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INTRODUCTION

The history of the Middle Ages is the history of the Church. This is especially true of the crusading epoch of the Middle Ages. As author and organizer and integral part of the Crusades the Church quite naturally acquired and played an important role in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem founded by the First Crusade. This study is concerned with one aspect of her position in this Kingdom, that of a property holder.

In chapter one the part played by the Church as organizer and part of the force that established the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem will be considered. Chapter two will place the Church in the constitutional framework of the Kingdom. Chapter three investigates the documentary evidence relative to the Church's property and the manner in which she acquired it. The concluding chapter assesses the possessions of the Church in the light of the effects of her wealth on the Kingdom. The first two chapters form an unavoidable introduction to the heart of the thesis, chapter three; and to chapter four. Without the foundation laid in chapters one and two, chapter three would be unintelligible. Chapter four naturally flows out of chapter three.

It is hoped that this study brings out a little more the tremendous influence of the Church in the Middle Ages, a fact almost beyond the grasp of the modern man.
CHAPTER I
THE ORIGIN OF THE LATIN KINGDOM

The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem was a feudal state established by noble warriors from the West who participated in what is known as the First Crusade. This state included all of Palestine and some territory to the north and south of Palestine. Though the kingdom eked out a moribund existence from 1187 to 1291 on the Syrian littoral, and after the close of the Syrian chapter enjoyed a century and a half of prosperity on the Island of Cyprus, this study is concerned with its history only up to 1187. After the conquest of Saladin there is practically nothing left of the kingdom and consequently relatively no Church property to consider. Founded by warriors of the First Crusade, the kingdom is in origin and to a lesser extent in duration a part of crusading history. To understand, therefore, what the kingdom was and how it originated, it will be necessary to inquire into the nature and origin of the Crusades and to follow the progress of the First Crusade.

The Crusades were Holy Wars waged by the Latin West against the Moslem East under the leadership of the papacy for the purpose of conquering and occupying the Holy Land. They were armed pilgrimages whose purpose was not only to visit the land sanctified by the Saviour's life and death, but also to conquer and hold the Holy land. They are called Crusades from the cross worn by the participants as a symbol of their faith and of their character as soldiers of the Cross. These were not ordinary wars, but wars directed
against the foe of Christendom. They were Holy Wars and the warriors engaged were milites Christi. Materially, as wars against the Mohammedans, the Crusades are part of that thousand-year struggle between the Cross and the Crescent. Formally, as wars undertaken to conquer and hold the Holy Land, the Crusades are the culmination of centuries of pilgrimage to the Holy Land by Latins from the West. From the inauguration of the crusading movement by Pope Urban II at Clermont, the 'cross-bearers' went year after year to the Holy Land to strike a blow for the protection or recovery of Christ's sepulchre until the fall of the last crusading stronghold, Acre, in 1291. ¹ The most outstanding expeditions because of the leaders, the results, or the occasion are the numbered Crusades. After the first and only successful Crusade which took place between 1096 and 1099, there were other numbered crusades which endeavored with uniform failure to reduplicate the achievement of the First Crusade. Two of these took place in the twelfth century, one occasioned by the fall of Edessa in 1144, the other occasioned by the fall of Jerusalem in 1187. Six other crusades occurred during the thirteenth century. Each of these shared in the general nature of those expeditions known as Crusades while at the same time having specific differences of time, place, routes, and other historical circumstances which makes each crusade an historical study in itself. In between


² Ibid., no. 640.
these prominent waves were the less spectacular attempts to reinforce the tenuous hold of the Latins in the East. Some of these attempts are numerically larger than the numbered Crusades. Once started the crusading movement burned for two centuries in Europe. The question is how did it start? What were the roots of this tree whose branches spread out over two centuries and whose first fruits were the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem and its vasa states of Edessa, Antioch, and Tripoli?

Since the Crusade was nothing more nor less than an armed pilgrimage to the Holy Land for the purpose of conquering and holding the land sacred to all Christians, the origin of the Crusade must primarily be sought in the practice of pilgrimage. Anyone superficially acquainted with the civilization of the Middle Ages knows the important place pilgrimages held in the religious life of clergy and laity. Each country had its local shrines honoring local saints to which the people journeyed in penance for their sins or to acquire greater devotion and strength in the service of the Lord or to obtain some favor. Though the practice of pilgrimage was open to abuses, yet the honor in which the pilgrim was held together with the sanction of the Church who made use of the pilgrimage in her penitentiary system indicated that pilgrimage was a genuine expression of religious devotion capable of purifying and enkindling a true religious spirit. Europe was covered with shrines erected in honor of some Christian hero or heroine, martyr, confessor, doctor, or apostle and the roads were filled not with sightseers but with pilgrims. Each locality had its famous shrine to which pilgrims flocked yearly in fulfillment of a vow or of a canonical penance, or to obtain special
favors from the saint's intercession. Besides the local goals of pilgrimage there were three great pilgrimages which appealed to all of Christendom. They were the shrine of St. James the Apostle at Campostella in Spain; Rome, the city of the popes and the site where thousands of Christians laid down their lives for the faith among whom were the apostles Peter and Paul; and Jerusalem, sanctified by the death of the God-man Jesus Christ, founder and organizer of that Church which was the heart and center of medieval life. Of these three universal goals of pilgrimage it can be readily understood that Jerusalem came to hold the most prominent place both because of its intrinsic sanctity and because of the difficulties attending such a pilgrimage. Since, connected with the idea of pilgrimage, there was the idea of penance for sin, that pilgrimage would be most prized which involved the greatest hardships, other things being equal. In the case of Jerusalem because of its distance and the inherent difficulties of travel, because of the roads and because of the necessity of travelling through hostile territory, Jerusalem was looked upon as the greatest of pilgrimages. Its popularity grew with the centuries and became on the eve of the Crusades almost a necessity for everyone of religious aspirations among both clergy and laity.

During the first three centuries of Christianity the faithful were too occupied with dodging Roman persecutions to visit the land sanctified by

their Redeemer. After the edict of Milan journeys to the Holy Land became an accepted institution in the West practiced by those who had the leisure and the money and who felt that some spiritual good could be derived from such a journey. Ever since the time of Constantine the Great pilgrims had gone in increasing numbers to Jerusalem. Constantine built a basilica over the Holy Sepulchre and his mother St. Helena discovered by a miracle the true cross. Devout men desired, as Paula wrote to St. Jerome, "to put the finishing touch to virtue by adoring Christ in the very place where the Gospel first shone forth from the Cross." 4 As early as 333 a native of Bordeaux made the pilgrimage and wrote an account of all the stages of the journey from Bordeaux by way of Constantinople to Jerusalem. Some fifty years later St. Jerome founded a convent and monastery with a dependent hospice for pilgrims from the West. 5 Not even the barbarian invasions of the fifth and sixth centuries could put an end to pilgrimage to Jerusalem on the part of Latins from the West.

After the first shock of the Arab conquests in the East during the seventh century pilgrimages were resumed under the mild rule of the Arabs. Indeed, Charlemagne was granted a protectorate over Christian churches in Jerusalem and established there a church, a hospital, and a library for pilgrims from the Latin West. 6 There existed during the eighth century

4 Ibid., 37.
5 Ibid.
monasteries on the Mount of Olives and on Mount Sion. Moreover, Popes and Emperors regularly sent contributions to the monasteries and churches in Jerusalem; even western lands and revenues were granted to the Latin establishments of the East. Under the Frankish Protectorate and the mild rule of the Arabs, pilgrimages increased in number. There is record for six pilgrimages during the eighth century, twelve in the ninth, and sixteen in the tenth. During the tenth century, for example, St. Conrad, bishop of Constance, made the trip three times; St. John of Parma went six times to Jerusalem; Leo, Abbot of Monte Cassino brought back a piece of the true cross from his pilgrimage; and Hilda, Countess of Swabia, made her pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 965. Though the chronicles record the pilgrimages of lay or clerical nobility only, it is safe to assume that persons of a lower station in life made the trip also. The pilgrims of the tenth century as also the pilgrims of previous centuries travelled in small bands for the most part.

The eleventh century brought some changes in the practice of pilgrimage to Jerusalem. These changes lead up to the creation of the Crusade. Altogether there is record of 117 distinct pilgrimages during the eleventh century before the birth of the Crusade in 1095. Besides the increase in the number of separate pilgrimages the actual size of the pilgrim bands expanded

7 Thompson, James Westfall, An Economic and Social History of the Middle Ages, The Century Co., New York, 1928, 388.
8 Ibid., 389.
9 Ibid., 388.
in several instances into hundreds of individuals and even thousands. Finally the conversion of the Hungarians in 1000 opened up the continental route to the Holy Land which would be used time and again by the Crusaders. The increase in the number of pilgrims and pilgrimages can be attributed to the renewal of religious fervor kindled by the Cluniac reform. Perhaps the disturbed conditions prevailing in the Holy Land from the early part of the eleventh century also had some influence in determining the size of the pilgrim bands. In 1010 the Frankish Protectorate was rudely terminated by the vandalism of the insane Caliph Hakem. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre was destroyed as well as other property belonging strictly to Latins. Shortly after this outburst the Greeks supplanted the Franks as protectors of the Holy City. This period especially after the schism of 1054, was attended by petty persecution of Latins on the part of the Greeks. Pope Victor II complained to the Empress Theodora concerning the treatment accorded pilgrims from the West. The Greek protectorate in its turn abruptly came to an end as a result of the conquest of Jerusalem in 1071 by the Seljuk Turks. The turmoil caused by the Seljuk occupation which extended into Asia Minor and Syria made pilgrimage quite a hazardous affair. Sometimes as in the case of Great German pilgrimage of 1064, the pilgrims had to defend themselves; of 7,000 that set out, only 2,000 returned home. The stories that survivors brought back concerning the treatment of Christians and the general ruin

10 Brehier, 62.
11 Ibid., 71.
12 Thompson, 390.
brought about by the Seljuk Turk in the Holy Land and elsewhere served to prepare the people of the West for an undertaking which would set things right in the Holy Land. Since pilgrimage to the Holy Land seemed safe only for large, armed bands the ideal of the warrior pilgrim began to lay hold of the mind of western Europe. It may rightly be said that, "by arming the pilgrimage Urban created the Crusade." ¹³

However, the sudden expansion of the Seljuk Turks at the expense of the Christian East toward the close of the eleventh century, though not influencing the people at large, had some influence in determining the action of the papacy. After 1050 the newly won converts to Islamism, the Seljuks swept westward from Baghdad against the heretical Caliphate of Egypt and the Byzantine Empire. ¹⁴ In 1070 the eastern emperor, Diogenes together with his army was destroyed at Manzikert. ¹⁵ Within ten years after Manzikert the reconquests of the Byzantine emperors made after the reverses of the eighth century were again lost to the Crescent. Just as the Arabs had pushed their conquests during the eighth century to the very walls of Constantinople so their successors the Seljuks carried all before them at the close of the eleventh century. Under these circumstances it was logical for the pope to lend a sympathetic ear to the appeals of the Christian East, for if Constantinople


¹⁵ Ibid.
fell, the West would be in grave peril. Gregory VII in response to the appeals of Michael VII, the Byzantine Emperor, planned to send an expedition of 50,000 which would rescue the Holy Land and lend assistance to the Eastern Emperors. The plan was never executed. Emperor Alexius repeated the appeals of Michael for aid from the West to Urban II who planned, indeed, not assistance to the Eastern Emperor but a Crusade. Thus the situation in the Holy Land reinforced by the appeals of the Greek Emperors was the occasion which prompted Urban to arm the pilgrimage thereby achieving in one action a double purpose, primary the deliverance of the Holy Land and secondary aid to the beleaguered East.

Conditions in western Europe and in France in particular were favorable to the idea of a Crusade at this time. For years the Church had striven to stamp out ruinous private warfare by the Truce of God and the Peace of God. Never completely successful in this effort the Crusade can be looked upon as a further attempt to purify and direct the fighting instincts of medieval society. Material benefits could be offered and were offered as inducements to go on the Crusade: The East was a "land flowing with milk and honey" where the Franks now crowded and shut in by the mountains and the sea could find greater room and wealth. Therefore, though the Crusade remained primarily spiritual, it did not exclude the attainment of other goads; though the rewards were essentially eternal, temporal inducements were also offered


to those who would enter upon this new via salutis.\textsuperscript{18}

Although the widespread practice of pilgrimage to Jerusalem together with the adverse conditions affecting this pilgrimage pointed to armed intervention on the part of the West in order to safeguard her immemorial right; the Crusade itself is the creation of Urban II. The form in which Urban cast the intervention of the West in affairs of the East, the Crusade, must be wholly ascribed to his action at Clermont and to his continuation of what he began at Clermont through the medium of personal appearances throughout the rest of France, legates and letters, and all the minutiae which go into organizing and directing such a popular movement as the First Crusade. Urban is the author of the Crusade and the organizer and director of the First Crusade. As such the Crusade is a clerical enterprise implemented in its military character by the warriors of Europe, the nobles. That Urban's idea of a Crusade met with the approbation of the West and of France in particular is well indicated by the enthusiastic response of thousands to his call and to a similar response to the calls of his successors. The dignity and sacred character of the activity of the Crusader in the minds of the Church and of the people at large is brought clearly home when it is realized that three large religious orders were dedicated to the protection or recovery of the Holy Land. Although it may be difficult for the modern man to appreciate what importance was attached to recovering the Holy Places by medieval Europe, the fact cannot be denied. Participation in the recovery of the Holy Land. The creation of the military phase in the history of devotion of the

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., 32.
Holy Land is due to the brilliant work of Urban.

Pope Urban II first broached the subject at a council held in Piacenza. However, the formal inauguration was to take place not in Italy but in France, the home of chivalry, where the virtues and vices of feudalism were most pronounced, the soil from which sprang the Truce of God and the Peace of God. Urban II, himself a Frenchman, on the second last day of a council held at Clermont in France in November of the year 1095 addressed the assembled clergy and nobility. After urging them to see to it that the laws of the Church were better observed he spoke of sending aid to the East. The accounts of Urban's speech agree in substance and emphasize aid to the Christian East as well as the delivery of the Holy Land from the hand of the Infidel.

Wherefore, I exhort with earnest prayer—not I but God, that as heralds of Christ, you urge men by frequent exhortation, men of all ranks, knights as well as footsoldiers, rich as well as poor, to hasten to exterminate this vile race from the lands of your brethren, and to aid the Christians in time.19

Urban continued his exhortation mingling in an effective way the natural and supernatural motives for embarking on an expedition for the relief of the East and the conquest of the Holy Land. Those dying in the effort will obtain the plenary indulgence of full remission of the punishment due to their sins. The landless will find a rich land flowing with milk and honey. Those who have fought against their own brothers can now freely exercise their warlike tastes in a war that will bring them life eternal. The response was tremendous. The crowd shouted as one "God wills It" and thousands took the

19 Krey, 29.
cross on the spot. Among the first to take the cross at Clermont was Bishop Adhemar of Puy. Urban followed up his success at Clermont by a personal tour of France and by sending letters and legates to the various princes of Christendom. Soon all Europe was acquainted with the pending campaign and its essential details. Adhemar, Bishop of Puy would take the Pope's place as leader of the Crusade. All were to set out on August 15, 1096 for the general rendezvous, Constantinople. There would be a three-year truce and those who embarked on the campaign as soldiers of the Church would be protected in life and property by the Church. The Winter and Spring would be spent in preparation for the long journey and the battles to come. Thus the Crusade was created and Europe roused for armed intervention in the East that would result in the foundation of the Latin Kingdom. The spark that Urban applied to the religious enthusiasm of the West that resulted directly in the First Crusade blazed again and again during the next two centuries after the First Crusade had finished its task. The occasion for the renewal of the Holy War on a large scale usually was some reverse to the Christian cause in the Holy Land. The fall of Edessa in 1144 and the consequent threat to Jerusalem roused Europe to go on the Second Crusade. The loss of Jerusalem in 1187 produced the Third Crusade, The Crusade of the Kings in 1192. Pope Innocent III planned and executed the Fourth and Fifth Crusade in 1204 and 1218 respectively. The Fourth Crusade back fired by terminating not in the conquest of the Holy Land but in the conquest of the Christian Greek Empire. The Sixth Crusade obtained Jerusalem by treaty between Emperor Frederick II and the Moslem. The

20 Ibid., 43.
last two were led by that great crusader St. Louis, King of France. Except for the First Crusade the remaining Crusades, numbered and unnumbered, were from a military point of view failures. This discouraging fact coupled with the fall of the last crusading stronghold in Syria in 1291 terminated the movement started by Urban. There would be other attempts and dreams of conquest but these are rather the epilogue of the Crusades rather than part of crusading chapter. The failure of the Crusades from a military viewpoint was due to a variety of causes. Chief among these were the growing strength of the Moslem power in the East and the lack of intelligent cooperation on the part of the Christians. However, since the purpose of this chapter is to account for the origin of the Latin Kingdom, the other Crusades though interesting must be disregarded while the progress of the cause of the Kingdom, the First Crusade, is considered.

The enthusiasm the greeted Urban's Crusade exceeded his plans. Without waiting for the warriors to assemble, the common people under such irresponsible leaders as Peter the Hermit, set out in early spring for Constantinople. Altogether there were five such bands, three of which failed to reach Constantinople, destroyed or turned back because of their excesses by the Hungarians. Of the two that survived the band under Walter the Penniless arrived at Constantinople first and waited for Peter. The Hermit arrived with his peasant army depleted by encounters with the Hungarians. Alexius, fearful for the safety of his city shipped the People's Crusade across the

21 Ibid., 48 ff.
straits of Bosporus in August of 1096.\textsuperscript{22} The people with foolish temerity challenged Kilij Arlson, ruler of Nicaea. As a result, when the nobles arrived in the vicinity of Nicaea all that remained of the Peasant Crusade were whitening bones. Peter himself escaped slaughter by remaining in Constantinople. He and the remnants of the Peasant Crusade that were lucky enough to stay with him awaited the arrival of the nobles.

The response to Urban's plea found its first orderly expression in the Crusade of the Nobles which got under way in the summer of 1096. Groups of nobles by divers ways set out for the general rendezvous, Constantinople. Among the nobles three leaders with their followers were destined to play an important part in the course of the First Crusade. They are Bohemund of Tarentum, son of Robert Guisgard, who led a splendid force of Normans from Sicily; Raymond of Toulouse, accompanied by Adhemar, at the head of the Provencals; Godfrey of lower Lorraine, together with his brother Baldwin. There were others of lesser importance, Hugh of Vermandois, brother to the king of France; Robert, Duke of Normandy and brother to Henry I of England; Robert, Count of Flanders; and Stephen of Blois, the richest man in Christendom, son-in-law of William the Conqueror and father of King Stephen of England.

Besides these nobles and their knights, there were included in the First Crusade a large number of non-combatants, both clerical and lay. As regards the clergy, Urban's only restriction for their participation was that

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 71; cf. also Von Sybel, H., The History and Literature of the Crusades, translated by Lady Duff Gordon, London, Chapman and Hall, 1861, 54.
they obtain the permission of their Superior. It is safe to conclude that the clergy constituted no inconsiderable part of the crusading host. Adhemar, of course, as representative of the Pope was the recognized leader of the Crusade. Besides Bishop Adhemar, there were other prelates on the Crusade, e.g., the Bishop of Agde near Narbonne in France; Arnulf, bishop of Martirano; Bonfilius, bishop of Foligno; Gilbert, bishop of Evreux; Helias, bishop of Bari; Odo, bishop of Bayeux; Otto, bishop of Strassburg; Peter, bishop of Anangni; and William, bishop of Orange. Besides the above mentioned bishops there were also a number of abbots who took the cross and were part of the First Crusade such as the abbot of Allerheiligen in Schaffhausen; Gerhard and the abbot of St. Savin sur la Guartampe, Gervais. Among the countless number of minor clergy both secular and regular mention must be made of Fulcher of Chartres, a priest who wrote an excellent eye-witness account of the First Crusade; of Arnulf of Chooques, who was elected first Latin patriarch of Jerusalem; Benedict, consecrated archbishop of Edessa; Peter of Narbonne consecrated bishop of Albara in 1098; Peter Tudebode, priest of Civray, who also left an eye-witness account of the First Crusade; Raymond of Agiles, chaplain to Raymond of Toulouse and author of the third best account of the First Crusade; Robert of Rouen consecrated bishop of Ramlah in 1099; and Roger consecrated bishop of Tarsus in 1099 also.

The chief function of the clergy was that of chaplains. Their aid in settl-

23 Krey, 32.
24 Porges, 21.
25 Ibid.
ing disputes, keeping discipline, and sustaining the morale of the crusading army cannot be overemphasized. Although a few of the clergy that participated in the First Crusade may not have been exemplary in their conduct, still the majority were outstanding for talent and virtue and quite equal to the task of ministering to the needs of the army on the march and of administering the dioceses that came under their direction as a result of the campaign.

More numerous than the clergy and the nobles together were the non-combatant lay pilgrims. Urban's plan for the First Crusade included besides the warriors and the clergy, the unarmed poor and even women. The very form in which he cast the Crusade--a pilgrimage--necessarily included the poor who would remain non-combatants unless armed by the richer participants in the Crusade. The number of non-combatants increased steadily while the number of warriors decreased until during the siege of Antioch the non-combatants formed an overwhelming majority.26 The presence of so many unfit for the military task that confronted the First Crusade prompted responsible leaders to ask from Antioch that for the present only those join them who had sufficient resources to maintain themselves. It must be said that however unavoidable the presence of large numbers of non-combatants on the First was, their right to be there was never questioned and the responsibility for their care and safety was never shirked. In this Adhemar led the way.

Of the great leaders, Godfrey took the land route through Hungary to Constantinople arriving there at the close of 1096. Raymond of Toulouse also went by land down the coast of Illyria and cross-country to Constantinople.

26 Porges, 3.
arriving in the spring of 1097. Shortly after Raymond, Bohemund arrived after taking the sea route to Durazzo and marching overland with Tancred his nephew who was destined to play a subordinate but nonetheless important role in the history of the kingdom. With the arrival of Robert of Normandy in the summer of 1097, the force that was to create a Latin power in the Orient was complete. They numbered altogether about 105,000.27

In the spring of 1097 the crusading host was ferried across the straits and soon began the siege of Nicaea, the first Turkish stronghold in sight of Constantinople. Alexius managed to have the city delivered into the hands of the Greeks, thereby depriving the Latins of the spoils of victory. To make up for their disappointment and chagrin, Alexius invited the crusading barons back to Constantinople where he loaded them with costly presents. Raymon of Toulouse was singled out for special preference, since the wily Emperor detected his use as a foil against his old enemy, Bohemund.

After Nicaea the army of crusaders proceeded across Asia Minor. Upon defeating the Moslems at Dorylaeum under the leadership of Bohemund, the Crusaders found no real opposition until they came to Antioch. The retreating Moslems had, however, ruined the wells and scorched the land so that the march across Asia Minor was accompanied by extreme suffering, especially from thirst. Before arriving at Antioch, Baldwin, brother of Godfrey, withdrew from the main crusading host to establish himself at Edessa. Thoros, King of Edessa, invited Baldwin to intervene.28 With some sixty knights Baldwin re-

27 Krey, 17.
28 Regesta, no. 5.
duced the Moslem power and had himself elected king of this Armenian territory upon the demise of Thoros. The main body of Crusaders pushed on to Antioch without Baldwin. In the rich environs of Antioch after the excruciating torments of the march across Asia Minor, the Crusaders relaxed and dissipated. No headway was made against the city. Then the food became scarce and the rainy season brought sickness and misery. Bohemund told the princes that he would solve their difficulties if in return the city would be given to him as his possession. Raymond objected and the other princes agreed with Raymond not to give into Bohemund. Far from being discouraged Bohemund merely waited until the situation was hopelessly desperate for the Crusaders. Yaghi-Sian, ruler of Antioch, had managed to obtain the aid of Kerbogha, ruler of Mosul, and already the patrols of Kerbogha's advancing army were spotted by the Crusaders. Faced by the dilemma of choosing between destruction at the hands of Yaghi-Sian inside Antioch and Kerbogha outside the city or yielding to the ambition of Bohemund, the princes agreed to Bohemund's terms. That very night Bohemund sent a message to his accomplice inside the city and the next day the Crusaders were inside the city. There followed a massacre of the Moslems' garrison and a wallowing in the luxury and ease of a city that was second only to Constantinople in size and magnificence.

Immediately after their first orgy the Crusaders woke up to the seriousness of their situation. They were closely besieged by Kerbogha; the water supply was exhausted and food was running short. After great suffering the emaciated army decided to stake all on a sally. The finding of what was purported to be the lance that pierced the Saviour's side was received as a sign
of God's good pleasure. The gaunt army grimly staggered out and utterly routed the surprised enemy who were as much disheartened by their frightening appearance as anything else. More time was wasted by the quarrel between Bohemund and Raymond and the unity of the Crusade was further crippled by the death of Adhemar who had thus far kept the nobles within bounds. Finally the common people impatient at the dilly-dallying of the nobles set off by themselves for Jerusalem. Godfrey and Tancred and the other prominent leaders with the exception of Bohemund and Baldwin soon followed. Except for a few days siege of Gabul by Godfrey, the crusading army marched straight down the coast to Jerusalem. The city was at that time in the hands of the friendly Caliph of Cairo who had taken it from the Seljuks in 1098. Nevertheless, the Christians laid siege to the city. With the aid of Genoese supplies and Genoese engineers the Crusaders erected towers with bridges which they moved in close to the walls. After a month's siege and after more than one tower had been burnt down, the Crusaders bridged the walls and engaged in a hand to hand combat with the defenders. The resistance was soon overcome on the very day of the entrance, July 15, 1099.

Immediately after the conquest of Jerusalem the barons met to elect a ruler. Raymond of Toulouse was first choice. But upon his refusal Godfrey was chosen for the unenviable task of ruling Jerusalem, unenviable because soon the majority of Crusaders would depart and leave Godfrey with but a


30 Rohricht, Reinhold, Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani (MXCVII-MCCXCI); Additamentum, Libraria Academica Wagneriana, Oeniponti, 1904, no. 19a.
handful of knights in the heart of Islam with which to defend Jerusalem. But before the Crusaders departed Godfrey assembled them to ward off the first threat to the newly won possession of the Christians. The Caliph of Cairo was marching with a large army against Jerusalem. Godfrey led his forces out to meet the Egyptian and destroyed the force near Ascalon in August, 1099. Shortly after the defeat of the last Moslem power in the East at that time, the Crusaders returned home. Godfrey's position, however, was far from secure. He would have to conquer the land by-passed on the way to Jerusalem in order to maintain communications with Bohemund and Baldwin to the north. To do the hardest part of his task, he secured the service of the Venetian and Genoese fleets for assistance in the reduction of coastal cities in return for liberal rights and privileges. After a little more than a year in office Godfrey died.

Raymond of Toulouse had also remained in the East and busied himself with the siege of Tripoli from which he had deviated on the march to Jerusalem. He received the aid of Alexius who hoped that Tripoli would prove an effective barrier to the southern expansion of Bohemund and in general prove to be a thorn in his side. Upon the request of Godfrey, Baldwin in far off Edessa, was summoned to succeed his brother as ruler of Jerusalem. In spite of the opposition of the Patriarch and Papal Legate Daimbert Baldwin was elected by the barons with the title of King to head the feudal principality
of Jerusalem. With the election of Baldwin as king in 1100 the kingdom of Jerusalem may be considered as established. 33

Several things that affected the crusading effort from 1097 and conditioned its success must be taken into consideration. Among the crusaders themselves there were bickerings among the nobles who at times were solicitous for their personal ambitions to the exclusion of the common good. The typical example of this type of crusader is Bohemund. His ambition to acquire Antioch doubtless inspired a similar ambition in Raymond and in Baldwin. 34 At any rate the policy of the Norman prince met with vigorous opposition from Raymond. Baldwin blocked Tancred when Tancred began the foundation of a Norman principality in Cilicia. Finally Baldwin withdrew from the main body of crusaders to establish himself in Edessa. Perhaps the only great leader not affected by secular ambition was Godfrey. The others at times marred the unity of the Crusade in the conflict of personal ambition. Thanks to the common people on the Crusade and the leadership of the clergy the nobles were always brought back to a realization of the unity of purpose of the Crusade.

The Emperor Alexius in his turn endeavored to use the Crusade to secure his political empire when he forced the princes to take an oath of fealty to him on the theory that whatever the crusaders conquered pertained to the lost provinces of the Greek Empire. All but Raymond submitted to his demands and became the vassals of Alexius in return for the promise of assistance in the
campaign. Because Alexius failed to come to the aid of the Christians at Antioch the crusaders felt no further obligation to him. Thus was sown the seed of hostility that did more than anything else to ruin the crusading movement. Alexius and his successors were frankly hostile to this movement; since they could not control it they were afraid that it might absorb their Empire. Had Alexius given whole-hearted cooperation to the Crusade, the success of the Crusade might have been lasting and the Empire secure. This incipient hostility led to the destruction of the Eastern Empire in 1204 when the Fourth Crusade under the leadership of the astute Dodge of Venice, Dandalo, captured Constantinople and set up the Latin Empire of the East.35

While the rift in Christendom weakened the Crusade, similar rifts in the Moslem East made possible the success of the First Crusade. The Seljuk empire was at this time broken into sections. In Asia Minor Kilij Arslan held sway independently of the Sultan of Bagdad. In Syria the military occupation of the Seljuks had degenerated into civil war among the military rulers of the various cities who considered themselves independent of all authority and viewed their neighbors as rivals. Antioch, Damascus, Aleppo, and Hams had their armies ready to ally themselves with anyone--Christian or Moslem--in order to advance their power at the expense of their rival. Moreover, the Moslem East was split by religious differences. The Abbasid Caliphs of Bagdad headed the Sunnite sect and the Fatimite Caliph of Egypt was leader of the Shiite sect. The Crusaders early sent envoys to Egypt to obtain

35 Additamentum, no. 740c
assistance against the Seljuks who, as will be remembered, had snatched Jerusalem from the rule of the Egyptian heretics in 1071.\textsuperscript{36} Damascus, fearful of absorption by Mosul, early established peaceful relations with the Crusaders.\textsuperscript{37} When this disunity of Islam was changed into unity under Zengi and later under Saladin, the Crusading kingdom was doomed. Until Zengi, the states established by the Crusaders survived not without continual watchfulness.

In relating the military aspect of the progress of the Crusade, sufficient stress has not been laid on the position of the clergy in the crusading host. As has been said the entire Crusade was under the general direction of Adehemar the Papal Legate. This does not mean that Adehemar had the powers of a generalissimo and directed the strategy of the army. Rather, the military conduct of the campaign was in the hands of the high council of Barons. Adehemar looked out for the common good of all participants and used the language of persuasion rather than command to keep the nobles in line. He had direct control over the clergy appointing the time for fasts, processions and so on.\textsuperscript{38} It was the conciliatory spirit of Adehemar that preserved some semblance of unity among the divergent elements and interests that made up the First Crusade. At the siege of Antioch when the people had reason to fear that the nobility would desert and leave them unprotected in enemy territory, it was Adehemar who exacted from the nobles an oath of

\textsuperscript{36} Conder, 45.
\textsuperscript{38} Porges, 8.
allegiance to the cause of the Crusade. The other bishops and priests seconded the efforts of Adhemar by never letting the people forget why they had undertaken the perilous journey. And when the nobles delayed for private gain, the clergy expoused the cause of the common people by urging the march on to Jerusalem. They fanned the flames of religious fervor of the pilgrims in times of great crises when nothing except devotion to the ideal of the pilgrimage could prevent disaster. At Nicaea, Dorylaeum, Antioch, and Jerusalem their exhortations and prayers before battle coupled with the hearing of confession and the administration of the last sacraments encouraged the fighters and consoled them during these harrowing experiences. Finally the difficult task of caring for the masses of the poor, of keeping up the morale, and struggling against the moral failings consequent upon camp life were the constant occupation of the higher and lower clergy. The authority of the Papal Legate and the work of the clergy was symbolic of the preponderantly religious character and purpose of the whole First Crusade and foreshadowed their future influence in the Kingdom in whose birth and development they played such a vital role.

Having seen the origin of the kingdom, the expansion, organization, and history of the kingdom until the conquest of Saladin must now be considered.

39 Ibid., 16.
40 Ibid., 15
CHAPTER II
THE ORGANIZATION OF THE LATIN KINGDOM

Urban II in organizing the First Crusade and placing at its head to take his place Adhemar, Bishop of Puy, obviously intended some kind of unity both in operation and execution. Unfortunately Adhemar died at Antioch in 1098 thus leaving the crusader-host leaderless.\(^1\) This even had a permanent effect on the results of the First Crusade. In the first place the occupation of the crusaders instead of forming one state, resulted in the formation of four states, each independent of the other and in the case of Tripoli, versus Antioch and Edessa versus Antioch, hostile to one another. In the second place the death of Adhemar and the absence of any cleric in the crusading host of sufficient dignity to succeed him resulted in the establishment of a lay ruler in Jerusalem rather than an ecclesiastical ruler. Naturally enough an army created by the Pope and led by his representative, would be expected to establish in the Holy City a clerical rather than a lay government. The unforeseen death of Adhemar dashed the hopes of a clerical power in Jerusalem and resulted not in the establishment of the dominium temporale of the Church in the Holy City, but in a feudal state consisting in a federation of nobles,

\(^1\) Regesta, no. 15.
headed by one of their number who bore the title, King of Jerusalem.² It is this federation of nobles called the Kingdom of Jerusalem that we are investigating in this chapter, and whose origin was considered in Chapter One.

Of the other Crusading states both Edessa and Antioch were established before Jerusalem. In the case of Edessa, Baldwin, brother of Godfrey, with a few knights had begun the establishment of the County of Edessa before the siege of Antioch. Baldwin did not participate in the siege of Antioch nor in the siege of Jerusalem but busied himself with his private possession of Edessa until summoned in 1100 to be ruler in Jerusalem. Obviously Baldwin's digression to Edessa had the approval of the other Crusaders. At any rate the conquerors of Jerusalem, who were also the founding fathers of the realm, were eager to have Baldwin succeed his brother as ruler in Jerusalem. On leaving Edessa, Baldwin invested his cousin Baldwin du Bourg with his possession in Mesopotamia. Thus Edessa became the natural fief of Jerusalem.³ In 1118 when Baldwin du Bourg was elected King of Jerusalem he gave the County of Edessa to Joscelin de Courtenay as a reward for helping him obtain the royal crown. Thus Edessa remained until its fall in 1144 the fief of Jerusalem.⁴ Exposed as it was to attacks from Moslem rulers on all sides Edessa

---

² There seems to be no doubt that the clergy was quite numerous on the First Crusade. However, outside of Adhemar, there appears to have been no member of the hierarchy present and consequently after Adhemar the control of the crusade passed completely into the hands of the lay lords. The minor clergy without a leader are forced to follow the lead of their lay lords.

³ La Monte, 120.

needed the protection of the kings of Jerusalem. Under the first three kings, this assistance was effectively given. On the death of Fulk, the third King of Jerusalem, and the accession of the first native King, Baldwin III, who was a minor, the kingdom came under the regency of the Queen Mother, Melisende. Taking advantage of the weakness of the monarchy, Zengi, the vigorous ruler of Mosul, conquered Edessa in 1144. Though a fief of Jerusalem Edessa acted independently. Like the other crusading states it made treaties, engaged in warfare regardless of the policy of Jerusalem. The position of Edessa as vassal to Jerusalem meant that the king was obliged to protect Edessa without any corresponding rights in dictating the foreign policy of that State. 5

The second crusading state established was Antioch. Though all Crusaders participated in the conquest of Antioch, Bohemund obtained possession of the city. When the Crusaders proceeded to Jerusalem, Bohemund remained in Antioch to consolidate his gains, going to Jerusalem in fulfillment of his vow two years later in 1100. 6 Established prior to and independently of Jerusalem, Antioch did not acknowledge the suzerainty of Jerusalem in the beginning. Later on in order to obtain assistance against the traditional enemy of the house of Bohemund, the Greek Empire, Antioch performed homage to Jerusalem. Later still, Antioch was forced to pay homage to the Greek Emperor. Having two suzerains, Antioch, like the Counts of Flanders, usually succeeded in ignoring both.

The last crusading state to be established was Tripoli. Begun by Raymond

5 La Monte, 125.

6 Regesta, no. 76.
of Toulouse and completed in 1104, the County of Tripoli originated with the aid of Baldwin I and the Greek Emperor. Both Raymond and Alexius were united in opposition to Bohemund, and Tripoli was calculated to be a thorn in the side of Antioch preventing expansion to the South. Having obtained aid from the king of Jerusalem and having such a powerful neighbor on its borders, Tripoli naturally enough became the vassal of Jerusalem. Yet like Antioch and Edessa, Tripoli had its own customs and feudal hierarchy, independent of Jerusalem. The influence of Jerusalem on Tripoli depended on the strength of the Jerusalemite kings and the weakness of Tripoli. After the fall of Jerusalem in 1187, Tripoli lined up with Antioch, forming more or less one state. During the thirteenth century, Antioch-Tripoli was as strong, if not stronger than the gravely contracted Kingdom of Jerusalem reduced now to Acre, Jaffa and Tyre with Acre as Capital of the kingdom. Theoretically Jerusalem with its vassal states of Edessa, Antioch and Tripoli formed one feudal state. Practically, each state was independent of the other and the position of Jerusalem was much like the position of the United States with reference to the Latin Americas, one of hegemony, entirely dependent on the strength and will of Jerusalem to obtain not subordination, but cooperation against a common enemy.

Having seen something of the relation of the other crusading states to the Kingdom, the Kingdom itself will now be considered under the headings of its geographical limits, expansion, and organization.

By 1131, except for the city of Ascalon, the territorial expansion and organization of the kingdom was complete. The eastern boundary was formed
by the valley of Baccar and the Ghor basin which includes the Jordan and the Dead Sea. But in the north the fortress of Bancas and the land of Soad lay East of this line; and in the southeast the Franks occupied the Gulf of Elim. As the land was conquered it was organized into fiefs, so that as early as 1131 we find the kingdom divided into four great baronies and twelve lesser lordships. The first were: (1) the county of Jaffa and Ascalon; (2) the lordship of Kerak and Montreal; (3) the principality of Galilee; (4) the lordship of Sidon. The lesser fiefs were Darum, Hebron or St. Abraham, Arsuf, Caesarea, Nablus, Bessan, Caimont, Haifa, Toron, Scandelion, St. George, and Beyrout.7

The county of Jaffa and Ascalon stretched over the plain of Sharon between the sea and the mountains of Judah, and from the river Leddar to Darum and the desert of Sin. It included the fortresses of Ibelin, Blanchegarde, and Mirabel, and the towns of Gaza, Lydda and Ramleh. Jaffa was erected into a county by Baldwin I for his kinsman Hugh de Puisset.8 After the untimely fate of his son Hugh II, it passed into Royal hands to be revived by Baldwin III for his brother Amaury, who was already Count of Ascalon.9 From this time the double county became an appendage of the royal house, and so was held by Guy de Lusignan and Walter de Brienne. The authority of the counts

7 Hebron or St. Abraham and St. George or Lydda were fiefs possessed by their respective bishops. Both presided over their seignorial courts which numbered in the case of St. George, 12 vassals and in the case of St. Abraham 10 vassals. Lois I, 385.


9 There are several documents which refer to Amaury as the count of Jaffa and Ascalon; Regesta nos. 431, 433, 440.
was, however, much circumscribed by the power of the great house of Ibelin. Balian the Bearded, founder of that house, appears in 1120 as Constable of Jaffa, and eventually became Lord of Ibelin, Ramleh, and Mirabel. In later days his descendants accumulated many fiefs in Jerusalem and Cyprus.

The lordship of Kerak and Montreal took its name from the two great fortresses in the land beyond the Dead Sea. Its peculiar importance lay in the fact that the rich caravans from Egypt to Damascus had to pass through its territories, and pay it toll. Its first lord was Roman de Puy; afterwards Fulk gave it to Payn, uncle of Philip of Nablus. Philip's daughter conveyed it to Reginald of Chatillon, its last and most famous lord. This lordship included the maritime fortress of Elim, and was eventually united with the lordship of Hebron.

The principality of Galilee, besides the district properly so called, included the land of Soad beyond the Jordan and had Tiberias for its Capital. It contained many important fortresses, such as Safed, La Feve, Forbelet, and Belvoir, and the towns of Nazareth and Saphoris. Tancred was for a short time Prince of Galilee; afterwards it was held by Hugh of Falkenburg, then by Joscelin of Courtenay, before he became count of Edessa, after him by William de Bures. Later it returned to the Falkenburg family and in the 13th century

10 Les Familles, 212.
11 Ibid., 213.
12 Ibid., 214.
13 Regesta nos. 403, 404.
14 Les Familles, 248.
passed by marriage to the Ibelins. On its northern borders lay the important lordship of Toron, whose rulers for four generations were called Henfrid and were for a long time constables of the kingdom. 15

The lordship of Sidon was bounded on the north by the Damour, on the west by the sea and on the east and south by the Litany. It included the strongholds of Beaufort and the Cave of Toron, with the towns of Sidon and Sarepta. It was first granted to Eustace Grenier, who was lord of Caesarea. Eustace married a niece of the Patriarch Arnulf; of his two sons, Walter became lord of Caesarea and Gerard lord of Sidon. 17

The immediate royal domain comprised, besides Jerusalem and its neighborhood, including Nablus, the two great cities of Tyre and Acre, the latter of which became in the 13th century the capital of the Latin colonies in Syria.

The Latin Kingdom thus established and organized in Syria had to face in the north a number of Mohammedan amirs, and in the south the Caliph of Egypt. The disunion between the Mohammedans of northern Syria and the Fatimites of Egypt, and the political disintegration of the former, were both favorable to the success of the Franks; but they had nevertheless, to maintain their ground vigorously both in the north and south against almost incessant attacks. The hostility of the decadent caliphate of Cairo was the less dangerous; and though Baldwin I had at the beginning of his reign to meet

15 Ibid., 230.
16 Ibid., 225.
17 Additamentum, no. 230c.
annual attacks from Egypt, by the end of his reign he had pushed his power to
the Red Sea, and in the very year of his death (1118) he had penetrated along
the north coast of Egypt as far as Farama. 18 But the real menace to the
Latin Kingdom lay in the northern part of Syria; where a power was eventually
destined to rise which would outstrip the kings of Jerusalem in the race for
Cairo, and then—with the northern and southern boundaries of Jerusalem in
its control—crush the kingdom, as it were, between the two arms of a vice.
Until 1127, however, the Mohammedans of Northern Syria were disunited among
themselves. With the accession of the ruler of Mosul, Zengi, the Mohammedan
power began to recover. In 1144 Edessa fell and Jerusalem itself was threat-
ened. The loss of Edessa and the peril of Jerusalem prompted the Second Cru-
sade which was a signal failure.

While the Mohammedan power was gaining strength, the Christians were
hard put to maintain the status quo. After the death of Fulk in 1143 the
kingdom passed to his son Baldwin III, a minor, with Melisende acting as
regent. Baldwin was succeeded by his brother Amaury who almost acquired
Cairo but finally let it slip into the hands of Saladin. Amaury's son,
Baldwin IV, was a leper; and on his death the weak and incapable Guy de
Lusignan, after what was almost civil war, gained the throne by the support
of such irresponsibles as Renaud de Châtillon. Saladin gathered his forces
and marched against the kingdom, destroying its military power in the Battle
of Hattin in 1187. 19 This was the end of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. For

18 Regesta, no. 191.
19 Ibid., no. 640.
another century the Christians were tolerated on the Sea-Coast only to be forced out of their last stronghold, Acre, in 1291. Until Hattin, however, the kingdom retained its territorial integrity achieved during the reigns of Baldwin I (1100-1118) and Baldwin II, (1118-1131) undiminished.

Concerning the political organization of the Kingdom it must be said that the High Court of the barons was all powerful and the kingship weak. Both features can be explained in the origin of the kingdom.

Shortly after the conquest of Jerusalem the barons who had participated assembled to determine upon whom the duty of ruling the new conquest should devolve. This assembly of the conquering lords, most of whom, according to Fulcher of Chartres, had carved out a fief for themselves on the way to Jerusalem, is significant. Just as on the march decisions were made not by one man but by the barons in council, so in determining who should have the title of ruler in Jerusalem, the decision was made by the council of the lords. Thus it is that even before the conquest of Jerusalem the sovereign body exists that will rule Jerusalem. For although Godfrey was elected, the real power resides in the council of barons of which he was merely the president. This council of the chief lords was called La Haute Cour. La Monte says:

Generally speaking we may affirm that the king of Jerusalem was merely the most important feudal lord, primus inter pares in his relationship to his vassals, and what powers he possessed were rather those of a feudal suzerain than of a monarch.20

The government established not by Godfrey but by the nobles who participated

20 La Monte, 14.
in the conquest was a feudal government, i.e., authority was decentralized among fief holding lords who were supreme in their own land and whose primary obligation was that of a military service at the call of the king. Not only military service but also judicial service in the king's court is implied in the feudal relationship between king and vassal. The great vassals of the king of Jerusalem formed La Haute Cour in which they settled their feudal relationships. The Assises de La Haute Cour are quite stringent on recalcitrant lords who fail to render military service as stipulated by the Haute Cour. In case of such an infraction of feudal obligation, the delinquent vassal was summoned and tried by his peers. If found guilty, he lost his fief for life. Not only did the High Court sit in judgment but in La Haute Cour the customs and laws regulating the feudal nobility were determined, not by the king but by the Haute Cour. As a member, in fact the top member of the feudal hierarchy, the king presided over the Haute Cour. The real governance of the realm accordingly pertained not to the king but to the barons. The king was merely the servant, the front, the spokesman for a feudal aristocracy that ruled.

However, as we have said, outside of the Haute Cour at Jerusalem presided over by the king and composed of his chief vassals, the decisions of the Haute Cour affected the realm as a whole only indirectly. Each great vassal

21 The principle of judicium parium had full meaning in the High Court of Jerusalem, cf. La Monte, 175.

22 The king's power is based on his royal domain. Theoretically the lords of the realm are his vassals owing him service. Practically the king gets just what and as much as his barons are willing to give him. Cf. La Monte, 130 ff.
back in his fief was master. Just as the High Court was composed of and regulated by the chief lords of the land, so in each fief there existed a feudal court for the vassals of the lord. Here again the same situation prevailed; the lord was merely primus inter pares in his fief and his power, like the king's, rested not in his theoretical lordship but in his private domain.

For the High Court in Jerusalem as well as for the High Courts in the fiefs presided over by the vassals of the king, there grew up a body of customary law called the Assises de La Haute Cour de Jerusalem. The authors of this body of law were the chief lords of the land and in it are set forth the mutual obligations affecting lords and vassals and the customs pertaining to the relations of the lords to the Church. This body of law, begun during Godfrey's time, reached more or less final form at the end of the expansion period of the kingdom; and these laws, together with the law affecting the non-noble population, were written down in a document called the Lettres du Sepulchre and locked in the Holy Sepulchre to which only the Patriarch had the key. Though this original document was lost we have the substance of these laws in works written by legists of the kingdom during the thirteenth century. Though the wording may be changed, the substance of the law remains the same during the thirteenth century as it was before the conquest of

23 Lois I, Introduction, XXXVII.
24 Grandclaude, Maurice, Etude Critique Sur Les Livres Des Assises de Jerusalem. These pour le Doctorat Faculte de Droit de l'Universite de Paris, Paris, Juien, 1923, 45, maintains that the Lettres du Sepulchre were a myth invented by the 13th century legists.
With regard to the law contained in the Assises as indicated by the thirteenth century legislators of the kingdom, the feudal ideas of the founders of the kingdom are clearly set forth. In the Assises de La Haute Cour is seen French feudal law. The Norman conquerors of England and Sicily as well as Antioch imported the Norman close-knit variety of feudalism. But in the kingdom, established for the most part by Frenchmen and maintained by French reinforcements, we see the loose French form of feudalism. If feudalism means a weak monarchy and dispersion of authority, then certainly there is in the Latin Kingdom the purest form of feudalism, G. B. Adams to the contrary, notwithstanding. The ideas of the founders of the kingdom, together with the conditions surrounding the origin and duration of the kingdom, worked together to form that feudalism of the kingdom, different in many respects from the feudalism in England and to a lesser extent also in France.

As has been pointed out, the crusading nobles established themselves before choosing a suzerain. The customs determined upon by the barons from the military point of view were conditioned by the fact that the kingdom, surrounded by a numerous and ever active enemy, was in a state of perpetual siege. This fact encouraged feudal institutions whose primary function was

25 Beugnot in his introduction to the Assises de La Haute Cour says: Les institutions judiciaires d'un peuple sont le miroir fidele de ses idees de moeurs et de ses interests.

26 Adams maintains that the purest form of feudalism is that which existed in England during the Norman period, Cf. Cam. Med. Hist. V, 130.
military. The whole realm was divided up into fiefs owing military service; and the dominant class was the knightly class. Since the towns were also part of the feudal system there was no development of communal government as in Europe. Instead the towns belonged to the king or to one of his vassals, who owed so many knights for his fief. Moreover, the service owed by a vassal was not limited to forty days, as in Europe; but was unlimited. For land-fiefs, liege or personal service was owed by the knight. For money-fiefs, granted out of the revenues of towns derived from exports and imports, simple homage was required, i.e., the holder of the money fief need not serve in person, but was merely required to secure for the lord from whom he held the money-fief the service of some knight. Besides the usual knight service owed from fiefs that constituted the backbone of the military establishment of the kingdom, there were fiefs that owed not knight service but sergeant service, i.e., instead of a knight mounted on horseback, a foot-soldier was required. Practically all the land and money fiefs that found their way into the hands of the Church owed this kind of service. The bourgeois population of the towns, in return for their rights and privileges, were also required to supply a fixed quota of sergeants for the armed night of the kingdom.

27 Lois, II, 300; La Monte, 195.
28 Ibid., 188; Lois I, 405
29 Rey, E., Les Colonies Franques de Syrie aux 12e et 13e Siecles, Paris, Leroux, 1883, 68; La Monte, 170; Lois I, 400.
30 Ibid., II, 215 ff.
31 Ibid., 250; La Monte 175.
The knight service and sergeant service owed from fiefs was not adequate for the military operations necessitated by the constant warfare against Egypt to the south and the other Mohammedan powers to the north of the kingdom. Consequently the king and the other lords of the realm were forced to hire native soldiery to fill up the gaps in their forces. The Armenian archers were used, and a body of native cavalry called Turcopoles was also used. Moreover, knights from the West who came yearly to visit the Holy Land were frequently hired for a prescribed length of time. The expense of keeping up the military might of the kingdom was a heavy drain on the finances of the kingdom; and unfortunately, though it was potentially the richest state in Christendom, the kings allowed rich revenues to slip into the hands of the Italian traders, thereby weakening the kingdom. This situation can be explained by the fact that it was necessary, in order to secure essential aid from the maritime cities of Italy, to grant them rights and exemptions to such an extent as to create "imperia in imperio."

After the departure of the crusaders following Godfrey's victory at Ascalon in 1099, Godfrey was left with 300 knights and the same number of foot-soldiers to defend four isolated districts, Jerusalem, Haifa, Ramlah, and Jaffa. Expansion inland could never be achieved as long as such important coastal towns as Acre, Caesarea and Tyre were in the hands of the Moslem. To take these fortified towns not only a land army but a navy was necessary.

32 Rey, Les Colonies, 70.
33 Barker, 48.
34 Ibid., 45.
The kingdom never possessed its own navy. This weakness of the kingdom together with the inadequacy of reinforcements from the West forced the kings to rely heavily on the Italian Cities. There were Genoese ships in St. Simeon's harbor in the Spring of 1098 and at Jaffa in 1099; in 1099 Daimbert, the Archbishop of Pisa, led a fleet from his city to the Holy Land.36 In 1100 there came to Jaffa a Venetian fleet of 200 sails, whose leaders promised Venetian assistance in return for freedom from tolls and a third of each town they helped to conquer.37 An alliance was struck in 1101, by which the Genoese promised their assistance, in return for a third of all booty, a quarter in each town captured, and a grant of freedom from tolls.38 In this way Baldwin was able to take Arsuf and Caesarea in 1101 and Acre in 1104.39 Baldwin enjoyed other aid besides that of the Genoese. In 1110, for example, he was enabled to capture Sidon by the aid of Sigurd of Norway, who came to the Holy Land with a fleet of fifty-five ships.40 At a later date, in the reign of Baldwin II, Venice also gave her aid to the kings of Jerusalem. A Venetian Fleet of 120 sails came in 1123, and after aiding in the repulse of an attack, delivered by the Egyptians during Baldwin II's captivity, they helped the regent Eustace to capture Tyre (1124), in return for considerable

35 La Monte, 167 ff.
36 Regesta no. 24.
37 Ibid., no. 31.
38 Ibid., no. 35.
39 Ibid., no. 43.
40 Additamentum, no. 58a.
privileges—freedom from tolls throughout the kingdom, a quarter in Jerusalem, baths and ovens in Acre, and in Tyre one-third of the city and its suburbs, with their own court of justice and their own church. \textsuperscript{41} Though necessary for the origin and expansion of the kingdom, the Italian cities drained off the wealth from the kingdom and in return gave nothing to the defense of the kingdom. Preoccupied with their personal profits, and more intent on check each other, The Venetians and Genoese added their bit to the sum total of causes that brought about the downfall of the kingdom in 1187.

Besides the hierarchy of nobles headed by the king there existed side by side the feudal regime, the bourgeois class with their own laws and customs. In the First Crusade we saw how the pedites insisted on continuing on to Jerusalem in protest against the dilly-dallying nobility who were spending their time in private quarrels and in seeking out towns and lands for their occupation. In the organization of the kingdom this same class came into its own with their own law and courts. The customs regulating this non-noble element are contained in the \textit{Assises de la Cour de Bourgeois}. \textsuperscript{42} Herein are set forth their rights and privileges. All cases relating to this class are brought before a court of twelve bourgeois, presided over by the viscount. \textsuperscript{43} In Jerusalem there were two such courts; and in every fief, along side of the High Court, there existed the Low Court supreme without appeal for cases involving a noble and a bourgeois. Thus, in the secular organization of the

\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Regesta}, no. 102.

\textsuperscript{42} These custome are contained in volume two of the \textit{Lois} edited by Beugnot.

\textsuperscript{43} \textit{Lois II}, Introduction, XV ff.
realm two separate courts and law existed side by side, each court supreme in itself having cognizance of both criminal and civil matters.

Along with the feudal hierarchy there was raised on the heels of conquest an imposing ecclesiastical hierarchy enjoying the rights and privileges usually accorded the church at that time. Immediately after the conquest there was some dispute concerning whether a spiritual or a lay ruler should be elected first. If Adhemar had not died at Antioch in 1098, there would have been no room for such a dispute. As authorized leader of the First Crusade, to Adhemar would naturally have fallen the task of organizing Jerusalem. Unfortunately for those that were looking for the establishment of a theocratic state, Adhemar had died at Antioch and there was no cleric of sufficient dignity to take his place. The Greek Patriarch of Jerusalem, Simeon, who had cooperated with Adhemar, had died in the same year while in exile on the Island of Cyprus. Ignoring the claims of the Greeks to the patriarchal see of Jerusalem, the Latins elected Armulf, Chaplain to Robert of Normandy, to perform the patriarchal duties.44 Armulph was supplanted in 1100 by Daimbert through the influence of Bohemund. Daimbert endeavored to assert the claims of the church to rule Jerusalem. Both Bohemund and Godfrey acknowledged themselves as vassals of Daimbert; and on Godfrey's death it seemed as if the theocratic state would be established. At the time of Godfrey's oath of

fealty to Daimbert, Godfrey promised to give the patriarch Jerusalem and Jaffa as soon as he could acquire a city for himself or if he died without heirs. 45 Not having acquired a city, Godfrey asked on his death-bed that his brother Baldwin succeed him as ruler in Jerusalem. The wishes of Godfrey were pushed by the Lotharingian Laity, and opposed by Daimbert. The Lotharingian party was victorious and Baldwin was crowned king by Daimbert himself on Christmas day, 1100. 46 The quarrel between Daimbert and Baldwin continued until Daimbert was deposed by the Holy See. Except for the two-year patriarchate of Stephen, 1128-1130, the remaining patriarchs acknowledged the right of the kings to rule in Jerusalem and let their support in favor of the kings. Moreover, they seem to have been at the head of things almost as much as the king. Whenever the king was absent or in captivity the patriarchs headed the government. In 1123 Warmund concluded a treaty with Venice and summoned the king's vassals to the siege of Tyre. 47 Heraclius, at the siege of Jerusalem in 1187, took charge and negotiated the terms of capitulation. 48 No law was passed without the patriarch's approval. Indeed, according to La Monte, he was the most important member of the Haute Cour. 49

Along side the secular courts for the nobles and non-nobles there were,

45 Additamentum, no. 34c.
46 Regesta, no. 36
47 Ibid., no. 102.
48 Additamentum, 640c.
49 La Monte, 215.
as in Europe, the ecclesiastical courts. At the head of the ecclesiastical organization stood the patriarch as primate of the kingdom. As Ibelin puts it:

Il y a au réaume de Jerusalem deus Chef's seignors, l'un espirituel, et l'autre temporel: le patriarche de Jerusalem est le Seignor espirituel, et le rei du Relaume de Jerusalem le seignor temporel doudit reaume.

Unlike the secular courts, there were appeals to the court of the patriarch; and, if dissatisfied, the seeker after justice could appeal to Rome. There was during the period we are studying a long line of ecclesiastics and laymen who journeyed to Rome in search of justice.

The ecclesiastical courts tried all clerics and all cases relating to marriage, testament, church property, the tithe, matters of faith. All cases involving crusaders were also brought before the ecclesiastical courts. Each prelate, whether bishop or archbishop or patriarch, presided over the court in his diocese. Cases tried in an episcopal court could be appealed to the arch-episcopal court; then to the patriarch; and finally if need be, to Rome. It would seem that the ecclesiastical courts enjoyed greater power and prestige in Jerusalem than they did in France or in any other part of Europe.

According to Beumanoir, there are eleven instances in which laymen are liable

50 Lois I, 460.

51 The documents relating to tithes are quite plentiful. All of these regulations come from the ecclesiastical courts. Cf. Regesta nos. 113, 150, 213, 310, 430, 547, 603.

52 La Monte, 219.
to be called before an ecclesiastical court:

1. accusations de foi. 2. marriage. 3. dons et aumônes aux église. 4. propriétés religieuses. 5. Croises. 6. affaire des veuves. 7. testament. 8. garde des lieux saints. 9. bastardie. 10. Sorcellerie. 11. dimes. 53

As can be seen from the above enumeration, the power of the Church courts in the kingdom was quite extensive. Ibelin mentions only three things that cannot be pleaded in the High Court:

Trois choses sont de quei l'en ne peut plaidoier en la Haute Cour, l'une si est la foi Catholique; l'autre si est d'ou mariage; la tierce si est de testament. Ces doivent conduire en la cour de l'eglise. 54

The military orders were exempt from both the secular and ecclesiastical courts, and enjoyed their own courts subject to the Holy See. Their exempt position was a source of grave annoyance to the Patriarch and to other members of the hierarchy. Quarrels constantly arose over the attempt on the part of the Hospital and Temple to vindicate their rights. The orders, with the heavy support of the Holy See behind them and also rich revenues, usually won.

Similar to the position of the religious orders with reference to the ecclesiastical organization was the position of the commercial communes with reference to the secular jurisdiction. Completely outside the jurisdiction of the feudal and Bourgeois Courts established by the Franks they constituted as we have said imperia in imperio. They could not exact the death penalty,

53 Lois II, 340.
54 Ibid., 315. Ibelin writing in the thirteenth century cannot be taken infallibly for conditions existing in the twelfth century.
but otherwise had full jurisdiction over their own people, and in their own sections of the towns ruled by agents sent out from the home city. Definitely the Latin Kingdom was a feudal state in the sense that authority was dispersed and atomized. On the secular side this can be seen by the seventeen feudal courts each supreme in itself and the thirty-seven bourgeois courts also supreme. The ecclesiastical organization alone was close-knit and this, perhaps, accounts for the predominant position of the patriarch. However, even the ecclesiastical organization suffered because of the privileges and exemptions enjoyed by the military orders. On the secular side, the only tie that united the fiefs to the kings was the oath of fealty. The vassalage of the fief-holders was conditioned by themselves. Hence, ultimately the king, whose obligation was to defend the protect the realm, had to rely on his High Court and his own resources. The king allowed much wealth to slip into the hands of the Church which was unfortunate for the Kingdom from a military viewpoint.55 The Kingdom thus established endured unimpaired until the conquest of Saladin in 1187.

In spite of constant warfare, the kingdom enjoyed an unusual degree of prosperity based mostly on the brisk trade carried on in the sea-ports and in the cultivation of sugar-cane. The land was ten times more cultivated in those times than at present, producing the usual grains and fruits of the

55 This opinion is held by La Monte, Barker, Munro and others and seems to be a sound viewpoint. However, when the military strength afforded by the Church through the orders is considered the Church seems to have been as much if not more of a help than a hindrance to the military machine.
west plus special crops such as figs and dates known only to the east. In the country, farming was done in villages called casals, corresponding roughly to the manor in England and capable of supporting one knight. Half of the produce went to the Lord of the casal and the other half was retained by the native serfs or villeins. Each casal was subdivided into carrucates consisting of eighty acres. In the documents, both the carrucates and casals were given or sold to the Church. In the cities, houses and shops, plus revenues from the commercial courts, formed the basis of what are known as money fiefs. These also found their way to the Church.

Having seen in outline what the Kingdom was, it is now time to consider what the Church acquired by way of property in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem.
CHAPTER III

HOLDINGS OF THE CHURCH IN THE KINGDOM

In chapter one we saw how the ties between the Holy Land and the West reaching back into antiquity, and the threat of the Seljuk Turks to Christian civilization, crystallized under the leadership of Pope Urban II in the First Crusade and the establishment of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. As a more proximate preparation for the kernel of the thesis, chapter two set forth the feudal character and organization of the kingdom and its relationships with the other crusading states, the Moslems, the Italian commercial cities, and the Eastern Empire. We now turn our attention to the position of the Latin Church in the kingdom as a property holder. We say Latin Church advisedly, for although there were also Eastern rites with their own bishops, priests, and monasteries in the Kingdom, these non-Latin Churches were for the most part ignored in that distribution of honors and wealth that inevitably followed in the wake of conquest. The Latin Church was part and parcel of the conquering Crusaders, and as such quite naturally received both the authority and the means of re-establishing with honor and splendor the Church which since the conquest of Jerusalem in 638 was merely tolerated in the Holy Land.

This third chapter, then, will examine the Church's acquisition and ownership of property. Before coming to the documented survey of the transactions by which the Church acquired property, it is fitting to say something about
the organization of the Church within the kingdom, its right to property, the kinds of property it obtained, and the sources on which we base our study.

The head of the Church in the kingdom was the Latin patriarch of Jerusalem. It is true that the position of Simeon, Greek Patriarch of Jerusalem at the time the first Crusade began and almost up to the conquest in 1099, was respected by Adhemar, Bishop of Puy and Papal legate for the Crusaders. Undoubtedly, if Adhemar had lived, the patriarch would have been Greek, if for no other reason than to conciliate and win back the estranged Greek Church. Two extant letters of Simeon show how far their rapprochement had progressed before their untimely deaths. The death of both of them was a blow to the cause of union between the Greek and Latin Church. Without the directing hand of Adhemar, the Latins hurried the unworthy Arnulf into the patriarchal see, thereby conferring a traditionally Greek see upon a Latin.

The non-Latin rites in union with Rome acknowledged the authority of the Latin patriarch over them. Four metropolitans in the kingdom, the Archbishops of Tyre, Caesarea, Nazareth and Petra, all prelates of the Latin rite, were suffragans of the primate of the Kingdom. Directly under the Patriarch of Jerusalem were the Bishops of Bethlehem, Hebron and Lydda. There were four suffragan bishops under the Archbishop of Tyre at Acre, Sidon, Beirut and Banias. The Archbishop of Caesarea had only one suffragan at

---

1 Hagenmeyer, H., Ed., Epistulae et Chartae ad Historiam Primi Sacri Belli Spectantes, Oeniponti, Libraria Academica Wagneriana, 1901, VI, IX.

2 In the beginning of the kingdom, Nazareth was just the seat of a bishop. In 1160 it became an archiepiscopal see. The early documents concerning Nazareth refer to the Bishop of Nazareth (Regesta, nos. 106-120; Additamentum, no. 259). Later documents refer to the Archbishop of Nazareth (Regesta, nos. 377, 515.).
at Tiberias. The Archbishop of Krak and Petra in the southern extremity of the Kingdom had for suffragan the Greek Bishop of Sinai. There were also directly under the Patriarch of Jerusalem the priors of the Holy Sepulchre, Templum Domini, Mount Sion, and Mount Olivet. Besides the above mentioned priors, there were the abbots of St. Mary Latin, St. Mary of the Valley of Jehosaphat, St. Anne, and the Lazarists of Jerusalem and Bethany. The Benedictines of Mount Thabor were under the Archbishop of Nazareth. The town of Jaffa was under the prior of the canons of the Holy Sepulchre and the town of Nablus was under the care of the Temple. Such briefly was the essential hierarchical organization of the Church imported by the conquerors.

Under the leadership of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, who after the King was first lord of the realm and whose consent was necessary for the validity of all laws, the hierarchy of the kingdom maintained the ecclesiastical exemptions, rights, and privileges vigorously. By way of parenthesis, it is well to recall that at the start there had been a controversy between Daimbert, the Papal legate and later Patriarch, and King Baldwin, in which Daimbert endeavored to assert in his person the claims of the Holy See to rule the Kingdom. Baldwin was ready to recognize the suzerainty of the Holy See but would not pay homage to the Patriarch for his throne. As it worked out, the king paid homage to the Pope but was free from control by the patriarch. Later patriarchs instead of quarrelling with the king lent their powerful support in working with the king.

In connection with the property of the Church, the question of the Church's right to property may be briefly reviewed. The right of the Church
to property is both divine and natural. On the one hand the Church as a perfect society existing side by side but independent of civil society in its purpose and the means to that end has a right to those material goods necessary to pursue its spiritual purpose on earth. Its ministers, apostles and teachers must be fed, clothed and housed; places of worship must be erected and cared for. Consequently although its purpose is spiritual, yet the Church cannot as a visible society pursue its spiritual goals without material goods. Regardless, therefore, of the attitude of the state, the Church has a right to expect from its members that material support necessary to carry on its work. In the middle ages this right was exercised through the law of tithes. A tenth part of the income of the faithful was demanded by the Church and binding in conscience. Today, though the law has lapsed, the right still exists and the faithful are still bound in conscience to contribute to the support of the Church according to their means.

Besides what may be considered a divine right the Church similar to the right of the state to levy taxes, the Church as a moral person has the natural right to acquire property by purchase, gift, and exchange. The various monasteries and bishoprics are in reality corporations, capable of acquiring and disposing of property. The exercise of this natural right will constitute the burden of the chapter. To sum up: a tenth part of the income of the laity belonged by right to the Church simply because it was the Church; over and above this stable income, the Church acquired wealth by gift, purchase, and exchange. The lawful administrators of the tithes were the members of the hierarchy.
Although in the kingdom tithes had been insisted upon from the very first it was not until 1120 in a council called by the Patriarch of Jerusalem at Nablus that the bishops made the payment of clerical tithes a grave duty binding in conscience on all Christians in the kingdom, from the lowly peasant to the king himself. The legislation provided that the tithe was due to the clergy by all Christian proprietors whether religious or lay. Only non-Christians, i.e., Moslems and Jews, were exempt from the clerical tithe. Although the law of tithes was never perfectly observed, the Church never tired of insisting upon its observance. Everything, including animals and soldiers, were tithed. Accordingly, even though not perfectly observed, the tithes must have been an exceptionally large source of income to the Church in what was the most prosperous country in the world at that time. Unfortunately, extant documents do not give us detailed information concerning the Church's income from tithes. From the documents that we do possess and which witness to the transfer of tithes from the hierarchy to monastic foundations, it is evident that the tithes constituted a substantial source of the wealth of the Church, that is, to the administrators of the tithes, the hierarchy, and to the regular clergy, with whose property we are chiefly concerned in this chapter.

Among the most important items of secular property acquired by the Church both by reason of intrinsic value and numerical strength is the casal or village. As we saw in chapter two when speaking of land organization, the casal in the Latin kingdom was, with certain local differences, the same as

3 Regesta, no. 89.
the manor in England. Both were agricultural units; both were given and exchanged by the lord of the land to lesser lords in order to obtain the usual military, financial and judicial services connected with what we know as feudalism. The actual labor in the fields was performed by serfs who retained their rights no matter who the lord might be. Each casal had at least one hundred inhabitants. The territory belonging to the village was subdivided into carrucates, strips of land each consisting of about eighty acres. One third or one fourth of the produce went to the lord of the casal; the rest was retained by the serfs. As in the west, according to the village customs, which the Latin lords left undisturbed, each serf had a right to cultivate a given number of carrucates or parts of the carrucate. In the sale or gift of a casal, the serfs bound to the land went with the transfer. Sometimes but not often the lord would give or sell only part of the casal; in this case the unit of transfer was the carrucate. If the land was devoted in whole or in part to the cultivation of the vine, half of the produce of the vineyard went to the master of the vineyard and the other half was retained by the cultivators. The lord of the casal owned the mill, the open-air ovens, and the other community appurtenances, and thus they, or their use, could and frequently were the subject of a gift on the part of the lords. Over and above the tithes to which reference has already been made, the serfs also paid dues in kind to the owner of the casal, at Christmas, Easter, and at the beginning of Lent. In the villages belonging to the Venetians, for example, these dues consisted of a fowl, a dozen eggs, a half-round of cheese, and a cord of wood for each carrucate of cultivated land. Though the customs
differed in different villages, the practice of paying dues was universal and added to the value of the casals which the Church purchased or received as a gift.

Besides the Church's rural possessions there were urban properties from which the Church derived a portion of her income. The possessions of the Church in the towns consisted for the most part of houses from which she collected annual rents, varying according to the size and quality of the house. Revenues from imports and exports as well as from the use of such town facilities as wells, mills and ovens also contributed to the income of the Church.

Abundant documentation exists for the secular holdings of the Church, the majority of which deal with the growth in property of the regular clergy. Among this latter group five monastic foundations are predominant: The Hospital of St. John, in Jerusalem; the canons of the Holy Sepulchre; the Monastery of St. Mary of the Valley of Jehosaphat; and the Lazarists of Jerusalem and Bethany; and the Monastery of St. Saviour on Mt. Tabor. The majority of the documents still extant are a result of the care of the various religious houses to preserve their cartularies.

Some monasteries and priories are not mentioned in the documents as receiving property. The same is true of many bishoprics and archbishoprics within the kingdom. The absence of documents concerning establishment of the Latin rite leads us to the conclusion that the cartularies of those establishments have been lost. We know this to be true of the Templars; it doubtless is true in part or in whole of other establishments. Of necessity, then, it
is within these limitations that the story of the Church's holdings between
1100 and 1187 must be made.

The documents pertaining to the five large proprietors of the Latin
kingdom, as well as that of the minor proprietors, can be classified accord­
ing to the form of the document under two headings: transfer, and confirm­
tion of transfer. Transfer documents may be subdivided into three kinds,
gifts, sales, and exchange, on the basis of the method of transfer. Confirm­
atory documents are particular or general, according to their content. Gen­
eral confirmations confirm existing property rights; particular confirmations
limit themselves to the transfer of a particular piece of property, whether
it be by gift, sale, or exchange. This latter type of document is quite
abundant for this period and exemplifies the feudal law of the land that no
fief or part of a fief can be given to the Church without the permission of
the secular lord. General confirmations have their importance for this
study, for in the many instances in which the original charters of property
transfers are not extant, they are our only source of knowledge concerning
the early possessions of a particular religious corporation.

Having now outlined the organization of the Church in the Latin kingdom,
its divine and natural rights to property, and the tithes and the landed
property which formed the principal sources of the Church's income, we will
now undertake our survey of the property indicated in the documents as coming
into the hands of the Church. The survey will be detailed but not exhaustive;
it is intended to be a substantial representation of all the documents extant.
Since the five great monastic corporations are the almost exclusive re-
cipients of property in the documents now available, these monastic proprietors will bulk large in the survey. The survey will present: First, the documentary evidence of the transfer of property into the hands of the regular clergy, first from the king and then from the princes. For convenience we will divide the discussion into three periods: early (1100-1132), middle, (1132-1174), and closing period (1174-1187). Second, property transactions involving the secular clergy.

Among the greatest benefactors of the regular clergy, the kings themselves were most important by reason of their personal gifts and also because as head of the feudal organization they were in a position to make permanent the gifts of their vassals. The first document issued by Baldwin I to the Hospital in 1110 was in the form of a general confirmation of omnia dona in toto regno. The King first mentions the gifts of his brother Godfrey, namely the casals Hessilia and two ovens in Jerusalem. Baldwin then mentions his own gift of two casals, Bethafava, and Montana, and lands and houses scattered about Jerusalem. Thirdly the King confirms the gifts of other lords consisting of casals, serfs, tracts of land in the various fiefs of the realm. Since we will have occasion while considering the property transfers of the feudal lords to mention the original grants, we will not note the same gifts now. Another confirmation was issued to the Hospital by Baldwin I in 1112: "die quo patriarcha Hierosolymitanus Arnulphus sanctae

4 Regesta, no 57; Paoli, A., Ed., Codice Diplomatico del Sacro Militare Ordine Gerosolimitano oggi di Malta, Lucca, 1733, 2, no. 3.
ecclesiae Jherusalem ordinationem suscepit."\(^5\) More important than the above mentioned gifts and privileges of the Godfrey and Baldwin I to the Hospital are the gifts mentioned as confirmed in a charter issued to the Holy Sepulchre by King Baldwin I in 1114. Baldwin I, *precibus Arnulphi patriarchae*, confirmed by seal what Godfrey and he himself had given to the priory, namely twenty-one casals and all the ovens in Jerusalem except two, one of which belonged to the Hospital and the other to St. Mary Latin.\(^6\) Most of the casals situated on the royal domain around Jerusalem, Acre, and Nablus were direct gifts of the king. The document mentions specifically the villeins on the fief of St. Lazarus and four casals situated on the same fief: Bene Hatie, Benehabeth, Ragabam, and Roma. Moreover, the monks are to receive from the territory of Nablus a thousand bushels of wheat annually.

Besides the royal gifts to the Hospital and the Holy Sepulchre, three more charters issued by Baldwin I to the Monastery of St. Mary of Jehosaphat testify to the royal munificence, exercised toward the same monastery. In 1108 Baldwin I granted to the Monastery of Jehosaphat the casal Aschar near Nablus and a small ruined village called Fondochn.\(^7\) Six years later, in 1114, Baldwin I confirmed the gift of three casals, Meschium, Delescu, and Michael,

---
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"quorum primum ultra montem Gaudii ad Sinistram partem viae Neapolim ducentis
ducentum et tertium ad dexteram partem viae ad Jordanum ducentis situm est."8

The casals were originally given by the king's viscount, Piscellus. The third charter issued by Baldwin I to Abbot Hugh is in the form of a general confirmation whereby the king concedes and confirms by seal "quae omne Col-
lata fuerunt."9 Among the things specifically mentioned are several casals: Zebezeb, given by Theobald of Nigella; Tymini, given by Tancred; Sephoria, given by Roger, Bishop of Romlah; and Soesme, given by Lambert, with the permission of Gosline, prince of Tyberias and William de Bure, who had given the casal to Lambert. Other things are mentioned, such as lands and vineyards in the territory of Jerusalem which will be treated later on when considering other charters.

The Jehosaphat Monastery seems to have been the favorite of the first two kings. For Baldwin II in 1122 gave the Monastery the casal Beteri in the land of Nablus, "pro salute animae antecessoris et parentum animarum," and threatens all trespassers on this grant with expulsion from the royal court and a fine of 1000 besants.10 In 1130 Baldwin II reconfirmed all that the Monastery had ever received. In particular he mentioned a gift of Godfrey consisting of an oven and mills in the Holy City and outside the city, a mill, a canal, gardens, and two-thirds of the revenues from Bethsan.11 In

8 Ibid., no. 76.
9 Ibid., no. 80.
10 Additamentum, 100a.
11 Regesta, no. 134.
the same year Baldwin II personally gave to Jehosaphat "per manum consan-
guinei ejus Gelduini abbatis" the casals of Bestella in the land of Tyre and
Sardanas among the mountains in back of Tyre and the royal greenhouse also
outside of Tyre. The motive of the pious king was expressed in these words:
"pro salute animae predecessoris et uxoris Morifae in dicta abbatia sepultae."

Baldwin II issued four more charters worthy of note, two in favor of the
Hospital and two in favor of the Holy Sepulchre. In 1125 Baldwin II gave the
casal of Derina to the Holy Sepulchre and in 1128 the casal of Cafermelich.13
In 1129 Baldwin II confirmed whatever had been given to the Hospital and
mentioned in particular four pieces of land given by Godfrey of Parenta near
the villlage of Beccafabam, a garden and cistern given by himself near the
tower of David on the road that leads to Bethlehem.14 He goes on to mention
houses and wells given by himself and others in Jerusalem. One year before
the above gifts were confirmed, Baldwin II confirmed the gift of a small
casal to the Hospital while engaged in laying waste the land of Ascalon. The
name of the casal is Kalancu and it was given to the Hospital by Godfrey of
Flujeac.15

More numerous and in a sense more significant than the gifts of the first
three rulers of Jerusalem, Godfrey, Baldwin I and Baldwin II were the gifts
from the various princes of the realm, during this formative period of the

12 Additamentum, 137a.
13 Regesta, no 109; 121. Lois II, 488, nos. 9, 10.
14 Ibid.
15 Additamentum, no 121a; Delaville Roulx I, 78, n. 83.
kingdom. There were gifts not only to the Hospital and the Holy Sepulchre and Jehosaphat, but also to other religious foundations such as the Monastery of St. Saviour on Mount Thabor.

One of the conquering barons, Tancred, "a duce Godofrido Dominus Tiberiadis et totius Galilaeae constitutus," gave to the Abbot Gerard of St. Saviour on Mount Thabor all of the abbey's ancient possessions, that is, the mountain itself and surrounding casals. The casals given are Kapharchemme, Kapharsepti, Naym, Seiera, Lubie, and Arbel. Besides the above six casals eleven more are named but which were bello vastata. Along the Jordan two casals Ruseme and Seyse are mentioned as part of the donation; and across the Jordan but still in the hands of the Saracens, the sanguine Tancred gave four more casals: Kaharthe, Taletarpe, Perekpayton, and Kapharsakai. Certain revenues which ordinarily should have gone along with Tancred's gift were held back temporarily to support his knights. As soon as other revenues are found, the monks will come completely into their own.

The Monastery of St. Mary of the Valley of Jehosaphat also experienced the beneficence of the princes of Galilee. In 1119 Gosline gave the casal of Casrielme. His successor, William de Bure, issued four charters of Jehosaphat, two concerning a hospital constructed by him in Tiberias and the other two involving the transfer by gift of casals. In 1121 on the advice of Bernard, Bishop of Nazareth, William gave the hospital of St. Julian in Tiberias

---

16 Regesta, no 36; Paoli, I, 200.
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to Jehosaphat on condition that as long as Amaury lived and legally ruled, "hospitalis et pertinentium custos et dispensator maneat." In the same year William gave Jehosaphat four carrucates of land for the upkeep of the hospital of St. Julian, a group of houses, a serf, and a Syrian with its carrucate of land. Five years later the same generous prince of Galilee gave to Jehosaphat the casal of St. George near Medan with the consent of his nephews and heirs, Elias and William. Three years later, in 1129, the same pious prince gave to Jehosaphat the casal of St. Job on condition that his nephew, now a monk, "dominio et redditibus quoad vivat fruatur." 

Leaving the principality of Galilee for the time being and crossing over to the coast and the county of Caesarea, we find two charters that testify to the liberality of Eustace Grenier, lord of Caesarea and Sidon. In 1126, Eustace issued a particular confirmation in which he confirmed, "assensu Papiae uxoris et baronum suorum" a gift made by Baldwin I to Jehosaphat on the advice of Eustace's father, Eustace Granery I. The gift confirmed was a factory, greenhouse, and garden. Eustace II also confirmed in this charter a casal given by Engard Lubet to Jehosaphat. A more informative charter was issued by Walter Granery, son of Eustace and lord of Caesarea and Sidon in
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1131. With the consent of his barons he confirmed whatever his father had
given to the Hospital, namely, houses in Caesarea, a nearby casal called
Aldefie, houses in the town of Caco, together with eight carrucates of land
near Caco. Walter himself gave the casal of Calumzum according to the
document. 24

South of Caesarea lay the county of Joppe, ruled over by Hugh during the
third decade of the twelfth century. In 1123 Hugh, "pro salute animae suae et
animerum parentum," gave, with the consent of his wife, Emma, to the new
abbot, Gelduin, the casal called Machoz, in the land of Ascalon. He also
gave the casal Saphe situated in the land of Nablus, and the ruined village
of Melbena. With the permission of Hugh, Barisan, the constable of Joppe
gave the casal Dargeboam and a third of Zonia, both situated in the territory
of Jerusalem. 25 The next three charters coming from the chancellery of Joppe
concern gifts to Hospital. In 1126 Barisan, constable of Joppe, gave to
Raymond, Master of the Hospital, the casal Algie situated in the land of
Ascalon. The gift is made "consensu Hugonis domini Joppensis et Emmae
uxoris." 26 In the same year Hugh, "pro statu Christianorum et pro redemp-
tione animae patris et matris necnon ut Deus civitatem rebellem Ascalonem
tradat in manus Christianorum," gave one of his three better casals in the
land of Ascalon to Raymond, Master of the Hospital, "Emma, uxore sua ceteris-
que baronibus suis concedentibus." Furthermore, in the same charter Hugh

_______
24 Regesta, no. 139; Paoli I, 14, no. 13.
25 Additamentum, no. 102a; Revue de L'Orient Latin, VII, 119, no. 9.
26 Regesta, no. 112; Delaville Roulx, 70, no. 2.
granted to the Hospital in all the land "quam habet et acquisitura est" the use of everything tax free.\textsuperscript{27} The constable of Joppe, this time called Balian but doubtless the same Barisan of the previous charters, gave to the Hospital a house at Nablus and all the revenues from Mirabel, Luceri, Marescalcio, Rentis, and Kafrecherre. The motive for this gift is expressed in these words: "\textit{pro salute sua et uxoris Heluissae.}" The gift was made with the consent of Baldwin II and Hough of Joppe, which would indicate that Barisan or Balian had two lords. Moreover, other lords are mentioned as confirming the transaction: Hugh of Ramlah, Baldwin, his brother and lord of Mirabel, and Balian.\textsuperscript{28} Obviously the revenues referred to as given from Mirabel do not include all the revenues of this fief but only that portion which belonged to the constable of Joppe, Barisan. The grant was made in 1122, four years before Barisan gave the casal of Algie to the Hospital referred to above.

Upon the death of Baldwin II in 1132, his son-in-law, Fulk of Anjou, was elected king by the High Court. His reign together with that of his two sons and successors, Baldwin III and Amaury I, constitutes the high water mark for the material prosperity for the Church and the kingdom at large. It should be borne in mind that Melisande, daughter of Baldwin II and wife of King Fulk, enjoyed equal power with Fulk. Upon Fulk's death in 1142, Melisande acted as queen regent for her son Baldwin III who was a minor. Her name appears on most of the charters either as actually granting some privi-

\textsuperscript{27} Regesta, no. 113; Paoli, I, p. 10, no. 10.

\textsuperscript{28} Regesta, no. 100; Paoli, I, p. 236, no. 191.
lege or of consenting to some royal grant. Fulk died in 1143, Baldwin III in 1162, and Amaury in 1174.

The Hospital alone during this period received fourteen charters from the royal house. In 1136 Fulk confirmed with the assent of Melisande and William the Patriarch, what Hugh of St. Abraham had given the Hospital, namely, a house in Bethgiblin and the following casals: Beithsur, Dirnachar, Deirrasin, Charroubete, Deirelcobebe, Meimes, Hale, Bothme, and Hethtavahim. The king added to these casals given by Hugh four more casals: Zeita, Courcoza, Fectato, and Sahalin.29 During the long reign of Baldwin III the Hospital acquired by gift from Baldwin III, Melisande, and Prince Amaury the casal Altun in 1147.30 Three years later Queen Melisande, among other things, confirmed the purchase of casal Assera from John, Lord of Bethsan. The document does not mention the amount of money involved in this exchange.31

Also in 1151 Melisande with the assent of her two sons gave to the Hospital the casal Beroeth.32 In 1154 Baldwin III, consensu matris Melisendis, confirmed by seal whatsoever the Hospital had every received. This document starts with the gift of Duke Godfrey and mentions the various gifts and sales by which the Hospital acquired her possessions around Jerusalem, Nablus, Tyre, Caesarea, St. Abraham, Arsuf, Acre, Tiberias, and Sidon.33 It will not be

29 Regesta, no. 164; Paoli I, 18, no. 17.
30 Regesta, no. 245; Paoli I, 26, no. 24.
31 Regesta, no. 256; Paoli I, 28, no. 26.
32 Regesta, no. 262; Paoli I, 30, no. 28.
33 Regesta, no. 295; Paoli I, 32, no. 30.
necessary to repeat these transactions since they have already been indicated in previous pages.

In 1157 Baldwin III confirmed what his constable, Humphred, Lord of Toron, had given to the Hospital, namely, half of the revenues of Paneadis and houses in Newcastle and two vineyards, all in the land of Toron, north of the principality of Galilee. In 1160 Baldwin III gave the Hospital fifty tents of Bedouins who had never before served himself or his predecessor. This would seem a dubious gift.

Though most of the charters involving property transfers were gifts to the Hospital and other religious foundations, the following charters granted by Amaury I will show that the Hospital acquired property from the kings by other titles. For instance, in 1165 Amaury exchanged the casal Sema for Faluge. In the same year Amaury confirmed the purchase of houses between the wall of Acre and the sea. Arnuf de Corbinhi had previously sold these houses to the Hospital for 800 bezants. In 1169, Amaury I relinquished to Gilbert, Master of the Hospital, Bulbesius, whose revenues amounted to 1150 bezants yearly, on the condition that all Christian inhabitants be given freedom. In the last year in his reign Amaury I confirmed everything that
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the Hospital had bought from John Lombard of Tyre for 800 bezants. The things purchased were lands, vineyards, and a garden. 39 A short time later Amaury conceded to the Hospital rights to a certain street in Jerusalem. 40 Finally, in exchange for the casal Amos, the Hospital received from Amaury I 230 bezants annually from the revenues of a house in Nablus. 41

Next in importance to the Hospital during this middle period in the history of the kingdom are the Lazarists, with two houses: one for men, outside the walls of Jerusalem, and one for women, located at Bethany, not far from Jerusalem. In 1138 Fulk endowed the new convent of Lazarists at Bethany with property given to him for that purpose by the Holy Sepulchre. The property consisted of houses in Jerusalem, villeins, Bedouins, and the casals Benehatie, Benehabeth, Ragabam, and Roma. The king himself gave the nuns his casal Thecua and granted permission to the inhabitants of this casal to gather bitumin from the Dead Sea and salt from nearby places. 42 This particular transaction seems to be a rather startling commentary on the state of affairs in the kingdom. In order to endow a convent of nuns the king must obtain the property from another religious order, which would indicate that the resources of the king are on the one hand quite limited, while the resources of the Holy Sepulchre on the other hand are superfluously large.

With the consent of Melisande and his son Baldwin, Fulk confirmed the land

39 Regesta, no. 514; Paoli, 244, no. 201.
40 Regesta, no. 516; Paoli, 243, no. 200.
41 Additamentum, no 517a; Delaville Roulx, I, 313, no. 454.
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granted by Baldwin, Lord of Caesarea, to the Lazarists of Jerusalem in 1142. The land was situated between Mount Olivet and the Red Well. Baldwin III in 1144 confirmed the gift of land and vineyard made by Fulk and Melisande to the lepers. Six years later Baldwin III confirmed the purchase of thirteen carrucates of vineyards situated in the plain of Bethlehem by the Jerusalemite Lazarists from a Syrian named Melange. The property was bought for 1050 bezants and a horse. In 1151 Melisande gave the Lazarists of Jerusalem a vineyard consisting of five carrucates situated in the plain of Bethlehem as compensation for the loss of a mill at the David Gate which had to be torn down. The grant was made on condition that: "Georgius et Salomon dictae vineae cultores medietatem inde percipiant." Melisande gave the convent of Bethany the ruined village of Bethana in 1159. The most interesting gift, however, was that given by Amaury to the Lazarists of Jerusalem in 1164 whereby the Lazarists were promised one prisoner from every expedition if the king obtained ten or more prisoners of war. The last royal grant to the Lazarists of Jerusalem consisted of forty bezants to be received annually from the revenues of the cour de la chain at Acre.
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Third in the race for royal favor during this period is the priory of the Holy Sepulchre. In 1138 Fulk confirmed two carrucates of land and a casal Mimas given to the priory by Lambert Hals. The circumstances and motive of the gift are thus expressed: "quas Lambertus Alsus coram rege regina et Guillelmo patriarcha pro anima uxoris Agnetis Neapoli dederat."\(^{50}\) In the same year Fulk with the consent of Melisande granted the Holy Sepulchre houses situated in Jerusalem.\(^ {51}\) Baldwin III confirmed in 1155 an important purchase made by the Holy Sepulchre. Hugh of Ibelin sold the territory of Vuetmoanal with appurtenances except casals belonging to a friendly Arab knight, to the priory for 7000 bezants. At the petition of Hugh of Ibelin and with the consent of Hugh's brother, Baldwin, his sister, Ermangard, mistress of Tiberias and of his mother, Heloise, Baldwin III confirmed this unusual sale.\(^ {52}\) This purchase is quite significant. It would seem that the nobility was interested in raising money and that the Holy Sepulchre at least had great purchasing power. Baldwin III confirmed in 1155 thirteen charters issued to the priory and already mentioned.\(^ {53}\) In 1161 Baldwin III confirmed another important purchase whereby the priory obtained the casals Bethahatap, Durhasen, Derxerip, and Culi for 1400 bezants. John Gothman had sold the casals with the consent of Hugh, lord of Caesarea.\(^ {54}\) John Gothman's motive in selling his
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cassals is revealed in another charter in which he confirms the sale:
"urgenta necessitate videlicet redemptione de paganorum captivitate."\(^{55}\) The last royal document was issued by Amaury I in 1164 in which several previous privileges were confirmed.\(^{56}\)

Though the Monastery of Jehosaphat outstripped the Hospital and the Holy Sepulchre in the race for wealth during the reign of the first two kings, during this middle period from 1132 to 1174 there are only two royal gifts to this former royal favorite. In 1160 Melisande gave Jehosaphat the cassal Casracos except for a section of land which she had given to a certain Turcopole.\(^{57}\) Baldwin, viscount of Nablus, made a claim to the cassal during Amaury's reign. Amaury settled the dispute in 1168 by giving Baldwin the cassal in question from whose revenues Jehosaphat was to receive 80 bezants yearly.\(^{58}\) The hopeful Amaury promised Jehosaphat 1500 bezants annually from the revenues of Egypt if he succeeded in conquering that country.\(^{59}\)

Leaving the royal chancellery for the time and going north to Galilee we find several gifts granted to the Hospital, the Holy Sepulchre, and one each to the monks on Mount Thabor and the Lazarists of Jerusalem. In 1154 Ermentgard, viscountess of Tiberias, with the consent of her son Walter and her
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daughter Hodierna gave the Lazarists two carrucates of land and a country house "pro animae ipsius mariti Calonis, liberorum ac parentum salute." In 1171 her son Walter, now prince of Galilee, gave to the monks on Mount Thabor 20 bezants annually from the revenues of Tiberias. William de Bure with the consent of the King and of his nephews Ralph and Simon gave the Holy Sepulchre the casals Gabul and Helkar in 1132. Moreover this generous prince gave the monks the right to fish in the sea of Galilee from Septuagesima Sunday to Easter and offered the services of his fishermen and his ships. The same William gave the Hospital in 1153 an entire city block next to the Hospital's house in Tiberias. William's successor was no less generous to the Hospital and the Holy Sepulchre. Walter, now prince of Galilee, confirmed the Hospital's possession of the casals Delehasa and Desant in 1165. Three years later Walter conceded and confirmed several sales to the Hospital: Belvoir, sold by Ivo Velos to the Hospital for 1400 bezants; Laberius, sold by Gormund for 1000 bezants; Losserim, sold by Simon Shevron for 1300 bezants; and Hubeleth, sold by Baldwin Gazella for 1000 bezants. The Hospital, it would appear, equals the Holy Sepulchre in purchasing power at this time.
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Caesarea, like Galilee, seems to have singled out the Hospital during the middle period of the kingdom for special preference. Hysimbard with the consent of Walter, Lord of Caesarea, and Arnul of Haynis, feudal lord of Hysimbard, sold to the Hospital the casal Arthabec for 500 bezants. Walter received 150 bezants and Arnulf 60 bezants on the occasion of this transaction.67 The sums of money paid to Walter and Arnulf would seem to be feudal reliefs usually paid to the lord when the vassal sells his fief. From the document it is not clear whether Hysimbard or the Hospital paid the reliefs in question. If the Hospital paid them, doubtless the money was deducted from the price of the sale. A year later Walter Granary, lord of Caesarea, sold the casal Betherias to the Hospital for 180 bezants.68 The same Walter ten years later sold some more property to the Hospital, namely a piece of land, a house, and a well for 800 bezants. The motive for this sale on Walter's part is clearly indicated in these words: "ut se suosque qui pro debitis Accone saepissime tenebantur liberet."69 Hugh, successor to Walter, gave to the Hospital a piece of land near Kaco in 1154.70 The same exchanged Zafaira and Abeiria for the Hospital's casal of Altafia in 1163.71 In 1163 Hugh sold his casal Hadedun for 2000 bezants to Gilbert, Master of the Hospital.72 There are only two other charters relative to Church pro-
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perty which emanated from the chancellery of Caesarea at this time; one concerning the Holy Sepulchre, the other, the Lazarists. In 1145, Walter, lord of Caesarea, confirmed by seal the gift of his father Eustace to the Holy Sepulchre consisting of half of the revenues from the casal Fiaisce. 73 His successor, Hugh, gave the Lazarists two houses and a greenhouse in 1160. The motive was quite pious as expressed in the charter: "pro animabus parentum et ipsius neonon pro amore fratris sui Eustachii, qui ejusdem domus frater est." 74

In 1154 Baldwin III conquered the city of Ascalon which had resisted all the efforts of the lords of Caesarea and Baldwin's predecessors to make it part of the Christian possessions. His younger brother was made count of Ascalon shortly after the Christian victory and thus Ascalon became part of the royal domain until lost shortly after 1187. In 1158 Count Amaury confirmed the sale of Huetdebes and Deimuesim already mentioned. Hugh of Ibelin was paid 3000 bezants by the Holy Sepulchre in the transaction. 75 Two years later Amaury confirmed the purchase of a vineyard from a Syrian named Naim and in return for 100 bezants relinquished his right in the vineyard to the purchaser, the Holy Sepulchre. 76 In 1160 Amaury gave the Holy Sepulchre the casal Gladia with 16 carrucates of land and a house in Ascalon in return, as the document reads, "pro expensis quas ad Ascalonem capiendam fecerunt." 77

73 Regesta, no. 237; Lois II, 511, no 29.
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Count Amaury also enriched the Lazarists. In 1155 Amaury gave the Jerusalemite Lazarists the casal Mejessie with ten carrucates and a house in Ascalon.\footnote{Regesta, no. 303; Archives de L'Orient Latin II, 134, no. 15.} In the same year Amaury confirmed the gift of the casal Zaythar with ten carrucates which Philip of Nablus had given to the brothers of St. Lazarus during the siege of Ascalon.\footnote{Regesta, no. 308; Archives de L'Orient Latin II, 133, no. 14.} Also in the same year Amaury exchanged four casals Bethtaże, Habde, Bethamamin, and Phaluge near Jerusalem for three casals near Ascalon. The Hospital participated in this exchange which took place with the consent of Melisande and King Baldwin III.\footnote{Additamentum, no. 315b; Delaville Roulx I, 177, no. 232.}

There remain a few more charters to consider during this period. South of Jerusalem lay the seigneurie of St. Abraham and immediately south of St. Abraham stretched the important fief of Mont Real. In 1144, Hough of St. Abraham gave three casals to the Hospital.\footnote{Additamentum, no. 228a; Delaville Roulx I, 129, no. 158.} There are no other charters for St. Abraham during this period. Later on St. Abraham (or Hebron, as it is sometimes called) was absorbed by Mont Real. In 1152 Mont Real's lord, Maurice, gave to the Hospital the casal Benisalem with dependencies, a Byrian by the name of Caissard, a house, land, and a tenth of all loot taken from the Saracens. Moreover, in the land of Moab the Hospital was given the casal Cansin near their castle of Crac and the following privileges: 

\begin{quote}
"ut dictis fratribus in navi et in transitu Maris Mortui absque omni censu et exactione ire et redire liceat."
\end{quote} \footnote{Delaville Roulx I 15.} In 1168 Walter, successor to Maurice as
lord of Mont Real gave the Lazarists of Jerusalem forty bezants annually from his revenues in Beirut. The gift was made with the consent of his brother Guy and his daughter Beatrice and the motive was "pro anima Helenae uxoris."

In the County of Joppa which later was joined to Ascalon two charters were issued to the Hospital. In 1133 Hugh, Lord of Joppa, gave to the Hospital the casal called Bulbus, the mills of three bridges, an entire island, and confirmed ten carrucates which Godfrey of Parentei had given to the Hospital. Another Hugh, lord of the neighboring fief of Ramlah, confirmed what his father and mother had given to the Hospital, namely, lands and gardens; Hugh issued this confirmatory charter in 1164 with the assent of Agnes, countess of Joppa. Further up the coast the lord of the fortified city of Caifa gave land to the Holy Sepulchre in 1162. How much land is expressed in the document in these terms: "quantum sex paria boum laborare possint, scilicet tria ad seminandum et tria ad garantandum."

In the northernmost section of the kingdom, Gerald, lord of Sidon, gave to the Hospital a section of land between the twin walls of the fortified town. Southeast of Sidon lay the seigneurie of Toron whose lords had been
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for generations constables for the kings of Jerusalem. In 1151 Hainfred, lord of Toron, gave to the Lazarists of Jerusalem an annual stipend of Thirty bezants from his hereditary fief of Toron.\textsuperscript{88}

South of Toron lay the fortress of Mirabel. The Hospital eventually took possession of this important stronghold. At this time however they merely shared in the largess of its secular lords. In 1163 Baldwin, lord of Mirabel confirmed what his father Balian had given to the Hospital in the land of Mirabel.\textsuperscript{89} Two years later the same Baldwin granted land to the Hospital adjacent to the Hospital's vineyard situated in Mirabel.\textsuperscript{90} One year later still, Baldwin of Ibelin, lord of Mirabel, with the consent of Amaury I and of his brothers Hugh of Ibelin and Balian confirmed whatsoever the house of the Hospital in Nablus possessed, namely, houses, vineyards, cultivated and uncultivated land which pertained to the lordship of Mirabel.\textsuperscript{91} In 1167 Baldwin of Mirabel with the consent of Hugh of Ibelin, his lord and brother, sold the casal of St. Mary's to the Hospital for 3000 bezants. The casal was situated near belfort, a possession of the Templars.\textsuperscript{92}

The last thirteen years of the kingdom embrace the reigns of Baldwin IV, the leper king, 1174-1183; his nephew, Baldwin V, 1183-1184; and Guy de Lusignan, 1184-1187. The kingdom is verging toward complete collapse. With-
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in the kingdom the affairs are in the hands of weak and incompetent rulers and without the kingdom Saladin was waiting for the most opportune time to strike. Whenever he did strike, the outcome was a foregone conclusion. The resources of the kingdom had been squandered in a vain attempt to capture Egypt. Disunion and party strife paralyzed whatever strength the cohesion an otherwise strong king might have been able to summon. Nevertheless the military array mustered to meet Saladin under the incompetent guidance of Guy de Lusignan might have parried Saladin's thrust had not the Templars, ever eager for a fight, persuaded Lusignan to disregard the decision arrived at by the council of barons and make a suicidal march on Saladin's position near the horns of Hattin. Wearied by the long march, the hot summer sun, and weakened by thirst, the Christian host gave valiant but futile battle. Saladin quickly ripped the Christian forces to shreds, capturing all who were not killed. Thus the kingdom came to an end. What survived during the thirteenth century was a ghost, a shadow of that kingdom which Egypt and Damascus had acknowledged as overlord, and whose princes had married daughters of emperors. Future attempts to restore the work of the First Crusade came to naught.

Did the Church continue to accumulate wealth as the sun was going down on the Latin kingdom? The records indicate a decrease in the flow of property into the hands of the Church, yet a goodly portion found its way into the hands of the gens d'Eglise, during the last thirteen years.

From 1174 to 1187 the royal favor continued to be the most prominent factor in the growth and development of Church property. Baldwin, who
reigned from 1174 to 1183, affixed his name to several important charters. In 1174 Baldwin IV confirmed the fact that Baldwin of Ramlah freed the Hospital from its obligation of paying 200 bezants annually from the revenues of St. Mary, in return for 1700 bezants. Two years later Baldwin IV confirmed the sale of Medium which John of Arsuf had sold to the Hospital for 3000 bezants. Another purchase by the Hospital was confirmed by Baldwin IV in 1178. The purchase was casal Sileta in the land of Nablus, bought from Amaury viscount of Nablus for 5500 bezants. In 1179 Baldwin IV confirmed the gift of forty bezants annually from the revenues possessed by Guy of Scandalion. In 1180 Baldwin IV gave to the Hospital through the land of Roger of Molins, master of the Hospital, one hundred Bedouin tents in the territory of Belvoir. The following year Baldwin IV confirmed the purchase of Chola from Hugh of Flanders for 3000 bezants. This confirmation was issued with the consent of Guy, count of Joppa and Ascalon, and of his wife, Sibilla, the sister of the king. Hugh had made the sale with the consent of Baldwin, lord of Ramlah. The last royal charter for the Hospital was issued in 1182 by Baldwin IV. In this charter the Hospital was given the privilege of using the mills of Tyre gratis.
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The only other religious foundation which received a royal charter at this time was the Abbey of St. Mary of the Valley of Jehosaphat. In 1185 Baldwin V with the consent of Raymond III, count of Tripoli and procurator for the realm, confirmed the purchase of Mesedule from Guy of Nablus for 4000 bezants. Guy was forced to sell "eo quod Neapolis redditus quos comparaverat Baliano Neapolis domino et assisies solvere non poterat." From this document it would seem that besides the Hospital and the Holy Sepulchre, Jehosaphat possessed capital for large and extended purchases, at least in these later years.

During the twilight years of the kingdom the various lords of the realm continued to transfer property to the Church by gift, sale, and exchange. On the coast, Hainfred, with the assent of Renaud, prince of Mont Real and lord of Hebron, gave the Lazarists of Jerusalem twenty bezants annually from his money-fief in Acre in 1183. The pious motive is expressed in the following terms: "pro salute Phillipi avi sui, Hainfredi constabuli patris sui, et ob redemptionem animae matris scilicet Stephaniae ejusque mariti Ramaldi principis montis Regalis." North of Acre Walter, lord of Caesarea, sold his casal Galilaea in the land of Caesarea to Roger, master of the Hospital, for 5000 bezants. The transaction took place in 1182. South of Acre, Sibilla, daughter of Amaury I and countess of Joppa and Ascalon gave to the Hospital "turrem puellarum in urbe Ascaloni... pro salute mariti sui
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This gift occurred in 1177 while Sibilla was still a widow and before her second marriage to that incompetent adventurer from the west and later king, Guy de Lusignan. Another charter coming from Ascalon in 1179 testifies that William Rufus, one time viscount of Ascalon sold with the consent of Sibilla the harvest of two casals, Coquebel and Mordefre for five years and five months to the Hospital for 1000 bezants.

To complete our survey of property transactions involving religious orders in the years immediately preceding the fall of Jerusalem in 1187, some charters issued by the lord of Ramlah and the lords of Nablus remain to be considered. In 1175 the lord of Ramlah, Baldwin, sold his casal Capheer to the Hospital for 4000 bezants. In the same year the above mentioned Badlwin gave to the Hospital a Syrian called John "cum omnibus utriusque sexus heredibus." 

North of Jerusalem in the territory of Nablus several charters were issued to the Hospital and Jehosaphat during these declining years. In 1177 Amaury, viscount of Nablus, gave some land to Jehosaphat. Eight years later Balian, lord of Nablus and Ibelin, confirmed the grant of land to Jehosaphat made by some of his vassals. In 1187 Amaury, viscount of Nablus, settled a dispute concerning land claimed by himself and the abbey in
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favor of the monks. The charters relative to the Hospitals possessions in Nablus involve five transfers of property to the Hospital, two by purchase and three by gift. In 1178 Amaury, viscount of Nablus, sold the casal Seleth for 2800 bezants. In the same year the same Amaury gave to the Hospital some land situated between their casals of Tare and Saleth. Another purchase made by the Hospital in 1178 involved all of Amaury's Bedouins of the tribe called Benekarkas, for 5000 bezants. Balian, Lord of Nablus, gave to the Hospital his moné-fief in Ascalon for two years; the revenues of this fief amounted to 1000 bezants yearly. Hence the Hospital received a gift of 2000 bezants from Balian in 1180. In the same year Balian gave to the Hospital two carrucates of land in back of the city of Ramlah.

Thus far much has been said about the acquisition of property on the part of monastic foundations in the Latin Kingdom. The question may be asked: What did the hierarchy possess? As a matter of fact the documentation concerning the possessions of the hierarchy is very meagre in comparison with the documentation for the possessions of the monastic foundations. What we do possess gives an indirect concept of their wealth. From the viewpoint of documentation, the hierarchy seems to have lagged behind in that wholesale
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distribution of property and privileges to the Church which characterized the
history of the Latin Kingdom.

In considering the property of the hierarchy, mention should first be
made of the tithes. As we have seen, the tithe was owed to the Church from
all productive property and was administered by the hierarchy. The higher
clergy could and did exempt religious foundations from paying the tithes in
certain dioceses. Frequently enough the higher clergy gave the tithes from
certain localities to an abbey or a priory. This munificence on the part of
the hierarchy exhibits a friendliness toward the regular clergy. More im-
portant for this study, it implies that the higher clergy could well afford
to dispense with such revenues in favor of the regular clergy. Hence,
although the Hospital and the Holy Sepulchre were later much more frequent
recipients of gifts in the form of property, it is safe to presume that in
the beginning of the kingdom the hierarchy possessed more property than the
monastic houses. A brief survey of the charters which emanated from the
diocesan chancellories will substantiate this point. Although the documents
are few, they are our only clews to the wealth of the higher clergy of the
Church.

The most abundant information concerning the material wealth of the
Patriarch of Jerusalem, the head of the Church in the Latin kingdom, is con-
tained in a charter issued by the Patriarch Arnulf to the Holy Sepulchre in
1114. The charter is of the utmost importance. It stipulates that half of
the gifts bestowed on the Holy Sepulchre may be kept by the monks while the
other half is to be retained by the Patriarch. In order to appreciate the
significance of the document, a few facts must be borne in mind. First, the Holy Sepulchre had always been the Patriarchal Church. Secondly, the priory had originated as a group of priests and religious who took care of the divine services of the Holy Sepulchre. As the number of canons grew, the Patriarch established them as monks following the rule of St. Augustine. Their income was assured by this present charter which guaranteed the monks one-half of all the gifts given to the Holy Sepulchre. The text of the charter reads in part:

de cunctis oblationibus quae ad Sanctum Sepulchrum veniunt medietatem, de cera duas partes ad luminaria—excepta tertia parte patriarchae reservata—de Cruce Domini, quam canones custodiant, omnes oblationes—excepta die Paraceyae et nisi patriarcha ipse eam secum detulerit. . .115

Far from representing a restriction on the income of the Holy Sepulchre, the charter is an outright gift of one half of the revenues of the Patriarch at this most sacred shrine of Christendom. As we have seen in the preceding pages, the gifts given to the Holy Sepulchre were very large, second, in fact, only to the gifts granted to the Hospital. The document, therefore, is of the utmost significance, for it indicates that the wealth of the Patriarch was at least as great as that of the Holy Sepulchre. This conclusion is further corroborated by the fact that the Patriarch and the Holy Sepulchre were assessed equally by the High Court in the number of sergeants to be supplied for military service in time of war.116 This fact again indicates that the wealth of the Patriarch was about the same as that of the Holy

115 Regesta, no. 75; Roziere, 44-47.
116 Lois II, 610.
Sepulchre, which as we have seen was quite substantial.

The liberality and power of the patriarch was indicated in the following charters and indirectly some light is thrown on his wealth. In 1112 Arnulf gave to Hugh, abbot of Jehosaphat, one-third of the tithes from Bervaldi. Warmund in 1123 confirmed the possessions of Jehosaphat upon the petition of Abbot Gelduin. The patriarch Stephen repeated Warmund's confirmation in 1129. In 1134 William gave to the Holy Sepulchre the monastery called St. Quarantana. Two years later the same patriarch gave to the priory of canons regular of the Holy Sepulchre at St. Quarantana the tithes from Jericho. In 1139 the patriarch William sold one of his houses in Jerusalem to Walter de Lucia for 80 bezants. In 1143 the same William gave to the Hospital the Church in the field called Acheldemach (Haceldema) where the bodies of the pilgrims were buried. In 1186 Heraclius settled a dispute between the abbey of the Templum Domini and Jehosaphat concerning tithes.

From the selected charters just given, two things are immediately evident: the power of the patriarch as head of the ecclesiastical organization
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of the kingdom in confirming transactions involving monastic groups; and his
great wealth, evidenced by his liberality in granting property and revenues
to monasteries.

Less information is available concerning the wealth of the episcopate. Baldwin I gave four casals to the bishopric of Bethlehem in 1110 on the
occasion of the elevation of the Church of Bethlehem to the dignity of a
diocese. One of the casals was situated in the land of Nablus; another was
near Bethlehem; the remaining two were near Ascalon. It would seem that
bishops sometimes were economically embarrassed. For instance, Ralph, bishop
of Bethlehem mortgaged his casal of Romandet and his houses in Acre for 1211
bezants in 1163. Since such a need for funds should have been little ex-
pected of a bishopric such as Bethlehem, we may infer that other prelates
occasionally experienced similar financial straits. In this particular case
Marseilles acted as banker for the bishop.

The same bishop Ralph came to an agreement with Johosaphat concerning
two casals, Gemerosa and Machoz, in 1163. In the other bishoprics there
was less evidence concerning casals and more concerning tithes. In 1135 John,
first bishop of Acre, gave the Hospital the whole tithe which was owed the
Bishop. Gerald, bishop of Tiberias gave to the monks of Mount Thabor the
tithe from Heodix and Heulem. Baldwin, bishop of Beirut, gave to the
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Hospital his house in Jerusalem which King Baldwin I had given to him before he was made bishop. 130 Another bishop of Beirut, Odo, settled a dispute between the Templars and the bishop of Valanien concerning a hospital, an oven and two gardens. According to Odo's decision, the Templars were to retain the hospital, while the bishop of Valanien was to keep a tenth of the revenues from the oven and one of the gardens. 131

There are two documents concerning Nazareth when its prelate was still just a bishop. In 1109 Bernard, Bishop of Nazareth gave to Jehosaphat the Church of St. George in Tiberias. 132 The same Bernard gave the tithe from Legion and from the land of Gunfred to Jehosaphat in 1115. 133 Two more documents were issued by archbishops of Nazareth. In 1150, Robert, archbishop of Nazareth freed the Hospital from the obligation of paying the tithe throughout his archdiocese except in the diocese of Tiberias. 134 Archbishop Letard together with Joscius, bishop of Acre, the bishop of Tiberias, and the abbot of Jehosaphat met in 1178 to settle a dispute concerning the Church of St. George in Tiberias. 135

The bishopric of Ramlah or St. George, also called Lidda, was a regular fief owing knights and possessing a baronial court presided over by the
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bishop. In 1115, Roger, bishop of St. George granted to Jehosaphat a casal called Sephoria. The same bishop in 1136 confirmed what he had previously granted to the Holy Sepulchre, namely, the casals, "Caparuth, Gith quae consensu Guarmundi patriarchae conesserat." Three years later in 1139 Roger confirmed the fact that he had given to Jehosaphat "quoddam casale desertum Cephrie munificatum • • • .precibus felicis memoriae Arnulphi patriarchae." Since however the heirs of the original holder of the fief contested the gift, he gave it again, retaining for himself half of the tithes.

The survey here presented represents by and large the flow of property into the hands of the Church, both monastic and hierarchical. Since an exhaustive recounting of every document relative to the property of the Church would assume unwieldy proportions, we are forced to be content with the substantial and representative survey just presented. The data gathered together in the survey may now be briefly summarized. The monastic foundations are the most important ecclesiastical property holders in the kingdom. Of these the Hospital stands preeminent. No less than 153 charters testify to the Hospital's growing accumulations of casals, houses, vineyards, rents, and revenues of all kinds. As one of the foremost defenders of the kingdom, this prominent position is readily understood. Less understandable is the almost equal property growth of the Canons of the Holy Sepulchre. The prominence of the
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Holy Sepulchre owes much doubtless to its very name and location; situated as it was in Jerusalem and caring for the most sacred shrine in Christendom, it was inevitable that it should be the recipient of the pious alms of the princes of the realm and of Christendom at large. This may account for the 103 extant documents that witness to the transfer of property to her name. Of course, as we have seen in the body of this chapter, property acquisitions both by the Hospital and the Holy Sepulchre, although involving for the most part gifts, also included purchases and to a lesser extent, exchange.

The total number of charters witnessing to the accumulation of property by the other three major manastic holders further extends our view of the vastness of Church property in the Latin Kingdom. From the monastery of Jehosaphat there are 56 extant charters; for the Lazarists, 32, and for the monastery of St. Saviour on Mount Thabor there are 14 extant documents.

Regarding the secular clergy, the feudal property of the Patriarch, as we have seen, must be considered equal to that of the Holy Sepulchre. Concerning the other members of the hierarchy, their material property was extensive, for feudal assessments on their property equals and sometimes surpasses that of the monastic foundations for which we have abundant information. 139

It is noteworthy that during the first two-thirds of the life span of the kingdom, there is relatively little evidence of Church organizations buying property. Up to 1150, all documents related simply gifts; after 1150 the
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the Church acquired property by purchase on an ever rising scale. Even the smallest ecclesiastical organizations became purchasers in the market for territory and buildings. The purchases were frequently necessitated by an economic crisis on the part of the seller to the Church. Gifts on the other hand were inspired most frequently by the motive of piety. Since we may say that about 70 per cent of the property acquired by the Church was obtained by free-grant from the laity, it is evident that it was the pleasure of the laity that the land should be in the hands of the Church.

We are now in a position to discuss the role of the Church as a property holder in the Latin Kingdom. The Church's large scale ownership of landed estates was not without its influence upon the stability of the kingdom. It will be the burden of chapter four to discuss in detail the effects of Church property upon the fortunes of the Latin Kingdom.
CHAPTER IV

THE EFFECTS OF THE CHURCH AS A PROPERTY HOLDER

We have seen in Chapter Two how the establishment of the Hierarchy in the kingdom accompanied almost pari passu the conquest under Godfrey and the first three kings. This dual establishment feudal and ecclesiastical, remained in all of its integrity until the conquests of Saladin in the last two decades of the twelfth century. In Chapter Three we saw that the various Church establishments acquired vast landed estates. Now we would like to investigate the function of the Church in the Latin Kingdom, a function based on its position as a large property holder. Did the extensive possessions of the Church advance or hamper the commonweal of the Latin Kingdom?

It must be remembered that the kingdom was not just another Christian feudal state, but represented to millions of Catholics a place of the greatest veneration: it was the shrine of Christendom. The natural custodians of the Latin Kingdom, in so far as it was a shrine, would be the clergy, both religious and secular. Since the heart of the kingdom was the Holy Land, which had been made sacred by the life and death of Christ, it was popularly understood that the guardianship of the land should be prominently in the hands of the special representatives of Christ, the clergy. Moreover, as the kingdom in its very origin was a project of the Church, it was fitting that the Church and its prelates should have a unique place in its control, due to the indebtedness to the Church for its very existence. These two factors,
then, the origin of the kingdom and its sacred character, combined to make the Church influential in the kingdom, and explains partially the wealth of the Church, without which it could not maintain its due prestige and influence in the Kingdom.

In order to arrive at a balanced judgment of the benefits of Church property to the Latin Kingdom, we must bear in mind that all those social obligations which today are in the hands of the state, devolved in the Latin Kingdom upon the Church. Such duties as relief of the poor and care for the sick, police protection, and the care for public monuments were expected of the Church by the lay lords. This social set-up is based on a hierarchy of values altogether foreign to the modern secularism and humanitarian sociology. In the Catholic scheme of life, the spiritual activities of the Church are not restricted to the mere relation of man's soul to God, but include also his corporal well being. The corporal works of mercy, clothing the naked, feeding the hungry, sheltering the homeless and pilgrim, care for the imprisoned and sick, as well as the works of education are Christian duties which the Church regards as one of its perogatives. The secular state, in accordance with this ideal, left these social works almost exclusively in the hands of the Church. That such social activities should be left exclusively to the province of the Church's activity was due to the recognition on the part of the state that the care for social well being is a spiritual activity of the Church. Moreover, in the twelfth century it was traditional for the Church to be the almost exclusive social agency and to be depended upon for the internal conditions of the state. At the breakdown of the Roman empire
in the fifth century, the Church was the only force for law and order capable of caring for the social needs of the state, particularly the care of the poor and unfortunate. As a result a tradition was formed whereby the domestic problems of the state were left in the hands of the Church. Thus in the Latin Kingdom we find the Church, like its Divine Founder many years before, engaged in caring for the lepers, the poor, the disabled. Overburdened by the political and military problems of the kingdom, the lay rulers were little inclined to infringe upon the traditional domain of the Church, which considered such activities as its obligations, and possessed both the leisure and the means to fulfill them fully. The tacit recognition by the lay lords is indicated in their liberal bequests to the Church in the form of property. As a consequence of the Church's role in the state, the secular rulers were free to devote their time to the pressing problems of politics and war, knowing that the internal situation of the kingdom was well in hand, thanks to the Church.

Having now seen the special role of the Church in the internal activities of the kingdom, we move on to see how the Church fulfilled its mission, supported as it was with large revenues derived from the gifts of the kings and princes as well as of the Christian laity.

The first point in our consideration of the benefits derived from Church property was the divine worship provided at the shrines and Churches. The immense number of pilgrims as well as the stable population was dependent upon the Church for the sacrifice of the Mass, for the sacramental forgiveness of sins, for the conduct of devotions and other religious activities. In
addition, the Church looked after the upkeep of the shrines and Churches and other religious public monuments. The holy places had to be adorned by special Churches; thus for example the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was rebuilt on a magnificent scale in the twelfth century and endures to this day. Churches and cathedrals were erected throughout the realm, as well as monasteries, which had to take care of the monks and pilgrims. Most of them were built during this period.¹ That the Holy Week ceremonies be carried out with due splendor, a large expenditure of money was involved. That lamps be kept in oil at the shrines in accordance with the fittingness desired by the pilgrims required in itself a financial outlay. But of greater importance of these material benefits derived from Church property was the daily celebration of Mass, the preaching of the word of God, and the administration of the sacraments. The Latin Kingdom has been described as a priest ridden country, which is a dubious evil, if any at all. From the true and Catholic point of view, the kingdom was gloriously rich in the sacred persons of the priesthood and religious, who maintained the glory of God by the divine worship, and the ministration to the spiritual needs of forgiveness of sins and the sacramental consolation of the dying, and the preaching of the word of God. These abundant spiritual works of the Church would not have been possible without the revenues derived from ecclesiastical property in the Latin Kingdom.

Over and above the spiritual ministrations of the Church were the corporal works of mercy, which put a still heavier strain on its financial re-

sources. Among the foremost of these works of mercy was its care of pilgrims. In Chapter One it was indicated that the practice of pilgrimage, dating back to the time of Constantine, was an important factor in creating the Crusades. After the conquest of Jerusalem, the number of pilgrims coming twice yearly to the Holy Land, at Christmas and Easter, multiplied by the thousands. The practice of pilgrimage was encouraged by the Church which looked upon pilgrimage to the Holy Land as a means of doing penance and of sanctification, a spiritual activity efficacious in making up for the temporal punishment due to sin and for acquiring greater merit in the treasury of heaven. Holy people were drawn to the Holy Land as to a source of inspiration to their lives of dedicated love. Also among the pilgrims were some of the most desperate characters of society, felons, murderers, criminals of all kinds, which the European feudal lords were glad to have absent from domains, and whose reform was hoped for by the Church. Thus Europe purged itself semi-annually of many of its human derelicts, which consequently made the Latin Kingdom the rendezvous of criminals, assembled not to escape justice, but to fulfill it.

Upon the Church fell the duty to care for pilgrims once they arrived in the Holy Land. Due to the commercialization of the practice of pilgrimage by maritime cities of Venice and Genoa, pilgrims frequently arrived in the Holy Land with nothing left in their wallets after the payment of passage money.

3 Ibid., 78.
These paupers intent on visiting the sacred spots were dependent upon the charity of the monastic foundations scattered throughout the kingdom for food, shelter, police protection, and in some cases funds to secure their passage to Europe. It must not be thought that all the pilgrims were in extreme need; nevertheless the wealthy pilgrim experienced the hospitality provided them by the Church, a hospitality usually afforded in our day by hotels, restaurants, and entertainers. The monastic groups never charged for their services, and rich and poor were received alike, even though the monastery may not have been recompensed.

Wherever the pilgrim went, he was always near a monastic foundation which would provide food, lodging, and if need be, medical attention. Arriving at Jaffa, pilgrims would ordinarily proceed directly to Jerusalem where many monastic foundations were prepared to care for them, particularly the Hospital and the Holy Sepulchre, which also maintained houses at the port of entry. They would then visit Bethlehem, Mt. Hebron (where the tomb of Abraham was said to be), and Mt. Thabor, and the scene of the Ascension, the location of the Monastery of St. Savior, as well as the tomb of the Virgin in the valley of Jehosaphat, which was cared for by the Monastery of St. Mary of the Valley of Jehosaphat. They would then travel to Capharnaum, the River Jordan, and Nazareth, where they would be taken care of by religious houses. Other objects of pilgrimage were Sidon and Tyre, at which latter city was situated a house of the Hospital. Among the specialized services for the Pilgrims was the work of the military orders, the Hospital and the Temple, in securing the roads for safe travel against Moslem attacks and the inroads of
brigands. To carry on such works, immense funds were necessary. The manifold wealth of the Church was thrown into the work of feeding, clothing, and sheltering the pilgrim; it was the burden of the Church, not of the lay rulers. Recalling the dictum, "the wealth of the Church is the patrimony of the poor," we can readily understand why the Church became a large property owner in the Latin Kingdom. The pilgrims, a burden on the community from the time of their arrival until they left, could not be kept out of the Holy Land for in a sense the kingdom belonged to the whole of Christendom. The secular rulers could not undertake to care for the pilgrims; they were merely protectors of something which was part of the Christian heritage. By calling, and thanks partially to the generous gifts she received, the Church was the natural protector and patron of these wayfarers. The care of pilgrims, therefore, must be enumerated as one of the greatest benefits of ecclesiastical property to the commonweal of the Latin Kingdom.

A special service of the Church, granted not only to the pilgrims but to the community at large, was the care of the sick. In the city of Jerusalem itself there were three hospitals. One of these was in charge of the Hospitallers, and had been established before the first Crusade. A second was a hospital for Germans; the third, called the Hungarian Hospital, cared for sick persons of that nation. It must be remembered that the Hospital's

---
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original work was the care of the sick, and although later on it took up military work, it never deserted its original activity; rather, this work grew in proportions as time went on. Hospitals were ample in size; the hospital in charge of the Knights of the Hospital in Jerusalem alone had two thousand beds. Not only did the hospitals care for the sick, but it also distributed alms to people outside the hospital so lavishly that John of Wurzburg says that "the amount cannot be estimated even by the managers thereof." The care given in the hospitals may not have been up to modern standards, but it was abreast of the medical science of the times, greatly enriched by contact with the Arabs, and certainly was a substantial endeavor to relieve human misery which otherwise would have been suffered unaided. The sick were surrounded with loving attention which perhaps more than anything else assisted convalescence. All of this was done gratis, and of course made possible by the revenues derived from the Church's landed property.

Another of the outstanding works of the Church at this time was the care of lepers. At the time, leprosy was quite widespread in Syria. The care of the lepers seems to have been the special concern of the kings who more than anyone else made possible the work of the Lazarists, by their liberal endowments to the Leprosoriums at Jerusalem and Bethany. There is a certain pathos in the fact that one of the kings, Baldwin IV, was himself a leper. The


religious order of St. Lazarus was founded during the first half of the twelfth century to care for these unfortunates. At Jerusalem there was a house for men afflicted with the disease and at Bethany a house for women. The heroic men and women of the congregation of the Lazarists spent their lives and their revenues in caring for these repulsive pieces of humanity, giving them the medical care that the times afforded, and especially consoling and strengthening them by their cheerful service and religious spirit.

Among the social activities of the Church, mention must be made of the educational work in the kingdom. As in Europe, there were attached to each monastery and each cathedral, schools for the education of the boys and girls of the neighborhood. The curriculum included the usual instruction in Christian doctrine, and the trivium and quadrivium in vogue in Western Europe. Though none of these schools attained to the status and fame of the older establishments in Europe, yet they provided for the ordinary needs of an educated clergy. That higher learning was held in honor is evidenced by the practice of sending talented clerics to Europe to pursue higher studies in law, philosophy and theology, at Paris and Bologna. A typical product of the educated class in the Latin Kingdom at this time is William of Tyre who produced the best historical work of the middle ages, the History of the Latin Kingdom. 10

Besides enabling the Church to provide an educated clergy, the property
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of the Church obligated churchmen to take an active part in government. The Church acquired and played an important role in every department of life because it was part of the feudal regime, that is, because it held fiefs. In return for benefits and privileges heaped upon the Church, the princes expected, almost demanded the services of Churchmen in governmental posts and in the routine business of government. As fief holders of the crown, the hierarchy belonged to the Haute Cour and thereby participated in the governance of the realm. Moreover as the most educated members of the feudal aristocracy to them fell most of the important administrative posts. All of the royal chancellors and the chancellors of the major fiefs of the land were selected from the clergy. We know that William of Tyre was chancellor for the king while archdeacon of Tyre and we also know that after his elevation to the archbishopric of Tyre, he still performed the duties of chancellor for the king. More than that, William, while still archbishop, acted as ambassador to the court of Manuel I, the Byzantine Emperor. Other bishops and ecclesiastics devoted freely their knowledge and talents to the service of the kingdom.

Despite the fact that the Church played the most important part in the internal problems of the kingdom, it still remains true that the security of the kingdom from a military viewpoint was the most fundamental need of the kingdom. Consequently, before arriving at a completely balanced view of the Church as a property holder, we must consider the effect of Church property on the military plight of the kingdom. The kingdom was never really secure.

11 Rey, Les Familles, 412ff.
The very foundation and expansion of the kingdom was due not so much to the military might of the founding crusaders but to the lack of unity on the part of the Mohammedans. Furthermore since the Latin occupation of the Syrian coast never penetrated further than fifty miles inland, it was surrounded on all sides by powerful foe. The narrow pass which lay to the east of the kingdom and joined the Moslems to the east and north with the Moslems of Egypt was never taken. The one effort of the second Crusade and the Frankish inhabitants of Syria to take Damascus failed. Had Damascus been taken, the union of the Mohammedan forces would have been effectively hampered.

Besides the strategic weakness of the kingdom, the growing aggressiveness of the Moslems was an imminent threat to the kingdom. In order to be constantly on guard against the Moslem power which grew stronger from the rise of Zengi and reached its climax in the person of Saladin, the kingdom's prime function and need was military. All the resources of the kingdom were needed to equip and maintain an army, to build fortresses, and to sustain military expeditions. For this reason the feudal system whose purpose is primarily military, remained widespread in the kingdom and communal government remained undeveloped in contrast with the growth of towns in the West.

Yet in spite of this great and constant need for an army and for resources to carry on a war, we saw in Chapter Three that the wealth of the kingdom was going into the hands of the Church. It might seem that under
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ordinary conditions the enrichment of the Church would have been praiseworthy but that in this case it was a rather serious liability to the very existence of the kingdom. The question might be raised, "Did not the kings and lords of Jerusalem allow their piety and devotion to the Church master what should have been their better judgment?" It is true that the wealth of the Church embellished life by providing schools, churches, hospitals and hospitality in abundance. But the prime need of the kingdom always remained troops and resources to carry on warfare in its struggle for existence. What good to frontier land were a plethora of bishoprics and monasteries? "Desit esse miles saeculi qui factus est miles Christi." The hard fact remains that except for the Military Orders, the Church did not contribute fully, in proportion to its property holdings, to the sinews of war necessary to meet the constant threat to the existence of the kingdom.

The king and the other lords of the land appear well aware of the danger of allowing fiefs or parts of fiefs to slip out of their hands into the hands of the Church. Several laws were passed forbidding the gift of sale of lands to the Church for the simple reason that the Church, like the townspeople, was a military cipher. The laws did not forbid the sale or gift of land as long as the lords' permissions were obtained. In spite of the legislation which controlled and regulated the transfer of property to the Church, the lords of the realm continued up to the very last days of the kingdom to lavish
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the sources of military resources in the kingdom upon the Church.

What has just been said from the viewpoint exclusively of military resources may apply to the property of non-military Church organizations. But besides such property, there was an equal amount if not more property under the control of the military orders whose raison d'être was the defense of the Holy Land, whose contribution to the military necessities of the kingdom must be considered. To arrive at a balanced judgment of Church property in its relation to the military needs of the kingdom, we will consider first the contributions resulting from the property in the hands of the Military Orders and then the effect of Church property under the control of non-military Church property holders upon the military needs of the kingdom.

Just as the Church originated the Crusades and directed the warriors of the West who established the Kingdom of Jerusalem, so also the Church under the leadership and blessing of the Popes provided the most numerous and valiant defenders of the realm, the knights of the Temple and the Hospitallers. The templars and the Hospitallers were religious orders whose main work was to defend the Holy Land. They were true religious, bound by the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. Unimpeded by worldly ties, nobles born and bred to fight, they were for two centuries the staunchest defenders of the Christian settlements in the East and of the Kingdom of Jerusalem in particular. Unlike the descendants of the first Crusaders who had become through intermarriage and environment, semi-orientalized in temperament and outlook, the knights of the Hospital and the Temple retained their western vigor and manliness. Moreover year by year fresh recruits
arrived from the establishments of the orders in the West, untouched by oriental softness and unsympathetic towards anything but a vigorous prosecution of the everlasting war against the Moslems. Their zeal and implacable hostility to the Moslem won for them, when captured after the debacle of Hattin, merciless death at the hands of the otherwise lenient Saladin.

As we have seen, the orders were established with headquarters in Jerusalem in the first half of the twelfth century. As the danger to the kingdom grew, so did the power and wealth of the military orders. After the fall of Jerusalem and after the kingdom had been reduced to a narrow strip along the coast, the orders together with a third military order, The Teutonic Knights, maintained almost single handed a heroic defense of the moribund kingdom which finally fell with the fall of Acre in 1291. Before the fall of Jerusalem, the military importance of the orders in the kingdom rested on the possession of strategic fortresses and on the knights they supplied in the campaigns of the kings. The great castles of the orders defended both the inland frontier and the coast, protecting the cities and keeping open the communications. 17 Mighty Krak-des-Chevaliers, the finest crusading castle in Syria and the chief inland stronghold of the Hospitalers, and Safita (Castel Blanc) of the Templars guarded the approaches from Homs protecting Tripoli and Tortosa. Belfort of the Templars and Montfort of the Hospitalers guarded Tyre, Acre, and Sidon. Along the coast were the Hospitalers castles of Margat and Zibel, and the Templars' strongholds at Archas and Chateau

17 The exact location of the fortresses enumerated can be found in Palestine of the Crusades, A Map of the Country on Scale, London, 1938.
Perlerin. In the castles, the orders held fortified portions of various cities, Acre, Gaza, Ascalon, Arsur, all being defended by citadels of the knights. In these strongholds the members of the Orders kept their treasure, imprisoned captives, sheltered pilgrims and fugitives, and maintained garrisons ready for defense or attack. In addition to the castles and towns which the orders held in their own right, they were often entrusted with the guard of royal castles, especially during a regency.

In all of the major engagements of the kingdom, the orders distinguished themselves in numbers and valor. In battle the members of the orders occupied the most dangerous positions, were the first to charge and the last to retreat. Their casualties were always heavy. On one occasion four hundred Templars were ambushed and killed while returning from victory.

Although the military orders were among the strongest supporters of the kingdom because it was their vocation and because they had ample means, yet, since they were ecclesiastics, they were outside the control of the king. They constituted along with the commercial communes an imperium in imperio. They made their own treaties with the Mohammedan rulers, and carried on their own wars with the Moslems irrespective at time of the policies of kings. As ecclesiastics, they were free from the usual feudal service for lands that they had received from the king and the barons of the realm. Such service as was required on rare occasions, that of sergeant service, was provided only when there was a grave need. Their military assistance was there-

inspired not from obligation but from the very nature of their work, which was to defend the Holy Land. That they did not always follow the king's lead merely proves that they were independent of the king and were at the very best, powerful ecclesiastical allies. Again, the fault which we notice is something inherent in the feudal state itself which was in organization weak, with authority and resources scattered among several lords with strong powers completely beyond the control of the lords existing in the realm, i.e., the communes and the military orders. Certainly the only solution would have been to reserve exclusively to the crown all power to make treaties with the Moslem enemy. But the crown was too weak and the orders had been commissioned and sanctioned to carry on their work by the Pope. Only the Pope could check or restrain the overeager foes of Islam. Perhaps the real solution for the troubled state of affairs in the kingdom would have been to convert them into practical papal states ruled over by a papal legate. Under such a government the clashing forces could have been brought to work harmoniously along one definite line. As it was, several autonomys in the state, frequently working at cross purposes, dissipated the strength of the kingdom.

In spite of the defects which arose from fostering the military orders in the realm, the benefits derived from the existence and presence of the orders far outweigh the annoyances and embarrassment their presence caused. Without them the state would surely have collapsed before it actually did. The man power shortage was keenly felt ever since the majority of the first Crusaders returned home under Godfrey's victory at Ascalon. Gravely in need of defenders for the realm, the orders made up to some extent for the in-
ability of the kingdom to attract a sufficiently large number of colonists to secure relative permanency for the kingdom. Without these religious knights holding strategic castles and ever ready to ride against the enemy, the military situation of the kingdom would have been impossible. The resources of the orders in the East and in the West were concentrated on the difficult task of retaining the Christian foothold in the East against tremendous odds.

But what can we say for the non-military foundations and the elaborate hierarchy of the kingdom? Certainly as regards helping the military situation both did not contribute adequately to the needs. Like the burgeois population, they were required to supply in times of grave need a fixed quota of sergeants. The number of sergeants bore some relation to the amount of property possessed by the prelate or monastery. The Patriarch of Jerusalem, for instance, owed in time of war, five hundred sergeants, and the same number was owed by the priory of the Holy Sepulchre. The Bishop of Bethlehem owed two hundred sergeants, as did the monastery of Jehosaphat. The monastic foundations and bishoprics owed sergeants in a descending scale, to fifty owed by the archbishop of Tyre and an equal number owed by the monastery of Mount Olivet. The Benedictine monks of Mount Thabor and the Bishop of Hebon owed 150 sergeants each. The only religious foundation we do not find listed is St. Lazarus which would indicate that their possessions were not large and that their charitable work consumed whatever income they did possess.

We can be sure that the bishoprics and monasteries supplied their quota

19 Lois II, 422-426. Ibelin lists the sergeants owed by the various Churches and towns.
of sergeants for the struggle with Saladin and at the few other crises in the history of the kingdom. But in general the Church was exempt from military service. Only the High Court of the realm could order out the sergeants owed by the Church. And since one of the most important and influential members of the High Court was the Patriarch himself, who was one of the largest holders of property in the kingdom, we can readily imagine that the letter of the law was observed and the clerical resources were for the most part untouched for military purposes.

The conclusions to the Church's contribution to the military needs of the kingdom rests on the distinction between the two kinds of Church property holders, the military and the non-military. The latter perhaps failed to contribute proportionately to their holdings. The military orders, on the contrary, contributed proportionately more than their due to the state's military needs.

We are now prepared to state the final conclusions of the thesis. Undoubtedly the property of the Church was an asset to the kingdom in solving its internal problems, such as the care of the poor, sick, and in filling the administrative offices of the kingdom. The effect of Church property on the military needs of the kingdom bears a distinction. The non-military orders failed to contribute to the military needs of the realm in proportion to their property. On the other hand, the military orders contributed to the military might of the kingdom far in excess of the property which they actually held in the kingdom. Adding up, therefore, the Church's contribution to the martial strength of the kingdom, the total of the military and
non-military Church property holders would seem to balance with the total amount of property held by the Church.

In so far as Church property weakened the military power of the kingdom, the Church failed the kingdom. In so far as the Church served the state and alleviated the social distress of the times, the Church brought honor and glory to the kingdom. In the military crisis which was constant, Church property was indirectly the kingdom's greatest help, though directly a hindrance. Taking the over all view, ecclesiastical property in the Latin Kingdom was not only a manifestation of the piety of the Christian crusaders, but the outstanding source of the internal and external stability of the Latin Kingdom.
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