



THE LATIN CHURCH IN
THE CRUSADER STATES

BERNARD HAMILTON

The Latin Church in the Crusader States

This page intentionally left blank

Bernard Hamilton

The Latin Church in the Crusader States
The Secular Church

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 1980 by Ashgate Publishing

Published 2016 by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Copyright © 1980 Taylor & Francis

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library CIP data

Hamilton, Bernard

The Latin Church in the Crusader states.

1. Roman Catholic Church in Syria – History

2. Latin Orient – Church history

I. Title

282'.5691

BX1627.3

ISBN 9780860780724 (hbk)

ISBN 9781138278646 (pbk)

Transferred to Digital Printing in 2011

VARIORUM PUBLICATION VP1

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	ix
1. The First Crusade and the Eastern Churches	1
2. The establishment of a Latin Church at Antioch	18
3. The establishment of a Latin Church at Jerusalem	52
4. Latin parish organisation	86
5. The senior Latin clergy in the twelfth century	113
6. The sources of income of the Latin Church in the twelfth century	137
7. Relations with the Orthodox, 1098–1187	159
8. Relations with the separated Eastern Churches, 1098–1187	188
9. The Latin Church of Antioch after 1187	212
10. The Latin Church of Jerusalem after 1187	243
11. The economic problems of the Latin Church in the thirteenth century	282
12. The Orthodox schisms at Jerusalem and Antioch	310
13. Reunion with separated Eastern Christians	332
14. The spiritual work of the Latin Church in Syria	361
Appendix.	
The date of Ralph of Domfront's deposition	370
Ecclesiastical lists	
I Popes	373
II Latin Patriarchs of Antioch	373
III Latin Patriarchs of Jerusalem	373
IV Orthodox Patriarchs of Antioch	374
V Orthodox Patriarchs of Jerusalem	374
VI Jacobite Patriarchs of Antioch	374
VII Catholicici of Armenia	375

	Page
Abbreviations	376
Bibliographies	
I Sources	379
II Secondary works	386
Maps	
I The Latin Patriarchate of Antioch	393
II The Latin Patriarchate of Jerusalem	394
Index	395

This page intentionally left blank

To Janet

PREFACE

The history of Frankish Syria has not hitherto proved very attractive to ecclesiastical historians. Important monographs have been written on special aspects of the history of the Latin church there, but there has been no general treatment of this subject except for W. Hotzelt's *Kirchengeschichte Palästinas im Zeitalter der Kreuzzüge, 1099–1291*, (Cologne 1940), which deals only with the kingdom of Jerusalem and concentrates chiefly on the activities of the Latin patriarchs. The present book has been written in an attempt to fill this gap in crusader studies.

I have not dealt with the military orders, except in so far as they exercised patronage in the secular church, because excellent studies of them already exist, nor have I written about the monastic establishment of Latin Syria, since adequate treatment of that topic would require a separate volume. I have been concerned solely with the history of the secular Latin church and of its relations with eastern-rite churches.

When rendering Arabic names into English I have, as a general rule, used the forms adopted in the Pennsylvania *History of the Crusades*, omitting diacritical marks which would be an affectation in a general work of this kind. For Greek names I have generally used Latin forms which are more familiar to English readers. I would not claim to have been completely consistent in either case, since sometimes I have considered it more helpful to use a form which is immediately recognisable to an English reader rather than one which is technically more correct.

My particular thanks are due to Professor J. Riley-Smith who read the manuscript of this book and made many valuable suggestions about the ways in which it might be improved; and also to Dr M.C. Barber who undertook the considerable labour of editing it. Since I have not in all cases acted on the advice which either of these scholars has given, they should not in any way be held responsible for mistakes which occur in the text. The faults of this work are exclusively my own.

I have received much help from many people in the course of my work. My thanks are particularly due to the Ecclesiastical History Society for giving me the opportunity to read preliminary drafts of some of my chapters as papers at their summer conferences. I am also grateful to the British Academy for making me a

generous grant which enabled me to visit some of the sites about which I have written. While in Israel I received much help from the Revd John Wilkinson, Director of the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem, and from Mr Kevork Hintlian of the Armenian Convent in Jerusalem. But my thanks are specially due to my medieval colleagues in the department of History of the University of Nottingham who, at some cost to themselves, have made time available to me to complete the writing of this book. I would also like to thank Mrs Turner and the staff of Variorum Publications for their courtesy and help at all stages of preparing this work for publication.

I wish to thank the staff of the following libraries who have assisted me: the Vatican Library and Archives; the Royal Library, Valetta, Malta; the British Library; the Warburg Institute; the University of London Library; the Institute of Historical Research; the London Library; Dr Williams's Library; and, not least, the University of Nottingham Library.

But my chief thanks must be given to my family for their continuous support: to my mother, who encouraged me in this work in its early stages, but who has, regrettably, not lived to see its completion; and to my wife, who has borne with good humour the antisocial hours and moods in which writing this book has involved me, and to whom, in gratitude, it is dedicated.

Bernard Hamilton

*Nottingham,
Spring 1980*

1. THE FIRST CRUSADE AND THE EASTERN CHURCHES

It was not part of pope Urban's intention when he launched the first crusade to set up Latin churches in the Levant. Writing to the people of Flanders shortly after the council of Clermont he stated:

the heathen in their fury have laid waste the churches of God in the east, causing great distress by their attacks, and, moreover, have brought into oppressive bondage the holy city and its churches, made glorious by the passion and resurrection of Christ. This situation is intolerable. Being much distressed by the proper concern which we felt about the news of this disaster, we visited France and asked most of the princes of that land and their subjects to free the churches of the east . . .¹

By the churches of the east the pope did not mean the separated churches, the Armenians, Maronites, Jacobites and Copts. The western church regarded these confessions as heretical and, with the exception of the Armenians,² the holy see had had little contact with any of them in the centuries immediately preceding the crusades and was probably not very well informed about them. The eastern churches to which the pope referred were the Orthodox patriarchates of Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem which, together with that of Rome, were traditionally believed to make up the Catholic church. To this it might be objected that although the papacy had conceived of the church in these terms in the early years of the eleventh century such a view was no longer tenable after the breach between Rome and Constantinople in 1054. The events of that year had indeed had serious consequences for Rome's relations with all the Orthodox churches, not only with that of Constantinople. The patriarch of Antioch was at that time a political subject of the Byzantine emperor, who was also regarded by the Fatimids of Egypt as the natural protector of their Orthodox subjects in the patriarchates

1. H. Hagenmeyer, ed, *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088–1110*, Innsbruck 1901, p 136, no 2.

2. Gregory VII corresponded with the Armenian catholicus: E. Caspar, 'Das Register Gregors VII', bk II, ep 31, *Epistolae selectae in usum scholarum ex MGH separatim editae*, 2 vols, Berlin 1955, II, p 167; B. Hamilton, 'The Armenian Church and the Papacy at the time of the Crusades', *ECR*, 10, 1978, pp 61–2.

of Alexandria and Jerusalem. But as recent examinations of the period between 1054 and the first crusade have shown, neither Rome nor the Orthodox regarded the breach as final.¹ There had been equally serious divisions between the eastern and western churches before, during the Iconoclast controversy of the eighth century and the Photian controversy of the ninth century, neither of which had proved irreparable, and churchmen in the second half of the eleventh century seem to have been hopeful of finding a solution.

Good relations between Rome and the Orthodox world could, however, only be restored with Byzantine co-operation, and the Byzantine attitude towards the papacy was ambivalent. As Runciman has observed, the Byzantine church viewed with disfavour and, it might be added, incomprehension, the revolution which at that time was transforming the papacy and leading it to claim universal temporal as well as spiritual jurisdiction.² The Byzantine emperors, on the other hand, were anxious to maintain friendly diplomatic relations with the popes who, since 1059, had been feudal overlords of the south Italian Normans: the Normans posed a threat to the eastern empire which it was thought papal influence might mitigate.

Gregory VII had attempted to harness Byzantine political goodwill in the interests of church unity. He won the favour of the emperor Michael VII by averting a Norman invasion of Macedonia, and then suggested that he should lead an army to the east in person to deal with the Seljuk threat in Asia Minor. Gregory added that during this campaign he would preside at an oecumenical council in Constantinople to bring about the unity of the churches. This was the genesis of the crusading concept, but nothing came of it at the time because the outbreak of the investitures' controversy in 1075 kept the pope occupied in western Europe. Gregory subsequently destroyed any goodwill which he might have built up at Constantinople by excommunicating first Nicephorus III (1078–81) and then Alexius I (1081–1118) for supplanting Michael VII, and by giving his full support to the Normans when they invaded the Byzantine empire in 1081.³

1. S. Runciman, *The Eastern Schism*, Oxford 1955, pp 68–92; R. Mayne, 'East and West in 1054', *CHJ*, 11, 1954, pp 133–48; G. Every, *The Byzantine Patriarchate (451–1204)*, 2nd ed, London 1962, pp 144–58; F. Dvornik, 'Constantinople and Rome', in *CMH*, IV(I), *The Byzantine Empire*, ed J.M. Hussey, Cambridge 1966, pp 460–5.

2. Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, pp 71–2, 80.

3. For Gregory VII's crusading correspondence and the literature arising from it, C. Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, trans with additional notes, M.W. Baldwin, W. Goffart, Princeton 1977, pp 164–70. On Gregory's support for the Normans in 1081, Caspar, 'Register', bk VIII, ep 6, vol II, p 524.

When he became pope in 1088 Urban II inherited the ambivalent legacy of Gregory VII in regard to the eastern churches. Although Urban's methods differed greatly from those of Gregory, the aim of the two popes was not dissimilar. Like Gregory, Urban wanted the papacy to become the paramount temporal and spiritual force in the Christian world. Urban's authority was only recognised in part of the west, since the western emperor and the majority of his subjects had for some years given their allegiance to an antipope, Clement III. This factor was probably decisive in convincing Urban of the need to seek a *rapprochement* with the eastern empire and church, since his position in the west would be greatly strengthened if eastern Christendom recognised him as lawful pope.

In 1089 he sent the cardinal archbishop of Reggio and the Greek abbot of Grottaferrata to Constantinople with authority to lift the excommunication of the emperor and with a request that the Latin churches in the city be reopened. This overture was welcomed by Alexius Comnenus, who saw in the pope a useful political ally, and who convoked a synod of the Byzantine church to discuss relations with the Roman see. The synod found that the pope's name had been omitted from the diptychs of Constantinople through oversight, and that no synodical decision had ever been made on the subject. The Latin churches of Constantinople were reopened, but the approach of the patriarch, Nicholas III, remained cautious. He stated that in view of the length of time which had passed since the pope's name had been commemorated at Constantinople the pope should either come in person to the east to discuss the matters at issue between the churches, or should submit in writing a detailed profession of faith. Urban certainly did not accept the first of these alternatives, and it is considered unlikely that he submitted the required profession of faith, although there is no certain evidence on this point.¹ Yet as a result of these negotiations good diplomatic relations were restored between the pope and the Byzantine emperor although, it would seem, full religious unity was not restored between Rome and the churches of the east.

This was the situation when in March 1095 envoys came from Alexius I to the council of Piacenza to ask the pope to help recruit western knights to serve in Alexius's army against the

1. W. Holtzmann, 'Die Unionsverhandlung zwischen Kaiser Alexios I und Papst Urban II im Jahre 1089', *BZ*, 28, 1928, pp 28-67, the correspondence is not complete. Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p 76, considers it unlikely that Urban sent the required profession of faith.

Seljuk Turks.¹ It was this appeal which led Urban eight months later to preach the first crusade at the council of Clermont. The crusade was, of course, in part an affirmation of the Hildebrandine concept of papal temporal authority: the pope placed himself at the head of the armies of Christendom in their fight against Islam, a role which in the west since the time of Charlemagne had traditionally belonged to the emperor, but which the schismatic Henry IV was unable to fulfil. The crusade was an eminently practical demonstration of papal power, since it led to the withdrawal of large numbers of fighting men from the authority of feudal rulers for an indefinite period of time under the command of the church.

But the pope also wished the crusade to be an instrument for promoting unity between Rome and the Orthodox churches. The avowed aim of the expedition was to free the churches of the east, particularly the holy places of Jerusalem, from the infidel. Urban was thus reviving the plan of Gregory VII to lead an army against the Turks. Unlike Gregory he did not propose to lead the expedition in person: he delegated that task to his legate, bishop Adhémar of Le Puy. Nor did he suggest that a council should be held at Constantinople during the campaign to restore church unity: perhaps as a result of his correspondence with the patriarch Nicholas he had a greater awareness than Gregory VII had had of the reserve with which Byzantine churchmen viewed the reformed papacy. His plan, as it can be discerned through the policies of his legate during the crusade, was a more gradual one. He sought to gain the goodwill of the Byzantine emperor, a necessary pre-condition for any progress in the achievement of church unity, by sending the military aid which he wanted. But he also wished to allay the fears which Orthodox churchmen entertained about the autocratic exercise of the Roman primacy, by instructing his legate scrupulously to respect the rights of the Orthodox hierarchy. For if it could be established in the course of the crusade that the pope was not seeking to interfere in the jurisdiction of the Orthodox patriarchs, then the greatest single obstacle to the recognition of Urban by his eastern colleagues would have been removed, and the cause of church unity greatly advanced.

Bishop Adhémar was thus entrusted with a delicate mission, but so long as he lived the pope's wishes were scrupulously observed.² Unfortunately nothing is known about his negotiations with the

1. Bernold of St Blaise, 'Chronicon', *MGH SS*, V, p 462; D.C. Munro, 'Did the Emperor Alexius I ask for aid at the Council of Piacenza?', *AHR*, 27, 1922, pp 731 *seq.*

2. J.A. Brundage, 'Adhémar of Puy: the bishop and his critics', *Speculum*, 34, 1959, pp 201-12.

patriarch Nicholas III of Constantinople, because Adhémar was injured in a skirmish while travelling through Macedonia and had to spend some weeks at Thessalonica recovering from his wounds. Consequently he did not reach Constantinople until the main armies, and with them the chroniclers of the crusade, had left for Asia Minor.¹ Yet it may be inferred that relations between legate and patriarch were cordial. Adhémar certainly raised no objection to the princes on crusade taking the oath which the emperor required of them: that they would restore to him all the lands they conquered which had formerly been part of the empire, and that they would hold any other lands which they conquered as fiefs of the empire. The territories referred to in the first part of the oath would seem to have been those which the empire had ruled before the Seljuk invasions, and therefore to have comprised Asia Minor, Antioch, Edessa and the lands of Syria north of the Dog river, though not Palestine.² This oath obviously determined the kind of ecclesiastical settlement which the legate tried to implement: there could be no question of setting up a Latin hierarchy in regions which were to be restored to full imperial control, while in those areas which were to be held as fiefs under imperial suzerainty it is unlikely that the emperor could have been expected to agree to the substitution of a Latin for an Orthodox hierarchy.

The crusade captured large parts of Asia Minor in 1097 and the terms of the oath were scrupulously observed. This territory was handed over to imperial representatives and no Latin fiefs were established there.³ Asia Minor formed part of the patriarchate of Constantinople and the patriarch's jurisdiction was respected: no attempt was made by the legate to appoint any Latin bishops in this area. Initially the same policy was followed in north Syria, which the crusade reached in the autumn of 1097.

North Syria formed part of the patriarchate of Antioch, but the crusaders initially made contact with the southern patriarch, Symeon II of Jerusalem. He was a Byzantine Greek, who had been appointed sometime in the 1080s, but when the crusade

1. *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*, IX, Paris 1969, pp 39, 42. The editors argue that this source places Adhémar's arrival in Constantinople before the point at which Raymond of Toulouse took the oath to Alexius (p 42, n 3) but the text does not imply this.

2. Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, X, 9, ed B. Leib, 3 vols, Paris 1937-45, II, pp 220-6. These were the lands which had formed part of the empire before the Seljuk invasions.

3. It is doubtful whether the fief of Coxon can be considered as Latin. The crusaders granted it to a Provençal knight, Peter of Aups, to hold of the emperor, but although a Frank, Peter was already in Alexius's service. *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, IV, 11, ed and trans R. Hill, London 1962, p 25.

arrived he was living in exile in Byzantine Cyprus where he had taken refuge from the oppression of the Artukid Turks who were ruling Jerusalem.¹ Symeon appears to have been the author of a treatise against the use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist, a Latin usage to which the Orthodox were traditionally opposed, but Symeon's work, it would seem, was written in defence of Orthodox practice, which had been attacked by a member of the western community in Jerusalem, and is not in itself evidence of a deep-rooted hostility towards the Latin church.² Certainly Symeon made no difficulty about co-operating with the pope's legate. The Byzantine government must have been responsible for establishing contact between Symeon in Cyprus and Adhémar who had accompanied the crusade on its overland route through Asia Minor. This contact was probably achieved when the Cilician ports were captured by the crusaders in September 1097 and lines of communication opened between Cyprus and the main crusader force at Marash.³

It is not known whether Symeon II came in person to the crusader camp, or whether he sent representatives, but negotiations between him and the legate were sufficiently advanced for a joint communiqué to be issued by them from the camp near Antioch on 18 October 1097. This took the form of an encyclical letter to 'the faithful dwelling in the regions of the north', reporting the progress of the crusade and urging that all those who had taken the cross but had failed to set out should be excommunicated unless they fulfilled their vows by the following Easter. It also related that the patriarch had had a vision of Christ who had told him that all who took part in the crusade would appear before Him wearing crowns at the Last Judgment.⁴ In January 1098 a second letter was addressed to the western church by 'the patriarch of Jerusalem, the bishops both Greek and Latin, and the whole army of the Lord and of the church'. It is, perhaps, significant, that the legate is not specifically mentioned in this letter. Further information is given about the progress of the crusade, but the letter is chiefly an appeal for reinforcements, and it ends with a solemn warning:

1. V. Grumel, *Traité d'Etudes Byzantines*, I. *La Chronologie*, Paris 1958, p 452; Albert of Aix, 'Historia Hierosolymitana', VI, 39, *RHC Occ*, IV, p 489.

2. B. Leib, 'Deux inédits sur les azymes au début du XIII^e siècle', *OCP*, 9, 1924, pp 85-107; Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, pp 89-90.

3. Liaison was effected at Marash on 15 October 1097 between the main army and the Cilician contingent. H. Hagenmeyer, *Chronologie de la première croisade (1094-1100)*, Paris 1902, p 101, no 195.

4. Hagenmeyer, *Kreuzzugsbriefe*, pp 141-2.

unless those who have taken crusader vows come and fulfill them, I, the apostolic patriarch, and the bishops and all the orthodox hierarchy excommunicate them and completely sever them from the communion of the church, and do you likewise, so that they may be denied Christian burial unless they have stayed behind for some valid reason.¹

These letters show that Adhémar recognised Symeon as lawful head of the church of Jerusalem and as in full communion with the western church: a schismatic could not have threatened western Christians with excommunication. The legate can only have adopted this policy with the prior consent of the pope. Equally, Symeon would have had no reason to co-operate with the crusaders unless he had supposed that they would restore him to his see when they recaptured Jerusalem. He would not have given his moral support to the expedition had he thought that it intended to supplant him by a Latin patriarch when it captured the holy city. The premature death of Adhémar of necessity means that the sincerity of his dealings with Symeon must remain a matter of speculation, but the presumption that he intended to acknowledge him as lawful patriarch when Jerusalem was captured receives some support from his treatment of the other Orthodox patriarch, John IV of Antioch.

Like Symeon, John was also a Byzantine Greek, and had been a monk at Oxeia. He had been appointed patriarch in 1091² and was living in Antioch when the crusade laid siege to it. Probably because the crusade was at this stage working in conjunction with the Byzantine emperor, the Turkish governor of Antioch persecuted the patriarch who was an imperial nominee. His cathedral was desecrated and he was suspended from the walls of the city in an iron cage during the siege. He survived this treatment and when, after eight months, the city finally fell to the crusaders, the legate restored the cathedral to Christian worship, enthroned the patriarch there, and recognised his canonical authority over all the clergy in his patriarchate, Latin as well as Greek.³ In this he does not seem to have met with any opposition from the crusaders, which may indicate that John IV was viewed with sympathy by the rank and file of the army because of his sufferings at the hands of the Turks.

The position of the Latin clergy at Antioch under the terms of Adhémar's settlement was analogous to that of the Latin clergy of Jerusalem who served the needs of western pilgrims before the

1. *Ibid.*, pp 146–9.

2. Grumel, *Traité*, p 448.

3. Albert of Aix, V, 3, *RHC Occ*, IV, p 433.

first crusade:¹ they would observe their own rite, but acknowledge the canonical authority of the Orthodox patriarch. This was the only acceptable religious settlement in the context of the political settlement which was envisaged when the crusaders captured Antioch. By the terms of their oath to the emperor the princes were committed to restoring the city to Byzantine control, and, after the relief army from Mosul had been defeated, envoys were sent to Alexius in July 1098 asking him to come and take possession of Antioch.² Hitherto the main crusade had worked harmoniously with Byzantium, and had restored to Alexius all lands which had formerly been part of his empire in accordance with the oath they had sworn. Even leaders like Baldwin of Boulogne, who had seized Edessa by a piece of shrewd pragmatism in March 1098, had not contravened the oath: no imperial representative had been present who could raise the matter of the emperor's rights, so the question of keeping the oath had not arisen.³ In ecclesiastical affairs Adhémar had restored the Orthodox patriarch of Antioch and been punctilious in respecting the canonical rights of the Orthodox patriarch of Jerusalem.

This conciliatory policy towards the Byzantine empire and the Orthodox churches was abandoned by most of the crusaders in the late summer of 1098. Adhémar, the architect of this policy, died on 1 August 1098 during an outbreak of plague⁴ and nobody else was present with the army whose authority was universally recognised. Shortly after this the crusaders learned that the emperor had abandoned his march to Antioch and left them to deal single-handed with a numerically superior Muslim relief force and they considered themselves to be absolved from their obligations to him. The only crusader leader who whole-heartedly wished to preserve the Byzantine alliance after that time was Raymond IV of Toulouse, but he was overruled.⁵

The abandonment of a policy of political and military cooperation with the Byzantine emperor by the crusader leaders was bound to make the implementation of pope Urban's ecclesiastical policy very difficult. The Orthodox hierarchies of Antioch

1. Sta Maria Latina and its annexed hospital and convent had been founded some fifty years before the first crusade, WT, XVIII, 5, *RHC Occ*, I, pp 824–6.

2. *Gesta Francorum*, X, 30, ed Hill, p 72.

3. Matthew of Edessa, 'Chronicle', *RHC Arm*, I, p 38; Fulcher of Chartres, *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem peregrinantium*, I, 14, ed H. Hagenmeyer, Heidelberg 1913, pp 203–15; J. Laurent, 'Des Grecs aux Croisés, étude sur l'histoire d'Edesse', *Byzantion*, I, 1924, pp 410–49; J.B. Segal, *Edessa, the Blessed City*, Oxford 1970, pp 225–9.

4. Hagenmeyer, *Chronologie*, pp 182–3, no 308.

5. Account of the quarrel over Antioch in S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 3 vols, Cambridge 1951–4, I, pp 236–62.

and Jerusalem were Byzantine Greeks and their readiness to cooperate with the crusade would necessarily be subject to strain if there were any conflict between the crusader leaders and the emperor. In the autumn of 1098 such a conflict had not become overt, but the crusader leaders, now that Adhémar was dead, were uncertain what kind of ecclesiastical policy they should pursue. This is clear from the letter which the princes sent to the pope on September 11 informing him of the legate's death. They did not mention the restoration of John IV in Antioch, but instead made an unusual suggestion:

What, therefore, seems more proper in all the world than that you, who are the father and head of the Christian religion, should come to the original and chief city where the Christian name was used, and bring to a conclusion on your own behalf the war which is yours? For we have beaten the Turks and the heathen, but we do not know how to defeat the heretics, the Greeks and Armenians and Syrian Jacobites. We therefore continually entreat you, our dearest father, that you, our father and ruler, will come to the city which is yours, and that you, who are the vicar of St Peter, will sit on his throne and then you will find in us obedient sons, acting rightly in all things, and you will be able to root out and destroy all heresies, of whatever kind they are, by your authority and our strength.¹

This is a blueprint for the Latinisation of the Orthodox churches in Syria, suggesting that the pope himself should occupy the throne of St Peter at Antioch. It is chiefly interesting because it shows how great a gap there was between the views of the pope and his advisors about the nature of the church and those held by the mass of western Christians. The pope's view did not differ greatly from that of the Orthodox world: the Catholic church consisted of a pentarchy of patriarchates of which Rome was one. Where the pope and the Orthodox differed radically was in their respective interpretations of the role of the holy see in that community. The mass of western Christians, on the contrary, thought of the Catholic church as co-extensive with the Latin church and regarded other forms of Christianity as deviant and almost certainly heretical. This view was almost universally held in the crusader army and it created a climate of opinion which was inimical to the kind of ecclesiastical settlement in Syria which Urban II and Adhémar of Le Puy had envisaged.

Had communications between Rome and Syria been better the

1. Hagenmeyer, *Kreuzzugsbriefe*, pp 141–2. Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p 102, suggests that by Greeks the princes meant Greek-speaking Paulicians. This construes the tolerance of the crusaders too generously: the plain sense of the text is Orthodox Greeks.

outcome might have been very different, but it was difficult for shipping to cross the Mediterranean between October and March, so although the pope appointed a new legate on learning of Adhémar's death, he did not reach Syria until the following year and by that time the situation there had changed radically. Although the crusaders made no change in the government of the church of Antioch while they were waiting for a reply from the pope, they did begin to appoint Latin bishops in Syria. The first occasion when this occurred was in September 1098 when Raymond of Toulouse captured the important city of Albara to the south-west of Antioch. A Provençal priest, Peter of Narbonne, was nominated bishop and was given half the city and its territory. His appointment was an irregular one in terms of canon law since there was no chapter of canons to make the formal election: Peter owed his elevation to the decision of the count of Toulouse who took the advice of his chaplains and lay commanders.¹ This was not intended to diminish the authority of the Orthodox patriarch of Antioch, for Raymond IV, almost alone among the crusader leaders, still maintained that Antioch should be restored to the Byzantine emperor, and this entailed the maintenance of the religious settlement which Adhémar had imposed there. Albara was not an Orthodox see, so that there was no conflict of jurisdiction involved in the new appointment,² and, according to a contemporary western source, Peter was immediately sent to Antioch to be consecrated by the Orthodox patriarch whose canonical authority was thus openly admitted.³

It would seem that the reason for Peter's appointment was political and social rather than ecclesiastical. In the late eleventh century the rulers of western Europe depended on the services of the clergy to carry out the work of secular government and customarily delegated extensive secular powers to bishops. But Orthodox bishops could not assume secular responsibilities of that kind because they had not been trained to do so. There was no need in the Byzantine world for clergy to be involved in the work of government because the eastern empire possessed a class of lay administrators for which there was at that time no parallel in the western world. It is therefore arguable that the crusaders, as soon as they began to conquer territory in Syria and to set up a form of

1. Hagenmeyer, *Chronologie*, pp 188–9, no 316.

2. See chapter 2 below.

3. *Gesta Francorum*, X, 31, ed Hill, p 75, states that John IV consecrated Peter. This contemporary source is to be preferred to William of Tyre who said that Peter was consecrated by Bernard, first Latin patriarch of Antioch, WT, VII, 8, *RHC Occ*, I, pp 288–9. When William wrote it may have seemed inconceivable that a Greek patriarch should consecrate a Latin bishop.

administration there modelled on that of the west, would have been obliged to appoint some Latin bishops to help in the work of government. The bishop of Albara was clearly expected to administer the city on behalf of the count of Toulouse rather than deal with the spiritual needs of its inhabitants, for only the garrison were Latin Christians and a chaplain would have performed those duties adequately.

The appointment of a Latin bishop in an Orthodox patriarchate was not in itself a cause of schism provided that he acknowledged, as the bishop of Albara did, the authority of the patriarch, any more than the appointment of Greek bishops in the Latin provinces of south Italy at this time was a cause of schism in the western church. Nevertheless, the appointment did act as a focus of popular discontent with the religious settlement. Raymond of Aguilers, chaplain of Raymond of Toulouse, relates that Peter's appointment was popular with the rank and file of the Provençal army: 'all the people gave thanks to God because they wished to have a Roman bishop in the eastern church to look after their affairs'.¹

It is, perhaps, symptomatic of the mood of the army that, when in 1099 the crusade finally moved south, neither the patriarch of Jerusalem nor any representative of his travelled with them. As is well known, the crusaders marched directly to Jerusalem and did not attempt to capture any of the cities in the regions through which they travelled. On 3 June they reached Ramla, which had been abandoned by its garrison, adjacent to which was the basilica of Lydda, principal shrine of the military patron, St George. This place had a dual importance, as a cult-centre and as a route-centre, for it stood at the junction of the Ascalon and the Jerusalem-Jaffa roads. Any army coming from Egypt to relieve the garrison of Jerusalem would pass through Ramla and the crusaders therefore had to guard the city. The princes adopted the same expedient which they had used at Albara: a general assembly of the army chose a Norman priest, Robert of Rouen, as bishop of Lydda, to serve the shrine and govern the city.² As a bishop Robert occupied a position of authority in the eyes of the western garrison of Lydda which he would not have enjoyed as a simple priest, and this meant that an experienced nobleman did not have to be detached from the army to take over the command of the city. The appointment of Robert of Rouen, while not in itself prejudicing the final

1. Raymond of Aguilers, ed Hill and Hill, p 92.

2. *Ibid.*, p 136; Albert of Aix, V, 42, *RHC Occ*, IV, p 461; Fulcher of Chartres, I, 25, s 13, ed Hagenmeyer, p 277.

decision about the government of the church of Jerusalem, created another precedent for the latinisation of the Orthodox churches of Syria and Palestine.

Jerusalem fell to the crusaders on 15 July 1099. Eight days later Godfrey of Bouillon, duke of Lower Lorraine, was elected ruler but refused a formal coronation, saying that he would not wear a crown of gold in a city where Christ had worn a crown of thorns.¹ At this time the see of Jerusalem was deemed to be vacant. The Orthodox patriarch, Symeon II, died in Cyprus at about the time that Jerusalem was captured, but it is by no means certain that the crusaders were aware of this when they came to choose a patriarch.² There seems to have been no doubt in any of their minds that the church of Jerusalem should be ruled by a Latin: Adhémar's recognition of Symeon was ignored, and no attempt was made to consult the Orthodox canons of the Holy Sepulchre who were living in Cyprus.

In the absence of a canonical body of electors the crusaders devised an *ad hoc* procedure: on 1 August the senior clergy met together to choose a Latin patriarch from among themselves. This highlighted one of the chief problems which faced the crusaders in initiating a policy of Latinisation in the Orthodox churches of Syria, that of an absence of suitable personnel. A great patriarchal see like Jerusalem required an incumbent who had wide administrative experience, a bishop, or the head of an important religious house. There was, however, nobody of that calibre available. The only bishop who had come on the crusade and survived to take part in the siege of Jerusalem was the south Italian bishop of Martirano, whom Ralph of Caen described as 'scarcely more learned than the uneducated mass of the people and all but technically illiterate'.³ The bishop perhaps himself recognised his own inadequacies, and gave his full support to the successful candidate, Arnulf.⁴

Arnulf was probably in his mid-forties and was a native of Chocques in the diocese of Thérouanne.⁵ He was a controversial

1. J. Riley-Smith, 'The Title of Godfrey of Bouillon', *BIHR*, 52, 1979, pp. 83–6, has convincingly argued that there is no reliable contemporary evidence that Godfrey assumed the title of Advocate of the Holy Sepulchre.

2. Albert of Aix, VI, 29, *RHC Occ*, IV, p. 489.

3. Ralph of Caen, 'Gesta Tancredi in Expeditione Hierosolimitana', c. 110, *RHC Occ*, III, p. 683.

4. Raymond of Aguilers, ed. Hill and Hill, p. 154, refers to the bishop of Martirano as 'huiusce rei inventor vel centor et administrator' when describing Arnulf's election.

5. 'Versus de viris illustribus diocesis Tarvanensis qui in sacra fuere expeditione', E. Martène, U. Durand, eds, *Veterum Scriptorum . . . collectio*, 9 vols, Paris 1724–33, V, 539–40; R. Foreville, 'Un chef de la première Croisade: Arnoul Malecouronne', *BHCTH*, 1954–5, pp. 378–9.

figure. Raymond of Aguilers complained that he was 'the son of a priest, was only in minor orders, and had such a bad reputation that the common people made up bawdy songs about him while the army was on the march'.¹ There clearly was some substance in these charges: Arnulf later had to obtain a dispensation from pope Paschal II so that he could exercise episcopal functions despite the canonical impediment of his birth, and he had to clear himself on oath before the same pope about charges that he had kept two mistresses, whom the pope named.² But this was only one side of Arnulf's character. He was also a learned man, who had been tutor of Cecilia, daughter of William the Conqueror and abbess of the Holy Trinity, Caen, and of Ralph of Caen, chaplain, and subsequently biographer, of prince Tancred of Antioch.³ He came on crusade as chaplain to Robert, duke of Normandy, Cecilia's brother, and was admitted to be a gifted popular preacher.⁴ But in addition to popular esteem, aristocratic patronage and wide learning, Arnulf occupied a place in the crusade which made him the obvious choice as first Latin patriarch of Jerusalem.

Twenty-five years ago Richard drew attention to a passage in the chronicle of Saint-Pierre-le-Vif which describes how Urban II appointed Arnulf and Alexander, chaplain of Stephen of Blois, as ancillary legates when he met the north French army travelling through Italy in 1096.⁵ Alexander returned to the west with Stephen of Blois before the fall of Antioch, so Arnulf was the only legate left with the crusade after Adhémar's death. The description which Ralph of Caen gives of Adhémar's commending the crusaders to Arnulf's care as he lay dying would therefore seem to be grounded in fact, although he was not an eye-witness of this event.⁶ Certainly it was Arnulf who arranged the trial by ordeal of Peter Bartholomew, the Provençal visionary, on Good Friday 1099.⁷ Yet, although Arnulf had enjoyed the confidence of

1. Raymond of Aguilers, ed Hill and Hill, p 154.

2. de Rozière, pp 11–13, no 11.

3. Guibert of Nogent, 'Historia quae dicitur Gesta Dei per Francos', VII, 15, *RHC Occ*, IV, p 232; Ralph of Caen, preface to 'Gesta Tancredi', *RHC Occ*, III, p 604; Foreville, 'Arnoul', *BHCTH*, 1954–5, pp 382–5.

4. Ralph of Caen, c 110, *RHC Occ*, III, p 683.

5. J. Richard, 'Quelques textes sur les premiers temps de l'Eglise latin de Jérusalem', *Mémoires et documents publiés par la Société de l'École de Chartes*, 12, *Recueil de Travaux offerts à M. Clovis Brunel*, 2 vols, Paris 1955, II, pp 420–30.

6. Ralph of Caen, c 94, *RHC Occ*, III, p 673.

7. Arnulf is also said to have preached to the crusaders on the Mount of Olives during their penitential procession round Jerusalem, Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, ed J.H. and L.L. Hill, *Documents relatifs à l'histoire des Croisades publiés par l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, XII, Paris 1977, p 138; for his part in the trial of Peter Bartholomew, Raymond of Aguilers, ed Hill and Hill, pp 116–20.

Urban II and bishop Adhémar, he did not share their views about the canonical status of the eastern churches. One of his first acts as patriarch was to expel all eastern Christians from the Holy Sepulchre and to confide the shrine entirely to the ministrations of Latin clergy.¹ Duke Godfrey endowed a chapter of canons to serve the cathedral, presumably chosen from the Latin clergy who had accompanied the crusade.² This act of triumphalism accurately reflected the mood of the crusader army. They had won Jerusalem without the help of any other Christian power and in the face of odds which, in human terms, appeared insuperable. Their victory was a manifest sign of God's favour, and it was therefore fitting that the holy city should be made subject to the Latin church to which the crusaders belonged.

Arnulf's election took place without reference to the pope, but the evidence suggests that he was not consecrated bishop at that time³ and it seems likely that he was considered patriarch-elect until papal ratification of his appointment was received. Fulcher of Chartres, the chaplain of Baldwin I of Edessa, who was in Jerusalem at Christmas 1099 and therefore had every opportunity to be well-informed, considered that the patriarchate was vacant before December 1099 pending a papal decision, an opinion substantially shared by William of Tyre.⁴ Urban II could not adjudicate on the matter of Arnulf's appointment for he died on 29 July 1099 before news of the success of his crusade and the abandonment of his religious policies by its leaders could have reached him. He was succeeded by Paschal II who was to prove far less friendly towards the Byzantine empire and the Orthodox churches than his predecessor had been.

The legate whom pope Urban had appointed to replace Adhémar reached Syria in September 1099. This was Daimbert of Pisa, a man of about the same age as Arnulf and, like him, reputed to be well-educated and a good preacher.⁵ He was a man of wide experience. He had become bishop of Pisa in 1088, and four years later the see was raised to an archbishopric in his honour by Urban II, who also granted him metropolitanical jurisdiction over the church of Corsica. In accordance with the spirit of

1. *Ibid.*, p 154.

2. Fulcher of Chartres, I, 30, s 2, ed Hagenmeyer, p 308; Albert of Aix, VI, 40, *RHC Occ*, IV, p 490.

3. Foreville, 'Arnoul', *BHCTH*, 1954-5, p 379, n 3. In 1112, when he was again appointed patriarch, Arnulf issued a privilege 'eo die quo consecratus fui', *CGOH*, no 25.

4. Fulcher of Chartres, I, 30, s 2, ed Hagenmeyer, p 308; WT, IX, 15, *RHC Occ*, I, p 387.

5. He became bishop in 1088 and was therefore probably born in the 1050s. For his learning and eloquence Ralph of Caen, c 140, *RHC Occ*, III, p 704.

the Gregorian reformers Daimbert supported the commune of Pisa in its struggle against the nobility of the city and succeeded in negotiating the right of the commune freely to elect its consuls. He accompanied pope Urban to Clermont, took the cross, preached the crusade in Pisa and raised 120 ships there. But in 1098 the pope sent him as legate to Alfonso VI of Castile, so that he was unable to come to Syria until the following year, when he travelled east with the Pisan fleet.¹

Daimbert's policies towards eastern Christians differed so radically from those of Adhémar that Krey was led to question whether he enjoyed legatine powers at all or whether he merely possessed authority when he reached Jerusalem because he was the senior-ranking Latin prelate there.² This thesis is not tenable, because in a charter of 1101 prince Tancred speaks of Daimbert as 'sent by God through the agency of the apostolic see to the regions of the east'.³ Daimbert must have been appointed by Urban II to succeed Adhémar, because Paschal II was not elected pope until 13 August 1099, long after the Pisan fleet had left the west.

There is no clear information about Daimbert's attitude towards the Orthodox churches: his views about them may not theoretically have been very different from those of pope Urban. He was, however, politically hostile to the Byzantine empire. There were two reasons for this. By the time Daimbert left the west it was rumoured that the Byzantines had betrayed and ill-treated the crusaders. Such reports were often ill-founded, but they did little to create an atmosphere of goodwill towards the eastern empire.⁴ Moreover, as archbishop of Pisa, and one who was very closely identified with the interests of the commune, Daimbert had little reason to favour the Byzantines who had granted a monopoly of trading rights with the west throughout the empire to Pisa's commercial rival, Venice. On their way to the east the Pisan fleet raided the Greek islands and when they arrived in Syria joined Bohemond in laying siege to the Byzantine-held city of Latakia and were only persuaded to desist by the remonstrances of crusader leaders who were returning to the west, who deplored war between Christians and who also needed Byzantine co-operation to return home.⁵

1. M.L. Gentile, 'DaiBERTO', *Enciclopedia Italiana*, Rome 1949, XII, 230.

2. A.C. Krey, 'Urban's Crusade, success or failure?', *AHR*, 53, 1948, pp 240-2.

3. Paoli, pp 200-1, no 166.

4. In June 1098 Alexius I wrote to Oderisius of Montecassino to deny allegations of Byzantine hostility towards the crusade which were already circulating in the west, Hagenmeyer, *Kreuzzugsbriefe*, pp 152-3, no 11.

5. Anna Comnena, XI, 10, ed Leib, III, p 45; Albert of Aix, VI, 55-8, *RHC Occ*, IV, pp 500-3.

Daimbert and the Pisan fleet accompanied the two northern princes, Bohemond of Antioch, and Baldwin of Edessa, duke Godfrey's younger brother, when they came to Jerusalem at Christmas 1099 to fulfil their crusader vows by praying at the Lord's Sepulchre. One of Daimbert's functions as legate was to review the appointment of Arnulf as patriarch. He received complaints about him, and presided at a council of clergy at which these charges were examined. Arnulf was found guilty and was removed from office. It is usually said that Arnulf was deposed¹ but it might be more accurate to say that his election was not confirmed. The office of patriarch being vacant once more, Daimbert was chosen to fill it.² He had the support of Bohemond of Antioch, but perhaps more persuasive than this was the presence of the Pisan fleet with whose help in the months that followed the port of Jaffa was fortified, thus securing the lines of communication between the infant state of Jerusalem and the western world.³ But it was not political expediency alone which recommended Daimbert to duke Godfrey and the Franks of Jerusalem. He seemed ideally qualified to be patriarch, for he had a wide experience in politics, diplomacy and administration and was well-esteemed by the holy see.

Soon after his enthronement Daimbert, at the request of Bohemond and Baldwin of Edessa, consecrated four Latin bishops to sees in north Syria: Benedict of Edessa, Roger of Tarsus, Bartholomew of Mamistra, and Bernard of Artah.⁴ Since all these dioceses were in the patriarchate of Antioch, Daimbert was showing scant respect for the rights of the Orthodox patriarch, John IV, although he may have considered that his legatine authority empowered him to interfere in the administration of another patriarchate. He made no attempt, however, to attack John of Antioch himself.

John's position at Antioch was rapidly becoming untenable for quite different reasons. In the spring of 1100 war broke out between Bohemond and the emperor Alexius who laid claim to the territories of Antioch, and whose fleet seized the coastal cities of Cilicia from the Franks. John IV was a Byzantine Greek and Bohemond was unwilling to leave him as head of the church in his state and virtual second-in-command of the city of Antioch

1. E.g. Runciman, *Crusades*, I, p. 305; H.E. Mayer, *The Crusades*, Oxford 1972, p. 66.

2. Hagenmeyer, *Chronologie*, pp. 273-4, no. 439.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 276-7, no. 443.

4. Ralph of Caen, c. 140, *RHC Occ*, III, p. 704; 'Historia Belli Sacri', c. 135, *RHC Occ*, III, p. 226.

while he was absent on campaign. In the summer of 1100 John left the city and retired to his monastery of Oxeia. The Franks chose to regard this as an act of voluntary abdication, but John's own account of events leaves no doubt that he considered that he had been expelled.¹ His eviction from Antioch was an embarrassment to later Frankish historians: he had undoubtedly suffered greatly for the faith at the hands of the Muslims and he had been restored to power by a papal legate. He deserved better treatment from the Franks than he obtained, and his deposition was imposed by a lay ruler who had not referred the matter to Rome. William of Tyre, who described John as 'a true confessor of Christ', found a tactful way of discussing his deposition: 'when scarcely two years had passed, realising that a Greek could not conveniently rule over Latins, he left the city and went to Constantinople'. In his place Bohemond, presumably with the advice of his clergy, appointed Bernard of Valence, who had been bishop of Adhémar's chaplain, and whom Daimbert had recently consecrated as bishop of Artah.²

The enthronement of a Latin patriarch in Antioch marked the total abandonment of Urban II's policy of co-operation with the Orthodox churches. Such a plan could only have been successful if the crusade had continued to work in harmony with the Byzantine empire. When the emperor Alexius made his understandable, but in the long term ill-judged, decision to retreat from Philomelium in June 1098 instead of marching to the relief of the crusaders beleaguered in Antioch, the pope's policies were doomed to failure. It is doubtful whether bishop Adhémar, had he lived, could have withstood the mounting pressure of anti-Byzantine, and, by extension, anti-Orthodox feeling in the crusader army. Certainly his successor as legate, Daimbert, made no attempt to do so, although he did not act overtly against the settlement which Adhémar had established at Antioch. Pope Urban's own death removed the only man who was powerful enough to stem the growth of Latin hierarchies in the patriarchates of Jerusalem and Antioch, for his immediate successors did not share his vision of the shape which a united Christendom might have under papal leadership, one in which the Orthodox patriarchs occupied a central place.

1. V. Benechewitch, *Catalogus Codicum Manuscriptorum Graecorum qui in Monasterio Sanctae Catherinae in Monte Sinai asseruantur*, St Petersburg 1911, p. 279.

2. WT, VI, 23, *RHC Occ*, I, pp. 274-5.

2. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A LATIN CHURCH AT ANTIOCH

When they first encountered a bewildering variety of eastern Christians at Antioch in 1098 the crusader leaders made no distinction between the Orthodox and members of the separated eastern churches. This view did not last, and by the time they decided to establish a Latin church in Syria they had revised their earlier opinion in conformity with the official teaching of the western church which held that the Orthodox, unlike other eastern Christians, were full members of the Catholic communion. The crusaders therefore regarded the Latin bishops whom they appointed as heirs of the Orthodox prelates whom they had dispossessed. Religious animosity played no part in the crusaders' decision to latinise the Orthodox churches for, like pope Urban, they believed that the Orthodox formed part of the one, holy, Catholic church to which they themselves belonged. What they disputed was Urban's contention that it was proper for an Orthodox bishop to exercise spiritual authority over Latins. Had the crusaders regarded the Orthodox as schismatics they would have adopted a different policy towards them and have treated them in the same way as they did the separated eastern Christians, the Armenians, Jacobites and Maronites, to whom they granted virtual religious autonomy. In Antioch, it is true, it might have proved necessary for political reasons to depose Byzantine Greek bishops, but they could have been replaced by bishops chosen from the native Orthodox community rather than by Latins. This did not happen because the Franks made no distinction between Orthodox and Latins in religious terms. For a variety of reasons, all of them secular, the crusaders considered that bishops should be chosen from their own race. In addition to the factors already discussed was the overriding consideration that the Franks had come to Syria as conquerors. The thought of being spiritually subject to Orthodox bishops drawn from a subject race was as little acceptable to them as the appointment of Indians to Anglican bishoprics would have been to the British rulers in nineteenth-century India.

Yet although the Franks appointed Latin bishops to Orthodox sees they did not disturb the lesser Orthodox clergy. Orthodox parish priests and Orthodox monasteries retained complete

religious freedom and were in full communion with the Latin church, though subject to the canonical authority of Latin bishops. Their position will be considered in more detail later in this work, but the toleration which the Franks showed to them demonstrates that they had no religious antipathy towards the Orthodox. They were quite prepared to leave in office Orthodox clergy who did not occupy a central place in secular government, who did not constitute a threat to the security of their states, and who did not exercise spiritual authority over Franks.

The Latins' claim to be the heirs of the Orthodox in Jerusalem and Antioch was decisive in shaping the ecclesiastical settlement which they made in Syria. If they had decided to establish new Latin churches in the east they could have founded bishoprics where they were most needed without reference to earlier practice, but this was not the case. At both Jerusalem and Antioch they took over Orthodox ecclesiastical records, among which were lists of the dioceses over which the respective patriarchs ruled.¹ These lists bore almost no relation to the realities of Orthodox organisation in the late eleventh century: they dated from the sixth century, and the majority of Orthodox sees did not survive the Arab conquest of Syria.² It is easy to understand why the Orthodox continued to publish these lists for 500 years after they had ceased to have any practical application. They were a religious minority within the Arab empire, subject to various humiliating civil disabilities, and they took courage, as such minorities often do, from remembering the time when they had enjoyed great power and prestige. It is, at first sight, more surprising to find that the Latins viewed these archaic lists with equal enthusiasm. They translated them not only into Latin, but also into French.³ The reason for this is that they could use the lists as an effective form of publicity. If the Latin patriarchs of Jerusalem and Antioch listed the scores of dioceses over which they had theoretical jurisdiction, their power appeared much more impressive than it would have done had they recorded only those sees which were filled which, throughout much of this period, were less than a dozen in each patriarchate. The papacy, similarly,

1. Tobler, Molinier, I, pp 323-43.

2. S. Vaill , 'Une "Notitia Episcopatum" d'Antioche du Xe si le', *EO*, 10, 1907, pp 90-101; 'La "Notitia Episcopatum" d'Antioche du patriarche Anastase, VIe si le', *ibid.*, pp 139-45; 'Les recensions de la "Notitia Episcopatum" d'Antioche du patriarche Anastase', *ibid.*, pp 363-8; Charon, II, pp 223-9; R. Devr esse, *Le Patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la paix de l'Eglise jusqu'  la conqu te arabe*, Paris 1945, pp 103-7.

3. Latin lists, Tobler, Molinier, I, pp 323-43; Old French lists, Michelant, Raynaud, pp 11-19.

found it useful to emphasise how extensive its jurisdiction was in the churches of the east, and the future pope Honorius III recorded in the *Liber Censuum* of the Roman church in 1192 that there were 153 cathedral churches in the patriarchate of Antioch, which he likened to the miraculous draught of fishes.¹ The reality, however, was very different.

A tenth-century list of the suffragans of Antioch, dating probably from the reconquest of north Syria by Nicephorus Phocas and John Tzimisce, records only nineteen sees, all of which were in the coastal cities.² Although there is no extant list of Orthodox sees in the eleventh century, the situation does not seem to have changed substantially by the time of the first crusade. Thus the Franks could not adopt the simple expedient of replacing Orthodox bishops by Latins; they had, in most cases, to set up a church organisation *ex nihilo* in areas where one had not existed for centuries. Nevertheless, in most cases they conformed very closely to the pattern set out in the sixth-century lists. Indeed, the chief innovation which the Latins made in the ecclesiastical administration of Syria was in the size of dioceses. Orthodox dioceses were on the whole very small by comparison with those of the west: the Franks therefore tended to amalgamate several Orthodox sees in one Latin diocese. James of Vitry, bishop of Acre in the early thirteenth century, explained why this policy had been adopted by the church of Jerusalem, and the reasons he gave no doubt obtained in the church of Antioch as well:

. . . many other cities in the promised land . . . before the time of the Latins . . . may have had bishops of their own . . . yet on account of their number and their poverty the Latins have subjected many churches and many cities to one cathedral city, lest the dignity of a bishop should be made cheap.³

The establishment of a Latin church of Antioch depended on close co-operation between the patriarch and the secular princes. The pope ratified the appointment of the patriarch by sending him a *pallium*,⁴ but apart from this Rome took no part in the appointment of archbishops and bishops unless an appeal were made to the pope against the nomination of a particular candidate.

1. P. Fabre, L. Duchesne, G. Mollat, eds, *Le Liber Censuum de l'Eglise romaine*, 3 vols, Paris 1910–52, I, p 239.

2. Charon, II, pp 233–5.

3. James of Vitry, *HO*, p 98.

4. Ralph, the second Latin patriarch, at his election took Bernard's *pallium* from the altar and wore it, WT, XIV, 10, *RHC Occ*, I, p 620.

The appointment of bishops was formally in the control of cathedral chapters, but in practice they chose the candidate whom the secular ruler favoured, though the ruler would normally take the advice of the patriarch about this. The patriarchs of Antioch had to deal with three independent rulers: the princes of Antioch (whose dominions in the early years of the century included Cilicia), the counts of Edessa and the counts of Tripoli, for all three states came under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Antioch. In fact the decisive influence in the establishment of the Latin church of Antioch was the patriarch, Bernard of Valence, who reigned for thirty-five years, during which time a succession of rulers held power in each of the three northern states.¹

Bernard's rise to power might justly be described as meteoric. He came from Valence in the Rhone valley, and had accompanied bishop Adhémar on crusade as one of his chaplains. He held the see of Artah for six months in 1100 before being appointed to the chair of St Peter at Antioch, a dignity which ranked fourth in the entire Catholic world, since its holder took precedence over all clergy except the pope and the patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria. Bernard had very little experience to qualify him for such a position, yet he proved to be a wise choice. He had physical courage, and in the early years of his reign he accompanied the armies of Antioch into battle, riding on a mule: though he does not seem to have taken any part in the fighting, he was, nevertheless, exposed to considerable danger.² He was loyal to his friends: he arranged for the ransoming of prince Bohemond, who had appointed him, from the Danishmendid Turks in 1103 against the wishes of Tancred who was regent of Antioch during Bohemond's captivity.³ His piety was of a conventional kind: he was a benefactor of the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem.⁴ He was also capable of assuming secular responsibilities. He took charge of the defence of the city of Antioch in 1119 after prince Roger and the entire army of the principality had been annihilated at the *Ager Sanguinis* until Baldwin II arrived with reinforcements; and in the years that followed, until Bohemond II came to take over the government in 1126, his influence in the affairs of the

1. At Antioch: Bohemond I, Tancred, Roger of the Principate, Bohemond II; at Edessa: Baldwin I, Joscelin I, Joscelin II; at Tripoli: Raymond IV of Toulouse, William-Jordan, Bertrand, Pons.

2. At the attack on Harran in 1104, WT, X, 29, *RHC Occ*, I, p 444; Ralph of Caen, cc 148, 150, *RHC Occ*, III, pp 710–11.

3. Ralph of Caen, c 147, p 709.

4. *CGOH*, nos 5, 102.

principality was considerable.¹ By this time he had become a respected elder statesman in the northern principalities, and he helped Baldwin II to mediate peace between Bohemond II and Joscelin I of Edessa in 1128.² In his last years he was again influential after the death of Bohemond II and during the minority of the princess Constance.³ He died towards the end of 1135:⁴ William of Tyre describes him as a 'vir grandaevus' at that time, and although his exact age is not known it seems likely, in view of the length of his pontificate, that he was in his seventies. William of Tyre describes him as 'a simple and God-fearing man', and it seems, from what is known of his career, to be a fair assessment.⁵ Bernard was in many ways typical of the first generation of bishops in Frankish Syria. He was not very well educated,⁶ he does not appear to have had any outstanding qualities as a diplomat, an administrator or a churchman, and he had certainly received no training commensurate with the responsibilities of the high office which he was required to fill. A similar man in western Europe, unless he had the backing of very powerful patrons, would probably have had an undistinguished career. But, being placed in a position of authority, Bernard showed himself to be more than adequate for the requirements of his office: the secular government of Antioch owed much to him for the way in which he assumed responsibility during times of crisis, and he gave the church of Antioch a structure which it had lacked when he came to power.

In 1100 there were five Latin dioceses in the patriarchate of Antioch: Albara, which had been set up by Raymond of Toulouse, Edessa, erected at the wish of count Baldwin, and Bohemond's three foundations, the sees of Tarsus, Mamistra and Artah. Artah, of course, fell vacant when Bernard of Valence was translated to the patriarchate. It had not been the seat of a bishop in Orthodox times, and was one of the few new dioceses set up by the crusaders in north Syria. The reason for this innovation must have been a military one. Artah was an important fortress to the east of Antioch, which guarded the approach roads to the Orontes valley

1. Baldwin II of Jerusalem was regent of Antioch from 1119–26, but during his absences in the south and his captivity the patriarch's influence was paramount, Runciman, *Crusades*, II, pp 154–75.

2. WT, XIII, 22, *RHC Occ*, I, pp 590–1; MS, XV, 2, vol III, p 224.

3. Officially after Bohemond II's death first Baldwin II and then king Fulk were regents of Antioch: neither of them stayed there for long and 'authority there was represented by the . . . patriarch Bernard'. Runciman, *Crusades*, II, p 198.

4. He is last mentioned on 2 August 1135, de Rozière, pp 166–7, no 86.

5. WT, XIV, 10, *RHC Occ*, I, p 619.

6. William of Tyre normally uses the word *simplex* to refer to men with little formal education.

from Muslim-held Aleppo, and its bishop doubtless acted as the representative of the prince of Antioch.¹ Bernard of Valence appointed a new bishop there, but the see is very poorly documented and little is known about it in detail.²

At Albara Peter of Narbonne remained the bishop for most of Bernard's reign,³ but his position needed to be regularised. In Orthodox times Albara had formed part of the province of Apamea, whose archbishop ranked fourth among the metropolitans of Antioch.⁴ Tancred captured Apamea from the Muslims in 1106, and if there was an Orthodox bishop there he was expelled.⁵ Soon after this the patriarch made Peter of Narbonne a metropolitan archbishop and transferred his see to Apamea. This happened before 1110, for in a charter issued in that year by count Bertrand of Tripoli Peter is called both archbishop of Albara and archbishop of Femia, which is a Latin form of Afamiyah, the Arabic name of Apamea.⁶ The archbishops continued to use the two titles of Albara and Apamea interchangeably for some years, but the traditional usage won out in the end, and the last recorded use of the title archbishop of Albara dates from 1144.⁷ The translation by Bernard of this see to Apamea is an indication of his determination, which informed his ecclesiastical policy throughout his reign, to restore in so far as was possible the hierarchy of Antioch as it had existed in its Orthodox heyday.

In the case of Edessa there was no conflict between ecclesiastical tradition and contemporary politics. Edessa was the seat of government in its county and had been in Frankish control since 1098: it was also the third of the metropolitan sees of Antioch.⁸ Count Baldwin I needed a Latin bishop to take spiritual charge of his Latin subjects, and to assume command of the city when the count was absent, and in 1099 he had appointed

1. This see was set up by Bohemond I, not by a patriarch. The prince clearly considered it of strategic importance and wanted a Latin feudal bishop to represent him there.

2. 'S. Arthasiensis episcopus', de Rozière, p 167, no 86.

3. Peter is last mentioned in 1119, WT, XII, 10, *RHC Occ*, I, p 526, but should, perhaps, be identified with the unnamed bishop of Albara of 1123, Ibn al-Qalanisi, *Chronicle*, extract trans H.A.R. Gibb, *The Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades*, London 1932, pp 168-9. His successor, Serlo, is first mentioned in 1140, WT, XV, 16, *RHC Occ*, I, pp 683-5.

4. Tobler, Molinier, I, p 332.

5. This see had been restored in the tenth century, Charon, II, p 234.

6. de Rozière, p 194, no 98.

7. *CGOH*, no 144. Delaville Le Roulx dated this document 1142. For the correct date, J. Riley-Smith, *The Knights of St John in Jerusalem and Cyprus, c 1050-1310*, London 1967, p 56, n 1.

8. Tobler, Molinier, I, p 332.

archbishop Benedict. Edessa is not recorded as an Orthodox see in the tenth-century list of the suffragans of Antioch, but since the city was in Byzantine hands from 1032–87 it seems likely that an Orthodox bishop was appointed during that time. If he was still there when the crusaders arrived, they expelled him. Archbishop Benedict is last recorded in 1104.¹ He was succeeded by Hugh, in whose appointment Bernard of Antioch must have had some share, who was enthroned by 1122² and held office for the rest of Bernard's reign.

The two other dioceses to which Latin incumbents were appointed before Bernard's pontificate were both in Cilicia, those of Tarsus and Mamistra. Bohemond had made these appointments, and his choice of dioceses would seem to have been dictated by military rather than by ecclesiastical considerations. Tarsus guarded the southern approach to the Cilician Gates, an important pass which a Byzantine army might use should it attempt to attack Antioch. Similarly, Mamistra commanded the Cilician approach road to the Syrian Gates which controlled communications between Cilicia and Antioch. It was common sense to place in these key cities bishops who were nominees of the prince of Antioch. In Orthodox times there had been three archbishops in Cilicia: those of Tarsus, Mamistra and Adana, of whom the archbishop of Tarsus had been the most important, ranking second among the metropolitans of Antioch.³ All three sees had had Orthodox incumbents in the tenth century. It is not certain whether they remained there after the Turkish conquest of 1090, but, if they did, the Latins expelled them.⁴ There was therefore no conflict between Bohemond's appointments and the ecclesiastical traditions of Antioch and Bernard made no innovations there. The third see of Adana was not revived but probably merged with that of Mamistra. Archbishop Roger of Tarsus, Bohemond's nominee, ruled until 1108 at least⁵ but by the end of Bernard's reign he had been replaced by archbishop Stephen.⁶ Bohemond's nominee at Mamistra, archbishop Bartholomew, had a much shorter reign:⁷ by 1108 he had been succeeded by an

1. WT, X, 29, *RHC Occ*, I, p 444; Albert of Aix, IX, 39–40, *RHC Occ*, IV, p 615; Ralph of Caen, cc 148–9, *RHC Occ*, III, p 710.

2. Letter to archbishop of Rheims, *PL*, 155, 877–80.

3. Tobler, Molinier, I, p 332, 'sedes secunda, Tarsus'; p 337, 'metropolitani per se subsistentes . . . Mopsuestia, Adana'.

4. Charon, II, p 234.

5. Müller, p 3, no 1; the unnamed archbishop of Tarsus in 1110 is probably Roger, Albert of Aix, XI, 42, *RHC Occ*, IV, p 682.

6. de Rozière, p 167, no 86.

7. He may be the unnamed archbishop of Mamistra in 1103, Albert of Aix, IX, 16, *RHC Occ*, IV, p 600.

archbishop R who appears only once as a charter witness.¹ He cannot be identified with Ralph of Domfront, who held the see at the end of Bernard's reign and who succeeded him as patriarch, since all the evidence suggests that Ralph was a comparatively young man at the time of his translation to Antioch, which he would not have been had he been archbishop of Mamistra for almost thirty years.²

In the early years of Bernard of Valence's pontificate Raymond IV of Toulouse was attempting to carve out a lordship for himself in the Muslim-held lands south of the principality of Antioch. He intended to make Tripoli the capital of his state and, although he died before that city fell, he nominated a south Frenchman, Albert, or Hubert, abbot of St Erard, to be its first bishop.³ His reasons for making this appointment were the same as those of count Baldwin in appointing a Latin archbishop of Edessa. Tripoli was an Orthodox see and had had a bishop in the tenth century.⁴ If there was an Orthodox bishop in residence when the Franks finally captured the city in 1109 he was driven out and bishop Albert was installed in his place. The appointment of a Latin bishop of Tripoli, though not marking a break with Orthodox tradition, nevertheless raised certain practical problems. Traditionally Tripoli was a suffragan see of the church of Tyre, but Tyre remained in Muslim hands until 1124 so that no Latin metropolitan could be appointed there. In these circumstances Bernard of Antioch made the church of Tripoli immediately subordinate to himself.⁵

In Bernard's pontificate a Latin bishopric was set up at Marash. This city, which commanded the approach roads to Antioch through the Anti-Taurus mountains, had been restored to the Byzantines by the leaders of the first crusade in 1097 in accordance with their oath to the emperor.⁶ In 1104 it was annexed by Bohemond who was at war with Byzantium and a Latin see was instituted there before 1114, in which year the first Latin bishop

1. Müller, p 3, no 1.

2. Ralph is first mentioned in 1135, Kohler, p 130, no 21.

3. Albert of St Erard appears as a member of Raymond IV's court at Tripoli in 1104, *RHC Lois*, II, pp 479-80, *chartes*, no 1. His appointment as bishop, William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, IV, 388, ed W. Stubbs, 2 vols, London 1889, *RS*, 90, II, p 458, where he is wrongly called Herbert.

4. Charon, II, p 233.

5. William of Tyre makes it clear that from the beginning the patriarch of Antioch had jurisdiction over the county of Tripoli, WT, XI, 28, *RHC Occ*, I, pp 502-5.

6. The crusaders left the Armenian governor, Thatoul, whom the Byzantine authorities recognised, in charge at Marash. Matthew of Edessa, 'Chronicle', II, 17, *RHC Arm*, I, p 50.

was killed in an earthquake.¹ Marash had been an autocephalous archbishopric in the sixth century, but there is no evidence that there was ever a bishop there after the Arab conquests.² It would seem that the Franks were motivated more by military considerations than by ecclesiastical ones in reviving this see, since it was in the interests of the prince of Antioch to nominate a bishop who could take charge of this strategically important city.

The Armenian scholar, St Nerses of Lampron, states that the Franks founded an archbishopric at Kesoun, which was situated between Marash and the Muslim emirate of Samosata.³ Although this is confirmed in no western source there seems no reason to doubt that it is true, for Antioch is very poorly documented in the early years of Frankish rule. Kesoun was an independent Armenian principality which was annexed by Baldwin II of Edessa in 1116, and he or his successor may well have wished to place a bishop there as his representative, even though the city had not been a see in Orthodox times.

Bernard of Valence was also responsible for appointing a Latin bishop in the coastal city of Jabala to the south of Antioch. This had been an autocephalous archbishopric in Orthodox times, an Orthodox bishop had been restored there in the tenth century, and one probably remained there until the Frankish occupation.⁴ The city was captured by Tancred in 1109 and a Latin bishop was probably appointed soon afterwards: he is first recorded in a document of 1115.⁵ He was an immediate suffragan of the patriarch.

After the fall of Tripoli in 1109 the entire north Syrian coast from Beirut to Seleucia was in Frankish hands. This was the one area where there had been Orthodox bishops before the Frankish conquest and where a transition from Orthodox to Latin bishops might most easily have been effected. It is therefore surprising that, except in Tripoli itself, where a Latin bishop was appointed by the count for political reasons, as has been discussed above, no Latin diocese was set up to the south of Jabala for some twenty years. The reason for this delay was a dispute about jurisdiction.

1. Walter the Chancellor, 'De Bello Antiocheno, Bello Primo', Art I, *RHC Occ*, V, p 83.

2. Tobler, Molinier, I, p 338, listed under its classical name, Germaniceia.

3. St Nerses of Lampron, 'Reflections on the Institutions of the Church and explanation of the Eucharistic Mystery', extracts, *RHC Arm*, I, p 577.

4. Charon, II, p 234.

5. Walter the Chancellor, 'De Bello Antiocheno', I, art V, *RHC Occ*, V, pp 91-2; J. Richard, *Le Comté de Tripoli sous la dynastie toulousaine (1102-87)*, Paris 1945, p 58, n 3, argues that Jabala was not a see but was confused by later scholars with the see of Gibelet. This opinion is untenable: both sees are named in the official papal list, Fabre, Duchesne, Mollat, *Liber Censuum*, I, p 239.

In the Orthodox tradition the ecclesiastical province of Tyre formed part of the patriarchate of Antioch. Its archbishop ranked first among the metropolitans of Antioch and ruled over thirteen suffragans, from Acre in the south to Tortosa in the north.¹ This system, which had been devised when the whole of Syria formed part of the Roman empire, created difficulties for the Franks. For the political boundary between the kingdom of Jerusalem and the county of Tripoli was fixed just north of Beirut and cut through the middle of the province of Tyre.

No problem arose when the Franks captured Acre in 1104, because no bishop was appointed there at that stage, but when Sidon and Beirut fell to Baldwin I in 1110 some ecclesiastical provision had to be made for them. Nobody denied that they formed part of the province of Tyre, but Baldwin I was naturally reluctant to concede that Tyre should be subject to the patriarch of Antioch over whom he had no control. The matter was referred to Rome by the king and the patriarch of Jerusalem and in 1111 they received a favourable reply from Paschal II who ruled that the ecclesiastical boundaries of Jerusalem and Antioch should follow the newly-established political frontiers between the Frankish states.² On this authority the patriarch of Jerusalem nominated a Latin bishop to Beirut: he was not consecrated because Bernard of Valence lodged an objection at Rome, stating that Tyre had traditionally formed part of his patriarchate. The pope replied to this tactfully, stating that he intended no derogation of the rights of the church of Antioch, but standing firm by his earlier judgment.³ Bernard of Valence was not satisfied, and sent envoys to the papal council of Benevento in 1113 to raise the matter again. One observer at least was troubled by their appearance: 'two men', he reported, 'whose hair and beards were matted and waved, not, as it would seem, by design, but through neglect, threw themselves at the pope's feet'.⁴ This comment suggests that already by the early years of the twelfth century the Franks in Syria were adopting different fashions from those prevalent in the west. The pope substantially upheld his earlier ruling: Baldwin I should keep control of the churches in his kingdom, which should come under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Jerusalem, but Bernard of Valence should control those churches which clearly could be proved to belong to the church of Antioch. By this the pope presumably meant the diocese of Tripoli and the other

1. Tobler, Molinier, I, pp 331-2.

2. *PL*, 163, 289-90, nos 323-4; *WT*, XI, 28, *RHC Occ*, I, p 502.

3. *PL*, 163, 303-4, no 346; *WT*, *loc. cit.*, Baldwin, elect of Beirut, *CGOH*, vol II, p 899, no 4.

4. Pflugck-Harttung, II, p 205, no 247.

former Orthodox dioceses in that county.¹ Bernard of Valence continued to press his claims to the province of Tyre and in 1118 Paschal II wrote to Baldwin I urging him to respect the traditional rights of the patriarch of Antioch, though not giving any specific injunctions about what form this should take.²

Rowe has traced the stages of this dispute and argues that, except in the case of Tripoli, no suffragans were consecrated in the province of Tyre until after that city was captured in 1124.³ In 1127 the patriarch of Jerusalem consecrated an archbishop of Tyre, and pope Honorius II not merely confirmed this appointment, but also ordered that all the suffragans of Tyre should give canonical obedience to their archbishop who should be subject to the patriarch of Jerusalem.⁴ Bernard of Valence refused to accept this decision, which would have deprived him of ecclesiastical control over the county of Tripoli which he had exercised for a quarter of a century. Indeed, it seems to have been at the point when an archbishop was nominated for Tyre that Bernard decided to create two new Latin bishoprics in the north of the province. These were at Tortosa, where a Latin bishop is first recorded in February 1128,⁵ and Gibelet, the classical Byblos. This see is exceptionally poorly documented in the twelfth century: the earliest evidence of a Latin bishopric there comes from 1138⁶ but it seems probable that this was set up at the same time as Tortosa as part of the ecclesiastical reorganisation of the county of Tripoli. Both sees had been Orthodox bishoprics before the first crusade.⁷ Bernard of Valence refused throughout his life to obey the pope's injunction in regard to the province of Tyre: the bishops of Tripoli, Tortosa and Gibelet remained directly subject to him as their metropolitan and did not acknowledge the archbishop of Tyre.⁸

At about the same time as the subdivision of the Latin diocese of Tripoli was being carried out a similar reorganisation took place in the archdiocese of Apamea. The Franks captured Rafaniyah in the north-west of the county of Tripoli in 1126 and immediately appointed a Latin bishop there.⁹ In the sixth century this city

1. *PL*, 163, 316, no 359; *WT*, XI, 28, *RHC Occ*, I, p 502.

2. *PL*, 163, 316–17, no 360; *WT*, *loc. cit.*

3. J.G. Rowe, 'The Papacy and the Ecclesiastical Province of Tyre', *BJRL*, 43, 1960–1, pp 160–90.

4. *WT*, XIII, 23, *RHC Occ*, I, pp 591–3.

5. *CGOH*, no 82.

6. de Rozière, pp 5–6, no 7; *RR*, I, p 44, no 175.

7. Charon, II, p 233.

8. *WT*, XIV, 13, *RHC Occ*, I, p 624.

9. Delaville Le Roulx, 'Inventaire des pièces de Terre Sainte de l'Ordre de l'Hôpital', *ROL*, 3, 1895, no 8, a document of 1128 in which bishop Gerald mentions his predecessor, Aimery.

had been a suffragan see of Apamea, but there does not seem to have been an Orthodox bishopric there in the twelfth century.¹ The erection of this see seems to have been another instance of the way in which strategic considerations, in this case the need to guard an important frontier town, dictated the religious settlement, so that the ruler might be represented by a bishop whom he helped to choose.

The small coastal city of Valania was also a suffragan see of Apamea, and probably did have an Orthodox bishop at the time of the Frankish conquest.² The city was captured by the Franks in 1109, but it is not clear when the first Latin bishop was appointed. The earliest record of one is found in a document of 1163, which mentions a former bishop, Gerald, who had died before the document was written.³ It is therefore possible, though necessarily unproven, that the see of Valania was created at about the same time as that of Rafaniyah.

Towards the end of Bernard of Valence's long reign the huge archdiocese of Edessa was subdivided. The lands of Edessa west of the Euphrates had formerly been part of the province of Hierapolis, which ranked fifth in dignity among the metropolitan sees of Antioch.⁴ Hierapolis itself was in Muslim hands throughout the crusader period, and the Frankish see of Hierapolis was therefore fixed at a place which the Franks called La Tulupe, but which Cahen has identified with Duluk, the classical Doliche, which had formerly been a suffragan see of Hierapolis.⁵ A Latin archbishop of this province is first mentioned in two documents of 1134⁶ which suggests that it had only recently been established then. Duluk is very near Tell Bashir, the Frankish capital of western Edessa,⁷ and the date of its foundation suggests that it was set up by count Joscelin II of Edessa as an ecclesiastical centre for the western half of his state soon after his accession in 1131.

When Bernard of Valence died in 1135 the number of Latin bishoprics in the patriarchate had risen from five to fourteen. He cannot, of course, be given all the credit for this, for the foundation of a new diocese was a political as well as an ecclesiastical decision. What is remarkable about Bernard's pontificate is

1. Tobler, Molinier, I, pp 332-3.

2. Charon, II, p 234.

3. Paoli, pp 40-1, no 39.

4. Tobler, Molinier, I, p 333.

5. C. Cahen, *La Syrie du nord à l'époque des croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche*, Paris 1940, p 115.

6. Kohler, p 129, no 19; *CGOH*, no 104.

7. WT, XVII, 17, *RHC Occ*, I, p 786.

the absence of friction between him and any of the thirteen rulers who held power in the three northern states during that time.¹ The close co-operation which existed between the patriarch and the princes must have been important in devising an ecclesiastical settlement for the northern states, and the Latin church of Antioch took shape very largely under Bernard's guidance. Wherever possible he followed the Orthodox tradition in deciding on the location of new dioceses.² But perhaps his greatest contribution to the development of the Antiochene church was the firm stand which he took about the province of Tyre. It is true that he did not succeed in gaining control of Tyre itself or of its suffragan sees in the kingdom of Jerusalem, but against the wishes of the papacy he preserved the sees of Tyre in the county of Tripoli as part of the patriarchate of Antioch. This had important consequences, for the county of Tripoli was to prove the most enduring part of the Frankish dominions in north Syria.

The second Latin patriarch of Antioch, Ralph, was a very different kind of man from Bernard of Valence. He came from Domfront in southern Normandy,³ but nothing is known about his early career except that by the end of Bernard's reign he had been appointed archbishop of Mamistra.⁴ When the patriarchate fell vacant the senior Latin clergy met with the canons of Antioch to choose a new primate. Ralph was not present at the meeting, although he was in Antioch, but while the rest of the clergy were conferring together he was acknowledged patriarch by popular acclaim and enthroned in St Peter's basilica. As he was already in bishop's orders he did not need to be consecrated, and he took Bernard of Valence's *pallium* from the altar and invested himself with it as a sign that his jurisdiction was valid.⁵ The method of his election was unique in the history of the Latin church in Syria and the closest parallel to it in the recent history of the western church was the election of pope Gregory VII.

William of Tyre, who had met Ralph of Domfront when he was a boy, gives a vivid and not unsympathetic account of him:

The Lord Ralph was a tall, handsome man. His eyes slanted a little, but not excessively so. He was not very well-educated, but was a fluent speaker and a cheerful companion and had good manners. Because he was very generous he gained the favour both of the knights and of the middle classes. He was not good at keeping promises and agreements

1. This number includes the regencies of Baldwin II and Fulk.

2. Only Artah and Kesoun had not been Orthodox sees. Artah was made a see before Bernard's accession.

3. WT, XIV, 10, *RHC Occ*, I, p 619.

4. de Rozière, p 167, no 86; Kohler, p 130, no 21.

5. WT, XIV, 10, *RHC Occ*, I, p 620.

that he had made and would say first one thing and then another. He was a complex character, cunning, cautious and discerning. His one weakness was that he would not take back into favour those whom he had rightly antagonised when they wished to make their peace. He was called arrogant and conceited, and this was true.¹

It is easy from this description to see why Ralph was popular with the laity, but popularity alone was not usually enough to secure a senior church appointment in the Frankish east. Normally such appointments were made by the lay ruler, using the mechanism of canonical election. That this could be by-passed in Ralph's case was due to the unusual political situation which obtained at Antioch in 1135.

Bohemond II had died in 1130 leaving as his heir a young child, Constance. Bohemond's widow, Alice, the sister of queen Melisende of Jerusalem, wished to act as regent, but she did not have the support of the baronage of Antioch who appealed to her brother-in-law, Fulk of Jerusalem, to take charge of the principality. Fulk came to Antioch in 1135 and agreed with the barons to send to the west for a husband for the young princess Constance, who could take over the government in his wife's name. The favoured candidate was Raymond of Poitiers, younger son of the duke of Aquitaine, to whom envoys were sent in the lifetime of Bernard of Valence.² While these negotiations were being conducted, in the winter of 1135–6, queen Melisende, who had recently been admitted to a full share of power in the kingdom of Jerusalem, persuaded her husband to relinquish the regency of Antioch in favour of her sister, the dowager princess Alice.³ Alice's position was, however, weak, since she did not have the full support of the baronage, and this would explain why she did not attempt to oppose the appointment of Ralph as patriarch since he was the barons' candidate and she wished to avoid a confrontation with them that she might not win.

The election was irregular and in normal circumstances the pope might have been expected to intervene. This did not occur because the papacy itself was in a very difficult situation. Innocent II, who had been elected in 1130, was recognised in the Frankish east, but his rival, Anacletus II, who had been elected at

1. *Ibid.*, XV, 17, p 686.

2. *Ibid.*, XIV, 9, pp 618–19.

3. *Ibid.*, XIV, 20, p 636, dates this while the negotiations for Raymond's marriage were in progress. On Melisende, see H.E. Mayer, 'Studies in the History of Queen Melisende of Jerusalem', *DOP*, 26, 1972, pp 102–13; B. Hamilton, 'Women in the Crusader States; the Queens of Jerusalem', in D. Baker, ed, *Medieval Women*, Oxford 1978, pp 149–51.