behaviour in the narratives recording their activities, so Arnulf was a

¹⁵¹ Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, p. 100.

versatile exemplar for the triumphs, opportunities, worldly snares and pitfalls which awaited clerics whether they went on crusade, or entered into any sphere of political activity.