

EAST AND WEST IN THE
CRUSADER STATES
CONTEXT — CONTACTS — CONFRONTATIONS

Acta of the congress held at Hernen Castle in May 1993

EDITED BY

68

KRIJNIE CIGGAAR, ADELBERT DAVIDS
and HERMAN TEULE

A.A. BREDIUS FOUNDATION



UITGEVERIJ PEETERS
LEUVEN
1996

THE LATIN CHURCH IN THE CRUSADER STATES

BERNARD HAMILTON

Before 1095 the permanent Latin presence in the Patriarchates of Jerusalem and Antioch was limited to the Benedictine community of St Mary of the Latins in Jerusalem, founded in c. 1070, the nearby convent of St Mary Magdalen, and the adjacent hospital of St John, which were intended to give spiritual direction and pastoral care to pilgrims from the West. They accepted that they were part of a single communion with the Orthodox and therefore did not question, or pose any challenge to the canonical authority of the Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem¹. They had no need to formulate any independent policy in their relations with the non-Chalcedonian Churches, which, in any case, had few direct dealings with Rome in the eleventh century, except for the Armenian Church which had entered into friendly correspondence with Gregory VII². Urban II had no wish to change this, and certainly the establishment of a Latin Church in the Levant was no part of his intention when he launched the First Crusade. Indeed, it is arguable that the foundation of independent Frankish states in the Eastern Mediterranean was not part of his plan either. One of his chief aims, revealed in his letter to the people of Flanders, was to aid the Christians of the East who were being attacked by the Turks³. He considered that the legitimate secular authority in the Eastern Mediterranean was the Byzantine Emperor, Alexius I Comnenus, and that the canonical church authorities were the three Orthodox Patriarchs: Nicholas III Grammaticus of Constantinople, John IV, the Oxite, of Antioch, and Symeon II of Jerusalem⁴.

¹ *Willelmi Tyrensis Archiepiscopi Chronicon*, IX, 18, XVIII, 5, ed. R.B.C. Huygens, *Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis*, LXIII, 2 vols (Turnholt, 1986), I, p. 445, II, pp. 815-817.

² *Pontificia Commissio ad redigendum codicem iuris canonici orientalis* [henceforth *CICO*], *Fontes*, Series III, I, *Acta Pontificum Romanorum a S. Clemente ... ad Coelestinum III* (Vatican City, 1943), no. 379, pp. 789-790.

³ H. Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae et chartae ad historiam primi belli sacri spectantes* (Innsbruck, 1901, reprinted Hildesheim and New York, 1973), no. II, pp. 136-137.

⁴ B. Leib, *Rome, Kiev et Byzance à la fin du XIe siècle* (Paris, 1924, reprinted New York, 1968), pp. 119-126.

When the leaders of the First Crusade reached Constantinople they made an agreement with the Emperor, which was confirmed by oaths in western form, that they would restore to him all the lands which had formerly been part of his Empire and would hold from him any other lands which they might capture⁵. They certainly observed these obligations in Asia Minor, where cities were either restored to Alexius, as Nicea was, or were held from him by the western commanders whom the crusaders appointed, as happened at Comana which was entrusted to Peter of Aulps⁶. In these circumstances the question of appointing Catholic bishops did not arise and the authority of the Patriarch of Constantinople was not challenged.

When the Crusade entered the Patriarchate of Antioch they could not establish communication with John IV because he was living in Antioch city under Turkish rule. But his colleague, Symeon of Jerusalem, left his see when he heard of the Crusade's arrival in Syria, and took refuge in Byzantine Cyprus. He contacted the Crusade leaders, probably in the early months of 1098⁷, and was welcomed by the Pope's legate, Adhémar of Le Puy. An encyclical letter was sent in their joint names to all the Christians of the West asking urgently for reinforcements⁸. Adhémar apparently considered it important to emphasize that the expedition had the support of eastern Christian leaders in whose lands it was now operating. Although Jerusalem was the most junior patriarchate in terms of canon law, it enjoyed greater prestige than any of the other Eastern Churches among western Christians in the eleventh century, and it was the Church which the Crusade was seeking to liberate. A further appeal for support was sent in the spring of 1098, the protocol of which deserves attention:

"The Patriarch of Jerusalem and the Greek and Latin bishops and all the army of the Lord and of the Church [send greeting] to the Church of the West that it may enjoy the fellowship of the Heavenly Jerusalem and have some share in the reward of their endeavours".

⁵ Albert of Aix, *Liber Christianae Expeditionis*, II, xvi, RHC Occ., IV, p. 311; Anna Comnena, *Alexiad.*, X, 9, ed. B. Leib, 3 vols (Paris, 1937-45), II, p. 226.

⁶ *Gesta Francorum*, IV, xi, ed. and trans. R. Hill (London, 1962), p. 25.

⁷ "Migravit enim idem patriarcha ab Hierusalem ..., audito adventu et sede Christianorum circa moenia Antiochiae, profectus ad insulam Cypri propter minas Turcorum et importunitatem Saracenorum." Albert of Aix, *Liber Christianae*, VI, xxxix (see n. 5), IV, p. 489.

⁸ Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae* (see n. 3), no. VI, pp. 141-2, dated this letter October 1097, because of the reference it makes to a third victory over the Turks, II. Hagenmeyer, *Chronologie de la Première Croisade* (Paris, 1902), no. 205, p. 106, but this is not consonant with the information given by Albert of Aix, and the reference is probably to the defeat of Duqaq of Damascus on 31 December 1097.

⁹ "Ierosolymitanus patriarcha et episcopi tam Graeci quam Latini universaque militia Domini et ecclesiae, sui laboris praemii portionem", Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, no. IX, p. 146.

The Patriarch Symeon, who was then living in Cyprus, was writing in the name of the Orthodox hierarchy (there were, after all, no Greek bishops in the crusader army) and associating the Latin bishops on the Crusade with them as a matter of politeness. He concluded the letter:

"I, the apostolic patriarch, and the bishops and the whole communion of the Orthodox excommunicate those who have taken [crusader] vows, unless they shall come and fulfil them, and we completely exclude them from the communion of the Church. And do you do the same, and let them be denied Christian burial unless they have stayed behind for sufficient cause¹⁰."

Bishop Adhémar must have agreed to the wording of this encyclical and probably have arranged for its translation into Latin, and it seems clear that he assumed that the Orthodox hierarchies would be maintained in the lands conquered by the crusaders. After Antioch had been captured in June 1098, the crusader leaders sent envoys to ask Alexius to come and take possession¹¹, and John IV was enthroned once more in his cathedral as "Prince of the Church of Antioch"¹². To this point the agreement with Byzantium had been honoured and its ecclesiastical consequences had been implemented. But later that summer it became known to the crusaders that Alexius, far from marching to join them as he had undertaken to do, had turned back at Philomelium when he learned that they were in grave danger from the Turks¹³. The crusader princes considered that this dispensed them from their obligations to the Emperor, and thereafter began to found independent states for which they did no homage to him. It then seemed to them desirable to establish a Latin Church in those states.

Bishop Adhémar's death in August 1098 removed the only crusader leader who might have sought to defend the rights of the Orthodox Churches¹⁴. The change of policy which then took place became evident when the Crusade conquered Jerusalem in July 1099. The Patriarch Symeon had died in Cyprus during the siege of the city¹⁵, and the

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 148-149.

¹¹ *Gesta Francorum*, X, xxx (see n. 6), p. 72.

¹² "[Franci] Patriarcham ... urbis ... decenter in cathedra sua relocaverunt, et principem Antiochenae Ecclesiae cum omni subiectione et religione praefecerunt." Albert of Aix, *Liber Christianae*, V, i, (see n. 5), IV, p. 433.

¹³ The story widely believed among the Franks is that in *Gesta Francorum*, IX, xxvii, (see n. 6), pp. 63-65.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, X, xxx, p. 74. The best treatment of Bishop Adhémar's role on the crusade is J.A. Brundage, "Adhémar of Puy: The Bishop and his Critics", *Speculum*, 34 (1959), pp. 201-212.

¹⁵ "Nam [ecclesia Hierosolimitana] viduata erat pastore suo, patriarcha, viro sanctissimo, in insula Cypri, tempore obsidionis Iherusalem, ex hac luce subtracto." Albert of Aix, *Liber Christianae*, VI, xxxix (see n. 5), IV, p. 489; V. Grumel dates Symeon's death June/July 1099, *Traité d'Études byzantines*, I, *La Chronologie* (Paris, 1958), p. 452.

crusader clergy immediately appointed one of their own number, Arnulf of Chocques, the chaplain of Robert of Normandy, as new Patriarch¹⁶. They do not seem even to have considered consulting the Orthodox clergy of Jerusalem: they were intending to make Jerusalem the capital of an independent Frankish state, and it seemed natural to them to establish the Latin Church there. At Antioch Prince Bohemond, who had made himself independent, was attacked by the Byzantines in 1100 and expelled John the Oxite, presumably because he doubted his loyalty¹⁷. The Franks regarded the see as vacant and appointed Bernard of Valence, the chaplain of Bishop Adhémar, as first Latin Patriarch. Pope Urban's death in July 1099 was a blow to harmonious relations between the Churches of East and West. His successor, Paschal II, did not question the propriety of appointing Latins to the patriarchal sees, although he was concerned about the calibre of the men appointed¹⁸. Paschal did not share his predecessor's oecumenical vision, but seems rather to have welcomed the opportunity of extending papal authority in the eastern patriarchates¹⁹.

The Franks at Antioch made no attempt to co-operate with the Orthodox hierarchy, but expelled all the Orthodox bishops and cathedral clergy and replaced them by Latins²⁰. The reason for this would seem to have been political rather than religious: the Franks were few, bishops occupied positions of authority in key cities, and the loyalty of the Orthodox was bound to be suspect because for the first ten years of its existence Frankish Antioch was at war with Byzantium²¹.

¹⁶ B. Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States: The Secular Church* (London, 1980), pp. 12-14.

¹⁷ William of Tyre tactfully records that John "videns ... quod non satis utiliter preeset Grecus Latinis, urbe cedens Constantinopolim abiit", *Willelmi Tyrensis Chronicon*, VI, 23 (see n. 1), I, p. 340. John considered he had been expelled, V. Benechewitch, *Catalogus Codicum Manuscriptorum Graecorum qui in Monasterio Sanctae Catherinae in Monte Sinai asservantur* (St Petersburg, 1911), p. 279.

¹⁸ Paschal's legate, Cardinal Maurice, who reached Syria shortly after John's deposition, made no attempt to restore Orthodox patriarchs in either Antioch or Jerusalem, although he, and the subsequent legates whom Paschal sent to the Latin Kingdom, were concerned about the suitability of the Latin patriarchs of Jerusalem: Hamilton, *Latin Church*, pp. 52-63.

¹⁹ This is clear from Paschal's letter of 4 May 1100 to the Latin clergy and the Crusaders in the East, introducing Cardinal Maurice: "Cui nimirum in praeceptis dedimus, ut Ecclesiae, quam per vos Dominus liberavit ... ordinationi vigilanter immineat; quae si minus canonicis regulis apta repererit, corrigat; et in eisdem cum vestro auxilio, plantanda plantet, aedificanda aedificet." *CICO* (see n. 2), ser. III, I, no. 384, p. 796. There is no mention of the Orthodox clergy.

²⁰ Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle*, XV, 9, ed. with French trans., J.B. Chabot, 4 vols (Paris, 1899-1924), III, p. 191.

²¹ C. Cahen, *La Syrie du nord à l'époque des Croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche* (Paris, 1940), pp. 227-256.

The Kingdom of Jerusalem was not at war with Byzantium, and although a Catholic hierarchy was established there some Orthodox bishops may have been allowed to remain as coadjutors to their Latin colleagues²². The real focus for the Orthodox in the Kingdom were the great monasteries, led by St Sabas, which were treated with considerable respect by the crown²³. Paschal II in 1111 decreed that all the lands conquered by the crown should be subject to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, thereby in effect making the Patriarchate co-extensive with the Kingdom²⁴. This ruling recognised the importance of cooperation between Church and state in a frontier area, even though it led to the ecclesiastical province of Tyre being divided between the two Latin patriarchs, whereas in Orthodox times it had been subject to the Patriarch of Antioch, a situation which William of Tyre deplored because it halved his metropolitan authority²⁵.

The Franks claimed to be continuing the traditions of the ancient patriarchates of the East, and merely to be changing their rites. They preserved the Orthodox lists of dioceses and translated them into Latin and even Old French²⁶. The Antioch list was copied into the *Liber Censuum* of the Roman Church, where its 153 cathedral churches were likened to the miraculous draught of fishes²⁷. Yet this should not disguise from us the fact that neither the Franks in the East nor the Papacy wanted to keep the patriarchates unchanged. Some local changes were made. The Franks were distressed to find that Bethlehem was only an Orthodox parish, and Nazareth a simple bishopric, and they translated the Bishopric of Ascalon to Bethlehem and the metropolitan see of Bethsan to Nazareth to give them ecclesiastical status comparable with their spiritual importance²⁸.

²² Hamilton, *Latin Church* (see n. 16), pp. 179-84.

²³ *Vie et Pèlerinage de Daniel, Hégoumène russe*, trans. B. de Khitrowa, *Itinéraires Russes en Orient* (Geneva, 1889), cc. I, 38-39, 97 (describing the honour shown to the Abbot of St Sabas by Baldwin I at the Easter ceremonies), pp. 5, 33-35, 75-83.

²⁴ "Secundum mutationes temporum", *Willelmi Tyrensis Chronicon*, XI, 28 (see n. 1), I, p. 538.

²⁵ J.G. Rowe, "The Papacy and the Ecclesiastical Province of Tyre", *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 43 (1960-61), pp. 160-189.

²⁶ Latin lists, *Itinera Hierosolymitana*, ed. T. Tobler and A. Molinier, Publications de la Société de l'Orient Latin, Série géographique, I, II (Geneva, 1879-80), I, pp. 323-343; Old French lists, *Itinéraires à Jérusalem*, ed. H. Michelant and G. Raynaud, Publications de la Société de l'Orient Latin, Série Géographique, III (Paris, 1882), pp. 11-19.

²⁷ *Le Liber Censuum de l'Eglise romaine*, ed. P. Fabre, L. Duchesne and G. Mollat, 3 vols (Paris, 1910-52), I, p. 239.

²⁸ Bethlehem was made a bishopric in 1108, H.-E. Mayer, *Bistümer, Klöster und Stifte im Königreich Jerusalem*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Schriften, 26 (Stuttgart, 1977), pp. 44-80. Nazareth was made an archbishopric between 1125-28, Hamilton, *Latin Church* (see n. 16), p. 67.

They also amalgamated the numerous small Orthodox sees into a few larger dioceses, "lest the dignity of a bishop should be made cheap", as James of Vitry explained²⁹.

But far more radical were the changes which were made to the status of the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem. Yael Katzir has discussed the situation in Jerusalem, but the same pattern may be observed at Antioch. The popes claimed that the Latin incumbents were the lawful successors to the Orthodox patriarchs³⁰, yet treated them as though their authority was on a par with that of metropolitans of western provinces. Their appointments were subject to papal scrutiny and they were expected to travel to Rome to receive the pallium after their enthronement; they were required to enforce western canon law in their churches; and ordinary, not extraordinary appeals lay to Rome from their courts³¹. They lacked the autonomy enjoyed by their Orthodox predecessors. This happened partly because the first Latin patriarchs had themselves grown up in the western tradition and accepted the monarchical model of papal authority as normative. But it was also partly the result of papal fears lest the Latins in the East should seek independence of Rome. Such fears were not unrealistic: the dynamic view of papal power associated with the reform movement of the eleventh century was of very recent growth when the Crusader Kingdom was first established. Moreover, it was not unchallenged: for quite long periods in the first quarter of the twelfth century large parts of Western Europe withdrew from the obedience of the Roman pontiffs and in some cases acknowledged antipopes, and even when unity was restored to the Church it proved fragile, as the schism of 1130 showed³². In those circumstances an independent Latin patriarch in one of the eastern sees might have been a serious focus of disaffection for Latin Christians in general. In the early years of the Frankish settlement papal anxiety in this regard focussed on Jerusalem. Paschal II accepted the appointment of Bernard of Valence to the see of Antioch, which ranked fourth in the hierarchy of the universal Church, even though he lacked the range of experience which might have been

²⁹ James of Vitry, *Historia Orientalis* (Douai, 1597), p. 98.

³⁰ For example, by giving them precedence at General Councils, "De dignitate patriarchum" Canon V of the Fourth Lateran Council, ed. G.D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, 31 vols (Florence and Venice, 1759-98), XXII, cols 990-991.

³¹ Yael Katzir, "The Patriarch of Jerusalem, primate of the Latin Kingdom", in P.W. Edbury, ed., *Crusade and Settlement* (Cardiff, 1984), pp. 169-175.

³² Antipopes: Clement III (1080-1100); Sylvester IV (1105-11); Gregory VIII (1118-21); Anacletus II (1130-38); Victor IV (1138-39).

considered essential for the holder of such an office³³. But Paschal sent a constant stream of legates to Jerusalem to supervise the Latin patriarchs³⁴.

It was therefore ironic that the only serious challenge to papal authority in the Latin East should have come from Ralph of Domfront, second Latin Patriarch of Antioch. He was an ambitious man who was elected to succeed Bernard of Valence, it is said by popular acclaim, in 1135, during the minority of the Princess Constance and also during the papal schism between Innocent II and Anacletus II³⁵. Although the Church of Antioch did not have the same degree of popular prestige in Western Christendom as Jerusalem, it nevertheless had great potential power, in that, like Rome, it claimed St Peter as its founder. Ralph did not seek papal ratification of his election, allegedly claiming that the Churches of Rome and Antioch were both the sees of Peter, but that "Antioch was the firstborn and therefore distinguished in its prerogatives"³⁶. Ralph was also able to exploit the political situation in Antioch by arranging the marriage of Princess Alice to Raymond on condition that Raymond did homage to him for the principality³⁷. Ralph therefore showed a disposition to be like a twelfth-century pope by claiming, as St Peter's successor, to be the supreme authority in temporal as well as spiritual affairs within his patriarchate. Inevitably his ambition made him enemies, and he was finally deposed by a legatine council and imprisoned in a monastery on the Black Mountain³⁸. But he succeeded in escaping to Rome where he successfully appealed to the new Pope, Lucius II, against his sentence and was reinstated, although he died before he could return to the Levant³⁹. Otto of Freising comments that it was only after this that "Antioch began to be fully subject to the Roman see"⁴⁰.

³³ He received a pallium, *Willelmi Tyrensis Chronicon*, XIV, 10 (see n. 1), II, p. 642.

³⁴ Hamilton, *Latin Church* (see n. 16), pp. 52-64.

³⁵ B. Hamilton, "Ralph of Domfront, Patriarch of Antioch (1135-40)", *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 28 (1984), pp. 1-21.

³⁶ "... sedem cui preerat, Antiochenam videlicet, Romanæ subiacere dedignabatur, sed ei eandem in omnibus parificare contendebat, dicens utramque Petri esse cathedram eamque quasi primogenite insignem prerogativa." *Willelmi Tyrensis Chronicon*, XV, 13 (see n. 1), II, pp. 692-693.

³⁷ "Exigitur ergo a domino Raimundo ut, iuramento corporaliter prestito, domino patriarche fidelitatem exhibeat ...", *ibid.*, XIV, 20, II, p. 658.

³⁸ Hamilton, "Ralph of Domfront" (see n. 35), pp. 9-19.

³⁹ *Willelmi Tyrensis Chronicon*, XV, 17 (see n. 1), II, p. 699.

⁴⁰ Otto of Freising, *Chronica, sive historia de duabus civitatibus*, VII, XXXIII, ed. A. Hofmeister, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum germanicarum in usum scholarum* (Hanover and Leipzig, 1912), pp. 363-364.

The Latin patriarchs claimed canonical authority over the Orthodox as well as the western Catholic faithful in their territories. One consequence of this was that all Orthodox cathedrals which were in use were taken over by Latin clergy. This included the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which in 1099 consisted of the rotunda of the present church, with a walled courtyard containing chapels, including that of Calvary. This complex had been completed under the patronage of the Emperor Constantine IX in 1048 and incorporated the remains of the Constantinian *Anastasis*⁴¹. The crusaders entrusted the church to a Catholic community of Austin canons, while allowing the Orthodox certain rights there from the beginning. But other Eastern Christian Churches were not at first allowed to have chapels there⁴².

Churches of the Orthodox rite, in which the liturgy was performed either in Greek or in Syriac, remained open for the use of the native population, but their clergy were made subject to the Latin hierarchy⁴³. The exception to this general rule was the Church of the Holy Nativity at Bethlehem, where the Orthodox clergy were replaced by Catholic Austin Canons, and the basilica was reserved for the Latin rite⁴⁴.

That the Latins did not sequester more Orthodox churches at the time of the conquest was partly a matter of chance. When the First Crusade entered the Holy Land in 1099 they found that most of the great shrine-churches, with the exception of the Holy Sepulchre and the Holy Nativity, were in ruins⁴⁵. They therefore embarked on an ambitious building programme. A new Latin cathedral was consecrated at Nazareth before

⁴¹ V.C. Corbo, *Il Santo Sepolcro a Gerusalemme*, Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Collectio Maior, 29, 3 vols (Jerusalem, 1981-82), I, pp. 139-181, II, pl. 4, 5.

⁴² *Le "Liber" de Raymond d'Aguilers*, ed. J.H. and L.L. Hill, Documents relatifs à l'histoire des Croisades publiés par l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 9 (Paris, 1969), p. 154; discussion of the events of Easter 1101 which led to the readmission of the Orthodox, Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana (1095-1127)*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1913), Appendix III, pp. 831-837; when Abbot Daniel spent Easter in Jerusalem some years later the Orthodox and Latin liturgies were both celebrated in the Anastasis on Easter Eve, *Vie et Pèlerinage de Daniel*, c. icvii, ed. de Khitrowa (see n. 23), pp. 75-83.

⁴³ Hamilton, *Latin Church* (see n. 16), pp. 161-166.

⁴⁴ It would appear to have been Latinized as early as Christmas 1100, when Baldwin I was crowned there. Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia* (see n. 42), II, 6, pp. 384-385; D. Pringle, *The Churches of the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: A Corpus* (Cambridge, 1993), I, p. 138.

⁴⁵ Saewulf, *Certa Relatio de Situ Jerusalem*, c. 21, 22, ed. with Italian trans. by S. de Sandoli, *Itinera Hierosolymitana Crucesignatorum (saec. XII — XIII)*, Pubblicazioni dello Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Collectio Maior, 24, 3 vols (Jerusalem, 1978-83), II, p. 22.

1109⁴⁶, and by 1112 a new group of churches had been built in and around Jerusalem. These were the Church of Our Lady of Sion, traditional site of the Last Supper, Pentecost, and the Dormition of the Virgin⁴⁷; the Church of the Ascension on the Mount of Olives⁴⁸; and the Church of Our Lady of Josaphat, it was believed, of Mary's burial and assumption into heaven⁴⁹. The Dome of the Rock, supposed site of Christ's presentation, had been converted into the Church of the Temple of the Lord⁵⁰. The chief early Latin shrine-churches in other parts of the Kingdom were built at Mount Tabor, in Galilee, site of Christ's Transfiguration⁵¹, and over the tombs of the patriarchs at Hebron⁵². Many of these sites had formerly been in Orthodox hands but were untenanted at the time of the Frankish conquest. The Franks entrusted them to communities of Austin Canons or Benedictines⁵³.

But the most Orthodox monasteries which were still in use were not disturbed. Many of them were in places which were of no devotional significance to western pilgrims, like St Sabas and St Euthymius in the Judaeian Desert⁵⁴, but others were on sacred sites, like the monastery of St John the Baptist in the Jordan valley, which was alleged to stand near the place where Christ had been baptized⁵⁵. The Franks made no attempt to Latinize this shrine, perhaps because initially there were not enough

⁴⁶ The Latin diocese of Nazareth is first recorded in 1109, Ch. Kohler, "Chartes de l'abbaye de Notre-Dame de la vallée de Josaphat en Terre Sainte (1108-1291)", *Revue de l'Orient Latin*, 7 (1899), no. 2, pp. 113-114.

⁴⁷ The Franks first restored the ruined Byzantine church, but soon after rebuilt it in western style, B. Hamilton, "Rebuilding Zion: The Holy Places of Jerusalem in the Twelfth Century", in *Studies in Church History*, ed. D. Baker, 14 (Oxford, 1977), pp. 107-108.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 109; John of Würzburg, *Descriptio Terrae Sanctae*, c. 14, ed. de Sandoli, *Itinera* (see n. 45), II, pp. 264-266; Theodoric, *De Locis Sanctis*, c. 27, ed. de Sandoli, *Itinera*, II, p. 356.

⁴⁹ John of Würzburg, *Descriptio*, c. 17, pp. 272-6; Theodoric, *De Locis Sanctis*, c. 23, pp. 350-2; Hamilton, "Rebuilding Zion" (see n. 47), p. 108.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 109-110; John of Würzburg, *Descriptio*, c. 4, pp. 236-44; Theodoric, *De Locis Sanctis*, cc. 14, 15, pp. 334-340.

⁵¹ Prince Tancred was a benefactor of the shrine, *Willelmi Tyrensis Chronicon*, IX, 13 (see n. 1), I, p. 438; a Benedictine community had been established there by 1103, Hamilton, *Latin Church*, p. 60.

⁵² The foundation antedates 1119, *Tractatus de Inventionem Sanctorum Patriarcharum Abraham, Isaac et Jacob*, ed. de Sandoli, *Itinera* (see n. 45), I, pp. 331-337; Pringle, *Churches* (see, n. 44), I, pp. 223-239.

⁵³ Benedictine communities were given charge of Our Lady of Josaphat and Mount Tabor; the other shrines were entrusted to Austin Canons.

⁵⁴ Daniel, cc. 38-39 (see n. 23), pp. 33-35.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, cc. 27, 29, pp. 26-27.

Latin regular clergy to serve it. But in the Kingdom of Jerusalem Orthodox shrines which were not expropriated within the first few years of the conquest remained in Orthodox hands thereafter⁵⁶. In addition to the Orthodox places of worship, there were many churches and monasteries in the Crusader Kingdom belonging to other Eastern Christian Churches. The clergy who accompanied the First Crusade did not know very much about them, as is clear from the letter which the princes wrote to Urban II in 1098 informing him of Bishop Adhémar's death, in which they invited the Pope himself to come and deal with the religious problems which confronted them: "we have beaten the Turks and the heathen, but we do not know how to defeat the heretics, the Greeks and Armenians and Syrian Jacobites⁵⁷."

At that stage they had not met the Maronites. But Frankish practice proved to be more enlightened than this initial reaction might suggest. This was partly due to the absence of a theologically sophisticated Latin clergy on the First Crusade, which was a consequence of Urban II's not intending to set up a Latin Church in the East. Michael the Syrian commented with surprise:

56 "The Franks never raised any difficulty about matters of doctrine, or tried to formulate it in one way only for Christians of differing race and language, but ... accepted as a Christian anybody who venerated the cross, without further examination⁵⁸."

They granted non-Byzantine Christians complete religious freedom under the authority of their own ecclesiastical leaders, a continuation of the Islamic system, but freed all Christians from the payment of the religious poll-tax⁵⁹.

Armenians, Jacobites and Maronites were allowed to keep their own churches and monasteries, even in cases where these were the shrines of saints whom all Christians venerated, like the house of St James held by the Armenians of Jerusalem⁶⁰. The sole exception was the Church of the Holy Sepulchre from which all eastern-rite Christians were expelled by the Franks in 1099. Although the non-Byzantine Christians were not

⁵⁶ This may be seen by comparing the information given by Abbot Daniel, see n. 23 above, with that of John Phocas, *Elphrasix*, in RHC, *Historiens Grecs*, 2 vols (Paris, 1875-81), I, pp. 527-558. There is not enough information about the other Crusader States to make any definite statement on this point.

⁵⁷ Hagenmeyer, *Epistolae* (see n. 3), no. XVI, p. 164.

⁵⁸ Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle*, XVI, i (see n. 20), III, p. 222.

⁵⁹ Hamilton, *Latin Church* (see n. 16), pp. 189-190.

⁶⁰ John of Würzburg, *Descriptio*, c. 15 (see n. 48), p. 268.

readmitted to the main church, when the new Latin cathedral was built provision was made for the Armenians and Jacobites to use the surviving Byzantine chapels along the western side of the southern courtyard⁶¹. Some arrangement of that kind may have been adopted from the first, but if so it is not documented.

The first generation of Frankish settlers, both clergy and laity, came to understand eastern Christianity in its diversity of confessions through contact with people rather than through theological explanations. This led to a realisation of the very large areas of belief which they had in common, rather than to an emphasis on the small, but acrimonious areas of doctrinal and disciplinary divergence. Good relations between the Franks and the native Christian population were also helped by intermarriage. This occurred at all social levels, including the royal family. Both Baldwin I and Baldwin II of Jerusalem had Armenian consorts; and through the marriages of Baldwin II's children Armenian blood passed into the ruling houses of Antioch and Tripoli. The royal family gave an example of how eastern Christians should be treated with tolerance and respect, and this was widely followed. It was, no doubt, through royal patronage that the Armenian community of Jerusalem were able to build a great cathedral in western architectural style, but designed for Armenian liturgical use, to incorporate the shrine-church of St James. This was constructed towards the end of the First Kingdom by masons trained in the western tradition⁶². The Armenians were in an unusually privileged position among the eastern Christians, because they had a powerful and independent nobility at the time of the Latin conquest and this led to their being treated on terms of social equality by the Franks. But this was not an unmixed blessing, particularly in the northern states, because the Franks coveted and often seized their lands⁶³. Yet this did not erode religious goodwill among churchmen on both sides.

The Maronites of Lebanon, despite a few brushes with the counts of Tripoli⁶⁴, were well regarded by the Frankish settlers as a whole because

⁶¹ Hamilton, *Latin Church* (see n. 16), pp. 195, 202; Corbo, *Il Santo Sepolcro* (see n. 41), I, pp. 179-181, II, pl. 4.

⁶² It is first recorded in c. 1170 by John of Würzburg, *Descriptio*, c. 15 (see n. 48), p. 268; K. Hintlian, *History of the Armenians in the Holy Land* (Jerusalem, 1976), pp. 51-56.

⁶³ B. Hamilton, "The Armenian Church and the Papacy at the time of the Crusades", *Eastern Churches Review*, 10 (1978), p. 63.

⁶⁴ They were held responsible, for example, for the death of Count Pons in 1137. *Willelmi Tyrensis Chronicon*, XIV, 23 (see n. 1), II, p. 661.

they were good fighting men⁶⁵; while the Jacobites were treated with considerable respect by the Franks. Except in the case of a few great monasteries, their social position in Frankish territory was fairly modest, but their leaders ruled over a large diaspora in the Islamic world and their friendship was important to the Frankish governments. But Frankish goodwill towards them was not entirely calculated, many Franks seem to have felt a genuine respect for them⁶⁶.

Later in the twelfth century, when learned clergy began to be appointed to high office in the Latin Church, good relations already existed between the Franks and the native Christians, and this enabled theological discussions to take place in a friendly atmosphere. The churchman who contributed most to Christian unity in the Crusader States in the twelfth century was Aimery of Limoges, third Latin Patriarch of Antioch. William of Tyre's description of him as "an uneducated man from Limoux whose general behaviour left much to be desired"⁶⁷ is quite unfounded and seems to be the product of personal dislike. Aimery was a learned man, interested in theology, who corresponded with Hugo Eteriano, the western theological adviser of the Emperor Manuel, about the Byzantine doctrine of the Holy Spirit⁶⁸. But he also showed a deep sympathy with and understanding for eastern Christian communions, which was perhaps a product of his fifty-three year long tenure of the see of Antioch. In c. 1180 he succeeded in bringing the Maronite Patriarch and some of his followers into full communion with the Latin Church. They renounced their Monothelism, made a statement of willingness to accept the traditions of the Roman Church where these differed significantly from their own, but preserved their own hierarchy, liturgy, canon law and autonomy⁶⁹. The Maronites formed the first Uniate Church. The process was less tidy than William of Tyre would have us believe, because there was strong opposition on the part of some Maronites and it took a long time to negotiate the changes which the act of union required⁷⁰.

⁶⁵ "... erant ... veri fortes et in armis strenui, nostris in maioribus negociis, que cum hostibus habebant frequentissima, valde utiles ...", *ibid.*, XXII, 9, II, p. 1018.

⁶⁶ Hamilton, *Latin Church* (see n. 16), pp. 190-199.

⁶⁷ "... Lemovicensem natione, hominem absque literis et conversationis non satis honeste", *Willelmi Tyrensis Chronicon*, XV, 18 (see n. 1), II, p. 700.

⁶⁸ *Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum*, ed. E. Martène and U. Durand, 5 vols (Paris, 1717), I, p. 479; P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143-1180* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 90-91.

⁶⁹ *Willelmi Tyrensis Chronicon*, XXII, 9 (see n. 1), II, pp. 1018-1019.

⁷⁰ K.S. Salibi, "The Maronite Church in the Middle Ages and its Union with Rome", *Or. Chr.*, 42 (1958), pp. 92-104.

But Aimery had sought the corporate reunion of the Maronite Church, not partial reunion or individual conversions, and this was in the end achieved⁷¹. This became the blueprint for Catholic attitudes towards religious unity in the Crusader States.

Aimery of Limoges may also have been responsible for moves towards closer unity with the papacy on the part of the Armenian Church. These were built on older initiatives which had been inconclusive⁷². But in 1184 the Catholicus Gregory IV sent an embassy to Pope Lucius III with a profession of faith. In return the Pope sent Gregory a pallium, signifying that in the eyes of the Pope he was in communion with the Holy See and was the accredited papal representative in his Church. The Pope also sent him a copy of the *Rituale Romanum* which St Nerses of Lampron is said to have translated into Armenian⁷³. These negotiations had no immediate sequel because of the dislocation caused by Saladin's campaigns in 1187-92, but they helped to lay the foundations for the official act of union which was achieved under Celestine III in 1198⁷⁴.

Although the Jacobites did not come into communion with Rome in the twelfth century, or make any attempt to do so, Aimery of Limoges was on very cordial terms with their Patriarch, Michael the Syrian. A later Jacobite source claims that Aimery allowed him to pontificate in Antioch cathedral, admittedly when it was briefly under Orthodox control again, so that Michael's enthronement there must have taken place on the orders of Prince Bohemond III⁷⁵. Aimery certainly invited Michael to attend the Third Lateran Council, which indicates that he did not regard the Jacobites as heterodox. It was, nevertheless, a remarkable invitation, because had it been accepted it would have meant that two Patriarchs of Antioch would have been present. Michael declined to go, but wrote a treatise against the Cathars, who were on the agenda of the Council, for consideration by the fathers⁷⁶. Aimery of Limoges therefore came near to achieving the unity of all eastern Christians with the Latin

⁷¹ P. Dib, "Maronites", *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, ed. A. Vacant et al., 30 vols (Paris, 1903-50), X (I), cols 1-142.

⁷² *CSCO* (see n. 2), ser. III, I, no. 379, pp. 789-790.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, no. 395, pp. 811-813.

⁷⁴ In 1189 Clement III reissued the letters of Lucius III for the Catholicus of Armenia, P. Jaffé et al., *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1881-88), no. 16463; Hamilton, "Armenian Church" (see n. 63), pp. 69-71.

⁷⁵ *Anonymi Auctoris Chronicon ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens*, trans. A. Abouna, CSCO, *Scriptores Syri*, ser. III, 154 (Louvain, 1974), p. 230.

⁷⁶ Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle*, XX, 7 (see n. 20), III, pp. 377-378.

Church. He sought corporate reunion on a basis which would allow each Church to keep its own traditions and its own cultural and hierarchical identity.

The Emperor Manuel had tried in the 1170s to unite eastern Christians with the Oecumenical Patriarch⁷⁷, but neither his model of Church unity nor that of Aimery of Limoges was able to accommodate both an Orthodox and a Catholic patriarch in the Churches of Antioch and Jerusalem. Manuel restored the Orthodox Patriarch, Athanasius III, at Antioch in 1165. This was an index of his political power at that time⁷⁸, but it was extremely unpopular with the Franks, and when Athanasius was killed by an earthquake in 1170 Manuel was unable to replace him because the Franks of Antioch were opposed to this and had full papal support⁷⁹. Similarly, when Manuel tried to introduce an Orthodox patriarch at Jerusalem in Baldwin IV's reign he was unsuccessful. Leontios II came to the Holy Land almost certainly in 1177, but was only given grudging permission by the Franks to celebrate the liturgy privately in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, assisted only by the Greek canons and behind locked doors. Soon after this he was required to leave the Kingdom, and he never returned⁸⁰.

It has not been sufficiently remarked that the chief religious consequence of crusader settlement in the Levant was that the Kingdom of Jerusalem became a Catholic country. Not only was the Orthodox hierarchy replaced by Latins, but also the cathedrals in the thirty-one dioceses which the Franks established were either newly built in western style or were adapted for western liturgical use. In the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, the Franks retained the rotunda of Constantine IX but demolished the apse and built a new cathedral adjoining it⁸¹.

The shrine-churches which the Franks had rebuilt were all designed in western style, and their number continued to grow throughout the First Kingdom. Some were very small, like the chapels of the Agony in the

⁷⁷ P. Tekeyan, "Controverses Christologiques en Arménie-Cilicie dans la seconde moitié du xii^e siècle (1165-98)", *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 124 (Rome, 1939), pp. 14-42; Magdalino, *Empire* (see n. 68), pp. 75-76 and n. 189.

⁷⁸ Hamilton, *Latin Church* (see n. 16), pp. 175-176; Magdalino, *Empire*, pp. 72-73.

⁷⁹ Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle*, XIX, 6 (see n. 20), III, p. 339. See Alexander III's letter to the clergy and people of Antioch, urging them to resist any attempt to make their Church subject to Constantinople, ed. S. Löwenfeld, *Epistolae Pontificum Romanorum Ineditae* (Leipzig, 1885), p. 164; Magdalino, *Empire*, pp. 75-108, with special reference to pp. 75, 103.

⁸⁰ R.B. Rose, "The Vita of Saint Leontios and its account of his visit to Palestine during the crusader period", *Proche Orient Chrétien*, 35 (1985), pp. 238-257.

⁸¹ Corbo, *Il Santo Sepolcro* (see n. 41), I, pp. 183-209, II, pl. 6,7.

Garden and the Sleep of the Apostles, which the monks of Our Lady of Josaphat built in Gethsemane to commemorate the events of the Passion⁸²; but others were more considerable, like the convent of Bethany, founded by Queen Melisende in 1138 on the site of the house of Mary, Martha and Lazarus⁸³; the abbey of Mountjoy, burial place of the prophet Samuel, staffed by Praemonstratensian Canons, and standing at the point where pilgrims from the north gained their first view of Jerusalem⁸⁴; the priory of Quarantena, a dependency of the Holy Sepulchre, situated in the mountains above the Jordan on the site of the Temptation of Christ⁸⁵; the Hospitaller church at Abu Ghosh, which the crusaders supposed was Emmaus⁸⁶; and the shrine of St John in the Woods, the place, it was thought, of John the Baptist's birth, which was administered by Cistercians⁸⁷. Outside the environs of Jerusalem rural Catholic shrines were less common, although there were many churches and chapels of the Latin rite in the cities, and in administrative centres in the countryside. But as the Kingdom became more peaceful in the course of the twelfth century because of the patrols by the Military Orders, the Franks began to build churches in undefended sites, like that of Jacob's Well at Sychar near Nablus, where Jesus had talked to the woman of Samaria⁸⁸. These churches were built in western architectural style so that the Latin liturgy might be performed in them.

Few changes were made in the Western rite by the Frankish settlers: some eastern saints, notably the early bishops of Jerusalem and Antioch, were incorporated in the church calendars⁸⁹; and in the Easter Liturgy of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre the ceremony of the new fire replaced

⁸² Theodoric, *De Locis Sanctis*, c. 24 (see n. 48), II, p. 352.

⁸³ *Willelmi Tyrensis Chronicon*, XV, 26 (see n. 1), II, pp. 709-10; John of Würzburg, *Descriptio*, c. 6, Theodoric, *De Locis Sanctis*, c. 28 (see n. 48), II, pp. 246, 358; S.J. Saller, *Excavations at Bethany (1949-1953)*, Publications of the Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, 12 (Jerusalem, 1957); Pringle, *Churches* (see n. 44), I, pp. 122-137.

⁸⁴ Hamilton, *Latin Church* (see n. 16), p. 94; Theodoric, *De Locis Sanctis*, c. 29 (see n. 48), II, pp. 358-360; Pringle, "Jabal Quruntul", *Churches* (see n. 44), I, pp. 252-258.

⁸⁵ H.-E. Mayer, "Sankt Samuel auf dem Freudenberge und sein Besitz nach einem unbekannten Diplom König Balduins V", *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, 44 (1964), pp. 35-71.

⁸⁶ Hamilton, *Latin Church*, pp. 105-106; L.-H. Vincent and F. M. Abel, *Emmaüs, sa basilique et son histoire* (Paris, 1932); Pringle, *Churches* (see n. 44), I, pp. 7-17.

⁸⁷ Theodoric, *De Locis Sanctis*, c. 38 (see n. 48), II, p. 368; D. Pringle, "Cistercian Houses in the Kingdom of Jerusalem", in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*, M. Gervers ed. (New York, 1992), pp. 185-188, 191-192; Pringle, *Churches*, I, pp. 38-47.

⁸⁸ Theodoric, *De Locis Sanctis*, c. 42, II, pp. 372-374; Pringle, *Churches*, I, pp. 258-264.

⁸⁹ F.M. Wormald, "Liturgical Notes", in *Miniature Painting in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, ed. H. Buchthal (Oxford, 1957), pp. 107-134.

the traditional western practice of kindling fire in the church courtyard to light the Paschal candle⁹⁰. But the liturgy in the main remained western, and in that, as in other ways, the Papacy was concerned that the churches of the Crusader Kingdom should conform to the Roman tradition⁹¹.

During the twelfth century the Holy Land remained the greatest focus of pilgrimage in the entire Christian world. Western pilgrims came there in greater numbers than ever before once the ports were in Christian hands and the journey could be made swiftly in Christian shipping⁹², but there may also have been an increase in eastern-rite pilgrims to the Kingdom because it had Christian rulers. The Catholic authorities did not discriminate against any eastern Christian visitors, whether they were Orthodox or non-Chalcedonian. The churches of their own rite were open and they might worship freely in them while no barrier was placed in their way if they wished to make their private devotions in shrines administered by the Latins. For example, the Russian Princess, Euphrosyne of Polotsk, who died in Jerusalem in 1173, was allowed to hang a golden votive lamp in the sanctuary of the Holy Sepulchre itself⁹³. The Orthodox were more privileged than other eastern Christians because in the Churches of the Holy Sepulchre and Our Lady of Josaphat the Orthodox liturgy was celebrated regularly at side altars⁹⁴. Furthermore, in the 1170s the Franks of Jerusalem who valued the protection of the Emperor Manuel allowed him to resume what had been the traditional role of his predecessors in the time of the Fatimid Caliphs, that of protector of Orthodox Christians in the Holy Land⁹⁵. Manuel not only endowed and in some cases rebuilt the Orthodox

⁹⁰ A.J. MacGregor, *Fire and Light in the Western Church*, Alcuin Club Collection, 71 (Collegeville, 1992), pp. 154-247; Ch. Kohler, "Un Rituel et un Bréviaire du Saint Sépulchre de Jérusalem (xii^e-xiii^e siècle)", *Revue de l'Orient Latin*, VIII (1900-1901), p. 421.

⁹¹ Paschal II ordered the Benedictines of Latina: "Psalmorum etiam modulatio sic apud vos teneatur, sicut Romana psallat ecclesia", "Papst-Kaiser und Normannenurkunden aus Unteritalien", ed. W. Holtzmann, no. 1, *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, 35 (1955), p. 51.

⁹² "Thirteenth-century data confirm that the majority of ships bound for the Holy Land left the West in the last weeks of March and early April. With an average passage eastwards taking about four to six weeks, ships would not arrive in Acre before mid to late April." J.H. Pryor, *Geography, Technology and War* (Cambridge, 1988), p. 3.

⁹³ B. de Khitrowa, "Pèlerinage en Palestine de l'abbesse Euphrosine, princesse de Polotsk", *Revue de l'Orient Latin*, III (1895), p. 33.

⁹⁴ Hamilton, *Latin Church* (see n. 16), p. 171.

⁹⁵ S. Runciman, "The Byzantine 'Protectorate' in the Holy Land in the XIth Century", *Byzantion*, 18 (1948), pp. 207-215; S. Runciman, "The Visit of King Amalric I to Constantinople in 1171", in *Outremer: Studies in the History of the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem Presented to Joshua Prawer*, ed. B.Z. Kedar, H.-E. Mayer and R.C. Smail (Jerusalem, 1982), pp. 153-158; B. Hamilton, "Manuel I Comnenus and Baldwin IV of Jerusalem", in *Kathegetria: Essays presented to Joan Hussey for her 80th birthday*, J. Chrysostomides ed. (Camberley, 1988), pp. 353-375.

monasteries of Judaea⁹⁶, the Franks also allowed him to commission Byzantine craftsmen to embellish the Holy Places with mosaics executed in accordance with Orthodox iconography. The shrine of the Anastasis, at the centre of the Christian faith in the Crusader Kingdom, was embellished with Byzantine mosaics⁹⁷; while in the Latin cathedral of Bethlehem a series of monumental mosaics of the oecumenical councils was commissioned by Manuel, whose panel portrait was hung in the sanctuary. These mosaics were remarkable because they set out the Orthodox and not the Latin tradition of conciliar teaching⁹⁸.

Yet despite these concessions to eastern spirituality the majority of important shrines in the Holy Land during the twelfth century were built in the western tradition and were served by Catholic clergy who performed the Latin liturgy. Eastern-rite pilgrims might perform their private devotions in the Catholic shrine-churches, but if they wished to assist at the liturgy in their own rite then they had to attend their own churches. Only the Catholic liturgy was performed with solemnity in the shrine-churches. This reached its climax in Holy Week, which began early on Palm Sunday, when the Latin patriarch and his entourage, bearing the Holy Cross in its jewelled reliquary, rode out to Bethany while it was still dark, and at dawn descended the Mount of Olives to be greeted by the faithful, led by the Catholic monks and canons of Jerusalem, who were holding branches of palm and olive blessed in the Garden of Gethsemane. The whole crowd then led the patriarch and the cross, symbolizing Christ, through the Golden Gate into the Temple precinct. Holy Week continued in that way. On Maundy Thursday the patriarch led the faithful to the Church of Mount Sion where the Last Supper had been celebrated; on Good Friday, before-dawn, he and his canons led the faithful barefoot up the stairs to the Calvary chapel in the Holy Sepulchre to venerate the reliquary of the Holy Cross on the spot where that Cross, they believed, had once stood; and there, at the hour of the Crucifixion, the patriarch celebrated the Good Friday Liturgy. On Holy Saturday the patriarch sat enthroned behind the high altar, facing down the choir of the Holy Sepulchre towards the Anastasis, flanked by

⁹⁶ For a general survey of Orthodox monasticism in Judaea in Manuel's reign, John Phokas, *Ekphrasis*, c. xvi-xxvi (see n. 56), I, pp. 545-552, Manuel's intervention is commented on *ibid.*, c. xxii, xxvii, pp. 549, 553.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, c. xiv, p. 541.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, c. xxvii, pp. 553-554; H. Stern, "Les représentations des Conciles dans l'Église de la Nativité à Bethléem", *Byzantion*, 11 (1936), pp. 101-152; 13 (1938), pp. 415-459; L.-A. Hunt, "Art and Colonialism: The Mosaics of the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem (1169) and the Problem of 'Crusader Art'", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 45 (1991), pp. 69-85; Pringle, *Churches* (see n. 44), I, pp. 141-146.

his canons, while the prophecies were sung. A procession was formed of four eminent pilgrims, often laymen, preceded by acolytes, all of them holding unlighted tapers and walking barefoot, who brought the Holy Cross from its chapel. Proceeding down the choir they circled the shrine of the Anastasis, kneeling each time they passed the entrance to see whether the holy fire had kindled. In some years this process had to be repeated six or seven times before a light appeared. When it did, the cross-bearer entered the Sepulchre and lit his candle from that fire, and took the light to the patriarch, from whose candle it gradually spread throughout the congregation, a symbol of the Light of the World. Then the patriarch continued with the Latin Easter Liturgy⁹⁹.

Eastern Christians who came to the Holy land during the time of Frankish rule were not uniformly hostile to the Latins. The more thoughtful among them found admirable features in Catholic spirituality. St Nerses of Lampron, Armenian Archbishop of Tarsus, for example, was particularly impressed by the daily recitation of the Divine Office in the Catholic cathedrals of the Crusader States, by the good order which the Franks observed in their public worship, and by the impressive range of charitable works which the Latin clergy undertook¹⁰⁰. But it is noteworthy that those who viewed Catholicism sympathetically were not Byzantine Christians, who tended to be critical. John Phocas, who visited the Holy Land shortly before the invasion of Saladin, says little about the Latins until near the end of his short treatise, when he relates how the Catholic Bishop "intruded" at Lydda and had tried to open the tomb of St George:

"But when he was trying to open it, fire blazed out of the tomb, causing one of those who sought to lay hands on it to be severely burned and instantaneously killing another¹⁰¹."

The First Kingdom came to an end in 1187 as a result of the Frankish defeat at Hattin. Although they later regained control of the coast of Palestine and Syria, the Franks did not permanently recover most of the Holy Places, and their presence in them was confined to a few priests who were allowed to say Mass for western pilgrims¹⁰². Even when the Franks regained temporary control of some of the holy places in 1229 as

⁹⁹ Kohler, "Un Rituel" (see n. 90), pp. 412-424.

¹⁰⁰ St Nerses of Lampron, *Réflexions sur les Institutions de l'Eglise*, RHC, Historiens Arméniens, 2 vols (Paris, 1869-1906), I, p. 574.

¹⁰¹ John Phocas, *Ekphrasis*, c. xxix (see n. 56), I, p. 557.

¹⁰² This was arranged with Saladin by Hubert Walter, Bishop of Salisbury, *Itinerarium Regis Ricardi*, VI, 34, ed. W. Stubbs, *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores*, Rolls Series, 99 vols (London, 1858-1911), 38 (I) (1864), p. 438.

a result of Frederick II's treaty with al-Kamil¹⁰³, their custodianship was half-hearted. Nazareth, for example, was in Christian hands from 1229-1265, yet as Archbishop Henry sadly recorded in 1251:

"the Holy Places of the Kingdom, and specially Nazareth, have been neglected and left without clergy, and have suffered grave and irreparable damage on both a spiritual and a material level through the neglect and indeed the total absence of canons, for so far scarcely anyone ... could be found who was prepared to devote his life there to the service of God¹⁰⁴."

The holy places of Jerusalem experienced similar problems: most of the Catholic clergy refused to leave Acre to come to live there, and only a few canons took over the Holy Sepulchre, which became a kind of priory of its own daughter-house, the Holy Sepulchre at Acre¹⁰⁵. The shrine-churches of the Holy Land in the thirteenth century either fell into ruins once more and were not rebuilt, or they returned to the control of eastern-rite Christians who had held them before the First Crusade. The reasons for this decline in Latin zeal for the Holy Places are complex and cannot be treated in this paper. The Latins in their coastal cities continued to maintain a titular hierarchy for the sees they no longer ruled, and a full complement of religious communities for the shrines they no longer administered¹⁰⁶. But there were few shrines of any importance in the areas which were securely under Frankish control, with the exception of Our Lady of Tortosa¹⁰⁷, and Mount Carmel¹⁰⁸. The Orthodox who lived in the Frankish states were more resentful of Catholic dominance than they had been in the twelfth century, because their own hierarchy had been restored in the lands under Muslim rule¹⁰⁹. With the Mameluke conquests of 1291 this ceased to be a problem. The Latin political presence ended, and the Catholic religious presence was institutionalized a generation later by the establishment of the Franciscan *Custodia Terrae Sanctae* to minister to Catholic pilgrims visiting the Holy Places¹¹⁰.

¹⁰³ J.-L. Huillard-Bréholles, *Historia Diplomatica Friderici Secundi*, 12 vols (Paris, 1852-61), III, pp. 86-90.

¹⁰⁴ *Les Registres d'Innocent IV*, ed. E. Berger, 4 vols (Paris 1884-1921), no. 5538.

¹⁰⁵ Gerold of Lausanne, Patriarch 1225-39, did not return to Jerusalem, but appointed the Dean of Jaffa and the Abbot of the Mount of Olives as his vicars there, *Le Cartulaire du Chapitre du Saint-Sépulchre de Jérusalem*, no. 184., ed. G. Brese-Bautier, *Documents relatifs à l'histoire des Croisades publiés par l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, XV (Paris, 1984), pp. 341-342.

¹⁰⁶ Hamilton, *Latin Church* (see n. 16), pp. 243-281.

¹⁰⁷ Jean de Joinville, *Vie de S. Louis*, c. cxviii, ed. N. de Wailly (Paris, 1868), p. 214.

¹⁰⁸ The best treatment of Carmel in the time of Crusader rule is the unpublished doctoral thesis of A. Jotischky, *Hermits and Eremitical Monasticism in the Holy Land, 1095-1291* (Yale University, 1991).

¹⁰⁹ *Les Lettres de Jacques de Vitry*, no. 2, lines 35-55, ed. R.B.C. Huygens (Leiden, 1960), pp. 84-85; James of Vitry, *Historia Orientalis* (see n. 29), c. 75, pp. 139-144.

¹¹⁰ L. Lemmens, *Die Franziskaner im Heilige Lande*, I, *Die Franziskaner auf dem Sion (1335-1552)* (Münster, 1925).