

III

SOCIAL CLASSES

IN THE CRUSADER STATES: THE "MINORITIES"

"Minority" is used in this chapter in the sense of "a group of people, differentiated from others in the same society by race, nationality, religion, and language, who both think of themselves as a differentiated group and are thought of by the others as a differentiated group with negative connotations. Further, they are relatively lacking in power and hence are subjected to certain exclusions, discriminations, and other differential treatment."¹ This definition is particularly useful, since although the "minorities" dealt with formed in total an overwhelming numerical majority in the areas conquered by the crusaders, their legal, social, and economic position was determined by the European conquerors who settled in Syria and Palestine. We shall be concerned, however, with more than a single minority. The term as applied to the crusader states covers many groups quite varied in culture, although the conquerors paid little attention to distinctions among them, looking upon the entire non-Frankish population of whatever kind as a single entity. Despite the efforts of some modern historians to distinguish different policies followed by the crusaders respecting natives who were Christians and those who were not, in law—as distinguished from practice—no such difference existed.

Contemporary sources written by Europeans are very much aware

In general see Hans Prutz, *Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Berlin, 1883; repr. Hildesheim, 1964); Claude Cahen, *La Syrie du nord à l'époque des croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche* (IFD, BO, I; Paris, 1940), esp. pp. 176–204. For more particular studies regarding Palestine see Joshua Prawer, *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem: European Colonialism in the Middle Ages* (London, 1972), pp. 46 ff.; Jean Richard, *Le Royaume latin de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1953); and Hans E. Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Stuttgart, 1965), tr. John Gillingham as *The Crusades* (Oxford, 1972). The sources and secondary bibliographies for the different minorities are given below at the appropriate places throughout the chapter.

1. Arnold M. Rose, in *International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, X (1968), 365, s.v. "Minorities."

of the kaleidoscopic variety of peoples, something almost unknown in the west. Wilbrand of Oldenburg describes the city of Antioch in 1212 as follows: "It has many rich inhabitants: Franks and Syrians, Greeks and Jews, Armenians and Moslems, all of whom are ruled by the Franks and each of whom follows his own laws."² A few years later, in 1217, Thietmar lists "Greeks, Jacobites, Georgians, Armenians, Nestorians, Jews, Sadducees [probably the Jewish sect of Qaraites], Samaritans, and Assassins."³ As time passes, the list grows. James of Vitry (d. 1240) adds the forgotten Maronites,⁴ and Burchard of Mount Sion (1283), having already mentioned Moslems, Syrians, and Greeks, adds "Armenians, Georgians, Nestorians, Jacobites, Chaldeans, Medes, Persians, Ethiopians, Egyptians, and many other people who are Christians."⁵ Even a Jewish native of Moslem Spain, Benjamin of Tudela, far more familiar with varieties of people of different languages and religions, says of Jerusalem about 1167 that it "has many inhabitants; and the Ismaelites [Moslems] call them Jacobites, Aramaeans [Armenians or Syrians], Greeks, Georgians, and Franks."⁶ To get a clearer view of the different communities involved, however, it will be necessary first to draw a rough picture of their geographical distribution in the Syro-Palestinian area held by the crusaders.

In the narrow stretch of land running some 530 miles in length from the confines of Cilicia to the Red Sea the crusaders met with a variety of races, religions, and languages. The aim of the First Crusade, to destroy the "infidel" and liberate oriental Christendom and the Holy Land, came up against hard realities, the existence of which could not have been suspected. It was one thing to lump all "infidels" together for general condemnation and destruction, but how to deal with eastern Christians? It was well known in the cultural and political centers of Europe that the Greek church was not in communion with Rome, but as for other Christian denominations, the Franks had never encountered them before. Among scholars there was some historical knowledge of their heresies, but none whatsoever of their identity as "nations" or, as the crusaders would sometimes call them,

2. Wilbrand of Oldenburg, in *Peregrinatores medii aevi quatuor*, ed. J. C. M. Laurent (Leipzig, 1873), p. 172.

3. *Mag. Thietmari peregrinatio*, ed. Laurent (Hamburg, 1857), p. 52 (repr. bound with *Peregrinatores medii aevi quatuor*).

4. James of Vitry, "Historia Iherosolimitana . . .," cap. 74, in Jacques Bongars, ed., *Gesta Dei per Francos* (Hanau, 1611; repr. Jerusalem, 1972), I, 1090.

5. Burchard of Mount Sion, in *Peregrinatores*, ed. Laurent, p. 89.

6. *The Itinerary of Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela*, ed. and tr. Marcus N. Adler (2 vols., London, 1907), I, 35.

"languages"; and there was no idea that some areas were densely settled by them, or that indeed they even formed a numerical majority in some places. As for knowledge of Islam in general, let alone its internal divisions, it was practically nil. Though merchants of Amalfi and Venice were in contact with the Levant, their knowledge had little diffusion in Europe. Only in the second half of the twelfth century did the image of Islamic peoples become clearer. It was a permanent loss to European cultural history that the first Latin history of Islamic peoples, by one who lived in the Levant and had an intimate knowledge of its inhabitants, namely William of Tyre, did not survive.

It is not easy to draw an accurate picture of the Moslem inhabitants of the crusader states. They disappeared almost entirely from all the fortified cities and fortresses during the ten years of conquest (1100–1110). Almost all sieges which ended in victory for the crusaders were followed by the massacre of Moslem and Jewish inhabitants (and occasionally also of eastern Christians, whose external appearance did not differ from that of the others). Moslems remained in only a few places, usually those taken without fighting, such as Nablus in Palestine. Even where the city capitulated, as did Tyre in 1124 and Ascalon in 1153, the Moslems to whom the Franks guaranteed their lives preferred to abandon their homes. After the initial conquest, however, with greater security and the economic development of the coastal cities, Moslems began to return. Some were probably former inhabitants,⁷ others migrated from the countryside, but in what numbers we cannot say. Certainly the Turkish garrisons of northern Syria and the interior of Palestine disappeared completely, as did the *mamlūk* garrisons of the Fāṭimids in the coastal towns. The Moslem city element seems to have been stronger in the north than in the south. Beirut and Sidon in the kingdom of Jerusalem, Jabala in the county of Tripoli, Jubail and Latakia in the principality of Antioch, all seem to have had large Moslem populations—indeed a majority, according to one Moslem source.⁸ There were probably large Moslem concentrations in other crusader ports such as Antioch, Tripoli, Tyre, and Acre. But there were none in Jerusalem. Both western and Jewish sources attest to the fact that immediately after the conquest the crusaders promulgated a law barring Moslems and Jews from the holy city.⁹

7. As late as 1136, after Zengi's recapture of Ma'arrat an-Nu'mān, the Moslems who had titles to property were allowed to recover it. Others had to find their titles in the dīwān of Aleppo (Ibn-al-Athīr, in *RHC, Or.*, I, 423).

8. 'Imād-ad-Dīn, in Abū-Shāmah, "Livre des deux jardins," *RHC, Or.*, IV, 309.

9. The relevant sources are analyzed in Prawer, "The Jews in the Latin Kingdom" (in Hebrew, with English summary), *Zion*, XI (1946), 38–82.

Though the Moslems abandoned the cities during the period of conquest they did not abandon their farms and villages, although there were refugees from Syria and Palestine in Damascus as well as in Egypt. After a period of silent hostility, the most spectacular expression of which was the abandonment of their farms,¹⁰ the Moslem peasants, with some exceptions,¹¹ and the Frankish seigneurs established a *modus vivendi*.

Whatever had been their historical background, the Moslem peoples of the crusader states formed a linguistic and ethnic bloc by the twelfth century. Arabic was spoken by everybody,¹² and former ethnic differences in Syria ceased to be important (they had never been important in Palestine, which had hardly been colonized by the Arab invaders of the seventh century). Within the frontiers of the Latin states there were virtually no Turks or nomadic Turcomans. Only the beduins, called "Arabs" in Moslem sources, stood out as a separate group.

Within this Moslem bloc, however, there were religious differences, in particular between the Sunnites, who acknowledged the 'Abbāsid caliphs of Baghdad, and the Shī'ites, who accepted the Fāṭimid imams of Egypt. In addition there were sectarian Shī'ites, unimportant within the crusader states but numerous along the frontiers. During the last quarter of the eleventh century when the Selchūkid Turks, the secular arm of the 'Abbāsids, pushed the Fāṭimids out of Syria and Palestine, there probably followed some strengthening of the Sunnah. Turkish garrisons in the newly conquered territories were Sunnites. Local emirs, qadis, and ra'ises who lost their independence or their links with Cairo, pronounced the *khutbah* or Friday prayer in the name of the 'Abbāsid caliphs. It is doubtful, however, that the allegiance of the mass of the local population changed. On the other hand Fāṭimid rule lasted for only a hundred years, during which Sunnite elements certainly continued to exist. On the whole, it seems that the Shī'ites were predominant in northern Syria, whereas southern Syria and Palestine were to a large extent Sunnite,¹³ but there were exceptions. By the end of the tenth century, the northern parts of Palestine and Transjordan

10. William of Tyre, IX, 19 (*RHC, Occ.*, I, 393). Cf. Praver, "The Settlement of the Latins in Jerusalem," *Speculum*, XXVII (1952), 490-503.

11. On Moslem refugees escaping the hard treatment of a Frankish lord in Nablus, see Emmanuel Sivan, "Réfugiés syro-palestiniens au temps des croisades," *Revue des études islamiques*, XXXV (1967), 135-147.

12. Abraham N. Poliak, "L'Arabisation de l'Orient sémitique," *Revue des études islamiques*, XII (1938), 35-63. Cf. Cahen, "Un Document concernant les Melkites et les Latins d'Antioche au temps des croisades," *Revue des études byzantines*, XXIX (1971), 285-292.

13. Cahen, *Syrie du nord*, p. 188.

were overwhelmingly Shī'ite (especially Tiberias, Kadesh in Galilee, Nablus, and 'Ammān).¹⁴

The Shī'ah underwent many schisms. Only the Druzes, however, who accepted the eccentric imam al-Ḥākim (996–1021) as the last incarnation of divinity, were to be found, at least partially, within the borders of the Latin states. They were in Jabal as-Summāq and Buzā'ah in northern Syria, though their special area was on the confines of the kingdom of Jerusalem and the county of Tripoli. "Some ten miles outside Sidon," writes Benjamin of Tudela, "there is a nation fighting those [Franks] of Sidon. This nation is called Druzes and they are pagans and have no religion. They inhabit the high mountains and the recesses of the rocks and there is no king or judge over them. And they stretch as far as Mount Hermon, some three days' march."¹⁵ This is the earliest description of the Druzes which has come down to us. In all probability there were also other heretical communities in this area near Belfort (Qal'at ash-Shaqīf), Banyas,¹⁶ and Wādī-t-Taim. A contemporary Moslem source describes the area as a concentration point of Nuṣairīs, Druzes, Zoroastrians, and other sects.¹⁷ The most spectacular of the Ismā'īlite sects was the *bāṭiniyah* (esoteric) sect of Assassins (Hashishiyūn) organized by the Persian Ḥasan-i-Sabbāḥ (al-Ḥasan ibn-aṣ-Ṣabbāḥ, d. 1124) at the end of the eleventh century in the stronghold of Alamut. From their fortresses at al-Kahf and other places near the Frankish frontiers, they menaced the lives of Moslem and Frankish leaders from time to time, but they can hardly be considered part of the local population.

On the fringes of the cultivated area and the desert, as often within the Latin states as without, were the nomadic beduins.¹⁸ The main tribe, of which the others were branches or related clans, were the

14. Al-Maqqdisī (al-Muqaddasī), "Description of Syria . . .," tr. Guy Le Strange, in *PPTS*, III-3 (London, 1892), 6; Nāṣir-i-Khusrau, "Diary of a Journey through Syria and Palestine," tr. Le Strange, in *PPTS*, IV-1 (London, 1893), 9, 11–12.

15. Benjamin of Tudela, *Itinerary*, ed. Adler, p. 18.

16. In 1126 the city of Banyās was handed over by Tughtigin to the Ismā'īlis who had to flee from Damascus. They in turn handed it over to the Franks in 1129; Ibn-al-Athīr, in *RHC, Or.*, I, 366–368, 385; Mayer, "Latins, Muslims and Greeks in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem," *History*, LXIII (1978), 175–192.

17. Ibn-al-Athīr, in *RHC, Or.*, I, 383; on the Druzes see Philip K. Hitti, *The Origins of the Druze People and Religion* (New York, 1928); O. H. Thompson, "The Druzes of Lebanon," *Moslem World*, XX (1930), 270–285; and Kamal S. Salibi, "The Buhturids of the Ḡarb: Mediaeval Lords of Beirut and of Southern Lebanon," *Arabica*, VIII (1961), 74–97. On the Nuṣairīs see below, note 122.

18. The major sources (slightly late, but based on tradition or earlier sources) are al-Qalqashandī, *Ṣubḥ al-a'ṣhā* (Cairo, 1914), I, 324; IV, 203–215; az-Zāhirī, *Zubdat kashf al-mamālik* (Paris, 1894), p. 105; al-Maqrīzī, *As-sulūk li-ma'rīfat ad-dulūk*, ed. Étienne Quatremère (2 vols., Paris, 1837–1844), I, 79–80, 83. Cf. Arthur S. Tritton, "The Tribes of Syria in the

Banū-Ṭaiy, who roamed the large expanses between Egypt, Palestine, and southern Syria. In northern Syria and Iraq they met with other tribes: the Kilāb, Uqail, and others. East and north of Egypt there were the Darmah and the Banū-Ruzaiq on the Egyptian border, some suspected of coöperating with the Franks. In the half-deserted area between Gaza and Hebron were branches of the Banū-Ṭaiy, namely the Jarm Quḏā'ah and, on the coast to the south of Gaza and Darum, the Banū-Ghaur (suggesting the valley of the Jordan) and Banū-Buhaid. In the area between Sinai and Transjordan, the sources also mention the Banū-Ṣadr (perhaps connected with Wādī Ṣadr in western Sinai), Banū-Ā'id, Banū-Fuhaid, and Banū-Ubaiy, the last having a reputation as eaters of dead animals, located in the al-Jafr and Ḥismah area.¹⁹ Southern Transjordan was a place much favored by the beduins, who found a prosperous market for their horses and cattle at the great annual fair in the plain of Maidān,²⁰ near Muzairib, in the Hauran. Around 1115 the Banū-Rabī'ah roamed here, from around Petra to 'Ajlūn. Then they moved to the Hauran and broke up into the powerful Faḡl, who moved to the north, and the Ḥamah and Mīrah, who remained in the Hauran. In southern Transjordan there were other tribes from Egypt, seemingly colonies of frontier defenders. They included the Banū-Kinānah, the Banū-Ḥaubar, and the Banū-Khālid. To the north, near the crusader castles of Krak de Montréal (ash-Shaubak) and Kerak, were the Banū-'Uqbah and Banū-Zuhair. Farther north still, near 'Ajlūn, were the Banū-'Auf, who gave their name to the high plateau of the area. Here they joined with the powerful Banū-Rabī'ah of the Ṭaiy, the successors of the Banū-Jarrāḥ, former rulers of central Palestine with their capital in Ramla (tenth-eleventh century), who roamed as far as the Hauran. Unspecified nomadic tribes pressed on the northern borders of the kingdom near the sources of the Jordan, and in the Marj 'Uyūn and Wādī-t-Taim, drawn by their excellent pastures.²¹

14th and 15th Centuries," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, XII (1948), 567-573. Additional material is in *An Arab-Syrian Gentleman and Warrior in the Period of the Crusades: Memoirs of Usāmah ibn Munqidh*, tr. Hitti (*CURC*, 10; New York, 1929; repr. Beirut, 1964); and Ibn-al-Qalānisi, *The Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades*, tr. H. A. R. Gibb (London, 1932). See also the excellent studies by Max von Oppenheim, *Die Beduinen* (Leipzig, 1939), I, 280 ff.; II, 7 ff., 82-83; Karl V. Zettersteen, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Mamelukensultane . . . nach arabischen Handschriften* (Leyden, 1919), p. 38-39; and Poliak, *op. cit.*

19. Usāmah Ibn-Munqidh, *An Arab-Syrian Gentleman*, p. 36. The coöperation of the Banū-Ruzaiq with the Franks (1112-1113) is mentioned by Ibn-al-Qalānisi, *op. cit.*, tr. Gibb, p. 130. He also mentions the Arabs of the Ṭaiy, Kilāb, and Khafājah tribes as participating in the attack on Tiberias in 1113.

20. On the Maidān fair see Prawer, *Histoire du royaume latin de Jérusalem*, I (Paris, 1969), 380.

21. Among them were certainly the Banū-'Āmilah; see below, note 120. Cf. Maurice Godefroy-

It is a remarkable fact that the beduins never threatened the security of the crusader kingdom. Until the Selchükid conquest of Palestine, the beduins were often its real rulers, but their raids and invasions then ceased for over two hundred years; only with the decline of Mamluk power in the late fifteenth century do the beduins reappear in force.

As we shall see, the Franks, faced with the problem posed by these nomadic tribes, soon found a way to deal with them.

The second most numerous element among the minorities were the eastern Christians, living in solid groups, but often, especially south of Tripoli, in enclaves amidst a mixed population. As a whole they were more numerous in Syria, in the principality of Antioch and in and around Edessa, than in Palestine, although there was an important Christian enclave, the Maronites, in the mountains of Lebanon.

In the city of Antioch, and in the countryside almost as far as the eastern frontiers of the Orontes river, the Christian element probably comprised a majority of the local population.²² Byzantine domination of Anatolia well into the eleventh century, the renewed Byzantine rule in Antioch during the century which preceded the First Crusade, the strong position of the Greek church under Byzantine rule, and the strengthening of the position of the non-Chalcedonian creeds after the Moslem conquest — all these factors had helped to preserve Christianity in Antioch and Edessa.²³

Demombynes, *La Syrie à l'époque des Mamelouks d'après les auteurs arabes* (Paris, 1923), p. 23, note 4. On the Wādi-t-Taim cf. Prawer, *Royaume latin*, I, 291, 309-310, 320, 334, 510-511.

22. Cahen, *Syrie du nord*, p. 343; Hitti, "The Impact of the Crusades on Eastern Christianity," in *Medieval and Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Aziz Suryal Atiya*, ed. Sami A. Hanna (Leyden, 1972), pp. 211-217.

23. There are a large number of studies relating to eastern Christians which occasionally deal with the period of the crusades, but there is no special study of the problem as a whole. Of the greatest importance is Gilbert Dagron, "Minorités ethniques et religieuses dans l'Orient byzantin à la fin du Xe et au XIe siècles: L'immigration syrienne," *Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance*, VI (1976), 177-216. For summaries and bibliographies see *Religionsgeschichte des Orients in der Zeit der Weltreligionen* (Handbuch der Orientalistik, ed. Bertold Spuler, I: Der Nahe und der Mittlere Osten, vol. VIII: Religion, part 2; Leyden and Cologne, 1961); Georg Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur* (Studi e testi, XXXV; 4 vols., Vatican City, 1944-1953); Stephan E. Assemani, *Biblioteca orientalis clementino-vaticana*, II: *De Scriptoribus Syris Monophysitis* (Rome, 1721); Anton Baumstark and Adolf Rucker, *Die syrische Literatur* (Handbuch der Orientalistik, II-III, 1954); Raymond Janin, *Les Églises orientales et les rites orientaux* (Paris, 1926); Donald Attwater, *The Christian Churches of the East* (2 vols., Milwaukee, 1961); Aziz S. Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity* (London and Notre Dame, 1968); and Anna D. von den Brincken, *Die "Nationes Christianorum orientaliū" im Verständnis der lateinischen Historiographie von der Mitte der 12. bis in die zweite Hälfte der 14. Jahrhunderts* (Cologne and Vienna, 1973), with copious bibliography, pp. 463-501.

There were also significant Christian elements farther east. The Nestorian church was the dominant Christian community in Mesopotamia and Persia, and had branches reaching into Central Asia and even farther.²⁴ Their patriarch was the only Christian prelate allowed a see in the 'Abbāsīd capital of Baghdad. The geographic area of Nestorianism lay for the most part well beyond the area of the crusader states and their immediate Moslem neighbors. Driven eastward by early persecution, the Nestorians found a home in the Persian empire, there to develop the famous Nestorian missions, the first to penetrate eastern Asia. The Moslem conquest did not bring about any significant return of Nestorians to Syria, Lebanon, and Palestine. Consequently, by the time of the crusades they were not numerous in these areas, although they were to be found in the county of Edessa, both in the cities and in the countryside.

Whereas Nestorians, Orthodox Georgians (often confused by the crusaders with Monophysites), Monophysite Armenians, Copts, and Abyssinians formed an outer Christian periphery, within the area of the crusader states the major Christian groups were the "Syrians" or Melkites, the Jacobites, and the Maronites of Lebanon. The overwhelming majority of eastern Christians were the "Syrians" and the Jacobites. Both were in large measure indigenous, going back to the native populations converted to Christianity during the fourth and fifth centuries. The "Syrians"—whose name led some crusaders to fanciful etymologies, connecting them with "Assyrians"—were Greek Orthodox in creed, and used Greek in their liturgy, although their normal language of communication was Arabic. The generic name *Suryānī* sometimes led to confusion, with some sources using it indiscriminately to denote all the eastern Christians of Syria and Palestine.²⁵

In contrast to the Greek Orthodox and "Syrians," called by their adversaries "Chalcedonians," and in Syria "malkānī" (Arabic: *malkīyūn*) and so Melkites, were the Monophysite Jacobites, whose creed was

24. There were virtually no Nestorians in the crusader states other than Edessa. A Nestorian monastery near Jericho existed between the fifth and ninth centuries, but was later abandoned; see Heinz Stephan, "A Nestorian Hermitage between Jericho and the Jordan," *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities of Palestine*, IV (1935), 81-86. A Nestorian scholar in Tripoli in the thirteenth century was the teacher of the great Jacobite Bar Hebraeus; see his *Chronicon ecclesiasticum*, ed. and tr. (into Latin) by Jean B. Abbeloos and Thomas J. Lamy (3 vols., Paris and Louvain, 1872-1877), II, 670. It is very likely that the "Mousserins" of the *Assises de Jérusalem* were Nestorian merchants who had connections with Acre; see Richard, "La Confrérie des Mosserins d'Acre et les marchands de Mossoul au XIIIème siècle," *L'Orient syrien*, XI (1966), 451-460.

25. Cf. Frédéric Macler, "Notes latines sur les Nestoriens, Maronites, Arméniens, Géorgiens, Mozarabes," *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, LXXVIII (1918), 243-260; Wilhelm de Vries, S.J., *Der Christliche Osten in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Würzburg, 1951).

that also embraced by the Armenians, Copts, and Abyssinians. But while these last were ethnic groups with what were in effect national churches, the Jacobites were never such. They were stronger in the north than in the south, but their communities could be found in all the crusader cities as well as in the countryside.

The relative numbers of "Syrians" and Jacobites are impossible to estimate. In the area of the principality of Antioch the Byzantine or Greek Orthodox church was important, although it has been alleged that even here the Jacobite church was stronger. It has been estimated that by the end of the tenth century the Orthodox hierarchy had lost a third of its former 152 episcopal sees, while the Jacobites counted some 160. In Antioch itself the Jacobites were apparently more numerous than the Orthodox when the city fell to the crusaders.²⁶ In the south, in Lebanon and Palestine, the Byzantine church was certainly weaker, but it controlled the great sanctuaries, such as the churches of Nazareth, Bethlehem, and the Holy Sepulcher. The number of Byzantine Christians was of course small, their clergy probably recruited in the Byzantine empire. But the protection given by the basileus was tangible enough. In the eleventh century, formal treaties were concluded between the empire and the caliphate to ensure the safety and property of the Byzantine church in the Holy Land. As a matter of fact, the last reconstruction of the church of the Holy Sepulcher before the crusades was the outcome of such an agreement.

26. For the Byzantine church see Bernard Leib, *Rome, Kiev et Byzance à la fin du XI^{ème} siècle* (Paris, 1924); *idem*, *Deux inédits byzantins sur les azymes au début du XII^{ème} siècle* (Rome, 1923); Walter Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz: Die Trennung der beiden Mächte und das Problem ihrer Wiedervereinigung bis zum Untergange des byzantinischen Reiches* (Berlin, 1903); Steven Runciman, *The Eastern Schism: A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches during the XIth and XIIth Centuries* (Oxford, 1955); Ferdinand Chalandon, *Les Comnène: Étude sur l'empire byzantin au XI^e et au XII^e siècles* (2 vols., Paris, 1912; repr. New York, 1960); W. de Vries, Octavian Bârlea, Joseph Gill, and Michael Lacko, *Rom und die Patriarchate des Orients* (Freiburg and Munich, 1963); George Every, *The Byzantine Patriarchate 451-1204* (London, 1947); Carlo Gatti and Cyril P. Karalevskij, *I Riti e le chiese orientali*, II, *Il Rito bizantino e le chiese bizantine* (Genoa, 1942); Hans G. Beck, *Die byzantinische Kirche im Zeitalter der Kreuzzüge (Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte, ed. Hubert Jedin, V-2; Freiburg, 1968)*. See also the detailed introduction by Theodosj T. Haluščynskij in his edition of *Acta Innocentii III (1198-1216) e registris Vaticanis aliisque fontibus* (PC, Fontes, ser. 3, vol. II; Vatican City, 1944). Of basic importance is Karalevskij, "Antioche," in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, III (1924), cols. 563-703. The Greek Orthodox view is presented by Aleksandr Popov, *Latinskaja Jerusalimskaja Patriarkhya epoki Krestonoscov* (St. Petersburg, 1903); A. Papadopoulos-Kerameos, *Analecta hierosolymitikes stachyologias e sylloges anecdoton*, II (St. Petersburg, 1894); cf. Chrusostomos A. Papadopoulos, *Historia tes ekklesias Hierosolymon* (Athens, 1970). Meliaras Kallistos, "Hoi hagioi en Palestne kai ta ep antu dikaia tu helleniku ethnes," *Nea Sion*, XX (1925), 677 ff.; C. Charon [i.e., C. P. Karalevskij], "L'Origine ethnographique des Melkites," *Échos d'Orient*, XI (1908), 35-40; and Venance Grumel, "La Chronologie des patriarches grecs de Jérusalem au XIII^e siècle," *Revue des études byzantines*, XX (1962), 197-201.

The Armenian church enjoyed a somewhat similar position in the county of Edessa, where autonomous or semi-autonomous Armenian communities preserved their identity and their own hierarchy. Outside this area, however, Armenian communities were small, probably consisting only of collegiate chapters and monastic communities, although around these there sometimes gathered secular communities. Such was the case, for example, in Jerusalem under the Moslems and later under the crusaders, with its Armenian sanctuary of St. James.²⁷

The Jacobites, who had successfully opposed Byzantine pressure, preserved a well-developed church organization.²⁸ It was the persistence of their church which to a large measure kept the community alive, preserving it from annihilation through conversion to the Orthodox or to the ruling Moslem creed. From the Jacobite point of

27. On the Armenians see below, note 90, but cf. Dagron, "Minorités ethniques."

28. In addition to the general studies indicated above, note 23, see Gabriel Khouri-Sarkis, "Introduction aux églises de langue syriaque," *L'Orient syrien*, I (1956), 3-30; Martin Jugie, "Monophysite (église syrienne)," in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, X (1928), cols. 2216-2251; I. Ziadé, "Syrienne église," *ibid.*, XIV (1939), cols. 3017-3088; George Every, "Syrian Christians in Palestine in the Early Middle Ages," *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, VI (1945-1946), 363-372; *idem*, "Syrian Christians in Jerusalem, 1183-1283," *ibid.*, VII (1947), 46-54; and Joseph Nasrallah, "Syriens et Surliens," *ibid.*, VII (1947), 487-505. The history of the Jacobites (and incidentally that of the Armenians and Melkites also) under crusader rule is better known than that of other eastern denominations, owing to the Jacobite literature (written in Syriac and Arabic) of the period. See Graf, *op. cit.*, II, 263 ff. Of great importance are three chronicles: Jean B. Chabot, ed. and tr., *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, patriarche jacobite d'Antioche (1166-1199)* (4 vols., Paris, 1899-1924); Gregory abū-l-Farāj (Bar Hebraeus), *op. cit.*, and *The Chronography of Gregory Abū'l Faraj, Commonly Known as Bar Hebraeus*, ed. and tr. E. A. W. Budge (2 vols., London, 1932); and *Anonymi auctoris chronicon ad annum 1234 pertinens*, ed. Chabot (*CSCO, SS*, ser. 3, vols. XIV-XV; Paris, 1920), Syriac text ed. Chabot (*CSCO, SS*, 37; Louvain, 1952), first part tr. Chabot (*CSCO, SS*, 56; Louvain, 1937); the French translation stops before the crusade. A partial translation of other parts by Chabot is in *Mélanges offerts à M. Gustave Schlumberger* . . . (2 vols., Paris, 1924; corresponding to the Chabot ed., II, 118-128), and one by Tritton and Gibb is in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1933), pp. 69-101, 273-305 (corresponding to the Chabot ed., II, 54-162); there is an excellent summary by Rücker in *Oriens Christianus*, XXXII (1935), 124-139. Later part tr. Albert Abouna, with introduction and notes by Jean M. Fiey (*CSCO, SS*, 154; Louvain, 1974). Cf. an evaluation by Fiey, "Chrétien syriaque entre croisés et mongols," *Orientalia Christiana analecta*, 197: *Symposium syriacum*, 1972 (Rome, 1974), pp. 327-341.

For secondary works see Peter Kawerau, *Die jakobitische Kirche im Zeitalter der syrischen Renaissance: Idee und Wirklichkeit* (Berlin, 1955); Paul Krüger, "Das syrisch-monophysitische Mönchtum in Tūr-'Abdīn von seinen Anfängen bis zur Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, IV (1938), 5-46; Ernst Honigmann, *Le Couvent de Barsaūmā et le patriarcat jacobite d'Antioche et de Syrie* (Louvain, 1954); Spuler, "Die west-syrische (monophysitische) Kirche unter dem Islam," *Saeculum*, IX (1958), 322-344. Cf. Chabot, "Les Évêques jacobites du VIIIème au XIIIème siècle d'après la chronique de Michel le Syrien," *ROC*, IV (1899), 444-452, 512-542; V (1900), 605-636; VI (1901), 189-220; and Judah B. Segal, *Edessa: The Blessed City* (Oxford, 1970).

view, even the Moslem conquest of the seventh century was advantageous, for it allowed them to spread into predominantly Nestorian Mesopotamia and Persia. Likewise the Selchükid conquest of Antioch freed them from the dominance of the Byzantine church.

The various Christian communities formed solid blocs in the north, but were little more than small enclaves in the predominantly Moslem population of the south. "Syrians" and Jacobites might be found in all crusader cities; there were some villages entirely of Christians of one or the other denomination.²⁹ Elsewhere they lived side by side with their Moslem neighbors in the villages, as they had for many generations in the cities before the crusader conquest. It is remarkable that, despite the poverty of eastern Christian sources, Frankish sources mention some twenty villages with an eastern Christian population in addition to the important communities in the cities, their monasteries, and some seminomadic Christian tribes living in Transjordan. Some areas seem to have had a special attraction for eastern Christians, especially the neighborhood of shrines, such as Bethlehem, Nazareth, and Mount Tabor. It is possible that these enclaves survived because the churches of the Orthodox and other Christian denominations had landed possessions in these areas and thus could more effectively shelter their Christian inhabitants from Moslem pressure for conversion than in areas where the Christian peasant had to face a Moslem landlord or a Moslem official alone.

In addition to Moslems and Christians, almost every city of importance in Syria, Lebanon, and Palestine had its Jewish inhabitants, although the Samaritans, who as late as the seventh century could still rise against Byzantium, were no more than a small community in the city of Nablus. The Jews suffered greatly during the First Crusade and the following period of expansion. There was a flourishing Jewish community when Ramla, the capital of the province, and Jerusalem, with its "Academy of the Holy Land" or "Yeshivat Gaōn Ya'akōv," were the major centers of the Fāṭimids and their schismatic brothers, the Qaraites. It withered with the Selchükid invasion. The crusader conquest destroyed all the urban centers, among them Jerusalem and Haifa, where the Jews took up arms in their defense together with Moslems. Yet the Jews did not disappear. Some two dozen villages in Galilee preserved their Jewish communities as did the two cities, Tyre and Ascalon, which were not taken by storm but

29. See Prawer, *Latin Kingdom*, p. 225, no. 21. With the completion of the new archeological survey the list will certainly be enlarged.

capitulated. Moreover, once the conquest was over, the Jews again settled in the cities although, as has been mentioned, they were barred from Jerusalem.

The variety of ethnic groups and religions posed problems of which, naturally, the crusaders had no knowledge before they arrived in the east. The situation varied in the different states; the population of the two northern principalities was to a great measure Christian, whereas from Tripoli southward the Moslem element was by far the dominant one. The law books which enshrine the "official" policy respecting minorities pertained to the kingdom of Jerusalem proper, rather than to the principalities. But it was a policy which probably applied to the entire conquered area, namely to treat all the natives as a single legal class of second-rate subjects, with fatal results for ultimate Latin survival.

Although the crusaders soon became aware of the internal divisions of the native Christian population, they lumped them all into a single category of people "who do not obey Rome."³⁰ To these they added the Moslems, Jews, and Samaritans, all in the same legal class. In contrast to these were those who were obedient to Rome, that is, all Latin Europeans. Though themselves subdivided into distinct classes — nobility, burgesses, and nationals of the communes — they all belonged to the dominant group, the conquerors.

There is no better evidence of the relative legal position of the Franks and the minorities than their respective money compositions for criminal offenses. If a Frankish burgess is convicted for assaulting another burgess, "he has to give the court 100 bezants and to the assaulted man 100 sous."³¹ If the assailant is a Syrian, however, "the court has to have from the Syrian 50 bezants and the assaulted Frank 50 sous, because the Syrian does not pay for assault but half the law and does not receive but half the law."³² We may compare this with the fines for a similar offense involving a knight and a burgess. A knight who assaults a burgess pays him 100 sous, and forfeits to the lord's court his horse, mule, and harness.³³ A burgess who assaults a knight loses his right hand or can redeem it by payment of 100 bezants to the

30. Philip of Novara, cap. 28 (*RHC, Lois*, I, 502): "Grés et Suriens et tous autres Crestiens qui ne sont de la ley de Rome."

31. *Livre des Assises de la Cour des Bourgeois*, cap. 295 (*RHC, Lois*, II, 221).

32. *Ibid.*, cap. 296 (p. 222). This is also the general rule applied to *dhimmīs* in Moslem lands. Their *diyāh*, which corresponds to the *wergeld*, is half that of the Moslems. See Cahen, s.v. "Dhimma," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new ed., II (Leyden and London, 1965), 226-231.

33. *Livre au roi*, cap. 19 (*RHC, Lois*, I, 619).

knight and 1,000 bezants to the court.³⁴ If he cannot pay the latter (roughly the annual income of two average villages, or two years' income of a knight's fee), he is to remain in prison at the mercy of the court.

The compositions for assault make no distinction even between native Christians and non-Christians.³⁵ In everyday life the crusaders may have felt a greater affinity for eastern Christians, and showed them more favor, but the law made no such distinction. Although the legal treatises, with one exception, date from the mid-thirteenth century, there is no doubt that the general policy toward the natives was fixed at an early period, probably during the first two decades after the fall of Jerusalem. Moslems, Jews, and Samaritans were left complete freedom of worship, but the Moslems, and in some measure the Jews, saw their sanctuaries destroyed or converted into Latin churches. This happened in Jerusalem where the two great Moslem sanctuaries, the Dome of the Rock (the mosque of 'Umar) and the al-Aqṣâ mosque, became the *Templum Domini* and *Templum Salomonis* respectively. It happened in all the maritime cities, like Ascalon where the mosque called al-Khiḍr (the Green One; or possibly connected with the prophet Elijah) became *Sancta Maria Cathara*. In many cases the mosques, which the crusaders called *mahumeria*, became simple lodgings. With the disappearance of the Moslem population from those cities taken by force, their mosques disappeared as well, and we do not know if any were reestablished under crusader rule. On the other hand, mosques remained in villages and possibly in some cities. With the reconquest by Saladin in 1187 there followed a complete reconversion of churches to mosques; in the process even churches founded by the crusaders became mosques or pious foundations.³⁶

A similar process, but on a smaller scale, probably took place with regard to the synagogues. The most numerous community of Jews and Qaraites was that of Ramla, although it had diminished in importance almost a generation before the First Crusade. The synagogues of Jerusalem were burned down together with the Jews who had sought within them a last refuge in prayer. This must also have happened

34. *Ibid.*, cap. 17 (pp. 617-618). There was no money composition between nobles: *ibid.*, caps. 40-41 (p. 635).

35. A Moslem who assaults a Christian pays living expenses and medication; otherwise he is beaten and expelled. If he is accused again of a similar offense, he is hanged; *Livre des Assises de la Cour des Bourgeois*, cap. 241 (*RHC, Lois*, II, 173).

36. Cf. Saladin's inscription of 1192 converting the church and nunnery of St. Anne into a Shāfi'ite madrasah, preserved in the tympanum of the church. For Acre and Jerusalem see Prawer, *Royaume latin*, I, 659, 676 ff.

in other places.³⁷ However, with the great waves of Jewish immigration into Palestine at the end of the twelfth century and during the thirteenth, synagogues were rebuilt or houses were converted into places for prayer. There were academies in Tyre and especially in Acre. By the time of Saladin's reconquest, Jewish prayer places had been rebuilt in some cities, foremost among them in Jerusalem about 1190 and again in 1267.

What might have been expected to happen to mosques and synagogues surprisingly happened to Christian churches also, though for different reasons and in a different way. Urban II's call at Clermont clearly included as a major aim the liberation of eastern Christians from the Moslem yoke. Yet three years later the leaders of the army of liberation, having captured Antioch and refused to hand it over to the Christian basileus of Constantinople, could write to the pope: "We conquered the Turks and pagans, but we could not defeat the heretics, the Greeks, Armenians, Syrians, and Jacobites." They then invited the pope to join them, "and all the heresies, whatever they might be, you will eradicate and destroy by your authority and our valor."³⁸ Clearly, crusading ideology had not survived confrontation with the Christian east. Eastern Christians might very well be liberated from the Moslem yoke, but voices in the army also demanded the eradication of the schismatic and heretical churches. No such policy was pursued, but the attitudes revealed had a fatal impact on the social and political organization of the crusader states, and quite possibly on their political destiny.

The attitude to these different Christian denominations, though the same in principle, was not so in practice. Generally speaking, the "schismatic" Byzantine and the "Syrian" or Melkite churches found themselves worse off than under the rule of Islam, whereas the "heretical" churches were better off than before.³⁹ The establishment of

37. Benedict of Alignan, bishop of Marseilles, mentions the ruins of a synagogue in the place where the Templars built their castle in Safad; see R. B. C. Huygens, "Un Nouveau texte du traité 'De constructione castris Saphet'," *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., VI-1 (1965), 355-387; cf. *BOF*, I (Quaracchi, 1906), 249-253.

38. *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100*, ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Innsbruck, 1901), p. 164 (ep. 16).

39. The position of the Greeks and Melkites can be gathered from some Orthodox itineraries: "Vie et pèlerinage de Daniel, hégoumène russe, 1106-1107," in *Itinéraires russes en Orient*, ed. and tr. Sofia de Khitrovo (Khitrowo) (SOL, SG, V; Geneva, 1889), pp. 1-83; tr. Charles W. Wilson in *PPTS*, IV-3 (London, 1895); and John Phocas, "A Brief Description of the Holy Land, 1185," tr. Aubrey Stewart in *PPTS*, V-3 (London, 1896). It is unnecessary to discuss here the partisan literature regarding the attitude of the crusaders to the Greek and Melkite church. Of the western descriptions, those of James of Vitry and Burchard of Mt. Sion pay more attention to the eastern churches than do the others.

the Latin church in Syria and Palestine was accompanied by the destitution of the Greek and Melkite hierarchies and by an almost wholesale spoliation of the Byzantine sanctuaries. The holiest places, such as the church of the Annunciation at Nazareth, the church of the Nativity at Bethlehem, and the Holy Sepulcher, became the property of the Latin church, though the Byzantine and other denominations preserved the right to celebrate offices there.

The Greek patriarchs John of Antioch and Symeon II of Jerusalem were replaced by the Latins Bernard of Valence and Daimbert of Pisa, respectively. The Byzantine church continued to appoint patriarchs who lived in Constantinople. This was more true for Jerusalem than for Antioch, not only because in Antioch there was a large Byzantine population, but also because the claims of the Byzantine emperor to the possession of the city of Antioch sometimes resulted in the acceptance there of a Greek patriarch.⁴⁰

Although the Byzantine church was not in communion with Rome, the idea of one church and one faith was never abandoned. It would have been scandalous, therefore, to have two bishops, one Greek and one Latin, in the same place, a practice which had been rejected by the church from the earliest times of Christianity. In effect, this meant that Byzantine bishops were replaced by Latins, and the lower Byzantine clergy subordinated to the jurisdiction of Latin prelates. This was put into practice almost immediately, although more thoroughly in Jerusalem than in Antioch, and had consequences far beyond the frontiers of the kingdom. When Greek Cyprus was captured, and later when the Byzantine empire became the Latin empire of Constantinople following the Fourth Crusade, the same principles were applied to these new areas, where there were few Moslem inhabitants and the population was overwhelmingly Orthodox.⁴¹ The policy had already become one of long standing when explicitly defined in a canon of the Fourth Lateran Council: "Since in many places in the same city and diocese there are people of different languages, who have different rites and customs under one faith, we order strictly that the bishops of such cities or dioceses should appoint suitable men who

40. In 1137 Raymond of Poitiers, prince of Antioch, promised to invest a Greek patriarch (Chalandon, *Les Comnène*, I, 132, note 3); so did Reginald of Châtillon (regent 1153-1160; *ibid.*, II, 445, 449). In 1165 Bohemond III installed the Greek patriarch Athanasius (*ibid.*, II, 531); the Greek Symeon II was installed in 1206-1207. David and Euthymius followed in the middle of the century (Karalevskij, in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, III, cols. 616-620).

41. The decisions of Honorius III for Cyprus expressly cite the customs of the crusader mainland; see Aloysius L. Tăutu, ed., *Acta Honorii III (1216-1227) et Gregorii IX (1227-1241) e registris Vaticanis aliisque fontibus* (PC, Fontes, ser. 3, vol. III; Vatican City, 1950), nos. 108, 140.

will celebrate the divine offices and administer the sacraments according to the diversity of rites and languages, instructing them both in words as by example. But we prohibit entirely that one and the same city or diocese should have different bishops, like one body with many heads, as though a monster."⁴² In the case of grave necessity, however, the local bishop might appoint a prelate to such "nations" as his vicar, who would be directly subject to him.

This was generally applicable also to the Syrians or Melkites. Since they were of the same rite as the Greeks, they should have been dealt with in the same way. In fact, however, we do not know how things worked out. There may have been "Syrian" bishops in cities and in the countryside, perhaps a remnant of the once-numerous hierarchy of the Byzantine church.⁴³ With the disappearance of the Byzantine population proper, the "Syrians" may have continued the tradition. But we do not find their bishops in the great sees, while those we know about were subject to the patriarchs of Antioch or Jerusalem.

The policy of replacing Greek patriarchs and bishops, like the removal of Greeks in Nazareth and Sebastia, could not be imposed on the lower clergy. Nor were the monastic establishments affected. The lower clergy and monasteries were required to recognize the supremacy of the Latin prelates; this was mere lip-service.⁴⁴ The "Syrians" had to have their own Arabic-speaking clergy as well as their Greek liturgy. Consequently, despite wholesale spoliation, they succeeded in hanging on to some churches and property. We have already mentioned Greek services in the Holy Sepulcher and in Bethlehem. On Mount Tabor the Greek monks kept the monastery of St. Elijah when

42. *Acta Innocentii III*, ed. Haluščynskyj, pp. 483-484; Karl J. von Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, tr. Henri M. Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles* (12 vols., Paris, 1907-1952), V-2, 1339, canon 9.

43. From signatures on an act of the order of St. John we learn of the Greek archbishop of Gaza and Bait Jibrin, one Meletos, as well as of Greek clergy of the chapter of the Holy Sepulcher with the titles *heireus* (abbot), *deuterarius* (prior), *protodecanos* (archdeacon), and *decanos* (dean) (J. Delaville Le Roulx, "Trois chartes . . .," in *AOL*, I [1881; repr. Brussels, 1964], 413-415; Reinhold Röhrich, *Regesta regni Hierosolymitani 1097-1291* [Innsbruck, 1893; repr. New York, 1960], no. 502). As our document states, the Melkite bishop was spiritually affiliated with the order. The Greek bishop of Pharan (Faran, on Mt. Sinai) was dependent on the Latin archbishop of Philadelphia ('Ammān); John of Ibelin, cap. 266 (*RHC, Lois*, I, 417); Mayer, "Die Laura des hl. Sabas und die orthodoxe Klerikergemeinschaft am hl. Grabe," *Bistümer, Klöster und Stifte im Königreich Jerusalem* (MGH, Schriften, 26; Stuttgart, 1977), pp. 406-409.

44. Latin prelates like James of Vitry, bishop of Acre, often complained of their insincerity, a complaint so often repeated in itineraries and histories and by the popes that we can be sure there was passive resistance. See *Acta Honorii III*, ed. Täutu, pp. 116-117 (nos. 86-87) and *passim*.

the Benedictines took over their former house.⁴⁵ In the greater cities there were Greek parish churches and hospices, for example, the monastery of St. Catherine in Acre, and the hospice of St. Moses,⁴⁶ the church of St. Abraham,⁴⁷ and the monasteries of St. Sabas and St. Chariton in or near Jerusalem.⁴⁸ It was a small remnant of what had belonged to the Orthodox church before. A considerable amount of landed property was taken over by the newcomers, some thirty villages with the Holy Sepulcher, and twelve villages belonging to Mount Tabor.⁴⁹

The position of the Greek church under the crusaders was precarious. In the principalities of Edessa and Antioch it was almost permanently on the brink of revolt. Yet the Greek and "Syrian" churches had their moments of triumph, almost always as a result of Byzantine military, or sometimes political, intervention. In Antioch there were times when Greek patriarchs were allowed to take over the cathedral of St. Peter and were accepted by the prince, though naturally excommunicated by the Latin clergy. When Byzantino-Frankish diplomacy allowed, as under Manuel I Comnenus (1143-1180), imperial support was made available to Greek churches and the great common Christian sanctuaries. Thus Manuel covered the tomb in the Holy Sepulcher with gold and installed marvelous mosaics in the chapel of Golgotha.⁵⁰ At the same time Byzantine artists and money embellished the church of Bethlehem with mosaics where bilingual inscriptions, Latin and Greek, testified to a kind of medieval ecumenism of convenience.⁵¹

The basileus also helped the Greek monasteries to hold their own when other ecclesiastical establishments were disappearing. These were

45. Cf. Daniel, in *Itinéraires russes*, ed. Khitrovo, p. 67, and Phocas, in *PPTS*, V-3, 14.

46. St. Catherine and St. Moses belonged to the abbot of Mt. Sinai; *Acta Honorii III*, ed. Täutu, pp. 35-37 (no. 17) and cf. no. 148; Röhricht, *Regesta*, no. 897.

47. Near the Damascus gate; it belonged, it would seem, to the Melkites or Jacobites. An eighteenth-century Georgian itinerary mentions St. Abraham in Jerusalem as a Georgian foundation: Marie F. Brosset, *Histoire de la Géorgie depuis l'antiquité jusqu'au XIXe siècle* (2 vols., St. Petersburg, 1849-1858), I, 197-209. See also John B. Hennessy, "Preliminary Report on the Excavations of the Damascus Gate, 1964-1966," *Levant*, II (1970), 22-27.

48. Röhricht, *Regesta*, no. 409.

49. As late as 1140 the chapter of the Holy Sepulcher was claiming possessions in Antioch which had originally belonged to it under Byzantine and Moslem rule: "qua temporibus Graecorum deservierant": Eugène de Rozière, ed., *Cartulaire de l'église du Saint-Sépulchre de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1849), p. 179 (no. 90), repr. in *PL*, 155 (Paris, 1880), cols. 1105-1262.

50. Phocas, in *PPTS*, V-3, 19. A beautiful mosaic of this period, an apotheosis, is still preserved in the Latin part of the Golgotha.

51. Cf. Robert W. Hamilton, *Guide to Bethlehem* (Jerusalem, 1939), and Bellarmino Bagatti, *Gli Antichi edifici sacri di Betlemme* (Jerusalem, 1952).

venerable institutions, some going back to the earliest period of Christian monasticism. Latins did not replace Greek monks in the monasteries, which were often in almost inaccessible places of the desert of Judea or on the banks of the Jordan, some surviving to our times.⁵² Moreover, even literary activity continued in them under crusader rule.⁵³

There is no doubt that the relative situation of the non-Greek denominations was more favorable. In the northern principalities, there were the two Monophysite groups, Armenians and Jacobites; only the latter were really important in the county of Tripoli and in the kingdom of Jerusalem, although there was an important Armenian sanctuary in Jerusalem, and churches and hospices in Tripoli, Acre, and other places.

Though never accepted by or integrated into Frankish society, these communities were accorded better treatment for various reasons. The Armenians were a political factor in Byzantino-Frankish relations, especially in the thirteenth century in the principality of Antioch. As the Armenian state, and even more their church, had long suffered from Byzantine persecutions, they were, in a sense, natural allies of

52. The following Greek monasteries are mentioned in contemporary sources: St. Elijah (Mār Elyās), on the road from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, destroyed by earthquake and rebuilt by Manuel Comnenus; St. Euthymius, St. Sabas (Mār Sābā), St. Chariton, Calamona, St. George of Khoziba in the Wādī al-Qilt, St. Gerasimus (Qaṣr Ḥajlah), and St. John (Qaṣr al-Yahūd) on the banks of the Jordan, also restored by Manuel Comnenus. The list is based on the itineraries of the Russian abbot Daniel, *PPTS*, IV-3, and Phocas, *PPTS*, V-3; cf. Otto F. Meinardus, "Notes on the Laurae and Monasteries of the Wilderness of Judaea," *Liber annuus*, XV (1964-1965), 220-250; *idem*, "Wall Paintings in the Monastic Churches of Judea," *Oriens Christianus*, L (1966), 46 ff. Cf. Siméon Vailhé, *Répertoire alphabétique des monastères de Palestine* (Paris, 1900; republished from *ROC*, IV [1899]); Robert Devreesse, "Les Anciens évêchés de Palestine," *Mémorial Marie Joseph Lagrange* (Paris, 1940), pp. 217-227. In addition to St. Sabas (on which see Vailhé, "Le Monastère de Saint-Sabas," *Échos d'Orient*, III [1899], 168 ff., and Albert Ehrhard, "Das griechische Kloster Mar Saba in Palästina," *Römische Quartalschrift*, VII [1893], 32-79), the most important monastery was that of St. Theodosius. A papal confirmation of its possessions mentions the church of St. Theodosius in Jerusalem with hospice, *apotheca*, and bakery; the monasteries of St. John the Baptist and St. George; property in Ascalon and Ramla; the church of St. Jonah outside Jaffa with *apotheca* and hospice; a church in "Zewel" (Jubail?) and another (in the same place?) of Sts. Peter and Paul with hospice; see *Acta Honorii III*, ed. Tăutu, pp. 1-2 (no. 2). One wonders if "Laberia" in the title Sanctus Theodosius Cenobiarcha de Laberia might not refer to La Berrie, the southern desert of Judea in crusader terminology.

53. This can be gathered from twelfth-century MSS. today in the library of the Greek patriarchate; Ehrhard, "Die griechische Patriarchat-Bibliothek von Jerusalem," *Römische Quartalschrift*, V (1891), 217-265, 329-331, 383-384; VI (1892), 339-365; cf. *idem*, "Das griechische Kloster Mar Saba," *ibid.*, VII, 32-79; Kenneth W. Clark, *Check List of MSS. in the Library of the Greek and Armenian Patriarchates in Jerusalem* (Washington, 1953); Praver, *Latin Kingdom*, p. 224, note 20; p. 226, notes 24, 26.

the Franks. The Jacobites were in a somewhat similar position. They never played any political role and had no military value, but the fact that they had been persecuted by Greeks and Melkites, which had led them to favor the Selchükid invasion, brought them the favor of the Franks. The Jacobites would emphasize the fact that Monophysite blood ran in the veins of the royal dynasty (from Melisend's mother Morfia). As "heretics" rather than just "schismatics" they retained their own hierarchy, simply recognizing their subjection to the Latins. Their patriarch at Antioch, Athanasius VII, and their bishops were neither expelled nor replaced by Latins. The Latin hierarchy and the papacy deplored the situation⁵⁴ but, in fact, required only a nominal obedience from them. Of course the relatively favorable attitude of the Franks, well attested by the great churchman and historian Michael the Syrian (d. 1199), Jacobite patriarch at Antioch, did not prevent the confiscation of property in the early years of the kingdom, or later spoliations in the county of Edessa.⁵⁵

Yet on the whole the Jacobites, with bitter memories that in the eleventh century their patriarch had been expelled by the Greeks from Antioch, now enjoyed freedom of worship. Given the particular structure of the Jacobite church, it was the patriarch at Antioch who was in direct contact with the Franks, whereas the realm of his vicar, the "Maphrian" (from *Prj*, fertilizer—that is, the ordainer of bishops) was in the east. The Franks often showed the patriarch favor, but not without a good deal of condescension.

The area of heaviest Jacobite population seems to have been between Antioch and Edessa in the north and in Palestine in the south. Jacobite bishops functioned in Acre, in Tripoli,⁵⁶ and in Jerusalem with its churches of St. Mary Magdalen and St. Simeon the Pharisee. Although built by a Copt, Macarius of Nabruwah, under the patriarch of Alexandria Mar Ya'qūb (810–830), the former became Jacobite under the benevolent Selchükids, through the exertions of a Jacobite in their service, Manṣūr al-Balbayī (the reading of the name is not

54. *Acta Honorii III*, ed. Täutu, pp. 117–118 (no. 88): "Suriani, Jacobini, Nestoriani . . . nec archiepiscopo et praelatis, nec ecclesiis obediunt Latinorum, sed tamquam acephali evagantes, suis sectis antiquis et erroribus innituntur." Consequently the pope orders: "quatenus Surianos, Jacobinos et Nestorianos . . . ad obedientiam . . . archiepiscopo et suffraganeis eius . . . impendendam, monitione praemisso, per censuram ecclesiasticam, appellatione remota, cogatis." The bull pertains to Cyprus, but was sent to Ralph of Mérencourt, the patriarch of Jerusalem, Peter of Limoges, the archbishop of Caesarea, and bishop Renier of Bethlehem.

55. Jean P. Martin, "Les Premiers princes croisés et les syriens jacobites de Jérusalem," *Journal asiatique*, XII (1888), 471–490; XIII (1889), 33–80. For Joscelin's plundering of the monastery of Bar Ṣaumā in 1148 see Michael the Syrian, *op. cit.*, III, 283 ff.; Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon*, II, 510; Fiey, "Chrétiens syriaques," pp. 327–345.

56. Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon*, I, 681, 708.

clear). It was consecrated in 1092, in the presence of the delegates of Cyril II, the Coptic patriarch of Alexandria.⁵⁷ Here lived the Jacobite bishops of Jerusalem, with a hospice and a residence for the patriarch when he visited Jerusalem. In a sense it was a Monophysite center where Jacobites mixed with Copts. The church was built in what had been the old Jewish quarter, colonized through the efforts of Baldwin I (about 1115), who brought in eastern Christians from Transjordan.⁵⁸ It is therefore possible that, although the inhabitants are described as "Syrians",⁵⁹ they were really Jacobites, perhaps with an admixture of Greeks and Melkites who probably kept to their own old quarter near the Holy Sepulcher. Not only was the monastery of St. Mary Magdalen an administrative center, but there was some literary activity there also.⁶⁰

Contacts between Jacobites and Franks were frequent, more so in Antioch than in Palestine. On the whole they were friendly, but internal ecclesiastical quarrels brought about the intervention of Frankish rulers and clergy. The Frankish authorities, whether lay or ecclesiastical, were called on to confirm ecclesiastical elections, which opened the way to bribery.⁶¹ Bar Hebraeus (d. 1286) goes so far as to accuse the west Jacobite church of simony "like that practised by the Armenians".⁶² No doubt the custom inherited from the earlier Moslem period, the confirmation of election by the local emirs, which continued now under the Franks, encouraged simoniacal practices.

57. Our knowledge of the Copts under the crusaders depends largely on Syrian Jacobite sources. For Coptic sources of the period see Sawirus ibn-al-Mukaffa', *History of the Patriarchs of the Egyptian Church . . .*, ed. and tr. A. S. Atiya, Yassa 'Abd-al-Masih, and O.H.E.K. Burmester (Cairo, 1948-1959); earlier part tr. B. T. A. Evetts in *Patrologia orientalis*, I-2/4; V-1; X-5; a Latin summary by Eusèbe Renaudot, *Historia patriarcharum Alexandrinorum Jacobitarum a D. Marco usque ad finem saeculi XIII* (Paris, 1713). Al-Maqrizi's study of Christian churches and monasteries deals mainly with Egypt. For the building and restoration of the Jacobite St. Mary Magdalen, see *Patrologia orientalis*, X, 461, and Sawirus ibn-al-Mukaffa', *op. cit.*, pp. 364-365; Hugo Duensing, "Die Abessinier in Jerusalem," *ZDPV*, XXXIX (1916), 98-115. Cf. Enrico Cerulli, *Etiopi in Palestina: Storia della comunità etiopica di Gerusalemme* (Collezione scientifica e documentaria dell' Africa italiana, 12; Rome, 1943), I, 10-13, and Meinardus, *The Copts in Jerusalem* (Cairo, 1960), pp. 11 ff.

58. Cf. Prawer, "The Settlement of the Latins in Jerusalem," pp. 490-503.

59. Between the street of Josaphat and the city walls, up to the gate of Josaphat (today the Gate of the Lions): "a rue ausi come une vile. La manoient li plus des Surriens de Iherusalem. Et ces rues apeloit on la luerie. Et en cele rue de luerie avoit j. Moustier de Sainte Marie Madelaine"; *Itinéraires à Jérusalem et descriptions de la Terre Sainte . . .*, ed. and tr. Henri Michéant and Gaston Raynaud (SOL, SG, III; Geneva, 1882), pp. 27, 160-161.

60. Cf. Meinardus, *Copts in Jerusalem*, p. 15.

61. Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon*, II, 470, 476-478, 498, 656-664, 668, 710-712. Cf. Michael the Syrian, *op. cit.*, III, 197, 211, 385-386: the rebellious Jacobite monk Bar Wahbün bribed Heraclius, the corrupt Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, to get possession of St. Mary Magdalen.

62. Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon*, II, 516. Cf. Michael the Syrian, *op. cit.*, III, 379: Amalric

The relations between the Monophysite denominations were on the whole very friendly. This was the result in part of their common hatred for the Greeks, the "Chalcedonians," in part of their creed, which, despite minor differences in ritual, was virtually the same for them all. Their leaders played down the differences; this did not prevent the writing of critical interdenominational tracts, but the polemical tone was less sharp than when they dealt with Franks and Greeks.⁶³

The Jacobite patriarch and the Armenian and Coptic prelates announced their elections to one another, and customarily received mutual congratulations, sometimes with pious exhortations. Their elections were also announced in the different patriarchates.⁶⁴ The only important quarrel under crusader rule was the interference of the Coptic patriarch of Alexandria in Jerusalem and that of the Jacobite patriarch of Antioch in Ethiopia. Ethiopia's bishops were usually ordained by Alexandria, and were Egyptians. But Ignatius II in a dispute with Cyril III, the patriarch of Alexandria, appointed a black named Thomas for Ethiopia, after Cyril in 1236 appointed a Copt named Basil as archbishop of Jerusalem, even though Jerusalem depended on Antioch. The new archbishop, appointed it seems under the pressure of Copts who visited the holy places, was confirmed by the Franks when he promised to unite his church with that of the Franks.⁶⁵

Friendly relations with the Franks not only allowed the repair and enlargement of the church of the Magdalen in Jerusalem, but also the erection of a new church in Antioch in 1156, the consecration of which was celebrated in the presence of the Frankish patriarch Aimery of Limoges.⁶⁶ There was even a rumor that the Maphrian Ignatius IV, who died in Tripoli in 1258, had left half his fortune to

(1163–1174) as well as Baldwin IV (1174–1185) confirmed the Jacobite patriarch. Joscelin, who played the role of protector of the Jacobites, insisted that the consecration of the new patriarch Athanasius, though he was elected in Kesoun, should be celebrated in his presence at Tell Bashir; Michael the Syrian, *op. cit.*, III, 231; Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon*, II, 484.

63. For polemical tracts written by Joannes Bar Andreas, bishop of Mabūj, against Armenians and Franks, see Michael the Syrian, *op. cit.*, III, 238; Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon*, II, 484. Cf. Michael the Syrian, *op. cit.*, III, 256, 344–345.

64. *Ibid.*, III, 331, 354–355.

65. This famous quarrel is described in detail by Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon*, II, 656–664. There is reason to suppose that this began a permanent rift among the Monophysites and the establishment of an independent hierarchy of Copts in Jerusalem. Saladin seems to have later confirmed the Copts and Abyssinians in their places in the church of the Holy Sepulcher; see Timotheos P. Themeles, *Les Grecs aux lieux saints* (Jerusalem, 1921), p. 68, cited by Meinardus, *Copts in Jerusalem*, p. 16.

66. Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon*, II, 667; Michael the Syrian, *op. cit.*, III, 303–653.

the Frankish churches and half to Jacobite churches and monasteries. In some cases Jacobites baptized their children in Frankish churches in Edessa,⁶⁷ in the light of which the plundering in 1148 of the great Jacobite monastery of Bar Şaumā by Joscelin II of Edessa⁶⁸ with the participation of Armenian troops seems to have been a sad episode, though local chicanery was never wanting.

Despite the seemingly amicable relations, and despite the efforts of Michael the Syrian to emphasize the friendliness of the Franks, something not too apparent in the chronicle of Bar Hebraeus, it was all very superficial. As for the Anonymous Syrian Chronicle of 1234, it is clear that the chronicler's Christian perspective did not lead him to favor the crusader establishments. He judged Moslems and Latin Catholics according to their attitudes toward and relations with the "orthodox" (non-Chalcedonian) nation of the Syrians.

The great Jacobite church, comprising in the eleventh and twelfth centuries some seventeen metropolitans and thirty bishops in the west (and some eighteen under the Maphrian in the east), never accommodated itself to the new conditions of a crusader state on the coast. Though the patriarchal see was Antioch, no Jacobite patriarch, except Mār Ignatius II (1222–1252), ever stayed there. Amida, Hişn Ziyād (Kharput), Bar Şaumā, and Mardin were the normal places of residence. The great centers of Jacobite learning remained the monasteries of Bar Şaumā in the west and Bar Mattai (near Mosul) in the east, though Bar Hebraeus studied rhetoric and medicine with a Nestorian in Frankish Tripoli.⁶⁹ Other than in times of war, Jacobite patriarchs moved so freely between Moslem and Christian lands that one has the impression of a single region peopled by the Jacobite or Syrian "nation."⁷⁰ Frankish Syria and Palestine had no attraction for them. Their focus of religious and community life remained in the lands of Islam. Whatever hopes they might have entertained at the moment of the crusader conquest, the event had no meaningful impact on their customary organization. When Jerusalem became a center of western Christendom, and the Jews, as always in times of

67. Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon*, II, 668. It is quite possible that the testament of the eastern Christian who left money to Latin and non-Latin establishments was that of a Jacobite (*ibid.*, II, 478). For a Jacobite church built on Frankish property in Antioch after a miraculous healing of a child, see Michael the Syrian, *op. cit.*, III, 304.

68. Michael the Syrian, *op. cit.*, III, 283 ff.

69. Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon*, II, 670.

70. Patriarch Michael, after his election, visited the centers of his community in Edessa, the Holy Mountain, Kesoun, Barīd, Cilicia, Antioch, Latakia, Tyre, and Jerusalem; Michael the Syrian, *op. cit.*, III, 331–332.

crisis, turned their eyes in expectation to Jerusalem, the holy city never ranked as a Jacobite patriarchate, but only as a bishop's see. Bar Şaumā remained their great sanctuary, and even Michael the Syrian wrote in the shadow of the great saint.

This attitude, whether dictated by experience or by a detached, un-sentimental appreciation that the majority of Jacobites lived in Moslem lands, led to an ambivalent view of the crusades and of the Franks. Jacobite writers, despite their "official" hatred of Moslems, judged events and people, Moslems and Christians alike, from a particular Jacobite perspective. This is true even with a Francophile like Michael the Syrian or the Armenian Matthew of Edessa (d. about 1136). They praised the Selchükids, for example, for allowing the construction of two Jacobite churches (St. Mary and St. George) in Antioch after its capture from the Byzantines.⁷¹ The liberality of the Selchükids was put on the same level as that of the Franks in allowing complete religious freedom to the Jacobites. The former drove out the Greeks, who could "no longer force the Orthodox [the Jacobites], as was their cruel custom, to be converted to their heresy." The Franks "never created difficulties in the matter of faith . . . in arriving at a single formula for all the nations and languages of the Christians, but regarded as Christian everyone who adored the cross, without further inquiry or examination."⁷²

This did not prevent the Syrian patriarch from condemning Joscelin II and his Armenian soldiery for the spoliation of the monastery of Bar Şaumā,⁷³ or Nūr-ad-Dīn for renewing discriminatory legislation against Christians and Jews.⁷⁴ On the other hand, when Kīlīj Arslan II, the Selchükid sultan, in 1181 invited the Jacobite patriarch Michael to meet him at Melitene, Michael heaped praises upon him, while "all the Christians lit candles, raised crosses on high, and lifted their voices to sing the office."⁷⁵

The Jacobite point of view was a function of the local attitudes they met as a minority. Their precarious position is clear from an episode, described by the Jacobite patriarch, which occurred in 1141 in Melitene. The Turks invaded the monastery at Zabar and sacked it. In May 1142 the crusaders decided on vengeance: "They robbed the goods of the Christians, but did not confront the Turks. And when

71. *Ibid.*, pp. 170, 174.

72. *Ibid.*, p. 222.

73. *Ibid.*, pp. 283 ff.

74. *Ibid.*, pp. 342 ff.

75. *Ibid.*, p. 351.

the Franks left, the Turks came again, pillaged, and departed. Thus the Christians were robbed by both sides."⁷⁶

In times of tension, the Moslem population often gave vent to anti-Christian feelings, even though the Jacobites were in no way involved. Thus, after the battle of Hattin, the repercussions were felt by the Jacobites. "How much outrage, injury, and contempt the Moslems then heaped on the persecuted Christians in Damascus, Aleppo, Harran, Edessa, Amida, Mardin, Mosul, and in the rest of their dominion, no words can describe,"⁷⁷ complains the Jacobite patriarch.

For the Jacobites there was only one consolation, the providence of God. No words are more illuminating than those of Michael the Syrian: "if, because of our sins, God has allowed Arabs or Turks to rule over us, nevertheless in his mercy he has never abandoned us and never will, at no time and in no way. By his providence he watches over us and delivers us from all our enemies, because of his love for his church."⁷⁸ The Franks did not consciously favor the Jacobites. Their attitude was one of toleration mixed with suspicion. As our sources are often one-sided it is not easy to judge events. Yet in some cases not much is left in doubt. Armenians of Albistan, calling in Moslems in 1106 against the Franks, and shouting the equivalent of "Franks go home!" is a revealing incident; it led the pro-Frankish Armenian Matthew to explain that the great Frankish warriors of the time of the conquest were dead and their principalities were in the undeserving hands of their descendents.⁷⁹ Earlier, in 1101, we are told that the holy fire (a pious fraud) did not appear on time, to punish the Franks "because they chased from their monasteries the Armenians, the Greeks, the Syrians, and the Georgians," and established nunneries. The Franks then repented (the holy fire having appeared after the prayers of the Jacobites) and "reinstated each nation in what belongs to them".⁸⁰

In 1104, after the defeat of the crusaders at Harran, when Chökürmish of Mosul attacked Edessa and Rîdvan of Aleppo Antioch, the Christian population opened the gates of the surrounding cities to Rîdvan.⁸¹ The same thing happened less than a generation later after

76. *Ibid.*, p. 249.

77. *Ibid.*, p. 404.

78. *Ibid.*, p. 345.

79. Matthew of Edessa, in *RHC, Arm.*, I, 81.

80. *Ibid.*, I, 54-55; Hitti, "The Impact," pp. 211-218.

81. Prawer, *Royaume latin*, I, 286.

the crusaders' defeat at Darb Sarmadā (the "ager sanguinis").⁸² In 1148 the Jacobites (though not the Armenians) were ready to accept Zengi in what was left of the county of Edessa.⁸³ In 1182, when Ḥabīs Jaldak in Transjordan fell to Farrūkh-Shāh of Damascus, its commander Fulk of Tiberias was accused of having left the place to a native Christian garrison.⁸⁴ All this culminated in the famous accusation in 1189 that the eastern Christians had connived at turning over Jerusalem to Saladin. The Coptic chronicler of Alexandria pointed an accusing finger at the Jerusalem-born Melkite Joseph al-Batīṭ, who moved to Damascus and entered the service of the Aiyūbids. In Egypt he met Saladin and tried to ensure the status of his community. Saladin used him as an envoy in his dealings with the Franks, but also as a spy and agent. In this latter capacity he was sent with bribery money to Jerusalem in return for Saladin's favor for his community.⁸⁵ It is impossible to know what really happened, but the story spread to the Franks and to Europe.⁸⁶

Quite possibly Zengid, Aiyūbid, and Mamluk attitudes toward eastern Christians explained Frankish suspicions, although in some cases there is no doubt about their pro-Moslem sentiments. Zengi tried to drive a wedge between the Franks and the eastern denominations. On his order the massacres in Edessa in 1144 were stopped. The Jacobite bishop Basil Bar-Shumnā became his adviser. The same favor was shown to Ananias, the Armenian bishop of Edessa. The churches and their spoils were restored and former Latin churches were handed over to them.⁸⁷ Saladin's proclamation that Christians who wanted to remain in the formerly Frankish cities would be allowed to do so was clearly aimed at the eastern Christians, since no Frank would have thought to remain. In fact, eastern Christians and Jews remained in Acre, Nablus, and Jerusalem. In the last, like the Franks, they had to pay ransom, and also the *jizyah* which they had earlier paid as *capitatio* to the Franks.⁸⁸ There is no reason to suppose that they evacuated other places. Strangely enough, when the Moslems and Jews abandoned Jerusalem in 1219 after the destruction of its walls by al-

82. *Ibid.*, p. 301.

83. *Ibid.*, pp. 398-399.

84. *Ibid.*, p. 601.

85. *Histoire des patriarches*, quoted by Edgar Blochet in his translation of al-Maqrīzī, *Histoire d'Égypte*, in *ROL*, IX (1902) 29-32, published separately (Paris, 1908), pp. 124-127.

86. Röhricht, *Regesta*, nos. 661, 664a.

87. *Syrian Anonymous Chronicle*, tr. Tritton, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1933), pp. 282-286. Cf. Michael the Syrian, *op. cit.*, III, 262-268.

88. 'Imād-ad-Dīn, in Abū-Shāmāh, *RHC, Or.*, IV, 340, 301-302.

Malik al-Mu‘azzam of Damascus, the eastern Christians remained behind.⁸⁹

While the Melkites were often held suspect, and the Jacobites were treated, or mistreated, more or less according to local circumstances, the Armenian church enjoyed a more privileged position.⁹⁰ The presence of independent principalities and later of an Armenian state had a decisive influence on Franco-Armenian relations. Furthermore, the Armenians and Maronites were the only local Christians whom the Franks appreciated as excellent warriors.

Within the boundaries of the Latin states the Armenian community was to be found mainly in Antioch and in Edessa. In the latter, on the eve of the crusade, they enjoyed a kind of precarious independence under both the Byzantines and the Selchükids. Together with the Jacobites they formed the majority of the local population. It was the Armenians who elevated Baldwin to the throne in place of their local Armenian ruler Ṭoros (d. 1098), and they kept faith with the Franks until the fall of Edessa and even afterward.

There was a marked difference in their position in the north and in the south. In Edessa Frankish rule was based on their coöperation. In Antioch their standing was bolstered by the Armenian principalities and later on by the kingdom in Cilicia and was thus often a function of interstate relations. Farther south their numbers diminished, but Armenian communities were to be found in the greatest of crusader ports, Acre, as well as in Jerusalem. According to an ancient Armenian tradition, they had some seventy monasteries at the end of the

89. Al-Maqrīzī, *Histoire d'Égypte*, tr. Blochet, *ROL*, IX (1902), 483 (ed. Paris, 1908, p. 277). Giles of Lewes, in a letter written on November 10, 1219, after the Frankish conquest of Damietta, says: "Civitas autem Sancta Jerusalem post destructionem murorum recedentibus Sarracenis, ex toto a solis Surianis et aliis cristicolis habitatur"; Röhrich, *Studien zur Geschichte des fünften Kreuzzuges* (Innsbruck, 1891), p. 43.

90. The Armenian chronicles of the period are published in *RHC, Arm.* Of special interest here are the chronicles of Matthew of Edessa and Gregory the Presbyter, published in translation by Édouard Dulaurier in the *Bibliothèque historique arménienne* (Paris, 1858); Armenag Salmaslian, *Bibliographie de l'Arménie* (Paris, 1946); Henry F. Tournebize, *Histoire politique et religieuse de l'Arménie . . .* (Paris, 1910); Macler, "Les Arméniens en Syrie et en Palestine," *Congrès français de Syrie*, II (Marseille, 1919), 151-688; L. Hugues Vincent and Félix M. Abel, *Jérusalem: Recherches de topographie, d'archéologie et d'histoire*, II, *Jérusalem nouvelle* (by Abel; Paris, 1926), 529-561; Anneliese Lüders, *Die Kreuzzüge im Urteil syrischer und armenischer Quellen* (Berlin, 1964); G. Ter-Gregorian Iskenderian, *Die Kreuzfahrer und ihre Beziehungen zu den armenischen Nachbarfürsten bis zum Untergange der Grafschaft Edessa* (Weida, 1915); Erwand Ter-Minassiantz, *Die armenische Kirche in ihren Beziehungen zu den syrischen Kirchen bis zum Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, 1904); Arshag Ter-Mikelian, *Die armenische Kirche in ihren Beziehungen zur byzantinischen vom IV. bis zum XIII. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1892); K. Hintlian, *History of the Armenians in the Holy Land* (Jerusalem, 1976); and Prawer, "The Armenians in Jerusalem under the Crusaders," in *Armenian and Biblical Studies*, ed. Michael E. Stone (Jerusalem, 1976), pp. 223-236.

Byzantine domination, clearly an exaggeration.⁹¹ Still, there is no doubt that Jerusalem had an Armenian and Georgian community at a very early period (mid-fifth century) centered around the Georgian monastery of St. Menas, which later became the great sanctuary of St. James. Beautiful mosaics outside the walls of Jerusalem near the so-called grotto of Jeremiah, and mosaics on the Mount of Olives, with tombs of Armenian abbots, testify to the high artistic level of these establishments.

On the eve of the First Crusade, almost contemporary with the reconstruction of St. Mary Magdalen, the Georgian monk Prokhorë rebuilt the church of St. James the Elder (1072–1088). The Spanish legend about the miraculous voyage of the head of St. James to Santiago de Compostela (known since the ninth century), was commemorated in crusader Jaffa, where a *perron* marked the place of his alleged embarkation.⁹²

Before the middle of the twelfth century, relations between Franks and Armenians were friendly enough for a great pilgrimage of the Armenian catholicos, Gregory III Bahlavouni (1133–1166), to Jerusalem. Received with pomp in Antioch, he participated in the church council of 1142, where he is supposed to have accepted the Latin dogma and the supremacy of Rome. This was the opening of a long series of promises to be given by the heads of eastern communities during the two hundred years of crusader domination.⁹³ It was possibly on this occasion that the catholicos received permission to reconstruct the cathedral and to add an Armenian hospice to it. This may have happened, however, a few years later during the visit of prince Ṭoros II (1152–1168) of Cilician Armenia at the court of Amalric.⁹⁴ Whatever the case, the new Armenian cathedral in Jerusalem in the rue des Arméniens (*Hermine*) was functioning by 1165, its architecture a mixture of Armenian and Frankish romanesque styles.⁹⁵

Armenian pilgrims, the "*Mahdeci*" (*Muqaddasi*), those visiting the

91. Leone M. Alishan, ed., "Deux descriptions arméniennes des lieux saints de Palestine," *AOL*, II-2 (1884), 394–405. After the Moslem conquest the number fell to fifteen. Cf. Charles Clermont-Ganneau, *Archaeological Researches in Palestine during the Years 1873–1874*, II (London, 1899), 329–339.

92. *Itinéraires à Jérusalem*, ed. Michelant and Raynaud, p. 92: "le perron Saint-Jacque de Galisce"; cf. pp. 181, 191.

93. Brosset, *Deux historiens arméniens: Kiracos de Gantzag, Histoire d'Arménie; Ouktanes d'Ourha, Histoire en trois parties* (St. Petersburg, 1870–1871), p. 61; Michael the Syrian, *op. cit.*, III, 256. On the synod of 1142 in Jerusalem, see Mansi, *Concilia*, XXI, 505–508, 583, 584.

94. *Chronique d'Ernouf et de Bernard le Trésorier*, ed. Louis de Mas Latrie (Paris, 1871), pp. 27–29. The exact date of the visit of prince Ṭoros II is not known, but it was during the reign of Amalric, after 1162.

95. Abel, *Jérusalem nouvelle*, II, 522.

holy places, were quite numerous. The Armenian mosaics near the grotto of Jeremiah in Jerusalem still have an inscription: "To the souls of all Armenians." Among the pilgrims was prince Ṭoros II. A Frankish chronicler tells an illuminating story of how the Armenian prince, very much aware of the problems of population and security facing the Franks, proposed an Armenian immigration of 30,000 peasants to colonize the country. The plan fell through when the Latin clergy insisted that the new settlers should pay the ecclesiastical tithe.⁹⁶

The Armenians certainly regarded the kingdom as a haven. When Saladin and his Kurdish and Syrian troops became lords of Egypt, the Armenian patriarch of Alexandria left Egypt (1172) and settled in Jerusalem, bringing with him seventy-five codices, among them a marvelous illuminated gospel. Thus were probably laid the foundations for the rich library of the Armenian patriarchate of Jerusalem. He established the monastery of St. Sharkis (Abū-Sirjah) with twenty monks, in the vicinity of Jerusalem. This initiative was supported by the Franks. He died soon afterward, and it was rumored that he was poisoned by the Armenian bishop of Jerusalem.⁹⁷ An Armenian bishop officiated in Jerusalem, and besides the cathedral he was in charge of some other places which belonged to the Armenians, such as the chapel of St. Mary in the Holy Sepulcher and a chapel in the courtyard of the property of the Holy Sepulcher on Mount Sion.⁹⁸

The fall of Jerusalem to Saladin was lamented in far-off Cilician Armenia, where the catholicos Gregory IV Dgha (the Child, 1173–1193) wrote a dirge to commemorate the event.⁹⁹ Saladin, pursuing a policy of favoring the eastern Christians in the crusader kingdom, confirmed the Armenians in their possession of the cathedral of St. James after the fall of the city (1187).¹⁰⁰ The Armenians also kept their property in Bethlehem, and in 1227 a magnificent carved wooden

96. It is not clear on what basis the Latin clergy demanded the tithe, which was paid by the Franks only — by the peasants from their crops, by the landlords from their incomes. Possibly Ṭoros stipulated that they were to be landowners, and not tenants from whom the Frankish lord would probably exact a part of the tithe. This may explain Ṭoros's answer: "The Armenians will not come to another man's land to be serfs."

97. *The Churches and Monasteries of Egypt and Some Neighbouring Countries Attributed to Abū Šālih the Armenian*, ed. and tr. Evetts (Oxford, 1895), pp. 6–7. The catalogue of the Armenian patriarchate in Jerusalem now in print does not mention any MSS. originating in the place during the crusader period.

98. Theoderic, "Description of the Holy Places," tr. Stewart, in *PPTS*, V-4 (London, 1896), 15, 20. There is some confusion regarding the monastery of St. Chariton in Jerusalem, which Theoderic, *ibid.*, p. 43, assigns in 1172 to the Armenians, but which belonged to the Jacobites. Similarly, the monastery of St. Sabas is erroneously assigned in 1165 by John of Würzburg to the Armenians, *PPTS*, V-2 (1896), 29, whereas in reality it belonged to the Greeks.

99. *RHC, Arm.*, I, 272 ff.: cf. *ibid.*, I, 686, no. 2.

100. *Ibid.*, I, 820.

door with Armenian and Arab inscriptions was brought as a gift to the church of the Nativity from the Armenian king Hetoum I,¹⁰¹ son of Constantine of Lampron. The only other Armenian community in the kingdom was in Acre, with a hospice for the needs of their pilgrims.¹⁰² But it was in Jerusalem¹⁰³ and Bethlehem (and later Jaffa) that Armenian sanctuaries assured the survival of the community.

A very similar position to that of the Armenians was enjoyed by the less numerous Grusinian (Georgians, Iberi) community.¹⁰⁴ Their distant homeland in the Caucasus had long-standing connections with the Holy Land, almost since their conversion to Christianity. It is more than probable that the first "Armenian" monastery in Jerusalem, St. Menas, was really Georgian. Some monasteries were founded in the second half of the fifth century and later rebuilt by emperor Justinian. Their number in the crusader area was rather small, but they are mentioned in various western and eastern descriptions of the Holy Land. According to Georgian tradition, king Bagrat IV of Georgia received from the Byzantine emperor Constantine IX half of Calvary and established a Georgian hegumen (bishop) in Jerusalem (about 1050). Whatever the case, the Georgian center under the crusaders was the church of the Holy Cross on the main road which led to the Jaffa gate in Jerusalem. It was a Georgian monk, Prokhorë, who built the sanctuary (1036–1055). It was probably at that time or slightly later that the two famous versions of the legend which explained or justified the name of the Holy Cross (the place where the tree grew from which the cross was made) came into being.¹⁰⁵ Some

101. Melchior de Vogüé, *Les Églises de la Terre Sainte* (Paris, 1860), pp. 112–114 (repr. with introduction and bibliography by Prawer, Toronto, 1973); and Prawer, *The World of the Crusaders* (London, 1972), p. 56.

102. Röhricht, *Regesta*, no. 696. An Armenian monastery is also mentioned near Jerusalem, *ibid.*, no. 590.

103. *Itinéraires à Jérusalem*, ed. Michelant and Raynaud, p. 104: "après j. petit est l'Eglyse des Hermites [sic: Hermines], ou saint Iaque de Galicie fu declés."

104. See the eighteenth-century itinerary of the archbishop of Tiflis, Timothy Gabachwili, in Brosset, *Histoire de la Géorgie*, II, *Additions et éclaircissement* (St. Petersburg, 1851), pp. 197–209. Cf. Janin, "Les Géorgiens à Jérusalem," *Échos d'Orient*, XVI (1913), 32–38, 211–219; Aleksandr A. Zagarelli, "Historische Skizze der Beziehungen Grusiens zum heiligen Lande und zum Sinai" (tr. from Russian, originally published by A. Anders in St. Petersburg, 1888, pp. 27–88), *ZDPV*, XII (1889), 35–73; Ehrhard, "Das Kloster des hl. Kreuzes und seine Bibliothek," *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft*, XIII (1892), 158–172, with detailed analysis of sources and bibliography; Gregory Peradze, "An Account of the Georgian Monks and Monasteries in Palestine as Revealed in the Writings of Non-Georgian Pilgrims," *Georgica*, I (1937), 181–246.

105. According to one version, Adam asked to plant here a branch of the forbidden tree from Eden. Stuck into his mouth, it implanted itself in his head. The True Cross was cut from its branches, and thus the blood of the Savior washed the skull of Adam. According to another version, it was Lot who planted these trees here; a cypress, a cedar, and a pine. They became

Georgian traditions have it that king David II (1089–1125) sent presents to the Holy Sepulcher and built a monastery on Mount Sinai. His daughter, or a widow of a Georgian king, became a nun in Jerusalem and with the consent of the patriarch Gibelin of Sabran (1108–1112) established a Georgian nunnery there.¹⁰⁶

It is not clear if the isolated monastery outside Jerusalem suffered from the Selchükid conquest (1071) or was partially destroyed by the Moslems a generation later in preparation for the defense of the city against the crusaders (1099), or both. However, when the English pilgrim Saewulf visited Jerusalem (1102), he saw it damaged, but a few years later (1106–1107) the Russian hegumen Daniel of Kiev merely mentioned it as belonging to the Georgians without referring to any damage.¹⁰⁷ It is possible that king David II of Georgia restored it. The monastery is mentioned in every crusader itinerary of the twelfth century, and some eastern itineraries also mention Georgian hermits, usually near monastic establishments of other rites.¹⁰⁸

The Georgians did not disappear with the conquest of Saladin. Their monks remained in Jerusalem, and a crusader source has it that when Christian pilgrims hardly dared to go to the holy city, the Georgians were allowed to enter it with pomp carrying their banners.¹⁰⁹ This seems rather a strange statement, but apparently the Georgian queen Tamar (1184–1212) actually established friendly relations with Saladin.¹¹⁰ It was during her rule that the Georgian monk Shoṭa Rustṭveli went to Jerusalem and wrote the greatest of the Georgian national epics, *Vepkhis Tqaosani* (The man in the leopard's skin), celebrated throughout Georgia in 1937 at the 750th anniversary of its composition. The monastery, which proudly stands now on the road to the Hebrew University, became the property of the Greek patriarchate

one, and the True Cross was cut from it. Cf. Janin, *op. cit.*, pp. 215–216. About 1110 a cantor of the Holy Sepulcher sent a particle of this cross to Galo, bishop of Paris (*PL*, 162, cols. 729–732). It was still being shown in the early nineteenth century; cf. Richard, "Quelques textes sur les premiers temps de l'église latine de Jérusalem," *Recueil de travaux offerts à M. Clovis Brunel*, II (Paris, 1955), 423–426; Prawer, "The Monastery of the Cross," *Ariel*, no. 18 (1967), 59–64; Zourab Avalishvili, "The Cross from Overseas," *Georgica*, I (1936), 3–11.

106. *PL*, 162, col. 730: "Congregatio sanctimonialium Georgianarum."

107. *PPTS*, IV-2, 21; IV-3, 82–83.

108. Johannes Phocas (fl. 1185) mentions Iberian monks in St. Sabas, St. Gerasimus, and St. Chrysostom. A curiosity to be noted is the Iberian monks shut up in a building which stood on the rock called "Kukumos" near Gethsemane. This possibly refers to the monument of Absalom in the valley of Josaphat.

109. James of Vitry, *PPTS*, XI-2 (1896), 84, repeated by Marino Sanudo, *Liber secretorum*, III, viii, cap. 3, in Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, II, 184.

110. Behâ ed-Dîn, tr. Charles W. Wilson and Claude R. Conder, in *PPTS*, XIII, 384.

in the nineteenth century. Some years ago, a Grusinian archaeological expedition discovered a magnificent painting of the national poet in a seventeenth-century fresco of the monastery.¹¹¹

There are few histories more obscure than that of the Maronites in Lebanon. Since the sixteenth century, when the ties between the Maronites and Rome became stronger and scholars of Maronite origin began writing their history, their early history has been a subject of controversy.¹¹² There has been little agreement either on the question of Maronite orthodoxy or heterodoxy (in the Latin sense) or on their relations with the crusaders, or even on the area in which they were settled at the time. What makes the study difficult is the fact that the documentation regarding Maronites is extremely poor, some scattered remarks in the chronicles which cannot be assigned with any certainty to the Maronites. Given such little evidence one can dismiss such notions as the continual preoccupation of the Franks with their fate. As a matter of fact nowhere in the rich literature of crusader jurisprudence are the Maronites even mentioned. As for the chronicles, they sometimes mention Christians in the mountains of Tripoli, or Syrians, or inhabitants of the mountainous regions of the

111. The plan of the church is in *Survey of Western Palestine*, III (London, 1883), 379; Irakli Abashidze, *The Monastery of the Holy Cross* (in Russian; Tiflis, 1962), reproduced in Prawer, "The Monastery of the Cross," pp. 59-64, and *idem*, *The World of the Crusaders*, p. 129; Thinatnath Virsaladze, *Les Peintures murales du monastère de la Sainte-Croix à Jérusalem et le portrait de Chota Roustaveli* (in Russian, with French summary; Tiflis, 1973).

112. The poet Ibn-al-Qilāṭī (d. 1516), the great scholar as-Sam'ānī (S. E. Assemani) (1742), through P. Duwaihī, P. Chebli (1903), T. al-'Anāisī (Tobias Anaissi, 1927), and Pierre Dib, who took a very partisan stand on the question of orthodoxy, in contrast to Siméon Vailhé, Henri Lammens, and more recently Robert W. Crawford, Kamal S. Salibi, and Philip K. Hitti. For a general introduction see Hitti, *Lebanon in History* (London, 1957); *idem*, *History of Syria, Including Lebanon and Palestine* (London, 1951); Richard, *Le Comté de Tripoli sous la dynastie toulousaine, 1102-1187* (Paris, 1945); Salibi, *Maronite Historians of Mediaeval Lebanon* (American University of Beirut, Oriental Series, XXXIV; Beirut, 1959). The most detailed study is by Dib, in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, X (1928), cols. 1-142, s.v. "Maronite, église"; republished with corrections as *L'Église maronite*, I, *L'Église maronite jusqu'à la fin du moyen-âge* (Paris, 1930); now see his *Histoire de l'église maronite* (Mélanges et documents, I; 2 vols., Beirut, 1962); see also Vailhé, "Les Origines religieuses des Maronites," *Échos d'Orient*, IV (1901), 96-102, 154 ff.; V (1902), 287 ff.; IX (1906), 143 ff.; Crawford, "William of Tyre and the Maronites," *Speculum*, XXX (1955), 222-229; Salibi, "The Maronites of Lebanon under Frankish and Mamluk Rule, 1099-1516," *Arabica*, IV (1957), 288-303; and *idem*, "The Maronite Church in the Middle Ages and Its Union with Rome," *Oriens Christianus*, XLII (1958), 92-104. The favorable attitude of the crusaders to the Maronites is alleged by Emmanuel G. Rey, *Les Colonies françaises de Syrie aux XIIème et XIIIème siècles* (Paris, 1883), p. 76, often repeated and expanded; cf. René Ristelhueber, *Les Traditions françaises au Liban* (Paris, 1925), pp. 58, 61, cited in René Grousset, *Histoire des croisades et du royaume franc de Jérusalem* (3 vols., Paris, 1934-1936), II, 758.

county of Tripoli, without specifying ethnic group or religion. There is certainly no reason to think that the majority of the inhabitants of the county of Tripoli were Maronites.

One reason it is so hard to establish the most elementary facts about the Maronites is that the mountains and deep valleys lying east of the narrow coastal plain were for hundreds of years an asylum of persecuted denominations under both Islam and Christendom. On the other hand religious propaganda might find there an undisturbed area almost cut off from the outside world. Renan has described the mountain of Lebanon as a tomb of history, and Philip Hitti writes of "the mountains . . . honey-combed with schismatics,"¹¹³ which is close enough to what was said by the Moslem chronicler Ibn-al-Athir, a contemporary of the crusades.¹¹⁴

Since the tenth century, following al-Mas'udī (about 950) and his contemporary Sa'īd ibn-al-Biṭriq (Eutychias), it was believed that the Maronites had been Monothelites and from the seventh century a heterodox denomination. William of Tyre introduced this view to the crusader world. It was then repeated by James of Vitry, bishop of Acre, and Marino Sanudo (d. 1337), and became accepted in the west. Since the sixteenth century Maronite scholars have energetically combated this view.¹¹⁵ An interesting explanation of this question has recently been suggested, namely that we are dealing not with two Maronite saints, St. Maro (d. 410) and John (Yuhanan) Maro (about 707), the organizer of the church, but with a Nestorian Maro of Edessa (d. 580), whom William of Tyre confused with his namesake, the first patriarch of the Maronites.¹¹⁶ If this thesis is accepted then the famous union of the Maronites during the patriarchate of Aimery of Limoges at Antioch (about 1182) must have another meaning—not the forswearing of heretical views, but the recognition of the supremacy of Rome by an orthodox church under its own primate or patriarch. The reforms mentioned then, and a generation later by Innocent III (1198–1216), were more in the nature of a unification of rites and

113. Hitti, *Lebanon in History*, p. 281.

114. *Ibn al-Athir*, in *RHC, Or.*, I, 583.

115. Possibly none more vehemently than Dib; see above, note 112.

116. Crawford, "William of Tyre and the Maronites," pp. 222 ff. This ingenious explanation also suggests that the sixth ecumenical council, which, according to William of Tyre (XXI, 8; *RHC, Occ.*, I, 1017–1019) excommunicated the Monothelites, in fact had nothing to do with it. Although this seems to be a very plausible explanation, one wonders how William of Tyre, who wrote two or three years after the Maronites were united with the Latin church, could have been so mistaken. For what it is worth, we may note that the French translator of William of Tyre left out the item on the council. Of course, he may have shortened the text, or perhaps used another version.

customs than of a union through acceptance of the orthodox dogma of the two wills in Christ.

It is in connection with this occasion that William of Tyre describes the Maronites as a Christian nation, 40,000 strong, living in the mountains of Lebanon.¹¹⁷ This would be repeated a generation later by James of Vitry, who adds a comment on their prowess as archers.¹¹⁸ The unsolved question is the area of Maronite settlement. It is usually accepted that in the seventh century they migrated southeastward from the Orontes valley and its tributaries into the mountains. They are mentioned by al-Mas'ūdī in the tenth century as being not only in the mountains, but also in Homs, Hamah, and Ma'arrat an-Nu'mān. The area is badly defined.

In the southern part of Lebanon, on the confines of the county of Tripoli and the Latin kingdom, the mountains seem to have been occupied partly by the Druzes. According to Benjamin of Tudela, the only available source,¹¹⁹ they stretched from the mountains east of Sidon to Mt. Hermon, which means that the area included the Wādī-t-Taim, Marj 'Uyūn, and the sources of the Jordan. It is quite possible that they here met with the beduins of the 'Āmilah tribe.¹²⁰

The Druzes adjoined to the north another heretical Moslem sect, the Nuṣairīs,¹²¹ and it is this problem of the Nuṣairīs which seems to be crucial in demarcating the Maronite area. Unfortunately the question cannot be easily resolved. It has been convincingly argued that the Nuṣairīs were probably among the Persian Shī'ites on the Lebanese coast and that they were the predominant factor in the mountains of Lebanon, not only in Jabal 'Akkār but also at Botron and 'Aqūrah; moreover, that the whole of the Kasrawān area was Nuṣairī and not Maronite.¹²² If this is so, then the Maronites were in reality north of the Nuṣairīs and moved into southern Lebanon only after

117. William of Tyre, XXII, 8 (*RHC, Occ.*, I, 1076).

118. James of Vitry, *op. cit.*, cap. 81.

119. Benjamin of Tudela, *Itinerary*, ed. Adler, p. 18.

120. The wandering of the Banū-'Āmilah, who gave their name to upper Galilee, is not very clear. In Galilee they fused with the Banū-Judhām and at the beginning of the eleventh century moved into the Bilād ash-Shaqīf in southern Lebanon; cf. Lammens, in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new ed., I (Leyden and London, 1960), 436, s.v. "'Āmila," in opposition to the view that they moved far more to the north. Cf. Lammens, "Notes de géographie syrienne," *Mélanges de l'Université de Saint-Joseph* . . . , I (Beirut, 1906), 275.

121. Hitti, *Lebanon in History*, p. 281.

122. On the Nuṣairīs see René Dussaud, *Histoire et religion de Nosairis* (Paris, 1900). The crucial problem of relations between the Maronites and Nuṣairīs was dealt with very convincingly by Lammens, "Les Nosairis dans le Liban," *ROC*, VII (1902), 452-477. In his later *La Syrie: Précis historique* (2 vols., Beirut, 1921) the problem is not mentioned; strangely enough, the most recent studies do not refer to it. See Matti Moosa, "The Relation of the Maronites of Lebanon to the Mardaites and al-Jarājima," *Speculum*, XLIV (1969), 597-608; Cahen, "Notes

the destruction of the Nuṣairīs' power. The Maronites, as far as can be ascertained, probably occupied a part of the coastal plain outside the maritime cities and the area from Jubail through Botron to Tripoli and the Besharrī area in the mountains to the east.

This not only suggests that the Maronites, far from being the majority of inhabitants of Lebanon, were in reality pressed into a relatively small and well-defined area (although some groups were probably to be found outside), but it may help in explaining the paucity of notes preserved by chronicles contemporary with the crusades. Christians are occasionally mentioned as giving help to the army of the First Crusade making its way along the Lebanese coast. Again, we find local Christians helping Raymond of St. Gilles (about 1102) in the siege of Tripoli.¹²³ We do not hear specifically about Maronites from crusader sources until their contact with Antioch around 1182.¹²⁴ Still we know that the Maronite community existed, and it is possible to establish a list of their patriarchs as well as the villages which they settled. The names of villages are almost always linked with monasteries which, with the titles of Maronite prelates, show that the monks were the solid core of their church, probably performing parish duties. There were patriarchal sees at St. Mary in Yānūḥ, St. Mary in Maifūq, St. Elijah in Lihfid, St. Mary in Habil, St. George in Kafar, all in

sur les origines de la communauté syrienne des Nuṣayris," *Revue des études islamiques*, XXXVIII (1970), 243-249.

123. Raymond of Aguilers, in *RHC, Occ.*, III, 288. The native Christians gave the Franks advice about the road to Jerusalem during the siege of 'Arqah. Their number is given as 60,000. This was probably used by William of Tyre, VII, cap. 21 (*RHC, Occ.*, I, 310). According to him, the Christians lived in the mountains between 'Arqah, Tripoli, and Jubail. In his chapter on the Maronite union William gave 40,000 as the size of their population. In discussing the siege of Tripoli Ibn-al-Athīr speaks about "the inhabitants of the mountains [*ahl al-jabal*] and those of the *sawād* [countryside] who were mostly Christians" (*RHC, Or.*, I, 212). Lammens understands this as being the majority of inhabitants of the plain, whereas the mountain region was settled by Nūṣairīs; "Les Nosairis dans le Liban," p. 455.

124. The well-known episode of the defeat and capture of Pons of Tripoli in 1136 caused many difficulties for historians. William of Tyre (XIV, 23, in *RHC, Occ.*, I, 640) says: "et prodentibus eum Surianis, qui in Libanicis super eadem civitatem [Tripoli] habitant jugis, occisus est." This was followed by a bloody punitive expedition under Raymond. He brought back captives with women and children to Tripoli: "ubi in praesentia populi, in ultionem sanguinis eorum qui in acie cederant, eos variis affectis suppliciiis, et durissima mortis genera . . . compulset experiri." This passage, if applied to the Maronites, would be rather exceptional, given their relations with the Franks. In fact, nothing of the kind happened to any Christian denomination. William of Tyre does not say that they were Christians, although "Suriani" would normally apply to them. The passage embarrassed the French translator of William of Tyre, who wrote: "li Surien qui abitoient el mont Libane le trairent. Ses genz furent descomfiz et tornerent en fuie. Il fu pris après par la bone volenté as Suriens. Li Turc traitors l'occistrent." It is more than likely, as already assumed by Lammens, that these Lebanese were not Maronites but Nuṣairīs.

the diocese of Jubail, and Kafarḥai and St. Maro in Kafarḥai in the diocese of Botron.¹²⁵ There were also the monastery of Sts. Basil and Luke, called Mār Nuhrāh, in the diocese of Jubail, and the monastery of St. Sergius near Hardīn in the diocese of Tripoli;¹²⁶ the monastery at Kaftūn (northeast of Botron) and the monastery of Ḥālāt (southeast of Jubail).¹²⁷ There were other villages such as al-Munaiṭirah, Dimilṣā (north of Jubail), and Bnahrān and Ḥadath (in the Besharrī mountains, southeast of Tripoli).¹²⁸

There is no proof that before the union with Rome around 1182 there had been direct contacts between the Maronites and the Latin church.¹²⁹ The act of union occurred in Antioch. It did not satisfy everyone; there was a popular movement against it, even accompanied by acts of violence.¹³⁰ We do not know the reaction of the local Latin clergy, but in 1203 the papal legate, cardinal Peter, met in Tripoli with the Maronites, who promised adherence to Rome.¹³¹ Ten years later Innocent III invited the Maronite patriarch, Jeremiah of 'Amshīt (1199–1230), to participate in the Fourth Lateran Council.¹³² Before he left Rome in 1216, a papal bull gave instructions to the Maronites regarding dogmas, rites, and customs. It remains a moot question how far the bull of Innocent III refers to real heterodoxy, but there is no doubt that he imposed Latin usages on the Maronites. He also tried to establish unity in the community between Uniates and anti-Uniates. This situation seems to have persisted throughout the thirteenth century and beyond. Frankish ecclesiastical and lay authorities tried to strengthen the Uniate party. As with other denominations,

125. Assemani, *Biblioteca medicea-laurentiana* (Florence, 1742), pp. 16–18; cf. Dussaud, *Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et médiévale* (Paris, 1927), pp. 69–72.

126. *Ibid.*, pp. 26–27.

127. Mentioned in the autobiographical note of the Maronite patriarch Jeremiah; see below, note 132.

128. Cf. Salibi, "Maronite Church," in *Oriens Christianus*, XLII, 97.

129. Although a Maronite tradition has it that Alberic of Beauvais, cardinal-bishop of Ostia, who presided over a synod in Jerusalem in 1140 with the participation of the Armenian catholicos, contacted the Maronites in Tripoli and they declared their submission to Rome.

130. This is indicated in a bull of Innocent III; Anaissi, ed., *Bullarium Maronitarum, complectens bullas, brevia, epistolas, constitutiones aliaque documenta a Romanis pontificibus ad patriarchas Antiochenos Syro-Maronitarum missa* (Rome, 1911), pp. 2–5 (no. 2).

131. *Ibid.*

132. Due to a misprint or mistranslation in Assemani, *Biblioteca orientalis clementino-vaticana*, p. 17, whereby he gave the year as 1490 of the Greek calendar instead of 1590, the patriarch Jeremiah of 'Amshīt (1199–1230) was confused with his namesake Jeremiah of Dimilṣā, who lived nearly a hundred years later. This was incorporated by Dib in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, X, which confused the entire picture. He later corrected it in his *L'Église maronite*, and the correct text was used by Salibi in *Oriens Christianus*, LXII (1958), 92–104, who straightened out the chronology. See Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum*.

the Frankish princes intervened in the elections of the Maronite prelates; the patriarch Jeremiah of Dimiṣā states clearly that the Embriaco lord of Jubail took part in his election.

The opposition to the union brought about the election of rival patriarchs supported by the *muqaddams* or local Maronite ra'ises. The Uniates were stronger near the coast, that is, nearer the Frankish strongholds and cities, whereas the opposition was stronger to the east, in the mountain regions. The papacy tried to strengthen the contacts with the Maronites. Their prelate Jeremiah of Dimiṣā, abbot of Kaftūn, elected after the death of Daniel of Ḥajīt in 1282, was invited to Rome, leaving the pastoral duties to a prelate named Theodore.

It was at the end of the Frankish rule and the fall of Tripoli¹³³ that a major change took place in Lebanon, the punitive expeditions of the Mamluks in 1292 and 1305 against the Nuṣairis. Their destruction allowed a Maronite migration into the south and Kasrawān and the redrawing of the ethnic map of Lebanon.¹³⁴

The Jews could not expect any better treatment than the rest of the native population;¹³⁵ if anything, they could expect worse. The news

133. As late as 1282 Jeremiah witnessed a crusader document at Nephin, together with some other Maronite prelates, the archbishop of "Villejargon" ("Arqah) and the archbishop of "Resshyn" (Ra'ashīn): L. de Mas Latrie, *Histoire de l'île de Chypre*, III (Paris, 1855), 662-668.

134. The expeditions are described by Ṣāliḥ ibn-Yaḥyā, *Histoire de Beyrouth et des Bohtors, émirs du Gharb* (Beirut, 1902); republished by Francis Hours and Salibi (Beirut, 1969); Arabic text: *Ta'riḥ Bairūt wa akhbar al-umarā' al-Buhturiyīn . . .*, ed. Louis Cheikho (Beirut, 1927); readings corrected by Jean Sauvaget, "Corrections au texte imprimé de l'histoire de Beyrouth de Ṣāliḥ b. Yaḥyā," *Bulletin d'études orientales de l'Institut français de Damas*, VII-VIII (1937-1938), 65-82. They are also mentioned by abū-l-Fidā' (d. 1331) and later by al-Maqrīzī (d. 1442). The texts were thoroughly analyzed by Lammens, "Les Nosairis dans le Liban," and compared with late Maronite historiography, which saw in them an expedition against the Maronites and turned the episode into a national heroic epic.

135. The main collection of sources regarding the history of the Jews under crusader and Mamluk rule will appear in *Sefer ha-Yishūv*, III, ed. Yitzhak F. Baer, J. Praver, and Chaim H. Ben-Sasson. The number of sources grows each year with the publication of the Genizah material. The latest publications are recorded in the *Bibliography of Jewish Studies*, ed. Issachar Joel, published by the National Library in Jerusalem. Four monumental collections of sources and studies are basic for our period: Jacob Mann, *The Jews in Egypt and in Palestine under the Fāṭimid Caliphs* (2 vols., London, 1920-1922; repr. New York, 1970); *idem*, *Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature* (2 vols., Cincinnati, 1931-1935); Solomon D. Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society* (3 vols., Berkeley, 1967-1978); and E. Ashtor-Strauss, *History of the Jews in Egypt and Syria under the Mameluks* (in Hebrew; 3 vols., Jerusalem, 1944-1970). Rich material was recently published in the collection of texts and studies by Goitein, *Palestinian Jewry in Early Islamic and Crusader Times in the Light of the Genizah Documents*, ed. J. Hacker (in Hebrew; Jerusalem, 1980). An important collection of excerpts from sources is Ben-Zion Dinur, *Israel in the Diaspora* (in Hebrew), new ed. (Tel Aviv, 1960-), II, 1; tr. Merton B. Dagut (Philadelphia, 1964). For a general study of the period, with extensive bibliography,

of the horrible massacres of Jews in the Rhineland in 1096 reached the east almost a year before the crusading armies appeared. The Jewish communities from Antioch in the north to Raffiyah in the south prepared themselves for the worst in the event of a crusader victory. Some tried to find refuge in the larger cities and fortifications.

The conquest was as much a calamity for the Jewish communities as it was for the Moslems. The Jews defended and died for Jerusalem (1099) and Haifa (1100).¹³⁶ In other places like Antioch, Jubail, and Beirut, they were exterminated together with the local population. Those who escaped tried to reach the Moslem lands of the 'Abbāsīd caliphate or Fāṭimid imamate.

Yet, after this period of calamity, which lasted some ten years, things began to change. Except in Jerusalem, where neither Moslems nor Jews were allowed to live,¹³⁷ there was no specific discrimination against the Jews in the sense of distinguishing between them and other natives. This remained so until the end of the crusader states on the coast of Syria and Palestine, a remarkable fact if we remember that it was precisely at this time that Europe initiated anti-Semitic legislation which for eight or nine centuries controlled the fate of the dispersed nation. Moreover, when every crusade from the first to that of Louis IX was accompanied by new pogroms, whether in France, England, or Germany, we hear of no excesses of this kind in the lands of Christian domination in the Levant. This does not mean that the crusaders were in any sense tolerant, but simply that they looked on all natives as a single legal class. This prevented specific discrimination against the Jews, although in daily affairs relations were certainly more nuanced. Thus William of Tyre complained that the crusader princes preferred Jewish and Moslem doctors to

see Salo W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, III-V (New York, 1957). Among studies directly dealing with our problem are Praver, "The Jews in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem" (in Hebrew with English summary), *Zion*, XI (1946), 38-82; *idem*, "The Jews," chap. 13 of *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, Hebrew ed. (Jerusalem, 1974) (with up-to-date bibliography); Goitein, "Contemporary Letters on the Capture of Jerusalem by the Crusaders," *Journal of Jewish Studies*, III (1952), 162-177; *idem*, "A Report on Messianic Troubles in Baghdad, 1120-1121," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, XLIII (1952), 57-72; Benjamin Z. Kedar, "Notes on the History of the Jews in Jerusalem in the 13th Century" (in Hebrew with English summary), *Tarbiz*, XLI (1972), 82-94; *idem*, "On the History of the Jews in Palestine in the Middle Ages" (in Hebrew with English summary), *Tarbiz*, XLII (1973), 401-418. See also Zvi Ankori, *The Karaites in Byzantium* (New York, 1953). Special attention is paid to the history of the Jews in the crusader period in Praver, *Royaume latin*.

136. E.g., Gilo Parisiensis, VI, vv. 305 ff. (*RHC, Occ.*, V, 798); Albert of Aachen, I, vii, 22 (*RHC, Occ.*, IV, 521).

137. William of Tyre, XI, 27 (*RHC, Occ.*, I, 500-501); Abraham bar Hiyā, *Megillat ha-Megale*, ed. Julius Guttmann (Barcelona, 1929), IV, 99; al-Ḥarīzī, *Tahkemoni*, ed. Armand Kaminka (Warsaw, 1899), cap. 28. Cf. Praver in *Speculum*, XXVII, 77 ff.

Christians, and James of Vitry accused the crusaders of being too tolerant of Jews.¹³⁸

The conquest created conditions which reshaped the map of the Jewish communities. They were exterminated in the cities, mainly on the coast, but as there was no real fighting for control of the countryside we find in the twelfth century some two dozen villages (there were possibly more) in Galilee with a Jewish population.¹³⁹ Moreover, the Jews, like the Moslems, soon settled again in the maritime cities. In two, Tyre and Ascalon, which capitulated rather than be taken by force, there is good reason to assume that the Jewish communities survived and continued to exist under crusader rule.

At the end of the first kingdom there were important changes in the Jewish community, bringing a kind of renaissance in the thirteenth century. Jewish pilgrimages to the Holy Land continued without any difficulties during the whole of the twelfth century. If anything, they were more frequent than before. Moreover, if the pilgrimages before the crusades were mainly restricted to Jews from the Moslem Near East, the development of commercial routes linking the Levant and Europe now brought Jews from western Europe. Some, like the Spanish Jew Benjamin of Tudela or the German Petahiyah of Regensburg (fl. 1190), left "Itineraries" not unlike their Christian contemporaries', but naturally with a different perspective.

This pilgrimage movement began to change in size and in character at the time of Saladin's conquest (1187). The occurrences which had focused attention on the Holy Land created repercussions among Jews everywhere. Soon messianic stirrings made their appearance from Spain to Baghdad and far off Khurasan.¹⁴⁰ Some were directly linked with the crusades, others were due to local circumstances, still others grew out of forces within the Jewish community, but all had in common the background of the wars of cross and crescent.

When the ideology of holy war transferred Europeans to the east and rekindled the Moslem *jihād* in reaction, the Jewish community reacted with their own interpretation of events. As early as the First Crusade there is recorded, in a letter which originated in the Balkans, a messianic movement centered on Thessalonica (1096) and spreading

138. William of Tyre, XVIII, 34 (*RHC, Occ.*, I, 879-881); James of Vitry in Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, cap. 81. His characterization of the Jews in Palestine was the one current in contemporary Europe but had hardly any application to the Jews of the Levant.

139. See the list of Jewish settlements in cities and villages in Prawer, *Latin Kingdom*, Hebrew ed., chap. 13.

140. Mann, "Jewish Messianic Movements at the Time of the Crusades" (in Hebrew), *Hatekufa*, XXIII (1925), 253 ff. Cf. Goitein, "Messianic Troubles," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, XLIII, 57 ff.

into Anatolia and Syria. Since the real causes of the crusade were unknown, the description is a mixture of fantasy and wishful thinking. The crusaders were conceived of as the ten lost tribes shut up by Alexander the Great behind the mountain of darkness. Now, moved by God's order, they were proceeding to the east. The prophet Elijah had appeared; and in some communities the Jews sold their property and waited for the Messiah who would bring them to Jerusalem.¹⁴¹ The whole aim of the crusade, according to the anonymous author of this letter, was "to gather them as on a threshing floor and then God will say to Israel: 'Stand up and thresh, O daughter of Zion'" (Micah 4:13).

The calamities associated with the crusades interrupted speculations for a time, although the messianic expectations did not cease.¹⁴² The new security offered by the crusader states on the coast brought about the reestablishment of Jewish communities there, and in the 1170's a flourishing Jewish community existed in Tyre. Although the Palestinian Gaonate ceased to exist in the Holy Land, the sages of Tyre were in contact with the great leader of the period, Maimonides (d. 1204), who settled in Fustat in Egypt. He praised them for their learning, which was renowned even outside the boundaries of the country. Another community of importance was that of Acre.¹⁴³

The fall of Jerusalem to Saladin had far-reaching consequences for the Jewish community. Crusader legislation prejudicial to Moslems and Jews was naturally abolished, and the few Jews who had lived under royal tolerance near the citadel of Jerusalem¹⁴⁴ became a fair-sized community. As a matter of fact, three Jewish groups settled in the place: the Ascalonites, whose city was dismantled on the order of Saladin (September 1191), Jews from the Maghrib who fled the persecutions (1198-1199) of abū-Yūsuf Ya'qūb al-Manṣūr and his son Muḥammad an-Nāṣir, and finally Jews from France and the Plantagenet dominions on French soil. This last was a migration of some 300 families with their rabbis, moving to Jerusalem in two groups in 1209 and 1210.¹⁴⁵

This sudden revival of Jewish community life in Jerusalem after

141. See above, note 139.

142. The rich apocalyptic literature begins at the time of the wars between Byzantium and the Sāsānid empire. The rise of Islam, the emergence of the Umayyads, 'Abbāsids, Selchūkids, and crusaders until the great onslaught of the Mongols in the thirteenth century, then found their expression in the different chapters of this literature. The texts were published by Even Shmuel, *Midrasheī Ge'ūla [The Exegesis of Salvation]* (Tel Aviv, 1954).

143. *Responsa of Maimonides* (in Hebrew), ed. Alfred Freimann (Jerusalem, 1934), par. 105.

144. Benjamin of Tudela, *Itinerary*, ed. Adler, p. 35.

145. Solomon Ibn Verga, *Shevet Iehūda*, ed. Azriel Shohet (Jerusalem, 1946/7), 147.

three generations of being barred from the city seemed providential. When al-Harīzī, the Jewish poet from Spain, visited Jerusalem in 1216, he was told by a Jewish inhabitant of the city: "And God moved the spirit of the king of [the] Ismaelites [Moslems] in the year 4950 of creation [1190] and the spirit of good counsel and right moved him and he and all his host went out from Egypt and laid siege to Jerusalem. And God gave it into his hands. And he ordered to be proclaimed in every city, to old and young, as follows: 'Speak ye to the heart of Jerusalem, let everybody from the seed of Ephraim, from the Diaspora of Ashur and Egypt, from all those dispersed in the four corners of the world, come to her.' And so they gathered from all horizons and settled inside her boundaries."¹⁴⁶ One cannot exclude the possibility of such an official proclamation by Saladin. There was the earlier example of Zengi, who after the capture of Edessa settled 300 Jewish families there, who would later be extremely loyal to the Moslems.¹⁴⁷ But on the whole this seems rather an explanation *ex post facto*, made some twenty-five years after the renewal of Jewish life in Jerusalem.

From then on the movement bore more the character of an immigration than a pilgrimage to the holy places. Some of the greatest Jewish luminaries of the period settled in the Holy Land. Suffice it to mention the leader of French Jewry in the middle of the thirteenth century, rabbi Yehīel of Paris (d. 1286), that of Spanish Jewry Naḥmanides in 1267, and rabbi Meir of Rothenburg, caught in 1283 by emperor Rudolph I of Hapsburg in northern Italy, while on his way to the Holy Land with his family.¹⁴⁸

Though certainly influenced by the general deterioration of the position of the Jews in Europe, the new attitude was mainly the outcome of Jewish reaction to the great events in the Holy Land. When the messianic expectations of the First Crusade were followed by massacres, the creation of the crusader kingdom was perceived by Jews as an act of injustice. How did it happen, asked the great Hebrew poet in far-off Spain, Yehūdah ha-Levī (fl. 1140), that "the Edomite [crusader] became resident in my palace, that the hands of the Arabs reign and that the red one ["Edomi," Esau, Christian] rules my sheep with his dogs?" And a twelfth-century German poet, who also wrote the "Chronicle of the Massacres" of the crusades in Europe, Ephraim

146. Al-Harīzī, *Tahkemonī*, ed. Kaminka, cap. 28.

147. Tritton and Gibb, "The First and Second Crusade from an Anonymous Syriac Chronicle," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1933), p. 291.

148. For Meir see the notice in the Jewish Community Book of Worms, in *Shem ha-gedolīm*, ed. Ben-Yaakov (Wilno, 1856), p. 84b.

of Bonn (fl. 1180), prays: "Let him turn Edom into Sodom and the cursed Ismā'el into Gomorrah. Let him return the power, which was once given to us, and let him give back to us the whole land [of Israel]." ¹⁴⁹

The European Jew saw little difference in the land of his forefathers being in Christian or Moslem hands. Both were unjust, both were unlawful, and providence would presumably soon take vengeance and restore the promised land to its legitimate heirs. It is in this framework that we should envisage the Jewish immigration to Palestine in the thirteenth century. The war between Islam and Christendom, in which defeat or victory on one side or the other never seemed decisive, and major battles in the Holy Land inexorably brought about its destruction, gave rise to a particular Jewish view of events. This is clearly expressed in the biblical commentary of Naḥmanides, begun in Spain but completed in Jerusalem, where he created a school of wide repute. The basic ideas of Naḥmanides are summarized in his exposition of Leviticus (22:36): "And I will bring the land into desolation and your enemies which dwell therein shall be astonished at it." Naḥmanides comments: "This is the message of glad tidings throughout the countries of the Exile, that our land does not accept our foes. It is also a decisive proof and a promise to us, for in all the inhabited world there is no land so fair and large, settled from time immemorial and which is as desolate as it is now. For ever since we departed from it, it had not accepted a single nation. They all try to settle it, but it is beyond their power."

The thrust of this interpretation was that the time of salvation was near. Moreover it would not do just to wait for the decree of providence and the coming of the Messiah. The legitimate right of the Holy Land was not prescriptive, and every generation, including Naḥmanides' own, was ordered to take hold and inherit the land. "It is a divine precept to inherit the land which God gave to our forefathers . . . and we shall not leave it either to the foreign nations nor to desolation." This right to the heritage is considered to be tangibly proved by the existing situation, which Naḥmanides sums up in a succinct phrase: "Great is the desolation in this rich and wide land, because they do not deserve you and you are not fit for them."

Naḥmanides not only expounded a theory, but what he preached he put into practice. He left his Catalonian birthplace, migrated to the Holy Land in 1267, and established himself among the ruins of Jerusalem, where soon a synagogue and a school made their appear-

149. Dinur, *Israel in the Diaspora*, II-1, 444-445.

ance. Yet it was not Moslem Jerusalem but crusader Tyre and Acre which became the centers of the Jewish community. Jerusalem suffered many vicissitudes in the thirteenth century, and life there was extremely insecure. When in 1229 al-Malik al-Kāmil handed it over to Frederick II, anti-Jewish legislation was reestablished. Following some negotiations, however, a Jewish family was allowed to live in Jerusalem and so to assure a halting place for Jewish pilgrims, who were allowed to visit the city.¹⁵⁰ The Khwārizmian invasion of 1244 and the Mongol raids of 1260 in the vicinity of Jerusalem made life almost impossible, and many who had tried to strike roots in the holy city left for the coast. Consequently Acre, the richest of the crusader cities, became the great Jewish center from the second quarter of the thirteenth century on. Security was greater in the cosmopolitan city and so were the economic means of subsistence.

The Jewish community in Acre became a cross-section of the different communities of the Diaspora. The leading elements were Jews from Spain and from northern and southern France, in addition to eastern Jews, whether Palestinian-born or from neighboring Moslem countries. Each element brought its own traditions in ritual and liturgy, but also its own attitudes to the great intellectual problem common to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam—the relation between philosophy and religion. Jewish Spain and southern France represented in this sense a more liberal attitude than the Diaspora of Ashkenaz in northern France and Germany, although a new trend, that of Spanish mysticism (the Kabbala), was quickly finding adherents. The focus of tension was the philosophical works of Maimonides (“The Guide of the Perplexed”). Vehement discussions between their admirers and those who condemned them stirred unprecedented troubles and even led to mutual excommunication of the contending factions. Acre became a battleground of the opposing views, where European and eastern Jewish centers, like Damascus and Mosul, intervened. The latter, who fanatically adhered to Maimonides, took a strong view against those who calumniated his memory, an attitude also to be found in Egypt and in crusader Acre. Here a Talmudic academy continued the tradition of the French Tosafists, whereas rabbi Salomon Petit (fl. 1280) expounded the Kabbala and Spanish Jews continued their own tradition. The flourishing community of Acre lived its great days in the last quarter of the century, but was wiped out

150. Goitein, “New Sources on Palestine during the Crusader Period,” *Eretz Israel*, IV (1967), 155.

during the massacre which followed its capture by al-Ashraf Khalil in 1291.¹⁵¹

There were two major factors which directly influenced the existence and the way of life of the minorities: the European traditional social structure imported by the crusaders and the organization of political and social life of the minorities in the previous Moslem period.¹⁵² The European feudal system offered a model of human interdependence; Moslem society at the turn of the eleventh century was evolving in the same direction, though one would hesitate to call it feudal. At no time before or after did the two societies so much resemble each other as at the beginning of the twelfth century. On the other hand, although minorities were not entirely unknown in Europe, it was the Moslem east which, during the previous four hundred years, had developed methods of rule over and coexistence with minorities. With the conquest of the Levant, and the problem of ruling a local population made up of heterogeneous groups, the crusaders took over the existing system and adapted it to their own needs and assumptions. They also accepted with some modification the system of social and economic dependence, which met their material needs and conformed to their image of society. The Franks had no wish to disrupt local groups and institutions; as a matter of fact they were happy to preserve them as the basis of their own feudal superstructure. The model seems to have been common to the northern principalities and the Latin kingdom, but different demographic patterns led to some variety.

The most striking change affected the Moslems. From rulers they became subjects, losing in the process their urban and rural aristocracy, their intellectual elite, and their political institutions. Relegated to the class of the conquered, their organization did not differ from that of the other non-Frankish communities.

The feature common to all the minority groups was their autonomous organization as religious communities. In some cases they were identified with territorial units—villages or quarters in cities. Some preserved a larger organizational framework, like the ecclesiastical

151. On the Jewish community in Acre see Prawer, *Royaume latin*, II, 397–419.

152. Cahen, *Syrie du nord, passim*; the question has been treated in more detail by the same author: "Le Régime rural syrien au temps de la domination franque," *Bulletin de la Faculté des lettres de Strasbourg*, XXIX (1950–1951), 286–310; *idem*, "La Féodalité et les institutions politiques de l'Orient latin," *Oriente ed Occidente nel medio evo* (Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, Fondazione Alessandro Volta, Atti dei convegni XII; Rome, 1957), pp. 167–191. See also Prawer, *Royaume latin*, I, 461–537; *idem*, *Latin Kingdom*, pp. 46–60, 126–159, 214–233.

organizations of Christians and Jews, but in everyday life it was the smaller units of tightly organized local communities which played a major role in the life of their members.

The independence of the communities was reflected in the jurisdictional rights of their religious leaders, including questions of marriage and inheritance. In many cases there was a mixed leadership of local clergy and lay notables, a feature common to Christians and Jews, but possibly also to Moslems. This was a legacy of the former Moslem period with its notion of *dhimmīs*, clients of the Moslem state. Basically applied to the 'Ahl al-Kitāb (the people of the Holy Scriptures of Revelation), it guaranteed life and property as well as the right to live according to one's own laws and customs.¹⁵³ This notion of second-class subjects, distinguished from the ruling group by religion, was taken over by the crusaders.

John of Ibelin, count of Jaffa (1250–1266), recounts somewhat naively how autonomy was granted to the minorities, and attributes it to Godfrey of Bouillon. The "Syrians," he says, came to Godfrey and asked for the privilege of being judged by their own courts and their own laws. Their request was granted. The story is an episode in a larger narrative about how the laws of the kingdom were created, the details of which are partly legendary, although there was nothing extraordinary in the Syrian request.¹⁵⁴

The crusaders granted autonomy not only to "Syrians" but also to Moslems and Jews. The institutional expression of this autonomy, according to John of Ibelin, was the court of the *ra'īs*, the headman of the community. Crusader documents furnish us with a number of cases in which such *ra'īs*es (though not their courts) appear. In addition to the rural or village *ra'īs*es there were *ra'īs*es in cities, whose position was to some extent different from that of their rural namesakes.¹⁵⁵

153. In addition to the studies in the previous note see Tritton, *The Caliphs and Their Non-Muslim Subjects* (London, 1930); *idem*, "Non-Muslim Subjects of the Muslim State," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1942), pp. 36–40; Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*; Neophytos Edelby, "Essai sur l'autonomie juridictionnelle des Chrétiens d'Orient," *Archives d'histoire du droit oriental* . . ., I (1952); Cahen, s.v. "Dhimma," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new ed., II, 227–231; *idem*, "Indigènes et croisés," *Syria*, XV (1956), 351–360; Sivan, "Notes sur la situation des chrétiens à l'époque ayyūbide," *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, CLXXII (1967), 117–130; Jonathan Riley-Smith, "The Survival in Latin Palestine of Muslim Administration," in *Eastern Mediterranean Lands in the Period of the Crusades*, ed. Peter M. Holt (Warminster, 1977), pp. 9–22.

154. John of Ibelin, cap. 4 (*RHC, Lois*, I, 26). On Godfrey as lawgiver see Praver, "The *Assise de tenure* and the *Assise de vente*: A Study of Landed Property in the Latin Kingdom," *Economic History Review*, ser. 2, IV (1951–1952), 77–87.

155. Cahen, "La Féodalité," pp. 185 ff.; Riley-Smith, "Some Lesser Officials in Latin Syria," *English Historical Review*, LXXXVII (1972), 1–26; *idem*, *The Feudal Nobility and the Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1174–1277* (London, 1973), pp. 90–91, 47–49.

The term *raʿīs*, transcribed as *raicius* (and the office as *raisagium*), must have meant different things depending on place and community. In the city of Antioch it seems to have corresponded to the *iudex*, a title taken over from the former Byzantine administration or derived from the Norman Sicilo-Byzantine administration;¹⁵⁶ in the Moslem and eastern Christian villages it must have corresponded to the headman of the village, the *mukhtār* of modern eastern villages. In the majority of cases, however, we may assume that it really corresponded to the head of the *ḥamūlah*, the extended family. The *raʿīs* was probably the head of the dominant *ḥamūlah* of the village. This explains why in several villages we find more than one *raʿīs*, who must have represented several village *ḥamūlahs*;¹⁵⁷ these were extraordinary cases, as the villages as a rule were relatively small and not many *ḥamūlahs* lived in a single village.

The *raʿīs* of the village, head of a *ḥamūlah*, was by definition a notable, and exercised a traditional kind of patriarchal jurisdiction over the inhabitants. He was certainly not chosen by the Frankish lord, although he was acknowledged and confirmed by him. Some were quite important, being *raʿīs*es of a district or a group of villages (possibly inhabited by the same clan), and therefore exercising considerable influence. In such a case, the Frankish lord took care to safeguard his rights, and although the post was certainly hereditary, at least in the notable's family, the confirmation was formal. A good example is that of the Hospitallers who "conceded to *raicius* Abet [ʿAbd] a number of villages to hold, till and guard as long as it will please the masters and brothers of the order."¹⁵⁸ This kind of native overlordship must have been more common in the thinly populated and less accessible mountain areas, hence the *raisagium montanae* to be found in a crusader document.¹⁵⁹ In similar cases, particularly in the mountains of Lebanon in the county of Tripoli, the Franks looked on the *raʿīs* as a *regulus*,¹⁶⁰ kinglet or chieftain, possibly corresponding to the local chieftains of the mountains of Tripoli, the *muqaddams*.

Head of the village community, notable of the district with traditional rights of jurisdiction, the *raʿīs* was also the Frankish lord's representative in his dealings with the community.¹⁶¹ As such he might

156. Cahen, *Syrie du nord*, pp. 461-462.

157. E.g., Röhricht, *Regesta*, no. 1220.

158. *Ibid.*, no. 1237.

159. *Ibid.*, no. 212.

160. J. Delaville Le Roulx, ed., *Cartulaire général de l'ordre des Hospitaliers de S. Jean de Jérusalem (1100-1310)*, I (Paris, 1894), 320 (no. 467).

161. Other officials, not necessarily natives or connected with the native community, were the *drugeman* and *scriba*; see Riley-Smith, "Some Lesser Officials," pp. 15-26.

be called a bailie, although this could also mean a Frankish supervisor, a kind of steward, like the Venetians' *gastaldio* in their rural domain in Tyre.¹⁶² As the lord's representative he was important, because the Franks drew their revenue as a rule not from individual peasant lots, but from the entire village community or some part of it.

In both his responsibilities, the traditional and the official, the *raʿīs* took counsel with the elders of the village, whom we see on occasion participating in the symbolic act of transferring the lordship of their village from one Frank to another or taking a form of oath in a mixed Frankish-oriental ceremony.¹⁶³

The problem of autonomy for minorities was far more complex in the cities. There had existed native courts headed by the *raʿīs*, but these disappeared in time, to be replaced by the *Cour de la Fonde*, or court of the market.¹⁶⁴ Though our sources speak only of "Syrians", possibly meaning Melkites and Jacobites, other minorities, Moslems and Jews, were undoubtedly affected. *Prima facie*, one has the impression that the replacement of the court of the *raʿīs* by the *Cour de la Fonde* was tantamount to the abolition of the autonomy of the non-Frankish communities. But Jewish sources prove beyond a doubt that Jewish autonomous jurisdiction not only continued to exist but, if anything, became stronger in the course of the thirteenth century. The rabbinical courts and the "good man of the city" (*tuveī ha-ʿir*) or the "presidency of the community" (*rosheī ha-qahal*) functioned even in smaller communities divided one from another because of their different liturgies, with their own religious and lay leadership.¹⁶⁵ Besides religious questions they took care of education, ritual baths, ritual slaughterhouses, synagogues, schools, the ransom of prisoners, and a multitude of welfare problems.¹⁶⁶

What is certain for the Jewish community was probably no differ-

162. Some of these officials bear distinctly eastern names, like Botros (Peter), Semes (Shams). Cf. Delaville Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, II, 784-785; Tafel and Thomas, II, 371: "prepositus casalis, quem nos appellavimus Gastaldiones [sic];" Praver, "Étude de quelques problèmes agraires et sociaux d'une seigneurie croisée au XIIIe siècle," *Byzantion*, XXII (1952), 5-61; XXIII (1953), 143-170.

163. Delaville Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, II, 764-767, 786-787.

164. *Livre des Assises . . . des Bourgeois*, cap. 241 (*RHC, Lois*, II, 171-173).

165. E.g., decisions of the rabbinical court in Acre in the second half of the twelfth century; *Responsa of Maimonides*, ed. Freimann; the decisions of the "Qahal of Acre" in 1234, *Responsa of R. Abraham, Son of Maimonides*, ed. Freimann and Goitein (Jerusalem, 1937), par. 8 (p. 25). For more details see Praver, "The Jews in the Latin Kingdom."

166. See the letters from Jerusalem by rabbi Yehiel ha-Zarfati in Mann, *The Jews in Egypt and in Palestine under the Fāṭimid Caliphs*, vol. I. The most up-to-date study is that of Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, vol. II, which deals with such problems in the Fāṭimid and Aiyūbid empire. Cf. Ashtor-Strauss, *History of the Jews in Egypt and Syria, passim*.

ent for other minorities. The silence of the sources respecting the court of the *raʿīs* in the cities (only larger cities with their own *Cour de la Fonde* are in question) should not be regarded as implying their abolition. It is reasonable to suppose that the native courts continued to function, catering to the needs of the members of the community. Their activity depended on the cohesion of the community, and its willingness to bring the cases of its own members before its own court. This had long been the case, certainly for the past four centuries, since the Arab conquest, and possibly much earlier, given the fact that Jewish autonomy had existed at least since the second century. The members of minority communities could bring cases involving their own members before the public court of the lordship, but this was always looked upon askance by every community, since it opened the door to outside interference. The invocation of the state was often formally prohibited by secular or ecclesiastical authorities' threatening the offender with anathema. This was as common as the official prohibition against invoking outside intervention in the election of ecclesiastics of the different communities. There were always jurisdictional problems regarding members of the same community, but the courts of the *raʿīs* or the ecclesiastical courts continued to act according to their own customs and laws.¹⁶⁷

However, Syrian and Palestinian cities were extremely heterogeneous in their ethnic and religious composition, to which there was now added a new ruling class, the Franks, whose economic life was interwoven with that of the local population. This created a new problem, that of jurisdiction in mixed cases involving members of different communities. Moreover, there was a wide range of criminal cases involving members of minority groups which were never in the hands of the *raʿīs*. This belonged to the local Court of Burgesses.¹⁶⁸ The same is true for civil cases involving property held in burgage tenure (*borgesie*).¹⁶⁹ However, the supplanting of the court of the *raʿīs* by the *Cour de la Fonde* was linked with the commercial traffic of the

167. The same rules existed in the contemporary Moslem state. A relevant case is that of Saladin, who called for legal advice regarding the jurisdiction of the *dhimmīs*. He received an answer from abū-dh-Dhāhīr ibn-ʿAūf al-Iskandarī of the Maliki rite, subscribed to by abū-dh-Dhāhīr as-Salafī of the Shāfiʿites. According to this decision Jews should be judged by their own customs (*ʿādah*) and their own *hakīms*. Only if both parties agree could the suit come before a Moslem judge, who could still refuse to hear the case. The decision is recorded by Tāj-ad-Dīn as-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt ash-Shāfiʿiyah al-kubrā*, in Martin Schreiner, "Notes sur les Juifs dans l'Islam," *Revue des études juives*, XXIX (1894), 208-213.

168. *Livre des Assises . . . des Bourgeois*, cap. 241 (*RHC, Lois*, II, 171-173).

169. Non-Franks were excluded *de jure* from holding *borgesies*, but in practice they were often proprietors of city land and city houses; cf. *Abrégé du livre des Assises de la Cour des Bourgeois*, cap. 24 (*RHC, Lois*, II, 254).

sūqs and bazaars and the coexistence of different communities in restricted areas. This created intercommunity agreements and litigation mentioned in crusader sources, respecting debts, mortgages, rents, loans, sales, purchases, and the like.

In the *sūqs* and bazaars, buyers and sellers often belonged to different communities. In Acre or Tyre the seller might have been a Moslem, eastern Christian, or Jew, often a peasant bringing his products or wares from the countryside; the buyer was usually a Frank. In litigation involving a Frank, the *raʿīs* of the community would hardly be acceptable to the crusaders as judge. The same would also be true in commercial cases involving members of different minorities. Such cases came before the *Cour de la Fonde*. Its president, the bailie, was a Frank, noble or burgess; two of its jurors were Franks, the other four were "Syrians," Melkites or Jacobites.¹⁷⁰ If the suit involved a sum greater than one mark of silver, the competent authority was not the *Cour de la Fonde* but the Court of Burgesses.¹⁷¹

Thus the emergence of the *Cour de la Fonde* left the court of the *raʿīs* intact, as far as its own community was concerned, its effectiveness depending on the willingness of its members to use it. A state court, royal or baronial, came into being for those who, for various reasons, preferred a public court, while the *Cour de la Fonde* was the institution competent to judge cases which involved Franks and natives.¹⁷²

Religion was at the basis of the crusaders' attitude to the minorities, but the legal and social standing of a member of any minority was additionally circumscribed by where he lived and his occupation. The major distinction was that between city and country dwellers. Religious affiliation had little to do with economic occupation, and consequently a Melkite or Jacobite, to mention the largest group of non-Latin Christians, or a Moslem or Jew, enjoyed several privileges when he lived in a city which he lost if he lived in a village or on

170. *Livre des Assises de la Cour des Bourgeois*, cap. 241 (*RHC, Lois*, II, 171).

171. At the beginning of the fourteenth century, one mark of silver equaled 25 bezants of Cyprus.

172. The standard procedure was that witnesses had to be produced by the defendant; *Livre des Assises . . . des Bourgeois*, caps. 59-65 (*RHC, Lois*, II, 53-56): "Car le droit comande que de cele lei, don celui est don l'on se clame, de cele lei deivent estre les garens" (cap. 65, p. 56); an exceptional case is *ibid.*, cap. 140 (p. 96). This often created legal difficulties, for example, the impossibility of church establishments' claiming their property. The papacy intervened several times on such occasions; e.g., *Acta Honorii III*, ed. Täutu, no. 80, pp. 108-109: "ut non tantum Graecos, vel Surianos vel Armenos et generaliter fideles omnes ad testificandum idoneos pro vobis et ecclesia vestra in testimonium inducere valeatis."

a farm. Basically, there were no serfs in the cities. The expression *servus* in the sense of serf is almost never to be found in crusader documents, though it does appear (with another meaning) in the writings of the jurists. In crusader acts, all non-Frankish peasants are *villani* or *rustici*.¹⁷³ The feudal vocabulary of the crusaders is manifestly that of northern France (with some exceptions in Antioch and Tripoli) and one wonders if the use of *villanus* rather than *servus* reflects the European legal distinction, foggy as it often was, between the two. Yet the *villanus* in the crusader kingdom was for all practical purposes a serf. If we had only the legal treatises to go by, the picture would seem clear enough, though not very detailed. Only John of Ibelin paid any attention to the problem. From him we learn about the existence of legislation and legal institutions dealing with villeins. A special assise, called *L'assise et l'établissement des vileins et des vilaines*, was promulgated to deal with some aspects of the problem. Unfortunately the precise date of promulgation, apparently in the first half of the twelfth century, is not stated. The aim of the assise was to establish the rights of feudal landlords over their villeins. At the same time, it ordered the establishment of special courts to deal with fugitive villeins.¹⁷⁴ The members of this special court are variously called *juges*, *enquereors*, or *ciaus qui tenent l'assise*. Their appointment was the responsibility of the overlord (it is not clear whether this meant the king or the holder of the lordship). There had to be "three liegemen to hold the assise," to be established *par les contrés et par les seignories*. If one of them failed to act or changed his place of residence, he had to be replaced by the overlord.¹⁷⁵

The procedure of the court is reminiscent of the Carolingian *inquisitio* or the Anglo-Norman inquest. Its main function was to decide questions of lordship over villeins as well as to call for the pursuit of fugitives and their restoration to their legal owners. In disputed cases the ownership of a villein could be decided by an *enquête* using the testimony of other villeins.

Thus the peasants were *ad glebam adscripti*. They were not allowed to leave their farms without permission of their lords. *Formarriage* was also prohibited, but if it took place with the connivance of another lord, the latter had to replace the loss of the female serf by another woman of the same age and condition. In some cases peasant

173. The noun *rusticus* is for some reason more frequent in the colonial Venetian documents; cf. Tafel and Thomas, II, 371. See Prawer, "Serfs, Slaves and Bedouin," in his *Crusader Institutions* (Oxford, 1980), pp. 203 ff.

174. John of Ibelin, caps. 251-255 (*RHC, Lois*, I, 403-406).

175. *Idem*, cap. 253 (*ibid.*, p. 405).

families, or rather their heads, were called *homliges*. Despite the noble origin of the designation they do not seem to differ from other villeins, and the noun does not seem to mean more than "subjects," people dependent on an overlord.¹⁷⁶

All this sounds very much like feudal European legislation. Although links of dependence, even strict dependence, had existed before, Islamic law, which sanctioned slavery, did not recognize the status of serf. Moslem legislation made a distinction between Moslems and the non-Moslem clients of the Moslem state, but this reflected their position as subjects of the state, not personal servitude.

Still, the crusader conquest did not sensibly change the position of the Syrian and Palestinian peasantry. By the eleventh century, free and independent peasants were rare in the Moslem Near East. There was a proliferation of large domains belonging to pious institutions (sing., *waqf*), a process probably accentuated by the Selchükids. In addition, the spread of the *iqṭā'ah*, a benefice or fief, made the peasant dependent on an overlord. Finally, the private usurpation of payments to the state also contributed to the same development, the disappearance of small independent properties. The Frankish lords merely generalized the existing system of servitude.

The legal position of villeins can also be deduced from the legal acts of the period. Land is alienated "cum omnibus terris, villanis et pertinentis suis";¹⁷⁷ or with the land there also go "praedicti villani cum eorum posteritatibus";¹⁷⁸ or land is transferred "cum omnibus villanis Surianis sive Sarracenis, ubicunque sint,"¹⁷⁹ or "cum vineis et olivetis et iardinis, cum omnibus terris suis cultis et incultis, cum omnibus villanis terre et cum omnibus pertinenciis et divisionibus suis."¹⁸⁰

Serfdom, being a personal condition, went with the villein wherever he might be. Thus land is alienated "cum rusticis quoque, qui de eisdem casalibus sunt nati, ubicumque sint";¹⁸¹ or "simul cum rusticis omnibus qui in predicto casali habitant presentialiter, et quicum-

176. I do not see any special reason, though there are opinions to the contrary, to regard these *homliges*, to be found in a Venetian inventory of the middle of the thirteenth century, as anything but serfs. In the Tyrian village of Theiretenne the *homliges* represent all the peasants who belonged to the Venetians: "sunt in dicto casali XII homliges"; Tafel and Thomas, *op. cit.*, II, 373-374. A clear proof is given by the village of Homeire (Humairah) in the same territory; "Habemus in dicto casali nostro tres homliges. Nomina rusticorum sunt hec: primus Raysinegid, Couaha, Habeluaif"; *ibid.*, II, 374.

177. Rozière, *Cartulaire*, no. 44, p. 81.

178. *Ibid.*, no. 48, p. 88.

179. Ernst Strehlke, *Tabulae ordinis theutonici* (Berlin, 1869; repr. Toronto, 1975), p. 3 (no. 3).

180. *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14 (no. 14).

181. *Ibid.*, p. 15 (no. 16).

que convinci potuerint inveniri fore de predicto casali."¹⁸² Possibly this applies to fugitive villeins. In some cases Frankish lords entered into special agreements with their neighbors to prevent villeins' running away and settling in other villages. Thus in 1186 Bohemond III of Antioch, when selling al-Marqab to the Hospitallers, specifies that if "my villeins, or those of my men, who are Saracens, by any chance come into the territory of Valanie or Margat . . . the brothers of the Hospital will return them to us according to the *assise* and the customs of the land. But if they are Christians, the Hospitallers will recompense us (*pacificabunt*) within fifteen days or will release them from their land. But if their villeins by chance come into my land or the land of my men, we shall likewise give them back to the brothers of the Hospital."¹⁸³ A curious agreement, from the neighborhood of Beirut, stipulates that the Buḥtur emirs of al-Gharb will hand all fugitive villeins from Beirut over to the Frankish lord of the city within eight days.¹⁸⁴

The flight of villeins was not uncommon in the early years of the existence of the kingdom, though this was more the result of political circumstances. In one case, however, in the middle of the twelfth century, Moslem peasants, because of maltreatment in the vicinity of Nablus, set up an organization to enable fugitives from Frankish lands to escape and join their Moslem coreligionists.¹⁸⁵

One peculiarity of this rural regime deserves looking at. Many documents mention the sale or gift of individual villeins or villein families. Thus in a generous grant of villages to the Hospitallers, Pons of Tripoli (1112-1137) adds: "And I give the right to all my men, who hold land from me, that if they are willing, they may give one villein to the Hospital . . . anyone whosoever in his fief. I likewise approve their giving more, if done after consulting me."¹⁸⁶ A confirmation of the Hospital's privileges in 1154 reads like a strange inventory of donations of single villeins: "one rich villein who lives in Nablus . . . three villeins given by the bishop of Nazareth [Achard], one given by William de Tenchis, another by Pagan Vacca, another given by Drogo," and so on.¹⁸⁷ There are many similar donations which prove such procedure to be customary in the Latin east. The frequency of

182. Delaville Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, II, 135 (no. 1372).

183. *Ibid.*, I, 495 (no. 783).

184. Cf. Clermont-Ganneau, "Deux chartes des croisés dans les archives arabes," *Revue d'archéologie orientale*, IV (1905), 5-31.

185. Sivan, "Réfugiés syro-palestiniens au temps des croisades," *Revue des études islamiques*, XXXV (1967), 135-147.

186. Delaville Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, I, 77 (no. 82).

187. *Ibid.*, I, 172 (no. 225).

this type of donation, though not unknown in the west, seems to be a product of the Frankish agricultural regime. In theory, the sale or gift (which was more common) of a villein meant the transfer of the man, his family, and his descendants into somebody else's power. It also meant the transfer of his tenure and of its dues and services to the new lord. However, our documentation points to the transfer of economic rights only, while jurisdiction over the person remained with the former lord, unless a whole village or a larger territory was transferred. This is understandable if we remember that the crusaders did not create a manorial system, or at least had little or no demesne land. Consequently, payments in kind or cash, and dues in kind on special occasions, were the main villein obligations. Other than the *xenia*, the bulk of these dues was paid by the village as a whole.¹⁸⁸ Corvées were almost entirely nonexistent or very limited and in such cases concentrated on special crops (olive groves, vineyards) or occupations (fishing).¹⁸⁹ Since the Frankish overlord was rather a *rentier* than a squire with land in the village, it was simpler in making an economic donation, therefore, to mention the villein and his family rather than describe his property.

Economically and socially a number of villein families enjoyed considerable local prestige. Such were the families of the *raʿīs*, as well as the richer villeins, forming a class similar to the European *villici*. Such, for example, was the villein given in 1154 by Paganus II, lord of Haifa, to the Hospitallers, together "with lands and houses in Haifa and Capharnaum" (Shiqmōna to the south of Haifa),¹⁹⁰ obviously a man of some standing, as was the *divis villanus* in Nablus.¹⁹¹ Sometimes villeins came into more property or income by performing special duties. In such cases they held service tenures, such as an eastern Christian 'Abd-al-Massīḥ (Abdelmessie), the *raʿīs* of Margat, who possessed three fourths of a village,¹⁹² or Guido Raicius, who seems to have held a large tract of land near Nablus.¹⁹³ In Antioch the care of the mill of the Holy Sepulcher belonged to three Syrians, Nicephor, Michael, and Nicholas; their office was hereditary and is described as

188. E.g., "Quicquid reddunt, acumulatur; et postea dividitur ita, quod terciam integram habemus." The same argument applied to fines. See the Venetian inventory of their possessions in Tyre, in Tafel and Thomas, *op. cit.*, II, 373.

189. Rozière, *Cartulaire*, p. 149 (no. 74): "angaria et auxilium piscatorum" in the Sea of Galilee.

190. Delaville Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, I, 172 (no. 225).

191. *Ibid.*

192. *Ibid.*, I, 314 (no. 457): 1174.

193. Henri F. Delaborde, *Chartes de Terre Sainte provenant de l'abbaye de Notre Dame de Josaphat* (Paris, 1880), p. 91 (no. 43): 1185.

feodum villanie and *villania*.¹⁹⁴ Others received real fiefs, like the Arab knight or warrior (*Arabicus miles*) who possessed two villages,¹⁹⁵ or the Turcopole who held land near Nablus.¹⁹⁶ The Barda Harmenus who in 1154 gave a whole village near Acre to the order of St. John¹⁹⁷ may also have been a military warrior. Still, such cases were exceptional, and one cannot draw the conclusion that Moslems served the Franks in a military capacity.

In addition to the villeins, the legal treatises also mention "serfs." Their appearance is so rare that we feel we are dealing not really with serfs but with slaves. It was a crusader rule that no Latin Christian could become a slave. The only slaves were Moslems, eastern Christians, or Jews, usually captured in conquered cities or bought in the market.¹⁹⁸ If a slave ran away, the *ban* was called throughout the city. The hiding of a fugitive slave was a criminal offense punishable by hanging.¹⁹⁹ The ransoming of captured Jews from the Franks is as well attested as the ransoming of eastern Christians and Franks from the Moslems.²⁰⁰

When dealing with villeins and slaves, one must also deal with enfranchisement. The jurists have almost nothing to say about it; only the mid-thirteenth-century compilation known as *Livre des Assises des Bourgeois* furnishes some details. Unfortunately it is not the most reliable source, since the chapters dealing with enfranchisement can be traced back to the Provençal *Lo Codi*, and indirectly to Roman law.²⁰¹ Still, some of the customs were certainly part of crusader law. Freeing a slave could be done in one of three ways: before three witnesses, by charter, or by testament.²⁰² By leaving property at death to a slave the latter is automatically enfranchised and becomes *libertin*.²⁰³ But there was still another way of being liberated, namely con-

194. Rozière, *Cartulaire*, p. 179 (no. 90): 1140.

195. *Ibid.*, pp. 110 (no. 56), 120, (no. 60), 128 (no. 63): 1155-1158.

196. Delaborde, *Chartes . . . de Notre Dame de Josaphat*, pp. 80-83 (nos. 33-35): 1159-1161.

197. Delaville Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, I, 173 (no. 225).

198. In Acre the selling of a slave was taxed one bezant; Tafel and Thomas, II, 398.

199. *Livre des Assises . . . des Bourgeois*, cap. 210 (*RHC, Lois*, II, 142).

200. The ransoming of Jews from the Franks by Jewish communities in Apulia and the different communities of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt is well known from the Genizah documents; cf. Kedar, "Notes on the History of the Jews in Palestine in the Middle Ages," *Tarbiz*, XLII (1973), 405 ff. For the ransoming of eastern Christians, for example after the capture of Edessa by the Moslems, see Matthew of Edessa, in *RHC, Arm.*, I, 329 ff. Ransoming of noble Franks by their vassals was a feudal obligation. The aim of a special congregation, that of the Holy Trinity, was the ransoming of Christian prisoners from Moslem captivity.

201. Prawer, "Étude préliminaire sur les sources et la composition du 'Livre des Assises des Bourgeois,'" *RHDFE*, ser. 4, XXXII (1954), 358-382.

202. *Livre des Assises . . . des Bourgeois*, cap. 207 (*RHC, Lois*, II, 140).

203. *Ibid.*, cap. 206 (pp. 139-140); cf. cap. 16 (p. 29).

version: "Because the Christian law and the people are called 'the land of Franks' they [the baptized] should be entirely free."²⁰⁴ Thus a fugitive Moslem slave who returns and accepts conversion is freed from the power of his former lord. Strangely enough, if the fugitive slave was a Christian he was not free on his return because he acted through *male fei*. His former lord can even sell him, but only to a Christian.²⁰⁵

The relations of the *libertin* to his benefactor are strictly prescribed and follow the rules of Roman law.²⁰⁶ He cannot plead against his former lord or he will be fined or even run the danger of mutilation. If the enfranchised slave dies without testament, his property goes to his benefactor or the benefactor's children.²⁰⁷ If he offends his former lord, he can be returned to slavery, although he cannot be sold, and his children are to be free. While the *Assises des Bourgeois* use the terms *serf*, *serve*, and *servage*,²⁰⁸ they undoubtedly meant slave and slavery, modified in translating from *Lo Codi*, since the Roman *servus* meant slave.

Conversion and enfranchisement of a villein are incidentally dealt with in one of the typical hairsplitting chapters of Philip of Novara (fl. 1243). Among those excluded from sitting in a seigneurial court because of religion or former offenses he includes the villein whom the lord has married off to a free woman, and *ipso facto* enfranchised. The defendant could claim that the enfranchised serf should not sit in court, by addressing the lord: "He is your man, you keep faith to him, but you cannot make him our peer."²⁰⁹

The problem of conversion was a difficult one. Whatever the ideology of the First Crusade, the crusaders in the east never became a missionary establishment, if "missionary" is taken in the sense of seeking the conversion of individuals. They were for the most part indifferent to the problem, or in some cases actually opposed to conversion. Nothing is more revealing than the complaint of the bishop of Acre, James of Vitry. Leaving aside his claims about his effectiveness as a preacher before eastern Christians and Moslems, we have his explicit statement that Franks, and even the order of St. John, were opposed to preaching and conversion.²¹⁰ Frankish opposition to conversion must have been strong if even the papacy had to intervene—

204. *Ibid.*, cap. 255 (p. 191).

205. *Ibid.*

206. *Ibid.*, cap. 16 (p. 29).

207. *Ibid.*, cap. 204 (p. 138).

208. *Ibid.*, cap. 205 (p. 139).

209. Philip of Novara, cap. 28, (*ibid.*, I, 502).

210. *Lettres de Jacques de Vitry*, ed. Huygens (Leyden, 1960), p. 88 (II, 206-210): "Christiani servis suis Sarracenis baptismum negabant, licet ipsi Sarraceni instanter et cum lacrimis

though rather mildly, which suggests that the curia was aware of the attitudes of the crusaders. Thus Gregory IX, in a letter to patriarch Gerald of Jerusalem (1237) mentions the fact that Moslem slaves (*sclavi*) are refused baptism because it would lead to their enfranchisement. The pope orders that they should be baptized if they promise "to remain in the state of their former serfdom."²¹¹ Some efforts were made in this direction, and the Latin clergy was ordered by Urban IV in 1264 to seek converts among the poorest Jews and Moslems by offering them food, shelter, and baptism.²¹²

Thus for the great majority of the population their status as second-rate citizens, the former *dhimmis*, was compounded by their status as villeins.

Moving from the countryside to the city, the picture changes. Once the period of conquest was over, the native population, not only eastern Christians, but also Moslems and Jews who had left the cities before the siege or escaped the massacres which accompanied the conquest, returned and settled in them again. The only exception, as already mentioned, was Jerusalem. The non-Frankish inhabitants of the cities were not regarded as villeins. They were not bound to city soil; not only were their movables their own, but it seems that they were also proprietors of land and houses. They paid rent and probably a recognition tax, *cens*, and were bound to some specific payments obligatory on non-Latins only. Such was the *capitatio*, doubtless a descendant of the Moslem *jizyah*, paid by every male over fifteen. It was paid to the *seigneur justicier*, not to the landowner. So, for example, the Venetians in Tyre collected a poll-tax from Jews and Syrians,²¹³ a privilege every *seigneur justicier* enjoyed over the villeins on his estate.

It was in connection with taxation that the non-Latins were discriminated against. In Acre, after the Third Crusade, the non-Latins, at least those under royal jurisdiction, were barred from living in the older part of the city and relegated to the new, not yet fortified, suburb of Montmusart. Moreover it is very likely that they were compelled to use a special market, which belonged to the king, not to

postularent. Dicebant enim domini eorum . . . 'si isti Christiani fuerint, non ita pro voluntate nostra eos angariare poterimus.' Cf. Prawer, *Latin Kingdom*, pp. 507 ff.

211. A baptized Moslem is immediately freed, according to the *Livre des Assises* . . . *des Bourgeois*, caps. 204-212 (*RHC, Lois*, II, 138-144). The quotation is from *Acta Honorii III*, ed. Täutu, no. 228, pp. 307-308.

212. See the letter of Urban IV to patriarch William of Jerusalem (1264), in Kedar, "Notes on the History of the Jews," *Tarbiz*, XLII, 416: "Sarraceni pauperes et Judei, converti ad unitatem ecclesiae cupientes, ad civitatem Acconensem accedunt et postulant baptizari."

213. Tafel and Thomas, *op. cit.*, II, 359.

the communes.²¹⁴ Though we do not know of any special taxation in Jerusalem, the fact that the non-Latins lived in a special quarter and had their own counters in the bazaars of Jerusalem would have facilitated such taxation.²¹⁵

Members of minority groups who lived in a city were personally free and could move from place to place, acquire possessions (basically burgage tenures), or rent property. Yet a number of documents point to the existence of another class among them, at least in the northern principalities, though we do not find them in the Latin kingdom proper. There were individuals who, while they lived in cities, might be granted away by the lord of the place. So a Syrian Ben Mosor was given by Bohemond III to the Hospitallers (1175) in Jubail together with "his children and all their rights and possessions" (*cum omni eorum jure et rebus*). In Latakia a Jew, called by the Franks Garinus, was also given away.²¹⁶ Again in Latakia in 1183 Bohemond III gave the order of St. John a number of Greeks (6), Armenians (5), and Jews (7). The document concludes: "And those men mentioned above, Latins as well as Greeks, Armenians, and Jews, the house of the Hospitallers may have, hold and possess in perpetuity, in peace and without appeal, free and quit of all *tallea*. And these are all that belong to the Hospital in Latakia; they shall not have others unless I myself have donated them."²¹⁷ There were only a few donations of this type, all in the northern principalities.²¹⁸

It is not easy to interpret these texts. Obviously those so donated were henceforth bound to make payments to their new lord. Possibly they were former serfs who had lived in the countryside and retained their former status after moving into the city. In a donation of Bohemond III to the Hospital in 1194 one such man, George the notary, son of Vassilius, son of Uardus, is described as *homo peculiaris*. His

214. Praver, "L'Établissement des coutumes du marché à Saint-Jean d'Acre," *RHDFE*, ser. 4, XXIX (1951), 329-351, unconvincingly opposed by Cahen, "À propos des coutumes du marché d'Acre," *ibid.*, XLI (1963), 287-290, who agrees on the space limitations but argues against the term "ghetto." The difference of taxation in different markets was proposed by Richard, "Colonies marchandes privilégiées et marché seigneurial," *Le Moyen-Âge*, LIX (1953), 325-340. Cf. Praver, *Latin Kingdom*, pp. 412 ff. A decision of the *maggior consiglio* of Venice of 1271, ordering all its Jewish subjects in Acre to live inside the Venetian quarter, has hitherto escaped the attention of historians; see *Deliberazioni del maggior consiglio di Venezia*, ed. Roberto Cessi, II (Bologna, 1931), septima rubrica, I, 15-16. It is thus possible that after the recapture of Acre by the crusaders in 1191 the communes kept "their" *dhimmis* and that the legislation ordering their seclusion in Montmusart referred to the royal *dhimmis* only.

215. Praver, *Latin Kingdom*, p. 410.

216. Delaville Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, I, 324 (no. 472).

217. *Ibid.*, I, 436-437 (no. 648).

218. A similar case for Tibnīn (1183) may possibly be regarded as not dealing with a city; Strehlke, *Tabulae*, p. 10.

property (*hereditas*) at the time of alienation was to remain with Bohemond III, but new acquisitions after this date would belong to the Hospital.²¹⁹ The adjective *peculiaris* points to the *peculium*, the property of a serf. Thus George the notary, despite his social standing, inherited the legal position of his ancestors even though living in the city.²²⁰ Whatever the case, we have very few examples of this kind suggesting serfdom in the cities; we are inclined to regard them as the outcome of particular circumstances.

A few words should be said about the legal status of the beduins. Several documents which enumerate beduins inside the borders of the kingdom point to the fact that the crusaders found a legal formula for dealing with them.²²¹ By definition neither city inhabitants nor serfs, they had a special legal status, being considered the king's property. This meant that they paid for their pasture rights, probably in horses, camels, or sheep, and were under royal jurisdiction rather than that of a particular lordship. This rule was well adapted to their mode of existence as nomads; the crown, theoretically at least, was the only force which could assure them protection in all parts of the kingdom. It needed a special royal grant to alienate a tribe or its branch to a lordship.²²² Still, we find beduin tribes in the possession of the Templars,²²³ and in a special grant king Baldwin IV permitted the order of St. John to allocate areas in Galilee to a hundred beduin tents on condition that they came from beyond the frontiers of the kingdom and had never been under the king's or any other lord's domination.²²⁴

219. Delaville Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, I, 613 (no. 966).

220. The presence of Latins in the donation of Bohemond III is puzzling, and we may regard it as a slip of the scribe. As a matter of fact, in the detailed enumeration of names no Latin is mentioned.

221. A detailed description of a beduin tribe and its branches or families is furnished by a deed of Baldwin IV to the Hospitallers in 1178. The tribe was once given by queen Melisend and her son Baldwin to Amalric, viscount of Nablus. They were sold to Baldwin of Ibelin, lord of Ramla, for the sizeable sum of 5,500 bezants. All in all there were 103 tents (families). It seems that the tribe was called Banū-Karkas or Banū-Kargas; Delaville Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, I, 372-373 (no. 550).

222. When Baldwin III invested Philip of Milly, lord of Nablus, in 1161 with Transjordan, he added: "salvis eciam Beduinis meis omnibus, qui de terra Montis Regalis nati non sunt"; Strehlke, *Tabulae*, p. 4 (no. 3).

223. In 1179, in a peace agreement between Templars and Hospitallers, the document mentions a "querela de quadam predacione Biduinorum Templi, facta a turcopolis Gibilini"; Delaville Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, I, 378-379 (no. 558).

224. ". . . dono . . . centum tentorum Beduinorum . . . quos ab alienis partibus convocare poteritis, et qui in regno meo sub meo vel hominum meorum potestate nunquam fuerint"; *ibid.*, I, 395 (no. 582).