

X

MISSIONS TO THE EAST IN THE THIRTEENTH AND FOURTEENTH CENTURIES

A. Missions in the Thirteenth Century

The organized movement to evangelize oriental peoples which had its origins in the early thirteenth century opened a new period in the missionary history of the church. In earlier centuries missionaries had penetrated the northern and eastern areas of Europe. More recently Peter the Venerable had suggested a missionary approach to the Moslems of Spain, and the establishment of the crusader states early in the twelfth century had made possible occasional rapprochements with oriental Christians. But there had been no sustained effort to convert to Christianity Moslems or other non-Christians of the Near or Far East.

This chapter is concerned with western missions to the Orient during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Papal relations with the Byzantine church have been excluded, as have missions to North Africa.

There are a few important collections of sources for mission history. *BOF* is a compilation of selections with biographical comment by the editor. It also contains considerable material relevant to Dominican missions. The standard Latin edition of the sources for the Central Asia and China journeys and missions of the Franciscans is Anastasius van den Wyngaert, O.F.M., *Sinica franciscana*, I, *Itinera et relationes Fratrum Minorum saeculi XIII et XIV* (Quaracchi, 1929). English translations of some of these can also be found in the publications of the Hakluyt Society, especially Henry Yule, *Cathay and the Way Thither*, revised by Henri Cordier (4 vols., London, 1925-1930), and the editions of John of Pian del Carpine and William of Rubruck by Charles R. Beazley and William W. Rockhill (1900-1903). Arthur C. Moule, *Christians in China before 1550* (London, 1930), includes translations of a number of significant selections. See also Manuel Komroff, ed., *Contemporaries of Marco Polo* (New York, 1928), and Christopher Dawson, ed., *The Mongol Mission* (New York, 1955), each containing extensive translations of sources.

Other primary sources for the history of medieval missions are widely scattered throughout the chronicles, letters, treatises, and documents of the mendicant orders, a few of which have been individually edited or translated, the chronicles and other literature of the crusade period, western and oriental, and the registers of papal correspondence. Relevant papal documents can be found in *Bullarium franciscanum*, ed. Johannes H. Sbaralea (Rome, 1759 ff., cited

Effective promotion of oriental missions had to await the appearance of that *vir catholicus et totus apostolicus*, Francis of Assisi, and his contemporary Dominic Guzmán. The impact of these two men and their followers on the civilization of Europe is too well known to require elaboration here, but no discussion of thirteenth-century missions can fail to emphasize two points. First, the type of organization adopted by the Franciscans and Dominicans was admirably suited to the furthering of distant ventures. Second, as the friars injected into the religious life of western Europe a new spirit and vitality, so they gave to a movement as old as Christianity, though languishing in the central Middle Ages, a new élan and direction.

This chapter is not, however, merely an account of missionaries traveling to distant lands, for the history of medieval missions to the Orient must be viewed in relation to a number of contemporary developments. One favorable factor was the remarkable growth of European-Asiatic commerce. In many instances the *fondachi* of the Italian merchants whose spiritual needs the friars served were the bases for missions either in the immediate area or beyond. Paradoxically, the merchants could also be a hindrance to religious propaganda, for there were Italians who engaged in the slave trade and continually flouted papal prohibitions against trade with Moslems.

In certain other respects the period was not propitious for missionary undertakings. European conditions throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were far from stable, and the western church faced a series of crises. The popes who were to give important direc-

as *BF*); *Bullarium ordinis praedicatorum*, ed. Thomas Ripoll (Rome, 1727 ff., cited as *BOP*); August Potthast, ed., *Regesta pontificum Romanorum* (Berlin, 1874-1875), the calendars published by the École française de Rome, on which see Leonard E. Boyle, *A Survey of the Vatican Archives and of Its Medieval Holdings* (Toronto, 1972), pp. 125-127; and *BOF*, cited above.

In addition to Marcellino da Civezza, O.F.M., *Storia universale delle missioni francescane*, vols. I-IV (Rome, 1857-1860), Franciscan mission history has been treated more recently in Leonhard Lemmens, *Geschichte der Franziskanermissionen* (Münster, 1929); Martiniano Roncaglia, O.F.M., *I Francescani in Oriente durante le crociate (secolo XIII)* (*BOF*, ser. 4: *Studi*, vol. I, *Storia della provincia di Terra Santa*, 1; Cairo, 1954); François de Sessevalle, *Histoire générale de l'ordre de Saint François*, part 1, *Le Moyen-âge, 1209-1517*, vol. II, *Les Missions franciscaines à l'étranger* (Le Puy-en-Velay, 1937); Noè Simonut, *Il Metodo d'evangelizzazione dei Francescani tra Musulmani e Mongoli nei secoli XIII e XIV* (Milan, 1947); Odolphus van der Vat, *Die Anfänge der Franziskanermissionen und ihre Weiterentwicklung im Nahen Orient und in der mohammedanischen Ländern während des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Missionswissenschaftliche Studien, n.s., VI; Werl, 1934).

The most important works on Dominican missions are Berthold Altaner, *Die Dominikanermissionen des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Breslauer Studien zur historischen Theologie, III; Habelschwerdt, 1924); Raymond J. Loenertz, O.P., "Les Missions dominicaines en Orient au quatorzième siècle et la Société des Frères pèlerins . . .," *AFP*, II (1932), 1-83; III (1933), 1-55; IV (1934), 1-47; and *La Société des Frères pèlerins* (Institutum historicum Fratrum Praedicatorum, Dissertationes historicae, fasc. VII; Rome, 1937).

tion to the missions were deeply involved in European political struggles. Heresy too was a major preoccupation.

Asiatic developments were equally disturbing. As previous chapters have indicated, the Moslems of Egypt, Syria, and Persia were divided politically in the mid-thirteenth century and hence not disposed to wage a *jihād* against the crusader states. Yet Islam as a faith retained considerable vitality. Moreover, the temporary Christian occupation of Jerusalem (1229–1244), made possible by Frederick II's treaty with al-Kāmil, was followed later in the century by the northward advance of the Mamluks and the eventual loss of the missionary bases in the crusader states.

After their first terrifying incursions into eastern Europe in the first half of the thirteenth century and their subsequent withdrawal and concentration in the Near and Far East, the Mongols occasionally permitted visits and even residence by the friars. This was especially true of those Mongols who had pushed southward and overrun the Baghdad caliphate in 1258. The il-khanate of Persia which they established was halted in its westward advance and continually thereafter threatened by the Mamluks of Egypt. More often than not the apparently receptive attitude of the Mongols was politically motivated, though this was rarely understood. It is not surprising that the west remained bewildered by Mongol diplomacy.¹

The conversion to Catholicism of oriental Christians, both Orthodox and heretical, was one of the major objectives of the missionary friars. These peoples constituted a considerable proportion of the pop-

Diplomatic and missionary journeys to the Mongol areas are treated in Paul Pelliot, "Les Mongoles et la papauté," *ROC*, XXIII (1923), 3–30, XXIV (1924), 225–335; XXVIII (1931–1932), 3–84; Jean Richard, "Les Missions chez les Mongoles aux XIIIe et XIVe siècles," *Histoire universelle des missions catholiques*, I, *Les Missions des origines au XVIe siècle* (Paris, 1956); Giovanni Soranzo, *Il Papato, l'Europa cristiana e i Tartari* (Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, ser. 5, vol. XII; Milan, 1930); Christian W. Troll, S.J., "Die China-mission im Mittelalter," *Franziskanische Studien*, XLVIII (1966), 109–150; XLIX (1967), 22–79.

Bishoprics in Mongol lands are discussed in Conrad Eubel, "Die während des 14. Jahrhunderts im Missionsgebiet der Dominikaner und Franziskaner errichteten Bisthümer," in Stephan Ehses, ed., *Festschrift zum elfhundertjährigen Jubiläum des deutschen Campo Santo in Rom* (Freiburg, 1897), pp. 170–195.

The following general works may also be cited: Aziz S. Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity* (London and Notre Dame, 1968); Beazley, *The Dawn of Modern Geography* (3 vols., London, 1897–1906); Louis Bréhier, *L'Église et l'Orient au moyen-âge* (Paris, 1919); Richard Hennig, *Terrae incognitae*, vol. III (Leyden, 1938); Kenneth S. Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, vol. II (New York, 1938); Horace K. Mann, *The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages*, vols. XII–XVII (London, 1925–1932); and Guillaume Mollat, *Les Papes d'Avignon*, 10th ed. (Paris, 1965); 9th ed., tr. Janet Love (New York, 1963).

1. On the Mongols and the crusades see also Claude Cahen, "The Mongols and the Near East," in volume II of the present work, chapter XXI, and Denis Sinor, "The Mongols and Western Europe," *ibid.*, volume III, chapter XV.

ulation of the coastal cities of the Levant, the kingdoms of Georgia and Cilician Armenia, the turbulent areas of greater Armenia, and the vast reaches of the Mongol domains.² The Georgians were traditionally Orthodox, as were the Greeks of Antioch and northern Syria and the Melkites farther south. But the Armenians were predominantly Monophysite, as were most of the Christians of Syria, Egypt, and Ethiopia. Nestorians were few in numbers, but often influential in Persia and regions farther east.

Among certain sectors of oriental Christianity there appeared at this period a disposition to some sort of union with the west. The motives, however, were rarely purely religious. Oriental Christians commonly enjoyed reasonable freedom under Moslem rule, and cultural and linguistic ties prompted rapport with their Moslem masters rather than rapprochement with the west. Before the major Mongol incursions into the Near East shortly after the middle of the century, such pro-western leanings as can be discerned seem to have resulted, in part at least, from rivalries among the oriental Christians themselves. Accustomed to seeking support from Moslem rulers, they tended to shift their policies with the diplomatic vicissitudes of the Moslem states. After the middle of the century, as the Mongol menace increased, those earliest endangered often displayed pro-western sympathies, though this was far from being a consistent attitude. Accordingly, although oriental Christians were often in a position to act as intermediaries between the western church and the worlds of Islam and Tartary, they too were caught in the confusion of local politics.

Inevitably, therefore, missions tended to become involved with diplomacy, and official Europe continued to think, however vainly, in terms of the crusade or of the conversion of important rulers and dignitaries. Most missionaries, particularly at the outset, shared the hopes, fears, and illusions of their time. But they were to learn much and to add significantly to western Europe's knowledge of Asian peoples; this is by no means the least important of their achievements.

EARLY MISSIONARY ORGANIZATION

Francis of Assisi was the first to state clearly the ideal of missions to Moslems, and it is a striking coincidence that this occurred precisely at the time of the ill-fated Fifth Crusade. As early as 1217 it had been decided at the first general chapter of the order, held at

2. On oriental Christianity during this period see Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity*.

Assisi, that Elias of Cortona should be sent to Syria, where in 1218 he laid the foundations for a Franciscan overseas province ("Ultra-mare"). After earlier failures to reach the Holy Land and Spain Francis himself journeyed to the Orient in 1219 accompanied by Peter de' Cattani, and was accorded an interview with the Egyptian sultan al-Kāmil. Under a safe conduct granted by the sultan he later visited Syria, and presumably the holy places in Palestine, and returned to Italy with Elias.³

In 1221 the so-called "First" Franciscan rule specifically included as an objective the conversion of "Saracens and other unbelievers." To enter upon this task the prospective missionary had to seek the permission of the provincial minister, who was strictly enjoined to grant this only to those he deemed suitable. A much shorter version of the mission chapter, shorn of the scriptural citations which had characterized the first, was included in the official *Regula secunda* of 1223.

During the course of the thirteenth century Franciscan ministers-general, Bonaventura and others, elaborated on the nature of the mission undertaking and the qualities a missionary should possess. Such statements, though by no means uniform in emphasis, form a sort of commentary on the mission chapters in the rule. The missionary's life is viewed, especially in the earlier writings, as one of sacrifice as a witness for Christ by word and example, with martyrdom, the crowning achievement and supreme evidence of religious devotion, always a possibility. In short, the early Franciscan missionary effort was highly idealistic. There was as yet no systematic preparation and no adequate knowledge of the areas to be evangelized.⁴

To some extent such inadequacies were remedied by the establishment of permanent convents in the east. Doubtless profiting from such favorable political factors as the temporary truce (1229-1244) which permitted Latin occupation of Jerusalem, the overseas province of the Franciscans prospered, with convents at Acre, Antioch, and Tripoli. It is possible that a cloister was founded early at Jerusalem. In the course of time, probably before 1263, the province of "Terra Sancta" came to be separate from another early establishment, the province of Greece ("Romania"). With the founding of these convents the first phase of Franciscan missions with its naive fervor came to an end. Convents served the needs of resident Latin Christians,

3. For a discussion of Francis's mission purposes and his journey to Egypt see Roncaglia, *I Francescani in Oriente*, pp. 13-17, 21-26; van der Vat, *Die Anfänge*, pp. 1-25, 39-59, 244-255; and volume II of the present work, pp. 378 (bibliographical note), 415-416.

4. On Franciscan missionary policies and ideals see Simonut, *Il Metodo*, pp. 15-38.

but they also made possible a more systematic approach to missions. Very possibly, too, the influence of contemporary Dominican establishments was an important factor, especially in the greater emphasis on training preachers.

Dominicans had from their foundation been dedicated to preaching, and Dominic, despite his preoccupation with Albigensian heretics in Languedoc, had given much thought to the possibility of missions to the east. Successive Dominican masters-general, notably Jordan of Saxony, Raymond of Peñafort, and Humbert of Romans, were also concerned about promoting missions, and their efforts were seconded by general and provincial chapters. These efforts, however, seem to have been largely designed to serve the areas of Spain and North Africa; preparation directed specifically toward the east is less easily traced. But like the Minorites, the Friars-Preachers established convents in the east. A Dominican province of the Holy Land was independent some time after 1228 and included cloisters at Acre and Tripoli.⁵ There was a Dominican community in Jerusalem during the period of truce with the Moslems of Egypt.

During the early decades of the thirteenth century there was also noticeable a more formal direction of missionary activity by Rome. Papal interest is most clearly manifest in the many letters sent to the authorities of the two orders and to prospective missionaries. Such letters are general in nature, but they echo the policies stated in the Franciscan rule that only suitable candidates be accepted and that permission be given by the provincial ministers. As time went on there is more emphasis on adequate religious training. Further, the popes also sent messages to oriental rulers requesting protection for the friars or urging that the recipient embrace the Christian faith.

The first papal letters to missionaries were little more than lists of instructions. Gradually such documents were expanded into detailed directives in which all peoples the missionaries might be expected to encounter and all faculties necessary in any possible missionary situation were specifically enumerated. Toward the middle of the thirteenth century a formula was evolved which combined the faculties for work among Moslems, other non-Christians, and oriental Christians. This new formula first appeared in Gregory IX's bull *Cum hora undecima*, on February 15, 1235, as instructions to the Dominican William of Montferrat. It appeared again in the bulls issued by Innocent IV in 1245 to the first envoys to the Mongols. By about

5. The establishments of the mendicant foundations in Syria are discussed in van der Vat, *Die Anfänge*, pp. 60-87; Roncaglia, *I Francescani in Oriente*, pp. 29 ff.; Altaner, *Die Dominikanermissionen*, pp. 1-9, chap. III.

1253 it had become a stereotyped formula of mission instructions. Though not the only form of mission letter used, the *Cum hora undecima* was often repeated in subsequent decades.⁶

The bull first enumerates the peoples whom the friars were expected to visit. Since the curia was not yet well informed regarding orientals, these are lumped together in a list which is comprehensive religiously, ethnically, and geographically, but is otherwise rather indiscriminate and fails to distinguish clearly between the diverse eastern religious groups. The ecclesiastical directives are much clearer. The friars were permitted to baptize converts, confer minor orders, absolve from excommunication, and reinstall separated clergy who desired to return to the Catholic church. They were also permitted to dispense the latter from certain irregularities (defect of birth, age, jurisdiction, and so forth) in the reception of orders, *salva disciplina ordinis*. Even those who contracted matrimony after the reception of orders were not to be disturbed. All who returned to the unity of the Catholic faith were to be permitted to live among their own people and enjoy clerical privileges provided they publicly proclaimed their obedience to the Apostolic See. The friars were also permitted to judge matrimonial cases and rectify situations with ecclesiastical censure if necessary. There were also various instructions regarding the proper celebration of all offices and sacraments, the reception of Holy Orders and similar matters. Portable altars were allowed, and priests among the friars might bless them in cases where Catholic bishops were unavailable. Finally, the friars were to do whatever seemed necessary to the successful furtherance of their mission.

The phraseology of the bull indicates that considerable care was taken in formulating the faculties necessary for reconciling separated Christians. This complicated problem was being squarely faced by the western church for the first time. Until then oriental Christians had, with one or two exceptions, been in direct contact with Byzantium, not Rome. Therefore, though the curia was not well informed about Asiatic peoples, it was evidently attempting in systematic fashion to foresee all contingencies of order, jurisdiction, and ecclesiastical discipline which the missionary friars might face. Moreover, as the contents of *Cum hora undecima* indicate and as further examina-

6. Examples of these early mission bulls are cited and discussed fully in van der Vat, *Die Anfänge*, pp. 137-146, 186-189. See also Altaner, *Die Dominikanermmissionen*, pp. 44-49, 73-74; Troll, "Die Chinamission," pp. 22-24. The bull of February 15, 1235, can be found in *BOP*, I, 73. For the bulls of 1245 see below, notes 27-29. An example of a typical later bull (1253) is in *BOP*, I, 237. For a discussion of papal mission policies see Simonut, *Il Metodo*, pp. 39-67.

tion of papal policy will reveal, Rome in the mid-thirteenth century was gradually acquiring some flexibility in its attitude toward oriental liturgies and usages. Nevertheless, although the lawyer-popes of that age were willing to tolerate differences in language and rite, they required strict adherence to precise formulas in the administration of sacraments and full acceptance of Roman primacy. Moreover, occasional letters urging adherence to Roman usages indicate that the curial attitude was not without hesitations and inconsistencies. Missionaries and missionary theorists were less hesitant.

Since the baptizing of non-Christians raised few questions of jurisdiction or order, the apostolate among Moslems is less emphasized in these papal letters. And although we must beware of judging policies merely by the number of words allotted in papal bulls to each subject, one complicated, the other comparatively simple, it does appear that the interest of the Holy See in the separated Christians predominated over its solicitude for the Moslem missions. The reasons for this will appear when we examine the missions themselves.

THIRTEENTH-CENTURY MISSIONS TO MOSLEMS

The story of missions to Moslems in the thirteenth century includes examples of dedication and heroism, but is otherwise one of frustration and disappointment. In the first place, the information available to westerners about Islam was insufficient and often inaccurate, and much of it came from Spain.⁷ Various mistaken notions persisted into the thirteenth century. It was generally held, for example, that Islam was a heresy, and it was also believed to be on the point of collapse. Toward the end of the century such optimistic views and at least some of the ignorance had been dispelled. But though the attitude of the adherents of each faith to the followers of the other did not preclude many demonstrations of mutual respect, no real understanding of the opposing religious beliefs was reached by either side.

The missionary experiences of the first friars, in North Africa as well as in the east, reveal the inadequacies of their preparation and the extreme difficulties they faced. Presumably they spoke through interpreters, since few if any knew the native tongues at that period. Audiences were apparently not unsympathetic at first and the reli-

7. For western views of Islam see Norman A. Daniel, *Islam and the West* (Edinburgh, 1960); Richard W. Southern, *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, Mass., 1962); Ugo Monneret de Villard, *Lo Studio dell' Islam in Europa nel XII e nel XIII secolo* (Studi e testi, CX; Vatican City, 1944). Cf. also Simonut, *Il Metodo*, pp. 77-87.

gious dedication evident in the friars' lives made a deep impression. But the friars seem all too often to have spoiled the favorable atmosphere by proceeding immediately to a denunciation of the Islamic religion. Thus they soon discovered that an initial obstacle confronting every Christian missionary to Moslem lands was the legal prohibition of any anti-Moslem propaganda. This was widely supported by public opinion, and any disparagement of Mohammed would invariably place the speaker in danger. Moreover, apostasy from Islam was legally punishable by death. In short, conditions which made Christian instruction feasible could rarely be found except in areas such as the crusaders' states where Moslems lived under Christian rule.

It is not, therefore, surprising that while few missionaries or missionary theorists would have defended the propriety of forcing individuals to accept the Christian faith, almost without exception all agreed that the conquest of a territory was justifiable as a means of promoting missions or, at least, of preventing "infidels" from injuring the faith of Christians. In short, toward the end of the thirteenth century the earlier optimism was turned by actual missionary experience, as well as by Islam's advances in the whole Near East, into a general attitude of pessimism. To most men the crusade still seemed a more effective way of dealing with the Moslem problem than missions. Neither point of view was conducive to that sympathetic understanding requisite to true missionary undertaking.

Records of actual missionary efforts on the part of Franciscan or Dominican friars during the first half of the thirteenth century are extremely scanty. James of Vitry, bishop of Acre, describes how Moslems cordially received the Franciscans, even giving them provisions, and willingly listened to them until they began to denounce Mohammed. At that point, he adds, they were set upon and driven out of town, and doubtless would have been killed but for the "miraculous protection of God." Where these incidents took place the bishop does not say; perhaps in the crusaders' territory and possibly even before Francis's own visit to the Levant.⁸

Somewhat later, papal letters add some, though still very limited, information. Moreover, it must be remembered that papal policy had manifold objectives. In fact, certain missionary undertakings were launched by the Holy See in connection with letters to oriental rulers which not only bespoke conversion to Christianity and a favorable reception for the friars who were being sent, but also attempted to

8. Van der Vat, *Die Anfänge*, pp. 56-57; Roncaglia, *I Francescani in Oriente*, p. 84; Simonut, *Il Metodo*, pp. 87-103.

promote political relations. Such, for example, appears to have been the purpose of Gregory IX's letters of 1233. At a time when the oriental world, Moslem and Christian alike, was facing new dangers resulting from the depredations of the Khwarizmian Turks and especially from the early southward drives of the Mongols, the pope addressed the rulers of Damascus, Aleppo, and Konya and the caliph at Baghdad. In the same months the pope also directed several bulls to Franciscan friars traveling or resident in the Orient, conceding faculties not only for the care of the souls of Latin Christians, but also for baptizing non-Christians and for reconciling separated Christians. Existing good relations with Moslem rulers evidently permitted the friars to enter and live in Moslem territory. Accordingly, although precise information is lacking, the possibility of missionary activity cannot be ruled out.⁹

Papal bulls similar to those directed to Franciscans seem to indicate that Dominican friars were also working among Moslems at this time. Somewhat more specific, but still indefinite as to place, is a statement in the report of the Dominican provincial of the Holy Land, friar Philip, in 1237 that several of his brethren had studied Arabic and were preaching in that tongue. These friars could, of course, have been preaching to Arabic-speaking Christians. Indeed, the context so implies. But again there is at least the possibility of an apostolate among Moslems. Moreover, in a bull of March 4, 1238, Gregory IX insisted that the conversion of the infidel was no less acceptable to God than opposing him with arms—a striking illustration of the contemporary attitude—and granted both Dominican and Franciscan friars the customary crusaders' indulgence. Subsequent papal bulls which conceded faculties for the reception of Moslems (1238, 1239, 1244) also indicate at least the possibility of missionary activity.¹⁰

In 1245, the year following the Khwarizmian sack of Jerusalem which ended the peace of 1229, and in the same months in which he was inaugurating the Mongol missions, Innocent IV also dispatched letters to various Moslem rulers in Syria and Egypt. Although in this case the original papal letters are not extant, some indication of the pope's purposes can be ascertained from the replies dated 1245-1246, which found their way into the papal registers. Communications were received from aṣ-Ṣāliḥ Ismā'īl, formerly of Damascus, then ruling Baalbek and the Hauran, from al-Manṣūr Ibrāhīm of Homs, who answered in the name of the sultan of Egypt as well as for himself,

9. *MGH, Epistolae saeculi XIII*, I, 410-413; *BF*, I, 93; *BOF*, I, 163; II, 295 ff.

10. *Ibid.*, I, 180; II, 301-305, 370-371; van der Vat, *Die Anfänge*, pp. 127-146, 190-191; Altaner, *Die Dominikanermissionen*, pp. 73-74. On friar Philip's report see below, note 20.

from as-Şāliḥ Aiyūb, the sultan of Egypt, and from an-Nāṣir Dā'ūd, the prince of Kerak, or possibly an Egyptian military commander in southern Palestine.¹¹

These replies reveal little regarding missionary activity. The Moslem rulers were courteous and disposed to grant safe conduct to friars, presumably for the religious needs of resident Latin Christians. As before, therefore, although the possibility of missions cannot be ruled out, there is no positive evidence thereof. Moreover, one letter which complained that the friars' ignorance of Arabic precluded fruitful conversations indicates that, despite friar Philip's report of progress in language study, much remained to be done in the way of missionary preparation.

Among the missionaries to Moslems in the late thirteenth century two stand out, William of Tripoli and Ricoldo of Monte Croce, both Dominicans. William of Tripoli was born in the east of Christian parents. He had acquired some familiarity with Arabic and an unusually extensive knowledge of the Moslem religion. According to his own account he baptized more than a thousand Saracens. It seems likely that he carried on his work within the crusader states, for only there could he have been able to preach without hindrance. Doubtless many of his converts were captives or slaves. He was, however, at one time an emissary to al-Manṣūr Muḥammad, the ruler of Hamah, and in 1271 he accompanied the Polo brothers as far as Cilicia.

In the same year he dedicated a treatise which he later reëdited (1273), the *De statu Saracenorum et de Mahomete pseudopropheta*

11. There are six documents in all: a letter from the former ruler of Damascus, dated at Baalbek (November 20, 1245), a letter from the ruler of Homs (December 30, 1245), two safe-conducts given at Homs (December 1245), a letter from the prince of Kerak (August 6-15, 1246), and one of the same date from Egypt (or from a military commander in Palestine). Perhaps because they all had to be translated (by a cardinal, according to Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, ed. Henry R. Luard [Rolls Series, 57], IV, 566 ff.), they were all filed together with five letters from oriental prelates under the third and fourth years of Innocent IV's pontificate (June 1245-June 1247, *BOF*, II, 327 ff.). There has been considerable discussion of these letters; the following are now the most important studies: Altaner, *Die Dominikanermissionen*, pp. 74-81; Pelliot, "Les Mongoles et la papauté," *ROC*, XXIV (1924), 225 ff., XXVIII (1931-1932), 6 ff.; Eugène Tisserant, "La Légation en Orient du Franciscain, Dominique d'Aragon (1245-47)," *ROC*, XXIV (1924), 336-355, and correspondence with Pelliot, *ibid.*, XXVIII (1931-1932), 8; van der Vat, *Die Anfänge*, pp. 155-157, 190-194. See also Reinhold Röhrich, "Zur Korrespondenz der Päpste mit den Sultanen und Mongolkanen des Morgenlandes im Zeitalter der Kreuzzüge," *Theologischen Studien und Kritiken*, LXIX (1891), 357-369.

In view of their previous activities there is a strong presumption in favor of the Minorites as the papal envoys. But the phrase "Fratres Praedicatorum" in two of the letters indicates that Dominicans were also sent. It is probable that one of the latter, perhaps the principal one, was Andrew of Longjumeau.

On the Moslem states during this period see H. A. R. Gibb, "The Aiyūbids," in volume II of the present work, pp. 709-710.

et eorum lege et fide, to the papal legate in the east, Tebaldo Visconti, the future Gregory X. This work, which he tells us he based on Arabic texts, contains an account of the career of Mohammed and the expansion of Islam and an analysis of the Islamic religion. In its general tone it differs markedly from most Christian writing on Islam of the period. Probably because his contacts with Moslems were within the protected areas of the Latin east he remained optimistic. He did not compose a crusade tract; rather his purpose was to understand and explain. For William seems to have felt that many Moslems were not far from Christian fundamentals and that more converts might be made once they understood that "the whole and perfect faith is contained in the teaching of Christ. . . . And so through the pure word of God, without philosophical arguments, without the arms of soldiers, as simple sheep they seek the baptism of Christ and cross over into the sheepfold of God."¹²

Some years later Ricoldo of Monte Croce, already an accomplished missionary with some knowledge of Greek, Hebrew, and Syriac, commenced what proved to be a remarkable journey into the Asiatic hinterland.¹³ As will be clear later, his most successful work was with oriental Christians. He also, however, made some significant contacts with Moslems. He left Acre, probably in March 1289, and traveled through Cilician Armenia and Konya. Not far from Sivas (Sebastia), where Genoese had established themselves and both Dominicans and Franciscans maintained missions, he entered country under Mongol rule. At Tabriz, then the capital of the Persian il-khanate and an important Jacobite center, he spent six months preaching through an interpreter since he had not yet mastered Arabic. Venetians and Genoese had established themselves there, and Franciscans and Dominicans were using a church in common. From Tabriz Ricoldo journeyed

12. On William of Tripoli, in addition to Southern, *Western Views of Islam*, pp. 62-63, and Daniel, *Islam and the West*, *passim*, see Altaner, *Dominikanermissionen*, pp. 85-88; and Palmer A. Throop, *Criticism of the Crusade* (Amsterdam, 1940), chap. v. For the text of William's treatise see Hans Prutz, *Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Berlin, 1883; repr. Hildesheim, 1964), pp. 575-598. Monneret de Villard, *Lo Studio dell' Islam*, pp. 70-73, has noted the inadequacy of this edition, which is based on three Parisian manuscripts, and raises the question whether the errors in Arabic terms are the result of William's imperfect knowledge or the faulty transcriptions of later copiers.

13. The most important works on Ricoldo of Monte Croce are those of Monneret de Villard: "La Vita, le opere, e i viaggi di Frate Ricoldo da Montecroce, O.P.," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, X (1944), 227-274; *Il Libro della peregrinazione nelle parti d'Oriente di Frate Ricoldo da Montecroce* (Dissertationes historicae, fasc. xiii, Institutum historicum Fratrum praedicatorum; Rome, 1948). See also Altaner, *Dominikanermissionen*, pp. 82-84; Pierre F. Mandonnet, O.P., "Fra Ricolde de Montecroce," *Revue biblique*, II (1893), 44-61, 182-202, 584-607; Röhrich, "Lettres de Ricolde de Montecroce," *AOL*, II-2 (1884), 258-296; Southern, *Western Views of Islam*, pp. 68-70; and Daniel, *Islam and the West*, *passim*.

via Maragha, an important Nestorian and Jacobite center, through Kurdish country to Mosul, where he found a thriving Jewish community and was able to hold public disputations in their synagogue. Finally he reached Baghdad, where the brethren of his own order joyously received him and where also he was greeted by the Nestorian patriarch, Mār Yabhalāhā III, who himself had recently been in communication with the west.

Although Ricoldo spoke of preaching in Arabic at Mosul, it was at Baghdad that he began the serious study of the language as well as of Moslem religion and law. His relations with Moslem scholars were extremely cordial. He attended their schools and was received in their homes. He found them interested in what he said "concerning God and Christ," but he reported no conversions. Apparently he commenced work on a translation of the Koran but later abandoned it.

While he was at Baghdad Ricoldo heard the news of the fall of Acre (1291) and witnessed the miserable plight of Christian prisoners, among whom were a number of Dominicans. He saw more at Mosul, where he took refuge for a time. He may have come back to Baghdad before returning to Europe in the early years of the fourteenth century.

In his *Itinerarium* Ricoldo not only left a detailed account of his journey, but he added many observations about the various peoples he encountered—Mongols, Buddhists, Kurds, and others. His comments on Moslem religious customs are especially important. For, although he was not always well informed and it can scarcely be said that he acquired a profound understanding, he was the first western European to penetrate deeply into eastern Islamic territory and bring back first-hand information. Formerly most of what had been known had come from Spain. Evidently he was favorably impressed and admitted that in many respects, in religious devotion, in regularity of prayer, in almsgiving and charity, Moslems sometimes excelled Christians.

Ricoldo had a high regard for the work of William of Tripoli and after his return to Europe, probably at Florence, he elaborated further some of the material of the *Itinerarium* in a treatise, the *Improbatio Alchorani* or *Tractatus contra legem Saracenorum*. It has been demonstrated that Ricoldo worked entirely from Arabic texts and apparently did not know of the translation of the Koran by Robert of Chester.¹⁴ Indeed, he would have found in early fourteenth-century Florence no such tradition of oriental scholarship as existed in Spain. Moreover, Ricoldo's purpose was different; he remained the mission-

14. Monneret de Villard, *Il Libro della peregrinazione*, pp. 93–118. The title of Ricoldo's work also appears as *Confutatio Alchorani*, *Tractatus contra legem Mahometi* and *Propugnaculum fidei*.

ary propagandist rather than the detached scholar. Moslem legal precepts he found confused, dark, and irrational. If, as we have mentioned, he respected the religious devotion of Moslems, he expressed surprise that "such works of perfection could exist in such a perfidious law." Perhaps because of his experiences following the fall of Acre he, unlike William of Tripoli, shared the growing pessimism about the future relations of Christendom and Islam.

It is evident that, with the exception of William of Tripoli, medieval missionaries to the Moslems of the east were rarely successful. Many, perhaps most, were insufficiently prepared. But the persistent opposition of Moslem authorities everywhere was unquestionably a major factor. And this opposition, usually backed by popular opinion, was doubtless strengthened later as Rome attempted to win Tatar support against Islam and anti-Moslem crusade propaganda became the order of the day. Gregory X, who received William of Tripoli's treatise, desperately tried to promote a new crusade, and the Council of Lyons in 1274 solicited from Fidenzio of Padua, the Franciscan provincial of the Holy Land, who was exceptionally well informed concerning Islam, a crusade plan, the *De recuperatione Terrae Sanctae*, which, however, he did not complete until 1291. The loss of the last crusaders' states in the same year added to Europe's discouragement and increased its fears. Even so ardent a missionary and missionary propagandist as Raymond Lull composed a crusade tract.

Under such circumstances any exchange of views which might lead to mutual understanding was all but impossible. Attempts to convert Moslems were not abandoned, but were regularly included in reissues of the mission bull, *Cum hora undecima*. But missions to Moslems were in fact feasible only in areas which fell under Mongol control, where the authorities permitted Christian propaganda. After 1291 the friars who resided in the Levantine lands under Moslem rule were concerned principally with the spiritual care of resident Latin Christians, the winning over of separated oriental Christians, or with such special tasks as the care of the holy places in Palestine.¹⁵

CONTACTS WITH ORIENTAL CHRISTIANS IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

The establishment of the crusaders' states brought western authorities, ecclesiastical and lay, into regular contact with oriental Chris-

15. On the establishment of the Franciscan *custodia* in the Holy Land see Roncaglia, "The

tianity for the first time in centuries. By the early decades of the thirteenth century considerable progress had been made in understanding the different native communities. This is evident in the *Assises de Jérusalem* and in the writings of contemporary chroniclers, notably James of Vitry, who are able to distinguish the diverse groups and no longer—as was formerly the case—lump them all together under the single category of “Syrians.”¹⁶ Misinformation, and especially optimistic illusions regarding the possibility of large-scale conversions, persisted. Nevertheless, the early friars were able to make use of a respectable fund of valid information.

The naming of a Latin patriarch of Jerusalem following the First Crusade had placed the Orthodox Christians in the kingdom in an ambiguous position of divided loyalties. Most of these in the south were Arabic in culture and were known as Melkites. As is evident in the papal bulls, Melkites became a concern of the popes in the middle years of the thirteenth century.¹⁷ In 1246 a distinguished Franciscan, Lawrence of Portugal, papal penitentiary and originally destined for the Mongol mission, was sent instead to various places in Anatolia and Syria with instructions to visit, among others, Jacobites, Maronites, and Nestorians. His principal dealings, however, were with the Latin and Greek (or Melkite) hierarchies of Syria, concerning which he and they received letters from Innocent IV.¹⁸

After the final retreat of the Latins from Jerusalem in 1244 the Syrian Melkite clergy seem for the most part to have turned to patriarch Athanasius II of Jerusalem, who in 1247 was negotiating with Rome through friar Lawrence. Innocent IV supported Athanasius against Robert, the Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, now not resident there, and reserved to Rome the immediate obedience of all bishops

Sons of St. Francis in the Holy Land: Official Entrance of the Franciscans as Custodians of the Basilica of the Nativity in Bethlehem,” *Franciscan Studies*, X (1950), 257–285; Lemmens, *Franziskanermissionen*, pp. 61–75; and *idem*, “Die Franziskaner im Heiligen Lande, I: Die Franziskaner auf dem Sion (1336–1551),” *Franziskanische Studien*, Beiheft IV, 2nd ed. (Münster, 1925).

Apparently some conversions were made as a consequence of the visit of Louis IX, mostly, it would seem, from among ransomed slaves. On an attempt by friars to refute Islamic doctrines by public argumentation in 1392 which resulted in their death, see Simonut, *Il Metodo*, p. 97.

16. Cf. Enrico Cerulli, *Etiopi in Palestina* (Collezione scientifica e documentaria a cura del Ministero dell’ Africa italiana, XII, vol. I; Rome, 1943), 82 ff., and docs. 3, 7.

17. On the term “Mossolini” (Moscelini, Mosoliti) as representing Melkites, see van der Vat, *Die Anfänge*, p. 144, note 38; Altaner, *Die Dominikanermissionen*, p. 48, note 40.

18. *BOF*, II, 319–324; Roncaglia, *Les Frères mineurs et l’église grecque-orthodoxe au XIIIe siècle (1231–1274)* (*BOF*, ser. 4, vol. II; Cairo, 1954), pp. 92–99; van der Vat, *Die Anfänge*, pp. 152–161; George Every, “Syrian Christians in Palestine, 1183–1283,” *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, VII (1947), 49–53; Steven Runciman, *The Eastern Schism* (Oxford, 1955), chap. IV; René Grousset, *Histoire des croisades et du royaume franc de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1936), III, 512–513.

who, or whose predecessors, had not actually submitted to Latin authorities. Somewhat later, Athanasius III of Alexandria was also in communion with Rome at the time of his death in 1308 at the hands of the Moslems. He had, it seems, accepted the provisions of union enunciated at the Council of Lyons in 1274. Thus the Palestinian branch of eastern Christianity, presumably largely Melkite, was in those years in communion with Rome.

The situation in Antioch was somewhat different. There the Orthodox church was ethnically Greek and constituted a strong element in the population. Although less evidently so in the thirteenth century with the decline of Byzantine power, the problem of the patriarchate had always been confused with political issues. Toward 1245 the Greek patriarch, David, seems to have accepted Rome's jurisdiction and been permitted to install himself alongside the Latin patriarch Albert Rezato, but his successor Euthymius was excommunicated by his Latin colleague Opizo Fieschi, only to be reinstated in 1260 by Bohemond VI acting under extreme pressure from Hulagu. Thereafter most of the Latin patriarchs remained *in absentia* and administered their province through vicars.

Innocent IV was most anxious to protect the uniate Melkites and Greeks of Jerusalem and Antioch against opposition on the part of the Latin patriarchs. In addition to the obvious motives of ecclesiastical policy, the pope was deeply concerned to preserve the unity of eastern Christianity against the Mongol menace. At the same time, he and his legates were aware that the newly reunited Greek clergy, particularly of Antioch, occasionally presumed on papal protection, thereby giving just grievance to the Latins. Apparently Lawrence of Portugal carried out a delicate mission with considerable success. But the union with Rome remained tenuous and presumably was largely lost with the destruction of the crusaders' states at the end of the century.

In 1237 the Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, Ignatius II (1222-1252), made an official visit to Jerusalem, where according to an old tradition the Jacobites had been given a section in the city and where they maintained the convent of St. Mary Magdalen.¹⁹ Jacobites, Monophysite in faith and fairly numerous, were divided into several ethnic or national communities in Syria, Egypt, Nubia, and Ethiopia, under the jurisdiction of patriarchs at Antioch and Alexandria. James of Vitry had distinguished the Jacobites from the Syrian Melkites, and the Latins had become aware that Nubia and Ethiopia lay beyond

19. Cerulli, *Etiopi in Palestina*, pp. 62-73.

the confines of Moslem Egypt. They seem also to have understood something of the difficulties between the two Jacobite patriarchates.

Ignatius, in retaliation for the naming of a metropolitan for Jerusalem by the Coptic patriarch of Alexandria, Cyril III, proceeded to appoint a metropolitan for Ethiopia. This was done against the advice of the Dominicans of Jerusalem, who immediately protested strongly and were joined by the Templars and Hospitallers. Presumably they were afraid of offending the Egyptian government and thereby endangering the truce which permitted the Latin occupation of Jerusalem. Ultimately the matter was smoothed over, partly through the good offices of the friars.

More significant to the present discussion is the report of Ignatius's 1237 visit by friar Philip, Dominican provincial of the Holy Land.²⁰ On Palm Sunday, Philip reported, Ignatius made a profession of faith in Chaldean (Syriac) and Arabic, proclaiming his allegiance to Rome, and put on the habit of the Friars-Preachers. Similar declarations were made by two archbishops, one a Jacobite from Egypt, probably the Copt recently named metropolitan of Jerusalem, and the other a Nestorian whose jurisdiction included Syria. Philip then mentioned that letters received from William of Montferrat, for whom, it will be recalled, the papal bull of 1235 had been issued, indicated that he and two other Dominicans conversant with the language had spent some time with the Nestorian catholicus ("iakelinus"), Sabarjesus V, whose jurisdiction extended eastward to include the domains of Presbyter John, and found him disposed to return to the Catholic church.

To the Coptic patriarch of Alexandria, who had also, according to Philip, expressed a desire to return to ecclesiastical unity, he sent friars. Among the Egyptians, Philip went on to explain, Saracen influences apparently cause more deviations in custom than among other oriental Christians. But he adds significantly that Libya (presumably Nubia) and Ethiopia were not subject to Moslem rule. There is no further information about the friars Philip sent. But if perchance

20. Altaner, *Die Dominikanermissionen*, pp. 45 ff. Philip's report can be found in Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, III, 396 ff., and *MGH, SS.*, XXIII, 941-942. Jean B. Chabot, "Échos des croisades," *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres* (1938), pp. 448-453, questions Ignatius's conversion and notes that Bar Hebraeus in describing the patriarch's visit does not mention it (*Chronicon ecclesiasticum*, ed. Jean B. Abbeloos and Thomas J. Lamy, I [Louvain, 1872], 653-654; also cited in Cerulli, *Etiopi in Palestina*, pp. 74-76). But Cahen, *La Syrie du nord à l'époque des croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche* (IFD, BO, I; Paris, 1940), pp. 681-682, accounts for this omission on the basis of Bar Hebraeus's hostility to the Latins. Apparently Ignatius, who resided several years at Antioch, aroused considerable opposition among other Jacobites. Cf. also Richard, "Les Premiers missionnaires latins en Éthiopie (XIIIe-XIVe siècles)," *Studi Etiopi* (Accademia nazionale dei Lincei), CCCLVII (1959), 324, on the relations between Dominicans and the Ethiopian hierarchy.

they went beyond Egypt into Nubia or Ethiopia they would have been the first known to have done so.

Philip also mentioned that the Maronites of the Lebanon, long since returned to obedience, were persevering in their faith, and added that oriental Christians in general were listening to the friars. Only the Greeks remained hostile. Philip concluded his report with the information about language study, particularly Arabic, by himself and his fellow friars which was discussed above in connection with the possibility of missions to Moslems.

It seems clear that Philip's report was overly optimistic. As he remarked, Ignatius's jurisdiction included lands already devastated by Mongol incursions. The same would have been true of the Nestorian catholicus farther east, and both may have been concerned about possible western aid. Nevertheless, the report made an impression in Rome, and pope Gregory IX immediately sent a cordial letter to Ignatius and the other prelates.²¹

As has already been mentioned, a majority of Armenians were Monophysite. But the relations between the Cilician kingdom of Armenia and the crusader states had been close, and successive rulers and *catholicoi* had sought to bring the Armenian church out of what seemed to them a position of isolation. As a consequence, the king, the catholicus, and at least a part of the church of Cilician Armenia might be said to have been in formal union with Rome in the first decades of the thirteenth century.²²

Such moves apparently made possible some western missionary activity. In his report Philip mentioned that at the urging of king and nobles he had sent four friars to Cilicia to learn the Armenian language. Some further indications of western contacts appear as a consequence of the expeditions and letters sent by Innocent IV in 1245 which will be discussed presently. The papal envoy, Dominic of Aragon, traveled extensively in the Levant and visited Cilicia, and it was perhaps owing to his efforts that the catholicus Constantine I, then

21. Aloysius L. Täutu, ed., *Acta Honorii III et Gregorii IX* (PC, Fontes, ser. 3, III; Vatican City, 1950), pp. 303-305 (no. 227). In the following year the pope granted permission to Templars captured by Saracens to receive absolution from Jacobite priests (*ibid.*, p. 318, no. 239).

22. Henry F. Tournebize, *Histoire politique et religieuse de l'Arménie . . .* (Paris, 1910), pp. 235-284; Cahen, *La Syrie du nord*, pp. 588 ff.; Sirarpie Der Nersessian, "The Kingdom of Cilician Armenia," volume II of the present work, pp. 647 ff.; Bertold Spuler, ed., *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, 1, *Die Nahe und der Mittlere Osten*, VIII-2, *Religionsgeschichte des Orients in der Zeit der Weltreligionen* (Leyden and Cologne, 1961), pp. 254-257; Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity*, pp. 332-334. It should be noted that both Gregory IX and Innocent IV supported the Armenian patriarch against interference from the Latin patriarch of Antioch.

residing at Sis, presented an exposition of the Armenian faith. Later in the thirteenth century Franciscans were active in Cilicia, and some time after 1270 mission stations were established at Tarsus and Sis, and at Sivas in northeastern Anatolia.

Despite these evidences of rapport, it seems clear that many Armenians in the kingdom and probably most in the diaspora, then under Moslem rule, were still unwilling to recognize either the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon or Roman primacy. Moreover, even for those who did, primacy usually meant a vague, distant suzerainty, not an active jurisdiction.

The kingdom of Georgia, during this period, was Orthodox and perhaps in a technical sense still in union with Rome. Although the kingdom's exposed position vis-à-vis the Mongols may have prompted the rulers to regard the west favorably, remoteness and a clergy not particularly well disposed toward Rome made the union scarcely a reality. In 1233 Gregory IX sent a cordial letter to the ruler. This was to be delivered by Jacob of Russano, who with other Franciscans had been in Georgia. Moreover, general instructions to friars traveling to the Orient now included Georgians among the peoples named. Nothing is known of Jacob's mission except that he reached Constantinople.

The mission letters of the next few years (1233-1240) do not mention Georgians, but some time in the third decade of the century a Dominican convent was established at Tiflis. In 1240 the pope again wrote to the queen-regent Rusudan and her son David IV requesting her to receive a deputation of Friars-Preachers. In 1254 Innocent IV wrote to the Georgian bishops and clergy bespeaking a favorable reception for the Dominican friars en route eastward and in a tone implying normal ecclesiastical relations with the Holy See.²³

THE MONGOL INVASIONS AND THE MISSIONS

The course of the mission effort in the thirteenth century was profoundly affected by the incursions of the Mongols into eastern Europe and the Levant. Europeans were terrified, and Innocent IV placed

23. Van der Vat, *Die Anfänge*, pp. 142-143; Altaner, *Die Dominikanermmissionen*, pp. 68-70; Cahen, *La Syrie du nord*, p. 686. The papal letters are in *BOF*, I, 165, II, 299-301. It is not clear why in 1233 the pope addressed the king and not the queen-regent, Rusudan, who was then ruling for her son David. In the bull *Cum messis multa* (*ibid.*, II, 301), to friars "in terras Georgianum, Sarracenorum et aliorum paganorum profiscentibus," the pope included faculties for dealing with Latins and mentioned friars who were priests. Presumably this letter was directed to friars then established in the Orient (April 8, 1233).

the Mongol problem on the agenda of the Council of Lyons in 1245. As other chapters have indicated, the first attacks were followed by the stabilization of the Mongol empire, the subsequent reorientation of Mongol expansion eastward toward China and southward into the Levant, and its eventual division into smaller khanates. This, in turn, made possible communication between Europe and Asia and opened the way to diplomatic negotiations and eventually to missions.

A persistent difficulty confronting western authorities throughout this period was the lack of trustworthy information. Various legends, such as those concerning Prester John or a Christian king David, continued to find western acceptance. Moreover, the actual existence of Nestorian Christianity in Asia and the exaggerated, if not deliberately falsified, accounts of the extent of Asian Christianity which occasionally reached the west tended to perpetuate an overly optimistic attitude regarding mission possibilities. And the Mongols, it may be added, seem to have been equally ignorant of the west. Nevertheless, some misunderstandings were cleared up, and among the objects of papal diplomacy the acquisition of reliable information held an important place.²⁴

Even before 1245 Innocent IV had received reports from Hungary concerning the first Mongol incursions toward the west. King Béla IV (1235–1270), representative of a people immediately endangered, had already promoted more than one exploratory mission before the Mongols actually attacked his own kingdom. The best known of these early ventures was that of the Dominican friar Julian, who in 1236–1237 traveled via Constantinople, Matrega, and the Alan country and thence northward into the region of the Volga or the Don. Julian reported his experiences in a letter to the papal legate in Hungary, bishop Salvius of Perugia. It seems that Béla forwarded this letter to the patriarch of Aquileia, Berthold of Andechs, a prelate later present at Innocent IV's curia and presumably one of the experts on Mongol affairs. A Russian bishop named Peter also appeared at the Council of Lyons with further information.²⁵

24. There is a considerable literature on the Prester John problem. Recent studies include José M. Prou y Martí, O.F.M., "La Leyenda del Preste Juan entre los Franciscanos de la Edad Media," *Antonianum*, XX (1945), 65–96; Charles E. Nowell, "The Historical Prester John," *Speculum*, XXVIII (1953), 435–445 (who identifies him as Yeh-lü Ta-shih [1087–1143], gur-khan of the Kara-Khitai); Richard, "L'Extrême-Orient légendaire au moyen-âge: Roi David et Prêtre Jean," *Annales d'Éthiopie*, II (1957), 225–242; Vsevolod Slessarev, *Prester John: The Letter and the Legend* (Minneapolis, 1959).

25. Sinor, "Un Voyageur du treizième siècle: Le Dominicain, Julien de Hongrie," *London University, School of Oriental and African Studies, Bulletin*, XIV (1952), 589–602. Sinor differs from previous writers in holding that Julian made only one journey and did not reach "greater

Whatever the extent of his information at the time of the Council of Lyons in 1245, Innocent's decision to attempt negotiations with Mongol rulers was a new and bold step and was taken in connection with several important contemporary developments, European, Moslem, and Mongol. The coincidence of such events as the death of khan Ögödei (1242), the ultimatum to prince Bohemond IV of Antioch in 1244, the fall of Jerusalem to the Khwarizmian Turks and the launching of a new crusade by Louis IX of France in the same year should be noted. Moreover, at the time the pope was not undisputed master in his own house, for it was at the same council that he solemnly excommunicated emperor Frederick II and authorized a crusade against him.

In the spring and early summer of 1245 three missions penetrated deeply into Mongol territory.²⁶ Whether each of these resulted from specific papal commissions given to the friars at Lyons is not always clear, since such commissions do not exist in every case. At any rate, in March, even before the opening of the council (June 28, 1245), the pope had drawn up two letters addressed to the "king and people of the Tatars." The first of these (March 5) was religious in tenor and invited the khan to embrace Christianity. It was originally entrusted to the Franciscan friar Lawrence of Portugal, but this commission, it seems, was subsequently withdrawn, for it was in the following year that Lawrence visited instead the Greek and Melkite clergy of the Levant.

About the same time a commission was given to the Franciscan Dominic of Aragon, possibly that originally intended for Lawrence. Dominic's actual journey, however, was confined to the Levant, with perhaps some penetration of the Moslem hinterland. He visited, as we have mentioned, Cilicia and possibly Moslem Syria and Egypt.

Hungary." The view that the friar traveled eastward twice (1234-1235, 1237) and reached "greater Hungary" on the first trip has again been proposed by Heinrich A. Dörrie, *Drei Texte zur Geschichte der Ungarn und Mongolen* (Akademie der Wissenschaft in Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, *Nachrichten*, 1956, no. 6), pp. 125-202. Dörrie also mentions the appearance at the Lyons council of the Russian bishop Peter.

26. These missions are discussed at length in Altaner, *Die Dominikanermissionen*, pp. 53-63, 120-138; Pelliot, "Les Mongoles et la papauté," *ROC*, XXIII (1922-1923), 3-30 (on John of Pian del Carpine); XXIV (1924), 225-335 (on Ascelin and Andrew); XXVIII (1931-1932), 3-84 (on Andrew); van der Vat, *Die Anfänge*, pp. 150-160; Soranzo, *Il Papato*, pp. 92 ff. Pelliot's second installment (1924) and Altaner's study appeared in the same year and were written independently. Pelliot, however, was able to procure a copy of Altaner's work while his own was in press and added a few references in his notes. Precisely the same thing occurred with Pelliot's third installment (1931-1932) and Soranzo, *Il Papato*. For general discussions see also Sinor, "Les Relations entre les Mongoles et l'Europe jusqu'à la mort d'Arghoun et de Béla IV," *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*, III (1956), 39-62; Leonardo Olschki, *L'Asia di Marco Polo* (Biblioteca storica Sansona, n.s., XXX; Florence, 1957), chap. II; Troll, "Die Chinamission," pp. 118-123.

He returned in the summer of 1247 after a protracted stay at Constantinople, where his good offices in pacifying various dissident factions were gratefully recognized by the authorities. Apparently, therefore, the first papal commission to Franciscan friars directed specifically to the Mongols was not carried out.²⁷

The second papal letter to the "king and people of the Tatars" (March 13) was primarily, though not exclusively, diplomatic and was designed among other things to moderate the ravages in eastern Europe. This letter was carried to the court of the great khan by the Franciscan John of Pian del Carpine, who returned to the curia in November 1247 bringing a haughty reply from the newly elected khan Güyük rejecting any cessation of hostilities and demanding total submission of all Christian rulers. Despite its pessimism the record of John's journey, the *Historia Mongalorum*, is a precious document, Europe's first real view into inner Asia.²⁸

In addition to these specific commissions to Franciscans the pope added more general instructions and grants of faculties to friars journeying to the Orient in the general bull *Cum hora undecima* (March 21), which included the now customary long list of peoples, Moslem, pagan, and separated Christian. And on March 25 a letter was sent to schismatic prelates inviting them to return *ad unitatem ecclesiae* and recommending the Franciscan friars.²⁹

27. Tisserant, "La Légation en Orient du Franciscain, Dominique d'Aragon (1245-47)," pp. 336 ff.; Roncaglia, *Les Frères mineurs*, pp. 87-88, 92-99; van der Vat, *Die Anfänge*, pp. 152-154, 158-160. Although no papal letter to Dominic exists, the pope wrote on March 10 to the Hospitallers and apparently also the Templars urging them to give the friar and his companions all possible help. On March 21 the Latin ecclesiastical authorities were similarly informed. While the direction of these letters would seem to imply the crusader states, the second letter specifically mentions non-Christians. It has, therefore, been suggested that the papal commission withdrawn from Lawrence of Portugal was herewith given to Dominic of Aragon. The papal letters mentioned are cited in *BOF*, II, 321 (*BF*, I, 354), 324-325 (*BF*, I, 771 ff.).

28. *BF*, I, 353 ff. A translation of John of Pian del Carpine's account can be found in Dawson, ed., *Mission to Asia* (London, 1955), pp. 3-86. Pelliot, *ROC*, XXIII (1922-1923), 8-9, suggests, on the basis of a passage in Güyük's reply which seems to indicate an invitation to conversion, that perhaps John took the letter intended for Lawrence of Portugal; cf. van der Vat, *Die Anfänge*, p. 152. It is worth noting that Innocent IV was also in communication with various princes and prelates, Latin, Greek, and Slavonic, in eastern Europe, cf. Soranzo, *Il Papato*, pp. 88 ff. The role of Benedict the Pole, John's companion, in negotiations with the church in Ruthenia is discussed by Bolesław Szczesniak, "Benoît le Polonais, dit le Vratislavien, et son rôle dans l'union de la Ruthénie de Halicz avec Rome en 1246," *Antemurale*, I (1954), 39-50.

29. *BOF*, II, 316; *BF*, I, 357, 360, 362; Theodosius T. Haluščynskij and Meletius M. Wugnar, eds., *Acta Innocentii papae IV* (Rome, 1962), pp. 36-39 (no. 19), 43-46 (no. 20). Van der Vat, *Die Anfänge*, p. 145, thinks that the general papal bulls were intended for John of Pian del Carpine only. But Pelliot, *ROC*, XXIV (1924), 329, suggests that one of the prelates interviewed by the Dominicans may have seen the letter addressed to the oriental prelates.

Two expeditions of Dominican friars also set out in 1245. The first was headed by friar Ascelino, probably a Lombard, who left Lyons perhaps as early as March and was later joined at the Dominican convent of Acre by three other Dominican friars.³⁰ Another friar, Guiscard of Cremona, joined them at Tiflis. Although a copy of Ascelino's commission does not exist, it is possible that it resembled that of John of Pian del Carpine in purpose. Because of a considerable delay in reaching his destination, his journey took a longer time—considerably over three years—than any of the others. Not until May 24, 1247, did Ascelino and his companions reach the camp of the Mongol general Baiju, probably somewhere in the mountains of Transcaucasia east of Lake Sevan. Despite threats against his life, Ascelino persisted in his refusal to prostrate himself before the Mongol dignitaries, even though one of his more experienced companions pointed out that no idolatry was implied. Since he also resisted demands that he travel to the court of the great khan Güyük, the friars' letters had to be translated and sent on. Finally, toward the end of July 1247, after the arrival of an envoy from the khan, the general Eljigidei, they were permitted to leave, accompanied by two Mongol envoys. They reached Acre in September and the curia sometime early in the following summer (1248). Baiju's reply, which they delivered to the pope, was strikingly similar in tone to that of Güyük. On the way home, presumably at Tabriz, they visited a Nestorian prelate named Simeon Rabban Ata, who, as we shall see, had been interviewed by the other Dominican envoy of 1245, the Frenchman Andrew of Longjumeau.

The record of Andrew's instructions has also been lost, but his journey had considerable religious as well as diplomatic significance.³¹ It was he and one companion, it will be remembered, who may have

30. Pelliot has reconstructed Ascelino's journey; see above, note 26. He feels that Ascelino may have occupied himself for some time with oriental Christians. On the analogy of the two types of commission, one diplomatic, the other missionary, and one each to the great khan and to some lesser dignitary, Altaner, *Die Dominikanermissionen*, pp. 122 ff., holds that Ascelino's commission probably resembled that given to John of Pian del Carpine while that given to Andrew of Longjumeau was similar to the one intended for Lawrence of Portugal. This "symmetrical" interpretation has been rejected by Tisserant and van der Vat. Although there has been discussion regarding the validity of the principal source for Ascelino's journey, Simon of Saint Quentin (e.g., Soranzo, *Il Papato*, pp. 114-119), the matter seems now to have been settled definitively by the new edition of Richard, *Simon de Saint-Quentin: Histoire des Tartares* (Documents relatifs à l'histoire des croisades, VIII; Paris, 1965); for the passages relevant here see pp. 94-117. Cf. also Olschki, *Marco Polo's Precursors* (Baltimore, 1946), pp. 48 ff.

31. Andrew's commission and journey have been examined at length by Pelliot and Altaner (see above, note 26). Cf. also Soranzo, *Il Papato*, pp. 119 ff.

been the bearers of one of the pope's letters to and replies from Moslem princes of Syria. More pertinent to the present discussion are his communications with oriental prelates. For it is principally as a consequence of Andrew's achievements and the five letters from oriental prelates which he brought back that we have some insight into papal dealings with oriental Christianity during this period.

Andrew traveled from Syria to Mosul, where the Jacobite maphrian John XV (1232-1253) made an Orthodox profession of faith. Some seventeen days journey beyond Mosul, presumably near Tabriz, Andrew met a detachment of Mongol troops. To the commanders of this contingent, which was very likely an advance guard of Baiju's army, he delivered the pope's letters. It is probable that it was also at Tabriz that he talked with Simeon Rabban Ata, a representative of the Nestorian catholicus, who styled himself *vicarius orientis*. Probably a Syrian, he was, it seems, patriarchal visitor to the Nestorian communities of central and eastern Asia, and apparently had won the respect of the Mongols. Expressing himself as extremely grateful for the pope's embassy, Simeon urged the pope to make peace with emperor Frederick II, and apparently he wrote the emperor in the same vein. To Andrew he presented to be delivered to the pope a *libellus* on matters of faith which he had brought from China. This has not been preserved, but the papal archives do contain professions from the archbishop of Nisibis, Işoyahb bar Malkhon, and five other prelates including Simeon.³² He requested the pope to insure proper treatment of Nestorians in the crusader states, especially at Antioch, Tripoli, and Acre, and he made intercession for his friend the archbishop of Jerusalem. The friars remained with Simeon for twenty days and were given a costly ivory staff for the pope.

It is worth noting that these contacts were made with a representative of the Nestorian hierarchy of upper Mesopotamia, Persia, and greater Armenia, by envoys sent expressly to Mongols. Although there is no reason to suppose that the catholicus was hostile to what Simeon was doing, it is true that he then resided at Seleucia (near Ctesiphon) in the territory of the Baghdad caliphate, not yet occupied by the Mongols. Presumably he feared them. For some unexplained reason Simeon did not remain well disposed toward the western church. When Ascelino and his associates stayed with him on their return

32. *BOF*, II, 356, cites the documents, but, following Tournebize, *Histoire de l'Arménie*, p. 289, wrongly identifies Simeon Rabban Ata as Armenian and Andrew as Franciscan. Pelliot, *ROC*, XXIV (1924), 230-235, points out that the use of the word "catholicus" here as applied to Simeon is probably the result of an error on the part of a papal scribe.

trip from Baiju's headquarters they found him in an entirely different mood. While they were awaiting a reply to a papal letter, possibly one delivered by Andrew, he died.³³

Meanwhile, on his return journey Andrew met at Antioch the Jacobite patriarch Ignatius II, who, it will be recalled, had made a profession of faith in Jerusalem some years earlier.³⁴ He had subsequently received letters from Gregory IX and now, it would appear, Innocent IV was following up his predecessor's moves and perhaps requiring a more precise definition of the terms of union. At any rate, Ignatius presented another profession to Andrew and added a number of significant requests which reveal something of the often difficult relations between eastern and western Christians. He asked that there be free election of the patriarch by the archbishops, independence of the Jacobite hierarchy from the jurisdiction of Latin bishops, and freedom of all Jacobites and of their establishments in Latin territory from any financial exactions. Finally, baptized Jacobites should not be required when marrying Latins to be rebaptized. The patriarch assured the pope of his coöperation, especially in the freeing of slaves and prisoners. Andrew returned to the curia in the spring or early summer of 1247 and delivered the replies to the pope's communications of 1245 to oriental prelates and perhaps also replies from Moslem princes. His own report was overly optimistic about the position and future of Christianity in Asia.

Andrew of Longjumeau is next encountered at Cyprus, where Louis IX was completing preparations for his attack on Egypt and where on December 19, 1248, there arrived two envoys sent by the Mongol general Eljigidei, then in command of armies in northern Mesopotamia, probably near Tabriz. Very possibly he was already meditating an attack on Baghdad. The envoys were Nestorians and the principal one, David, was known to Andrew, whom he had probably met in 1246. It was Andrew who translated Eljigidei's letter to the king from the original Persian into Latin. Although the letter was far more cordial in tone than the earlier reply of Güyük, it is possible that it was designed to create a deceptively favorable impression. This would enable the Mongols to avoid a confrontation with Louis's crusading armies if they moved against Baghdad.³⁵

33. It is not clear whether Ascelino presented to Simeon a new letter or whether this refers to a previous communication delivered by Andrew. Pelliot suggests that it was probably the letter sent by the pope to dissident prelates on March 25, 1245 (*ibid.*, p. 329); cf. above, note 29.

34. According to Cahen, *La Syrie du nord*, pp. 681-682, and Altaner, *Die Dominikanermisionen*, p. 53, Andrew met Ignatius at Mardin, northwest of Nisibin.

35. Pelliot, *ROC*, XXVIII (1931-1932), 19-20, 26, 37, 66-67, contends, against certain older

At any rate Eljigidei's communication seems to have strengthened the impression already created by Andrew, at least as far as mission possibilities were concerned. For after discussing the matter in council and with the papal legate, cardinal Odo of Tusculum, the king decided to respond by sending a legation of which certain members would return after delivering letters to Eljigidei while others would proceed further to the court of the great khan Güyük, the news of whose death in the spring of 1248 had evidently not yet reached the west. Andrew of Longjumeau was chosen to head the embassy and was accompanied by two other Dominicans, one of them being his brother, William, who also spoke Arabic, two seculars, two royal officers, and the two Mongol envoys. Another cleric of Acre, named Theodulf, accompanied them in a private capacity into Persia. He eventually left the group and was found later by William of Rubruck in Karakorum.

The details of the journey are of no concern here. Suffice it to say that the entire party, including perhaps even the Mongols' envoy David, after reporting from some point en route, continued on to the Mongol imperial court, then presided over by the queen-mother and regent, Oghul Kaimish, and probably situated in the valley of the river Imil east of Lake Balkhash. The ambassadors were courteously received, and returned to report to the king at Caesarea in the spring or early summer of 1251. But neither was the cause of Christianity furthered nor were closer diplomatic ties promoted.

Thus Andrew of Longjumeau returned once again from Asia. Although perhaps too much influenced by oriental propaganda after his first trip, he was nevertheless an accomplished missionary and ambassador. Moreover, in the course of his travels he had mastered Arabic and Persian and perhaps understood Greek. He had also seen Christians in lands under Mongol and Moslem dominion. As a consequence, his experience was recognized and his advice sought. When, for example, he urged that some missionary friars be raised to the episcopate, king Louis wrote to the pope in this vein. By the bull of February 20, 1253, Innocent gave his legate in the Orient, Odo of Tusculum, powers to proceed with the consecrations. Although not then carried out, this plan, inspired by the advice of Andrew,

authors, including Beazley, *The Dawn of Modern Geography*, II, 278, 645, that the envoys were not impostors and that the letter was not a fabrication. Cf. Richard, "The Mongols and the Franks," *Journal of Asian History*, III (1969), 50-51. It should also be noted that western optimism regarding the extent of Christianity in Asia was further strengthened by the receipt of a letter which the Armenian constable Sempad wrote to his brother-in-law, king Henry I of Cyprus. It was written from Samarkand en route to the Mongol court: Altaner, *Die Dominikanermissionen*, p. 132; Grousset, *Histoire des croisades*, III, 526-527; Soranzo, *Il Papato*, p. 157.

foreshadowed the establishment of a Latin hierarchy in the Orient in the following century. Andrew's influence may also perhaps be observed in the preparations made by William of Rubruck, the Franciscan missionary, whom he met in Syria in 1252.³⁶

Meanwhile the kingdom of Cilician Armenia had also established contact with the Mongols, whom they found to be a welcome counterpoise to the Turks of Konya. The constable Sempad, brother of Hethoum I, journeyed into Mongol territory and from Samarkand wrote in 1248 to his brother-in-law, Henry I of Cyprus. From these varied sources came further indications of Christianity in Asia, among them the report that Sartak, son of Batu, khan of the Kipchak Golden Horde and ruler of a territory west of the Volga, was a Christian. It was this especially which prompted king Louis, then at Acre, to authorize the journey of William of Rubruck.³⁷

William, a Franciscan friar at the convent at Acre, set out with the original purpose of establishing a mission center in Sartak's kingdom. He did, it is true, carry letters of recommendation from king Louis to Sartak, to his father, Batu, and to the great khan Möngke. As a consequence, he occasionally had to protest his unofficial capacity. But he also took with him religious books, vestments, and articles suitable to his evangelical intentions, and insisted that he desired only to fulfil the missionary ideals of his order. Thus, unlike John of Pian del Carpine and the Dominicans, and despite some misunderstanding among the Mongols, William was exclusively a missionary.

Friar William set out from Acre early in 1253 with friar Bartholomew and two others and an interpreter. He first stopped at Constantinople and then traveled north and east and reached Sartak's camp at the end of July 1253. About Sartak's Christianity William expressed some doubts. Moreover, he and his companions were told that it was necessary for them to proceed to Batu's camp. Accordingly, they left

36. The definitive account of Andrew's journey can be found in Pelliot, *ROC*, XXVIII (1931-1932), 37-82. Cf. also Altaner, *Die Dominikanermissionen*, pp. 134-137; Soranzo, *Il Papato*, pp. 128 ff. For Innocent IV's bull see *Acta Innocentii papae IV*, p. 148 (no. 86).

37. There have been many studies on William of Rubruck. The principal ones are listed in Soranzo, *Il Papato*, p. 144, note 1; Olschki, *Marco Polo's Precursors*, pp. 49 ff., and *idem*, *Guillaume Boucher* (Baltimore, 1946), pp. 18 ff. See Chrysologus Schollmeyer, O.F.M., "Die missionarische Sendung des Frater Wilhelm von Rubruk," *Ostkirchliche Studien*, IV (1955), 138-146, and "Die Missionsfahrt Bruder Wilhelms von Rubruk," *ZMR*, XL (1956), 200-205; Jean Dauvillier, "Guillaume de Rubrouck et les communautés chaldéennes d'Asie centrale au moyen-âge," *Annuaire de l'École des législations religieuses* (1951-1952), II, 36-42; Troll, "Die Chinamission," pp. 124-125. Cf. also Southern, *Western Views of Islam*, pp. 47-52. On the influence of Andrew of Longjumeau see Pelliot, *ROC*, XXVIII (1931-1932), 77. For translations of William's account see Rockhill, *The Journey of William Rubruk to Eastern Parts of the World, 1253-55* (Hakluyt Society, London, 1900), and Dawson, *Mission to Asia*, pp. 87-220.

with Sartak their books and vestments, save a Bible and book of Sentences which William managed to keep with him, and journeyed to Batu's headquarters on the east bank of the Volga, only to find that he in turn insisted that they travel to the court of the great khan Möngke at Karakorum. They reached the court on December 27, 1253.

At the imperial court William lost no opportunity to exercise his ministry. He was especially welcome to the many European Christians, mostly captives or technicians resident at the khan's headquarters. He was able to establish friendly relations with Nestorians although he was highly critical of their practices, and he participated with them and with Moslems and *tuins*, a term he used to describe Asiatic pagans in general, in a public debate before the great khan. According to king Heṭoum of Armenia, who visited the Mongol court shortly afterward, William offended the khan by the intemperance of his preaching, but to judge from his own straightforward account he seems to have acquitted himself well.³⁸ His evident skill in debate impressed the Moslems. As might be expected of a man who was appointed lector at the convent at Acre on his return, he had a thorough knowledge of scripture and a capacity to organize and present an argument. Of his success as a missionary it is difficult to judge. He mentions only a few converts of his own and describes the baptism of some sixty persons by Nestorians.

In August 1254 William took his leave, parting with great sadness from his colleague Bartholomew, whose illness precluded any such journey at that time. It was not until May 1255 that William again saw the Mediterranean. Since he was ordered to remain at Acre, he was not able to report to king Louis in person, for the king had returned to France. Somewhat later, through the influence of the king, he did return to Paris; there he met Roger Bacon, who was greatly impressed by what he had to say. Meanwhile he composed a written account of his journey (*Itinerarium*) which still stands as one of the most significant travel reports of the Middle Ages. As far as missions are concerned, William's experiences prompted him to suggest that instead of humble friars the pope should send a bishop in order to make a suitable impression. Significantly, too, he emphasized the necessity of adequate interpreters.

Thus all the early politico-missionary expeditions to the Mongols failed to achieve fruitful results, and attempts to establish diplomatic

38. Van der Vat, *Die Anfänge*, p. 80, note 90; Soranzo, *Il Papato*, p. 155, note 2; de Sessevalle, *Histoire générale de l'ordre de Saint François*, II, 622. Southern (*Western Views of Islam*, pp. 47-52) identifies William's pagan opponents as Buddhists; he also comments on William's influence on Roger Bacon. See also Simonut, *Il Metodo*, pp. 135-137.

relations ceased for some years as Europe awaited or feared renewed Mongol attacks. The few contacts with oriental prelates seemed more promising, but it must be observed that although such dignitaries as made professions of faith gave evidence of a desire to live in harmony with Rome, there was no assurance that they fully understood the primacy of jurisdiction. This may, for example, explain Innocent IV's seeking through Andrew of Longjumeau a second profession from Ignatius II. Further, there is little doubt that hope of western aid was a powerful motive in certain cases, and the conversion of individual prelates was usually not followed by corporate movements of the faithful. It has been pointed out that Ignatius II spoke for only a section of the Jacobite church. After his death in 1252, his successor John VI (the maphrian John XV) maintained a precarious union for a short time, but the majority of Jacobites followed a rival, Dionysius VII, who was traditionally Monophysite and anti-Latin.³⁹

THE SECOND HALF OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

During the 1260's changes in the political balance of the Levantine world opened up new opportunities for missionaries. In 1261 the Byzantine empire was restored with the assistance of the Genoese, who subsequently established themselves in the Black Sea area. The northern coast of the Black Sea lay within the jurisdiction of the khanate of the Kipchak Golden Horde, which also comprised the territory stretching from southern Russia to the Caspian. A variety of peoples inhabited the region, Goths, Alans, Circassians, Abkhasians, Georgians, as well as Russians and Greeks, all in the main Christian, in addition to Khazars, Turks, Kumans, and Mongols. A large Armenian colony had settled in Kaffa, the principal city and port of the Crimea.

Although Islam steadily gained adherents in the Kipchak khanate, diplomatic and commercial interests, especially rivalry with the Mongol rulers of Persia and a long frontier with western Christendom in Poland and Hungary, prompted the khans to grant protection to merchants and missionaries and to maintain formally cordial rela-

39. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades* (3 vols., Cambridge, Eng., 1951-1954), III, 232; Cahen, *La Syrie du nord*, pp. 681-684. Chabot, "Échos des croisades," p. 453, has pointed out that since the professions of faith made by oriental prelates are extant only in the Latin form and may have been drawn up under missionary direction, they may not represent the real views of the signers. See also Altaner, "Sprachkenntnisse und Dolmetscherwesen im missionarischen und diplomatischen Verkehr zwischen Abendland (päpstliche Kurie) und Orient im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, LV (1936), 83-126.

tions with Rome. Thus the Genoese obtained from the Mongol authorities the right to establish a colony at Kaffa. Their rivals, the Venetians, at first excluded, came on the scene somewhat later with a consul at Soldaia, and the Pisans began to exploit the Azov region.

Meanwhile the Byzantine emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus and his son Andronicus, while attempting to maintain correct relations with Rome after accepting a formula of reunion at the Council of Lyons in 1274, but menaced from the west by Charles of Anjou and from the north by the Bulgars, were disposed to remain on terms of virtual alliance with the Kipchak khanate. In such a situation, and especially in view of the growing predominance of Islam in the entire region, missions depended on a policy of toleration dictated by a diplomacy which could easily change. Nevertheless, it was in this area that both mendicant orders established missionary organizations and bases which were also important to their work farther east and south.

In the thirteenth century the Franciscans took the lead. The minister-general Bonagratia (1279-1283) was especially active in promoting missions and dispatching friars to what chroniclers began to call the vicariate of the north (*vicaria aquilonis*). A somewhat overly optimistic report of friar Ladislav (1287), *custos* of Gazaria (the Crimea), indicates that within the vicariate of the north there were two *custodiae*, one in the Crimea with its principal center at Kaffa, the other centering at Sarai (old Sarai on the Akhtuba), the Kipchak capital.⁴⁰

Meanwhile the Dominicans were also entering this area. The preaching friars had been in Constantinople during the thirteenth century, but with the Byzantine recovery in 1261 and the Venetian sack of Pera in 1296 their residences had been lost. In the last years of the thirteenth century, however, new convents were established at Pera and at Kaffa. The missionaries who set out from these stations to more distant residences came to be known as *peregrinantes*, religious outside the established convents. It was evidently to regularize their position and to maintain discipline that the Dominican authorities between 1300 and 1304 appointed a vicar, probably Franco of Perugia, over the friars in the Black Sea region. This proved to be the first move in the formation of a new missionary organization, the *Societas fratrum peregrinantium propter Christum*, which was to play a major mission role during the fourteenth century.

Equally significant for the missionary effort farther south was the halting of the Mongol southwestward advance by the Moslems of

40. BOF, II, 266, 443. On the origin of the Franciscan vicariates see van der Vat, *Die Anfänge*, pp. 131 ff.

Egypt. After encompassing the fall of the Baghdad caliphate in 1258, the Mongols were stopped at 'Ain Jālūt in Syria (1260). Thereafter, a resurgent Islam, led by the Egyptian Mamluks, increased the danger to the kingdom of Cilician Armenia and the crusader states. The new balance of power did, however, offer certain advantages. The il-khanate of Persia, also menaced from Egypt and insecure in its relations with other Mongol khanates, was disposed to solicit western aid. As the situation in the Latin Levant steadily worsened the attitude of Rome and the Latin Christians, previously hostile to the Mongols, underwent a change. Beginning around 1264, when the curia was informed that the il-khan Hulagu was disposed to become a Christian, there was considerable diplomatic activity designed to establish some sort of Christian-Mongol coöperation against Islam.⁴¹

Commercial relations also improved during this period. Italians maintained stations in several places within the il-khanate as well as farther north. Tabriz, the Mongol capital, was an important depot. Trebizond on the Black Sea prospered as a port of entry, especially after the loss of the crusader states in 1291. The Genoese were established in Sivas on the routes which linked Persia with the Black Sea and the Mediterranean. As in other areas, the presence of western Christians was often the initial reason for the establishment by the friars of a station which might also serve the missions.

Late thirteenth-century Franciscan lists of stations mention Tabriz, "Salamastrum" (Salmas), Sivas, and Arzena (Erzinjan).⁴² At Tabriz the friars maintained a second station at the principal church in the city, which they served alternately with the Dominicans. Within this territory, which was included in the Franciscan vicariate of the east, the Minorites continued, at least occasionally, their efforts to convert Moslems. Two friars were martyred in Persia about 1284, and other martyrdoms were reported early in the fourteenth century. But to judge from subsequent developments native Christians were the principal objects of missionary attention.

Dominicans were also moving into Persia in the later years of the thirteenth century. Ricoldo of Monte Croce, whose contacts with the Moslems have already been described, was equally active among ori-

41. Richard, "Le Début des relations entre la papauté et les Mongoles de Perse," *Journal asiatique*, CCXXXVII (1949), 291-297, in discussing the papal reply to Hulagu, formerly dated 1260 (Alexander IV), places this shortly before October 2, 1264, the death of Urban IV. The change in attitude may, therefore, be placed at this time. For further discussion on this and the contrast in papal policy as recently as 1260 see the same author's "The Mongols and the Franks," *Journal of Asian History*, III (1969), 55 ff.

42. *BOF*, II, 265.

ental Christians.⁴³ At Tabriz, it will be recalled, he preached first through an interpreter. But in Mosul he preached openly in Arabic to the Jacobite clergy and people. At the convent of St. Matthew outside Mosul, the seat of the Jacobite maphrian, he held public conversations and the maphrian Gregory III was one of the converts. Later, at Tikrit, he received a profession of faith from an archbishop and a number of formerly Monothelite Maronites. In the account of his travels Ricoldo also mentions meeting other Dominican friars whom he found residing at Sivas and Maragha. Finally, he recalls the warm welcome he received from his confreres at Baghdad, where he first heard the news of the disasters of 1291.

At Baghdad Ricoldo was at first cordially treated by the Nestorians. Then when he attacked their beliefs he was driven from the church they had granted him. The catholicus Mār Yabhalāhā III, who had been sent a profession of faith in 1288 by pope Nicholas IV, intervened and directed, against the will of many of his clergy, that Ricoldo be allowed to preach freely. He also received the friar at his pontifical throne. Apparently many converts were made.

Mār Yabhalāhā III had been involved in one of the most important missions sent to the west by the Mongol government of Persia. In 1287-1288 his chief deputy, Rabban (Mār) Şaumā, a remarkable Nestorian bishop of Uighur parentage and a native of Peking (Khanbaliq), visited Rome and the west bearing letters from the patriarch and the il-khan Arghun.⁴⁴ When he and his associates arrived at Rome, probably in April 1287, pope Honorius IV had just died. During the ten-month interval before the election of a new pope the envoys traveled through Italy to the court of Philip IV at Paris, thence to an interview with Edward I of England in Gascony. Finally, on their return to Rome they presented to the newly elected Nicholas IV (1288-1292), the former Jerome Masci of Ascoli, minister-general of the Franciscans, the gifts and letters of Arghun.

The cordial, even enthusiastic welcome everywhere accorded the en-

43. For the literature on Ricoldo see above, note 13. On the Dominican residences see Loenertz, *Frères pèlerinants*, pp. 152-153, 160-161.

44. Chabot, *Histoire de Mar Jabalaha III et du moine Rabban Şauma* (Paris, 1895), also in *ROL*, I (1893), 567-610; II (1894), 73-142, 235-304, 630-638, 641-643; James A. Montgomery, *The History of Yaballaha III, Nestorian Patriarch* (New York, 1927); Moule, *Christians in China*, ch. iv; E. A. Wallis Budge, ed. and tr., *The Monks of Küblai Khān, Emperor of China* (London, 1928); Richard, "La Mission en Europe de Rabban Şauma et l'union des églises," *Oriente ed Occidente nel medio evo* (Accademia dei Lincei, XIIo Convegno Volta; Rome, 1957), pp. 162-167; Franz Altheim and Ruth Stiehl, "Rabban Sauma's Reise nach dem Westen, 1287-1288," *Geschichte der Hunnen*, vol. III (Berlin, 1961), 190-217; *BOF*, II, 433-437; Soranzo, *Il Papato*, pp. 260 ff.

voys seemed evidence that a formidable crusade was to be launched. Such, of course, was not to be the case, even though the pope, despite involvement in Italian and Sicilian diplomatic problems, attempted to organize military assistance to the beleaguered east both before and after the fall of Acre in 1291.

More relevant to the progress of missions are the religious discussions with Rabban Şaumā at the curia. Possibly owing to mistakes made by inept interpreters, Nicholas IV and the cardinals apparently either misunderstood or overlooked the envoy's Nestorianism and confused his faith with that of the Greek schismatics. At any rate he was questioned about the procession of the Holy Spirit. He received communion at the hands of the pope and among the letters entrusted to him on his return was one to Mār Yabhalāhā which exhorted him to persevere and which contained the profession mentioned above, identical to that sent by Clement IV to Michael Palaeologus in 1267. To Arghun the pope wrote expressing his gratitude for his favors and protection to Christians. But he rejected the idea that the khan, who had apparently expressed a desire to become a Christian, should await the capture of Jerusalem before receiving the sacrament of baptism. The papal letters to the queen-mother Maria (Palaeologina, called Despoina Mugulion) and other Mongol dignitaries also remained on the same purely religious plane.⁴⁵

Other letters consigned to Rabban Şaumā on his return journey give the same impression. These included a communication to nine Latin Christian interpreters of the Mongol ruler praising their zeal and urging them to aid even more the work of the missionaries. Since their names all appear to be Italian, it is probable that they were resident merchants who had perhaps offered their services. A letter to all the Franciscan friars confirming and enlarging their faculties for the missionary apostolate was also included, as was also a gracious letter to the Jacobite bishop Dionysius of Tabriz, who had apparently been won over by the Minorites. He was sent a profession of faith and urged to further the work of the missionaries.

In the following summer (1289) another important batch of letters was entrusted to the Franciscan John of Monte Corvino.⁴⁶ John, who

45. For a discussion of Nicholas IV's correspondence and his religious and diplomatic aims, including citations from his principal letters, see Soranzo, *Il Papato*, pp. 266 ff.; *BOF*, II, 437-442. For a summary of thirteenth-century papal mission policy with special emphasis on Nicholas IV see Mann, *The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages*, XVII, 14-141. According to the *History of Yaballaha*, p. 72, Yabhalāhā was given patriarchal authority over all oriental Christians and Rabban Şaumā power of visitation. No such concessions appear in papal documents. Cf. Soranzo, *Il Papato*, pp. 265-266.

46. *BOF*, II, 440-442; Soranzo, *Il Papato*, pp. 273 ff. How many of these letters were de-

was to become perhaps the most celebrated of medieval missionaries to the east, was already a friar of considerable oriental experience and something of a linguist. He had been in Persia and had brought to the pope letters from Arghun and from Heṭoum II of Armenia, whose envoy he was. Cilician Armenia was then hard pressed by the Egyptian advance northward. Moreover, Heṭoum was personally well disposed toward the western church. What is important here is that Nicholas IV was evidently much impressed by friar John's reports and disposed to place considerable confidence in his experience.

Among the persons to whom John was directly to carry papal letters were Arghun, king Heṭoum II of Armenia, and various dignitaries, lay and ecclesiastical, including a number of distinguished Jacobite, Nestorian, Armenian, and Georgian prelates whose "good works" he had reported and who were urged either to profess or to continue in conformity with the faith of the Roman church. Finally, John was given missionary commissions well beyond the area of the Persian khanate. He was directed to send a communication to the emperor (Solomon I, 1285–1294), archbishops, bishops, and people of Ethiopia bespeaking observance of Catholic teaching, and to khan Kaidu of Turkestan urging his conversion and requesting liberty for missionaries. Then John was to continue on to the court of the great khan Kubilai at Khanbaliq.

While these communications show Nicholas's energy in promoting missions, it also seems clear that hopes for coöperation against Islam were not far from his mind and reflect the attitude of many in the curia. Moreover, in August 1290 and again a year later, following receipt of news of the fall of Acre, the pope addressed a large number of letters to eastern rulers and prelates. Many of these were religious in content and urged perseverance in the faith or, as in the case of the letter to Arghun's third son, who had been baptized and taken the name of Nicholas, included a profession of faith. Yet to Arghun the pope addressed two letters, one religious in character, the other political, as though the two subjects, being of a different order of importance, were to be treated separately.⁴⁷

Nicholas IV's pontificate was critical in the history of papal dealings with the Orient, much as that of Innocent IV had been. Though

livered is not known. Since John traveled to India and China by sea, he could not have delivered the letter to khan Kaidu of Turkestan personally. Presumably he also forwarded the letter intended for Ethiopia.

47. Ernest Langlois, ed., *Les Registres de Nicolas IV* (2 vols., Paris, 1886–1905), pp. 894–895 (no. 6722), 904 (no. 6814); *BOF*, II, 473 ff., where Golubovich points out that the envoys could have learned of Arghun's death (July 22, 1291) at Trebizond or Constantinople, but would nevertheless have fulfilled their mission. Cf. also Soranzo, *Il Papato*, pp. 290–291.

missions were inevitably involved with diplomacy both before and after the events of 1291, the pope, a former Franciscan minister-general, tried to keep the two distinct, and it is possible to discern the greater emphasis on religious matters. Most of the pope's letters, it is true, were sent to lay or ecclesiastical dignitaries, for Rome still attached great importance to the conversion of such persons. But such a tactic did not exclude missions to peoples. Nicholas issued mission bulls, sent out friars, solicited from rulers protection for missionaries, and called for reports of the entire eastern situation.

Nicholas's hopes were not to be fulfilled. Arghun died in March 1291 without having formally embraced the Christian faith, and no coalition against Egypt materialized. In fact Ghazan, who came to the throne of the il-khanate in 1295, renounced the religious policies of earlier Mongol rulers and became a Moslem. Nicholas himself died in April 1292. A two-year interregnum was followed first by the pontificate of Celestine V and then by that of Boniface VIII and by continuing European diplomatic crises. In the east the Egyptian advance which overran the crusader states subjected Cilician Armenia to repeated marauding and threatened its very existence. A number of residences maintained by the friars were destroyed or abandoned, and an entirely new orientation had to be found in the succeeding decades. Oriental prelates who persevered in union with Rome did so increasingly at their peril. Mār Yabhalāhā, for example, remained well disposed toward the western church, and in 1304 the Dominican friar James of Arles translated and brought to Rome a second profession of faith from the patriarch which, it should be noted, clarified those points, particularly concerning the Virgin Mary as the mother of God, which had not been emphasized in the document originally sent in 1288. But it has also been noted that Mār Yabhalāhā's letter, though exclusively religious in content, was sent at a critical moment in east and west. Benedict XI had just succeeded Boniface VIII. Ghazan's successor was Arghun's third son, "Nicholas," now called Öljeitu, or Khodābanda Muḥammad, who had renounced his Christian religion and, it was feared, might be even less disposed than his predecessor to seek rapport with the west.⁴⁸

Mission methods and policies will be discussed more fully at the end of this chapter, but it may be well to summarize briefly what had been done during the thirteenth century.⁴⁹ Rome, much preoccu-

48. Soranzo, *Il Papato*, pp. 341-344; Chabot, *Histoire de Mar Jabalaha III*, pp. 250-256. In this case the original text in Turco-Uighur is extant. Moule, *Christians in China*, pp. 132-134, doubts Yabhalāhā's submission to Rome.

49. The most important recent work on this subject is Simonut, *Il Metodo*. An excellent

pied with European crises and deeply concerned with the protection of Christendom's frontiers, had given its sanction and support to an entirely new mission venture. Curial policy remained closely associated with diplomacy and the promotion of the crusade, but with the pontificate of Nicholas IV religious and political objectives tended to become more distinct. The curia had acquired considerable information about the Orient, but its knowledge of actual conditions still left much to be desired.

Organization of the mission effort was the responsibility of the two mendicant orders, and while the almost naive fervor of the early Franciscan days had not entirely disappeared, experience had pointed the way to somewhat more rational procedures. For example, Franciscan general chapters in 1263 and 1292 addressed themselves to the problem of recruiting. Evidently, therefore, the eastern missions were regarded as a responsibility of the entire order and not merely of the provinces immediately concerned. Toward the end of the century each order had laid the foundations for a mission organization: the Franciscan vicariate and the Dominican *Societas fratrum peregrinantium*.

Consideration had been given to the problem of missionary preparation. Later commentaries on the Franciscan rule add practical suggestions regarding training and conduct. No one was to be constrained to undertake a mission against his will nor was any friar to enter upon the task lightly or simply to escape discipline. Martyrdom was not to be sought for its own sake; indeed, under certain circumstances it was to be avoided. Significantly, too, in addition to Mos-

brief treatment is Mathias Braun, "Missionary Problems in the Thirteenth Century," *Catholic Historical Review*, XXV (1939-1940), 146-159. Particularly important are the many studies by Altaner; in addition to the references in his *Die Dominikanermissionen*, the following are the most important articles: "Sprachstudien und Sprachkenntnisse im Dienste der Mission des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts," *ZMR*, XXI (1931), 113-135; "Raymundus Lullus und der Sprachkanon des Konzils von Vienne (1312)," *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft*, LIII (1933), 190-219; "Die Durchführung des viennener Konzilbeschlusses über die Errichtung von Lehrstühlen für orientalische Sprachen," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, LII (1933), 226-236; "Die fremdsprachliche Ausbildung der Dominikanermissionäre während des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts," *ZMR*, XXIII (1933), 233-241; "Sprachkenntnisse und Dolmetscherwesen," pp. 83-126; "Zur Geschichte der antiislamischen Polemik während des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts," *Historisches Jahrbuch*, LIV (1936), 227-233; "Zur Geschichte des Unterrichts und der Wissenschaft in der spätmittelalterlichen Mission," *ZMR*, XXVI (1936), 165-171; "Zur Kenntnis der Arabischen im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, II (1937), 427-452.

See also Martin Grabmann, O.P., "Die Missionsidee bei den Dominikanertheologen des 13. Jahrhunderts," *ZMR*, I (1911), 137-146; Fritz Heintke, *Humbert von Romans* (Historische Studien, no. 122; Berlin, 1933); Throop, *Criticism of the Crusade* (Amsterdam, 1940); Cahen, chapter XXI in volume II of the present work; van der Vat, *Die Anfänge*, pp. 11-17, 29-36, 206; de Sessevalle, *Histoire générale de l'ordre de Saint François*, II, 610-612; Monneret de Villard, *Lo Studio dell' Islam*, pp. 35-51; and Joshua Prawer, *Histoire du royaume latin de Jérusalem*, II (Paris, 1970), ch. III.

lems and infidels specifically mentioned in the rule, schismatics and heretics were also included. There is also greater emphasis on preaching and training for it. Indeed, in both orders the thirteenth-century missionary approach was the sermon. Doubtless intimate individual work followed, but the accent seems always to have been on public disputation.

Among Dominican writers Humbert of Romans and Ricoldo of Monte Croce stand out, and both urged a tolerant and flexible attitude toward eastern ecclesiastical usages. Ricoldo, of course, spoke from personal experience. In dealing with oriental Christians, he maintained, the missionary should distinguish the fundamental matters of faith from those of ecclesiastical discipline or liturgy. He should be conversant with the culture and speech of the country. A solid knowledge of scripture was indispensable, and in discussion the missionary should commence with the less complicated problems. Above all, he should avoid overbearing and impolite behavior and always strive to conduct himself humbly and respectfully. Like most men of his day Ricoldo felt that it was important to win over the leaders of a given community first. Others would then be more likely to follow.

A conspicuous weakness in thirteenth-century missionary preparation was the absence of adequate language preparation. Successive Dominican masters-general attacked this problem, and their efforts were seconded by the acts of general and provincial chapters. But these efforts seem to have been largely designed to serve the area of Spain and North Africa, and linguistic preparation directed specifically toward the east is less easily traced. Humbert of Romans in a circular letter of 1256 urged the study of Arabic, Hebrew, Greek and the language of the "barbarians," and directed that instruction be provided by convents in the east. Nothing, however, is known of the results. Information regarding similar action by the Franciscans is lacking, despite the fact that Roger Bacon, who spoke with William of Rubruck on his return from Asia, publicized the necessity for better language preparation.

The principal effort of Rome to promote language study came in 1311 at the Council of Vienne and was inspired by the Franciscan tertiary Raymond Lull. Lull, who met his death while preaching to Moors in North Africa (1315/6) spent most of his life promoting missions. He learned Arabic and in his voluminous writings repeatedly harped on the importance of training not only in that language but also in other oriental languages. He understood the diplomatic significance of the Mongol conquests and the importance of knowing their speech and also the languages spoken by the separated Christians within their

domains. His efforts to enlist the support of the curia were rewarded when the Council of Vienne in Canon 11 decreed the establishment of schools for the teaching of Arabic, Hebrew, Syriac, and Greek at the curia and at the universities of Bologna, Paris, Oxford, and Salamanca.

This ambitious program was not, however, destined to be realized, and scattered references indicate language teachers only temporarily at Paris. It would seem, therefore, that the medieval academic community — not unlike its twentieth century counterpart — was interested in procuring translations of essential scientific and philosophical material, not in oriental languages as a means of communication. Presumably, therefore, those friars who mastered oriental speech did so in the mission field, and there is at least one record of formal training in the Orient. The report of the Dominican provincial of the Holy Land, friar Philip, in 1237, which was mentioned above, states that four friars had been sent to Armenia to study the language. More important, Philip indicates that he had directed that native languages be studied in each convent. No further reference to any such schools can be found and apparently only a few friars became adept.

Popes were also aware of the advisability of training a native clergy. This appears to have been the purpose of Innocent IV's attempt to establish an oriental study center at Paris. References from the chancery of Alexander IV and Honorius IV indicate its continued existence for a time, but give no further details.

In an age still convinced of the necessity for the crusade it is significant that some ecclesiastical writers were becoming more aware of the antithesis between war and peaceful persuasion. The Franciscan Adam Marsh, in a memorandum to the pope (about 1250), while not repudiating the crusade, urged most eloquently the promotion of propaganda by preaching. As we have seen, the Dominican William of Tripoli pleaded for a contact "without arms." Thirteenth-century theology would have condemned attempts to convert unbelievers by force, force being justified only to avert danger to the Christian faith. But there is no evidence of any tendency toward the modern concept of the "salus infidelium."

Despite all these shortcomings and the frustrations and disappointments it would be incorrect to characterize thirteenth-century missions as a failure. If nothing else, a great deal of experience had been gained which was of incalculable importance to any future planning. Above all, the vast size of the world and the relative insignificance of the Christian population as compared with the adherents of other faiths was beginning to dawn on the consciousness of western Christendom.

B. Missions in the Fourteenth Century

NEW ORGANIZATION

The pontificate of Clement V and the subsequent papal residence at Avignon did not materially change the diplomacy of the Holy See with regard to the Orient. Clement and his successors were as eager to promote new expeditions to recover the Holy Land as their predecessors and they were aware of the precarious position of the kingdom of Cilician Armenia. European politics precluded any major crusade effort, however, especially when the outbreak of the Hundred Years' War removed the possibility of French or English participation. Finally, whatever hopes remained were dashed by the ravages of the Black Death in the middle of the century.

The various Mongol khanates, particularly after the death of Kubilai Khan (1294), generally pursued diverse and often opposing diplomatic policies.⁵⁰ The Persian il-khanate, though its rulers were Moslem, was still concerned about the power of Egypt and continued for a time to seek accord with the papacy and the west. But when it became evident that no western military expedition was to be expected, the rulers, beginning with Abū Saʿīd (d. 1335), perforce turned to a *modus vivendi* with Egypt. The death of Abū Saʿīd was followed by the political disintegration of both Persia and formerly Selchūkid Anatolia. Cilician Armenia continued to be a prey to Egyptian attacks and was finally overrun in 1375.

Fourteenth-century missions in the Kipchak khanate were, as in earlier years, dependent partly on the goodwill of the Mongol rulers and partly on the assistance of Italian merchants. A few Tatar princes and princesses were Christian, but the khans themselves remained cold to papal entreaties. For as Islam gained ground in the Kipchak khanate and in Central Asia Moslem influence at the court increased. Some, it is true, have held that Toktai (1291-1312) became a Christian, but this remains doubtful. Certainly he was outraged by the slave trade, which victimized Tatars among others; he expelled the Genoese from Sarai in 1307 and took over Kaffa in the following year.

50. For the politics of the Near East in this period see Mustafa M. Ziada, "The Mamluk Sultans, 1291-1517," volume III of the present work, chapter XIV, Sinor, *ibid.*, chapter XV, and Soranzo, *Il Papato*, chaps. XII, XIII.

Uzbek (1312–1342), his successor, permitted the restoration of the Genoese colony in Kaffa. Though Moslem influence remained strong and relations with Egypt close, Uzbek seems to have limited his opposition to Christians to forbidding them to ring their church bells. Moreover, he maintained a cordial correspondence with both John XXII and Benedict XII.

Under Janibeg (1342–1356) sporadic violence again endangered Christian settlements. But, following an accord with Venice which assured the independence of their colony at Tana from the control of Genoa, Janibeg too returned, doubtless for political and economic reasons, to a general policy of toleration.

The presence and support of Italian merchants remained essential to the friars. But they could also be a hindrance and embarrassment. The Dominican William Adam, among others, scathingly denounced the Genoese slave traffic, although he was careful to point out that many opposed it. All in all, no less than in the thirteenth century, missions were beset with persistent difficulties.

The missionary organizations which the mendicant orders launched in the later years of the thirteenth century were carried further in the early years of the fourteenth. The Franciscan vicariate of the north included, it will be recalled, two *custodiae*, Gazaria (the Crimea) and Sarai. An important document dating probably somewhat before 1318, the *De locis fratrum minorum et predicatorum in Tartaria*, lists the stations maintained by the friars around that date.⁵¹ In addition to a large establishment at Sarai, the capital of the Kipchak khanate, there were two convents at Kaffa and fourteen other residences of which Soldaia, Cembalo (Balaclava), Tana (Azov), and Kherson were probably convents, the rest smaller stations. Most of these, it will be observed, were in the Black Sea region, an important area of Italian trade.

The Franciscan vicariate of the east by the early fourteenth century was divided into three *custodiae*; Trebizond, comprising all but the extreme western part of Anatolia; Tabriz, which included greater Armenia, Azerbaijan, southern Georgia, and Mesopotamia; and Constantinople, which included western Anatolia. Despite losses, by around 1318 the number of stations had grown to eleven. Not all were of equal importance, but at least Constantinople, Trebizond, and Tabriz supported convents.⁵²

While the Franciscans were establishing the vicariate as a basis for

51. Golubovich (*BOF*, II, 72) dates the *De locis* around 1320. Loenertz (*Frères pèlerins*, p. 3, and *AFP*, II [1932], 72–74) dates it sometime before 1318.

52. Golubovich (*BOF*, II, 265 ff.) designates practically all mission stations as convents. De Sessevalle, *Histoire générale de l'ordre de Saint François*, II, 527–528, follows Golubovich.

missionary organization, the Dominicans were developing their own characteristic missionary society. In the first years of the fourteenth century, as has been noted, the *peregrinantes*, or friars not connected with regular convents, were placed under the obedience of a vicar, Franco of Perugia. By the year 1312 the term *fratres peregrinantes inter gentes* was used.

Since this new congregation, the *Societas fratrum peregrinantium propter Christum* as it came to be called, had no geographical unity, it was not organized into a province. It was, in fact, a "society," a word whose meaning excluded territorial limitations. Although it did possess the right to bestow the habit if vocations were forthcoming, it was, like its missionary predecessor the province of the Holy Land, composed largely of religious from other provinces. Gradually the office of vicar-general developed from a simple delegation of authority by the master-general into a position of considerable importance resembling that of a provincial.⁵³ The society flourished in the first half of the fourteenth century, but suffered grievously as a consequence of the Black Death. In 1363 the convents of Pera, Kaffa, and Trebizond were incorporated into the province of Greece. The society, restored in 1375, was suppressed after the capture of Constantinople in 1453 and again restored in 1464.

The missionary jurisdiction of the *fratres peregrinantes* included parts of Greece, Egypt, and Nubia, and all Asia except Palestine, Syria, and Cilician Armenia. This vast area was divided into sections

The *De locis* uses the terms "monasteria immobilia" or "loca," as do most of the Franciscan documents. Cf., e.g., *BOF*, I, 301-355, II, 265 ff. It seems advisable to designate as convents only those stations where there is record of a "guardian" (*custos*) or where there is evidence of a considerable number of friars. For the vicariate of the east only Trebizond and Tabriz, the residences of the *custodes*, satisfy these requirements. Golubovich (*BOF*, II, 131, 568; III, 437) repeatedly refers to two convents at Tabriz, but since the second station, or at least its church, was served alternately by Franciscans and Dominicans, and since the latter claimed no convent at Tabriz, it seems unlikely that there were two "large convents" of Minorites there. Presumably most of the other stations were occupied by only a few friars, although comparable evidence is lacking. They were Sultaniyeh, Salamastrum (Salmas), Karachisia (Karakilissa) between Erzerum and Mt. Ararat, Erzerum, and Tiflis, all in the *custodia* of Tabriz. Porsico, Summisso (Samsun), and Carpi (Kerpe), on the southern shore of the Black Sea, were in the *custodia* of Trebizond. Loenertz, *Frères pègrinants*, pp. 189-190, notes 46-50, places both Carpi and Porsico (identified with Pisanith) in the region of Erzerum and Tiflis, but identifies Karachisia with the Armenian monastery of St. Thaddeus of Karakilissa or Sisian, not with Karaköse in the province of Erzerum.

53. The standard work on the *Societas fratrum peregrinantium* is Loenertz, *La Société des Frères pègrinants*. See also Altaner, "Zur Geschichte der Societas fratrum peregrinantium propter Christum," *ZMR*, XII (1922), 116-118. Loenertz has pointed out that the society included principally Italians, a number of French, a few English, and occasional Spanish, German, Hungarian, and Polish friars. Novices from mission territory included Latins from the Orient, Greeks, and Armenians.

(*contratae*) which may conveniently be called "missions." The principal missions were Greece (Romania), the Black Sea region (Gazaria or Tartaria aquilonaris), and the territories of greater Armenia, Georgia, and Persia (Tartaria orientalis). Within these areas were two kinds of establishment, the convent and the more modest residence.

In the Black Sea region the *De locis* lists two Dominican residences, Kaffa and Tana, and three in "Tartaria orientalis," Tabriz, Maragha, and Dekharegan. Apparently a convent was also founded at Trebizond not long after 1315. In addition, the report of the Franciscan bishop of Kaffa, Jerome Catalani, in 1323, and the presence of Dominican bishops later would seem to indicate the possibility of perhaps temporary Dominican stations in Vosporo (Kerch), Kherson, Soldaia, Cembalo, and Sebastopolis. Tana, it seems, was abandoned in 1343.⁵⁴

The next step in the organization of missionary activity in the early fourteenth century was taken by the papal curia when the suggestion made by mid-thirteenth-century missionaries that missionary bishops be provided was finally carried out. The immediate cause of this important move was the receipt of letters from the Franciscan John of Monte Corvino, perhaps the most celebrated of all medieval missionaries. It will be recalled that among the letters which Nicholas IV entrusted to friar John in 1289 was one addressed to the great khan Kubilai.

Doubtless the pope, as had his predecessors, sought contact with the chief Mongol ruler for the usual diplomatic reasons. But this, the most distant of medieval missions, was the least involved with diplomacy. In fact, the domains of the great khan contained at that time considerable numbers of Christians. Most of the Turkic peoples who had inhabited the border lands of the Chinese kingdom and who had in large numbers moved west with the Mongol conquests were Nestorians, as were many non-Chinese inhabitants of large cities. In addition, a large body of Greek Orthodox Alans from the Black Sea region had been brought to China by the Mongol conquerors.

Before he left Tabriz in 1291, friar John had already had considerable experience as a missionary and ambassador. He was familiar with Armenian and Persian and, either then or soon thereafter, learned the speech, probably Uighur Turkish, common in Tartary. Accompanied by a Dominican friar, Nicholas of Pistoia, and Peter Lucalongo, an Italian merchant, he took the sea journey to India, where Nicholas died and where John remained a year preaching and baptizing

54. For the statement of Jerome Catalani see *BOF*, III, 48 ff.

some hundred converts. Sometime in 1294 John reached Khanbaliq and was courteously received by Kubilai's successor, Temür Öljeitu (Ch'êng Tsung).⁵⁵

The full story of John of Monte Corvino's extraordinary mission lies beyond the scope of this chapter. What does concern us is the impact on papal mission policy. In 1305 and 1306 John was able to dispatch two letters to the west. The first, dated January 8, 1305, was entrusted to Venetian merchants who handed it on, along with a tablet from the great khan, to a Dominican missionary. He, in turn, gave it to some Dominican and Franciscan friars farther west and added the interesting information that a number of Dominicans, acquainted with the Mongol speech, had set out for China, but were forced to turn back after reaching the Crimea. The second letter, dated February 13, 1306, was brought to the curia, then at Poitiers, in the early summer of 1307 by Thomas of Tolentino, a Franciscan missionary in Tartary. It was addressed, moreover, to the vicars-general and friars of both mendicant orders then in Persia. Apparently friar John, who had originally set out with a Dominican friar, hoped for a collaboration of the two orders in the Asia mission. Together, the letters constitute one of the most remarkable of missionary reports and it is not difficult to understand why they made such a profound impression on the curia and the pope.⁵⁶

Clement V, despite poor health and persistent difficulties with king Philip IV, did not neglect the east. Naturally overjoyed by friar John's communications, he issued the bull of July 23, 1307, in which the intrepid missionary was named archbishop and primate of the church in Tartary and patriarch of the Orient with jurisdiction from the Pacific to the borders of eastern Europe.⁵⁷ Suffragan bishops chosen by the minister-general of the Franciscans were consecrated by the pope and instructed to consecrate John. These suffragans, it should be added, were not assigned sees by the pope; clearly the new metropolitan was to exercise his own judgement in this matter. The suffragans also car-

55. The sources for the China mission are listed above in the bibliographical note. See also van den Wyngaert, *Jean de Mont Corvin, O.F.M., premier évêque de Khanbaliq (1247-1328)* (Lille, 1924). Two studies which summarize present knowledge are Richard, "Essor et déclin de l'église catholique de Chine au XIVe siècle," *Bulletin de la Société des missions étrangères de Paris*, ser. 2, no. 134 (1960), 285-295, and Troll, "Die Chinamission im Mittelalter," with full bibliography of earlier works. See also the chapter by Fortunato Margiotti, "China 13-14 Jahrhundert," in *Historia missionum Fratrum Minorum: Asia-centro-orientalis* (Secretarius missionum, O.F.M.; I, 1967).

56. For the letters of John of Monte Corvino see Golubovich, *op. cit.*, III, 87-93. There is an English translation in Dawson, *Mission to Asia*, pp. 224-231. Loenertz, *Frères pèlerins*, pp. 183-184, emphasizes the role of the Dominicans.

57. *BOF*, III, 93-95.

ried letters to the great khan announcing Monte Corvino's promotion and bespeaking favors for Christians and missionaries.

Of the seven bishops named only three survived the dangers and hardships of the long journey. With a number of other friars they arrived in Khanbaliq, probably sometime in 1308, and there consecrated John archbishop. Two of them, Andrew of Perugia and Peregrine of Castello, were retained at the capital while other friars were sent to found new missions elsewhere. Later reports would indicate that these were at Yangiu (Yangchow), Quinsai (Hangchow), and possibly Nanking. Bishop Gerard Albuini took up residence at Zaitun (Chüanchow, Tsinkiang) where a wealthy Armenian woman built what became the cathedral church. Thus Zaitun, one of the great ports of the Far East, became the second see of China. In 1311 Clement V named three more suffragans for the China mission, doubtless to replace those who had died, but only one, Peter of Florence, actually completed the journey.

A further step in the formation of an oriental hierarchy was taken by John XXII in April 1318 when he withdrew a large section from the original Franciscan province of Khanbaliq and created for the Dominicans a second Asiatic province with its archiepiscopal seat at Sultaniyeh (Kangurlan) in Persia, then the residence of the il-khan Abū-Sa'īd. The pope was probably influenced by the Dominican William Adam, a celebrated and much-traveled missionary, who had been in Persia in the years preceding and who was then at Avignon, where he composed his crusade treatise, *De modo Saracenis extirpandi*.⁵⁸

Since Franciscans not unnaturally protested the proposed infringement on their original jurisdiction, the boundaries between the two were the result of an agreement between the two orders. It is likely that the Franciscan Jerome Catalani, a distinguished missionary, one of the suffragans named in 1311, and in February 1318 named bishop of Kaffa, was active in the negotiations. At any rate, he was present at Avignon in 1318.

Thus it seems clear that the pope's move was, at least in part, a consequence of rivalries between the two orders and that he was seeking to rectify the imbalance in oriental missions by bringing the Dominicans more prominently into the picture. Most rivalries resulted

58. *Ibid.*, III, 197-207; Soranzo, *Il Papato*, pp. 514-521; Loenertz, *Frères pèlerinants*, pp. 137-140. A second bull of May 1 assigned suffragans, and a third of August 8 conferred the pallium on Franco of Perugia. On William Adam see Charles Kohler in *RHC, Arm.*, II, introduction; "Documents relatifs à Guillaume Adam, archevêque de Sultanieh, puis d'Antivari, et son entourage, 1318-46," *ROL*, X, (1903-1904), 38-48; and Henri A. Omont, "Guillaume Adam, missionnaire," *Histoire littéraire de la France*, XXV (1921), 277-283.

from a rather natural desire of one order to maintain exclusive operations in a given area. But in the early and middle years of the fourteenth century they were accentuated by the fact that among the Franciscan missionaries were a number of adherents of a controversial doctrine concerning the poverty of Jesus and his apostles which John XXII condemned in 1323.

It is difficult to determine precisely the dividing line between the two provinces. It may have run along the northern and eastern shores of the Black Sea to a point not far from the Crimea, or have passed south of the coast to Mount Ararat. Thence it extended east to the Caspian coast and followed the line of demarcation between the Kipchak khanate and the Mongol domains east of the Caspian. Owing to the difficulty of determining the exact boundaries of the central Asiatic kingdoms of "Doha and Chaydo" mentioned in the bull, the eastern limits of the province of Sultaniyeh are not clear. But apparently the northern jurisdiction consigned to the Franciscans included the Kipchak khanate, the eastern part of the Central Asiatic khanate of Chagatai, and the eastern empire of the great khan. The Dominican jurisdiction comprised Anatolia, the Persian khanate, including Tiflis in Georgia, and Transoxiana with the diocese of Samarkand, India, and "Ethiopia."⁵⁹

The curia was also at some pains to regularize the relations between the missionary bishops of the new dioceses and the superiors of their respective orders. The friars, or their native affiliates, were normally the clergy of the missionary dioceses, and each order had stations in the province of the other. Accordingly, while it was provided that the province of Khanbaliq should in general be the responsibility of the Franciscans and Sultaniyeh that of the Dominicans, it was also stipulated that the archbishops and their successors should obey their

59. According to Soranzo, *Il Papato*, p. 515, note 1, the "Mons Barrius" mentioned in the bull was probably somewhere in the western chain of the Caucasus near the Black Sea and was not Mt. Ararat, as Golubovich and others have suggested. This would explain the inclusion of Sebastopolis on the eastern shore of the Black Sea in the province of Sultaniyeh, as well as all (not part) of Anatolia. The problem of the northeastern boundary of the province of Sultaniyeh is complicated by the fact that the kingdoms of "Chaydo and Doha" have been identified (e.g., by William Adam) as equivalent to the *medium imperium*. Evidently, however, eastern Turkestan and the diocese of Almalyk were included in the province of Khanbaliq. Soranzo also maintains, against Golubovich, that the Ethiopia mentioned in the bull signified the kingdom in Africa, not lower India.

Loenertz, *Frères pègrinants*, pp. 137-140, follows Golubovich in placing the southern boundary of the Khanbaliq province south of the Black Sea shore and so drawn as to exclude Smyrna, Sivas, and Sebastopolis from the province of Sultaniyeh. It is worth noting that the see of Smyrna, then in Turkish hands, was transferred to Tiflis (Dominican) in 1329. It was revived after 1358 for the Franciscans. Cf. *BOF*, V, 70 ff.; de Sessevalle, *Histoire générale de l'ordre de Saint François*, II, 535-555; Troll, "Die Chinamission," pp. 34-36.

respective masters-general (or their vicars) as vicars of the Holy See in missionary areas; the power of removal, however, was specifically excluded. Further, suffragans were to be subject to their respective provincials saving the authority of the Holy See in all things. On the death of a provincial the Dominican (or Franciscan) prior was to administer the archdiocese, and the friars of the archiepiscopal see were to convoke the suffragans as electors.

Thus, although Franciscan suffragans who might be chosen in Dominican territory were to remain and be subject to the Dominican archbishop and vice versa, the masters-general of the two orders were given considerable authority. As in the case of Khanbaliq in 1307, the archbishop of Sultaniyeh might designate sees and provide them with incumbents.

The dioceses of the Orient bore only a slight resemblance to those of Europe. Bishops had no regular revenues from their sees and no cathedrals. Their pastorate consisted of the small commercial communities of Latin Christians, the resident friars, and converts, and strict adherence to the rule of residence was neither practicable nor desirable. Jurisdictional lines were not always observed, and as conditions changed new sees were instituted and old ones transferred or suppressed. In certain areas where considerable numbers of oriental Christians were brought into contact with the western church bishops were a necessity. It was the policy of the Holy See to reordain conditionally all formerly dissident clerics about whose ordinations there was any doubt.

In addition to providing missionary bishops the curia demonstrated its solicitude for the missions in other ways. Letters were sent frequently to Latin and uniate clergy and to oriental rulers, for the Avignon papacy attempted, insofar as it was possible, to impose on eastern clergies the same authority it was so efficiently implementing in the west. Papal correspondence reveals repeated efforts to enforce the Roman primacy of jurisdiction. Eastern liturgies were, it is true, not forbidden, but a Latinizing tendency persisted, for the papacy, fearful that doctrinal error might be associated with divergence of rite, held to the ideal of uniformity in all matters. Thus the impression was conveyed that oriental liturgies were tolerated only by papal concession. Such policies inevitably met resistance from eastern churches accustomed to a centuries-old tradition of autonomy, and could scarcely have reassured prospective converts.⁶⁰

All these procedures were especially evident during the pontificate

60. On the mission policies of the Avignon popes see Wilhelm de Vries, S.J., "Die Päpste

of John XXII (1316–1334). His mission bulls followed a form similar to those already described. Certain additional clauses reflect the controversy over poverty within the Franciscan order, others, particularly the reservation to Rome of absolution from the sin of shipping contraband to Moslems, his hopes, however vain, for the crusade. In the provision of prospective missionaries John urged the selection of well-trained experienced men, and he was concerned over their material support. In one or two instances he provided a subvention. Letters were written to oriental rulers and prelates bespeaking protection for missionaries, and under his auspices several departures took place. Certain letters, such as instructions given Dominican missionaries in 1333 concerning conditional rebaptism and reordination in cases of doubt, reveal that solicitude for uniformity so characteristic of the Avignon popes.⁶¹

John XXII stands out as a pope concerned over missions, but his predecessors had pointed the way and his successors continued his policies. Furthermore, what was done was accomplished in the face of mounting obstacles at home. The difficulties which had become apparent during the pontificate of John XXII grew worse. The war between France and England became a reality. The situation in the papal states and Italy remained unstable. The Black Death was a disaster which affected everybody, and, finally, the papal schism which began in 1378 enormously complicated all ecclesiastical activities.

MISSIONS IN THE PROVINCE OF KHANBALIQ

The Franciscan China mission continued well past the middle of the century and was in some respects the most flourishing of the medieval missions, perhaps embracing as many as 30,000 souls. Sometime around 1322 Odoric Mattiuzzi of Pordenone, one of the best-known Franciscan travelers, visited China after extensive journeys in Asia. He brought the remains of four Minorites martyred at Thana

von Avignon und der christliche Osten," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXX (1964), 85–128. See also Jules Gay, *Le Pape Clément VI et les affaires d'Orient (1342–52)* (Paris, 1904); Francesco Giunta, "Sulla Politica orientale di Clemente VI," *Studi di storia in onore de Roberto Cessi* (Rome, 1958), pp. 149–162; and "Sulla Politica orientale di Innocenzo VI," *Miscellanea in onore de Roberto Cessi* (Rome, 1958), I, 305–320.

61. For typical bulls of John XXII see *BOP*, II, 136–137, 153–155, 182–186; *BOF*, III, 214–218 (1321), 350–359 (1329), 404 ff. The instructions regarding conditional rebaptizing and reordaining were repeated by Urban V and Gregory XI; see de Vries, "Die Päpste von Avignon," p. 112; Soranzo, *Il Papato*, pp. 521–523.

in India to Zaitun where he deposited them in one of the two Franciscan residences he found there. Odoric also described the mission at Quinsai and added to our knowledge of the mission in the Mongol capital.⁶²

There are, however, a number of indications that after John of Monte Corvino's death (about 1328) regular communication between the China mission and the Holy See was not successfully maintained. There was, for example, considerable delay in naming John's successor. Not until 1333 was Nicholas of Botras, professor of theology at Paris, designated, and he appears not to have reached his post. In 1336 khan Toghan Temür sent an embassy, guided by a Genoese merchant, Andalo of Savignone, to Benedict XII urging more regular contacts and conveying a significant request from five Alan chieftains. These men asked for the pope's blessing and, recalling the ministrations of John of Monte Corvino, complained that they had been long without a shepherd. Apparently it was not known at Avignon that bishops Peter and Andrew, the last of the suffragans, had died. John de' Marignoli, a Franciscan who set out in 1339 as papal nuncio accompanied by some fifty friars, made an impressive appearance before the khan (1342), and remained four years, was sent back with a similar request. The khan asked that he or some higher representative of the pope, preferably a cardinal and a bishop, should return as soon as possible. Marignoli's account of his visit pictured an otherwise flourishing Christian community.⁶³

Although Marignoli's report prompted pope Innocent VI to urge renewed efforts on the Franciscans, there appears to have been little or no response. And, so far as is known, no episcopal nominees reached their posts in China. Meanwhile the Black Death had taken its toll of active and prospective missionaries, and the spread of Islam throughout the Near East and Central Asia added to the difficulties of communication. And when in 1368 the tolerant Mongol Yüan dynasty was replaced by the Mings the mission experienced added difficulties. No doubt, too, the popes' return to Rome from Avignon and the subsequent schism hampered papal initiative. It would seem, therefore, that the final decline can be attributed largely to the breakdown of regular contact combined with the failure of what had apparently

62. *BOF*, III, 375-393; de Sessevalle, *Histoire générale de l'ordre de Saint François*, II, 575-578.

63. *BOF*, IV, 257-309. On his return John de' Marignoli was designated bishop of Bisignano in Calabria (May 12, 1354) and consecrated later the same year. See Moule, *Christians in China*, pp. 196, 254; Robert S. Lopez, "European Merchants in the Medieval Indies," *Journal of Economic History*, III (1943), 181, and *idem*, "Nuovi luci sugli italiani in estremo Oriente prima di Colombo," *Studi Colombiani*, III (1951), 387, 397-398.

been the pope's plan for a relatively autonomous province capable of existing on its own resources.⁶⁴

John de' Marignoli's name is also associated with a kind of by-product of the China mission which lasted for a short time in the Central Asiatic khanate of Chagatai. As we have seen, Nicholas of Botras, named in 1333 to succeed John of Monte Corvino, apparently never reached Khanbaliq, but he did find a cordial reception at Almalyk in 1334. Some of the twenty-six friars who had accompanied him remained there with Richard of Burgundy as bishop. Two Christian courtiers of khan Buzan, probably Alans, donated a place in the city and built a church for one of the friars. Friar Francis of Alessandria, who had cured the khan of illness, became the tutor of his son, whom he later baptized. During a brief period of Moslem ascendancy the bishop, several friars, two lay brothers, a tertiary who acted as interpreter, and a Genoese merchant suffered martyrdom (1340). Among them was friar Paschal of Vittoria, a remarkable missionary who had come alone to Almalyk and had foreseen the danger consequent on the accession in 1338 of a new khan, Yosün Temür.

When John de' Marignoli stopped at Almalyk in the following year on the way to China, he was able to preach freely. In fact, he built a new church and baptized a number of converts. These conditions were, however, destined to be of short duration. The latest report from the region dates from 1362 when James of Florence, named bishop of Zaitun, was put to death by Saracens. Two other friars were imprisoned and starved by Nestorians. These events presumably took place in Almalyk.⁶⁵

What were the actual accomplishments of the Franciscan mission

64. The problem of a hierarchy is discussed by Richard, "Essor et déclin de l'église catholique de Chine au XIVe siècle." There were requests for the appointment of an archbishop, notably from the Alans. Nicholas of Botras, professor of theology at Paris, was designated in 1333 and apparently reached Almalyk in Central Asia. News of this had reached the curia by 1338, and one of the letters entrusted to John de' Marignoli was addressed to Nicholas as archbishop. Although there is no evidence that Nicholas reached Khanbaliq, the curia evidently so assumed. Marignoli, as indicated, returned with another request for an archbishop. Apparently the news of the fall of the Mongol dynasty had not reached Avignon by 1370, for in that year Urban V sent out friar William of Prato as archbishop (*BOF*, V, 149-154). De Sessevalle, *Histoire générale*, II, 645, maintains that Nicholas reached Khanbaliq and lived until 1369. Loenertz, *AFP*, II (1932), 50, notes that Dominicans were recommended to the emperor in 1333 along with archbishop Nicholas; the curia may have supposed that there were Dominicans in China. A letter of king John I of Aragon, dated 1391, mentions a Franciscan who had just returned from a mission of many years at the court of "Prester John" (*BOF*, V, 281). This might indicate that some Franciscans were still in the Far East, possibly in Tenduk. Cf. also Troll, "Die Chinamission," pp. 145-150.

65. *BOF*, IV, 248, 273, 297, 310; V, 92; V. Rondelez, "Un Évêché en Asie centrale au XIVe siècle," *Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft*, VI (1951), 1-17.

to the Far East? John of Monte Corvino mentions figures of around six thousand converts. The Alans were said to number fifteen thousand. Perhaps the total number reached thirty thousand. Apparently the friars were free to preach to anyone. Peregrine even mentions preaching in Moslem mosques and John de' Marignoli speaks of disputations with Jews and adherents of other faiths. There remains the difficult question whether many of the converts were Chinese. None of the missionaries mentions learning Chinese. In fact, Monte Corvino tells how he "had six pictures made of the Old and New Testaments for the instruction of the ignorant, and they have inscriptions in Latin, Turkish, and Persian." Of course, the friars may have used interpreters, and a Latin gravestone recently discovered at Yangchow shows unmistakable evidence of having been done by a Chinese artist. On the other hand the presence of numerous non-Chinese in the cities is well known. The Nestorian communities, for example, were probably largely non-Chinese. Moreover, after 1318 Monte Corvino devoted his labors to a church of the Armenian rite.

John did, however, report that he "had an adequate knowledge of the Tatar language and script," and in a temporarily successful mission established in the domains of the Ongut prince George of Tenduk along the frontier of the Chinese empire, he tells how he "had translated into that language and script the whole of the New Testament and the Psalter," and says that while the prince lived, "mass was celebrated . . . according to the Latin rite in their own script and language, both the words of the canon and the preface."⁶⁶

On the whole, therefore, it would seem correct to conclude that Chinese converts were few in number and that the medieval Chinese mission, oriental though it certainly was, ministered principally to foreigners living among the Chinese.

Meanwhile the Franciscans were continuing their work in the vicariate of the north, which lay largely within the domains of the khanate of the Kipchak Golden Horde. The episcopal sees of this area had formally been under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Khanbaliq, but the distances involved, combined with the fact that after

66. See especially Richard, "Essor et déclin," and Troll, "Die Chinamission," pp. 68-69. See also the discussion by Pasquale M. d'Elia in *Fonti Ricciane*, I, *Storia dell' introduzione del Cristianismo in Cina* (Rome, 1942), pp. lxxv ff. D'Elia accepts the view of Moule, *Christians in China*, p. 150, note 7, and "The Primitive Failure of Christianity in China," *International Review of Missions*, XX (1931), 459, that the bulk of the converts were non-Chinese. Van den Wyngaert, *Sinica franciscana*, I, ciii ff., contends, however, that the non-Nestorian converts were Chinese. The quotations are from the translation of John's letters in Dawson, *Mission to Asia*, pp. 227-228.

John of Monte Corvino's death no replacement seems to have reached the Mongol capital, meant that any effective direction was impossible.

The most important see of the Black Sea region was Kaffa, which, it will be recalled, had been established in February of 1318 by John XXII with the Franciscan Jerome Catalani named as the first incumbent. Since Kaffa was a center of Dominican as well as of Franciscan missions, there were occasional Dominican bishops. The same was true of other sees—Sebastopolis, Soldaia (Sudak), Tana (Azov), Cembalo (Balaclava), Surgat (Solgat), and a short-lived archdiocese of Vosporo (Kerch), with a suffragan see at Kherson.

Sarai, the Mongol capital and the seat of a bishop from around 1319, was raised to an archdiocese sometime after the middle of the century, and a papal document of 1363 mentions an archdiocese of Matrega with suffragan sees of Mappa (Anapa), Syba, and Lucuk. Apparently these archdioceses were also ephemeral and presumably reflect the practical acceptance of the nonexistence of any effective jurisdiction from Khanbaliq. They are also, however, evidence of Franciscan mission expansion north and east of the Black Sea.⁶⁷

The continued expansion of Franciscan missions is evident in other ways. Among the letters sent back to the authorities in the west two are especially significant: one addressed by friar Iohanca, a Hungarian, and his associates to Michael of Cesena, the Franciscan minister-general, and dated 1320 at Bashkir (Bascardia) in "greater Hungary," and the second sent from the friars at Kaffa to the general chapter of the order at Toulouse in 1323.⁶⁸ Both letters report considerable success in conversions and in ministering to the many Christian captives among the Tatars despite constant harassment by Moslems. In fact, they estimate that a large proportion (one-third to one-half) of the population was Christian. Each letter appeals urgently for more friars to assist in this important work and, since those who do not know the language give instruction through interpreters, it is suggested that English, German, or Hungarian friars be sent because they seem to learn the language of the area more easily than others.

Friar Iohanca reported that he had been at Bashkir for six years,

67. For the episcopal sees see *BOF*, III, 205; IV, 310; V, 40-47, 92-94, 109-110, 233. Aksarai (Zarew, New Sarai) was founded sometime around 1331 (*ibid.*, II, 541); according to Golubovich, this became the seat of the bishop, but the evidence does not seem clear (*ibid.*, II, 564; III, 205, 223-224; IV, 233, 252; V, 69, 92-94). In 1396 Surgat was raised to an archdiocese (*ibid.*, V, 314).

68. Michael Bihl, O.F.M. and A. C. Moule, eds., "Tria nova documenta de missionibus Fratrum Minorum Tartariae Aquilonaris annorum 1314-22," *AFP*, XVII (1924), 55-71; "De duabus epistolis Fratrum Minorum Tartariae Aquilonaris an. 1323," *ibid.*, XVI (1923), 89-112; Simonut, *Il Metodo*, pp. 120 ff., *passim*.

but he was constantly on the move following the camps of the Mongol armies. Friars in the convents in the towns could not leave to assist him without neglecting their own charges. Saracens, about whose doctrines he seems singularly well informed, strove to subvert the converts. When he tried to demonstrate the falsity of their beliefs "in every way possible," they threw him into prison and tortured him. Only their fear of the Mongol authorities prevented his death. While he was in Bashkir Iohanca received a request from Sibur (Siberia) for four Latin priests. A Ruthenian "schismatic," he tells us, had made many converts. Once again, the scarcity of missionaries available prevented any response to the request.

The friars at Kaffa described how they were able to redeem a number of captives with the alms given them and how they had trained some of the young boys to be friars. Since they were fluent in the native speech they could teach others and made excellent missionaries. Although the Kaffa letter refers to pope John XXII's having received joyfully some news of their work, there seems to have been no effective response from the west at that time. Perhaps the contentions within the Franciscan order were partly responsible for the failure, for it was in the same year 1323 that John XXII condemned the teachings of the Franciscan extremists.

Missions in the Kipchak khanate did, however, continue though with increasing difficulty after the death of Uzbek (1342). Friar Elias of Hungary seems to have been *persona grata* at Uzbek's court and useful as an envoy both to and from the curia. A letter of friar Paschal of Vittoria (1338) reports that Sarai had remained a center for language study, for he stopped there to study the *lingua Cumanica et lettera Vingurica*. Thence he traveled to Urgench, a remote Franciscan station south of the Aral Sea, and finally on to the Franciscan residence at Almalyk, where, as we have seen, he was martyred in the Moslem reaction of 1340. En route he had preached the Christian faith to Saracens and was severely maltreated as a consequence.⁶⁹

The Black Death took its toll of actual and prospective missionaries, but in later years the Minorites continued to push eastward and northward. Although the lists of stations for the years up to 1390 show some losses near the Black Sea, there were gains farther afield. Uzbek permitted an establishment in New Sarai (Aksarai), the new capital on the Akhtuba some miles south of the old. Apparently even after the Black Death reinforcements kept coming from Europe, though probably not in sufficient numbers. In 1370 Urban V sent a Fran-

69. On Paschal of Vittoria see *BOF*, III, 18; IV, 244 ff.

ciscan bishop and twenty-five friars to "Georgia and other parts." More friars were commissioned the following year after a visit to Avignon by Francis of Podio (Le Puy), the vicar of the north, and, along with Dominicans, again in 1375.

Some time before 1389 a diocese was established at Kumukh in the Caspian region, and in 1392 two Franciscans whom the northern vicar sent to Avignon for recruiting purposes spoke of the urgent need for more missionaries in this remote area. With what seems some exaggeration, readily understandable under the circumstances, they maintained that "more than ten thousand converts there . . . and many multitudes elsewhere" stood in dire need of priests to prevent them from falling back into schism or embracing Islam. A letter of Boniface IX which mentions the mission stations along or near the Caspian coast is additionally significant because it mentions a Franciscan *Societas peregrinantium*. This is one of the earliest references to the Franciscan counterpart of the Dominican *fratres peregrinantes*.⁷⁰

Dominican missions in the Black Sea region were, as has been pointed out, less extensive, and with the exception of Kaffa little is known about them. Franco of Perugia could preach in the Tatar language and translate documents. It will be recalled that the Dominican missionaries bound for China in 1308, but forced to remain in the Crimea, apparently knew the language. There are other such references, and in 1333 the Dominican general chapter at Dijon directed that a language school be set up in Kaffa.

Meanwhile Armenian communities in the Crimea and elsewhere were proving to be an important factor in the missions. Around 1335 a young Armenian named Nicholas was converted at Kaffa, journeyed to Florence, and returned as a Dominican missionary. The Armenian Dominican Thaddeus, who translated part of the Dominican breviary into Armenian, was Latin bishop of Kaffa from 1334 to about 1357. Especially after the middle of the fourteenth century, when western missions suffered irreparable losses as a consequence of the Black Death, Armenian communities remained important points of contact with western Christianity.

Another community with which the preaching friars seem to have made fruitful contacts was the Alan element in the city of Vosporo (Kerch). They were active there around 1333 when John XXII designated the city a metropolitan see.⁷¹

70. For the missions of the later years of the century see *BOF*, V, 144 ff., 149 ff., 159-160, 213, 301, 314, 320, 330-333, and II, 266, 272. For the Franciscan *Societas fratrum peregrinantium* see Autbert Groeteken, "Eine mittelalterliche Missionsgesellschaft," *ZMR*, II (1912), 1-13.

71. Loenertz, *Frères pègrinants*, pp. 89-134.

Evidence concerning the actual accomplishments of the missionaries is, as is so often the case, not clear. Papal letters and missionary reports indicating "numerous" or "thousands" of converts from "schismatics and unbelievers" reveal progress but little specific information. Presumably, separated Christians constituted the bulk of the conversions, though one or two reports specify Mongol magnates and their families. Presumably too, the peak of missionary achievement was reached by the mid-fourteenth century before the ravages of the plague. Certainly by the end of the century on the eve of the invasions of Timur (Tamerlane), the mission situation had deteriorated. By the early years of the fifteenth century the Franciscan vicariate of the north had shrunk to the *custodia* of the Crimea, then called the vicariate of the Crimea. Dominican missions in the Black Sea area were by that time largely the responsibility of the Armenian *fratres unitores*, an organization which had become an affiliate of the Dominican order.

MISSIONS IN THE PROVINCE OF SULTANIYEH

When John XXII created the province of Sultaniyeh for the preaching friars, he provided that six suffragan sees should be designated and their incumbents installed by the new metropolitan. Since both pastoral and missionary work was the responsibility of the *fratres peregrinantes*, it was appropriate that the first archbishop of Sultaniyeh was Franco of Perugia, vicar-general and one of the founders of the Dominican missionary organization. A month after the original bull six suffragans were named and duly established by Franco at Smyrna, Sivas, Sebastopolis, Tabriz, Dehkharegan, and Maragha.⁷²

The first three of these sees were situated at some distance north and west of the centers of Dominican activity in Azerbaijan, and they proved to be of short duration. Smyrna was taken by the Turks and no successor was named for William Adam when he was transferred to Sultaniyeh as Franco's successor in 1322. When the city was recovered in 1344 there began a new series of bishops, none of whom was a Dominican. Meanwhile in 1329 the pope had transferred the Dominican see to Tiflis; its designation as an episcopal see indicates at least the possibility of renewed mission activity in Georgia. The original Dominican residence there, abandoned toward the end of

72. *Ibid.*, pp. 137-141; Loenertz notes that three sees were outside the frontiers of the province. But see above, note 59, for a discussion of the boundaries between the two Asiatic provinces.

the thirteenth century, had been restored by the *peregrinantes*, but little else is known.⁷³

Apparently Sivas too had been abandoned toward the end of the thirteenth century. But since a suffragan, Bernard of Piacenza, was named in 1318 it can be assumed that the friars had returned. Bernard is, however, the only incumbent who is known to have taken up residence. It is clear, therefore, that soon after the bull of 1318 the problem of staffing the missionary dioceses had become extremely difficult. In fact, it was necessary in 1329 to appoint new bishops for Sultaniyeh, Tabriz, and Dehkharegan.

Sebastopolis, in ancient Colchis, on the eastern shore of the Black Sea, was in a part of Georgia not then under Mongol domination. The inhabitants were largely Abkhasians, related to the Circassians, who like the Georgians followed the Byzantine rite. The ruler at the time was favorably disposed to missionaries. The city was, however, a prominent slave mart, and in 1330 the second bishop, Peter Gerald, sent to the bishops of England a remarkable letter in which he described his ineffectual efforts to curtail the shameful traffic as well as many other difficulties which confronted a missionary bishop living among separated Christians, not all of whom were well disposed, and hostile Moslems. Doubtless it was such frustrations which prompted him to plead for military aid from the west. There are no records of any successors.

There was, however, a growing awareness that the principal Dominican sphere of activity was to be in greater Armenia. Whether this area ever constituted an official *contrata* of the *peregrinantes* is doubtful. Nevertheless, it is here that the Dominicans achieved their greatest successes, and it is significant that some time between 1333 and 1356 Nadjivan (Nakhchevan) was added as a suffragan see of Sultaniyeh.⁷⁴

In this same Armenian region the Franciscans had already labored with considerable success. Since this proved to be one of the rare instances where a natural rivalry between the two orders degenerated into serious tension, it will be wise to describe the Franciscan activities first.

Traditionally, the "dispersed" churches of greater Armenia were dependent on the metropolitan see of Sis in the kingdom of Cilician Armenia, long in close political and religious association with the west,

73. *Ibid.*, pp. 172-175.

74. *Ibid.*, pp. 135-172, for a discussion of all the suffragan sees of Sultaniyeh. Loenertz doubts that Persia can with any certainty be classified as a *contrata* under a vicar. A French translation of Peter Geraldus's letter is given *ibid.*, pp. 133-134.

and where formal union had been ratified by synods at Sis (1307) and Adana (1316). Union with the western church was, however, never popular with the bulk of the clergy and faithful, especially in the areas of greater Armenia not under the political dominion of the Cilician kingdom. Accordingly, the Holy See, and notably John XXII, gave the entire Armenian problem considerable attention. This meant diplomatic communications with rulers and attempts to launch a crusade as well as frequent letters to bishops in both the Cilician kingdom and the wider area to the north and west.

This region lay within the Franciscan *custodia* of Tabriz, where fourteenth-century lists mention two establishments in the city of Tabriz, one shared with the Dominicans, and stations at Sultaniyeh, Salmas, and Erzerum. The most successful mission was maintained at the monastery of St. Thaddeus at Karakalissa near Maku. Around 1321 bishop Zacharias, who made his headquarters at St. Thaddeus, accepted union with the Holy See and speedily became a bulwark of the native Armeno-Catholic community and protector of both mendicant orders.⁷⁵

Prominent among a group of Franciscans who left Europe for the east and greater Armenia was William Saurati, a man of considerable learning. Saurati finally established himself at the monastery of St. Thaddeus, where he mastered Armenian and translated books from Latin into the native tongue. He then proceeded to give public lectures on holy scripture in Armenian, and his discourses were attended by native monks as well as by archbishop Zacharias. Another Minorite associated with St. Thaddeus was friar Ponzio, who also mastered the Armenian tongue and while at Avignon in 1344 completed an Armenian version of the Roman missal. In 1345, after Clement VI had named him titular archbishop of Seleucia in Cilicia, he returned to his charges in Persia.⁷⁶

During these years Dominican missions had also been growing in the same area. In 1323 William Adam, whom John XXII had named to succeed Franco of Perugia, was especially urged to promote missions among the Armenians of Persia. The pope also wrote to the catholicus Constantine IV, in union with Rome, informing him of this mission and asking for his assistance. William was metropolitan of Sultaniyeh only two years, and we know nothing of his missionary accomplishments there. But some information comes from the re-

75. *BOF*, III, 215–218, 370–373. On John XXII's letters see also above, note 61, and Tournèze, *Histoire politique et religieuse de l'Arménie*, pp. 317 ff.

76. *BOF*, III, 407–413; IV, 381–388; de Sessevalle, *Histoire générale de l'ordre de Saint François*, II, 556 ff.

ports of Jordan Catalani of Sévérac, a Dominican who had acquired considerable experience and a thorough command of the native tongue in Persia. In 1328 he returned to Europe after several years in India. Jordan reported that the church of Sultaniyeh had a congregation of some five hundred and that a thousand converts had been made from dissident Christians at both Tabriz and Maragha.⁷⁷

It can readily be understood that the appearance of Dominicans in a region where Franciscans had already been successful might occasion some resentment. In Tabriz, for example, where a single church was served, probably in alternate weeks, by both Franciscans and Dominicans, the Dominican bishop had only limited rights over what would normally have been his own church. In 1332 the Franciscans refused to recognize the bishop, William of Cigiis, and went so far as to celebrate a second mass on Holy Thursday, a procedure contrary to the liturgical usage of that period.⁷⁸

As the Dominicans apparently had considerable success in promoting the doctrines of Thomas Aquinas, recently canonized (1323), among certain communities of Armenian clergy, this, too, created tension, and Saurati, among other Franciscans, expressed opposition to the intrusion of such teachings.

Evidently, therefore, the situation had passed beyond the stage of natural rivalry. The root of the matter seems to lie in the rift within the Franciscan order following John XXII's condemnation in 1323 of the extreme doctrine regarding the poverty of Jesus and his apostles. Many adherents of the faction of "Spirituals" had left Europe and a number appeared in the Franciscan community at Tabriz. Finally, faced with rebellion on a doctrinal matter, William of Cigiis held an inquest in which he was assisted by the local Dominican vicar and the vicar of Persia. Although Saurati was probably not an adherent of extreme Spiritual teachings, apparently he was on good terms with those who were and who eagerly sought his advice. At any rate, his correspondence constituted part of the dossier of evidence along with other letters and the depositions of local Italian merchants. The friars named were not given a hearing. In 1334 the report was forwarded to Avignon, where bishop William appeared in person later in the same year.

The outcome of this matter is not known, but twelve Franciscans, suspected of adherence to the extreme doctrines, were expelled from Persia sometime after the death of John XXII (1334). In 1344-1345

77. Loenertz, *Frères pérégrinants*, pp. 153, 162, 165.

78. *Ibid.*, pp. 154-155.

Clement VI published a bull against the Spirituals in Asia and instructed the archbishop of Sultaniyeh to investigate rumors that friar Ponzio had embraced this heresy. No record of any inquest has survived. Undoubtedly this whole affair seriously damaged the Franciscan missions in Persia, and most of the evidence of continued effort comes from Dominican sources.⁷⁹

Sometime around 1328 Bartholomew, Dominican bishop of Maragha, was visited by a Basilian monk, John of Qrna, superior of the convent of St. Mary, mother of God. Completely won over to the cause of union with the western church, he asked Bartholomew to accompany him northward to Qrna. This the bishop did in 1329, and before his death in 1330 he and John had laid the foundation for a new Armeno-Catholic community.

John had originally hoped to transfer his community bodily into the Dominican order, but finding this impracticable, he set out to reform his monks along Dominican lines. Assisted by the Friars-Preachers, they studied Latin and western theology. The Dominicans, in turn, applied themselves to the Armenian language. From this combined effort came translations of theological works, principally those of Aquinas, the constitutions of the Dominican order, and the Dominican breviary and missal.

Meanwhile John of Qrna had visited Avignon and returned to organize what was in effect a new religious congregation where several houses were grouped under one "governor." Sometime after 1333 John of Florence, recently instituted bishop of Tiflis (1330) and Bartholomew's successor in the direction of the enterprise, formally received the vows of John of Qrna and his associates. Thus was established what became known as the *fratres unitores* (of St. Gregory the Illuminator), an Armenian branch of the Dominican order. In 1356 Innocent VI gave his official approbation and decreed that the Dominican master-general should have the right of visitation, a measure which resulted in occasional friction between the *unitores* and the *peregrinantes*.⁸⁰

It has been pointed out that the popes repeatedly gave instructions regarding conditional rebaptism and reordination, and that the "repe-

79. *BOF*, III, 424-452; IV, 378-379, 381-383; de Sessevalle, *Histoire générale de l'ordre de Saint François*, pp. 556-559; Loenertz, *Frères pègrinants*, pp. 157, 169.

80. For the Dominican missions in general and the *fratres unitores* see Loenertz, *Frères pègrinants*, pp. 135-175, 188-198; "Les Missions dominicaines . . .," *AFP*, II (1932), 33-45; and "Évêques dominicains des deux Arménies," *AFP*, V (1940), 258-291. There are also several studies by Marcus A. van den Oudenrijn, O.P., of which the latest and most comprehensive is "Unitours et Dominicains d'Arménie," *Oriens Christianus*, XL (1956), 94-112; XLII (1958), 110-133; and XLIII (1959), 110-119.

tion" of sacraments, as the Armenians viewed it, continued to arouse hostility. Apparently the *unitores* were inclined to be over-zealous in such matters. Some of them, including it seems John of Qrna, in a desire to promote uniformity, overemphasized minor matters of usage rather than significant differences of doctrines. An extreme example was the list of 117 errors presented to the curia by the *unitor* Nerses Balientz. It was an Armenian Franciscan, Daniel of Tabriz, who took it upon himself to defend his Armenian coreligionists. In 1341 he presented at Avignon a detailed refutation of the charges. After the Council of Sis in 1345, where the matter was further discussed, Daniel visited the curia once again and returned after Clement VI had named him bishop of Bosra in Syria.⁸¹ The ultimate effect of such controversies on Armenian Christianity is not clear, but it does seem evident that the *unitores* were commonly regarded as "Latinizers" and were far from popular, especially in the areas where Monophysitism remained strong.

When the Black Death took its toll of the *fratres peregrinantes* after 1348, the *unitores* proved to be the bulwark of Catholicism in the Near East. At one time there were no bishops in Persia and only three friars. Finally the curia and the Dominican authorities in Europe heeded the pleas of the Armenians and in 1356 named Thomas of Tabriz to the see of Nadjivan. Thomas was an Armenian bishop and probably a member of the *unitores*.

By 1363 the situation had so deteriorated that what was left of the *fratres peregrinantes* was temporarily placed under the jurisdiction of the Dominican province of Greece. In 1365 the *unitores* were accorded the same privileges formerly enjoyed by the *peregrinantes*. A decade later, largely owing to the pleadings of the *unitores*, the Holy See revoked the earlier decisions of the Dominican authorities and reestablished the *fratres peregrinantes*. Constitutionally, it was much the same as the congregation founded by Franco of Perugia, but times had changed. Islam was advancing rapidly, and virtually the only surviving Catholic communities were in the Crimea and in greater Armenia. In fact, the friars who went out in the later years of the fourteenth century formed a sort of mission of assistance to their Armenian brethren and, as a rule, resided in their houses.

During the fifteenth century, after Cilician Armenia had been conquered by Egypt, and then, along with greater Armenia, had been overrun by Timur in 1394, the Crimean communities of the *unitores*

81. *BOF*, IV, 333-362. Cf. also the chronicle hostile to Armenians written around 1322 and presented to king Philip V of France by a Dominican (*ibid.*, III, 404-407).

took on added importance. But after the fall of Kaffa in 1475 contacts between the *peregrinantes* and the *unitores* were broken once again. The latter, however, persisted in regarding themselves as Dominicans. Finally, in the sixteenth century, the Dominican authorities legalized what had already transpired by designating Nadjivan a province of the order.⁸²

The tradition of the residence and martyrdom of St. Thomas the Apostle in India had remained strong during the Middle Ages, though much confused with legend. Moreover, although scholars have debated the exact locations, Christian communities existed in India from early times.⁸³ The evangelization of India in the Middle Ages first developed as an outgrowth of journeys to China. As we have mentioned, John of Monte Corvino visited the east and west coasts and baptized some one hundred persons. He reported that he had spent thirteen months "in the church of St. Thomas the Apostle." Somewhat later William Adam traveled as far as Thana, Cambay, and Quilon, and preached in various places.

The most important missionary to India in the fourteenth century was the Dominican Jordan Catalani of Sévérac.⁸⁴ Friar Jordan had acquired considerable experience and a thorough command of the native tongue in Persia. In 1320 he and two Genoese merchants joined Thomas of Tolentino and three other Franciscans bound for China. Thomas was a missionary of some standing who, it will be recalled, had delivered John of Monte Corvino's letter to the curia. The party took the sea route, intending to stop first at Quilon on the southern Malabar coast in order to visit the church of St. Thomas the Apostle. They were forced to disembark on the island of Salsette near the modern site of Bombay. At the nearby town of Thana they were received by some Nestorians (March 1231). Jordan was then persuaded to visit the community of Sofale some miles up the coast, where he found a church built on the ruins of an older edifice attributed to St. Thomas and where he baptized some twenty persons.

Meanwhile Thomas of Tolentino and his companions had been ar-

82. Loenertz, *Frères pérégrinants*, p. 150.

83. On Indian Christianity see Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity*, pp. 359 ff.; Slesarev, *Prester John: The Letter and the Legend*, pp. 7 ff.

84. In addition to the works of Loenertz: *Frères pérégrinants*, pp. 175-182, and "Missions dominicaines," *AFP*, II (1932), 50-55, see Moule, "Brother Jordan of Sévérac," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1928), 348-376; Charles V. Langlois, "Jourdain Catala, missionnaire," *Histoire littéraire de la France*, XXXV (1921), 260-267; Beazley, *Dawn of Modern Geography*, III, 231 ff.; and Cordier, *Les Merveilles de l'Asie par le père Jourdain Catalani de Sévérac* (Paris, 1935).

rested by the Moslem governor at Thana. As Jordan returned to assist them he learned news of their martyrdom. Apparently the death of the Franciscans made such a profound impression that even several Moslems requested baptism. But the vigilance of the authorities forced Jordan to abstain from all propaganda. He did, however, after a long delay obtain permission to bury the martyrs.

Returning to Sofale with some of the relics of the martyrs Jordan resumed his mission among the Christians of the region. At length (October 12, 1321), while he was at Ghogah on the Kathiawar peninsula, he was able to entrust a report to one of the Genoese, who took it to the Dominican and Franciscan headquarters at Tabriz.⁸⁵ By this time Jordan had baptized some one hundred and twenty converts.

Although the Dominican Nicholas of Rome left Tabriz shortly after the receipt of Jordan's letter, the latter was again at Thana in 1323, for in January of that year he wrote another letter far less hopeful in tone. Difficulties were mounting and only ten more converts had been made. Two other letters and relics of the Thana martyrs were sent to Dominicans in Persia. Jordan also spoke of Ethiopia, which he hoped to visit, and pleaded that ships be equipped in the Indian Ocean for a new crusade against Egypt. Not for some years did other friars arrive and enable Jordan to return to Europe. The precise date is not known, but he was in Avignon in 1329.

In Avignon Jordan was named bishop of Quilon (Coilum) in southern India and entrusted with letters from the pope to various Christian communities in India, to a number of Indian princes, and to the king of Ethiopia, 'Amda Seyon. Apparently Jordan was still in Avignon in 1330, but that is the last that is heard of him and virtually the last of the medieval Indian mission. Sixteen years later the Franciscan John de' Marignoli, who spent a year in Quilon on his return from China, mentioned a Latin church of St. George and some "friars," but told practically nothing of the western Christian community in India.

While at Avignon Jordan met Thomas Mancasola, who had brought to the curia a report of Dominican activities in the western section of the khanate of Chagatai, which according to the demarcation of 1318 was included in the province of Sultaniyeh. Mancasola, it seems, had been sent to Avignon by khan Eljgidei, and his favorable report prompted the pope to reply and to appoint the Dominican friar the first bishop of Samarkand. He was to have left for the Orient with Jordan, which raises the question whether in fact he departed. If he

85. *BOF*, II, 69-71, 113.

did, he had returned to Avignon by 1342, and no other bishops of Samarkand are mentioned.⁸⁶

Although the Egyptian government permitted the friars to maintain a caretaker establishment in Jerusalem and to serve the spiritual needs of Latin Christians resident in their domains, they were hostile to missionary effort and suspicious of any dealings between westerners and the Christians of Ethiopia and Nubia. Nevertheless, there is some evidence which indicates the possibility of contacts with the Christians of Ethiopia during the thirteenth century. It was mentioned above that the friars sent about 1237 to "the Jacobite patriarch of the Egyptians" by Philip, the Dominican provincial of the Holy Land, might have gone beyond the Egyptian frontier. Moreover, from the time of Innocent IV the rulers and people of Ethiopia and Nubia were regularly included in the papal missionary letters. A letter of Clement IV asking the master-general of the Dominicans to send friars to various lands including Ethiopia is somewhat more specific in that it mentions that they were to be accompanied by a certain friar Vasinpace who had been there. And it will also be recalled that among the commissions entrusted to John of Monte Corvino was a letter to the archbishop of Ethiopia. Moreover, John later mentioned that he had received a delegation from Ethiopia requesting missionaries. Evidently, therefore, the curia was aware of the existence of an Ethiopian hierarchy. Further evidence of missionary journeys is lacking.⁸⁷

William Adam, the Dominican whose activities in Persia and India have been mentioned, stayed some time on the island of Socotra awaiting a chance to enter Abyssinia. Not only did he desire to evangelize the Ethiopians, but he considered Socotra a possible base for crusaders. As we have seen, Jordan Catalani had similar ideas. Such references may have contributed to the growing belief that Prester John's empire was to be located in the southern continent.

There are reports of considerable missionary activity on the part of the Dominicans in the fourteenth century, but they appear to be of late origin and not substantiated by contemporary documents. It must, therefore, be concluded that the possibility, even the probability, of missions in east Africa during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries may be admitted, but that conclusive evidence of actual journeys or accomplishments is lacking.

86. Loenertz, *Frères pègrinants*, pp. 168-169, 176.

87. On fourteenth-century missions to Ethiopia, in addition to the material cited above in notes 19 and 20, see Richard, "L'Extrême-Orient légendaire," pp. 225-242. Cf. also Carlo Conti Rossini, "Sulle Missioni dominicane in Etiopia nel secolo XIV," *Reale Accademia d'Italia, Rendiconti della classe di scienze morali e storiche*, ser. 7, 1 (1940), 71-98.

MISSIONARY METHODS IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY: CONCLUSION

The principal innovation in the policy of the western church toward the east during the fourteenth century was the establishment of an oriental hierarchy.⁸⁸ This, together with the formation of the *fratres peregrinantes* and the expansion of the Franciscan vicariates, enabled the popes and the mendicant orders to proceed in a somewhat more systematic fashion. This is evident in a number of ways. Papal letters and the official pronouncements of the orders indicate, for example, an insistence that the missions be served by adequately trained men and that those unfit be removed. With regard to such matters as religious training and theological competence there is evidence that friars, even on the longest journeys, carried books. Books are mentioned in mission reports, in instructions to missionaries, and in financial provisions by the curia. Primarily, as might be expected, these are liturgical books. But Dominicans, it will be recalled, taught Aquinas in Armenia and translated some of his works into the native language. Friar Iohanca cited Peter Lombard, albeit incorrectly, in refuting the doctrines of the Ruthenian "schismatics." Since Iohanca seems in other ways to have been a well-educated person, his mistake may well have resulted from the lack of books in his remote station.⁸⁹

Scarcity of material precludes any detailed analysis of the methods of the missionaries themselves, but some tentative conclusions can be drawn. In order to facilitate the friars' adjustment to varied surroundings — "accommodation" as it is called in modern times — the curia granted privileges regarding dress, beards, and such matters not enjoyed by their confrères in Europe. Although results are difficult to estimate, some modest attempts were made to train native clergies, a policy suggested, it will be remembered, as early as the pontificate of Innocent IV. We have already referred to the ruler of Tenduk on whom John of Monte Corvino conferred minor orders and his report that he was training forty native boys and had taught them to chant in Latin, as well as to the 1323 report of the Franciscans of the Kipchak khanate that they were training converts to become friars. A later notice of the year 1364 emphasized the teaching of Latin, and

88. In addition to the works cited above in note 49 see the following studies by van den Oudenrijn on the Armenian mission: *Das Officium des heiligen Dominicus des Bekenners im Brevier der "Fratres Unitores" von Ostarmerien* (Rome, 1955); "Eine armenische Übersetzung der Summa Theologica des Hl. Thomas im 14. Jahrhundert," *Divus Thomas*, VIII (1930), 245–278; "Oratiuncula S. Thomas Aquinatis in Armenica lingua," *Angelicum*, VI (1929), 77–82. On papal policy see de Vries, "Die Päpste von Avignon," pp. 85–128.

89. Cf. Bihl and Moule, "Tria nova documenta," p. 69, note 4.

in 1370 Franciscan official instructions to missionary vicars directed that no new members be received without careful testing of their orthodoxy.⁹⁰ From such scattered references as these it can be assumed that at last a beginning had been made and that the problem was being faced. Further, these same sources indicate that, despite the emphasis on preaching and disputation which persisted into the fourteenth century, some progress was made toward promoting more intimate work with individuals.

One intensely practical concern of the missionary friars was that of material support. In China, and perhaps in other Mongol countries, the khan provided a special subsidy for the Franciscan friars. Apparently it was the custom for the Mongol rulers thus to provide for ambassadors and envoys of foreign rulers. On certain occasions the papacy furnished travel expenses and money for books. Both Dominicans and Franciscans were permitted to make use of ill-gotten goods which might be turned over to them provided those to whom restitution was due could not be found. The Dominican authorities allowed the missionary friars to use money and permitted solicitation everywhere regardless of conventual or provincial regulations. At least one master-general, Berengar of Landorre, recommended the *fratres peregrinantes* to the good offices of all priors and ordered that when in Europe they be given hospitality and provided with liturgical books. The expenses of the vicar of the *peregrinantes* were defrayed by a subvention levied on all convents of the order.

The principal means of support were the merchants whose spiritual needs the missionaries served. In fact, it must be evident from the preceding pages that many friars were chaplains to merchant establishments first and missionaries second. Apparently a certain amount of papal pressure was sometimes necessary. Gregory IX, for example, specifically requested merchants to defray certain expenses for the first installations of the Dominicans.⁹¹ Moreover, there were occasions, as for example when they opposed the slave traffic or trade with the Moslems, when friars incurred the enmity of merchants.

Although accurate figures are not available, it seems clear that the

90. Altaner, "Zur Geschichte des Unterrichts," p. 167. For the report of 1323 see above, pp. 502-503, and note 68. Van der Vat cites the 1370 directive in his review of Simonut, *Il Metodo*, in *Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft*, IV (1948), 154. He also points out the difficulty of determining the ethnic origin of converts and the possibility that some may have been repurchased slaves; see his "Expensae camerae apostolicae pro missionibus Fratrum Minorum inter Tartaros ann. 1318-53," *AFP*, XXXI (1938), 538-540.

91. On expenses, concessions regarding dress, and so on see de Sessevalle, *Histoire générale de l'ordre de Saint François*, II, 610-612; van der Vat, *Die Anfänge*, note 87; *BOF*, V, 112-113, 148. Gregory's bull is cited in Potthast, *Regesta*, no. 9846; cf. Tăutu, *Acta Honorii III et*

Franciscans, the larger of the two mendicant orders, sent out more missionaries and maintained a larger number of permanent stations. Doubtless there was rivalry, for even after the delimitation of the two oriental provinces in 1318 members of each order could be found in most of the territories of the other. But the most spectacular cases of friction were a byproduct of the controversy within the Franciscan order over poverty. Certainly in Persia this must have interfered seriously with the work both orders were promoting.

There is also, however, ample evidence of coöperation. The houses of both orders were open to missionaries en route. John of Monte Corvino set out for China in company with a Dominican, addressed one of his letters to the authorities of both orders, and apparently hoped that both might be established in China. The Dominican Jordan Catalani traveled with Franciscans to India, cared for the relics of the Franciscan martyrs, and reported to the authorities of both orders in Persia. Other examples could be cited.

If such developments may be regarded as positive achievements, it must also be added that in the entire mission picture there remained many inadequacies. The overall impression left by the scanty sources is one of experiment, of trial and error, of a beginning only in the confrontation of an enormous task. It has already been pointed out, for example, that the projected plans for systematic language training in Europe did not materialize. Only Paris, apparently, and only for a short time, carried out the directives of the Council of Vienne. Something of the discouragement as well as the strangely provincial attitude prevailing in the west, even at the curia, may be seen in John XXII's suggestion to the king of Cilician Armenia that to facilitate the work of the friars his subjects should devote themselves to the study of Latin. Thus, while it is true that a considerable number of missionaries learned one or more oriental languages — an impressive achievement, and an improvement over the preceding decades — the use of interpreters continued. Further, it has been pointed out that the curia was less well equipped with interpreters than were the courts of eastern magnates.⁹²

Somewhat similar observations can be made about the west's knowledge of oriental civilization and religion. Something has already been said of the lack of any real understanding of Islam. Understanding of oriental Christianity, though it did improve in the fourteenth century, was still insufficient. The Holy See continued to be overly optimistic

Gregorii IX, pp. 286–287 (no. 210). On the merchants in Asia see Lopez, "European Merchants in Asia," p. 131, and "Nuovi luci," pp. 337–398.

92. Altaner, "Sprachstudien und Sprachkenntnisse," pp. 129–131.

about the possibility of large-scale conversions, and it still attached too much importance to the conversion of magnates, ecclesiastical or secular. Moreover, though the plan for an oriental hierarchy may have been bold and imaginative, it proved difficult to implement. Viewed in retrospect, it seems too ambitious, perhaps revealing more zeal and energy than comprehension of Asiatic conditions.

In a work dedicated to the history of the crusades, it would seem appropriate to add some observations about the relation between mission and crusade. What has been presented here points inescapably to the conclusion that missions were more often than not associated with diplomacy. While the appearance of the Mongols first posed a new danger and then raised hopes of coöperation, Europe's constant concern remained Islam. This was, after all, still the age of the crusades, though becoming increasingly theoretical in the fourteenth century. The twentieth-century west has only to consult its own fears of communism to understand how deeply the expansion of Islam must have affected the mentality of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. There is no doubt that many, perhaps most, of the missionaries shared the feelings of their contemporaries and accepted the war with Islam as an unavoidable necessity. Moreover, in an age when religious and political affairs were not so compartmentalized as they are today it could scarcely have been otherwise.

From the standpoint of numbers converted the medieval missionary achievement in the Orient was not brilliant. Moreover, as is evident in so many mission reports, the total number of missionaries sent out was hardly sufficient. Such observations must not, however, be permitted to obscure certain very real accomplishments. Mission stations in widely separated and distant lands had been maintained for decades. Contacts had been renewed with oriental Christians, some of which, at least, proved to be permanent. Europeans had finally gained some first-hand knowledge of Asia and its peoples.

It must again be emphasized that European conditions were adverse, while after the middle of the thirteenth century in the east the triumph of Islam in Central Asia and the overthrow of the Mongol dynasty in China were followed by the rise of the Ottoman Turks in Anatolia. Meanwhile the Black Death took its toll of active and prospective missionaries. As a consequence of all these things, much that had been started could not be carried forward.

In short, medieval missions to the Orient were in a real sense only a beginning. In many areas, where centuries were to pass before missionaries were able to take up again the work begun by the

friars of the high Middle Ages, they represent a beginning without a sequel.

The most impressive feature of the entire mission story is the extraordinary dedication of the friars themselves. Many of them faced incredible obstacles. Oriental Christians were often jealous and Moslems hostile. Martyrdoms were not infrequent. Travel in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries was always difficult and usually dangerous. The trip to the Levant had become fairly routine, but the overland journey into central and eastern Asia commonly required many months to complete, and the endurance of hunger, thirst, intense heat, and severe cold. Food was scarce and often unpalatable to westerners. Moreover, the ships which plied the Indian Ocean were not designed to reassure the faint-hearted. A considerable number of friars never reached their destinations. Those men who braved all the hazards which confronted the medieval missionary to the Orient deserve to be numbered among the great pioneers of history.