

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

(continuation)*

The Premonstratensians in the Kingdom of Acre

From 1187 until 1263, the Premonstratensians in Palestine were represented by the house of St. Samuel at Acre. Canons from St. Habacuc and Mountjoy who escaped martyrdom when the kingdom fell formed a joint community there¹¹⁴). Their interests were vigorously promoted by their general abbot, Gervase of Prémontré (1209-1220), whose letters are the only source of information for the house at Acre during its early years¹¹⁵). After Gervase's elevation to the see of Séz (1220-1228), the canons were secure enough in their new position to act as papal judges delegate in quarrels between such protagonists as the Hospitallers and the bishop of Acre¹¹⁶). St. Samuel was the base for at least one preacher of the Fifth Crusade, Hellinus of Floreffe¹¹⁷). Hellinus died at the Premonstratensian abbey, Bellapaise, founded between 1206 and 1211, and celebrated as «the most beautiful of the medieval remains in Cyprus»¹¹⁸). The order as a whole was intimately involved in preaching and raising funds for the Albigensian and Fifth Crusades, both as papal agents and as land-holders in Ramla-Lydda, Mountjoy, Acre and Cyprus.

The history of the house at Acre rests on twenty-nine charters and letters, of which eleven belong to the letter collection of Gervase, and eighteen refer to papal business entrusted to the abbot of St. Samuel. N. Backmund has suggested another source of information about the

*) See *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 67 (1991), 207-231.

¹¹⁴) BACKMUND, *Monasticon*, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 500-501; MAYER, «Sankt Samuel», p. 43.

¹¹⁵) HUGO, *Monumenta*, pp. 1-124. See CHENEY, *Texts*, p. 243 on Gervase, who has «passed unnoticed in modern times by historians who might have found (his letters) instructive».

¹¹⁶) RÖHRICHT, nos. 1062a, 1080a (two letters), 1087, 1127, 1135, 1193a, 1197, 1217, 1244, 1249, 1271, 1275, 1276, 1277, 1278, 1305a, 1323b.

¹¹⁷) HUGO, *Monumenta*, ep. 115, 38, pp. 102-104, 38-39.

¹¹⁸) Sir G. HILL, *A History of Cyprus*, 4 vols. (Cambridge, 1940-1948), vol. 3, p. 1125, and plates IV, V.

house in a short notice in his *Monasticon*¹¹⁹). This notice provides an outline of the history of the house, as well as a bibliography, and it refers to H.E. Mayer's article about St. Samuel, Mountjoy. It will be convenient to look at Backmund's and Mayer's suggestions first, before turning to the charters.

The charter published and analysed by Mayer shows that by 1184, the Norbertines owned a house in Acre, along with a tower in the wall of the city, close to the house. Besides this, there was a «camera» which the canons bought from a certain Peter Filot, and two hundred bisants, which Baldwin III had given to the house «*in funda Accon civitatis singulis annis*». In Mayer's opinion, the canons were never able to return to either St. Habacuc or Mountjoy. Their only base in Palestine after 1187 was the property at Acre¹²⁰). Gervase of Prémontré first mentioned a house of Norbertines at Acre in 1213¹²¹). From 1235 until 1263, there are a steady stream of letters addressed to, issued by, or referring to, the abbot of St. Samuel, Acre, who continued to use the seal of the house at Mountjoy¹²²). After 1263, there is neither charter nor chronicle evidence to prove the continued existence of the house in Acre. There is a tradition, preserved within the order, that «Aegidius de Marle, the last abbot of St. Samuel, suffered martyrdom with his twenty-six canons in 1291». C.L. Hugo related this story in his *Annales*, but offered no supporting evidence¹²³).

Backmund proved that there was no link between the Premonstratensians at Acre and the Norbertine abbey Notre-Dame de Huveaune, near Marseilles. The name of the French abbey, «Ybelina», suggests a connection with the Ibelins¹²⁴). However, it is clear that the name of the abbey was taken from the river Huveaune/Yvelina, close by, rather than from the Ibelin family. In an article published in 1931, Backmund corrected R. van Waefelghem's Norbertine bibliography, noting that the name «Ybelina» was misleading, and that the name of the house was «Huveaune»¹²⁵). Backmund did provide, however, conclusive evi-

¹¹⁹) BACKMUND, *Monasticon*, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 500-501.

¹²⁰) MAYER, «Sankt Samuel», pp. 69-70 (text), 42 (discussion).

¹²¹) HUGO, *Monumenta*, ep. 37, pp. 37-38; RÖHRICHT, no. 884.

¹²²) See note 116, above.

¹²³) MAYER, «Sankt Samuel», p. 42; BACKMUND, *Monasticon*, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 500.

¹²⁴) *Ibid.*, p. 501 and n. 4. Cf. *ibid.*, vol. 3, pp. 185-187, where Backmund proves the falsity of the Ibelin connection, using the documents edited in L. DAILLEZ, «L'Abbaye de Notre-Dame d'Huveaune à Marseille», *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 43 (1967), pp. 39, 40, ns. 1-3.

¹²⁵) N. BACKMUND, «Zur Bibliographie Ordinis Praemonstratensis», *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 7 (1931), p. 178, no. 410.

dence of a link between Huveaune and Bellapaise, through Hayto, prince of Armenia (see below).

Gervase, abbot general of Prémontré, 1209-1220

John of Brienne's (1210-1225) letter announcing his coronation and asking for the prayers of the Premonstratensians has been lost. Two of the king's letters are now known only through Gervase's replies to them, in which the abbot carefully repeats what the king has asked, before commenting¹²⁶). This pattern of formal repetition can clearly be seen in a surviving inquiry of John's of 1215, answered by Gervase in the same year; but also in the abbot's reply, in 1214, to a missing letter¹²⁷). In his reply to the lost coronation (1210), Gervase congratulated John of Brienne, thanked him for his (unspecified) «*oblata*», and promised, on behalf of his general chapter, to pray for the king's success in war, in recognition of confraternity between John and the order¹²⁸). A new collect, for the king himself, would be added, to be said «in all the churches of our order»¹²⁹). These prayers constituted more than a spiritual benefit. The order was noted for undertaking parish ministry, and had houses not only throughout France and Germany, but also in Sweden, England, Scotland, Ireland, Spain and Hungary. England alone had thirty Norbertine abbeys by 1220¹³⁰). Prayers said in Premonstratensian churches could not fail to draw attention of the faithful to the plight of Jerusalem, and might result in donations or crusade vows. The king asked for no more than this, and Gervase may have been unable to do more at this time. The abbot had taken over the leadership of his order at the peak of its popularity in Europe, but at a time when the corruption of several abbots of Prémontré (between 1201 and 1209) had alienated the papacy¹³¹). Gervase, although he personally had been able to win Innocent III's good will («... *exaudistis me in multis* ...»), was not able to restore his order to full favor until 1215¹³²).

C.R. Cheney has thoroughly investigated the evidence for Gervase's

¹²⁶) HUGO, *Monumenta*, ep. 84, 115, pp. 76-77, 102-104.

¹²⁷) *Ibid.*, ep. 36, 37, pp. 36-38.

¹²⁸) *Ibid.*, ep. 84, pp. 76-77; RÖHRICHT, no. 847.

¹²⁹) Translations of phrases from the letters are mine, unless otherwise noted.

¹³⁰) CHENEY, *Texts*, pp. 248-249.

¹³¹) *Ibid.*, p. 249.

¹³²) HUGO, *Monumenta*, ep. 3, pp. 5-6.

life in order to dispel a persistent identification of the abbot with a certain Gervase of Chichester¹³³). From his epitaph it is known that Gervase was English, but there is no record of the place or date of his birth. He joined the order as a canon of the house of St. Just, Beauvais. He took the office of abbot first at St. Just, and then at Thenailles, Laon. In 1209 Gervase became abbot of Prémontré, and therefore abbot general of the order. In 1220 he was elected bishop of Séz. He died in 1228¹³⁴). Gervase's secretary made a collection of his letters because «... I had heard from several people that many commended my abbot for his style of speech and composition»¹³⁵). The letters deal mostly with the business of the order «from Börglum in Jutland to Brindisi in Apulia, and from Ireland to the Holy Land»¹³⁶). Their style is succinct and matter-of-fact. Cheney pointed out that the two most famous letters, to Innocent III and Honorius III «probably state more forcibly than any other contemporary document some defects in the organization of the crusade»¹³⁷).

In 1210, John of Brienne was in desperate need of western aid. The new king's truce with Saif-ad-Din expired in September of that year, and by 1211 the Moslems had taken Mt. Thabor. John wrote to Innocent III, requesting men, especially, and the pope responded by having the crusade preached in Europe¹³⁸). The king's request for confraternity, and the abbot's promise of wide-spread publicity through the new collect, should be seen as part of John's appeal to Europe, and of the response of the West. Gervase was soon to be in charge of raising funds, under Simon, archbishop of Tyre, but for the moment he was hampered by Innocent's indifference to his order¹³⁹). His predecessor, Robert I, abdicated in February, 1209. Robert had come to Prémontré

¹³³) Cf. CHENEY, *Texts*, pp. 243ff, and SETTON, vol. 2, pp. 384-386; PETIT, *Spiritualité*, p. 79.

¹³⁴) *Gallia christiana* (= G.C.), ed. by the Congregation of St. Maur, Benedictine Order (Paris, 1715-1865; repr. in 16 vols.: Farnborough, England, 1970), vol. 11, col. 693; CHENEY, *Texts*, p. 242.

¹³⁵) *Ibid.*, p. 246.

¹³⁶) *Ibid.*, p. 245.

¹³⁷) *Ibid.*, p. 256.

¹³⁸) SETTON, vol. 2, pp. 537, 539, describes the taking of Mt. Thabor and the Latin reaction in Outremer and the West.

¹³⁹) HUGO, *Monumenta*, ep. 84, p. 76 (Gervase to John of Brienne): «Oblata nobis ex parte vestra petitio inter curas multiplices, quibus circa negotia nostris Ordinis occupamur, exhilaravit nos plurimum ...»

from Ardenne, apparently elected after the deposition of William of St. Omer in 1206, in the hope of rehabilitating the reputation of the office. Of the previous two abbots, Baldwin, 1201-1203, had died of dysentery, and Gormund was somewhat mysteriously elected and then moved on to another abbey in 1203. William of St. Omer's case had been taken to Rome, apparently to the detriment of the order in the eyes of the pope. Robert I seems to have added the finishing touch to Innocent's disgust. He is characterized as «... *luxui et vanitatibus serviens, homo mediocris*¹⁴⁰). Previous to these four abbots, the order seems to have enjoyed the pope's favor. Peter I of Prémontré, 1196-1201, had, like Gervase, come originally from St. Just, and was able to procure various privileges for the Norbertines from Innocent III¹⁴¹). C.R. Cheney attributed Gervase's reconciliation with the pope partly to a shared concern for the Fifth Crusade. «The relief of the Holy Land was a cause which lay very near the heart of Innocent III, and one in which the Premonstratensians distinguished themselves by their preaching»¹⁴²).

The king of Jerusalem, unable to get the help he needed from the West in 1210, concluded a truce with the Moslems which was supposed to last until 1217. In 1212 his wife, Mary, died, leaving him in an equivocal position as regent for his infant daughter, Isabel. Two years later the king married Leon of Armenia's daughter. It is clear from John's hurried trip to Armenia in May, 1219, that he hoped to claim it through his wife, thereby consolidating his own hold on some portion of Syria¹⁴³).

In 1210, Gervase had not neglected to ask that John, if he should be able to defend his new kingdom, and regain lost territory, remember to return «...*loca illa, in quibus Ordo noster ante subversionem Terrae Sanctae antiquitus habebatur* ...»¹⁴⁴).

In 1213, Innocent III sent out letters calling for representatives from all of Christendom to attend a council to be held at Rome in 1215. Gervase's answer conveyed his enthusiasm for the dual aims expressed by the pope: help for the Holy Land and reform of the church¹⁴⁵). The abbot was to be present at Lateran IV, and in this year, 1213, sent at

¹⁴⁰) G.C., vol. 9, col. 647 (partially from HUGO, *Annales*).

¹⁴¹) *Ibid.*, col. 646.

¹⁴²) CHENEY, *Texts*, p. 256.

¹⁴³) SETTON, vol. 2, pp. 537, 539.

¹⁴⁴) HUGO, *Monumenta*, ep. 84, pp. 76-77; RÖHRICHT, no. 847.

¹⁴⁵) SETTON, vol. 2, p. 378; HUGO, *Monumenta*, ep. 3, pp. 5-6.

least one canon to preach the Albigensian crusade. In 1219, Gervase comforted the widow of Simon de Montfort by referring to her husband as a «saint», and promising her more help from his order¹⁴⁶).

1213 was also the year in which Gervase received a desperate appeal from the king of Jerusalem, which appears to have survived only in the collection of the abbot's letters. John's description of his plight is as follows:

«Sciatis itaque quod de die in diem fit deterior, cum nos summa paupertate et defensorum paucitate laboremus. Treugas enim adhuc habemus, sed ex parte Saracenorum claudicantes: verum cum nos eisdem simus viribus impares, et ipsi nostram attendant debilitatem, praesumimus et timemus quod treugas debeant interrumpere, et illud quod speramus auxilium praevenire¹⁴⁷).

The king did not mention the Premonstratensians he had been asked to find and endow in Palestine in this brief letter. He begged that Gervase would pray for his kingdom and his daughter Isabel. John also explained his marriage to Leon's daughter as being undertaken in the hope of securing Armenia's aid, and by the advice of the prelates and nobles of Palestine.

Gervase's answer was encouraging, but once again laid stress on the interest of the order in its lost properties¹⁴⁸). The abbot assured the king that his letter had been read in the (annual) general chapter, and that he had not been able to hear the account of John's troubles «sine moerore animi ac dolore cordis». Nevertheless, the help Gervase was willing to offer was still no more than what John asked: continued prayers for the Holy Land. The abbot was congratulatory about the help available through the Armenian marriage, but was careful to remind John that «maledictus est ... qui confidit in homine». The bulk of the letter develops this theme, ending with a slightly testy assurance that the Norbertines were praying for John, having already added a special collect to what was accepted practice throughout the western church. However, yet another collect would be added. Then Gervase again asked that the king cherish «reliquis ... Ordinis nostri, Fratribus scilicet Sancti Samuelis (quos ut in Terra Sancta, memoria nostri Ordinis

¹⁴⁶) CHENEY, *Texts*, p. 257.

¹⁴⁷) HUGO, *Monumenta*, ep. 36, p. 36; RÖHRICHT, no. 873, lists no other source for this letter.

¹⁴⁸) HUGO, *Monumenta*, ep. 37, pp. 37-38; RÖHRICHT, no. 884. On the annual general chapters mentioned in this letter, see BACKMUND, *Monasticon*, vol. 2, p. 521.

haberetur, voluit Dominus apud Accaron refidere)». This is Gervase's first reference to the house at Acre. Possibly refugees from Mountjoy and St. Habacuc simply joined the canons who were living in Acre, in St. Samuel's house there, which had been in existence since sometime before 1184. Gervase gave no description of the Acre house, however, and no thanks were offered to John for a part in augmenting its possessions to accomodate fugitives from the other houses¹⁴⁹).

Apparently, the next letter in this correspondence, from John to Gervase, has been lost, but the abbot's answer survives¹⁵⁰). John had again requested prayers, this time for his new Armenian wife, as well as for Isabel. Gervase warmly promised to comply, and again offered assurances of God's assistance in the reconquest of the Holy Land. The bearer of the letter, a certain «master O.», is commended to the king as a scholarly canon who «*de vobis praedicat multa bona*». Do these words refer to the crusade preparations in the West? As was noted above, Innocent was already organizing the great council of 1215, and given the date (about 1214), the messenger would be able to report on the progress of Innocent III's preparations for a new crusade. Unfortunately, nothing more seems to be known of «O.» He is not mentioned even in the histories of the order dealing with the mission to Palestine¹⁵¹). It should be remembered that Gervase had sent a canon to preach the Albigenian crusade in 1213, and was to send the abbot of Floreffe to Acre to preach the Fifth Crusade in 1217 (see below). There is nothing unlikely in the assumption that «master O.» was to preach fairly widely, and the emphasis placed on his learning seems to support this. Equally, he could have been sent simply to look after the order's affairs in Acre.

John asked for, and received from Gervase, prayers, and through them, publication of the kingdom's distress. In 1215, Simon, archbishop

¹⁴⁹) Could the *oblata* John offered in 1210 have been donations to the tiny Norbertine holding in Acre? Gervase did thank the king for his munificence in that first letter. We simply do not know what happened to the canons in Outremer between 1187 and 1213.

¹⁵⁰) HUGO, *Monumenta*, ep. 115, pp. 102-104; RÖHRICHT, no. 854. Curiously, Röhricht has dated his letter 1211, and mistaken the number, although not the pages, in Hugo's edition. The letter refers to John's wife, and to his daughter by a previous marriage, which must mean Stephanie of Armenia and Isabel, Maria of Montferrat's child. Therefore, the letter must be dated after 1214, the date of John's second marriage. For John's marriages, see SETTON, vol. 2, pp. 536-537; J.M. BUCKLEY, «The Problematical Octogenarianism of John of Brienne», *Speculum* 32 (1957), pp. 320-321.

¹⁵¹) For example, BACKMUND, *Monasticon*, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 500-511.

of Tyre, was appointed papal legate for the promotion of the Fifth Crusade in France, and commissioned Gervase to supervise the collection of funds in two dioceses¹⁵²). Presumably both were appointed at Lateran IV. Gervase's letters to Innocent III and Honorius III of 1216 and 1217-1218 prove that he himself preached the Fifth Crusade, and that his order in general did¹⁵³).

In the letter to Innocent of 1216, Gervase refers to the archbishop of Tyre's preaching mission in France¹⁵⁴). Simon was not only preaching, to recruit crusaders, but was given power to commute the vows of those too poor or infirm to go¹⁵⁵). Gervase had apparently either appointed himself spokesman for, or been asked, «by many», to get answers to some organizational questions affecting crusaders in France. The fact that Gervase was the one who wrote to Innocent about these questions (although he was «as if at the gates of death»), rather than Simon himself or nobles who had taken the cross, proves that the abbot felt himself responsible for preparations in his area. He was well-informed, not only about the decrees of the councils of Rome and Melun, but of the practical difficulties arising from them. Many people wanted to know, according to the abbot, whether the magnates of France who had taken the cross would be allowed a year's delay, or would have to meet the original departure date. Gervase was appealing directly to Innocent because Simon had brought no new answers to questions Gervase now reviewed for the pope. The archbishop could say only that the decrees of the previous councils stood. Gervase wanted to know whether the various contingents could leave on time, and how the departures could be enforced. Simon had responded that he himself had not received any authority to force crusaders to depart on time, and that he knew of no one else with powers to do so.

¹⁵²) SETTON, vol. 2, p. 381; HUGO, *Monumenta*, ep. 33, 35, pp. 34, 36. On Gervase as a crusade procurator, see J. M. POWELL, *Anatomy of a Crusade, 1213-1217* (Philadelphia, 1986), p. 22 and n. 20.

¹⁵³) See below, and SETTON, vol. 2, pp. 384-386.

¹⁵⁴) HUGO, *Monumenta*, ep. 2, pp. 3-6; for a French translation, see also M. DAUNOU, «Gervais de Chicester», *Histoire littéraire de la France* 18 (1835), pp. 41-50. The biographical details in this article are incorrect. See CHENEY, *Texts*, p. 243.

¹⁵⁵) HUGO, *Monumenta*, ep. 2, p. 3: «[Simon] ... cui dedistis potestatem promovendi Christi fidelibus verbum Crucis, et commutandi vota humilium personarum, quae vel propter infirmitatem, vel nimiam paupertatem sunt inutiles subsidio Terrae Sanctae». On Innocent's preparations for the Fifth Crusade, and the roles played by Simon and Gervase, see POWELL, esp. p. 22 and n. 20; and H. ROSCHER, *Papst Innocenz III und die Kreuzzüge* (Göttingen, 1969)

The letter to Innocent followed a meeting between Gervase and Simon. The two had met to discuss the progress of their preparations since the council of Melun: «*Dixit autem mihi idem Dominus Archiepiscopus quod Vobis super his quae egerat cum Domino Rege et cum aliis de negotiis sibi commissis scripsisset statim post Concilium Meludini in eius adventu solemniter celebratum ...*» (1216). Simon was obviously the liaison between the military leaders and Innocent. But Gervase saw himself as at least second in command, if not as the archbishop's equal in responsibility for planning and recruitment: «*... sed ego non curavi quaerere quid scripsisset, credens quod per eum de omnibus negotio necessariis essetis sufficienter instructi; nec ego aliud optare debebam*». However, since Simon's visit things had happened of which the archbishop knew nothing, and it was up to Gervase to inform the pope. Because Innocent had neither authorized a delay, or given anyone power to enforce departure, the «masters of Paris» had independently decided that those who did not leave on time would be guilty of mortal sin and forfeit their privileges as crusaders.

Gervase insisted that this decision was unfair. Those who had taken the cross would lose the privileges of crusaders, including the remission of sins and the indulgence, even if they were lesser men, who had no influence over the departure date of their contingent. This perplexity had been caused by Innocent's neglect. The pope had not realized that the original date could not be met, and therefore had neglected to change it. Moreover, the pope's failure to provide a legate with powers to enforce departure had precipitated disaster. Not only had the magnates no fear of procrastinating («*Magnates autem de quibus pro majori parte constat quod non ibunt*»), but they intended to use the delay as an opportunity to oppress the poorer crusaders. Fearing neither spiritual nor temporal punishments the «powerful men and city communes» planned to ignore the crusaders' privileges, and collect their usual taxes after the feast of John the Baptist¹⁵⁶).

Gervase's indignation, and forceful pleading of the case of the «inferior people», are the outstanding characteristics of both this letter and the following one to Honorius III. In the letter to Innocent, Gervase defined these «inferiors» as «burgesses and country people, of whom the number is great». They have been «exposed by this decision

¹⁵⁶) I do not think that Gervase meant to deal here with the question of men who took vows as a way of avoiding these taxes. He seems to be discussing the case of vow-takers known to him who were willing to depart.

to temporal hardship». In the next sentence Gervase again stresses the great number of these inferior crusaders, and reiterates that they will be reduced to «great bitterness and anguish of heart». They, unlike the «great men» are eager to obey the pope — if only he will give them clear orders. At the moment they are prepared to meet their expenses and want to set out. Continuing to speak for them, Gervase relays their complaint that they will be unable to reach Syria, much less accomplish anything there, if they attempt to depart without leaders from their regions, who speak their language.

These letters support the conclusions of J. Powell, who has investigated the preparations for the Fifth Crusade¹⁵⁷). First, recruitment of men and fund-raising for the Fifth Crusade were being managed by the pope, not only through legates, but through local clerics of great influence like Gervase. Then, in Gervase's opinion, far from controlling or even assisting these preparations, the great nobles were actively hampering them, while preying on their inferiors. Finally, Gervase himself knew the practical difficulties too well, was too much relied upon by Simon, and felt his information to be too vital to Innocent, for the abbot to be considered as anything but one of the prime movers of the crusade in the West. Could his order have been anything but equally engaged?

In urging Innocent to hurry and make a decision so that the lesser men will not be moved to despair by the oppression of the nobles, Gervase makes his own connection with the inferior crusaders plain. The pope must act: «... *ne fideles Christi, quos cum tanta devotione vidi suscipere signum crucis ... in desperationis foveam prolabantur ...*» Gervase saw them take the cross himself. He must have been one of those who convinced them to do so, and is still their leader and spokesman.

Gervase vividly contrasts the «religious loyalty» of his protégés with the fearless rapacity of the noble crusaders. He urges Innocent to put more pressure on the dukes of Burgundy and Brabant «and others», and in any case, to give express orders to all, both the great, and the lesser men, backed-up with clearly defined penalties for delay. The point here does not seem to be an attack on the more important nobles, but on the pope himself, for failures in administration which had created difficulties between the leadership and the lesser men. Gervase's

¹⁵⁷) POWELL, p. 22, *passim*.

advice regarding separate routes for the French and Germans, «who can never agree in any great undertaking», is well-known¹⁵⁸).

Who are the recruiting agents to whom the pope should relay his decisions? The archbishops of Bourges¹⁵⁹), Reims¹⁶⁰), Rouen¹⁶¹), Tours¹⁶²), and Sens¹⁶³), along with «their suffragans and any others ... [the pope] ... may designate». Added to his other instructions, the pope should release the French from an obligation to embark at the ports of Apulia and Sicily, but should allow them to take ship wherever they can.

There was another lapse on Innocent's part to discuss, as well. A bishop with a papal commission was imposing financial penalties, under threat of excommunication, on the «lesser men», while leaving the nobles alone. He was hoping to line his own pockets, Gervase thought, rather than promote the crusade, but no one could stop him because he had papal authority. Gervase's two primary concerns, the crusade preparations and a pastoral duty to the *inferiores*, are clear in his complaint, and also in the following one. «Finally», the abbot wrote, «we have in France many men excommunicated for having followed Prince Louis to England». Gervase was in touch with some of these men too: «along with many others, I have relations with them which are not without peril». The abbot suggested that they be offered absolution if they fought the Albigensians for a time equal to that which they had spent in England. Again, he knows their complaints

¹⁵⁸) SETTON, vol. 2, p. 385.

¹⁵⁹) Girard de Cros (1209-1219), previously archdeacon of Clermont. From PETER OF VAUX-CERNAY, *Historia Albigensis*, ed. P. GUÉBIN and E. LYON, 3 vols. (Paris, 1926-1939), c. 594, vol. 2, pp. 285-286, it is known that Girard took the cross in 1215, and came to Simon of Montfort in 1216 at St. Gilles with Bishop Robert of Clermont and «cum eis milites et servientes quamplures». See also G.C., vol. 2, cols. 63-64.

¹⁶⁰) Albert de Humbert/de Alto Villari (1207-1218), formerly archdeacon of Paris. He took the cross against the Albigensians in 1209, and went to Jerusalem in 1217: *ibid.*, vol. 9, cols. 104-107.

¹⁶¹) Robert I Poulain/le Baube (1208-1221). Robert's election was overseen by a papal delegate. He was «the poorest of the canons, but a good and simple man». He took the cross in 1209, and «ad id bellum (The Albigensian crusade) profectus est cum aliis episcopis anno 1212». He attended Lateran IV: *ibid.*, vol. 11, cols. 59-60.

¹⁶²) John de Faye (1209-1228), took the cross against the Albigensians, and attended the council of Paris in 1223: *ibid.*, vol. 14, p. 100.

¹⁶³) Peter II of Corbeil (1200-1222), formerly Master of Theology and canon of Paris, and for one year (1199) bishop of Cambrai (L. HÖDL, «Petrus v. Corbeil», *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*). He took the cross against the Albigensians in 1209: G.C., vol. 12, pp. 57-60; M. DAUNOU, «Pierre de Corbeil», *Histoire littéraire de la France* 17 (1834), pp. 223-228.

intimately, and is taking their part even against the church: «... you should know that, if many of them do abstain from entering their churches, it is because of their own fear of God and respect for his commandments, rather than because of any precautions taken by their prelates». Surely Gervase's knowledge of the concerns of large numbers of non-noble crusaders was based on more than his personal efforts of preaching and fund-raising. Some information must have come from the hundreds of canons of his order who were acting pastors, and in whose churches the special collects for Jerusalem were being said.

Gervase was himself accused of slackness the same year (1216), by Archbishop Simon of Tyre¹⁶⁴). The abbot's illness was evidently a serious one, and had prevented his fulfillment of what Simon clearly stated as Gervase's duty: «the business for which you were appointed, through us, by apostolic authority». Simon addressed Gervase as his dear friend, and commiserated with him over his ill health, but warned him that the collections for the crusade were, in some cases, not even begun («*vel etiam inchoatum*»). It is interesting to note that Simon received a report on the collections at Noyon and Châlons from the canons there¹⁶⁵). Simon wanted either Gervase himself, or a trustworthy representative («*per vicarios ad hoc sufficientes et idoneos*») to go to these two churches and appoint «prudent and faithful (men), above all suspicion» to oversee the collections. These agents were to work with the counsel of the bishops, as Simon himself had done («*cum enim in aliis Dioecibus Episcoporum consilii usi fuerimus*»). Gervase had obviously been delegated by Simon to recruit men and collect money, with the help of local bishops and clerics, in these two dioceses, while the archbishop was operating a similar network in others: «*Cum autem istud negotium in aliis Dioecibus fere jam fuerit terminatum, necessarium est in istis quoque Diocesis, ut infra mensem, vel paulo post, executioni demandetur, si tamen fieri potuerit competenter*».

Gervase seems to have responded by delegating the collection in Châlons to the archdeacon there¹⁶⁶). Gervase addressed him as a

¹⁶⁴) HUGO, *Monumenta*, ep. 33, p. 34; RÖHRICHT, no. 905.

¹⁶⁵) POWELL, p. 22 and n. 20, discussed what he felt must have been annual reports on collection and recruitment. The only evidence he found for the existence of these reports is this passage from Simon's letter, and Gervase's reply (see below).

¹⁶⁶) HUGO, *Monumenta*, ep. 35, p. 36. The list of archdeacons of Châlons given in G.C., vol. 9, col. 903, no. 13, includes the following: «Hugo, post destructam sancti Nicolai ecclesiam, canonicos qui in ea deserviebant transtulit ad ecclesiam SS. Trinitatis. Occurrit ab anno 1190 ad annum 1221».

personal friend. The abbot reported that Simon had recently told him, by letter and through his chaplain, that money collected in individual dioceses (and also from those who had taken the cross, if there was any) was to be kept safely for the archbishop to collect no later than the feast of St. Remigius. Gervase was on his way to Germany, and therefore unable to come to Châlons himself. He asked the archdeacon to act in his place, either with the help of the bishop («who I believe has received orders about this recently») or with some other canon of his chapter. They were to hasten to act in this business of the cross and of the poor crusaders («*in negotium Crucifixi, et in pauperes Crucesignatos*»).

Not only was Simon traveling in France, but he had brought a retinue suitable to his office, who were equally active in crusade preparations. Gervase's answer to Simon's rebuke was a full account of his own management of the collection¹⁶⁷). The abbot mentioned Simon's chaplain, who had entrusted to Gervase the collection of money paid in commutation of crusading vows by priests, clerics and women («*sicut injunxit mihi dictus Magister Gerardus ex parte vestra*»). Money was to be collected in each diaconate, and in all its parishes. The money was then to be collected from the diocese in its turn, along with letters accounting for it, and deposited in a safe place¹⁶⁸). Gervase seems to have relied on his own agents, rather than on bishops or chapters, to actually collect the money, in spite of what Master Gerard had proposed: «*sicut injunxit mihi ... ordinare curavi: excepto quod litteras Episcoporum et Capitulorum testimoniales super hoc nec quaesivi, nec quaesitum me credo: maxime cum quidam eorum sint indignantis naturae, nec interfuerint personaliter (licet eorum intervenerit consilium et assensus) dispensationibus faciendis*». They were to be trusted only if they collected and accounted for the money as suggested above.

Gervase mentioned the disruptive consequences of Prince Louis' expedition to England, and then his own imminent journey to Germany. Then, he listed the places where the money collected in each of the dioceses under his care had been put for safe-keeping. It was evidently Archbishop Simon who was to receive and disburse these

¹⁶⁷) HUGO, *Monumenta*, ep. 36, pp. 34-35.

¹⁶⁸) *Ibid.*: «... pecunia singularum Dioecesium in aliquo Religioso loco deponatur cum testimonialibus litteris collectorum, continentibus quid, et quantum, et a quibus personis nominatim et sigillatim expressis receperunt in singulis Decanatibus, in singulis Parochiis decanatum singulorum».

funds. Money from the diocese of Noyon went to the church of St. Bartholomew in Noyon (Augustinian), from Laon to St. Martin of Laon (Premonstratensian), and from Châlons to the monastery of St. Peter (Benedictine), unless Gervase's agent there, Master I., the archdeacon of Châlons, should decide otherwise.

Sometime during this year, Gervase wrote to Honorius III, to point out new difficulties over crusade preparations¹⁶⁹). Once again, papal delay was the occasion of problems in France. Since Innocent's death (1216) and Simon's departure, there had been no legate to commute the vows of those who would be of no use to the expedition, and to regulate, along with the noble crusaders, the departure of the army. Gervase had been eager to see this office delegated to James of Vitry, whose reputation as a crusade preacher was at its peak¹⁷⁰). The latter was on his way to Acre, however, where he «vigorously preached ... the crusade»¹⁷¹).

Once again, Gervase was defending the interests of non-noble crusaders. He accused the pope of writing only to those of the highest rank. This category apparently did not include the abbot, who didn't know whether these papal letters mentioned «lesser men» («*qui adhuc non minus devote, quam nobiles Crucem gerit*»). Gervase proposed to pass on their complaints to the pope. They were obscure and poor soldiers, who had taken the cross at the first hint from the leaders of the church, and had abandoned their own interests in favor of the Holy Land. These people could not find money, advice or leadership, either among the great nobles, or among those prelates who had promised them so much. There was no one to console, instruct, or guarantee them justice, in spite of the privileges they had thought were promised them. Moreover, these non-noble crusaders wanted to know what had been done with money collected in the trunks set up in the churches, and to the crusading tax of a twentieth levied on the clergy. Hadn't they been

¹⁶⁹) HUGO, *Monumenta*, ep. 4, pp. 6-8; DAUNOU, «Gervais de Chicester», pp. 48-50, offers a partial French translation.

¹⁷⁰) James studied at the University of Paris, took vows as an Augustinian canon at Oigny in 1211, preached the Albigensian crusade in France and Lotharingia in 1213, and the Fifth Crusade in 1214-1215. He was consecrated bishop of Acre in 1216, and was with the crusaders at Damiatta 1218-1221. From 1225-1229, he served as auxiliary bishop of Liège, and 1229 was made cardinal-bishop of Tusculum: J.F. HINNEBUSCH, ed., *The Historia Occidentalis of Jacques de Vitry. A Critical Edition* (Fribourg, 1972), pp. 4-7.

¹⁷¹) SETTON, vol. 2, p. 538; KEDAR, p. 126; POWELL, p. 27. All three historians have seen this as a mission of recruitment and fund-raising for the crusade among the Latins in Syria.

promised, in the name of the Holy Church, that all this money would be used to defray the expenses of poor crusaders? Various abuses were detailed by the abbot, which were contributing to a growing resentment against the church, since the money had been collected by «Templars, archbishops, bishops, or their officials». Particular resentment had been aroused by a certain «N.», who had been the coordinator of the collection in France sometime (unspecified) in the past¹⁷²).

Honorius's hesitation was causing confusion among the nobles, as well. The duke of Burgundy and Walter of Avesnes were petitioning for a delay in the departure, but had received no answer from the pope. Honorius must answer soon. Gervase himself had consulted with «*quibusdam, qui expediat scire creduntur*», and suggested that a delay be granted. If the pope would not send a legate, he should establish in each diocese or province commissioners who would have four duties. First, to guarantee the privileges of crusaders; then, to commute the vows of those who could not fight; to collect all the money so far paid in from commuted vows, the trunks in individual churches, and the clergy's twentieth; and finally, in order to prevent scandal, to distribute the money to both crusaders, and to those «who they believe will be useful in promoting this business». Gervase remarked that he knew the payment of the twentieth tax, without a deduction of ordinary and general taxes, was impossible for all those clergy who did not live on fixed revenues.

Not only did Gervase devise this plan, but he immediately set about naming those he felt should be appointed as commissioners. For the diocese of Reims, he suggested the dean and «*scholasticus*» of Noyon¹⁷³), «I.», archdeacon of Châlons, and the dean of St. Peter, Laon¹⁷⁴). The archdeacon presumably would be the same man to

¹⁷²) I am unable to find any evidence for an «N.», legate in France. Nicholas de Romanis, bishop of Tusculum (1205-1219) was legate in England in the years 1213-1214. He was empowered to arrange for funds collected for the crusade to be deposited in Templar and Hospitaller houses: C.R. and M.G. CHENEY, *The Letters of Pope Innocent III (1198-1216), Concerning England and Wales. A Calendar with an Appendix of Texts* (Oxford, 1967), nos. 923, 934, 947, 980 and note, pp. 153-154, 157, 163. There is a letter from Gervase to Nicholas, which does not deal with crusade preparations (ep. 61). See also F. UGHELLI, ed., *Italia sacra*, 9 vols. (Venice, 1717-1722), vol. 1, p. 231, no. 16. Nicholas of Tusculum is the only crusade legate «N.» mentioned for this period by W.E. LUNT, *Papal Revenues in the Middle Ages*, 2 vols. (New York, 1934), vol. 2, p. 64.

¹⁷³) G.C., vol. 9, col. 1033, no. 16: «Johannes de Buchi, transegit an. 1208 cum Hugone majore de Thyeccourt, ex tabulario Ursi-campi, praeerat adhuc anno 1219».

¹⁷⁴) *Ibid.*, col. 561, no. 22, Adam de Courlandon.

whom Gervase had written in 1217 about the collection in his diocese, and commended in the letter to Simon¹⁷⁵). For the province of Sens, Gervase named Peter of Corbeil¹⁷⁶), and the bishop of Auxerre. The latter was William de Seignelay (later bishop of Paris), «of a noble family», educated in the church of Auxerre, elected bishop in 1207. He led troops into Narbonne against the Albigensians c. 1213, and founded a Cistercian abbey in 1219-1220¹⁷⁷). For Rouen, the abbot named the archbishop¹⁷⁸), and the bishops of Bayeux and Lisieux. The bishop of Bayeux was Robert des Abléges, who went to Jerusalem in 1216 or 1217, was appointed a papal judge delegate in France in 1223, and died in 1231¹⁷⁹). Jordan du Houmet was bishop of Lisieux c. 1202-1218. He took the cross against the Albigensians in 1208, founded the abbey of Mons Dei (Mondaye, Premonstratensian) in c. 1202, took vows as a Premonstratensian in c. 1216, and died in Palestine in 1217 or 1218¹⁸⁰). In Tours, the commissioner was to be the bishop of Le Mans¹⁸¹), and in Bourges, two canons: the dean of the cathedral and Master Peter, canon of Bourges¹⁸²). Finally, for Bordeaux, the suggested officers were the archbishop himself, and the bishop of Poitiers. The former was William II of Amous (1207-1227), who went to Spain in 1212 «with many men» to fight the Saracens, witnessed a charter issued by Simon of Montfort and Arnold, bishop of Agen in 1217, was in Acre in 1221, and in Rome in 1226. The bishop of Poitiers from 1217 until 1225 was William IV, who founded a house of Dominicans in his city just before his death¹⁸³).

Of the fourteen suggested commissioners, five (Peter of Corbeil, Robert Poulain, William de Seignelay, and Jordan du Houmet) seem to have led troops against the Albigensians or Saracens, three made the journey to Jerusalem (Robert des Abléges, Jordan du Houmet and William II of Amous) and three founded houses of Cistercians, Pre-

¹⁷⁵) HUGO, *Monumenta*, ep. 34, 35 (see above).

¹⁷⁶) See note 163, above.

¹⁷⁷) G.C., vol. 12, cols. 300-303.

¹⁷⁸) See note 161, above.

¹⁷⁹) G.C., vol. 11, cols. 366-367.

¹⁸⁰) *Ibid.*, col. 181-183; R. VAN WAELFELGHEM, *Répertoire des sources imprimées et manuscrites relatives à l'Histoire et la Liturgie des monastères de l'Ordre de Prémontré* (Brussels, 1939), pp. 168-169, no. 383.

¹⁸¹) G.C., vol. 14, p. 394: Mauricus, 1216-1231.

¹⁸²) *Ibid.*, vol. 2, col. 112, no. 15: the dean was «Archambaldus», c. 1202-1221.

¹⁸³) *Ibid.*, cols. 821-822, 1183.

monstratensians, or Dominicans (William de Seignelay, Jordan du Houmet and William IV of Poitiers). From their careers, Gervase's idea of a trustworthy and admirable prelate arises. The picture is reinforced in a negative way by the abbot's description of an unsuccessful prelate, the «simpleton» of letter n°. 30. «... He is said to be no good, as regards spiritual edification, at choosing brethren or as regards temporal advantage, at constructing buildings, nor is he successful in promoting the business of his Order in the Roman Curia»¹⁸⁴).

These criteria may be the only clue to the character of the man Gervase sent to Palestine in 1217, Hellinus, abbot of Floreffe. Gervase's letter introducing Hellinus to the patriarch of Jerusalem is important for the history of the order both in Europe and in Palestine. First of all, it proves that Premonstratensians preached the crusade in the west: «... *et ut viderent oculi nostri diem, quo eam [the Holy Land] audiremus Christiano cultui restitutam, studiose prout permiserint negotia nostra, quae nec differri poterant nec ommitti interposuimus partes nostras; videlicet aut personaliter disseminando in populis verbum Dei, aut injungendo hoc — ipsum Fratribus Ordinis nostri, quos ad hoc credebamus et superiores vita, et clariore doctrina*»¹⁸⁵). Hellinus himself had preached the crusade in France: «*qui multos labores in terra sustinuit, ut ad liberandam haereditatem Domini fidelium mentes et exemplo moveret, et verbo*».

Secondly, Gervase's letter proves that both St. Habacuc and St. Samuel, Mountjoy were in the hands of the Moslems in 1216, when Hellinus and James of Vitry reached Acre. From it, we also know that St. Samuel was dependent on Prémontré, and St. Habacuc on Floreffe. The latter fact may have some bearing on the early life of Amalric of Gottesgnaden and Sidon. Then, the letter makes it plain that James of Vitry had asked the pope to allow Hellinus to accompany him, presumably to assist in preaching to Europeans in the Holy Land, in order to prepare them for the Fifth Crusade¹⁸⁶).

Gervase requested the return of St. Samuel and St. Habacuc, if the crusade should be successful, and made it clear that Hellinus was to receive them in the name of the order. The abbot of Floreffe had been

¹⁸⁴) Trans. by CHENEY, *Texts*, p. 251.

¹⁸⁵) HUGO, *Monumenta*, ep. 38, pp. 38-39; RÖHRICHT, no. 906.

¹⁸⁶) SETTON, vol. 2, p. 538: «In Syria the crusade was vigorously preached by James of Vitry, appointed bishop of Acre by the new pope, Honorius III, in order to prepare the land for the crusade».

given full power to act for Gervase in everything pertaining to the order in Syria.

Unfortunately, Hellinus died after only two years in Syria. He is not mentioned, even in James of Vitry's descriptions of the Fifth Crusade, and appears to have died at the Norbertine house on Cyprus in 1219¹⁸⁷). It is interesting to note that the three commissioners suggested by Gervase who traveled to the Holy Land seem to have gone in 1217. Were they part of James of Vitry's party?

This letter, and the letters dealing with the Albigenian crusade, which have been discussed elsewhere, make it plain that the Premonstratensians considered preaching against heretics and for the crusade to be compatible with the aim of their order¹⁸⁸). Gervase's letters to Innocent III, Simon, archbishop of Tyre and Honorius III show how deeply the order was involved in carrying out papal plans in Europe. The history of the house in Acre shows that the canons in Palestine were also effective papal agents.

In 1220, Gervase wrote to Frederick II, asking him to restore the houses of Sts. Habacuc and Samuel when the Holy Land was reconquered¹⁸⁹). This is the last surviving petition about these houses. From 1235 until 1278, the Premonstratensians in Outremer possessed only the house at Acre, and Bellapaise on Cyprus. The activities of the canons at Acre can be known now only through eighteen documents concerning their role as papal judges delegate¹⁹⁰).

St. Samuel at Acre

In 1235, Pope Gregory IX delegated a dispute between the Templars and Hospitallers to the abbots of the Temple of the Lord and St. Samuel, both of whom were residing, with their canons, in Acre¹⁹¹). The importance of the abbot of St. Samuel should be estimated first by

¹⁸⁷) BACKMUND, *Monasticon*, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 507; R. RÖHRICHT, ed., *Testimonia minora de quinto bello sacro e chronicis occidentalibus excerpta* (Geneva, 1882): «Catalogus abbatum Floreffensium», no. 14, pp. 22-23, and «Chronique rimée de Floreffe», no. 19, p. 25; LEPAIGE, vol. 2, p. 520.

¹⁸⁸) SLACK, dissertation, *op. cit.*

¹⁸⁹) HUGO, *Monumenta*, ep. 130, p. 117; RÖHRICHT, no. 906.

¹⁹⁰) For the charters, see note 160, above.

¹⁹¹) RÖHRICHT, no. 1062a; J. DELAVILLE LE ROULX, ed., *Cartulaire générale de l'ordre des Hospitaliers de St. Jean de Jérusalem (1100-1310)*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1894-1906), vol. 2, p. 490, no. 2121; L. AUVRAY, ed., *Les Registres de Grégoire IX (1227-1241)*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1890-1918), vol. 2, no. 2744, cols. 149-150.

the fact that Gregory felt he would have enough authority in Acre to be effective, and secondly by the choice of the abbot of the *Templum Domini* as the other judge. This latter house was originally established at the Temple of Jerusalem, and the canons were directly dependant on the patriarch. They belonged to the order of the Holy Sepulchre, and served «the second most important sacred edifice in Jerusalem»¹⁹²). They had before 1187, been responsible for providing one hundred and fifty men at arms, and had held the city of Nablus in fief¹⁹³). Their position in Acre must have been sufficiently strong to encourage Gregory to believe that a sentence of excommunication, passed by these two abbots on the Templars and Hospitallers, would prevent further violence between «the two greatest landowners in Syria»¹⁹⁴).

In May, 1238, Gregory again delegated a dispute, this time between the Hospitallers and the bishop of Acre, to Gerold, patriarch of Jerusalem, Peter, archbishop of Tyre, and the abbot of St. Samuel¹⁹⁵). The dispute over taxes due to the bishop had a long history, and had been settled by the legate, Pelagius, in 1228. This earlier agreement was to be enforced by the judges, but they had authority to change two troublesome articles of it¹⁹⁶). In February, 1239, John, abbot of St. Samuel, witnessed a charter issued by Girard, abbot of Mount Sion, along with the archbishop of Caesarea, the bishop of Acre, the prior of St. Catherine, «and many others» — presumably not important enough to mention¹⁹⁷). Again, the importance of the other named witnesses lends credence to the theory that St. Samuel had considerable prestige. St. Catherine enjoyed «great veneration both in the East and in the West»¹⁹⁸). The monastery dedicated to her still survives at Mount Sinai, and continues to be an important pilgrimage center. Like the abbot of the *Templum Domini*, the prior of St. Catherine was forced to reside in Acre. It is significant of their importance that the writer of the

¹⁹²) B. DICHTER, *The Orders and Churches of Crusader Acre* (Israel, 1979), p. 76.

¹⁹³) *Ibid.*

¹⁹⁴) J. RILEY-SMITH, *The Knights of St. John in Jerusalem and Cyprus, c. 1050-1310* (London, 1967), pp. 443, 450.

¹⁹⁵) RÖHRICHT, no. 1080a; DELAVILLE LE ROULX, *Cartulaire*, vol. 2, nos. 2199, 2200, pp. 529-531.

¹⁹⁶) For a full account of the causes of the quarrel, see RILEY-SMITH, pp. 405-409. On the legate, see J.P. DONOVAN, *Pelagius and the Fifth Crusade* (Philadelphia, 1950).

¹⁹⁷) RÖHRICHT, no. 1087; E. STREHLKE, ed., *Tabulae ordinis Theutonici* (Berlin, 1969), no. 86, pp. 68-69, see also p. 123.

¹⁹⁸) DICHTER, p. 94.

charter chose these four clerics out of a group of witnesses, to be represented by both name and title.

R. Röhricht, in his edition of the charters of the kingdom, included a list of clerics with his summary of the letter sent by the Latin church in Palestine to the bishops of France and England, in 1244¹⁹⁹). The patriarch of Jerusalem, the archbishops of Nazareth and Caesarea, the bishops of Acre and Sidon, the vice-master of the Templars, and abbots/priors of the Holy Sepulchre, St. Samuel, the Mount of Olives, *Templum Domini*, Mount Thabor, and Mount Sion are listed, in that order, as the issuers of the letter. «The land of St. Samuel's», near Acre, is mentioned in a charter of 1245²⁰⁰).

In 1250, another pope, Innocent IV, chose the abbot of St. Samuel as his sole delegate in an attempt to restore to the Hospitallers all «tithes, castles, villages, possessions, jurisdictions and rights which had been alienated illegally ... (in the Holy Land)»²⁰¹). Innocent wrote again to the abbot of St. Samuel in 1251, this time asking him, along with the abbot of the Cistercian house of Belmont, Tripoli, and the cantor of the church of Beirut, to collect information about a dispute then being heard in Rome between the Hospitallers and the bishop of Tortosa²⁰²).

A third pope, Alexander IV, asked the bishop of Tiberias and the abbot of St. Samuel to ensure the transfer of the convent of St. Lazarus of Bethany, with all of its «rights, privileges immunities and appurtenances» to the Hospital in 1256²⁰³). St. Lazarus' holdings in Acre were large, and there was opposition to this donation, notably by the patriarch of Jerusalem. The latter, as Urban IV, revoked the donation in 1261²⁰⁴).

In 1256, John of St. Samuel, confirmed, with his seal, the letter of the

¹⁹⁹) RÖHRICHT, no. 1127. The list can be found in MATTHEW PARIS, *Chronica majora*, ed. H.R. LUARD, 7 vols., *Rolls Series*, no. 57 (London, 1872-1883), vol. 4, p. 337: «... H. prior Dominici Sepulchri, abbas Sancti Samuelis, Praemonstratensis ordinis, B. Montis Oliveti ...», but not in S. PAULI, ed., *Codice diplomatico del Sacro militare ordine Gerosolomitano, oggi di Malta*, 2 vols. (Lucca, 1733-1737), vol. 1, no. 43, pp. 321-324, where the text of the letter is given.

²⁰⁰) RÖHRICHT, no. 1135; PAULI, vol. 1, no. 217, pp. 257-258.

²⁰¹) RILEY-SMITH, p. 443; RÖHRICHT, no. 1193a; DELAVILLE LE ROULX, *Cartulaire*, vol. 2, no. 2542, p. 699; MAYER, «Sankt Samuel», p. 43.

²⁰²) RÖHRICHT, no. 1197; DELAVILLE LE ROULX, *Cartulaire*, vol. 2, no. 2553, pp. 704-705; RILEY-SMITH, pp. 418-419.

²⁰³) *Ibid.*, p. 401; RÖHRICHT, no. 1244; DELAVILLE LE ROULX, *Cartulaire*, vol. 2, no. 2781, pp. 801-802.

²⁰⁴) RÖHRICHT, nos. 1275-1278, 1305a; PAULI, vol. 1, nos. 135-137, pp. 164-167; DELAVILLE LE ROULX, *Cartulaire*, vol. 3, n. 2993, pp. 11-12; RILEY-SMITH, p. 403.

monks of Mount Thabor to Alexander IV about the transfer of their house to the Hospital²⁰⁵). About 1258, the bishop of Acre and the abbot, John, confirmed a sale of land made to the Hospital in 1254²⁰⁶). A year later John was again appointed by Alexander IV, as part of a commission to inquire into the dispute between the archbishop of Nazareth and the lord of Haifa, on one side, and the abbey of Josaphat on the other²⁰⁷). Albert, prior of St. Mary of the Latins, Acre, issued a charter *coram* John, «S. Samuelis O. Pr. abbate», Master Jacob, canon of Lydda and papal clerk, Master Nicholas the notary, John, scribe of the house of Mount Sion, John of Paris, and «many other witnesses»²⁰⁸).

Curiously, there is a charter, apparently authentic, which mentions a house of «St. Samuel, Acre» as early as 1125²⁰⁹). However, there is evidence that the charter has been wrongly dated. In fact, it belongs to the documents for the abbots of St. Samuel, Acre, as papal judges delegate between 1235 and 1263.

The confusion has arisen because there were two bishops of Tripoli called Bernard²¹⁰). The name of the first appears in three charters issued between 1117 and 1127. Bernard I issued a charter in favor of the Hospital in 1125²¹¹). Bernard II's name appears on charters of the kingdom in 1289 and 1290²¹²). The charter in question was apparently issued by Bernard II. In it, Bernard II included the text of the charter issued by his predecessor and namesake²¹³). This included charter carries the date 1125, which led to the mistaken date for the whole. The general acceptance of the wrong date for the charter makes it worth a

²⁰⁵) RÖHRICHT, no. 1249; PAULI, vol. 1, no. 127, pp. 148-150; RILEY-SMITH, pp. 413 and ff.

²⁰⁶) RÖHRICHT, no. 1217.

²⁰⁷) *Ibid.*, no. 1271, is from the pope to Thomas, bishop of Bethlehem and S.A. legate, and the abbots of the Mount of Olives and St. Samuel, Acre. John was still abbot of the house in 1263, when the last known mention of it was made.

²⁰⁸) *Ibid.*, no. 1323b; C. KOHLER, «Chartes de l'Abbaye de Notre-Dame de la Vallée de Josaphat en Terre-Sainte (1108-1291)», *Revue de l'Orient latin* 8 (1898), no. 80, pp. 188-190.

²⁰⁹) RÖHRICHT, no. 107, and cf. no. 107 in his supplement; PAULI, vol. 1, no. 7, pp. 7-8; DELAVILLE LE ROULX, *Cartulaire*, vol. 1, no. 72, pp. 69-70; RILEY-SMITH, p. 404.

²¹⁰) On the bishops of Tripoli, see C. CAHEN, *La Syrie du nord à l'époque des croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche* (Paris, 1940), pp. 321ff; J. RICHARD, *Le comté de Tripoli sous la dynastie toulousaine (1102-1187)* (Paris, 1945), p. 59 and n. 4. Both list Bernard I, 1117-1127.

²¹¹) RÖHRICHT, nos. 84, 107, 118, 1274 (1117-1127).

²¹²) *Ibid.*, nos. 1494, 1496, 1505 (1289-1290).

²¹³) DELAVILLE LE ROULX, *Cartulaire*, vol. 1, no. 72, pp. 69-70.

rapid survey of the reasons for thinking it belongs to the episcopate of Bernard II of Tripoli rather than Bernard I.

The first problem is that in the introduction to the disputed charter, an arrangement that had been made by Philip, cantor of Tripoli, is referred to. The only person of that name and office mentioned in the charters of the kingdom was active between 1257 and 1259. He issued a charter in favor of the Hospital in 1257, and was identified by R. Röhricht as *magister* of Florence, who had accepted the office of cantor at Tripoli from Innocent IV in 1250. In 1259, Philip issued a charter jointly with Hugh Revel, master of the Hospital²¹⁴). In this disputed charter, Philip's is the only proper name mentioned in the list of parties to the transaction. The master of the Hospital was also involved, but was represented only by what Delaville le Roulx thought was the letter «R». The arrangement Philip had reached with the Hospital was ratified in the presence of three judges delegate, all unnamed: the archbishop of Caesarea, the abbot of St. Samuel's, Acre, and the archdeacon of Nazareth. Both Delaville le Roulx and Röhricht supplied names for these people to fit with a date of 1125.

So, the only persons mentioned who can be used to date the charter are Philip the cantor, and Bernard, the bishop, of Tripoli. However, the text of the earlier agreement, included in this charter, obviously dates from the time of Bernard I, as it mentions Pons of Tournon, bishop of Puy (1105-1128), and Raymond, master of the Hospital (1119-1159). It carries the date 1125. Its use as evidence in the quarrel means the disputed charter was issued later. Philip, the cantor, was active in the late 1250's. No other Philip, cantor of Tripoli, is known. Although St. Samuel's, Mountjoy, did hold a small property in Acre from before 1184, the abbots of this house did not act as judges delegate until 1235. The years of Philip's other charters dealing with the Hospital, 1257 and 1259, correspond with the years when St. Samuel's abbots acted as judges delegate most often.

On the basis of this evidence, it is suggested that the charter in question was issued by Bernard II, bishop of Tripoli, sometime during his episcopate, which we know to have included the years 1289 and 1290. In his charter, Bernard II referred to a quarrel between Philip, the cantor of Tripoli, and the Hospitallers, which had been settled by three judges delegate, including the abbot of St. Samuel's, Acre, sometime in

²¹⁴) RÖHRICHT, nos. 1258b and n. 1, 1270a.

the 1250's. Bernard II also included, in this confirmation, the full text of the original agreement between Bernard I of Tripoli and Raymond, master of the Hospital, which had been issued in 1125.

The abbot of St. Samuel, Acre, apparently used the seal of Mountjoy from 1215 until 1263. The only description of this seal dates from a charter of 1259. The seal shows a man standing, dressed in a priest's robes, holding the «pastoral staff» in his right hand and a book in his left. Around the edge was first a cross, and then the words: «The abbey and church of St. Samuel of Mountjoy»²¹⁵).

The lack of chronicle or charter evidence for St. Samuel, Acre, after 1263 is a problem without a solution. Mayer suggested that the destruction of Nazareth in 1263 and the attack on Acre in 1265 may have induced the Norbertines to flee to Europe²¹⁶). They need not have gone so far. The Cistercians of Belmont and Jubin fled from Antioch to their property on Cyprus in 1268²¹⁷). There is no evidence for or against the theory that the canons of St. Samuel joined the house of Episcopia sometime in the 1260's.

It is clear that Baldwin II's original offer to Bernard of Clairvaux was based on a mixture of piety and desire for western aid, and that the Norbertines sent by Bernard and by Innocent II were intended to fill both needs. The correspondence of John of Brienne with Gervase implies the same mixed desire for spiritual and material help. Gervase was able to supply both. Gervase's letters have been largely ignored by historians of the crusades, except for the two written to popes Innocent III and Honorius III. The letters show that the order in Europe, because of its emphasis on preaching and its properties in the Holy Land, supported the Fifth Crusade by prayer, publication of the plight of Outremer, preaching, recruitment and fund-raising. Charters of the kingdom prove the Norbertines in Acre to have been papal agents and mediators from 1235 until 1263. The Premonstratensians in Palestine, through their European houses and ties to the papacy, were able to

²¹⁵) RÖHRICHT, no. 1275; DELAVILLE LE ROULX, *Cartulaire*, vol. 2, no. 2925, pp. 875-876; PAULI, vol. 1, no. 135, p. 164. «... Ymago ad similitudinem hominis stantis, indumentis sacerdotalibus vestiti, habentis in manu dextera baculum pastorem, in sinistra vero quasi librum. In cuius circonferentia primo erat crux, deinde tales littere: S. abbatis et ecclesie S. samuelis D. Monte Gaudii».

²¹⁶) MAYER, «Sankt Samuel», p. 43.

²¹⁷) J. RICHARD, «L'Abbaye cistercienne de Jubin et le prieuré Saint-Blaise de Nicosie», *Epeteris* 3 (1969-1970), p. 72.

offer significant military and financial aid to the crusading effort, and therefore to the kingdom of Jerusalem.

Episcopia/Bellapaise

The Norbertine presence in Greece seems to have been restricted to a few houses, about which so little is known that their very existence is dubious²¹⁸). The exception to the rule is Episcopia, or Bellapaise, on Cyprus. The magnificent buildings donated and embellished by a succession of kings, the exasperated complaints of the episcopacy about disobedient abbots, and a monumental quarrel with the Cypriot Greek Orthodox Church, all testify to the importance of this Premonstratensian abbey to the history of the island. Two canons of Bellapaise are known to have made significant contributions to the history of Outremer: Hugh of Fagiano, archbishop of Nicosia c. 1253-1268, and Hayto of Gorhigos, author of *La Flor des Estoires de la Terre d'Orient*²¹⁹).

The ruins of Bellapaise are located «on the northern slope of the Kyrenian range near the modern village of Kazaphani»²²⁰). There have been numerous conjectures about the date and circumstances of the foundation of the house²²¹). The only evidence seems to be a letter of 1232 from Gregory IX to the abbot; and the ruins of the abbey, parts of which are said to date from the early thirteenth century²²²). Gregory IX wrote to the abbot and convent of «*Episcopia*», a name which was replaced by the French with «*Notre-Dame de la Paix*», later corrupted into the Venetian «*Lapaise*», «*Delapaise*», or Bellapaise²²³). The pope began by saying that he had his information about the priory from the archbishop of Nicosia, who claimed the obedience of the canons. Gregory's recapitulation of the convent's history is vague:

«... quod monasterium ipsum quibusdam fratribus ibidem sub regula

²¹⁸) BACKMUND, *Monasticon*, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 501-506.

²¹⁹) L. DE MAS LATRIE, «Histoire des archevêques latins de l'île de Chypre», *Archives de l'Orient latin* 2 (1884), pp. 229-243; HILL, vol. 2, p. 226.

²²⁰) J. HACKETT, *A History of the Orthodox Church in Cyprus* (London, 1901), p. 611.

²²¹) They were discussed by BACKMUND, *Monasticon*, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 501-502; and in his article, «Delapais», *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastiques*.

²²²) L. DE MAS LATRIE, *Histoire de l'île de Chypre sous le règne des princes de la maison de Lusignan*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1852-1861), vol. 3, p. 632; C. ENLART, *L'Art gothique et la renaissance en Chypre*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1899), vol. 1, pp. 202-236, for a description of the ruins.

²²³) BACKMUND, «Delapais». The text of the letter can be found in MAS LATRIE, *Histoire ... Lusignan*, vol. 3, p. 632.

beati Augustini degentibus ab inclite recordationis rege Jerosolimytano pia fuerat liberalite concessum; ac post modum, fratres eiusdem loci, de assensu bone memorie T. archiepiscopi Nicosiensis, loci diocesani, Premonstracensem susceperant ordinem et actenus in omnibus observant, eo dumtaxat excepto quod nondum incorporati fuerant ordini memorato in visitationibus, correctionibus, et aliis que idem ordo tanquam caput membris suis impendere consuevit; ...»

The best account of the early history of the priory, by J. Hackett, and the notices by N. Backmund, all seem to be based on this letter, as it was edited and annotated by L. de Mas Latrie in 1852²²⁴). Mas Latrie's conclusions were necessarily conjectural, given the paucity of the evidence. P. Seesselberg's remarks on the abbey's architecture are valuable, but his short history of Bellapaise is not reliable²²⁵). Backmund followed Mas Latrie in asserting that the founder of the abbey was Amaury of Lusignan (1194-1208)²²⁶). Given the evidence of the ruins, combined with the phrase «*ab inclite recordationis rege Jerosolimytano*», this assumption is reasonable, and is supported by what Hackett was able to find out about the archbishop of Nicosia, «T». The see of Nicosia was vacant on 28 January, 1206; but there was a new archbishop by 5 August, 1207. Also, the obituary of Notre-Dame at Paris lists the death of an archbishop of Nicosia, Thierry, as occurring before 1213. A charter of 30 December, 1211, mentions a new archbishop of Nicosia, Durand²²⁷). Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that the monastery was founded some years before the administration of Archbishop Thierry (1207-1222), when the canons were placed under a modified Premonstratensian rule.

Backmund has suggested that the original Latin foundation at Bellapaise was intended as a refuge for Austin canons fleeing Palestine between 1187 and 1198: «... *tanquam prioratus modicus pro canonicis Sti. Augustini — Forsitan «canonicis Templi» — ex Hierosolymis fugiti-vis ...»*²²⁸). There are two problems with this hypothesis. First, the

²²⁴) HACKETT, p. 611; BACKMUND, *Monasticon*, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 501-502; IDEM, «Delapais».

²²⁵) W.F. SEESSELBERG, *Das Praemonstratenserkloster Delapais auf der insel Cypern* (Berlin, 1901), pp. 40-57; and see Hill's discussion of the problems with Seesselberg's account, vol. 2, p. 26, n. 3.

²²⁶) MAS LATRIE, *Histoire ... Lusignan*, vol. 3, p. 632, n. 3; BACKMUND, *Monasticon*, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 502, and «Delapais».

²²⁷) HACKETT, pp. 537-538.

²²⁸) BACKMUND, *Monasticon*, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 502.

timing is wrong, if it was Amaury of Lusignan who founded the abbey. Then, this theory seems to be based on a misunderstanding of the background of the canons of the Temple. In his note to the sentence quoted above, Backmund characterized them as a branch of the regular canons. Actually, the canons of the Temple were directly dependent on the patriarch of Jerusalem, having been formed as a secular priory by Godfrey of Bouillon (1099-1100), and converted to the Augustinian rule by 1112. The *Templum Domini* was one of a group of priories of regulars dependent on what became the order of the Holy Sepulchre. The order of the Sepulchre had extensive possessions in the Holy Land and in the West; the canons of the Temple are known to have possessed houses in Acre and on Cyprus before 1187²²⁹). It would have made more sense for them to have offered refuge to the Premonstratensians on Cyprus. We know that canons of the *Templum Domini* and of the Premonstratensian order had separate houses in Acre after 1187. There is no evidence for Norbertine presence in Cyprus at this time. Gervase of Prémontr , writing to John of Brienne c. 1210, said that the canons in the Holy Land were «scattered», and implied that some had abandoned their vows²³⁰). Although Gervase wrote several letters between 1210 and 1219 mentioning the lost houses of Sts. Habacuc and Samuel, and the new establishment at Acre, he never referred to Norbertine possessions on Cyprus²³¹).

In any case, Gregory IX's letter of 1232 proves that Bellapaise had been in existence for some years by then, and had become important enough to be a source of irritation to the archbishop of Nicosia. There is a charter issued by the abbot of the Temple in 1233, witnessed by «John, prior of Lapais»²³²). Another letter from Gregory IX to the abbey, of 1237, requests that the canons reinforce a demand for reform sent by the pope to the king and queen of Cyprus: «... *Quocirca monemus quatenus dictos regem et reginam ad id moneatis attentius ac inducere procuratis*»²³³).

²²⁹) On the Temple, see S. SCHEIN, «Between Mount Moriah and the Holy Sepulchre: The Changing Traditions of the Temple Mount in the Central Middle Ages», *Traditio* 40 (1984), p. 181 and n. 22.

²³⁰) HUGO, *Monumenta*, cp. 84, pp. 76-77.

²³¹) *Ibid.*, pp. 1-124, for Gervase's letters.

²³²) J. LA MONTE, «A Register of the Cartulary of the Cathedral of Santa Sophia of Nicosia», *Byzantion* 5 (1929-1930), no. 37, p. 459.

²³³) MAS LATRIE, *Histoire ... Lusignan*, vol. 3, pp. 641-642, and n. 1: The pope's complaint was that the knights of Cyprus, following royal example, did not pay tithes to,

If Mas Latr  e's dating of this letter is correct, the abbey must have obeyed Gregory's commands of 1232. Certainly, by 1246, Bellapaise was closely associated with Eustorge d'Auvergne, archbishop of Nicosia 1217-1250. There is a charter of 1246, recording the testament of Roger the Norman, who donated a fragment of the true cross to the abbey²³⁴). Roger left the relic and 600 besants in the hands of the archbishop, who was to decide where annual prayers for the knight and his wife should be said: at the dependant priory at Paphos, or elsewhere. This charter is the only evidence which survives for the house at Paphos. Eustorge is referred to as the diocesan and ordinary of the abbey.

Hugh of Pisa, a canon of Bellapaise, replaced Eustorge as archbishop of Nicosia. Privileges granted to Eustorge as archbishop by Innocent IV were issued in 1245, and renewed in 1249, 1250 and 1251²³⁵). The last two confirmations, of 23 December, 1250, and 22 December, 1251, were addressed to the abbot of Bellapaise, who was expected to actively support Eustorge and see that his authority was recognized in the diocese²³⁶). The existence of this last confirmation, of 1251, is curious in light of the chronicler Amadi's assertion that Eustorge, archbishop of Nicosia, died in Damietta on 28 April, 1250²³⁷). Hugh first appears as archbishop in a document of 1253²³⁸).

Mas Latr  e's article on Hugh's life is based on a notice by «Mattei» in *Memorie istoriche di piu uomini illustre pisani*²³⁹). According to Mattei, the archbishop was born in the village of Fagiano, near Pisa, at the end of the twelfth century. In spite of the poverty of his family, he was educated at the university of Bologna, and served as an advocate at the court of Rome c. 1234. Sometime after this he was made prior of

and disregarded the interdicts of, the church; married within the prohibited degrees; and employed Syrian or Greek baillis, who were hostile to the church, instead of Latins.

²³⁴) *Ibid.*, p. 646.

²³⁵) HACKETT, pp. 476-477.

²³⁶) MAS LATRIE, *Histoire ... Lusignan*, vol. 3, p. 645, and n. 2.

²³⁷) R. DE MAS LATRIE, ed., *Chroniques d'Amadi et de Strambaldi*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1891-1893), vol. 1, p. 200, an. 1250; HILL, vol. 3, p. 1055, n. 2.

²³⁸) See the discussion of these documents in MAS LATRIE, «Histoire des archev  ques», pp. 231-233. The problem of the date of Hugh's election appears to be insoluble. Given the death of Eustorge in 1250, and a letter which apparently accompanied the pallium sent in 1251, it would appear that the papal letter of 1251 to the abbot of Bellapaise is incorrectly dated.

²³⁹) This work was published (and is available only) in Pisa, in 4 volumes, in 1792. I have not seen it.

the metropolitan chapter of Rouen²⁴⁰). During the vacancy of the see, in 1247, Hugh received the abbot of Bec at Rouen, and reportedly conducted a search for good singers for the choir. Hugh instituted a rent of 20 *sous* to be paid to the clerics of the choir of the cathedral so that they would celebrate an annual mass for him on the fifth of January²⁴¹). Mattei is the source of the suggestion that Hugh traveled to Cyprus with St. Louis' army, and took his vows at Bellapaise. A sermon of Frederic Visconti, archbishop of Pisa and Hugh's patron, survives, in which Frederic said: «*Cupiens perfectus esse, vendidit omnia et dedit pauperibus, ut nudus Christum nudum sequeretur; intravit in religionem ordinis Beati Augustini, quae vocatur Episcopia, in insula Cypri*»²⁴²).

Hugh was passionately opposed to the continued tolerance of the Greek Orthodox church on Cyprus, and particularly objected to the election of Greek archbishops. Papal opinion on this issue fluctuated, while the royal policy seems to have been based on a desire to conciliate the Cypriots and avoid paying tithes to the Latin church²⁴³). According to the chronicle of Amadi, Hugh put the island under interdict soon after his election, and left for Tuscany, returning after the death of Henry I (18 January, 1253)²⁴⁴). The archbishop demanded that Orthodox believers in his diocese obey reforming statutes which Hugh himself had devised, and which he read at a council of 1253²⁴⁵).

In 1253-1254 three documents were issued which show Hugh opposing the regular church in his diocese. In 1253, Hugh, backed by Odo, bishop of Tusculum and apostolic legate, ordered attendance at Santa Sophia rather than at private chapels or abbey churches. This decree was expressly supported by Innocent IV the following year²⁴⁶). In 1254, Hugh demanded that land sold by the Friars Minor of Nicosia (contrary to the rule of their order) to the Cistercians be returned to the archbishop²⁴⁷). Other documents show Hugh vigorously fulfilling his duties as archbishop through 1261. It is probable that he spent Decem-

²⁴⁰) MAS LATRIE, «Histoire des archevêques», p. 229, based on Mattei.

²⁴¹) *Ibid.*, p. 230; G.C., vol. 11, col. 232; BOUQUET, vol. 23, pp. 358B and n. 6, 454F.

²⁴²) MAS LATRIE, «Histoire des archevêques», pp. 230-231.

²⁴³) MAS LATRIE, *Histoire ... Lusignan*, vol. 3, pp. 641-642; HACKETT, pp. 112-115.

²⁴⁴) MAS LATRIE, *Amadi*, p. 202, an. 1253; IDEM, *Histoire ... Lusignan*, vol. 1, p. 364.

²⁴⁵) MAS LATRIE, «Histoire des archevêques», p. 233; HACKETT, p. 112.

²⁴⁶) See MANSI, *Concilia*, vol. 26, pp. 318-319; and LA MONTE, no. 102, p. 478.

²⁴⁷) *Ibid.*, no. 80, p. 472; MAS LATRIE, *Histoire ... Lusignan*, vol. 3, p. 651.

ber, 1260 - January, 1261, at St. John of Acre. By 1263, however, Hugh had become so disgusted with papal efforts to negotiate an agreement with the Greek Orthodox church on Cyprus that he once more left the island for Tuscany. Hugh retained the title of archbishop, but delegated his responsibilities and revenues to the abbot of Bellapaise. The archbishop was received and assisted in Italy by Frederick Visconti. In December of 1263, Hugh founded a house of Augustinian canons at Rezzano, in the valley of Calci, and called it *Episcopia* (the contemporary name for Bellapaise). Mas Latrie described this foundation as a convent and «magnificent» church, for which Hugh collected «public» funds, as well as using his own money. Hugh's friend, the archbishop of Pisa, described the priory: «*opere sumptuoso, in cuius fundamento primariam posuimus lapidem*»²⁴⁸). Statutes, written by Hugh, survive, as well as the archives for this house²⁴⁹).

Mas Latrie has shown that Hugh kept the title of archbishop until his death in 1268 or 1269, and that during 1264, he went to Rome in an attempt to get papal support for his refusal to return to the island while there was a Greek archbishop in residence²⁵⁰). Hugh's furious resistance to the survival of the Cypriot church is unattractive to twentieth-century historians²⁵¹). However, his character, judging by his career, was consistent and sincere; and evidently inspired admiration among his fellow-clergy on Cyprus, and in the archbishop of Pisa. It must be indicative of the feelings of the Latin clergy on Cyprus that Hugh was elected to succeed the conciliatory papal legate, Eustorge. It should also be said that Hugh's attitude towards the Greek church was strongly encouraged by Urban IV in 1263-1264²⁵²).

Presumably the new abbey at Rezzano yielded a considerable revenue, since Hugh was able to make lavish gifts to the city of Pisa. The archbishop had made over his revenue from Cyprus to his delegate there, and came from a peasant family. Yet he was able to donate money to Pisa to repair its walls and reconstruct the bridge of the fortress. Hugh restored «several» churches in the diocese of Pisa, and

²⁴⁸) MAS LATRIE, «Histoire des archevêques», p. 238, n. 161. For all of Hugh's charters, and an account of his career, see: *ibid.*, pp. 233-243.

²⁴⁹) F. BONAINI, ed., *Statuti inediti della città di Pisa dal XII al XIV secolo*, 3 vol. (1854-1870), vol. 1, «Appendix», pp. 651-672.

²⁵⁰) MAS LATRIE, «Histoire des archevêques», pp. 240-241.

²⁵¹) HACKETT, p. 112.

²⁵²) LA MONTE, nos. 93-98, pp. 475-476: the pope demanded that Hugh be assisted by «the secular arm».

constructed an altar in the cathedral, attaching to it pensions for six clerks, who were known as «clerks of Nicosia». Hugh was venerated in Pisa, and was given the title of «blessed» when he died in 1268-1269²⁵³).

Although Hugh was unable to remove Germanos, his Greek Orthodox rival for final authority on Cyprus, Alexander IV did decide the issue in Hugh's favor. The bull of 1260, which was meant to settle the quarrel between Hugh and Germanos, recognized the Latin archbishop as the sole metropolitan on the island. Germanos kept his title and rights only for his own lifetime²⁵⁴). Regardless of what may now seem to us to have been an unjust solution to the dilemma of the church on Cyprus, Hugh took a position on the issue which was at least comprehensible, and presumably laudable, in the eyes of his contemporaries. He undoubtedly saw himself as a reformer, since he abandoned his position in a secular chapter for the more austere Norbertine profession, and founded his priory under the Augustinian rule. His career, apart from its importance in the history of the Latin colonization of Cyprus, is a good example of the attractive power of the twelfth- and thirteenth-century combined ascetic and crusading ideal.

The abbey on Cyprus was rebuilt by Hugh III (1267-1284), who also procured papal privileges for it. So great was his patronage that C.L. Hugo mistakenly identified Hugh as the abbey's founder²⁵⁵). Hugh III procured for the abbots of Bellapaise the right to wear the mitre, and a gilded sword and spurs, «...come fanno gli altri Cavallieri et feudatarii»²⁵⁶).

Curiously, there seem to be no surviving documents for Bellapaise from the reign of Hugh III until the chronicle of Hayto (1307), except for a charter, issued by the archbishop of Caesarea, in 1280, at Nicosia, and witnessed by «*Dionisius, praepositus abbatiae Episcopiae*»²⁵⁷).

²⁵³) MAS LATRIE, «Histoire des archevêques», p. 241.

²⁵⁴) HACKETT, pp. 114-115.

²⁵⁵) S. LUSIGNANO, *Chorografia e breve historia universale dell'isola di Cipro* (Bologna, 1573), p. 54b; MAS LATRIE, *Histoire ... Lusignan*, vol. 3, p. 523. I am unable to find the basis for Backmund's suggestions that: a) «... Hugo I rex Cypri eis donavit locum Episcopiam in vicinitate situm, ubi forsan antiquitus fuerat monasterium graecum», b) that Hugh III removed the canons from St. Samuel's in Acre to establish them at Bellapaise (*Monasticon*, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 502). Hugo said only that «*Praemonstratensium agmen ad insulam Cipri hac aetate trajecit ...*», without giving the source of this information, or specifying the origin of the Norbertines who «crossed over» (*Annales*, vol. 1, p. 650).

²⁵⁶) LUSIGNANO, p. 54b.

²⁵⁷) L. DE MAS LATRIE, ed., «Documents nouveaux servant de preuves à l'histoire de

Any suggestion that the Norbertine abbey was in some way diminished in importance in the latter years of the thirteenth century is obviated by the career of Hayto in the early fourteenth century. Hayto, lord of Gorhigos in Armenia, retired to the convent of Bellapaise as a lay brother c. 1305. His role in the struggle for the Armenian succession in and after 1289 has been much discussed²⁵⁸). Hayto was the nephew and namesake of Hayto I, possibly through the king's brother, Ochine (d. 1265). As prince of Gorhigos, Hayto is known to have commissioned a calendar and a treatise on medicine, to have participated in the Egyptian campaigns of the early fourteenth century, and to have visited Notre-Dame de Vauvert on pilgrimage²⁵⁹). He was well-informed about the Tartars, having either traveled to their kingdom himself, or obtained first-hand information from his uncles Hayto I and Sempad, the constable. Whether or not Hayto was exiled as a result of his role in the succession quarrel, he abandoned his lordship to enter Bellapaise, and produced his history of the Armenians and Tartars about two years later. The chronicler went to the papal court at Avignon in 1307, during the conflict over the throne of Cyprus, which added to Hayto's reputation as a trouble-maker. There is no evidence, one way or another, for his role in the intrigues of Armenia and Cyprus, except for the disparaging comments of several chroniclers. Hayto did arrange for various papal privileges to be granted to Bellapaise, and succeeded in getting his history read by Clement V²⁶⁰). His chronicle was written for the purpose of inducing Clement to use Hayto's plan for a new crusade. The reconquest of the Holy Land was to be accomplished from Armenia, and with the help of the Tartars. Hayto followed his history with a short but more emphatic version of the crusade strategy. P. Paris and J. Delaville le Roulx have both written about Hayto's plan, pronouncing it to be well-informed and feasible²⁶¹). In spite of Hayto's

l'île de Chypre sous le règne des princes de la maison de Lusignan», *Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques. Mélanges historiques* 4 (1882), no. 6, pp. 348-349.

²⁵⁸) For a life, with bibliography, see C. KOHLER, ed., «Hayton. La Flor des Estoires de la Terre d'Orient. Introduction», in *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades. Documents arméniens*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1869-1906), vol. 2, pp. XXIII-CXLII. See also: F. TOURNEBIZE, «Aïton», *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastiques*; BACKMUND, *Geschichtsschreiber*, pp. 292-307.

²⁵⁹) G.M. ALISHAN, *Sissouan ou l'Arméno-Cilicie* (Venice, 1899), pp. 402-403; MOREAU, p. 285: «Vauvert».

²⁶⁰) ALISHAN, p. 404; KOHLER, pp. XXIX, XXXV.

²⁶¹) P. PARIS, «Hayton, Prince d'Arménie, Historien», *Histoire littéraire de la France* 25 (1849), pp. 491-498; J. DELAVILLE LE ROULX, *La France en Orient au XIV^e siècle*;

protests, western opinion that Armenia could not serve as a base for a large army remained unshaken.

The privileges for Bellapaise were contained in three letters, which Hayto carried back with him to Cyprus in 1308. There was also a letter for Amaury of Lusignan concerning the Templars. It has been suggested that sometime after the assassination of Hayto II and Leon III, Hayto was made constable of Armenia. F. Tournebize examined the evidence for this and decided that it was more likely that Hayto returned to Bellapaise, and died in 1310²⁶²). Why did Hayto choose Bellapaise abbey? The Norbertine houses on Cyprus and in Palestine were royal foundations. Episcopia continued to be enlarged and embellished by the kings of Cyprus through the mid-fourteenth century. Whether or not he needed to escape from Armenia, Hayto obviously wanted to join the order, but also to participate in a projected crusade. Finally, Hayto's wife Isabel was an Ibelin. The only recorded benefactor of the Norbertines in Palestine, besides the king and patriarch, were Balian and Hugh of Ibelin. The senechal, Balian of Ibelin, was buried at Episcopia in 1309²⁶³).

Hayto's primary concern, as lord of Gorhigos and *conversus*, was the reconquest of Palestine. His ability to combine the roles of prince, lay brother, chronicler and strategist is reminiscent of, for instance, Oliver of Paderborn, who devised and paid for the siege engine that was so successful at Damietta. Hayto's crusade plan was not used, but Clement V certainly consulted him as an authority on affairs in the East. The pope had Hayto's work translated into Latin, granted his requests for his abbey, and entrusted him with the letter to Amaury of Lusignan. Moreover, Hayto was able to intercede in the affairs of two abbeys, Huveane near Marseilles, and St. George Lamangana in the diocese of Nicosia²⁶⁴).

expéditions du maréchal Boucicaut, 2 vols., (*Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises de Athènes et de Rome*, 44, 45) (Paris, 1886), vol. 1, pp. 65-70. Cf. TOURNEBIZE, «Aiton», who disagreed.

²⁶²) KOHLER, pp. XLIV-XLV; TOURNEBIZE, «Aiton».

²⁶³) SLACK, p. 194; MAS LATRIE, *Amadi*, p. 293, an. 1309; ENLART, *Chypre*, vol. 1, p. 203 and n. 3.

²⁶⁴) *Regestum Clementis papae V*, Order of St. Benedict, ed., 10 vols. (*Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises de Athènes et de Rome*, ser. 2) (Rome, 1885-1892), nos. 2434-2437, annus tertius, pp. 30-31. St. George was briefly taken over from the Greeks by Episcopia. Hayto's connection with Huveaune remains a mystery. See BACKMUND, *Geschichtsschreiber*, p. 294 and n. 12; and DAILLEZ, p. 43, who mentioned these documents but not Hayto.

Materials for the further history of Bellapaise Abbey are surprisingly meagre. There was a bitter controversy between the abbot and the archbishop of Nicosia in 1337, leading to the former being held in chains for four months²⁶⁵). A portion of the *Livre des Ventes* of 1368 records that the abbey had a hospice in Nicosia²⁶⁶). Hugh IV (1324-1358) added «magnificent buildings» to Bellapaise, according to Backmund, who characterized this period as the «height of (the abbey's) splendor»²⁶⁷). During the wars of 1426, the abbeys of the island were «ravaged and desolated», and the Norbertines were among the few religious who returned to Cyprus. Their return marked the beginning of a long period of decay, however, during which nomination of the abbots became a source of quarrels among various protagonists, including Rome, the Venetian Senate, the archbishop of Nicosia, and the community itself. In 1540, the general chapter of Prémontré asked the Senate for a visitation and reform of the abbey. It should be remembered that the community at Episcopia never formally placed itself under the authority of the order. It had apparently remained an independent house, following the Norbertine rule, but submitting only to the archbishop of Nicosia. The request was presumably denied, since Bernardo Sagredo reported in 1562 that the canons were destitute, some had married and secured abbey property for their families, and the buildings were being carried away in pieces by the near-by villagers²⁶⁸). Some effort at reform was made, and it is possible that the Norbertines were replaced by canons of the order of the Humiliati. But the Latins were expelled from the island by the Turks in 1571²⁶⁹). The Humiliati were reorganized by Innocent III in 1201. The «male branch», canons, were suppressed in 1571. It is questionable whether they would have replaced canons of Episcopia in the 1560's. There were recognized lay communities, and there are still nuns of this order²⁷⁰).

How close were the abbey's ties to Prémontré? Gregory IX's letter, discussed above, states specifically that the house was not subject to the

²⁶⁵) Benoît XII (1334-1342), *Lettres communes*, J.M. VIDAL, ed., 3 vols. (Paris, 1903-1911), vol. 1, no. 5120, p. 482; BACKMUND, «Delapais».

²⁶⁶) MAS LATRIE, *Histoire ... Lusignan*, p. 288. See also J. RICHARD, *Chypre sous les Lusignans. Documents chypriotes des archives du Vatican (XIV^e-XV^e siècles)* (Paris, 1962), pp. 69, 85.

²⁶⁷) BACKMUND, «Delapais».

²⁶⁸) *Ibid.*, and compare with Hackett's slightly different dates, p. 614.

²⁶⁹) *Ibid.*

²⁷⁰) M.F. LAUGHLIN provides a bibliography in «Humiliati», *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, *dia*.

order. Hugh of Fagiano founded an independent Augustinian house and devised his own rule in Pisa, instead of appealing to Prémontré. Even Hayto of Armenia is referred to in the papal letter for «*sanctae Marie de Ybelina, Praemonstraten. ordinis ...*» as «*Aytoni de Curcho, ordinis s. Augustini ...*» In another letter issued by Clement V in the same year (1308), Hayto is «*conversus monasterii sanctae Mariae de Episcopia, s. Augustini ordinis, Nicosien. dioecesis*». But in the following letter, also of February, 1308, Hayto is «*fratre ... ordinis Praemonstraten.*»²⁷¹). Could Hayto have taken orders while living in Poitiers? In any case, Episcopia was recognized as a Premonstratensian house. In 1327, John XXII issued a letter in which the abbey is referred to as «*Episcopia, Praemonstraten. ord., ...*»²⁷²). The canons seem to have thought of themselves as Norbertines, but to have avoided close ties with the order in Europe²⁷³).

What is important about the Premonstratensian presence in Outremer, and what comes through clearly in the careers of Hugh of Fagiano and Hayto, is that the Norbertines were vitally concerned with the crusades. Innocent III's own passion for a success in Palestine was reflected in the dedication to preaching/recruitment of the new orders, without which there would not have been the popular response in men and money necessary for the expeditions of the thirteenth century. The help of the regular clergy was seen as vital in the East. One of Baldwin I's first acts as emperor of Constantinople was to write to Innocent III asking for men «of whatever condition» to come out to him to receive «temporal and eternal riches». How was the pope to collect these colonists? «*Specialiter autem Deo amabiles ecclesiasticos viros, cuiuslibet religionis aut ritus, sollicitudo vestra paterna potenter inducat, ut ad idem populum praedicationibus publicis et potentibus verbis accendant et exemplis edoceant, catervatimque et ipsi venire festinent, in locis amoenissimis ...*». Baldwin specifically asked for religious from all the major orders to be sent out to him²⁷⁴). E. Brown, in writing about this letter, has said that Baldwin's aim in asking for the regular clergy to be sent was

²⁷¹) *Regestum Clementis*, nos. 2435, 2436.

²⁷²) *Lettres communes de Jean XXII (1316-1334)*, G. MOLLAT, ed., 17 vols. (Paris, 1904-1947), vol. 3, no. 29055.

²⁷³) Cf. BACKMUND, *Monasticon*, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 499, where he asserts the opposite view.

²⁷⁴) G.C., vol. 18, col. 523.

to «gain favor with Innocent»²⁷⁵). This is undoubtedly true, but it leaves out the complex reasons for Baldwin's dependence on the pope. The new emperor's only hope of holding on to his conquest was to colonize it as quickly and effectively as possible. Establishing monasteries, as sources of western men and money through their mother houses in Europe, and as land-holders in the East, was as important in Constantinople as it was in Prussia, where Norbert and his order established priories and took over bishoprics in a great preaching mission, and where the Cistercians became agents of colonization²⁷⁶). In the East, the Norbertines supported this general colonization effort, which was headed by the wealthier orders of the Holy Sepulchre and the Benedictines.

Examination of the Norbertine role in preaching, recruitment, fundraising and administration sheds light on the organization of the crusade movement in Europe. Evidently Gervase of Prémontré was a member of an unofficial network of men who could be counted on to further papal designs in the Holy Land and in the West. Evidence for Gervase's appointment as crusade procurator raises questions about the extent of Premonstratensian involvement in crusade preaching and the connections between the apostolic life movement and the crusades. Certainly Norbertines, as pastors, had tremendous potential to influence the opinions of their noble and non-noble parishioners. Gervase's letters offer a tantalizing hint of how enthusiasm for the crusades was communicated by the church hierarchy to the mass of crusaders.

The leadership displayed by the Norbertines as keepers of major shrines, bishops, and papal judges delegate, was not a negligible force in the history of the Latin churches of Outremer and Cyprus. Premonstratensians were an element of the influential regular church in Outremer, which served as an important channel for western aid, and without which the existence of the Kingdoms of Jerusalem, Acre and Cyprus would not have been possible.

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

C.K. SLACK

²⁷⁵) E. BROWN, «Documents relatifs au temporel de Saint-Augustin de Théroutanne ignorés du cartulaire abbatial», *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 44 (1968), p. 78, n. 82.

²⁷⁶) R. LADNER, «L'Ordo praedicatorum avant l'ordre des Prêcheurs», in P. MANDONNET, ed., *Saint Dominique: L'idée, l'homme et l'œuvre*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1937), vol. 2, p. 42.