Journal of Medieval History, 2013
Vol. 39, No. 2, 220–239, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03044181.2013.779297

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Honour, Shame and the Fourth Crusade

Natasha Hodgson*

Nottingham Trent University – School of Arts and Humanities, Clifton Campus, Nottingham NG11 8NS, United Kingdom

(*Received 4 September 2012; final version received 6 December 2012*)

This article evaluates how far chivalric notions of honour and shame had become associated with crusading by the early thirteenth century. It stems from a wider investigation into how crusading helped to forge standards for knightly behaviour and influenced the development of chivalric ideals. The Fourth Crusade serves as a focused case study, and this article examines the significance of its controversial course and conclusion as well as how two lay authors, Geoffrey of Villehardouin and Robert of Clari, used ideas about honour and shame in their narratives. It takes a close look at terminology, exploring a variety of expressions for concepts of honour and shame, and highlights the contexts in which they were used: whether to describe military encounters, the pressure on social bonds, or leadership roles. It argues that by the turn of the thirteenth century, crusading played a significant rather than extraneous role in developing ideas about chivalric conduct and proper social behaviour.

Keywords: Fourth Crusade; honour; shame; chivalry; Robert of Clari; Geoffrey of Villehardouin; Baldwin IX of Flanders

In the version preserved in the *Chronica regia Coloniensis*, Fourth Crusader Count Hugh IV of St Pol ended his letter to Henry I, duke of Brabant with the following words:

> We have accepted a tournament against the sultan of Babylon in front of Alexandria. If, therefore, anyone wishes to serve God … and wishes to bear the distinguished and shining title of 'knight' let him take up the cross and follow the Lord, and let him come to the Lord's tournament, to which he is invited by the Lord himself.[1]

Hugh's letter was written directly after the first capture of Constantinople in July 1203, and it was intended both to inform those at home about the crusaders' success and to encourage fresh recruits from the West.[2] It illustrates just how integral crusading had become to the concept of knighthood

*Email: Natasha.Hodgson@ntu.ac.uk

[1] The following abbreviations have been used in this paper: Clari: Robert de Clari *La conquête de Constantinople*, ed. and trans. Peter Noble (Edinburgh: Société Rencesvales British Branch, 2005); *RHC Occ.*: *Recueil des historiens des croisades: historiens occidentaux*. 5 vols. in 6 (Paris: L'Académie impériale des inscriptions et belles-lettres, 1844–95); Villehardouin: Geoffrey of Villehardouin, *La conquête de Constantinople*, ed. and trans. Edmond Faral. 2 vols. (Paris: Société d'édition Les Belles Lettres, 1938).

Hugh's letter can be found in Georg Waitz, ed., *Chronica regia Coloniensis*. Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum 18 (Hanover: Hahn, 1880), 208; translated in Alfred J. Andrea, *Contemporary Sources for the Fourth Crusade* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 201. This text appears in only one of the three extant versions.

by the early thirteenth century. This article is a preliminary investigation into how crusading helped to forge standards for knightly behaviour and influenced the development of chivalric ideals.

Modern scholars are often pre-occupied with motivation when considering the historical explanation of crusading. They have closely examined the pre-conditions necessary to produce a society in which Christian holy war could flourish, often incorporating these with the development of a professional military elite that had its own rules of conduct.[3] While these avenues of enquiry can help to explain the attraction for knightly classes of participating in crusades, the influence of crusading on aristocratic culture and ideology is more difficult to quantify. Keen asserted that the crusade movement had a powerful impact on chivalric ideology as it developed in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, but also treated it as a divergent branch from earlier Christian influences on knighthood rather than incorporating it into mainstream knightly culture.[4] Others have suggested that the achievements of crusaders (especially the conquest of Jerusalem in 1099) imbued the knightly classes with a new sense of their own identity and encouraged them to record their activities. This argument has met with varying degrees of acceptance, as only a very few crusaders committed their own experiences to historical writing.[5] Many left charters donating relics or other gifts to local monasteries on their return, which occasionally included supplementary information about their journeys. Some crusaders evidently provided news and information to chroniclers, or commissioned songs and poems on crusading themes.[6] Perhaps the most pertinent full-length studies on the latter to date are Trotter's

[2] Andrea, *Contemporary Sources*, 179.

[3] For example, Marcus Bull, *Knightly Piety and the Lay Response to the First Crusade: the Limousin and Gascony, c.970–c.1130* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).

[4] Maurice Keen, *Chivalry* (London: Yale University Press, 1986), 2.

[5] Crusading certainly stimulated the writing of new histories, and potentially allowed for a greater degree of lay involvement in recording them. The authorship of the *Gesta Francorum* is still disputed, but Raymond of Aguilers claimed to have co-written his history with a lay knight, Pons of Balazun, who died at 'Arqah: John Hugh and Laurita L. Hill, eds., *Le Liber de Raymond D'Aguilers* (Paris: P. Geuthner, 1969), 35–6. For views on the authorship of the *Gesta Francorum*, see Colin Morris, 'The *Gesta Francorum* as Narrative History', *Reading Medieval Studies* 19 (1993): 55–71; John France, 'The Use of the Anonymous *Gesta Francorum* in the Early Twelfth-Century Sources for the First Crusade', in *From Clermont to Jerusalem: the Crusades and Crusader Societies 1095–1500*, ed. Alan V. Murray (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), 29–39; Jay Rubenstein, 'What is the *Gesta Francorum*, and Who was Peter Tudebode?' *Revue Mabillon* 16 (2005): 179–204; Jean Flori, 'De l'anonyme Normand à Tudebode et aux *Gesta Francorum*, l'impact de la propagande de Bohémond sur la critique textuelle des sources de la Première Croisade', *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 102 (2007): 717–46. Damien-Grint asserts that crusading initially inspired vernacular *chansons de geste* rather than 'histories', but it should be pointed out that these still fulfilled a historical purpose. Peter Damien-Grint, *The New Historians of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1999), 10–11. A knight, Geoffrey of Bechada, is also believed to have produced a vernacular poem on the First Crusade during the early twelfth century, a fragment of which was reworked into Occitan: Linda M. Paterson and Carol E. Sweetenham, eds. and trans., *The Canso d'Antioca: an Occitan Epic Chronicle of the First Crusade* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 5–7. Bouchard suggests that the crusades were 'an inspiration to the writers of epics and romances, who were able to have their Christian and chivalrous heroes fight Muslims, thus exercising their warrior skills without endangering their souls': Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Strong of Body, Brave and Noble: Chivalry and Society in Medieval France* (London: Cornell University Press, 1998), 84.

[6] See Giles Constable, 'Medieval Charters as a Source for the History of the Crusades', in *Crusade and Settlement*, ed. Peter W. Edbury (Cardiff: University College Cardiff Press, 1985), 73–89; Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders 1095–1131* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); and Corliss Konwiser Slack, *Crusade Charters 1138–1270* (Tempe: Arizona Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2001). Monastic chroniclers were often keen to assert that they had consulted eyewitnesses to crusading events where they could, for example, William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, eds. and trans. Roger A. B. Mynors, Rodney M. Thompson and Michael Winterbottom. 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998–9), 1: 658–9. For poems and songs see below nn. 8, 18 and 24.

exploration of crusading themes in fictional Old French literature, and Smith's work on the French literary context of crusading in the mid-thirteenth century.[7] Crusade songs, which performed motivational as well as commemorative functions, have also attracted considerable attention as measures of lay enthusiasm.[8] Latin crusade narratives, usually authored by ecclesiastics, had an impact on the secular courts too, as evidenced by their presentation to various monarchs.[9] Historical texts, in Latin or the vernacular, formed an important component in the remembrance of key crusading events, but also placed crusade ideals into a framework of social values with which their intended audiences could easily identify. An important avenue of investigation is to examine two lynchpins of knightly culture: honour and shame. According to Crouch, in the developmental stages of the pre-chivalric noble *habitus*, 'it was desire for honour and fear of shame which policed the whole system.'[10] In order to explore these concepts in a crusading context, we must consider how far knights were motivated to crusade by the rhetoric of honour and shame, and how authors recording their activities employed these notions to explain crusaders' experiences. Shame and honour appear in most crusade narratives in some form or other; this article will provide an evaluation of their employment in the vernacular histories written by Fourth Crusaders Robert of Clari and Geoffrey of Villehardouin.

---

[7] David A. Trotter, *Medieval French Literature and the Crusades, 1100–1300* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1988). Trotter focused solely on crusading to the Holy Land, however (18–20). Caroline Smith, *Crusading in the Age of Joinville* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).

[8] J. Bédier and P. Aubry, eds., *Les Chansons de Croisade* (Paris: H. Champion, 1909), included a collection of 29 songs, and the works of other poets such as Marcabru and Rutebeuf have also attracted the attention of crusade scholars. For overviews see Michael Routledge 'Songs', in *The Oxford Illustrated History of the Crusades*, ed. Jonathan Riley Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 91–111; Elizabeth Siberry, 'Troubadours, Trouvères, Minnesingers and the Crusades', *Studi Medievali* 29 (1988): 19–43; C. Dijkstra, 'Troubadours, Trouvères and Crusade Lyrics', in *Le rayonnement des troubadours. Actes du colloque de l'AIEO, Association Internationale d'Études Occitanes, Amsterdam, 16–18 Octobre 1995*, ed. A Touber (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1998), 173–84, and Smith, *Crusading*, 15–45. See also W.C. Jordan 'The Representation of the Crusades in the Songs Attributed to Thibaud, Count Palatine of Champagne', *Journal of Medieval History* 25 (1999): 27–34; idem, '"Amen!" cinq fois "Amen!" Les chansons de la croisade égyptienne de Saint Louis, une source négligée d'opinion royaliste', *Médiévales* 34 (1998): 79–90; and idem, 'The Rituals of War: Departure for Crusade in Thirteenth-Century France', in *The Book of Kings: Art, War and the Morgan Library's Medieval Picture Bible*, eds. William Noel and Daniel Weiss (London: Third Millennium, 2002), 99–105; William E. Jackson, 'Poet, Woman and Crusade in Songs of Marcabru, Guiot de Dijon, and Albrecht von Johansdorf', *Medievalia* 22 (1999): 265–89; and R.L. Crocker, 'Early Crusade Songs', in *The Holy War*, ed. T.P. Murphy (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1976), 78–98. For further editions of songs, see Simon Gaunt, Ruth Harvey and Linda Paterson, eds., *Marcabru: a Critical Edition* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000) and Rutebeuf, *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. M Zink. 2 vols. (Paris: Bordas, 1989–90).

[9] For example, the *Historia Iherosilimitana* of Robert the Monk commissioned for Frederick Barbarossa *c*.1188 before he departed on the Third Crusade, now: The Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat. Lat. 2001. A manuscript comprising histories written by Fulcher of Chartres, Raymond of Aguilers and Walter the Chancellor was presented to Louis VII by William Grassegals, who claimed to have been on the First Crusade. The 1137 letter accompanying it exhorted the king to follow the example of his forefathers. William Grassegals, 'Monitum', in *RHC Occ.* 3: 317–18. See Jay Rubenstein, 'Putting History to Use: Three Crusade Chronicles in Context', *Viator* 35 (2004): 131–67. Naus has recently argued for this connection stemming from the earlier twelfth century. James L. Naus, 'The French Royal Court and the Memory of the First Crusade', *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 55 (2011): 49–78. The crusading activities of the aristocracy also appeared in local and dynastic narrative histories, see Nicholas Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps: the Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012), *passim*.

[10] David Crouch, *The Birth of Nobility: Constructing Aristocracy in England and France 900–1300*, (Harlow: Pearson/Longman, 2005), 79.

Honour and shame

Concepts of honour and shame exist in most societies; their exact meanings vary according to the contemporary framework of social morality and acceptability in which they manifest.[11] They are not necessarily binary opposites. In its broadest sense, honour can be interpreted as a combination of personal worth (or self-esteem), and worth in the eyes of contemporaries – reputation (*fama*) – which can be damaged by shameful acts. Such acts can either be perpetrated by the individuals themselves, or against their persons by an external agent, 'shaming' them.[12] During the period in which crusading developed, honour and shame were invariably associated with peer evaluation in the aristocratic classes. They were measured through a combination of factors: success on the battlefield, noble birth and family reputation, the possession of wealth, and largesse in its distribution. Nobles were expected to lead by example through Christian behaviour and morality, 'the Davidic ethic'.[13] Honour and shame were not precise constructs, however. They could be perceived differently in relation to status, wealth, ethnicity, gender or religion where certain characteristics and behaviour were deemed acceptable within groups that shared identities. Some consideration was also given to circumstances beyond an individual's control, but praiseworthy or shameful behaviour could lead to inclusion or exclusion from the group, depending on the forbearance of peers. This exclusion might last until a person took steps to redeem themselves.[14]

The public nature of honour and shame is key to understanding how people were motivated to maintain their social bonds, as medieval culture was still predominantly visual and oral rather than written. Social relationships were established and governed by public demonstrations of commitment: homage, investiture or taking the cross, for example. Justice and contrition (penance) were also dealt with publicly.[15] However, songs and histories preserving the deeds of noble individuals and families were growing in popularity and, especially if they were written down, could also have an impact on conventions surrounding honour and shame.[16] The idea of preserving bold

[11] Unni Wikan has explored the relationship between the two in a study based on modern Cairo and Oman. Unni Wikan, 'Shame and Honour, a Contestable Pair', *Man* 19 (1984): 635–52. See also Crouch, *Birth of Nobility*, 79–80.

[12] Herzfeld warns against 'massive generalisations' in terms of honour and shame when applied to different societies. Michael Herzfeld, 'Honour and Shame: Problems in the Comparative Analysis of Moral Systems', *Man* 15 (1980): 339–51.

[13] Crouch, *Birth of Nobility*, 56–80. Following the epistemological groundwork laid by nineteenth-century historians, Crouch subdivides the key qualities of the emergent nobility into loyalty, forbearance, hardihood, largesse, the Davidic ethic and honour. Keen, *Chivalry*, 2, cited *prouesse*, *loyauté*, *largesse*, *courtoisie* and *franchise*, 'the free and frank bearing that is visible testimony to the combination of good birth with virtue'. Nigel Saul, *For Honour and Fame: Chivalry in England 1066–1500* (London: Bodley Head, 2011), 3, explores some of the problems defining chivalry in both medieval and modern sources, but considers its central qualities to be 'loyalty, generosity, dedication, courage and courtesy'.

[14] For example, Stephen of Blois' return to the Holy Land on the 1101 crusade after his desertion of the First Crusaders at Antioch in 1098.

[15] For the public nature of the crusade oath, see James Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law and the Crusader* (Madison WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969), 45, n. 60; 49; 60–2. The historical importance of public shaming in terms of regulating social behaviour has also been explored in recent studies such as Judith Rowbotham, Marianna Murayeva and David Nash, eds., *Shame, Blame and Culpability: Crime and Violence in the Modern State* (London: Routledge, 2013), especially Part I, 'Theorising Shame'.

[16] The literacy of the nobility is difficult to ascertain, but there was an interest in the patronage of both verse and prose with historical themes, especially in terms of family history. See Gabrielle M. Spiegel, *Romancing the Past: the Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-Century France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 11–54; Jean Dunbabin, 'Discovering a Past for the French Aristocracy', in *The Perception of the Past in Twelfth Century Europe*, ed. Paul Magdalino (London: Hambledon Press, 1992), 1–14; and Keen, *Chivalry*, 32. Of particular interest in a crusading context is Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps*.

deeds for posterity, or worse, incurring an everlasting reputation for shame, was yet another means of imposing restraints on knightly behaviour. To an extent, such written examples complemented the reformist ideals of knighthood encapsulated by crusading. Both scholars and poets were trained in a tradition of rhetoric where the two principal functions were *praise* and *blame*, for which 'the ideology of the crusade … provided the perfect structure.'[17]

The literary and social contexts of the Fourth Crusade

Typically it is to the literature of the courts – epics, *chansons de geste* and romances – that scholars turn when trying to establish the lay values which underpinned knightly honour.[18] Some lay-authored histories, especially the thirteenth-century prose accounts of John of Joinville, Geoffrey of Villehardouin and Robert of Clari, are often included in such studies because they are seen to provide a genuine knightly perspective despite the religious aspects of their subject matter.[19] They are an essential starting point for a study in this field. As Smith has recently given detailed consideration to the social and literary context of Joinville, this article will focus on the Fourth Crusade.[20] In some respects, it is an expedition ideally placed for a study of honour and shame, precisely because of the controversy surrounding its course, and the ultimate capture of Constantinople in 1204. It produced some of the earliest surviving vernacular prose narratives authored by identifiable lay participants, giving a first-hand indication of how knights understood their own crusading experience and interpreted it for an audience of their peers. Keen equated Villehardouin's work completely with the 'language of the *chansons*' and 'the classic chivalrous qualities of the warrior'.[21] Noble has recently argued to the contrary: that both Villehardouin and Clari failed to capitalise on the potential for epic in the exploits of individual crusaders, because they were either uninterested in doing so or simply lacked the skill. For Noble, the historical events of the Fourth Crusade and the troubled establishment of the Latin empire resulted in a general lack of enthusiasm for portraying its participants as 'epic heroes'.[22]

It is unquestionably important to consider the literary influences an author, and to examine the style in which he or she chooses to convey a narrative. However, attempting to categorise these early works on the basis of genre, especially in the context of the crusades, can be

[17] Routledge, 'Songs', 99.

[18] The Old French Crusade Cycle is a testament to the popularity of crusading themes in vernacular verse, but it initially attracted less attention from early scholars of *chansons* and epics. It was dismissed as 'too close to history' and seen to lack a true epic aesthetic: see Emanuel Mickel, 'Writing the Record: the Old French Crusade Cycle', in *Epic and Crusade: Proceedings of the Colloquium of the Société Rencesvales British Branch held at Lucy Cavendish College Cambridge 27–28 March 2004*, eds. Philip E. Bennett, Anne Elizabeth Cobby and Jane E. Everson (Edinburgh: Société Rencesvales British Branch, 2006), 39–64.

[19] For example, Richard W. Kaeuper, *Holy Warriors* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 2009), 66–93, draws more extensively from crusade sources than in his previous works, including lay-authored narratives and two texts probably written by ecclesiastics (*De expugnatione Lyxbonensi* and the *Itinerarium peregrinorum et gesta regis Ricardi*), because he considers them to be 'close to a knightly point of view'. See Charles Wendell David and Jonathan Phillips, eds. and trans., *De expugnatione Lyxbonensi* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), and Helen Nicholson, trans., *The Chronicle of the Third Crusade: the Itinerarium peregrinorum et gesta regis Ricardi* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997), 1–14.

[20] Smith, *Crusading*. The importance of Henri of Valenciennes as an early lay prose chronicler has also been established, but as he focuses entirely on the later settlement period, his work is not considered in this article. Peter Noble, 'The Importance of Old French Chronicles as Historical Sources of the Fourth Crusade and the Early Latin Empire of Constantinople', *Journal of Medieval History* 27 (2001): 399–416.

[21] Keen, *Chivalry*, 55.

[22] Peter Noble '1204: the Crusade without Epic Heroes', in *Epic and Crusade*, ed. Bennett, Cobby and Everson, 89–104.

counter-productive.[23] Only a very few, celebrated individuals populating crusade histories became heroes of epic poetry, and they were almost exclusively associated with the resounding success of First Crusade.[24] Whether Latin or vernacular, verse or prose, narrative sources outlining the deeds of crusaders invariably included examples of individual heroism, treachery, cowardice and shame to greater and lesser degrees; in doing so, they provided a growing corpus of guidelines for appropriate behaviour on crusade. Some also drew overtly from the realms of contemporary fiction in order to relate to their audiences.[25] They recorded not just the achievements of crusade heroes, but also their setbacks and failures with a view to setting future crusaders on a path to success. Crusades were distinct in certain elements from other types of warfare, but both the secular *chevalerie* and religiously motivated crusaders were taught to idolise prowess, which provided a common ideological ground for the ecclesiastics and laymen writing about these expeditions.

In the period before the Fourth Crusade, the courtly literature of the twelfth century had broadly espoused lay ideals of noble virtue in the form of the *prodome*: the 'worthy aristocrat' who embodied characteristics fundamental to emergent chivalric ideology. He wielded military and judicial power with wisdom and restraint, displaying generosity, determination on the battlefield and conducting himself sufficiently well amongst his peers in order to attain 'honour'.[26] Crouch argues that the first two decades of the thirteenth century, contemporary to the Fourth Crusade, were fundamental for the development of the chivalric 'code', and encompassed the transformation from the *prodome* to the *pro chevalier*.[27] Developing chivalric culture also allowed for the growth of vernacular literature, including histories designed for a lay audience.[28] These developments had a direct impact on recruitment for, and the recording of, the Fourth Crusade. Participants came from areas where vernacular literary culture was flowering, such as the court of Champagne made famous by the patronage of Countess Marie, and Monferrat, the Lombard court of crusade leader Boniface.[29] Susan Edgington and Carol Sweetenham have linked the existing poetic tradition of the *Chanson d'Antioche* to St Pol in Picardy at around 1200, when enthusiasm for the Fourth Crusade (in which Count Hugh IV participated) was at its height.[30] At the outset of the Third Crusade, Conon of Béthune, knight, poet and serial crusader, interpreted the expedition as a call to arms from his lord, but also exploited its chivalric elements in the oft-cited song *Ahi! Amors con dure departie*. He spoke of how great and small

[23] There is a debate over whether crusade songs should be considered to be a distinct genre, as suggested by Cathrynke Dijktstra, *La chanson de croisade: étude thématique d'un genre hybride* (Amsterdam: Schiphouwer en Brinkman, 1995). For opposing views, see Routledge, 'Songs', 93, and Smith, *Crusading*, 19.
[24] For example, Godfrey of Bouillon (*Enfances de Godefroi*), Bohemond of Taranto (*Les chetifs*) and Baldwin of Boulogne (*La chanson de rois Baudouin*); see Mickel, 'Writing the Record', *passim*. In the case of the Third Crusade, Noble also includes Richard the Lionheart, citing Ailes' study of Ambroise. See Noble, '1204', 89–90, and Marianne Ailes, 'Heroes of War: Ambroise's Heroes of the Third Crusade', in *Writing War: Medieval Literary Responses to Warfare*, eds. Corinne Saunders, François Le Saux and Neil Thomas (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004), 29–48.
[25] For examples, see Trotter, *Medieval French Literature*, 20–8, and Susan Edgington, 'Albert of Aachen and the Chansons de Geste', in *The Crusades and Their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton*, eds. John France and William G. Zajac (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), 23–37.
[26] See Crouch, *Birth of Nobility*, 32–3.
[27] Crouch, *Birth of Nobility*, 29–86.
[28] Sarah Kay, *The Chansons de Geste in the Age of Romance: Political Fictions* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 1–21.
[29] Donald E. Queller and Thomas F. Madden, *The Fourth Crusade: the Conquest of Constantinople.* 2nd edn. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997), 5.
[30] Susan B. Edgington and Carol Sweetenham, trans., *The Chanson d'Antioche*: *an Old French Account of the First Crusade* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2011), 20–4.

should take the field in chivalry to win honour, paradise, reputation and their ladies' love. He also showed concern about the shame which might be incurred if those who considered themselves honourable failed to act and take the cross in order to avenge their Lord, who had been grievously humiliated through the loss of Jerusalem in 1187.[31] Conon later accompanied his lord, Baldwin of Flanders, on the Fourth Crusade, and acted as an envoy on several occasions: Villehardouin was keen to emphasise his eloquence, and he evidently believed firmly in the cause and progress of the Fourth Crusade.[32] Guy, castellan of Coucy, was another Third and Fourth Crusader whose poems have survived for posterity: *Li nouviauz tanz et mais violete* and *A vous, amant, plus qu'a nule autre gent*.[33] Both Conon and Guy seem to have focused on the Third Crusade, but the Fourth Crusade, too, inspired songs. One participant, Hugh of Berzé, wrote *S'onques nus hom por dure departie*, and the castellan of Arras (Huon, son of Baldwin, whose presence on the crusade is uncertain) wrote *Aler m'estuet la u je trairai paine*. Both poems focused on love, rather than recruitment, but still espoused ideas about a crusader's duty.[34] Educated and talented composers were, therefore, present on the Fourth Crusade. The lack of any surviving writing in epic form does not necessarily constitute proof that composers thought the Fourth Crusade lacked 'epic' quality.[35] The events of the Fourth Crusade thus need further examination to understand how they forced its participants to evaluate both the actions of comrades and the deeds of opponents in terms of honour and shame, and subsequently forged a controversial historical legacy for this expedition.

The Fourth Crusade as a focal point for honour and shame

Historiography over the last century and beyond has for the most part retained a scandalised view of the Fourth Crusade's diversion to Constantinople and its sack.[36] Measuring the attitude of contemporaries to these events is rather more complex. In 1198, Christendom had not recovered from the loss of most of the kingdom of Jerusalem to Saladin, a failure compounded by the inability of the Third Crusade to redeem the Holy City from its perceived 'shame' at the hands of the enemy.

[31] Conon of Bethune, 'Ahi! Amours, con dure departie', in Bédier and Aubry, eds., *Chansons de Croisade*, 27–37. For Conon's role in the Fourth Crusade, see Jean Longnon, *Les compagnons de Villehardouin: recherches sur les croisés de la quatrième croisade* (Paris: Champion, 1978), 146–9.
[32] Villehardouin, Chapters 144 and 213.
[33] Bédier and Aubry, eds., *Chansons de croisade*, 85–106. For his crusading career, see Longnon, *Compagnons*, 118.
[34] See Bédier and Aubry, eds., *Chansons de Croisade*, 121–31 and 135–41, and Longnon, *Compagnons*, 213–14.
[35] Noble argues that the Fourth Crusade was 'not remembered for any epic quality', that no writers were interested in presenting it in epic form 'and most of them probably lacked the talent to do so'. Noble, '1204', 104.
[36] Steven Runciman, a Byzantinist, was possibly the most damning, but other titles such as John Godfrey's *1204: the Unholy Crusade* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), also indicate this position. Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*. 3 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951–4), 3: 476–7. For a recent critical assessment of Runciman's work, see Christopher Tyerman, *The Debate on the Crusades* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), 192–9. Later scholarship has provided a more nuanced perspective, revising the roles of the Venetians and Boniface of Monferrat, and exploring a much wider range of crusader motivations, but tensions between different schools continue, notwithstanding the political differences evidenced by Pope John Paul II's apology for the sack of Constantinople in 2004. See Thomas Madden, 'Inside and Outside the Fourth Crusade', *International History Review* 17 (1995): 726–43; Queller and Madden, *Fourth Crusade*; Michael Angold, 'The Road to 1204: the Byzantine Background to the Fourth Crusade', *Journal of Medieval History* 25 (1999): 257–78; Jonathan Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade and the Sack of Constantinople* (London: Penguin, 2004); and Jonathan Harris, 'The Debate on the Fourth Crusade', *History Compass* 2 (2004), at http://history-compass.com

Pope Innocent III's letter of 1198 exhorted knights to cease fighting amongst themselves, 'rebut the insults of the insulters' and redeem the honour of Christ and the Holy Land, 'profaned by the impious'. He described in vivid terms the insults (presumably imagined) that were offered by their adversaries, suggesting that Muslims were openly proclaiming their superiority over the English, French, Germans and Spaniards, and casting aspersions upon the power of the Christian God whose advocates were so quick to run away and make excuses for their cowardice.[37] Abbot Martin of Pairis, preaching to the people of Basel, claimed to speak on behalf of Christ himself, 'exiled from the city which he consecrated with his own blood', imploring 'true warriors' (*validi bellatores*) 'to restore him to his patrimony, from which he has been so unmercifully expelled'.[38] Such emotive exhortations were deliberately designed to incite a response and to appeal to cultural notions about redemption from shame. They were not an innovation of Fourth Crusade preaching: similar themes can be found in the accounts of the speech of Urban II, in the crusade encyclicals of Eugenius III and Gregory VIII, in the sermon by the bishop of Oporto to the Lisbon crusaders, in the letters of Bernard of Clairvaux and also in the sermons of later preachers.[39] That secular participants understood the crusade message in these terms is also clear. The envoys sent to bargain for Venetian aid deliberately reflected this preaching theme, mentioning Christ's 'shame' (*honte*) twice in their appeal to Enrico Dandolo, the doge, and later in almost exactly the same terms to the audience at the public meeting organised by him at St Mark's.[40]

Despite initial recruitment problems, the first large body of knights to sign up for the expedition had gathered to take part in a tournament in November 1199 at the castle of Écry-sur-Aisne in northern France. The idea that they were inspired to repent their worldly ways by the impromptu preaching of Fulk of Neuilly has now lost credence, but even staging a commitment to crusade in such a public fashion was a shrewd way of bolstering the number of participants, as some might join simply to avoid being shamed in the eyes of their peers.[41] Leading by individual example was also important. The host, Count Thibaut III of Champagne, and his cousin, Louis of Blois, were the first to put down their arms and take up the cross. According

[37] O. Hageneder and others, eds., *Die Register Innocenz' III*. (Graz: H. Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1964–), vol. 1, Reg. I: 336, translated in Andrea, *Contemporary Sources*, 9–19.
[38] Gunther of Pairis, *Hystoria Constantinopolitana*, ed. Peter Orth (Hildesheim: Weidman, 1994), 111–12 and 113; Gunther of Pairis, *The Capture of Constantinople*, trans. Alfred J. Andrea (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997), 69–70.
[39] Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana (1095–1127)*, ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1913), 135–6; Robert of Rheims, *Historia Hierosolymitana,* in *RHC Occ.*, 3: 717–882 (728); Baudri of Bourgueil, *Historia Jerosolimitana*, in *RHC Occ*., 4: 1–111 (13–15); Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta per Francos et cinq autres textes*, ed. Robert B.C. Huygens. Corpus Christianorum continuatio mediaevalis 127A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1996), 111–17; Eugenius III, *Quantum Praedecessores*, in Rolf Grosse, 'Überlegungen zum Kreuzzugsaufruf Eugens III von 1145/6: mit einer Neuedition von JL8876', *Francia* 18 (1991): 85–92; St Bernard, 'Epistola ad orientalis Franciae clerum et populum', in *S. Bernardi abbatis primi Clarae-Vallensis Opera omnia*, ed. J.-P. Migne. Patrologiae cursus completes series Latina 182 (Paris: Garnier Fratres, Editores et J.-P. Migne Successores, 1879), cols. 564–8 (letter 363). The sermon by 'a certain priest' – probably Raol – focuses very strongly on concepts of honour, shame and duty: Wendell David and Phillips, eds., *De expugnatione Lyxbonensi*, 146–59. See also Christoph Maier, *Crusade Ideology and Propaganda: Model Sermons for Preaching the Cross* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000). The idea of the Holy Land being defiled and shamed has been explored in some depth by Penny Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land 1095–1270* (Cambridge, MA: Medieval Academy of America, 1991), and more recently Susanna Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance, 1095–1216* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2011), especially 117–43.
[40] Villehardouin, Chapters 18 and 27.
[41] Edgar Holmes McNeal, 'Fulk of Neuilly and the Tournament at Écry', *Speculum* 28 (1953): 371–5. See also Cole, *Preaching of the Crusades*, 87–92.

to Villehardouin many others, impressed by the example of such high men, followed suit.[42] Lordly enthusiasm was evidently an important factor in securing recruitment; the troubadour Raimbaut of Vaqueiras asserted that he had no intention of crusading until inspired by the example of his lord, Boniface of Monferrat.[43] Whether or not Écry was 'staged', these knights were responding in a public fashion to the papal directive: they ceased fighting amongst themselves and took up the cross.

Events during the course of the Fourth Crusade put to the test the fragile bonds holding the crusading army together. Crusaders were forced to explore the boundaries of their social and religious commitments in the face of economic and physical hardships, disillusionment and disagreement. The strain on knightly loyalties began with the deaths of crusade leaders such as Thibaut III of Champagne and Geoffrey of Perche, followed by the failure of the bargain with Venice. Diversions to Zara and later Constantinople exposed divisions not only between leaders, but also among their vassals and the rank and file, leading to oath-breaking and desertion. Byzantine imperial intrigues invited scandalised retellings of bad faith, betrayal and murder. The sack of Constantinople in 1204, with its accompanying atrocities, squabbles over booty and new titles, exposed yet more layers of conflict and attempts at resolution. All provide rich material for investigating the development of social bonds and constructs, and we are fortunate enough to have two narratives which act as similar, if not identical, lenses for comparison.

Honour and shame in Robert of Clari and Geoffrey of Villehardouin

The histories of Robert of Clari and Geoffrey of Villehardouin provide us with a benchmark in crusade historiography.[44] Similarities in genre, language and lay perspective mean that their accounts lend themselves well to comparison, but the authors' differences in social status and focus introduce competing notions of honour and shame. They are sufficiently well known to need little introduction, but it is worth highlighting that Villehardouin was an experienced crusader, marshal of Champagne, a high-profile negotiator and member of the crusade leadership, and ultimately a settler in the new Latin empire. Manuscript tradition suggests that his history was influential.[45] Robert of Clari was a knight from Picardy, whose small patrimony of Cléry le Prenois indicated limited financial resources.[46] His history only survives in one manuscript.[47]

[42] Villehardouin, Chapters 3–4.
[43] 'Epic Letter', in *The Poems of Raimbaut of Vaqueiras*, ed. and trans. Joseph Linskill (The Hague: Mouton, 1964), 303–8 (304).
[44] See Peter Noble, 'Importance of Old French Chronicles', 399–416, and Marianne Ailes, 'Early French Chronicle – History or Literature?', *Journal of Medieval History* 26 (2000): 301–12.
[45] His history survives in six manuscripts and has been edited and translated on a number of occasions, aside from the Faral edition (n. 1 above) used here, including Natalis de Wailly, ed. and trans., *Histoire de la conquête de Constantinople par Geoffroi de Villehardouin avec la continuation de Henri de Valenciennes* (Paris: Hachette, 1870). See Villehardouin, xxxvii–xliv, for earlier versions. More recent works include Geoffroy de Villehardouin, *La conqueste de Constantinople*, ed. J.R. White (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968); and M.R.B. Shaw, trans., *Joinville and Villehardouin: Chronicles of the Crusades* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963). The last has been retranslated with a new introduction and notes as Caroline Smith, trans., *Joinville and Villehardouin: Chronicles of the Crusades* (London: Penguin, 2008); hereafter, Smith, *Chronicles*.
[46] Clari, xxiii.
[47] The more recently discovered Clari was first edited as Robert of Clari, *La conquête de Constantinople* ed. P. Lauer (Paris: Champion, 1924), later translated into English as Robert of Clari, *The Conquest of Constantinople*, trans. Edgar Holmes McNeal (New York: Columbia University Press, 1936). The Old French and English parallel text produced by Peter Noble in 2005 provides a more literal translation (n. 1, above).

Both were keen to justify the course and purpose of the crusade, but chose differing examples of individual and group behaviour to support this agenda.

Both authors expressed the concepts of honour and shame in a variety of ways.[48] When shame was mentioned explicitly, it was usually conveyed by forms of the word *honte*, but in many cases shame was implied rather than openly stated.[49] *Blasme* (blame, censure, reproach) was also used to indicate when the actions of a group or an individual were considered socially unacceptable. In comparison, the word *onor* and its variants were used relatively infrequently. *Onor* was usually used to indicate the conferring of a gift or title, or the ceremonial manner in which someone was received or welcomed, rather than to describe a personal characteristic.[50] In their portrayal of crusading individuals, both authors used a range of vocabulary when they wished to convey the positive qualities of nobles. Villehardouin overwhelmingly referred to high status using *haut* and often described a noble leader as a *prodome* (worthy man) and others as *chevaliers*. These expressions were sometimes used together for high-ranking men in specific reference to someone's fighting ability. The term *chevalier* was also employed to indicate the composition of troops, especially when differentiating between a knight and a mounted sergeant (*serjant a cheval*). Knights and lords were variously described as *bon* (good), *pro* (worthy – commonly spelt *preuz*), *hardi* (brave) or *vaillant* (valiant). Other 'good men' comprised knights, but also sergeants and men-at-arms.[51] Although influenced by his Picard dialect, Clari used similar descriptors including *prodome*, *pro* (*preus*), *vaillant*, *hardi* and occasionally *bel* (fair or good, most commonly spelt *biax*). Individuals could also be described as behaving badly or in a cowardly fashion, usually with variations on *faire mal* or *mauvais*. For oath-breaking or duplicity, *traison* or *triche* might be used. Further terms relating to the idea of good lordship were also employed. Leaders with economic power and a capacity for patronage were described in terms of *richece* (wealth) or *largece* (generosity), and occasionally they were praised for their wisdom, usually conveyed by *sages*. These terms were often used in association with certain key themes relating to honour and shame which appear in both texts: military prowess (or lack of it), social status, the bargain with Venice, desertion and leadership.

Military prowess and social status

Knightly prowess (*proeche*) was a key component in the success of any military expedition. Villehardouin and Clari were keen to distinguish the prowess of individual crusaders as evidence of divine approval for the venture, even if they did not give blow-by-blow details of each encounter in which these warriors engaged. Rising stars included Peter of Bracieux, a vassal of Louis of Blois from near Beauvais in the county of Clermont. He distinguished himself in several crusade battles and continued to maintain a high profile in the establishment of the Latin empire, dying around 1210. Clari, Villehardouin, Hugh of St Pol and even Nicetas Choniates mention his reputation for bravery.[52] The key to Peter's high profile was the quantity of his deeds of prowess:

[48] The orthography, vocabulary and style of both authors have attracted considerable attention. Key studies include J. Dufournet, *Les écrivains de la IVe croisade; Villehardouin et Clari* (Paris: Société d'Édition d'Enseignement Supérieur, 1973); Jeanette Beer, *Villehardouin: Epic Historian* (Geneva: Droz, 1968); Gérard Jacquin, *Le style historique dans les récits français et latins de la quatrième croisade* (Paris: Champion, 1986).

[49] Terms vary significantly in spelling throughout both texts. Where not quoting directly in this paragraph I have standardised spellings using Alan Hindley, Frederick W. Langley and Brian J. Levy, eds., *Old French-English Dictionary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

[50] Crouch, *Birth of Nobility*, 280–92. There were a couple of exceptions, for example, see below n. 60.

[51] Villehardouin, Chapters 48 and 49.

[52] Longnon, *Compagnons*, 91–8.

Robert of Clari seems to have kept a running total, almost as if he were the champion of a tournament. Peter was described as a worthy, hardy and valiant knight, who 'did the greatest feats amongst both the rich and the poor', to the extent that he later attracted the attention of the Vlachs and Cumans, who marvelled greatly at his knightly excellence.[53] Villehardouin concurred that Peter won greater praise (*plus le pris*) than anyone else during the first siege of Constantinople in 1203, but attributed this to the fact that he had camped closest to the gate near the Blachernae palace from which the Greeks sallied forth most frequently. Noble interprets this as a criticism, but Villehardouin does not otherwise question Peter's military reputation.[54] The knight was described as 'one of their best knights' later in the text, and he went on to take part alongside the author in what Villehardouin describes as one of the most dangerous missions ever undertaken.[55]

Social status was evidently important to Clari, as he differentiated between rich and poor knights who had performed great deeds of prowess, presenting them in two separate lists and explicitly recording their names for posterity.[56] He included his brother, Aleaumes, in the latter group, indicating his own lower social status. This corroborated other information Clari provided about his background and the position he took in relation to the actions of the crusade leadership. It also reinforced contemporary ideas about opportunities for *li grant et li menour* on crusade.[57] Clari's list of the poor reveals the desire of the author to commemorate those who might not otherwise be deemed important enough to be included in the annals of history. Villehardouin did not make such overt distinctions, perhaps because of his own higher status. He emphasised social divisions between the 'high barons' and other good men or knights. Noble asserts that, unlike Clari, Villehardouin seldom singled out individuals for praise, passing over 'potential epic heroes' like Renier of Trit and Thierry of Termonde. There were a few exceptions, especially Villehardouin's praise of Boniface of Monferrat (on his election and later at his death), but Noble puts these down to 'the epic influence which appears from time to time' in the marshal's history, rather than interpreting them as true epic descriptions.[58] In fact, it is striking how often Villehardouin praised the prowess and character of individuals on their deaths rather than during active conflict on the battlefield. As it progresses, his narrative takes on qualities similar to a eulogy, as more and more *bons gents* and *chevaliers* from the crusader host met their ends, for example Peter of Amiens, Gerard of Mauchicourt and Giles of Aunoi.[59] Even before the crusade began, he lamented the losses of Thibaut III of Champagne and Geoffrey of Perche, heaping effusive praise on their personal qualities.[60] Later, Matthew of Montmorency, who died before the second siege of

[53] Clari, Chapters 1 and 106. In Chapter 75, he reiterated Peter's supremacy above all the other high and low knights for the quantity of his deeds of prowess.
[54] Villehardouin, Chapter 169. Noble suggests that this was because of rivalries between contingents: Noble, '1204', 95. See also Jean Dufournet, 'Villehardouin et les champenois dans la quatrième croisade', in *Les champenois et la croisade: actes des quatrièmes journées rémoises 27–28 novembre 1987*, ed. Yvonne Bellenger and Danielle Quéruel (Paris: Aux Amateurs de Livres, 1989), 55–69.
[55] 'un de lor bons chevaliers …' At the failed siege of Adrianople Peter had been injured in the head by a rock thrown from a mangonel, but recovered. Villehardouin, Chapter 396; Smith, *Chronicles*, 106. The rescue mission was to relieve Renier of Trit at Stenimaka: Villehardouin, Chapter 436.
[56] He distinguishes clearly between 'des riques hommes qui plus y fisent d'armes' and 'des povres'. Clari, Chapter 1.
[57] Conon of Bethune, 'Ahi! Amours, con dure departie', 32 (n. 31, above).
[58] Noble, '1204', 94–5.
[59] Villehardouin, Chapter 291.
[60] He called Thibaut one of the finest men in the world, emphasising his qualities as a lord and the calibre of his vassals. Of Geoffrey, he wrote 'mult ere hals ber et honorez, et bon chevaliers', a rare combination of the title of knight alongside 'high baron', as well as using honour in a descriptive capacity. Villehardouin, Chapters 37 and 46.

Constantinople, was described as 'one of the best knights from the kingdom of France'. He had been deeply loved and respected, and was one the greatest losses to the stricken army.[61] Like Clari, Villehardouin evinced a strong desire to commemorate fallen comrades, and while this may add to the rather pessimistic mood of the history, he evidently considered them to be worthy of high praise.[62] There were also exceptions to this format when Villehardouin mentioned acts of battlefield bravery which he considered to be extraordinary. During the Greek sallies from the city of Constantinople, the marshal claimed that he could not begin to describe all the blows given and received in the battle, but recounted how one of Henry of Flanders' knights joined in the fray with nothing but a padded jerkin, steel cap and shield. 'He acquitted himself very well (*le fist mult bien*) as he drove the enemy off, and received high praise (*grant pris*) as a result.'[63]

Terminology relating to secular leadership could also apply to religious figures. Villehardouin and Clari both described Fulk of Neuilly and Simon, the Cistercian abbot of Loos, as 'worthy' men.[64] Clari even characterised Bishop Nivelon of Soissons as a *preudons*, and described him as *vallans*.[65] Perhaps this was not surprising, bearing in mind that Clari's own brother was a cleric who seemed to have no qualms about taking up arms: Aleaumes, 'who was very brave and did many deeds of hardiness and prowess'.[66] He 'was so brave (*preus*) in every crisis that he was first in all the attacks wherever he was' and carried out many brave deeds at the capture of the tower at Galata.[67] His bravery seems to have extended to rashness – Clari provides a touching account of how he tried to restrain his brother from crawling through a gap in the wall of Constantinople by grasping his foot. Aleaumes pressed on regardless and met a horde of Greeks with nothing but his knife. He later championed the cause of clerics over the spoils from Constantinople, arguing that they should receive a share equal to that of the knights. In his view, he had armour and a horse, and had done as many if not more feats of arms than his fellow knights. He pleaded this case successfully to Hugh of St Pol.[68]

Evidently, both Clari and Villehardouin were accustomed to naming honourable participants, and shaming those who did not comport themselves adequately, a customary practice even in early crusade narratives such as the *Gesta Francorum*.[69] At a time when personal relationships between lords, vassals and their dependents were key to the success of a campaign, desertion was viewed as the worst kind of betrayal and the most shameful, as it indicated cowardice. It comes as little surprise that in crusade armies made up of diverse contingents, the networks of dependence which maintained unity were highly complex: they were also subject to the fortunes of war and open to abuse in times of hardship. During any crusade expedition financial resources

[61] 'un des meillors chevaliers del roiaume de France': Villehardouin, Chapter 200; Smith, *Chronicles*, 54.
[62] 'Villehardouin is a master of the technique, well known to the professional military, which consists of painting the darkest possible picture of what the enemy might do if he is not immediately wiped out': Paul J. Archambault, *Seven French Chroniclers: Witnesses to History* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1974), 32.
[63] Villehardouin, Chapter 168; Smith, *Chronicles*, 44.
[64] Clari described Fulk as 'molt preudons et molt boins clercs', and Simon as 'molt sages' and 'molt preudons': Clari, Chapter 1. Villehardouin described Fulk as 'saint' (or sain) as well as 'prodome', and Simon as 'sainz hom' and 'prodom'; Villehardouin, Chapters 1, 2, 73, 97 and 206.
[65] Clari, Chapter 1.
[66] Clari, Chapter 1: 'qui molt y fu preus et molt y fist de hardement et de proesches'. I have opted for a more literal translation than Noble here.
[67] Clari, Chapters 75–6.
[68] Clari, Chapter 98.
[69] For further discussion of honour, shame and group identity on the First Crusade, see Natasha Hodgson, 'Reinventing Normans as Crusaders? Ralph of Caen's *Gesta Tancredi*', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 30 (2008): 117–32.

ebbed and flowed with the capture of booty, and personnel changes occurred through death, desertion or the arrival of reinforcements; thus social and military relationships required a degree of flexibility. The leaders of the Fourth Crusade were in the additionally awkward position of having bound themselves by oath to promises which they, or those to whom they were pledged, proved unable to keep, and this determined many of their later actions.[70]

Honour, oath-breaking and desertion

The ability to keep one's word and uphold an oath was a sign of personal integrity and perhaps more importantly, loyalty – a key knightly quality. In Villehardouin's history, the fulfilment of the bargain with Enrico Dandolo, the doge of Venice, was entirely a matter of honour. He asserted that the doge would have been within his rights to take the crusaders' money by default, but the Venetian leader worried that 'we and our country would be soundly blamed (*grant blasme*)' if he did so.[71] Robert of Clari agreed that the wider public image was Dandolo's major concern.[72] Similarly the leaders of the crusade who had committed to attacking Zara in recompense for the money owed to the Venetians could not be seen to renege on the agreement without breaking their word and shaming themselves (*honi*).[73] Later, because they knew they could not give succour to the Holy Land without Alexius' help in Egypt, the leaders agreed on the diversion to Constantinople in order to avoid disgrace: 'it would be dishonourable (*honi*) to refuse it.'[74]

The originators of all these problems, according to Villehardouin, were those who had failed to come to Venice, or had sailed to the Holy Land from other ports. He considered even the latter to be deserters, despite the fact that many would have argued that they were simply fulfilling their crusade vows. As Villehardouin himself points out, the army which ended up at Constantinople represented the minority of those who had taken the cross overall.[75] He consistently emphasised that the other groups were oath-breakers and therefore disgraced. The beneficiaries of Thibaut of Champagne's will had sworn an oath to present themselves at Venice, which some broke and therefore incurred great blame. On his death, Count Geoffrey of Perche left money and armour to his brother Stephen, charging him to fulfil his vow.[76] Unfortunately, Stephen was left behind when crusaders departed from Venice in October 1202, claiming illness. After his recovery he went straight to the Holy Land via Apulia in 1203 with others who received much scorn for their actions. According to Villehardouin, Stephen 'did not do so well at all' (*ne le fist mie si bien*) and 'deserted the army' (*guerpi l'ost*), pointing out that Matthew of Montmorency, who had also been ill in Venice, managed to rejoin them at Zara.[77] As Villehardouin listed others who failed to travel through Venice, the Flemish fleet, under Jean of Nesle, Thierry of Flanders

[70] See Thomas F. Madden, 'Vows and Contracts in the Fourth Crusade: the Treaty of Zara and the Attack on Constantinople in 1204', *International History Review* 15 (1993): 441–68.
[71] Villehardouin, Chapter 62; Smith, *Chronicles*, 19.
[72] The doge reputedly worried that if they reneged on the agreement, 'we [the Venetians] will always be held to be evil cheats.' Clari, Chapter 12.
[73] Villehardouin, Chapter 84.
[74] Villehardouin, Chapter 98; Smith, *Chronicles*, 27.
[75] Villehardouin, Chapter 55. The *Devastatio Constantinopolitana* agrees that those who left with the Venetians were the minority (*minima pars*). Andrea, *Contemporary Sources*, 214, 332. Also see below, n. 80.
[76] See Kathleen Thompson, 'Family Tradition and the Crusading Impulse: the Rotrou Counts of the Perche', *Medieval Prosopography* 19 (1998): 1–33, especially 25–30.
[77] Rotrou of Montfort and Ivo of La Jaille were also named and shamed: Villehardouin, Chapter 79. It is possible that Stephen, like others, was unhappy with direction the crusade took, but the *Devastatio Constantinopolitana* also mentions his ship *Viola* sinking soon after the fleet left Venice. Andrea, *Contemporary Sources*, 333.

and Nicholas of Mailly, came under criticism for breaking their oaths to their lord, Baldwin of Flanders, and the other pilgrims. He accused them of bad faith and cowardice: 'They did not keep the promise they had made to their lord and all the other pilgrims, because these men (like many others) were afraid of the great danger that the army gathered at Venice had undertaken to face.'[78] Failure to keep their promises, sworn on relics, constituted serious social misconduct, but it does not seem to have prevented a large number of crusaders from doing so. Similar accusations of cowardice and oath-breaking were levelled at the bishop of Autun, Count Guy of Forez, Peter Bremond, Bernard of Moreuil, Hugh of Chaumont, Henry of Airaines, John of Villers, Walter of Saint-Denis and his brother, Hugh. Villehardouin recorded that 'they were greatly dishonoured and heavily blamed for this; and they encountered great misfortune afterwards.'[79]

Given Villehardouin's commitment to the crusade which went to Constantinople and his need to justify the crusaders' attack on the city, this judgement is to be expected, but Queller, Compton and Campbell traced the fortunes of this 'neglected majority', and it seems that almost all did meet with defeat, capture or death.[80] Still more good men (*mult bones genz*) went to Apulia from Piacenza, but because of their sins (*por les pechiez*), God would not allow them success; the unhealthy climate of Syria proved fatal to some; others went back to their own country. Villain of Nully, 'one of the best knights in the world', was killed there.[81] Giles of Trasegnies, who died alongside him, was another oath-breaker: the sworn vassal (*hom liges*) of Baldwin of Flanders who had given him 500 *livres* to accompany him on the journey. In describing their deaths, Villehardouin asserted that 'this book is your faithful witness that no man abandoned the army at Venice without some shame or hurt befalling him.'[82] Later at Zara, a number of others deserted: Simon of Montfort and the abbot of Les Vaux-de-Cernay even joined forces with the crusaders' enemy, Andrew of Hungary. 'This was a great injury to the army and a shame to those who inflicted it.'[83] During the winter at the port, there were further desertions: the German Werlander of Borlen abandoned the army and was 'greatly blamed' (*grant blasme*).[84] Renaut of Montmirail contrived to be sent to Syria with his retinue, promising that they would return, but they broke their word. One of the four envoys sent to the pope at that point, Robert of Boves swore on relics that that he would carry out the mission faithfully and loyally, and then rejoin the army, but 'carried out his mission in the worst possible way, broke his promise and took himself off to Syria after the others'.[85]

Redemption from the shame of desertion or oath-breaking was possible, however. When, in the winter of 1204–5, Stephen of Perche came to join the crusaders with some reinforcements, Villehardouin does not seem to have begrudged his return. He was welcomed and given the titular duchy of Philadelphia, and ultimately demonstrated his loyalty by giving his life at the fateful battle before

[78] Villehardouin, Chapter 49; Smith, *Chronicles*, 16.
[79] Villehardouin, Chapter 50; Smith, *Chronicles*, 17.
[80] Donald E. Queller, Thomas K. Compton and Donald A. Campbell, 'The Fourth Crusade: the Neglected Majority', *Speculum* 49 (1974): 441–65. See also Marco Meschini, 'The Four Crusades of 1204', in *The Fourth Crusade, Event, Aftermath and Perceptions. Papers from the Sixth Conference of the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East, Istanbul, Turkey, 25–29 August 2004*, ed. Thomas F. Madden. Crusades Subsidia 2 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 27–42.
[81] 'uns des bons chevaliers del monde': Villehardouin, Chapter 54; Smith, *Chronicles*, 17. Villain was also given this accolade when he died going to the aid of Bohemond IV of Antioch: Villehardouin, Chapter 231.
[82] Villehardouin, Chapters 54 and 231; Smith, *Chronicles*, 61.
[83] Villehardouin, Chapter 110; Smith, *Chronicles*, 30.
[84] Villehardouin, Chapter 101.
[85] Villehardouin, Chapter 106; Smith *Chronicles*, 29. Robert of Clari also notes his desertion: Clari, Chapter 15.

Adrianople in 1205.[86] En route from Corfu, the crusader fleet encountered two ships of pilgrims already returning from the Holy Land. The lords 'were so ashamed that they dared not show themselves', but Baldwin of Flanders sent a vessel to find out their identities. In one of the only attempts by Villehardouin to give character to the lower ranks, he describes a certain enterprising sergeant on one of the ships, who decided to desert his comrades by jumping overboard and swimming over to Baldwin's boat. His motives appear to have been acquisitory rather than religious, as he shouted 'I'm going with these men, since it looks certain they must conquer lands.' Villehardouin clearly saw his behaviour as exemplary: 'because of this it is said that one can turn back from a thousand wicked ways.'[87] This was a great credit to the sergeant, we are told, and the army welcomed him warmly, but the very mention of this man and his low rank also served, in juxtaposition, to increase the shame of his noble lords who were on their way home.

As well as deserters, there were dissenters who stayed with the army but, according to Villehardouin, still tried to break it up at every possible opportunity. For most of the text he employed a topos of secrecy, a tactic often employed when it was assumed that the audience would know to whom he referred. Guibert of Nogent employed a similar method when discussing the desertion of certain crusaders from Antioch on the First Crusade, ostensibly to protect their families from shame.[88] At Corfu, the significance of acting in public was highlighted when some of these 'dissenters' were deliberating whether or not to go on to Constantinople. Villehardouin claimed not to know all their names and asserted that some were afraid to state their allegiance openly for fear of shame (*honte*). However, he named several important leaders of the host specifically, and said that almost half the army were behind them. Those accused were: Odo the Champenois of Champlitte; James of Avesnes; Peter of Amiens; Guy, the castellan of Coucy; Ogier of Saint-Chéron; Guy of Chappes and his nephew, Clarembaut; William of Aulnay; Peter Coiseau; Guy of Pesmes and his brother, Aimon; Guy of Conflans; and Richard of Dampierre and his brother, Odo.[89] The crusade leaders, in a shrewd manipulation of public opinion, went to see the would-be deserters where they mustered and, taking the young Alexius and important abbots with them, publicly begged the disgruntled members of the host to stay, weeping bitterly and prostrating themselves in front of their comrades.[90] The dissenters, too, wept at having to watch their friends and families humiliating themselves on their behalf and relented. Archambault interpreted this scene with some scepticism. 'Strategists like Villehardouin know how useful tears can be in reducing logical structures. Whether or not they are historically factual, tears serve to blur description' and 'heighten the dramatical nature of a critical moment.'[91] While Villehardouin may have been using a literary device, given the fact that leaders lacked the physical ability to prevent crusaders from leaving, it is not inconceivable that they employed alternate means to encourage them to stay, and public shaming would have been a very effective tool. A strikingly similar scene occurred during the crusade to Lisbon in 1147, when Hervey of Glanvill wept, offered to kneel in supplication and to hand over leadership of the Anglo-Norman contingent to William Viel in order to convince him to remain with the host.[92] In both cases the demonstration of humility by leaders also worked to earn God's favour in a crusading context: they would only achieve

[86] Stephen and Renaut of Montmirail were welcomed by Louis of Blois, we are told, because they were 'mult halt homme et mult riche; et amenerent grant plenté de bone gent'. Villehardouin, Chapters 315 and 361.
[87] Villehardouin, Chapters 121–2; Smith, *Chronicles*, 33
[88] Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta per Francos*, ed. Huygens, 109. See also Hodgson, 'Reinventing Normans', 130, and Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps*, 80–3.
[89] Villehardouin, Chapters 114–15.
[90] Villehardouin, Chapters 116–17.
[91] Archambault, *Seven French Chroniclers*, 33–4.
[92] Wendell David and Phillips, eds., *De expugnatione Lyxbonensi*, 108–11.

success by acting in accordance with his will. Villehardouin may have asserted that those who left or attempted to break up the army incurred great shame, but his attitude towards these particular dissenters was perhaps not so black and white.[93] He displayed a degree of sympathy for the concerns of those who wished to leave; and of those named crusaders who dissented at Corfu, Villehardouin did not censure them overmuch in his history subsequently, often praising their prowess if they died. For example, Odo of Champlitte, a companion from Champagne, was subsequently described as part of a company of 80 *mult bone gent* who bravely attacked 500 Greek knights and was described as one of the most noble barons of the army when he was buried with *grant honor*.[94]

For Robert of Clari, honour and shame were not so overtly connected with desertion from the crusade. Like Villehardouin, he mentioned Robert of Boves absconding to Syria and the respective decisions of Enguerrand of Boves and Simon of Montfort not to attack Zara, but did not record any other specific names in this context.[95] His use of honour and shame revolved largely around justifying the conquest of Constantinople, and in describing proper social relations between the leaders and the crusade host. After Corfu, he interrupted his narrative to provide a long account of Boniface of Monferrat's reasons for waging war on Byzantium.[96] The shameful and treacherous activities of Byzantine emperors, the humiliating death of the usurper Andronicus and the persecution of Conrad of Monferrat all provided him with further justifications for the sack of the city – and underlined his support for the conquest in knightly terms, by right of arms.[97] He also demonstrated the historical influence of popular narratives when he described Peter of Bracieux claiming the right of conquest as a descendant of the city of Troy, arguing that the crusaders were reclaiming land that was previously theirs.[98] It is interesting that Clari saw Conrad of Monferrat as justified in refusing King Guy of Jerusalem entry to Acre in 1191 because of his military failure to keep the kingdom intact: he had 'shamed everything' (*tot houni*).[99] He also made use of links between love and prowess in chivalric culture on the battlefield. The disapproval of women was employed as a shaming device: the ladies and maidens on the walls of Constantinople admired the crusaders' horses and armour but criticised the emperor for cowardice (*molt blasmés*) when he withdrew back into the city.[100] Clari's main concern about improper behaviour within the army stemmed not from desertion, but from the betrayal (*traïr*), bad faith (*male foi*) and bad comradeship (*male compaignie*) of the richer knights who failed to share their booty from the sack of city with the poorer knights. He interpreted later military disasters as due recompense for the sins they had committed in doing so.[101] Villehardouin spread the blame more evenly, asserting that

[93] See Archambault, *Seven French Chroniclers*, 25–39.
[94] 'uns des plus halz barons de l'ost': Villehardouin, Chapters 138–40 and 262. Odo and another dissenter, James of Avesnes, were included with the best men in the army who joined Henry of Flanders' raid on Philia (Chapter 226). Peter of Amiens was described as 'mult ere riches et halz hom, et bons chevaliers et proz', on his death (Chapter 291). The others received only fleeting mentions.
[95] Clari, Chapters 14–15.
[96] Clari, Chapters 17–29.
[97] For the mistreatment of Conrad and the reigns of Andronicus Comnenus and Isaac II Angelos, see Clari, Chapters 18–28. When Alexius IV Angelos was murdered by the emperor Murzuphlus (Alexius V Doukas), Clari recounted how the bishops and priests argued that it was this treacherous usurpation, as well as the refusal of the Greeks to respect the Roman Creed, which justified the crusaders' capture of the city: Clari, Chapters 72–3.
[98] Clari, Chapter 106.
[99] Clari, Chapter 34.
[100] Clari, Chapters 47–9.
[101] Clari, Chapter 80.

high and low took part in shameful greed during the sack of Constantinople, but emphasised that the leadership took swift action to curtail it. He told how Hugh of St Pol hanged one of his own knights with his shield around his neck as a very public display that rank was no protection from the shame of a common death.[102]

Honour, shame and leadership

There were high expectations of crusade leaders in terms of honour and shame. In the historiographical tradition of crusade narratives, the leaders of expeditions were expected to act as examples not only to the troops they led, but were written about with a view to influencing successive generations of crusaders who followed them. Group effort, unity and humility were also important components in a successful expedition, but the actions of individuals, usually leaders, consistently formed a key aspect of historical narrative in keeping with the contemporary popularity of didactic histories based on the deeds of great men. Of course, the vassals and troops in their contingents were also significant, but the actions of a leader could influence or reflect on them all. The early lay authors of vernacular crusade narratives also followed this pattern. Robert of Clari's overriding aim was to champion his lord Peter of Amiens and, by extension, Hugh of St Pol, but he was also keen to record the deeds of the lesser knights with whom he identified. Villehardouin was balancing a defence of the Venetians, his own role as an envoy, and the leadership of both Baldwin IX of Flanders and Boniface I of Monferrat. He emphasised in particular the courage and tenacity of Enrico Dandolo, the doge of Venice, who despite his age and blindness shamed his countrymen onto the battlefield by his own actions. He was also described as wise or articulate (*sages*), a term not used in conjunction with any other crusade leader apart from Conon of Béthune, who was potentially also an old man at the time of the Fourth Crusade.[103] Boniface was simply 'one of the most highly esteemed knights in all the world and one whom his fellow knights loved most, since there was no one more generous and open handed than he'.[104] Baldwin of Flanders, who was eventually elected emperor, had a relatively low profile in the course of the Fourth Crusade itself. It is perhaps surprising that no surviving crusade narrative championed Baldwin exclusively, but given his short reign and early death in 1205, histories of the early Latin Empire, such as that of Henry of Valenciennes, focused instead on the achievements of his successor, Henry of Flanders.[105] It is arguable that the two brothers shared a similarly high profile in some Fourth Crusade narratives: Henry's martial prowess was highlighted by his defeat of an ambush planned by the emperor Murzuphlus (Alexius V Doukas), and God's approval of his worthiness was demonstrated by the subsequent capture of the icon of the Virgin Mary.[106] Clari was impressed enough to devote a long chapter to this exploit, and

[102] Villehardouin, Chapter 255.
[103] Villehardouin, Chapters 15, 25, 29, 144 and 364. The exact age of Conon is uncertain, but he was known to have taken part in the Third Crusade: see Longnon, *Compagnons*, 146–9. Other people described as *sages* include Sgouros of Nauplia and Corinth (Chapter 331); Bègues of Fransures, a knight and messenger of Louis of Blois (Chapter 292); Master John of Noyon, chancellor of Baldwin of Flanders (Chapter 290); and the electors of the Latin emperor of Constantinople (Chapter 234).
[104] Villehardouin, Chapter 500; Smith, *Chronicles*, 135. See also 'mult prodom et un de plus proisiez qui hui cest jor vive': Villehardouin, Chapter 41.
[105] Henry of Flanders, also known as Henry of Hainault (n. 108 below), was a younger son of Baldwin V, count of Hainault (later Baldwin VIII of Flanders). He ruled the Latin Empire of Constantinople from 1205 to 1216 after his brother's death and played a significant role in establishing Latin authority.
[106] Villehardouin, Chapters 226–8; Clari, Chapter 66.

Villehardouin, too, was probably keen to uphold the reputation of an emperor whose election he may well have endorsed.[107]

Noble has recently reconsidered the roles of Baldwin and Henry as military commanders.[108] Baldwin's prestigious leadership of the van during the assault on Constantinople on 17 July 1203 seemingly led to some criticism of his ability. In what Andrea calls an example of 'machismo running wild', Robert of Clari claimed that his lord, Peter of Amiens, and Hugh of St Pol shamed an overcautious Baldwin into action on the battlefield. Apparently Baldwin's own knights threatened to reject his lordship unless he engaged the enemy.[109] This event does not appear in other sources, however. In comparison, Villehardouin's account of Baldwin's capture at Adrianople in 1205 underlined his bravery. The emperor's comrade, Louis of Blois, is generally thought to have been mortally wounded after succumbing to a Cuman ploy, and Baldwin dutifully came to his rescue.[110] In what Noble calls 'a useless display of gallant chivalry', the two resolved to stay together: Louis refused to abandon Baldwin, and the emperor would not consent to flee.[111] Baldwin's foresight may have been lacking in this situation, but the chivalric credentials of both were clear. Their plight exposes the tensions between the desire to act honourably on the battlefield and the practical necessities of avoiding captivity and staying alive in order to meet the demands of leadership.[112] This decision, while honourable in character, essentially ended Baldwin's career as he later died in captivity at the hands of Johanitza, king of the Vlachs.[113]

Battlefield aside, Baldwin demonstrated other key qualities of the *prodome* in Villehardouin's history by exhibiting largesse. He was one of the first to add extra money to crusader funds at Venice, although his example was later matched by the other main crusade leaders, Louis of Blois and Boniface of Monferrat. He was also reputedly generous in giving out moneys to the army when he became emperor.[114] One aspect of leadership unique to Baldwin was the strong emphasis placed by several authors on his sexual continence and devotion to his wife Marie, the daughter of Henry I of Champagne and Marie of France. She took the cross in 1200 but,

---

[107] See Peter Noble, 'Villehardouin, Robert de Clari and Henri de Valenciennes: Their Different Approaches to the Fourth Crusade', in *The Medieval Chronicle: Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle*, ed. Erik Cooper (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1999), 202–11.

[108] Peter Noble, 'Baldwin of Flanders and Henry of Hainault as Military Commanders in the Latin Empire of Constantinople', in *Knighthoods of Christ: Essays on the History of the Crusades and the Knights Templar Presented to Malcolm Barber*, ed. Norman Housley (Aldershot, 2007), 65–76.

[109] Andrea, *Contemporary Sources*, 183. Apparently Baldwin's knights rebuked their lord for not moving forward, which they saw as incurring 'great shame' (*grant honte*). They threatened: 'If you do not ride on, we will not hold you as our lord any more!'; Clari, Chapter 48.

[110] Later the Chronicle of Morea asserted that the emperor was killed in the battle, having refused to withdraw after the previous day's defeat because of his reputation: 'I consider it better to die a death today than rebukes be spoken elsewhere about me.' Harold E. Lurier, trans., *Crusaders as Conquerors: the Chronicle of Morea* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1964), 100. For a recent re-assessment of versions of this source, see Theresa Shawcross, *The Chronicle of Morea: Historiography in Crusader Greece* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

[111] Noble, 'Baldwin of Flanders', 65.

[112] For some of the problems inherent in the ideal of the *roi chevalier*, see Richard Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 89–120.

[113] The captivity of a leader could also invoke connotations of shame. See Yvonne Friedman, *Encounter Between Enemies: Captivity and Ransom in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), and John Gillingham, 'The Kidnapped King: Richard I in Germany', *German Historical Institute London Bulletin* 30 (2008): 5–34.

[114] Villehardouin, Chapters 61 and 263. The distribution of wealth to the army is described in detail by Robert of Clari and Ralph of Coggeshall: Clari, Chapter 98; Ralph of Coggeshall, *Chronicon Anglicanum*, ed. Joseph Stevenson. Rolls Series 66 (London: Longman and Co., 1875), 150.

delayed by pregnancy, died at Acre before she could rejoin him.[115] Marie was the only crusader's wife that Villehardouin listed amongst the main nobles who took the cross, perhaps in view of her relationship to his native Champagne. Her presence in his text evidences the growing desire for details about the romantic as well as military exploits of heroes.[116] It also emphasised the Davidic ethic – Baldwin's moral leadership – and preserved God's favour for the outcome of the crusade. As the first Latin emperor it was important for Baldwin to maintain an unblemished character, but those who wrote about him did not exclusively treat him as the perfect knight. He started off as one of many crusade leaders whose image invited less controversy than some, such as the doge of Venice or Boniface of Monferrat. Historical events had singled him out for comment: mainly his elevation to the imperial throne, the tragic demise of his wife, his heroic attempt to save Louis of Blois, and the mysterious circumstances surrounding his death. These key elements of his brief, glittering career were ideally suited to a variety of romanticised retellings in the West, to the extent that an impostor even attempted to take his place at court many years later.[117]

Conclusion

The histories of Villehardouin and Robert of Clari unquestionably mark a watershed in the recording of crusade history, but they drew from a tradition of crusade stories and songs circulating in Western courts, as well as from their own personal experiences.[118] Honour and shame were useful to both authors in interpreting the actions of their fellow crusaders as they interlinked with many other issues which they considered to be important: the emphasis on maintaining crusader unity, criticism of greed, the desire for divine approbation and vengeance on God's behalf. These themes are similar to those found in ecclesiastical crusade histories, and support the opinion of Ailes that early prose chronicles shared more in common with Latin narratives than *chansons*.[119] All could be explained effectively to audiences using variations on the *schema* of honour and shame. A much wider study comprising Latin and vernacular sources from the outset of the First Crusade would allow us to understand the relationship between the contemporary use of these concepts and crusading ideals more fully. The examination of these two texts alone demonstrates that honour and shame were central to the thinking of Clari and Villehardouin, who used them to explain the expectations placed on crusaders and the reciprocal nature of social bonds in the crusade army. Their narratives highlight the constraints on a group of people trying to keep up appearances while managing a network of allegiances that sometimes forced them to commit to unrealistic promises. They were also trying to meet the demands of taking the cross and to secure God's approval for their actions. Accounts of desertions on the Fourth Crusade demonstrate that while cowardice and oath-breaking were socially unacceptable, there were ways to alleviate a shameful reputation and redeem one's honour. There were also individuals on the Fourth Crusade who were described as acting in heroic ways; they may not have become the primary

[115] For examples, see Villehardouin, Chapters 317–18; Niketas Choniates, *O City of Byzantium: the Annals of Niketas Choniates*, trans. Harry M. Magoulias (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1984), 328; Gislebert of Mons, *Chronique*, ed. Leon Vanderkindere (Brussels: Kiessling, P. Imbreghts, 1904), 192.
[116] For broad analyses of these trends see Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England.* Vol. 1, *c.500 – c.1307* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974), 186; and Gabrielle M. Spiegel, *The Past as Text: the Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 180.
[117] See especially Robert Lee Wolff, 'Baldwin IX of Flanders and Hainault, First Latin Emperor of Constantinople: His Life, Death and Resurrection, 1172–1225', *Speculum* 27 (1952): 281–322.
[118] Villehardouin compared the leadership struggle of Boniface of Montferrat and Baldwin of Flanders to that of Raymond of St Gilles and Godfrey of Bouillon: Villehardouin, Chapter 257. Clari's detailed knowledge of events in the Holy Land suggests the same.
[119] Ailes, 'Early French Chronicle', 301–12.

subjects of epic poetry, and we may not have details of each blow they struck, but they distinguished themselves on the battlefield, distributed largesse and kept their word even when they had doubts, thereby earning their reputations as men of honour.[120] Holding such individuals up as an example was even more important given the need to justify the controversial conclusion to the crusade. The differing perspectives of Clari and Villehardouin show that concepts of honour and shame were not fixed, immutable notions, but relied on the author's interpretation and subsequent retelling of events.

Crusade narratives, ecclesiastical and lay, were designed to mirror both knightly and ecclesiastical views, and explored a wide range of concerns about proper behaviour. From the time of the First Crusade they instinctively capitalised on the *habitus* in which contemporary notions of honour and shame were developing. By the Fourth Crusade, its lay participants were able to equate the concept of crusading firmly with key aspects of chivalric conduct and proper social behaviour. Honour and shame thus formed an essential component in the subsequent narrative interpretation of events, just as they did in the public displays of power and leadership designed to inspire unity in the army that captured Constantinople.

Natasha Hodgson is Senior Lecturer in Medieval History at Nottingham Trent University. Her PhD (University of Hull, 2005) was published as *Women, Crusading and the Holy Land in Historical Narrative* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007). She has since written on Norman identity, Cilician Armenia and animal imagery in the context of her research into crusade narratives, and is currently engaged on a monograph for Palgrave entitled *Gender and the Crusades*.

[120] Noble, '1204'.