

The Premonstratensians and the Crusader Kingdoms in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries

In 1977, H.E. Mayer published his *Bistümer, Klöster und Stifte im Königreich Jerusalem*¹⁾. The following year, N. Backmund commented that although Mayer had set out to exhaust all the surviving sources for a history of the Latin regular church in the Holy Land during the time of the crusades, no mention had been made of the houses of the Premonstratensians at Ramla-Lyddā, Nebi Samwil, Acre, or Cyprus²⁾. Backmund himself had written about these houses in his *Monasticon Praemonstratense*, where he had corrected long-standing errors of fact about the order and its members in the Holy Land, errors which still find their way into histories of Outremer³⁾. Backmund did not analyse the evidence for the history of the order, but presented a brief gloss and bibliography for each house.

Actually, Mayer had not forgotten the Premonstratensians. In 1964, he had published and analysed a previously unknown confirmation grant to the order in Palestine, prefacing his discussion with some remarks on the Norbertines in Outremer⁴⁾. Neither scholar has presented a full history of the order in the Kingdoms of Jerusalem, Acre and Cyprus⁵⁾. Even more surprisingly, no one seems to have taken up F. Petit's suggestion that the role of the order in preaching the crusades

¹⁾ *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Schriften*, Band 26 (Stuttgart, 1977).

²⁾ Review, *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 54 (1978), p. 245.

³⁾ N. BACKMUND, *Monasticon Praemonstratense*, 3 vols., 1st ed.: vols. 1-3 (Straubing, 1952-1956), 2nd ed.: vol. 1, pts. 1-2 only (Berlin, 1983). For an analysis of some of the problems, see C.R. CHENEY, *Medieval Texts and Studies* (Oxford, 1973), pp. 243-244. For an example of the errors, cf. K. SETTON, gen. ed., *A History of the Crusades*, 6 vols. (Philadelphia, 1955-; repr. 1969-), vol. 2, pp. 384-386.

⁴⁾ H.E. MAYER, «Sankt Samuel auf dem Freudenberge und sein Besitz nach einem unbekannten Diplom König Balduins V», *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 44 (1964), pp. 35-71.

⁵⁾ Nor has anyone else, to my knowledge, except for two works by M. GEUDENS, «L'Ordre de Prémontré en Palestine et en Chypre», *Revue de l'Ordre de Prémontré et ses Missions* 16 (1914), pp. 35 sv.; and *De Orde van Premonstreit in 't Oosten* (Tongerloo, 1913). The former is very brief, places equal reliance on charters, chronicles and the traditions of the order, and contains errors of fact which have recently been corrected by various authors (see below). The latter is not available to me.

has been neglected⁶). An examination of the contribution to the crusades made by the Premonstratensians in Outremer and Europe is valuable to historians of both the order and the Crusader Kingdoms. This study also opens the broader question of the role of the regular canons in the Holy Land, and in the crusade movement.

St. Habacuc was in the diocese of Lydda, which was directly dependent on the patriarch of Jerusalem⁷). Presumably, Amalric, the first dean of Gottesgnaden, obtained the church there from the patriarch, or at least with his confirmation and approval. The foundation date is unknown, but Amalric's arrival in Palestine could not be dated later than the 1130s⁸).

There were two houses of Premonstratensians in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. Bernard of Clairvaux maintained a correspondence with Melisende, daughter of Baldwin II, and queen of Jerusalem 1131-1152⁹). His letters have provided the basis for a great deal of discussion, since they are not dated, and one of them introduces «these Premonstratensian brothers»¹⁰). The assumption so far has been that this letter refers to the house of Norbertines at Nebi Samwil¹¹). However, since the letter cannot be dated, and since neither an individual nor a place is mentioned in it, it is impossible to use it as anything more than a proof that Norbertines came to Palestine, recommended by Bernard, sometime between the beginning of Melisende's husband Fulk's reign (1131-1143), and the end of her regency for her son Baldwin III (1152). There is no way to know how long it took Amalric and his companions to reach Palestine, but his abbey must have been founded in the mid-1130's. We also do not know how many compa-

⁶) F. PETIT, *La Spiritualité des Prémontrés aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles* (Paris, 1947), p. 83.

⁷) E.G. REY, ed. and con. of C. DUCANGE, *Les familles d'Outremer* (Paris, 1869; repr.: New York, 1971), p. 799.

⁸) *Fundatio monasterii Gratiae Dei, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, ed. by G.H. PERTZ, 30 vols. (Hanover, 1826-1896; repr. Stuttgart and New York, 1963), vol. 20, p. 688: «... et Emelricum quendam quem de Francia secum adduxerat prepositum illi loco primam ordinavit ... Qui cum postmodum postulata licencia transmarinasset ... qui et postmodum in ultramarinis partibus factus est episcopus...» For details of Amalric's career, see W. GRAUWEN, «Norbert et les débuts de l'abbaye de Floreffe» *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 51 (1975), pp. 17-18.

⁹) BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX, *Opera*, ed. by J. LECLERCQ and H. ROCHAS, 8 vols. (Rome, 1974-1977), vol. 8: *Epistolae*, ep. 206, 289, 354, 355; see also vol. 7, ep. 56.

¹⁰) *Ibid.*, vol. 8, ep. 355, and the discussion of the date, p. 299, n. 5.

¹¹) MAYER, «Sankt Samuel», pp. 38-39.

nions he brought with him. By 1159, when Herbert, abbot of St. Habacuc issued the only surviving charter for his house, there were twenty-three «brothers»¹²). We do know that Amalric came from France. If he was with Norbert at the council of Reims in 1131, he must have gone on with his superior to St. Martin of Laon, a Norbertine house visited by Innocent II and Norbert after the council¹³). Could Amalric have taken canons from St. Martin's, or near-by Prémontré, to Palestine?

In 1216, Gervase, abbot-general of Prémontré, sent Helin, abbot of Floreffe, to Acre to receive as his representative any property belonging to the order which might be recaptured eventually by Emperor Frederick II. St. Habacuc is mentioned by name in the letter Helin carried to the patriarch of Jerusalem. Historians writing about the Norbertines have assumed this means that St. Habacuc was always dependent on Floreffe, and have argued that Amalric must have originally come from that house¹⁴). W.M. Grauwen has pointed out that Floreffe was in the diocese of Liège, part of the empire, and not of «*Francia*», Amalric's country of origin. Moreover, there is no evidence that Amalric was ever a canon at Floreffe¹⁵). He is mentioned in a necrology of that house, but the entry is erroneous¹⁶). One version of the necrology, now lost, listed Amalric as the first abbot, which J. Barbier disproved. Amalric is called the bishop of Sidon, but is said to have died in 1148. The version of the necrology edited by Barbier reads: «*Commemoratio domini Almarici, Sydonensis episcopi, fratres nostri, 1138*». Grauwen has commented that the phrase «*fratres nostri*» usually referred to someone, not a member of the house, who had some right of fraternity with it¹⁷). By the time Helin was commissioned to go as Gervase's representative to Palestine, the church of St. Habacuc had been destroyed, and canons from both Palestinian houses had been scattered.

¹²) G. BRESCH-BAUTIER, ed., *Le cartulaire du chapitre du Saint-Sépulcre de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1984), no. 52.

¹³) *Vita Norberti, archiepiscopi Magdeburgensis* (= Vita A), in MGH. SS. (repr. Stuttgart and New York), vol. 12, p. 698 and n. 63.

¹⁴) J. BARBIER, *Histoire de l'abbaye de Floreffe, de l'ordre de Prémontré* (Namur, 1880), pp. 26-28.

¹⁵) GRAUWEN, p. 17 and n. 43.

¹⁶) J. BARBIER, ed., *Nécrologe de l'abbaye de Floreffe, de l'ordre de Prémontré, au diocèse de Namur* (Louvain, 1876). Barbier discussed the errors in the necrology in his history of Floreffe, p. 28 and n. 1.

¹⁷) BARBIER, *Nécrologe*, p. 251; GRAUWEN, p. 18 and n. 47.

There was a new house in Acre, to which some of the brothers had fled. It seems probable that Gervase meant simply to send a member of his order to ensure that his property was returned, and not that Helin went because the houses were dependent on Floreffe; although the dependency may well have developed at some time after the house's foundation.

Amalric of Gottesgnaden and Sidon

William of Tyre's identification of Amalric, combined with the existing charter from St. Habacuc, and two other charters in which the house is mentioned, prove that the abbey existed well before 1155. The chronicle of Gottesgnaden contributes an explanation of Amalric's presence in Outremer, and the probability of a foundation date in the 1130's¹⁸). That Amalric preached fairly extensively in Outremer can be deduced from three facts. First, he was released from an equivalent office (preaching to the pagan Wends) at Gottesgnaden. Secondly, there were a good number of canons at St. Habacuc in 1159. And finally, he would have been chosen as bishop of Sidon at least partly because of a reputation as a speaker. Some pastoral care must have been the result of both the preaching of Amalric, and the establishment of his order at a shrine church. Express permission to take on the *cura animarum* had been given to regular canons by Urban II in 1096 at the council of Nîmes: «... we decide that those who hold to the pattern of the apostles can preach, baptize, give communion, receive penitents, and give absolution»¹⁹). Silence, seen as a «preparation for didactic speech», was strictly observed in Premonstratensian houses, even among the lay brothers²⁰). The *conversi* were forbidden all books, and were presu-

¹⁸) Some inaccuracies in early histories of the order led to an inflated view of Amalric's importance in Europe. B. Kedar and M. Grauwen have reacted by doubting the existence of St. Habacuc or of Amalric. Cf.: J. LEPAIGE, *Bibliotheca Praemonstratensis Ordinis* (Paris, 1633); C.L. HUGO, ed., *Sacri et Canonici Ordinis Praemonstratensis Annales*, 2 vols. (Nancy, 1734-1736); and GEUDENS, *op. cit.*; with: W. GRAUWEN, *Norbertus, Aartsbisshop van Maagdenburg (1126-1134)* (Brussels, 1978), pp. 481-482; B.Z. KEDAR, *Crusade and Mission. European Approaches Toward the Muslims* (Princeton, 1984), p. 134 and n. 127.

¹⁹) G.D. MANSI, ed., *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, con. by L. PETIT and J.B. MARTIN, 53 vols. (Florence, etc., 1759-1962), vol. 20, cols. 934-935; trans. and discussion: C.W. BYNUM, *Jesus as Mother. Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley, etc., 1982), p. 31.

²⁰) *Ibid.*, p. 45.

mably illiterate. That there were lay brothers in most, if not all, Norbertine priories seems certain, judging from the fact there was legislation concerning them at Prémontré as early as 1134²¹). If the pattern set at Prémontré was followed, the canons would have devoted themselves to the office, study, preaching, pastoral care, and possibly manual labor, sharing only one meal a day²²).

As a bishop, Amalric figures in William of Tyre's chronicle as a patriarchal supporter. «Amaury, of pious memory in the Lord, was chosen [to be bishop of Sidon]. Amaury was abbot of the regular canons of the Order of the Premonstratensians in the monastery of St. Habacuc ... he was a sincere and God-fearing man of godly life ... he is said to have received the gift of consecration in the church of Lydda from the hands of Peter, archbishop of Tyre ...»²³). The bishop of Sidon had court, coins and justice, and owed a service of 50 serjeants. The church in the Holy Land had jurisdiction over clerics and over moral offenses, but referred those sentenced to the secular courts for punishment²⁴).

Amalric took the Patriarch Fulcher's (1146-1157) side in a dispute with the Hospitallers in 1155, and as a result, visited Italy in that same year. The Hospitallers and other orders founded in the Holy Land — such as the Templars and the order of the Holy Sepulchre — received donations in Europe and were usually anxious to place their possessions directly under papal jurisdiction. St. Habacuc, similarly, was founded with the approval of the patriarch of Jerusalem, but was subject to the Premonstratensian order²⁵). The Premonstratensians managed to avoid the hostility which developed between the military orders and the secular church, remaining supporters of both patriarch and papacy. From the chronicler's point of view, all of the orders founded or endowed in the Holy Land owed allegiance to the secular

²¹) G. VAN DEN BROECK, «Les frères convers dans la législation des Prémontrés», *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 44 (1968), p. 216.

²²) F. PETIT, «L'ordre de Prémontré», *La Vita Comune del Clero nei secoli X^e-XII^e*, 2 vols., *Miscellanea del Centro di Studi Medioevali* 3 (1962), pp. 466-467.

²³) WILLIAM OF TYRE, *Chronicon*, ed. R.B.C. HUYGENS, 2 vols., *Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis*, 63, 63A (Turnhout, 1986) 17.26 (HUYGENS, p. 797); trans. from E.A. BABCOCK and A.C. KREY, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, 2 vols. (New York, 1941; repr. 1976), vol. 2, p. 225.

²⁴) J. RICHARD, *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, 2 vols., trans. J. SHIRLEY (Oxford, 1979), vol. A, p. 107.

²⁵) C.L. HUGO, ed., *Sacrae Antiquitatis Monumenta Historica, Dogmatica, Diplomatica*, 2 vols. (Étival, 1725), p. 117.

church there. But the Hospitallers in particular «never ... showed any reverence to the prelates of the church and absolutely refused to give tithes from any of their estates, regardless of the conditions under which these had come into their possession»²⁶). The Hospitallers compounded their offence by offering the sacraments to those whom their bishops had excommunicated, and added insult to injury by enlarging their building in Jerusalem. «The most intolerable wrong of all ... a thing abhorrent to all Christians, was done to the patriarch and the holy church at Jerusalem. For before the very doors of the [patriarch's church] ... to show their insolent contempt ... they began to erect an edifice far higher and more costly than the church of the Holy Sepulchre». Equally exasperating, the Hospitallers, «with intentional malice» frequently interrupted the patriarch's preaching on the hill of Golgotha, by setting «their many great bells ringing so loudly and persistently that the voice of the patriarch could not rise above the din, nor could the people, in spite of all his efforts, hear him»²⁷). Threats followed the attempted intervention of the citizens on the patriarch's behalf, and were fulfilled in an exploit which caps the rather ludicrous squabble. Armed Hospitallers broke into the church of the Holy Sepulchre and released «showers of arrows». The patriarch had the arrows collected, and hung up «before the place of Calvary». Then he prepared to take his case to the pope, accompanied by seven bishops, including Amalric of Sidon. In the spring of 1155, Fulcher and his «train of reverend bishops» arrived in Apulia, at that time in a dangerously unsettled state because of an invasion by the Byzantines. Fulcher was able to intercept the Emperor Frederick as he was leaving Italy in August, 1155, and to obtain letters to support his plea²⁸). The pope evaded Fulcher, however, first at Narni and then at Rome. When finally cornered by the patriarch's party at Ferentino, Hadrian refused to give any judgement, and treated the contingent from Jerusalem with such contempt that they finally realized the futility of their mission, and returned home²⁹).

²⁶) WILLIAM OF TYRE, 18.6 (HUYGENS, p. 817); BABCOCK, vol. 2, pp. 245-246 and n. 24.

²⁷) WILLIAM OF TYRE, 18.3 (HUYGENS, pp. 812-813); BABCOCK, vol. 2, p. 240.

²⁸) WILLIAM OF TYRE, 18.6, 7 (HUYGENS, pp. 818-819).

²⁹) *Ibid.*, 18.8 (HUYGENS, p. 820). See also *Ottonis et Rahewini Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris*, ed. G. WAITZ, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum* (Hanover and Leipzig, 1912), bk. 2, c. 27, an. 1155, p. 132, on the Emperor's presence in Italy, with Anselm of Havelberg, in 1155. Anselm had just

Amalric was bishop of Sidon from 1153 until 1170. In 1156, when the patriarch returned from Italy, he found that his chapter had engaged in a dispute over precedence with the monks of the Mount of Olives. The canons of the Holy Sepulchre demanded that the monks be made to do penance, that the chapter's right to take a leading position in processions on major feast days be acknowledged, and that their prior be confirmed in his right to celebrate mass and deliver the «sermonem ad populum» in the patriarch's absence. The monks duly marched barefoot to the church of the Holy Sepulchre, and the chapter's rights were confirmed by all the archbishops, bishops and abbots dependent on the patriarch³⁰). Curiously, the list of bishops and abbots includes the only two known Premonstratensian bishops of the first kingdom, as well as the only two names of Norbertine abbots which survive for that period³¹). Amalric's name, with the title «bishop of Sidon», appears again on a witness list to a confirmation document issued at Acre in 1160 by Baldwin III³²). The charter concerns various properties held by the chapter of the Holy Sepulchre, including land sold to it in 1155 by Hugh of Ibelin³³). The witness list includes the three archbishops and the eight bishops dependent on the patriarch of Jerusalem at that time. Hugh and his brother Baldwin of Ibelin are among the lay witnesses.

In 1170, Amalric, as bishop of Sidon, issued a charter in which it is explained that while visiting the Holy Sepulchre, he had made a pact of confraternity with the Benedictines of the great house of Josaphat. In return for the benefits of their prayers, he exempted them from half of the tithe they had been used to pay him as bishop of Sidon³⁴).

Like Norbert, Amalric had ties with a Benedictine monastery³⁵). He emerges, from combined charter and chronicle evidence, as a strong supporter of the episcopacy, and of the patriarch in particular. He

returned from Constantinople as Frederick's legate, and was rewarded with the exarchate of Ravenna. Both Anselm and Amalric had been Norbert's companions in Magdeburg. Did they meet in Italy in 1155, and was Anselm's influence with Frederick of assistance to Fulk and his party?

³⁰) BRESCH-BAUTIER, *Cartulaire*, no. 54 (except for the sisters of St. Lazare).

³¹) *Ibid.*: Letardus, archbishop of Nazareth, Amalric of Sidon, Herbert of St. Habbacuc, and «R.», abbot of St. Samuel.

³²) *Ibid.*, no. 45.

³³) *Ibid.*, no. 50, on the sale of 1155.

³⁴) R. RÖHRICHT, ed., *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani, MXCII-MCCXCI*, 2 vols. (Oeniponti, 1893-1904; repr.: New York, n.d.), no. 475.

³⁵) F. PETIT, *St. Norbert et l'origine des Prémontrés* (Paris, 1981), p. 227.

traveled with the patriarch for about a year, and is known to have been in Jerusalem in 1170. Amalric's own abbey had been founded near Jerusalem, with patriarchal approval. Both F. Petit and P. Lefèvre have noted a similarity between the vows and liturgy of the Premonstratensians and those of the Holy Sepulchre³⁶). It seems reasonable to assume that such a similarity resulted from contacts between the two orders in Palestine. Amalric's career as Norbert's companion, abbot of Habacuc and bishop of Sidon gives rise to the supposition that it was more specifically his influence which was felt by the new order of regular canons in Jerusalem.

Sts. Habacuc of Cansie and Joseph of Arimathaea

William of Tyre's identification of Amalric provides the earliest date for the existence of the Norbertine abbey near Jerusalem, in the diocese of Ramla-Lydda, known by the double name of Sts. Habacuc and Joseph of Arimathaea³⁷). The next mention of the house is in 1156. Herbert, abbot of St. Habacuc, witnessed the document about the dispute between the canons of the Holy Sepulchre, and the monks of the Mount of Olives, discussed above³⁸). This charter is also the first mention in the *acta* and chronicles of the kingdom of the Norbertine abbey of St. Samuel, on Mountjoy. Both abbots were included as witnesses because the chapter of the Holy Sepulchre wanted confirmation of its rights by all the bishops and abbots of the kingdom.

Only one charter survives for St. Habacuc. It was issued by «*Herbert ... abbas Sanctorum Joseph et Abacuc ... in presentia nostri fratrumque nostrorum et Balduini, archidiaconi Sancti Georgii, cantorisque eiusdem ecclesie Gisleberti et magistri Anshetini, fratris Roberti de Git, ... in ipsa ecclesia Sancti Joseph ...*»³⁹). Presumably, Herbert was made abbot in 1153, when Amalric became archbishop. He was certainly abbot by 1156, but after 1159 there is no chronicle or charter evidence for this house or its abbots. There is a tradition, passed down in the order, that canons were martyred in 1187. Certainly their abbey and church were

³⁶) PETIT, *Spiritualité*, p. 87; P. LEFÈVRE, «Prémontré, ses origines, sa première Liturgie, les relations de son Code législatif avec Cîteaux et les chanoines du Saint-Sépulcre de Jérusalem» *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 25 (1949), pp. 102-103.

³⁷) WILLIAM OF TYRE, 17.26 (HUYGENS, p. 797).

³⁸) BRESCH-BAUTIER, *Cartulaire*, no. 54.

³⁹) *Ibid.*, no. 52.

destroyed⁴⁰). Presumably Gervase of Prémontré's letters to Frederick II and the patriarch of Jerusalem, petitioning for the return of St. Habacuc to the order in 1216 referred to the property and revenues of the house⁴¹).

From the charter issued by Herbert, we know that his church was called «St. Joseph». The assumption has been that the abbey founded there was dedicated to St. Habacuc. Herbert himself made his mark, a cross, on the document. Following his name is a list of twenty-three «*fratres*». None of the names are distinguished by any title or office. Presumably, these are all canons, and not lay brothers. If so, and if the house followed the European pattern of admitting *conversi*, the abbey must have been quite large. The chapter of the Holy Sepulchre was founded with twenty-one prebends.

The charter records that Herbert returned land given to his canons by Balian of Ibelin, to Balian's son Hugh, lord of Ramla. Hugh had asked for the property, in order to repay the canons of the Sepulchre, who had provided ransom for him. Hugh replaced Balian's original gift with other property, thus effecting an exchange with the Norbertines for the benefit of the chapter of the Sepulchre. The charter was sealed by Constantine, who was styled «bishop of Ramla», «*ad corroboracionem presentis privilegii ...*» Constantine was the abbot's diocesan, whose bishopric depended directly on the patriarch. The episcopal church was actually at Lydda, and was dedicated to St. George. Constantine was apparently represented at this transaction by his archdeacon, Baldwin, his cantor, Gislebertus, and the «*magister*», Anschetinus⁴²). Judging from the following charter, which confirms this one, Marsirius de Ramatha, Andreas of Anjou and Albert Lombard were Hugh of Ramla's knights⁴³). The chapter of the Holy Sepulchre, to which Hugh transferred the property he received from Herbert, was represented by its cantor, Bernard, and *magister*, Achilles.

The name of Hugh's father, Balian of Ibelin, appears only in the charters which mention this transaction⁴⁴). He is known to have held

⁴⁰) BACKMUND, *Monasticon*, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 507.

⁴¹) HUGO, *Monumenta*, p. 117.

⁴²) I am unable to identify brother Robert de Git. On the lordships of Ramla and Lydda, and the bishop's claim to both, see H.E. MAYER, «The Origins of the Lordships of Ramla and Lydda in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem», *Speculum* 60 (1985), pp. 549-550.

⁴³) BRESCH-BAUTIER, *Cartulaire*, no. 53.

⁴⁴) *Ibid.*, nos. 51-53.

Ibelin from 1134. The Ibelins held Ramla through marriage from 1141, and received Mirabel as well in 1152⁴⁵). From William of Tyre we know that Balian died sometime between 1148 and 1151⁴⁶). Balian's gift to St. Habacuc, even if made on his deathbed, provides additional proof that the House was in existence before 1151. Hugh used the title «of Ibelin» in a charter for the first time in 1155⁴⁷). In that year, Hugh sold land to the chapter of the Holy Sepulchre⁴⁸). He was forced to sell property to the chapter again, in 1158, in order to raise a ransom after his capture by the Moslems at Banyas⁴⁹). Abbot Herbert of St. Habacuc returned to Hugh Bethel, Baytin, Izza, two carucates and five *journatas* of land, a tower, and «all that we built there». Hugh had requested the property so that he could offer it to the chapter of the Holy Sepulchre in return for their aid when he needed ransom⁵⁰). This would seem to be a considerable sacrifice of land, and also buildings which the Norbertines had themselves constructed. For instance, Herbert gave the «... chapel which we built there ...» to the chapter of the Holy Sepulchre «*precepto domini patriarche A[malrici], tum domini Hugonis precibus*»⁵¹). On the surface, this transfer seems to benefit only the Ibelins and the Sepulchre, while depriving the Norbertines of both their property and labour. B. Hamilton has taken it to mean that the canons of the Holy Sepulchre objected to the Norbertine presence in Palestine, notwithstanding Herbert's assurance that the transaction was made freely and with the consent of all his canons⁵²). It seems possible, however, that it was a free, and even desirable transfer. Herbert's charter goes on to note that Hugo, «*voluntati nostre satisfaciens et utilitati ecclesie nostre consulens*» gave the abbey part of the tower near the fortress of Mirabel, and two carucates in that area, in exchange for the land the house had lost. In the next charter, issued by Hugo, in which his transactions with the two orders are described, another reason is given for Herbert's willingness to part with land, buildings

⁴⁵) MAYER, «Ramla and Lydda», p. 547. W.H. RÜDT DE COLLENBERG, *Familles de l'orient latin, XII^e-XIV^e siècles* (London, 1983), p. 469, gives different dates.

⁴⁶) WILLIAM OF TYRE, 17. 1 (HUYGENS, p. 761).

⁴⁷) BRES-CAUTIER, *Cartulaire*, nos. 37, 39, 41, 44-47, and cf. p. 385 (index).

⁴⁸) *Ibid.*, nos. 37, 41, 44, 50.

⁴⁹) *Ibid.*, nos. 51, 52, 53; WILLIAM OF TYRE, 18.14 (HUYGENS, p. 831).

⁵⁰) BRES-CAUTIER, *Cartulaire*, nos. 52, 53.

⁵¹) *Ibid.*, no. 52.

⁵²) B. HAMILTON, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States: The Secular Church* (London, 1980), pp. 101-102.

and chapel⁵³). The exchange «... *longe meliora et commodiora eis esse noscuntur, Bethel enim, quia termini eorum ibi dilatari non poterant, sicut ab eis sepe audivi, aut parum, aut nichil eis prodesse poterat*».

M. Benvenisti has identified Bethel as the village of Mahomaria or al-Bira, two kilometres from Beitin, north-east of Ramla. There is a tower there, «beside the Ramallah-Jericho road ... square ... 10 metres wide»⁵⁴). Benvenisti thought that it had been built of stones belonging to an older Byzantine church on the same spot. Could this be the tower mentioned in Herbert's charter? Bethel, in any case, is identified with a town belonging to the Holy Sepulchre, al-Bira (Mahumeria). The other properties given up by Herbert are the *casals* Baytin and Bayt Izza (Beze), both within four kilometres of al-Bira. Al-Bira had belonged to the Holy Sepulchre since 1114, and was, by 1159, an important village⁵⁵). It is perhaps not surprising that the Norbertines felt cramped, and that the patriarch Amalric ordered their chapel to be turned over to him. In exchange, the order was given two properties on either side of the pass of Afeq, «one of the most important natural passes in the coastal plain»⁵⁶). This property had been held by the Ibelins only since 1152. On the east side of the pass was the fortress of Mirabel. On the west side was the fortress called «*Turon ad surdos fontes*»⁵⁷). Perhaps this exchange was really to the benefit of both the Norbertines and the canons of the Sepulchre. There was no later quarrel resulting from it, and Herbert's charter states that it was a free exchange. Hugh of Ibelin seems to have meant well towards the Norbertines, in spite of being extremely hard-pressed. There is at least as much evidence for a friendly exchange as there is for hostility towards the Norbertines on part of the Sepulchre. No other evidence exists for anything but cordial relations between them.

This charter carries the only known seal for the Norbertines in the First Kingdom, that of the house of St. Habacuc⁵⁸). The Norbertine seal itself does not seem to have survived. Neither E. Rozière, nor G.

⁵³) BRES-C-BAUTIER, *Cartulaire*, no. 53.

⁵⁴) M. BENVENISTI, *The Crusaders in the Holy Land* (Jerusalem, 1970), p. 318.

⁵⁵) BRES-C-BAUTIER, *Cartulaire*, no. 26, and pp. 409, 411 (index).

⁵⁶) BENVENISTI, p. 194.

⁵⁷) *Ibid.*; MAYER, «Ramla and Lydda», p. 547.

⁵⁸) In BRES-C-BAUTIER, *Cartulaire*, no. 52, the final sentence, before the witness list, reads: «*Ut igitur hoc ratum inconvulsumque permaneat, sigilli nostri impressione et fratrum subscriptorum testimonio confirmamus*».

Bresc-Bautier, in their editions of the charter, commented on it. H.E. Mayer mentioned it in passing, but did not describe it⁵⁹).

In spite of the lack of surviving documents for the order of Prémontré in Palestine, the Norbertines' holdings there were not negligible. Herbert's twenty-three brothers, chapel, and unspecified «buildings» testify to a thriving community. That Amalric should be elected bishop of Sidon is significant of the esteem in which he personally, or the order in general, was held. The evidence for the house of St. Samuel on Mountjoy adds weight to the thesis that the Norbertines made an important contribution to the history of the First Kingdom, through preaching and pastoral care.

St. Samuel at Mountjoy

H.E. Mayer, in his article concerning the priory of Premonstratensians on Nebi Samwil, has analysed the only surviving document which mentions property belonging to the house⁶⁰). In the context of this discussion, Mayer has attempted to fix the date of the foundation of the house. He has made a good case for Baldwin II (1118-1131) as the original benefactor⁶¹). Mayer's argument is based on the charter of Baldwin V, published in his article, and on five letters of Bernard of Clairvaux⁶²). It is clear, from these letters, that Bernard of Clairvaux received an unsolicited gift from Baldwin II of Jerusalem. The king offered Bernard the hill Nebi Samwil, called by the crusaders «Mountjoy», with 1,000 pieces of gold, if the abbot would build a Cistercian monastery there. Bernard turned the money and property over to the new order of Prémontré, and urged the Norbertines to go to Palestine in his place.

The charter of Baldwin V (1185) confirms to the priory on Nebi Samwil the possessions and privileges «... *quem Balduinus, dominus et abavus meus Latinorum in Jerusalem rex secundus ...*» gave to the

⁵⁹) E. DE ROZIÈRE, ed., *Cartulaire de l'église Saint Sépulcre de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1849), no. 133; H.E. MAYER, «Das Siegelwesen in den Kreuzfahrerstaaten», *Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, new ser.) 83 (Munich, 1978), p. 74.

⁶⁰) MAYER, «Sankt Samuel», pp. 67-71 (text), pp. 57-67 (discussion of possessions).

⁶¹) *Ibid.*, p. 39.

⁶²) BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX, ep. 175, 206, 289, 354, 355.

order⁶³). In a letter generally dated about 1150, Bernard of Clairvaux reminded Hugh of Fosse (first abbot of Prémontré) that «at Jerusalem, King Baldwin, while he was still alive, gave me the site of St. Samuel and money to build there, but you have both the site and the money by my gift»⁶⁴). It is clear that the foundation gift came through Bernard, whatever may have been added by various benefactors later. Baldwin V's diploma does give the impression that Baldwin II was alive to receive the Premonstratensians and increase the original gift: «... *et libertatem, quam praeinominatus rex dictis fratribus dedit in porta funda cathena pondere et mensura, ut possent emere vendere intrare et exire per totum regnum Ierosolimitanum omnia et singula* ...» The difficulty, as Mayer pointed out, is that an undated letter to Queen Melisende from Bernard of Clairvaux introduces and recommends the Premonstratensians to her good will. Mayer suggested, among other possibilities, that the Premonstratensians being introduced were Amalric and his companions. In short, Mayer believed that the foundation of St. Samuel occurred in the reign of Baldwin II (1118-1131), rather than during the reign of Fulk (1131-1143), as Backmund, for instance, suggested⁶⁵). There are difficulties with this hypothesis, as Mayer himself admitted. The charter of Baldwin V gives no clue as to when or how Baldwin II conferred gifts and privileges on St. Samuel. No mention is made, for instance, of St. Bernard, or any of the circumstances surrounding the foundation. The letter to Melisende sounds as if it introduces an order previously unknown in her kingdom:

«*Videtis quantum praesumam de vobis, qui audeo et alios commendare. Quanquam Praemonstratenses fratres istos magis fortassis superflue commendarim quam temerarie. Sunt merito ita commendabiles suo, ut non egeant alieno. Invenientur, nisi fallor, viri consilii, spiritu ferventes, in tribulatione patientes, potentes in opera et sermone. Induerunt se armatura Dei ... Suscipite illos tamquam bellatores pacificos, mansuetos ad homines, violentos ad daemones. Immo Christum in eis suscipite, qui est causa peregrinationis eorum*»⁶⁶).

Moreover, there is a letter by Bernard to the patriarch of Jerusalem, which is important, but to which Mayer gave very little weight. The

⁶³) MAYER, «Sankt Samuel», p. 68.

⁶⁴) BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX, ep. 253; trans. by B.S. JAMES, *The Letters of St. Bernard of Clairvaux* (London, 1953), no. 328; MAYER, «Sankt Samuel», p. 38.

⁶⁵) *Ibid.*, pp. 38-39; BACKMUND, *Monasticon*, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 508, n. 2.

⁶⁶) BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX, ep. 355.

letter is dated 1135, and is presumed to be addressed to William, patriarch of Jerusalem 1130-1145. It reads, in part:

«*Patriarchalibus scriptis saepius visitatus, ingratus jam videbor si non rescripsero. At si saluto eum qui me salutavit, quid amplius feci? Tu enim me praevenisti in benedictionibus dulcedinis, tu me prior dignatus es tuis transmarinis epistolis visitare, tu mihi primas humilitatis caritatisque praeeripuisti partes. Quid condignum iam referam? Nihil mihi denique reliquisti quod pari queam rependere vice, qui etiam de thesauro saeculorum mihi impertire curasti, id est, de ligno Domini ... De loco autem ad quem nos invitatis, frater Andreas dicet vobis voluntatem nostram*»⁶⁷).

Mayer dismissed the suggestion that the last sentence of this letter refers to the offer of the site on Nebi Samwil. But Bernard must have been referring to Baldwin's offer when he wrote «*de loco autem ad quem nos invitatis*». Could there be two independent offers of a site to Bernard emanating from the king and patriarch of Jerusalem at the same time?

It is of the greatest significance that Bernard mentioned «the site to which you have invited us» and that he introduced «Brother Andreas», who was to explain his wishes about the property. It was common practice to send a cover letter, which expressed greetings and compliments, but which actually served as a recommendation of the envoy who would introduce the real business⁶⁸). This reference to the offered site, combined with Andreas' mission, are a strong proof that William was acting for Baldwin II in reiterating the king's offer of land for a Cistercian monastery.

It is worth suggesting that the sequence of events was as follows. Baldwin II, before his death in 1131, offered land and money to Bernard of Clairvaux. William, who became patriarch in 1130, wished to honor the king's dying request. Moreover, William himself had a strong admiration for the Cistercians. He expressed both in a letter to Bernard, which accompanied a piece of the true cross⁶⁹). The patriarch's

⁶⁷) *Ibid.*, ep. 175. For Bernard's refusal to send Cistercians to the Holy Land, see GODFREY OF CLAIRVAUX, *S. Bernardi Vita Prima*, bk. 3, c. 22 (J.P. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina*, 221 vols. (Paris, 1844-1865), vol. 185, col. 316).

⁶⁸) P. CHAPLAIS, *English Medieval Diplomatic Practice*, 3 vols. (London, 1982), vol. 1, pp. 46-103: «Letters of credence and credences», nos. 34-67; K.J. LEYSER, «Frederick Barbarossa, Henry II and the Hand of St. James», *English Historical Review* 90 (1975), pp. 486-487.

⁶⁹) The letter from the patriarch is known only through the abbot's reply to it: BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX, ep. 175.

letter was sent to confirm Baldwin II's offer, which might seem to have been invalidated by the king's death, and to reassure the abbot, in the strongest terms, of the patriarch's approbation for Baldwin's plan. In Bernard's reply, he expressed his sense of the compliment paid to himself and his order. He also sent an envoy to discuss his alternate plan for the site Baldwin II had offered. There is no reference to the church the Premonstratensians founded on Mountjoy in the chronicles or charters of the Latin Kingdom until 1156⁷⁰). However, we know from Bernard's letter to Hugh of Fosse that the abbot of Clairvaux transferred the property to the Premonstratensians before 1150. It would have taken time to make all the arrangements for the exchange, and to collect Norbertines for the new foundation. If Bernard's letter to William does indeed date from 1135, the Norbertines could have arrived in 1141, as Premonstratensian traditions suggest⁷¹). Alternately, the letter from Bernard to Melisende could have introduced them after 1143, when Fulk was dead and the Queen was regent. This would conveniently clear up the error Mayer was forced to attribute to the obituary of Prémontré⁷²). The obituary credits Baldwin III (1143-1163) with the foundation of St. Samuel. The foundation of St. Samuel would have occurred during Queen Melisende's regency, technically the reign of Baldwin III, which would explain why he was honored as founder.

But one last alteration makes a more satisfactory theory. Baldwin II's offer dated from 1130-1131. William reiterated it soon after the king's death. Bernard replied by 1135. The Premonstratensians arrived in 1141. It took several years for them to build their church on Mountjoy, which still exists as a magnificent ruin. The church was therefore not consecrated until the reign of Baldwin III, or some time after 1152. Perhaps he made some donation, the record of which has been lost, in honor of his grandfather's gift. Or perhaps the date of the consecration misled the compilers of the obituary of Prémontré, and therefore he was honored as founder.

What about St. Bernard's letter to Melisende? It sounds too much like the introduction of a previously unknown order to be anything but a recommendation of Amalric and his canons, in the 1130's. This was Mayer's hypothesis, and it gains credence from the fact that both

⁷⁰) RÖHRICHT, no. 340.

⁷¹) PETIT, *Spiritualité*, p. 80; BACKMUND, *Monasticon*, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 508, n. 2.

⁷²) MAYER, «Sankt Samuel», p. 39.

Bernard and Norbert were at the council of Reims in 1131. It will be remembered that Amalric probably obtained his «license» to go overseas from Innocent II at that council. The friendship between Norbert and Bernard, and Bernard's previous correspondence with Melisende, make the recommendation for Amalric very likely. Moreover, the magnificent establishment at Mountjoy is obviously a royal foundation. The sizeable, but not equal, property at St. Habacuc, for which the Ibelins were the major patrons, would reflect the fact that Bernard introduced Amalric and his canons as pilgrims, asking only that Melisende receive them. They were given a church sometime after their original preaching mission, under circumstances which are unknown to us.

Patriarch William's letter, which the abbot of Clairvaux refers to as initiating their correspondence, reinforced Baldwin II's request for a Cistercian house near Jerusalem. Moreover, it accompanied a precious relic, a portion of the cross, intended as a gift to Bernard. Why was this relic sent to the abbot? This gift followed a donation of a piece of the cross and of the sepulchre to Notre-Dame in Paris by Anseau, chantor of the Holy Sepulchre, in 1120⁷³). G. Bresc-Bautier has seen the gift of Anseau in the context of an effort by the order of the Holy Sepulchre to establish connections with western orders capable of providing money and propaganda for crusading expeditions⁷⁴). William's gift to Bernard should be seen as part of the same effort, an attempt to secure the powerful influence of the Cistercians for the Kingdom of Jerusalem⁷⁵). In the event, Bernard sent a group of Norbertine canons, an order with which he had ties of confraternity⁷⁶). It has already been noted that by doing so, Bernard made a considerable impact on the history of the Latin Kingdom. The influence of the regular canons remained predominant in the major shrines of the kingdom, and the Augustinian Norbertines added to this pre-eminence. Where the Cistercians would certainly have rivaled the regulars, and perhaps superseded them as bishops,

⁷³) G. (BRES-C-)BAUTIER, «L'envoi de la relique de la Vraie Croix à Notre-Dame de Paris en 1220», *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 129 (1971), p. 387.

⁷⁴) (BRES-C-)BAUTIER, «Vraie Croix», p. 394.

⁷⁵) For possible reasons for Bernard's refusal to send Cistercians to the Holy Land see: GODFREY OF CLAIRVAUX, bk. 3, c. 7 (MIGNE, vol. 185, col. 316B); BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX, ep. 399; and a letter by Pope Urban II in MIGNE, vol. 151, p. 483C,D.

⁷⁶) BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX, ep. 153; T.J. GERITS, «Les actes de confraternité de 1142 et de 1153 entre Cîteaux et Prémontré», *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 40 (1964), pp. 192-205.

papal delegates, and keepers of the great shrines, the Norbertines supported and extended the hold of the Augustinian canons on the church in Outremer.

The tomb of the prophet Samuel was said to be located on a hill called Nebi Samwil. The first crusaders saw Jerusalem from the summit, and called the place *Mons Gaudii*. According to C. Enlart's description, the mount is 895 metres high, and the remains of an «*antique*» village, a fortress of the kings of Judah, and a Byzantine monastery can be found there⁷⁷). J. Prawer mentioned the Norbertine building, «the great church, later turned into a mosque, which overlooks Jerusalem today»⁷⁸). The plan of the twelfth-century church has been discussed by Savignac and Abel, who attributed the foundation to the patriarch of Jerusalem, and described the mountain as being settled by «a small colony of Franks»⁷⁹). «*Ce est l'usage de tous les pelerins, qui vont en Jerusalem, que illueques aorent avant, por ce que d'illueques voit l'on le Temple et le Sepulcre*»⁸⁰).

In 1172, Theodoric visited «a congregation of religious» there, whom he called the «grey monks» because of their habit of undyed wool⁸¹). Surprisingly, H.E. Mayer based the date of the foundation of the Spanish order of Mountjoy on Theodoric's reference to the grey habits of the monks he saw⁸²). Since the Norbertines, the Cistercians and the new order of Mountjoy all wore white, or unbleached (grey) habits, it is impossible to base the foundation date of the order of Mountjoy on Theodoric's description alone⁸³). Mayer has discussed what little charter evidence is available for the Premonstratensian house of St. Samuel on Mountjoy, and also for the order established on the hill by Count Rodrigo in the 1170's⁸⁴). Briefly, St. Samuel was directly dependent on

⁷⁷) C. ENLART, *Les monuments des croisés dans le royaume Jérusalem: architecture religieuse et civile*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1925-1929), vol. 2, p. 278.

⁷⁸) J. PRAWER, *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem: European Colonialism in the Middle Ages* (London, 1972), p. 172.

⁷⁹) PP. SAVIGNAC and ABEL, «Chronique. Nèby Samouïl», *Revue Biblique Internationale*, new ser. 9 (1912), p. 270.

⁸⁰) *L'Estoire de Eracles Empereur et la Conqueste de la Terre d'Outremer*, in *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades. Historiens occidentaux*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1844-1895), vol. 2, p. 184, variant text, section D.

⁸¹) THEODERICUS WIRZBURGENSIS, *Libellus de locis sanctis*, ed. T. TOBLER (St. Gallen, 1865), p. 88.

⁸²) MAYER, «Sankt Samuel», p. 40.

⁸³) PETIT, «L'Ordre de Prémontré», p. 470.

⁸⁴) MAYER, «Sankt Samuel», pp. 40-41. See also: J. DELAVILLE LE ROULX, «L'Ordre de Montjoye», *Revue de l'Orient latin* 1 (1893), pp. 42-57; A.J. FOREY, «The Order of Mountjoy», *Speculum* 46 (1971), pp. 250-266.

Prémontré. Its abbot was counted among the six suffragen abbots of the patriarch of Jerusalem⁸⁵). There were six suffragen abbeys: Mount Sion, Latina, *Templum Domini*, Mount of Olives, Josaphat and St. Samuel on Mountjoy. The five first carried «mitre et croce et anel», but the last, «croce et non mitre ni anel» The prior of the Sepulchre was the only suffragen prior. He carried «mitre et anel et non croce». In C.R. Cheney's opinion, Prémontré did not become exempt from episcopal visitation until the beginning of the thirteenth century. Augustinians, and early Premonstratensians, would be obedient to their abbot general «saving the rights of the bishop»⁸⁶). In 1156, the abbot of St. Samuel, along with the Norbertine bishop of Sidon and all the other bishops and abbots of the kingdom, witnessed the settlement of a dispute between the canons of the Holy Sepulchre and those of the Mount of Olives. According to Enlart, the church was consecrated in 1157. There is no proof of this, just a charter of the Holy Sepulchre referring to the «*ecclesiae Montis Gaudii*» in 1159⁸⁷). In 1187, canons from St. Habacuc and St. Samuel fled to Acre, where they established a joint house, called St. Samuel. Canons from this house may have settled eventually at the monastery of Episcopia, on Cyprus, sometime between 1206 and 1211⁸⁸).

The evidence for the history of the order of Mountjoy in Outremer has been clearly presented by Mayer, in a way which shows that Count Rodrigo's story is peripheral to that of the Norbertines⁸⁹). There are only four surviving documents to support the history of the order of Mountjoy in the Holy Land: a grant of property by the countess of Ascalon in 1177, a confirmation of various gifts by Baldwin IV in the same year, a grant from the prior of the Holy Sepulchre in 1178, and a letter of Alexander III in 1180⁹⁰). A.J. Forey mentioned the location of Mountjoy, but without commenting on the Premonstratensian presence there⁹¹). Count Rodrigo's initial visit to Nebi Samwil, when he must

⁸⁵) *Livre de Jean d'Ibelin, Recueil des Historiens des croisades. Lois*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1841-1843), vol. 1, p. 415, c. 261.

⁸⁶) C.R. CHENEY, *Episcopal Visitation of Monasteries in the Thirteenth Century* (1st ed.: Manchester, 1931; 2nd ed., rev: 1983), pp. 38-39, 42-43.

⁸⁷) RÖHRICHT, nos. 323, 340; ROZIÈRE, no. 129; ENLART, *Jérusalem*, vol. 2, p. 278. MAYER, «Sankt Samuel», p. 40, dated the charter 1156.

⁸⁸) BACKMUND, *Monasticon*, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 500-501, 501-504.

⁸⁹) MAYER, «Sankt Samuel», pp. 40-41.

⁹⁰) RÖHRICHT, nos. 553, 553a, 561, 594a.

⁹¹) FOREY, p. 253. For texts of the documents, see DELAVILLE LE ROULX, «Montjoye», pp. 51-57.

have visited the magnificent Norbertine church, may have influenced him in his desire to found a new order.

Both Premonstratensian houses supplied mediators and judges in various episcopal disputes, some of which were taken to the papal court, from 1156 until 1265⁹²). There is also the question of whether there was a Norbertine bishop of the First Kingdom besides Amalric of Sidon: Lotardus of Nazareth, 1158-1190. Lotardus has been characterized, with certainty, as a Norbertine by B.F. Grassi and L. Goovaerts, but his claim to a Premonstratensian background appears to rest on a conversation between the Marquis de Vogüé and Louis de Gonzague Daras, canon of Frigolet. The canon published a notice in 1886, in the *Annales Norbertines*, in which he related that the Marquis de Vogüé showed him a medallion as proof that Lotardus was both bishop of Nazareth and a Premonstratensian⁹³).

The two men who founded the Premonstratensian houses of Strahow in Bohemia and Neuffonts, near Clermont, are said, by F. Petit and N. Backmund, to have visited Norbertine houses in Palestine in 1136 and 1147, respectively. These claims must be investigated because, if true, they would help to fix foundation dates of St. Habacuc and St. Samuel.

Henry Zdik, bishop of Olmütz, is widely believed to have taken vows either as a Norbertine or as an Augustinian canon in Jerusalem in 1137⁹⁴). Petit has explained the foundation of Strahow, in 1143, as a direct result of Henry Zdik's vow of 1137, and Backmund has suggested that the bishop was first impressed by the «order of the Temple of Our Lord»⁹⁵). It should be noted that there was no «order» of the

⁹²) MAYER, «Sankt Samuel», p. 43.

⁹³) B.F. GRASSL, «Der Prämonstratenserorden, seine Geschichte und seine Ausbreitung bis zur Gegenwart», *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 10 (1934), p. 20, is based on A.L. GOOVAERTS, *Écrivains, artistes et savants de l'ordre de Prémontré*, 4 vols. (Bruxelles, 1899-1900), vol. 4, p. 165. Louis de Gonzague Daras published a notice in 1886 in the *Annales Norbertines*, pp. 17-20 (unavailable to me), in which he related that the Marquis de Vogüé showed him a medallion as proof that Lotardus was both bishop of Nazareth and a Premonstratensian. The account of the conversation is as reported by Goovaerts. See also BACKMUND, *Monasticon*, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 511. On Lotardus, see WILLIAM OF TYRE, 18.22 (HUYGENS, p. 842); and M. BOUQUET, ed., *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France*, 24 vols. (1st ed.: Paris, 1738; new ed. by L. DELISLE: Paris, 1869-1904), vol. 16, pp. 192-193, an. 1171.

⁹⁴) A. ZAK, «Episcopatus ordinis Praemonstratensis», *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 4 (1928), pp. 309-310, no. 87; GOOVAERTS, vol. 2, pp. 430-432; PETIT, *Spiritualité*, p. 85; BACKMUND, *Monasticon*, vol. 2, pt. 2, pp. 378-379; IDEM, «Heinrich Zdik», *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*.

⁹⁵) PETIT, *Spiritualité*, p. 85; BACKMUND, *Monasticon*, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 378, n. 1.

Temple of Our Lord. Canons of the order of the Holy Sepulchre were installed in the church called the «Temple of the Lord». They should also not be confused with the Templars. The story of the bishop of Olmütz's journey can be found in three Bohemian chronicles. In the *Annales Gradicenses*, Henry Zdík is said to have traveled to Jerusalem in 1137, and to have returned in 1138⁹⁶). Vincent of Prague, in his *Annales*, said that the bishop brought back a piece of the true cross from Jerusalem, and that he was impressed by the Augustinian canons (not Premonstratensians) he saw there⁹⁷). The most detailed account of the connection between the bishop's voyage to Outremer and foundation of Strahov was written by Gerlac, Premonstratensian abbot of Mülhausen, in Prague, between 1207 and 1222⁹⁸).

F. Petit translated a section of Gerlac's chronicle to the effect that: «*Henri Sdyck reçut notre habit qu'il avait vu à Jérusalem sur le Sépulcre de vie ... Il renonça à l'usage de la viande et à tout confort de la vie pour apporter à la Bohème un nouvel homme et un nouvel ordre*». Petit said, in this context, that Henry saw «*chanoines réguliers ... Ceux du saint-Sépulcre d'abord, puis les prémontrés qui sous la conduite d'Amalric prêchaient la pénitence parmi les croisés*»⁹⁹). Unfortunately, there is no evidence that Henry Zdík saw Amalric in Jerusalem. Petit seems to have inferred a meeting from the theory that Amalric was in the Holy Land by 1137, combined with Gerlac's statement. A close reading of Gerlac's chronicle reveals an ambiguity about when Henry took vows as a Premonstratensian. In fact, Strahov seems to have originally been founded as a house of Augustinian canons, and later to have been affiliated with Prémontré. The portion of the chronicle Petit quoted reads as follows:

«... *Zdico qui et Heinricus, bonae memoriae Olomucensis episcopus, habitum nostrum, quem Iherosolymis viderat, super sepulchrum vitae susceperat ... et abdicatis ibi tam esu carnium quem ceteris vitae blandimentis, reportabat memorato duci et Bohemis sicut novum hominem ita et novum ordinem*»¹⁰⁰).

⁹⁶) *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores* (=MGH.SS), vol. 17, p. 650, an. 1137, 1138.

⁹⁷) MGH.SS, vol. 17, p. 659, an. 1141: «... Qui etiam quis in seculo hoc sit sibi aptus modus vivendi subtiliter inquirens, habitum et regulam sancti Augustini sub sancti apostolis constitutam Hierosolimis assumpsit, ...»

⁹⁸) MGH.SS, vol. 17, pp. 683-710; another ed. by J. EMLER, in *Cosmae Chronicon Boemorum cum continuatoribus*, (Prague, 1874), vol. 2.

⁹⁹) PETIT, *Spiritualité*, p. 85.

¹⁰⁰) GERLAC, MGH.SS., vol. 17, p. 695, an. 1184.

This seems to be conclusive, except that the Sepulchre was served by regular canons of the order of the Holy Sepulchre, not Norbertines. Also, Vincent of Prague, writing before 1198, called the canons Henry saw Augustinian rather than Norbertine (see above). Moreover, Gerlac himself seems to be speaking ambiguously when he says «*habitum nostrum*». A few lines further on in his history of Strahow, he says that duke Wladizlaus and his wife Gertrude, influenced by the example and exhortations of Henry «... *novam ecclesiam novo conduunt ordini* ...» at Strahow, and that the bishop collected «... *maxime in spiritualibus ... undecunque posset religiosos fratres, quibus et praefecit imprimis quendam Blasium*»¹⁰¹). But were these brothers Premonstratensians? Gerlac says they were not: «*Postquam vero liquido comperit de institutione Praemonstratensis ecclesiae, quod inde initium ordinis, quod inde esset magisterium vitae regularis, illico habita deliberatione cum ipsius fundatoribus unanimi voto miserunt et de Steinveldensi domo conventum postularunt*». It seems at least that by «our habit» Gerlac meant the habit of an Augustinian canon, a point which Petit mentioned. Later, when he returned to Bohemia, Henry decided to affiliate his house with the famous Steinfeld, near Prague. Blaise was the prefect of the first group of canons, but Gezo was the first abbot of Strahow when it became a Norbertine house: «... *idem Gezo, primus Stragoviensium abbas primum in Steinveld ad conversionem venerit*»¹⁰²).

Backmund, in his *Die Mittelalterlichen Geschichtsschreiber des Prämonstratenserordens* has noted the two stages of the foundation of Strahow, dating the establishment of the house of canons 1140, and the affiliation with Steinfeld 1142¹⁰³). Finally, Bishop Henry himself, writing about his visit to Jerusalem and the foundation of Strahow, mentioned only the patriarch and canons of the Holy Sepulchre. In a letter written in c. 1143, about Strahow, the bishop remarked that his visit to the sepulchre made him anxious «... *sub regula sancti patris Augustini in habitu religiosorum Deo servire* ...». It is significant that Henry did not mention Norbertines: «*Intimato itaque tam domino patriarche, quam cunctis fratribus ad sepulchrum nostri redemptoris in eodem regulari habitu Domino famulantibus mentis mee desiderio, quod desiderabam, inueni, et in loco nostre redemptionis habitum sancte*

¹⁰¹) *Ibid.*

¹⁰²) *Ibid.*

¹⁰³) *Bibliotheca Analectorum Praemonstratensium*, facs. 10 (Averbode, 1972), p. 184, n. 12.

conuersationis suscipiens ad propria remeare contendit»¹⁰⁴). There is no evidence that Amalric and his group of Norbertines had a direct influence on the foundation of Strahow. It follows that the bishop's journey to Outremer does not help to date either Norbertine foundation there. Unfortunately, the evidence for the connection between St. Habacuc or St. Samuel and Neuffonts is equally inconclusive.

According to J. Pycke's article, for instance, Gilbert was lord of École and Aubeterre, was brought up at the court of Louis VI, and went to Palestine with the Second Crusade. On his return, he founded Neuffonts, and he died in 1150¹⁰⁵). Pycke based his article on two references to Gilbert in the chronicle of Robert of Auxerre and a general reference to Odo of Deuil's chronicle, pointing out that most of the available information about Gilbert comes from J. LePaige. LePaige took his history from a manuscript he found at Neuffonts, which was subsequently lost. J. Pycke felt that this seventeenth-century biography by a Premonstratensian canon was suspect as a source for Gilbert's life¹⁰⁶).

The chronicle evidence for Gilbert's life is inconclusive. An examination of Robert of Auxerre's history leads to the conclusion that the first of Pycke's references is mistaken. The «*magister Gilbertus*» of page 234 is obviously not the «*sanctus Girbertus*» of page 236, and is, in fact, mentioned elsewhere in the chronicle. That leaves one reference to Gilbert, by Robert, which, in its entirety, reads: «*1152. Hoc anno sanctus Girbertus ex potenti milite seculi humillimus miles Christi, elemosinarum, abstinentiae, paupertatis admirandus exemplis, apud Scholam Arvernie vicum migravit ad Dominum. Sepultus est autem in monasterio non procul a prefato vico, ubi Premonstratensem ordinem pii laboris instantia ipso anno adduxerat, cuius magnitudinem meriti miraculorum magnitudo declarat*»¹⁰⁷). This short section establishes Gilbert as a secular knight, a crusader, and the founder of a Norbertine house near «*Scholam Arvernie*». N. Backmund based his account of Neuffonts on this passage and on LePaige's *Vita*, without mentioning Odo of

¹⁰⁴) A. BOCZEK, ed., *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Moraviae*, 15 vols. (Olmütz, 1836-1903), vol. 1, p. 218.

¹⁰⁵) J. PYCKE, «Gilbert de Neuffonts», *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastiques*.

¹⁰⁶) *Ibid.*, and cf.: N. BACKMUND, «Die Mittelalterlichen Geschichtsschreiber des Prämonstratenserordens», *Bibliotheca Analectorum Praemonstratensium*, fasc. 10 (Averbode, 1972), p. 266, n. 75, and pp. 308-309, 311, on the question of LePaige's reliability.

¹⁰⁷) MGH.SS., vol. 26, p. 236.

Deuil¹⁰⁸). An examination of H. Waquet's edition of Odo's chronicle reveals that no Gilbert of Arvernia is mentioned. There are two references to forces traveling separately, and one to the army of the Count of Auvergne camped outside Constantinople¹⁰⁹). Odo's «William» is identified with Count William VIII, but there is no mention of a Gilbert in the history of the house for the late eleventh or early twelfth centuries. According to N. Backmund, the archives of Neuffonts have been destroyed, so that LePaige is now the only source of information on Gilbert. From Robert of Auxerre we know that Gilbert was in Palestine before 1152, and that he did found a Premonstratenian house on his return to France. This information does not help to date the foundations of St. Habacuc and St. Samuel, which we know from other evidence to have been in existence before 1150. J. LePaige's account of Gilbert's life adds no definite information on what Gilbert did or saw in the Holy Land. LePaige did say that Gilbert went over with Louis VII in 1147, but it is not clear whether this is simply an educated guess based on Robert of Auxerre's comment, or whether the lost manuscript gave LePaige reason to believe so¹¹⁰). It is certainly possible that Henry Zdik and Gilbert of Neuffonts saw Norbertines in Palestine, but we cannot prove it.

To complete the scanty evidence for the house of Mountjoy with a last negative, there is a note by R. Röhricht to the effect that an abbot of «St. Samuel», Theodoric, witnessed a charter in Saxony in about 1145¹¹¹). There was, however, an Abbot Theodoric of the Premonstratensian house of St. Samuel's, Barletta in 1143¹¹²). There is no way to be sure, but he seems a slightly more likely candidate for the Saxon charter.

*

* *

¹⁰⁸) BACKMUND, *Monasticon*, vol. 3, pp. 151-153.

¹⁰⁹) EUDES DE DEUIL, *La Croisade de Louis VII, Roi de France*, ed. by H. WAQUET, *Documents relatifs à l'histoire des Croisades*, no. 3 (Paris, 1949), bk. 4, p. 51 and n. 2. For Arvernia/Auvergne, see J. MOREAU, *Dictionnaire de Géographie historique de la Gaule et de la France* (Paris, 1972; *Supplément*, 1983), p. 32; J. VAISSETE and C. DEVIC, eds., *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, 3rd ed., 16 vols. (Toulouse, 1872-1904), vol. 4, pp. 85-92; É. BALUZE, *Histoire généalogique de la maison d'Auvergne* (Paris, 1708).

¹¹⁰) LEPAIGE, pp. 482-483.

¹¹¹) RÖHRICHT, no. 216, p. 15 in vol. 2. The text of the charter is in *Codex Diplomaticus Saxoniae Regiae*, ed., O. POSSE, 6 vols., Haupttheil I, Band 2: *Urkunden der Markgrafen von Meissen und Landgrafen von Thüringen 1100-1195* (Leipzig, 1889), no. 181, pp. 127-128 and cf. no. 188, p. 132.

¹¹²) BACKMUND, *Monasticon*, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 478.

What emerges most clearly from the evidence for the early history of the Norbertines in Outremer is the role of the chapter of the Holy Sepulchre as a patron of new orders and center of Augustinian reform. The fact that the order of Prémontré was based in Europe, spread very rapidly in the twelfth century, and continues to exist today, has inclined scholars to emphasize the ways in which the Norbertines influenced the chapter of the Sepulchre. The paucity of documents for, and the short life of the chapter of the Sepulchre were due to the disaster of 1187 and subsequent collapse of the chapter's European organization. The evidence for the period before 1187 shows the patriarchs of Jerusalem as patrons of the Norbertines, with Premonstratensian abbots and bishops playing a supporting role. Royal patrons of the Norbertines were influenced by the patriarchs and by Bernard of Clairvaux, perhaps more than by the newly-founded order of Prémontré. Moreover, the role of the Sepulchre in establishing Augustinian priories in Outremer and Europe, which has been demonstrated elsewhere, is here supported and extended¹¹³). The bishop of Olmütz certainly founded Strahow in imitation of the regular canons of the Sepulchre, while the patriarch and his chapter extended their support for the Augustinian rule by establishing two major houses of Norbertines close to Jerusalem.

The evidence for the Norbertines in Outremer adds an important new dimension to our knowledge of the church in the crusader states. It also provides a clue to the thinking of king and patriarch about relations with the new orders in the West. The acceptance of Amalric and his canons as preachers in the 1130's indicates support for the apostolic life by Melisende, by the patriarch, and by such patrons as the Ibelins. The decision to endow the itinerants with a church shows that the church in Outremer followed the European tendency to insist on stability of a traditional kind. Hugh of Ibelin's charter demonstrates the wealth of the chapter in the 1150's, and the firm control it maintained over establishments such as St. Habacuc. Baldwin II and Patriarch William expressed both a strong admiration for the Cistercians, and a desire to secure an effective means of spreading propaganda in the West. However, the fact that they accepted Norbertines, testifies both to the influence of St. Bernard, and the swift rise to prominence of the order of Prémontré in Europe. Presumably king and patriarch felt their need

¹¹³) C.K. SLACK, «Regular Canons and the Crusades in the Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries», D.Phil. thesis, Oxford University, 1988.

for effective propaganda in Europe would be fulfilled by the Norbertines almost as well as by the Cistercians.

Finally, the extent of the property and privileges held by the Norbertines in the East, testifies to a significant impact on the kingdom in terms of preaching and pastoral care. The evidence of the shrine church on Mountjoy, and its apparent effect on Count Roderigo, supports the idea of his influence. The picture which emerges, of the predominance of Augustinian ideals of preaching, liturgy and pastoral care, offer a glimpse of the crusader kingdom from a fresh perspective.

The Premonstratensians, in their early years, were trying to resist the pressure to acquire tithes, land and the resulting lawsuits. This attempt, along with the destruction of many archives of the kingdom in 1187, helps to explain why so little written evidence of their presence remains. However, the physical remains of Mountjoy, and charter evidence for a large number of canons at the house of St. Habacuc, point to impressive establishments. So do the elections of Amalric and Lotardus to the bishoprics of Sidon and Nazareth. This prominent role in the history of the kingdom was continued after 1187. The Norbertine's good relations with the papacy and episcopacy led to frequent employment as papal judges delegate in the Kingdom of Acre. Their history on Cyprus was a stormy one, which also adds to the amount of evidence for their activities in the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Their preaching mission of the 1130's, followed by their substitution for the Cistercians in the 1140's, had a profound effect on the history of the church in the crusader states.

(to be continued)

History/Political Studies
Whitworth College
Spokane, WA 99251, USA

C.K. SLACK