

THE PAPACY AND THE ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE OF TYRE (1100-1187) ¹

By JOHN GORDON ROWE

PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY, HURON COLLEGE,
UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO

AS we all know, the papal monarchy of the high Middle Ages achieved substantially the consolidation of its powers, spiritual and temporal, both in theory and practice, during the twelfth century. It is therefore readily understandable if the historian, in presenting a general account of that fascinating development, be occasionally tempted to over-simplify, i.e. to depict the growth of papal power in quasi-linear terms, beginning in the latter half of eleventh century and rising steeply, without deviation or regression, towards its culmination in the reign of Innocent III. The reality was, of course, far removed from this abstraction. The development of papal power underwent constant fluctuation, influenced always by the pressure of men and events. Just as there were many victories, many advances, so there were also many stalemates, compromises and even outright defeats.

To illustrate the irregularities in the development of papal power, we may direct our attention profitably to the Latin Orient, and, in particular, to the controversy over the ecclesiastical province of Tyre.² It should be said at once that this ecclesiastical dispute has not been ignored by historians. There are

¹ I owe much to the advice and criticism given, during the preparation of this article, by Sir Steven Runciman and Professors B. Wilkinson (Toronto) and R. K. Harrison (Western Ontario).

² An introduction to the ecclesiastical history of the Latin Orient may be found in S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades* (Cambridge, 1952-4), ii. 310-4; J. La Monte, *Feudal Monarchy in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Cambridge, Mass., 1932), pp. 203-16; C. Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord à l'Époque des Croisades* (Paris, 1940), pp. 308-26, 501-26; M. W. Baldwin, "Ecclesiastical Developments in the Twelfth Century Crusaders' State of Tripoli", *Catholic Historical Review*, xxii (1936-7), 149-71. A comprehensive history of the churches of the Latin Orient is promised in the fourth volume of the new *A History of the Crusades*

several monographs and articles which deal with the problem of relations between *regnum* and *sacerdotium* during the early years of the kingdom of Jerusalem, and these perforce touch on the controversy, if only in its early stages.¹ Besides, the great historians of *Outremer* have referred to it, sometimes in considerable detail.² Nonetheless, there is still need for a thorough account of the controversy, a lacuna which it is hoped to fill by this article. Yet beyond this, we intend to call attention to some of the problems which the Papacy encountered in its dealings with the Latin Orient, hoping in this way to cast additional light on the rise of the Papacy to spiritual hegemony in Western Christendom.³

(ed. Kenneth Setton, Philadelphia, 1955). For the present, the most satisfactory treatment of the subject as a whole is to be found in W. Hotzelt, *Kirchengeschichte Palästinas im Zeitalter der Kreuzzüge* (Köln, 1940). Other works which have proved useful in the writing of this article are: M. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus* (Paris, 1740); R. Röhrich, "Syria sacra", *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästinavereins*, x (1887), 1-48; L. de Mas Latrie, "Les Patriarches Latins de Jérusalem" and "Les Patriarches Latins d'Antioche", *Revue de l'Orient Latin*, i-ii (1893-4), 16-41, 192-205; P. Fabre and L. Duchesne, *Le "Liber Censuum" de l'Église Romaine* (Paris, 1910), i, 237-8; the many articles by A. Alt, G. Beyer and W. Hotzelt in *Palästinajahrbuch des deutschen evangelischen Instituts für altertumswissenschaft des Heiligen Landes*, vol. xxix (1933), vol. xxxiii (1937), vol. xxxiv (1938) and in *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästinavereins*, vol. lxiii-lxviii (1940-51); R. Devreesse, *Le patriarcat d'Antioche* (Paris, 1945), esp. pp. 119-23, 162-201, 305-8; J. Laurent, "La Géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire Byzantin", *Actes du vie Congrès International des Études Byzantines* (Paris, 1948), (Paris, 1950), I, 279-88. Additional information on the episcopal lists in the patriarchate of Antioch may be found in Cahen, op. cit. pp. 319-23, and J. Richard, "Note sur l'Archidiocèse d'Apamée et les conquêtes de Raymond de Saint-Gilles en Syrie du Nord", *Syria*, xxv (1946-8), 103-8. I should point out here that in my copy of Cahen the episcopal lists on 321 belong on 322 and *vice versa*.

¹ F. Kühn, *Geschichte des ersten lateinischen Patriarchen von Jerusalem* (Leipzig, 1886); E. Hampel, *Untersuchungen über das lateinische Patriarchat von Jerusalem* (Breslau, 1899); J. Hansen, *Das Problem eines Kirchenstaates in Jerusalem* (Luxembourg, 1928); J. G. Rowe, "Paschal II and the Relation between the Spiritual and Temporal Powers in the Kingdom of Jerusalem", *Speculum*, xxxii (1957), 470-501.

² Runciman, op. cit. ii, 85, 101, 311; R. Grousset, *Histoire des Croisades* (Paris, 1934-6), i, 115, n. 2, 309 f., ii, 24 f.

³ For the general problem of the Papacy and its relations with the crusaders in the East, see D. C. Munro, "The Popes and the Crusades", *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, lv (1916), 348-56; J. La Monte, "La Papauté et les Croisades", *Renaissance*, ii-iii (1945), 154-67; M. W. Baldwin, "The Papacy and the Levant during the Twelfth Century", *Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America*, iii (1945), 277-87.

I. *The Origin of the Controversy*

What seemed at first to be a simple problem, requiring the re-alignment of the traditional ecclesiastical boundaries between the patriarchates of Jerusalem and Antioch with the political divisions established by the Christian reconquest in Syria-Palestine, developed into a dangerous quarrel whose resolution turned upon the problem of relations between *regnum* and *sacerdotium* in the Latin Orient. Seeking to preserve peace and harmony among the crusaders as well as to strengthen its authority over the churches in the crusaders' states, the Papacy under Paschal II (1099-1118) attempted to find a solution to the problem, but with little success. As we shall show, the problem of Tyre remained unsolved at the time of Paschal's death and was complicated increasingly by the unmistakable reluctance of the churches of Jerusalem and Antioch to accept papal supremacy in all its necessary consequences.

In the fifth century the patriarchate of Antioch was the principal seat of ecclesiastical power in Asia Minor, and chief among its suffragan metropolitans was Tyre. The ecclesiastical province of Tyre stretched along the Mediterranean coast to the north and south of the see, embracing some thirteen dioceses, six of which are important for our purposes: to the south and adjoining the patriarchate of Jerusalem, the suffragan episcopal see of Acre; to the north, towards Antioch, Sidon, Beirut, Jubail (Byblos), Tripoli and Tortosa. Although the extent of Tyre's jurisdiction was great and although the triumphs of Islam had wrought confusion in the churches, the patriarchs of Antioch never forgot that by tradition Tyre and all its suffragans belonged to them, and the right to rule the province of Tyre was part of the proud heritage of their Latin successors on the throne of Peter the Apostle.¹

¹ For the ecclesiastical structure of the province of Tyre before the advent of Islam, see Devreesse, *op. cit.* pp. 194-201, 305-8. His list of dioceses does not correspond in every detail with those supplied by William of Tyre, xiii. 2, xiv. 12, 14, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum, Recueil des historiens des croisades, Historiens occidentaux*, hereafter abbreviated RHCOC (Paris, 1844-95), i. 558, 623, 626. However, these discrepancies are unimportant for our purposes. All future references to William of Tyre (WT) will cite book, chapter and page in this edition.

The Patriarch Bernard of Antioch was in nowise reluctant to assert his traditional rights over Tyre. However, in the early years of the Latin reconquest, his attention was of necessity directed towards the northern half of the province of Tyre, and in particular, towards Tripoli, Tortosa and Jubail.¹ With regard to Tripoli, a recent authority, J. Richard, has suggested that Raymond of Toulouse had hoped to establish Tripoli as a metropolitan see, enjoying independence from both Antioch and Jerusalem. He had Albert, the former Abbot of Saint-Erard, consecrated archbishop of Tripoli, and, according to Richard, Albert was sent to Rome to obtain confirmation of his metropolitan rank. This was refused. The evidence advanced by Richard to support these suggestions seems insufficient. However, if we cannot accept with complete confidence this account of Raymond's aspirations for the church of Tripoli, we can be reasonably certain that the said Albert was chosen bishop of Tripoli and that he was active in his diocese from perhaps as early as the year 1104. Further, there is every reason to believe that he followed the tradition and acknowledged Bernard of Antioch as his ecclesiastical superior.² As for Tortosa and Jubail, Richard also says that these cities received their bishops almost immediately after their occupation in 1102 and 1103 respectively.³ Here Richard relies on the evidence of William of Tyre who relates that the

¹ For a general discussion of the episcopal churches of Tripoli, see Röhricht, "Syria sacra", pp. 26, 31-2; Cahen, op. cit. p. 321; J. Richard, *Le Comté de Tripoli sous la Dynastie Toulousaine* (Paris, 1945), pp. 58-62.

² Richard, op. cit. p. 59, and in his "Note sur . . . Apamée", pp. 103-4. Evidence for Albert's election as bishop of Tripoli may be found in William of Malmesbury, *De Gestis Regum Anglorum*, ed. W. Stubbs (London, 1887-89), ii. 458. The evidence given by Richard for Raymond's desire to raise Tripoli to metropolitan status and Albert's journey to Rome is to be found in C. Brunel, *Les Miracles de Saint Privat* (Paris, 1912), in *Collection de Textes pour servir à l'Étude et à l'Enseignement de l'Histoire*, pp. 37-8. In this document, Albert is designated archbishop of Tripoli, present at a council in France (c.) 1106. The pious account of the translation of the remains of St. Privatus does not mention any appeal to Rome. The account was composed some sixty years after the event and is open to the suspicion which attaches to all hagiographic writing. We have no other evidence with which to support Richard's suggestions. Albert appears as Bishop of Tripoli first in 1112 on the episcopal lists compiled by Röhricht, "Syria sacra", 32, and Cahen, op. cit. p. 321.

³ Richard, op. cit. p. 58.

patriarch of Antioch installed bishops in the cities of the Latin county of Tripoli, i.e. Tripoli, Tortosa and Jubail, as soon as they had been restored to Christian hands.¹

Is William of Tyre reliable at this point? In defence of his account it might be argued that William should be expected to have precise information on the history of his own church.² In addition, the controversy which developed over Tyre was a sore point with William, and he included in his great history many of the documents which provide the basis for this article. On the other hand, A. C. Krey has suggested that William inserted most of his material concerning the controversy into his history sometime after the year 1175.³ Perhaps a space of some seventy years would reduce the accuracy of even so careful a historian as William. Indeed, his chronology for the early history of the Latin Hierarchy of Tyre is vague and uncertain.⁴ In addition, as we shall have occasion to indicate below, William was not above suppressing evidence dealing with the controversy.⁵ Thus it is suggested that considerable caution should be exercised in using William's account of the early beginnings of the controversy. Specifically, with regard to Tortosa and Jubail, since no reference by name to any bishops for these cities can be found in William or in any official document dating from this period,⁶ it may be proposed with some certainty that the Patriarch Bernard was content for the present to hold Tortosa and Jubail vacant.⁷ He probably intended to return these

¹ WT, xiv. 14, 626-7.

² William of Tyre, the great historian of the Latin Orient, became archbishop of Tyre in 1175. He was the second archbishop by that name and should be distinguished from Archbishop William I of Tyre, 1127/8-34/5.

³ William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds done beyond the Sea*, ed. and trans. A. C. Krey and E. A. Babcock (New York, 1943), ii. 36, n. 50, p. 69, n. 36.

⁴ *Infra*, p. 165, n. 2.

⁵ *Infra*, p. 180, notes 2 and 3.

⁶ I refer here to those which can be found in such collections as R. Röhrich, *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani* (Innsbruck, 1893-1904), hereafter abbreviated RR, and E. de Rozière, *Cartulaire de l'Église du S. Sépulchre de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1849).

⁷ Cf. Richard, *op. cit.* p. 58. In a more recent work, *Le royaume latin de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1953), p. 97, Richard makes the sound observation that the Latin episcopate spread but slowly through the areas held by the crusaders. This is supported by Hotzelt, *op. cit.* p. 8. I can find no record of any bishops for Jubail and Tortosa during this period. See Cahen, *op. cit.* p. 322-3 and Röhrich, "Syria sacra", pp. 26, 31.

cities, as well as Tripoli, to the immediate jurisdiction of Tyre when and if that city were recovered from the heathen and an archbishop installed therein. Of course, Bernard planned that it would be his archbishop who would be placed in Tyre, and thus Tyre and its suffragans would be restored to their traditional position within the patriarchate of Antioch.

The Patriarch Bernard might well have high hopes for the fulfilment of these ambitions. The tradition, after all, was on his side. Nonetheless, there were certain developments which did not augur well for his plans. Politically speaking, Tripoli, Tortosa and Jubail were all part of the Latin country of Tripoli. After the death of William Jordan, the vassal of Antioch, all of the county was united under Bertrand of Toulouse, the vassal of King Baldwin I of Jerusalem. There was now a strong possibility that the county's ecclesiastical allegiance might follow its new political orientation towards Jerusalem.¹

Of far greater danger to his plans was the fact that by the year 1110, Beirut, Sidon and Acre had been captured by the kingdom of Jerusalem. William of Tyre reports that the Patriarch Gibelin of Jerusalem provided bishops for these cities immediately upon their capture from the infidel. The criticisms given above of William's account of the early history of the ecclesiastical province of Tyre apply here, and his evidence is rendered all the more suspect in that he describes Gibelin as justifying his actions on the basis of a papal decree which was not issued until June, 1111.² We may therefore conclude that the patriarch of Jerusalem at first kept these episcopal churches empty of bishops.

However, it was only natural that he eventually became concerned to restore the episcopate to these cities. Such action would be advantageous to himself if only because it would strengthen his control over the cities concerned. That the three episcopal sees belonged by tradition to Tyre and Antioch probably did not trouble him. Was not possession nine-tenths of the law, and should not therefore the ecclesiastical tradition

¹ For the early history of the county of Tripoli, see Cahen, *op. cit.* p. 244 f. and Setton, *op. cit.* i. 397-8.

² WT, xiv. 14, 626-7. For the episcopal succession in these cities, Röhrich, "Syria sacra", pp. 20, 23, 30.

be altered in favour of Jerusalem? Seeking advice and assistance, Gibelin consulted King Baldwin.¹ In all likelihood, Gibelin argued that if Beirut, Sidon and Acre acknowledged Jerusalem's king they should also acknowledge Jerusalem's patriarch. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction should follow upon temporal jurisdiction. Convinced by Gibelin's arguments, Baldwin appealed to Rome, and on 8 June 1111 he received the assent of Paschal II to his proposal that all towns and provinces which he had recovered or might recover from the heathen were to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Jerusalem church.² It is quite probable that Paschal had no clear idea as to the nature and ramifications of the problem. Baldwin's request that Jerusalem's ecclesiastical jurisdiction follow upon the jurisdiction of the king of Jerusalem must have seemed to be a routine matter, arising out of the normal expansion of the Latins in the East.³

However, there may have been a deeper motive behind the papal decision. It is possible that Paschal hoped to demonstrate by his decree the full implications of papal supremacy over the churches of Antioch and Jerusalem. The extension of the

¹ Röhricht, *Geschichte des Königreichs Jerusalem* (Innsbruck, 1898), p. 98, and Hotzelt, *op. cit.* p. 76, suggest that Gibelin precipitated the controversy by nominating a bishop for Beirut. This judgement is based upon a reference in RR, no. 58, dated 1111, to "A. ep. Biterrensis". To locate this unknown bishop in the see of Beirut seems to me to be somewhat hazardous. For the first reliable reference to a bishop in Beirut, *infra*, p. 167, n. 2.

² These letters are JL, 6297-8; PL, 163, 289-90; RR, now 60-1. They are preserved in WT, xi. 28, 502-3. A shortened version of the papal letter to Gibelin may also be found in Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1913), pp. 742-5.

³ It is appropriate here to refer to the much debated problem of the relationship between *Regnum* and *Sacerdotium* in the early years of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem. The opinion of many authorities has been that the original intention of the crusaders was to create an ecclesiastical patrimony in the Holy Land. See W. B. Stevenson, *The Crusaders in the East* (Cambridge, 1907), p. 42 f., p. 68; Grousset, *op. cit.* i. 164 f.; Hansen, *op. cit.*, *passim*; M. Villey, *La Croisade* (Paris, 1942), pp. 168-77. Reference to other writers of similar opinion will be found in my article, *op. cit.*, esp. pp. 471-90, wherein I attempted to criticize this interpretation. Closely connected with this problem is the question of papal suzerainty in the Latin Orient. For this, *infra*, p. 175, n. 1. While both problems are beyond the scope of this article, it may be suggested, with reference to this papal decision, that here is no papal meddling in temporal affairs, no assertion of suzerainty over the Latin Orient. The essential point of Paschal's decree concerns ecclesiastical matters.

boundaries of the Jerusalem patriarchate was perhaps designed to show that the patriarchs of the East were metropolitans and primates, and nothing more. It could also be suggested that the Papacy had good reason to emphasize its supremacy, particularly with regard to Antioch. In this connection, it is pertinent to note that there is almost no evidence for any papal dealings with the patriarchate of Antioch during this early period, and the silence of the documents leads us to suspect that the Patriarch Bernard had gone his own way, quite independently of Rome. Further, the Treaty of Devol (1108) had recognized the rights of the Greek Church over the patriarchal see of Antioch.¹ Perhaps for these reasons Paschal felt that Antioch needed to be taken in hand and incorporated more fully into the papal obedience. A display of papal authority might in this connection prove useful and hence the decrees of June 1111.

Thus the Patriarch Gibelin obtained a canonical basis for his control of Beirut, Sidon and Acre. That he proceeded to act upon the papal decision is indicated by the fact that now for the first time we find reference made to a bishop for one of these cities, Baldwin, Bishop-elect of Beirut.² To the north, Bernard was moved to protest. Most of the southern portion of his patriarchate, which was held by the Latins, had been conquered by Jerusalem. Even the claim of Antioch to Tripoli was now in question since that city had been conquered by armies commanded by Baldwin of Jerusalem. To his letters of protest, however, the Papacy replied in August 1112, saying on the one hand that it had acted only out of a desire to preserve peace and harmony between Antioch and Jerusalem and on the other that the Apostolic See had the right to alter the boundaries, even of patriarchates, if it judged it expedient to do so.³ The papal answer did not satisfy Bernard of Antioch. He consulted with the Prince Roger, and together they decided to make another appeal to Rome. Their legates arrived before Paschal during the papal synod at Benevento in February, 1113. In substance, the legates asked the Papacy to protect the ancient boundaries of the Antioch patriarchate against the encroachments of Jerusalem

¹ Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, ed. B. Leib (Paris, 1937-45), iii. 125-9.

² RR, no. 69.

³ JL, 6328; PL, 163, 303-4; WT, xi. 28, 503-4.

by establishing the rights of Antioch over Tyre and all its suffragan bishoprics, including not only the churches of Tripoli but also Beirut, Sidon and Acre.¹

It is likely that now, for the first time, the Papacy realized how serious the situation was in the Latin Orient. It was not a question of some minor adjustment of boundaries between the patriarchates. Clearly the Papacy was being called upon to make a decision touching the fundamental relationship between the spiritual and temporal powers in the Latin Orient. The argument of Jerusalem had been that ecclesiastical jurisdiction should follow upon temporal jurisdiction. Was the Papacy to accept this as the rule, no matter what the consequences were for the ancient prerogatives of the Antioch patriarchs? Yet, on the other hand, what might happen if the Papacy confirmed the traditional boundaries of the Antioch Patriarchate? Perhaps the Prince Roger, for whom the Antioch legates had spoken as well as for the Patriarch Bernard, might be inclined to extend his own power southward, at the expense of Jerusalem, arguing that temporal jurisdiction should follow upon ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the reverse of Jerusalem's attitude. Plainly the conflict in ecclesiastical jurisdiction had within it the seeds of strife between the two leading states of the Latin Orient.

That the Papacy was uncertain of a proper course of action is clearly revealed in the following events. At first, during the Benevento synod, Paschal sided with Jerusalem against Antioch. In this he relied upon a decree promulgated by Urban II at Clermont. This decree had promised to the leaders of the First Crusade the possession of all territory which they might conquer from the infidel, and further, that the churches restored to Christian hands were to belong to the principalities which the crusaders might establish. Therefore to Jerusalem, king and patriarch, belonged all territory which had been conquered or might be conquered by Baldwin. To Bernard and Roger belonged only that territory which the principality of Antioch could claim by right of conquest.²

¹ J. V. Pflugk-Harttung, *Acta Pontificum Romanorum Inedita* (Tübingen, 1881-8), ii. 205. See also JL, i. p. 749 and RR, no. 72.

² Ibid. Another version of Urban's decree is in Hagenmeyer, *Fulcher*, iii. 34, 739-42. The presence of the Antioch legates at Benevento is attested by PL, 163, 314.

Yet within a few weeks Paschal thought better of his decision. Perhaps the Antioch legates made another appeal. Perhaps they argued that Urban could not have foreseen the present situation and that therefore his decree was not applicable. Perhaps they pointed out to Paschal that his decision was one which was contrary to the *raison d'être* of the church of Rome. The Papacy was the supreme guardian of the traditions of the Catholic Church, and yet Paschal had set one of those traditions aside. The Papacy, exercising those powers which the Gregorian reformers had successfully claimed for it barely two generations before, had sacrificed the *sacerdotium* to the *regnum*.

Whatever the reason, Paschal soon reversed the decision given at Benevento. His new attitude may be seen in letters written to Bernard of Antioch and Baldwin of Jerusalem in the early spring of 1113.¹ It was this: the church of Jerusalem could have only those cities and areas which had either clearly belonged to the Jerusalem patriarchate in early times or for which no ancient ecclesiastical allegiance could be determined. However, if Baldwin captured a city belonging by tradition to the patriarchate of Antioch, then, while he might remain there supreme in things temporal, the city was to be given over into the spiritual jurisdiction of the Antioch patriarchs. In summing up his new policy, Paschal insisted that he did not wish the dignity of a church to be sacrificed for the sake of the power of a prince, nor did he wish the power of a prince to be reduced for the sake of an ecclesiastical dignity.

In other words, the basic principle of the new papal policy was that ecclesiastical allegiance was one thing, temporal allegiance another, and that both were to be respected. It is possible that Paschal here was under the influence of the distinction between spiritual and temporal powers advocated by Ivo of Chartres, a distinction already coming into effect in France and England and which eventually served as the basic principle for the Concordat of Worms.² When applied to the situation in the Latin Orient, this new doctrine could be interpreted to mean

¹ JL, 6343-4; PL, 163, 316-7; WT, xi, 504-5.

² A. Fliche, *La Réforme grégorienne et la Reconquête chrétienne* (Paris, 1950), p. 347 f., pp. 387-90.

that it was no longer necessary to make ecclesiastical and temporal allegiances coincide. Therefore there was no need to change the traditional ecclesiastical boundaries in the Latin Orient for the sake of conformity with existing political divisions. Regardless of the political boundaries, ecclesiastical allegiances would henceforth be determined, for the most part, by the ancient ecclesiastical tradition. A vestige of the original decision remained, however, in that the Pope acknowledged the right of the Jerusalem patriarch to control any reconquered area which did not fall into the traditional division between the churches of Antioch and Jerusalem.

However, it was one thing to enunciate a new policy and quite another thing to have it enforced. The patriarchs of Jerusalem seem to have assumed a position combining indifference with discretion. Despite Paschal's final decision, they gave no sign of any intention of abandoning Beirut, Sidon and Acre into the hands of the patriarchs of Antioch. If any excuse were required to justify this action, no doubt they were prepared to plead that the needs of the kingdom would not permit the separation of ecclesiastical allegiances from temporal loyalties. Nonetheless, Jerusalem was prepared to be discreet. The patriarch stopped any plan he might have had for placing bishops in Sidon and Acre, and perhaps he even went so far as to force Baldwin, Bishop-elect of Beirut, to withdraw from his see until Jerusalem's claim to Beirut might be more fully established.¹ As evidence for these assertions, we can point to the silence of those documents which deal with two events in which the clergy of the Latin Kingdom played an important part. The first of these was the great council of the realm at Nablus in 1120. William of Tyre tells us that all the prelates of the realm were present, and he even enumerates the names of the bishops and their sees.² The second was the treaty between Jerusalem and the Venetians, signed in 1123. William informs us that the

¹ The next documentary reference to Baldwin of Beirut is probably 1133. *Infra*, p. 176, n. 2. "Syria sacra", p. 23, incorrectly gives the year 1132. The evidence supporting this date is from 1139, not 1132. See RR, no. 186; WT, xiv. 13, 625; *infra*, p. 182, n. 3.

² WT, xii. 13, 531-2. *Translatio mirifici martyris S. Isidori*, RHCOc v, i. 322-3; La Monte, *op. cit.* p. 9; RR, no. 89.

Patriarch Gormond was present with all his "suffragan brethren". The names of the bishops appear at the bottom of the treaty.¹ Yet neither here nor in the episcopal lists for Nablus is there any mention of bishops for the three cities in question. Their absence, in the case of the Venetian treaty, is all the more striking when we recall that the treaty was signed in the church of the Holy Cross in Acre. Thus, while the Jerusalem patriarch was determined to control these cities, he was also prepared to keep them *sede vacante*. He hoped that his discretion in this regard might camouflage Jerusalem's indifference to the final decrees of Paschal II.

To the north, Bernard of Antioch continued much as before. It is true that his power was somewhat weakened by the fact that Baldwin II had obtained effective overlordship of the principality after the disaster of "The Field of Blood" had carried off Prince Roger and the main strength of the Antioch baronage.² On the other hand, despite Baldwin's ascendancy over the Latin states, the drift of the county of Tripoli towards Jerusalem had been arrested. Pons of Tripoli had married the widow of the Prince Tancred in 1115,³ and his attempt in 1122 to throw off his ties of vassalage to Jerusalem, if unsuccessful, showed that the county of Tripoli was determined to return to its former political alignment with the principality of Antioch.⁴ This political development and the fact that the final decrees of Paschal placed the entire county of Tripoli within the jurisdiction of the Antioch patriarchate combined to give Bernard a free hand in the ecclesiastical affairs of the county.⁵ Not only this, there was no reason for Bernard to despair of obtaining Tyre for himself. Even if the kingdom of Jerusalem effected the capture of Tyre, the final opinion of Paschal concerning the assignment of territory

¹ WT, xii. 25, 553.

² Walter the Chancellor, *De Bello Antiocheno*, RHCoc v, i. 101-11, 129-31; Hagenmayer, *Fulcher*, pp. 621-3, 633-5; WT, xii. 9-14, 523-34. Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle*, ed. J. B. Chabot (Paris, 1899-1910), iii. 201; Matthew of Edessa, *Chronicle*, RHC Documents arméniens (Paris, 1869-1906), i. 121-4.

³ WT, xi. 18, 483-4.

⁴ Hagenmayer, *Fulcher*, pp. 647-8; WT, xii. 17, 536-7.

⁵ As William of Tyre acknowledges, xiv. 14, 626. For additional proof of Bernard's power over Tripoli, see RR, no. 107.

conquered from the heathen was on Bernard's side. Tyre's ancient position within the patriarchate of Antioch was known to all.

Thus Antioch retained the county of Tripoli and Jerusalem the churches of Beirut, Sidon and Acre. Yet far more significant than mere indifference by Jerusalem to Paschal's final decrees was the clear indication that as far as both parties were concerned, papal power was something not to be obeyed, but rather to be used or ignored according to the dictates of ambition and aggression. It cannot be said that the Papacy was totally guiltless in this development. From Antioch's point of view the controversy had been precipitated by Paschal's ill-considered action in 1111. From Jerusalem's point of view the Papacy had shown itself indecisive and unreliable in Paschal's final decrees of 1113. Indeed, when in the late summer of 1121, the cardinal legate, Peter of Porto, came to give Gormond of Jerusalem his pall, he ignored the entire situation.¹ His silence was not calculated to restrain effectively the ambitions of the king and patriarch of Jerusalem. It suggested that if the Papacy had changed its mind before it might change its mind again, and further, that the present attitude of indifference to papal commands might be continued indefinitely. In any event, the role played by the Papacy in the controversy had done little to advance the prestige of the Apostolic See in the Latin Orient.

II. *The Capture of Tyre*

By the year 1122 it was clear that the capture of Tyre by the kingdom of Jerusalem was imminent. The Patriarch Gormond of Jerusalem realized that by the terms of Paschal's decrees of 1113 the church of Tyre would have to be surrendered to the patriarch of Antioch. It would thus become increasingly difficult to keep the churches of Beirut, Sidon and Acre within the patriarchate of Jerusalem. Accordingly Gormond now planned a bold stroke: he would steal a march on Antioch and stake out a claim to the see of Tyre, papal decision or not.

¹ JL, 6922; PL, 163, 1216-17; RR, no. 96. Since the papal letter is dated 6 July, 1121, and evidence in PL, 163, 1228, indicates that the Cardinal was back in Rome by 28 December, 1121, we are able to estimate the approximate date for Peter's visit to the East.

Therefore, sometime in 1122-3, Gormond consecrated a certain Odo as archbishop of Tyre. Unfortunately for his plans, his archbishop died just before the city was captured on 7 July 1124.¹

Gormond's motives at this point become more obscure. He did not replace Odo, and the see of Tyre remained vacant. William of Tyre attributes this action to *supina et crassa prudentia*.² His meaning is not entirely clear. Did Gormond, now more hesitant, fear that the consecration of an archbishop for Tyre might provoke the anger of Antioch and Rome? Did he perhaps decide that it was better for all concerned to keep control of the church of Tyre—and its revenues? Or did he reflect on what might happen if he placed an archbishop in Tyre only to see the same archbishop, after consecrating bishops for Beirut, Sidon and Acre, renounce his allegiance to Jerusalem and desert to Antioch, taking his suffragans with him? Whatever his reasons, Tyre remained without an archbishop.

However, he could not keep the see of Tyre vacant forever. It needed its own master to rescue it from confusion and decay. Besides, Bernard of Antioch was continuing to strengthen his grasp on the county of Tripoli. In 1127 he consecrated a bishop for Tortosa, and this reminded Gormond that Bernard would never relinquish his claim to Tyre without a struggle.³ Thus eventually Gormond was obliged to replace prudence with

¹ Hagenmeyer, *Fulcher*, pp. 647-8; WT, xiii. 13, 23, xiv. 11, 575, 592, 621; Le Quien, op. cit. iii. 1311; Röhricht, "Syria sacra", p. 17. The date of consecration is uncertain but 1122 is likely.

² WT, xiii. 23, 592.

³ RR, no. 118; Cahen, op. cit. p. 322; Röhricht, "Syria sacra", p. 31. Mention should be made here of the episcopal see of Raphanea, captured by Pons of Tripoli in March 1126 (WT, xii. 19, 585-6). Richard (*Le Comté de Tripoli*, pp. 58-9) says that Raphanea was part of the Tripoli episcopate. It is true that Raphanea belonged to Pons by right of conquest. However, by tradition it was subject to the metropolitan see of Apamea and therefore to the patriarchate of Antioch. See Devreesse, op. cit. p. 183. Its position *vis-à-vis* Apamea and Antioch was never questioned during the long controversy over Tyre. There has been some doubt as to its first bishop. Richard (loc. cit., and in his "Note sur . . . Apamée", p. 107) names Aimery as first bishop followed by Gerald. The latter is listed as first bishop by Cahen, loc. cit., and "Syria sacra", p. 29. That Aimery preceded Gerald in the see is supported by evidence in J. Delaville Leroulx, "Inventaire de Pièces de Terre Sainte de l'Ordre de l'Hôpital", *Revue de l'Orient Latin*, iii (1895), 46, no. 8.

boldness, and he consecrated the aged but godly William, Prior of the Holy Sepulchre, as archbishop of Tyre sometime in the winter of 1127-8. However, difficulties soon arose between patriarch and archbishop. When William attempted to go to Rome to receive his pall, Gormond prevented him by force from making the journey. The patriarch was driven to such extreme measures by his fear of what might result if William appeared in Rome to ask for recognition of his position as metropolitan of Tyre within the patriarchate of Jerusalem and what trouble he might cause the Jerusalem church when he returned to the East, armed with his metropolitan authority.¹

Yet such high-handed action accomplished nothing. It did not solve the problem of Tyre and, in addition, if William were not allowed to exercise his traditional prerogatives as a metropolitan, there could be little peace within the Jerusalem church. In his perplexity, and following the example of his predecessor Gibelin, Gormond turned to King Baldwin II for help. It is easy to reconstruct their thinking in the light of what followed. They agreed that there could be no separation between ecclesiastical and temporal allegiances in the Latin Orient. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction must follow upon temporal jurisdiction. If Tyre belonged to the kingdom of Jerusalem, then Tyre must also belong to the patriarchate of Jerusalem. The final decrees of Paschal must therefore be rescinded by the Papacy. It is probable, too, that Baldwin observed, for his part, that as long as Bernard remained supreme in the churches of Tripoli, there would be a continuing diminution of Jerusalem's political power in the county of Tripoli. The answer to the entire situation was to have the Papacy grant William his pall and place the entire province of Tyre, including the suffragans of Tripoli, within the patriarchate of Jerusalem. To obtain these objectives, William, Archbishop of Tyre and Roger, Bishop of Ramleh, were sent to Rome in the early spring of 1128.

The result was an overwhelming victory for Jerusalem, and the nature of this victory may be seen in a letter written by Pope Honorius II to Baldwin II, dated 29 May 1128.² In this the Pope was pleased to repeat the action of his predecessor, Paschal

¹ WT, xiii. 23, 592.

² JL, 7314; PL, 166, 1279-80; RR, no. 122.

II, by "conceding" the kingdom of Jerusalem to Baldwin and his successors, and with his apostolic authority Honorius declared inviolate the honour and integrity of the kingdom and church of Jerusalem. This decree has attracted much attention, particularly from those scholars who are persuaded that the kingdom of Jerusalem was a fief of the Papacy. A thorough investigation of the problem of papal suzerainty in the Latin Orient is far beyond the scope of this article. Whatever the merits of the case, it seems likely that Honorius was only doing here what Paschal had done in June 1111, when the latter had decided that the power of the Jerusalem patriarch should follow upon the power of Jerusalem's king. In effect, Honorius was re-affirming the first decision of Paschal and setting aside Paschal's final decrees of 1113. Tyre, not papal suzerainty, was the issue in this letter of May 1128, and by the same decree, Tyre now belonged to Jerusalem.¹

The action of Honorius need occasion no surprise. Paschal's attempt to separate ecclesiastical jurisdiction from temporal jurisdiction had been a manifest failure, and it was easy to believe that such a division was prejudicial to the strength of the Latin establishments in the East. Since it was the duty of the Papacy to direct and foster in a general way the growth and welfare of the Latin states, it was necessary that the Papacy return to Paschal's original decision and make ecclesiastical boundaries depend upon temporal boundaries. From this it followed that Tyre belonged to Jerusalem. If Antioch objected, it could be replied that Jerusalem was far more significant than Antioch. The protection of Jerusalem's shrines was the entire purpose behind the crusade, and it was therefore fitting that the kingdom and patriarchate of Jerusalem be strengthened in every possible way.

¹ H. S. Fink (in Setton, *op. cit.* i. 379, n. 15) interprets the decree of Honorius as a declaration of papal suzerainty over Jerusalem, and Runciman (*op. cit.* ii. 310) speaks for many scholars when he advances in guarded fashion the opinion that the king of Jerusalem was the vassal of the Roman Church. The most convincing rebuttal of this interpretation is to be found in M. W. Baldwin, "The Papacy and the Levant", p. 283. In this connection, a comparison of this papal letter with other contemporary papal documents enunciating papal suzerainty, e.g. JL, 8590, 8600, is instructive. While I agree with Baldwin, I must add that the problem is exceedingly difficult and probably incapable of a definitive solution.

Yet if it is easy to see why Honorius was persuaded to give Tyre to Jerusalem, it is not so easy to understand why in the following weeks he also proceeded to give the churches of Tripoli to Tyre and Jerusalem. Having granted Archbishop William his pall, Honorius now ordered the bishops of Tripoli to transfer their allegiance from Antioch to the archbishop of Tyre and the patriarch of Jerusalem. Bernard of Antioch was told in summary fashion to withdraw from Tripoli.¹ Although King Baldwin I had led the expedition which had captured the city of Tripoli, it could not be said that Jerusalem had conquered the entire county, thus giving the Jerusalem church the right to claim the county as its own. Nor was the "honour and integrity" of the kingdom of Jerusalem involved since, although in vassalage to Jerusalem, the county of Tripoli was not, technically speaking, a part of the kingdom of Jerusalem. Nonetheless, these indisputable facts were not as convincing as the arguments put forward by Roger and William in their capacity as spokesmen for the collective ambitions of *regnum* and *sacerdotium* in Jerusalem. It was but natural that William requested the Pope to restore the unity of the ecclesiastical province of Tyre. The churches of Tripoli by tradition belonged to Tyre, and if the Papacy transferred Tyre to Jerusalem, it was proper that the Papacy transfer all of the suffragans of Tyre to Jerusalem. On the other hand, Roger of Ramleh probably argued that since Tripoli was the vassal of Jerusalem, its churches must acknowledge the ecclesiastical suzerainty of Jerusalem. Whether by truth or clever misrepresentation, William and Roger obtained what they wanted. All of Tyre now belonged to Jerusalem.

When Archbishop William returned to the East, he proceeded to provide bishops for Sidon, Acre and perhaps even for Beirut. Baldwin, possibly the same Baldwin described above as Bishop-elect of Beirut, appears in possession of his see by the year 1133.² As for Acre, we find a certain John described in 1129 as *praepositus ecclesiae Acconensis*, and, in a document dated 1135, as *primus episcopus Acconensis*.³ For Sidon we find reference in 1133 to

¹ JL, 7315-7; PL, 166, 1280-1; WT, xiii. 23, 592-3; RR, no. 123.

² *Supra*, p. 170, n. 1; RR, no. 144.

³ Röhrich, "Syria sacra", p. 20; RR, nos. 127. 155.

Bernard, the first Latin bishop of that church.¹ Yet there is some doubt as to just how far these suffragan bishops were allowed to accept the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Tyre. It is clear that the experience of Archbishop William under the patriarch of Jerusalem was far from happy, and there is good reason to believe that the patriarch did not allow William full exercise of his rights as metropolitan.² The bitterness of the church of Tyre towards Jerusalem for its treatment of the metropolitan and the suffragans of Tyre was to have an important bearing on the controversy in future years.

No evidence survives to inform us precisely of Bernard of Antioch's reaction to the decisions of Honorius II. If he protested to Rome, the letter does not remain. The political strength of Antioch continued at low ebb due to the ravaging of the principality by Joscelin of Edessa and the early death in battle of Bohemund II in 1130. Jerusalem thus retained its position of superiority over Antioch.³ Yet such superiority was bitterly resented by many, especially the Princess Alice of Antioch who hated Baldwin II and his successor, Fulc of Anjou. Against the latter she inspired a conspiracy which encouraged Pons of Tripoli in 1132 to attempt once again to throw off the yoke of vassalage to Jerusalem. This attempt proved as unsuccessful as the previous one.⁴ However, relations between Tripoli and Jerusalem were increasingly tenuous, and there was little to prevent Bernard of Antioch from continuing his control of the churches of Tripoli. At this time, he provided a bishop for Jubail, Romanus.⁵

¹ Röhricht, "Syria sacra", p. 31, lists Bernard for the year 1131 on the basis of evidence in William of Tyre. This evidence should be dated 1139, RR, n. 186, *infra*, p. 182, n. 3. The first documentary reference to Bernard is dated 1133, RR, no. 144.

² WT, xiv. 14, 626-7, says that after the installation of a Latin archbishop in Tyre the Jerusalem patriarch returned Beirut, Sidon and Acre to Tyre's jurisdiction. This is contradicted by his report (xiv. 13, 624) that when William's successor, Fulcher of Tyre, returned from Rome in 1138 then, and only then, did the archbishops of Tyre succeed in exercising their metropolitan rights over the three cities. The second report is undoubtedly the correct one.

³ WT, xiii. 22, 27, 590-1, 598-601.

⁴ WT, xiv. 4-5, 611-4.

⁵ Röhricht ("Syria sacra", p. 27) lists Romanus under the see of Jabala. Romanus belongs under Jubail as is clearly shown by the papal confirmation cited in p. 178, n. 2. His successor at Jubail was Hugh, also listed by Röhricht under

By this consecration, Bernard and his bishops in Tripoli indicated that they chose to ignore the decrees of Honorius II.

The Papacy seems to have accepted this defiance of its commands without demur. In this connection we note that the papal decisions on Tyre and Tripoli were given into the care of the papal legate, Giles of Tusculum. Yet when Giles arrived in the East he did nothing to force Bernard of Antioch and the bishops of Tripoli to obey the papal decrees. Giles realized that any determined effort to enforce obedience might only serve to strengthen their resistance. Besides, the problem of Tyre was so distorted by political animosities that the greatest caution was necessary. Tripoli was best left alone, if only for the time being.¹ That the Papacy adopted this attitude is shown by the fact that Pope Innocent II in 1133 confirmed Romanus as Bishop of Jubail without raising the problem of Romanus's allegiance to the patriarch of Antioch.² Of course, the Papacy had been in schism since 1130, and it may be that Innocent in confirming Romanus was attempting to get the support of the Tripoli bishops in his struggle against the anti-Pope Anacletus.³ Nevertheless, the confirmation of Romanus probably indicates that the Papacy was quite willing to leave Tripoli with Antioch.

Jabala. The documentary evidence cited in regard to Hugh shows that he was bishop in Jubail (c.) 1139. See RR, no. 184. However, there was a bishop, Hugh of Jabala, as is proved by evidence in Otto of Freising, *Chronicon* vii. 33, MGHSS, xx. p. 266, and WT, xv. 16, 683. Cahen (op. cit. p. 322) knows of this Hugh of Jabala but does not list the names of Romanus or Hugh under the see of Jubail, 323. Richard (*Le Comté de Tripoli*, p. 58, n. 3) saw Röhrich's error but failed to realize that there were two bishops named Hugh, one for Jabala and one for Jubail. Le Quien (op. cit. iii. 1169-70, 1177) knew that there were two Hughs, one for each see, but unfortunately he thought that Romanus belonged to Jabala and not to Jubail.

¹ We know little of Giles's sojourn in the East although William of Tyre tells us (xiii. 23, 593) that the legate himself wrote letters to the people of Antioch. William had seen these letters, but unfortunately he did not see fit to quote them in his history.

² JL, 7627.

³ There is no reason to suppose with Cahen, op. cit. p. 316, that the Latin Orient, angered by the way that the papacy had handled the problem of the disputed sees, had sided with Anacletus. For Anacletus's claim of the support of the Latin Orient, see JL, 8413. That Innocent was acknowledged by the patriarch of Jerusalem is shown in JL, 7531, PL, 179,-119. See also *Annales Reicherspergenses*, MGHSS, xvi. 16, p. 454 and RR, no. 140.

Thus the division of the province of Tyre between Jerusalem and Antioch assumed at this time the quality of permanence.

That the Papacy accepted the refusal of Antioch to surrender the churches of Tripoli was probably due to something more than a clear recognition of the dangers involved in forcing its commands upon a recalcitrant patriarch and a disobedient episcopate. The Papacy could surely see the weaknesses of its own position. In particular, the decrees of Honorius II were open to the charge of profound inconsistency. They denied the ancient tradition by assigning Tyre to Jerusalem. They affirmed the same tradition by ordering the bishops of Tripoli to submit to the metropolitan of Tyre. Saner minds in the papal curia must thus have seen that it was reasonable for Antioch to feel that Rome had acted unjustly and had become the willing instrument of the ambitions of Jerusalem. It was therefore the wisest course to ignore Antioch's disobedience. If Jerusalem had Tyre and Antioch Tripoli, then perhaps the controversy would die a natural death.

III. *Fulcher of Tyre*

William of Tyre died in the winter of 1134-5. His successor was Fulcher of Aquitaine, former Abbot of the canons of Celles.¹ More than anything else, Fulcher wished to bring unity to the province of Tyre. Past experience had shown that Tyre could not be united within the patriarchate of Jerusalem. Perhaps unity might be achieved under Antioch. Supported in his plans by the bishops of Beirut, Sidon and Acre, Fulcher turned towards Antioch, seeking assistance from the patriarch.²

The church of Antioch had acquired a new master. The Patriarch Bernard had died in 1135, and his successor was a formidable man. Through skilful manipulation of the Antioch

¹ WT, xiv. 11, 621-2. Hotzelt (op. cit. pp. 98-9) has a good summary of Fulcher's activities as metropolitan of Tyre which is to be preferred to Grousset, op. cit. ii, pp. 25-6. However, both accounts suffer from an insufficiently critical examination of the evidence in William of Tyre and from a failure to give proper weight to those papal letters which William excluded from his history.

² Grousset, loc. cit., incorrectly suggests that Fulcher was motivated at this point by a desire to achieve independence from both Antioch and Jerusalem.

mob and the Princess Alice, Ralph of Domfront, Archbishop of Mamistra, had forced the clergy of Antioch to accept him as patriarch. Disregarding the authority of Rome, he seized the pall of his predecessor and proceeded to rule the patriarchate of Antioch, crushing all opposition by violence and cruelty.¹ Ralph was just the man to extend his authority when and if the occasion offered, and he therefore welcomed Fulcher's proposal to bring the entire province of Tyre under the authority of Antioch.

Thus, by the year 1137, the Patriarch William of Jerusalem was confronted with the possible defection of Fulcher and his suffragans from his jurisdiction. Quite naturally, he appealed to Rome for help. Innocent II acted promptly. A series of papal letters in July 1137 and March 1138, commanded Fulcher and his bishops to obey the patriarch of Jerusalem.² In their turn, Fulcher and his episcopal brethren responded with a series of arguments, justifying their action. They cited the mistreatment which Fulcher's predecessor had received from William of Jerusalem. They pointed out that the Jerusalem patriarchs had refused to give to Tyre the same pre-eminent position which Tyre had held within the Antioch patriarchate as premier suffragan metropolitan. Most of all, they argued that submission to Jerusalem had brought loss and humiliation to the province of Tyre, now divided between two patriarchs and thus deprived of its integrity and unity.

Innocent turned a deaf ear to these arguments. In July 1138 he reiterated his demand that Fulcher and his suffragans submit to Jerusalem.³ However, at the same time the Pope rebuked William of Jerusalem for his lack of regard for the

¹ WT, xiv. 10, 619-20.

² JL, 7847, 7875 ; PL, 179, 329, 347 ; RR, nos. 171, 175. These letters are not preserved in William of Tyre, who doubtless wished to pass lightly over this attempt by Fulcher to defy both Rome and Jerusalem.

³ JL, 7908 ; PL, 179, 372 ; RR, no. 178. This letter is also not found in William of Tyre. The references to the patriarch of Antioch reveal the active role played by Ralph at this stage of the controversy. Hotzelt (*op. cit.* pp. 98-9) fails to appreciate this, depicting Ralph as unalterably opposed to Fulcher. Yet how would Fulcher have secured the support of the Tripoli episcopate without Ralph's active encouragement?

feelings of Fulcher and his bishops. He reminded the patriarch how the Jerusalem church had become more powerful through papal patronage. It was therefore incumbent upon him to be all the more generous with those who owed him obedience. Fulcher had been ordered to accept William as his primate. Now it was William's part to honour Fulcher by granting him the first place among the suffragan metropolitans of Jerusalem. Just as Tyre by tradition had pride of place under Antioch, so she should have the same position under Jerusalem.¹

Papal opposition eventually forced Fulcher to reconsider his plans. It was foolish, after all, to attempt to escape from Jerusalem. All papal opposition aside, Tyre was an integral part of the realm, and the kingdom of Jerusalem would never permit its withdrawal from the Jerusalem patriarchate. Besides, Ralph of Antioch was not really capable of assisting Fulcher in his struggle to restore the unity of Tyre. Ralph's position was steadily deteriorating. The Antioch clergy hated him, and this hatred was encouraged by Raymond of Poitiers, since 1136 the Prince of Antioch.² In addition to this, Fulcher was aware of the insecurity of his own position. He had not been recognized by Rome as metropolitan of Tyre, and he did not have his pall. Without this recognition, his authority over his own church and suffragans was open to question at any moment. All in all, his attempt to withdraw from Jerusalem would accomplish nothing. The only thing left to do was to shift his tack and unify the province of Tyre, this time within the patriarchate of Jerusalem.

Consonant with this change in policy, Fulcher appeared in Rome in the fall of 1138 to ask for his pall. He used the occasion to present another detailed brief of what the archbishops of Tyre had suffered, and were suffering, at the hands of the Jerusalem patriarchs. As in the case of his predecessor, Fulcher also accused the patriarch of attempting to prevent him from going to Rome to receive his pall. His complaints made an impression on Innocent. Having granted Fulcher his pall, the Pope wrote again to William of Jerusalem commanding that he grant to Tyre the same position of honour which that church

¹ JL, 7906; PL, 179, 370; WT, xiv. 12, 623-4; RR, no. 176.

² WT, xiv. 20, 635-7.

had formerly enjoyed under the patriarchs of Antioch. Further, Innocent demanded that William award adequate compensation for any damages which the church of Tyre had sustained at the hands of the Jerusalem patriarchs. As for the problem of the unity of the province of Tyre, Innocent told Fulcher that the Papacy would take the entire matter under review. For the present, however, his place was within the patriarchate of Jerusalem.¹

Yet, despite the commands of the Pope, when Fulcher returned to the Latin Orient he encountered only increased difficulties. There was no compensation forthcoming from William of Jerusalem for damages inflicted upon the see of Tyre.² As for Tyre holding the chief place among the metropolitans of Jerusalem, William would not hear of it. Worst of all, he would not surrender Beirut, Sidon and Acre to the direct control of Fulcher, their proper metropolitan. Needless to say, the bishops of Tripoli refused to recognize Fulcher as metropolitan within the patriarchate of Jerusalem and instead continued steadfast in their loyalty to Antioch.

Fulcher was thus forced once again to write to Innocent. In January 1139 the Pope issued a group of letters couched in the strongest language.³ The Patriarch Ralph was ordered to renounce his claim to the province of Tyre. The bishops of Tripoli were curtly informed that their allegiance to Antioch was null and void. Beirut, Sidon and Acre received a stern warning that the Papacy would uphold any disciplinary action which Fulcher might take against them if they refused to acknowledge his authority. As for William of Jerusalem, Innocent

¹ WT, xiv. 12, 623. The papal letter written to William of Jerusalem and given at this time to Fulcher for delivery is referred to in another papal letter written several months later, in January 1139 (note 3 below). This letter is not, in my judgement, to be identified with the papal letter which William of Tyre inserted into his narrative at this point. That letter belongs a few months earlier (*supra*, p. 181, n. 1.)

² Richard (*Le royaume latin de Jérusalem*, pp. 97-8) points out that the control of the city of Haifa was one of the points of contention between Fulcher and his patriarch. Jerusalem has denied the rights of Tyre in Haifa, and this was one of the "injuries" for which Fulcher had demanded compensation.

³ JL, 7940-3; PL, 179, 399-401; WT, xiv. 11, 13, 622-3, 624-5; RR, nos. 184-7.

declared that if the patriarch did not right the wrongs inflicted on Tyre within forty days the province of Tyre would be withdrawn from his jurisdiction and placed directly under the control of the Apostolic See. These threats had their effect, at least as far as William and the bishops of Beirut, Sidon and Acre were concerned. The three bishops quickly acknowledged Fulcher as their metropolitan. William of Jerusalem at once realized that further resistance to the papal commands was dangerous, and accordingly his relations with Fulcher began to improve.

To the north, in Antioch, events were about to give the Papacy an excellent opportunity to settle the problem of the disputed sees once and for all. Early in 1139, the combined hatreds of prince, clergy and laity drove the Patriarch Ralph from Antioch to seek judgement in Rome. Once there, Ralph devised a clever plan to gain papal support against his enemies. He attracted attention at once by proclaiming Antioch to be the superior of Rome, since it had been Peter's first see. Then, at the height of the uproar provoked by that grandiose claim, Ralph contrived a dramatic repentance. He renounced his claims to supremacy in the most abject terms, laid aside the insignia of his exalted office and asked for papal clemency. The Papacy was so relieved by this sudden renunciation that it granted Ralph his pall and sent him home to take possession of his patriarchate.¹ As for the investigation of the reasons for his expulsion from Antioch, Innocent decided that this was best done in Antioch by a papal legate. The Cardinal Alberic of Ostia was sent to the East. He arrived in Antioch towards the end of 1140 and summoned a synod to consider the charges which Ralph's enemies had preferred against him. As a result of its deliberations, Ralph was deposed and Aimery of Limoges was elected in his place.² Yet

¹ WT, xiv. 10, xv. 12-14, 620, 676-81. As for the dating of these events, there is evidence in P. Kehr, *Italia Pontificia* (Berlin, 1908-35), i. 169, that Ralph was present at the Second Lateran council of April 1139.

² For the synod held at Antioch by Alberic of Ostia, see WT, xv. 16-18, 683-8. There are difficulties in dating here. The usual date given for the synod is 1139 (Röhricht, *Geschichte*, p. 223; Cahen, *op. cit.* p. 503; Runciman, *op. cit.* ii. 220-1). The first papal legate sent out to investigate the charges against Ralph was Peter of Lyons, who died on 28 May 1139, shortly after his arrival in the East (WT, xv. 11, 15, 674, 682). The news must have reached Rome quickly, and another

the significant fact for our purposes is that nowhere in the proceedings do we find any mention of the problem of Tyre. This is especially surprising when we note that many prelates from Jerusalem, including the Patriarch William and Fulcher of Tyre, were present at this synod which deposed Ralph and elected Aimery.¹ Not only this, at no other time during his many activities in the Latin Orient did Alberic take any action dealing with the controversy. Our evidence tells us nothing of any complaint lodged by Alberic or anyone else against the loyalty of the bishops of Tripoli to the patriarchate of Antioch. It was almost as if the problem had ceased to exist.

Yet why did Alberic fail to use the humiliation of Ralph of Antioch as an occasion for forcing his successor to renounce all claims to the churches of Tripoli? We have mentioned above that in 1138 Innocent II had told Archbishop Fulcher that the problem of Tyre would be taken under review by the Papacy. Yet it is likely that the study of the controversy since the days of Paschal II convinced the Papacy that a proper decision had to be based on first hand knowledge of conditions existing in the Latin Orient. Therefore, in instructing his legate, Innocent probably indicated that the final decision on Tyre would have to be made by Alberic himself. Beirut, Sidon and Acre belonged without question to the kingdom of Jerusalem, and from this it followed that the bishops of these cities belonged to the patriarchate of Jerusalem. As for Tripoli, it was not quite the same thing. The

legate could perhaps have arrived in time to open a council in Antioch in November 1139. However, WT (xv. 15, 682) says that Arnulf, one of Ralph's most persistent opponents, "*Roma profiscens, iterum opportune et importune pulsatus; tandemque precibus proterve insistens*" until the Pope had agreed to send out another legate. This indicates a considerable passage of time. Further, William tells us that Alberic upon landing joined the crusaders at the May-June 1140 siege of Banyas (Caesarea Philippi) (xv. 11, 674-6). There he was encouraged by Prince Raymond to come directly to Antioch and begin his investigations. Hence the synod is to be dated 30 November 1140. On the other hand, RR, no. 203 dated it 30 November 1141. This is too late. If we consult the papal letters, we shall find the name of Alberic among the signatures for 1139-40, appearing for the last time on 6 May 1140 (PL, 179, 514) and re-appearing again on 22 September 1141 (PL, 179, 551). This evidence has its limitations, but if it is correct, it supports the date for the synod suggested above.

¹ WT, xv. 16, 683.

political status of the county *vis-à-vis* Antioch and Jerusalem was a more complicated matter. It was best, therefore, if Alberic become cognizant of the many factors involved in the problem and then make a decision on the spot.

We are told by William of Tyre that Prince Raymond of Antioch exercised considerable influence over Alberic with regard to the deposition of the Patriarch Ralph.¹ Undoubtedly, Raymond's influence over Alberic extended to other matters, such as the disposition of the churches of Tripoli. It was to Raymond's political interests that the patriarchs of Antioch continue to be the spiritual rulers of the county. Perhaps a more important factor in making up Alberic's mind was the Greek question, now more pressing in Antioch than ever before. The famous descent by the Emperor John Comnenus on Antioch in 1137-8 had, despite the greatest opposition, led to the recognition of Greek suzerainty over the principality.² Alberic could see that any intimidation on the subject of the Tripoli bishops might encourage Antioch to look more kindly upon the Emperor and the Greek Church. The unity of the province of Tyre was certainly not as important as the retention of Antioch within the orbit of Latin Christendom. Accordingly, Alberic decided to accept quietly the place of Tripoli within the patriarchate of Antioch. For political and ecclesiastical reasons, things were best left alone. It is even possible that he persuaded everyone to accept the *status quo*. Certainly, peace now reigned between Jerusalem and Tyre. When Banyas (Caesarea Philippi) was captured in June 1140, Fulcher of Tyre, with the consent of William of Jerusalem, consecrated Adam, Archdeacon of Acre, as first Latin bishop of that suffragan see of Tyre.³ Five years later, Fulcher was elected patriarch of Jerusalem.⁴ Outwardly, at least, the reconciliation was complete.

¹ *Supra*, p. 183, n. 2.

² The opposition to the Greeks was strengthened by the famous letter of Innocent II, dated 28 March 1138, which had threatened with excommunication all Latins serving in John's army (JL, 7883; PL, 179, 354-5).

³ WT, xv. 11, 675-6; Röhricht, "Syria sacra", p. 29. For Banyas's traditional position within the province of Tyre, see Devresse, op. cit. p. 199.

⁴ WT, xvi. 17, 733.

IV. *Conclusion*

There matters stood, and what evidence we possess suggests that there they remained. That the Papacy accepted the division of Tyre between Antioch and Jerusalem and was far more concerned to maintain some degree of control over the patriarchate of Antioch is shown in a curious story, related by John of Salisbury, concerning a certain bishop-elect of Tripoli. After the debacle of the Second Crusade, one of the papal legates on that unhappy expedition, Guy of Florence, remained for some time in the East. As part of his activities, he summoned a council of the hierarchy of the Latin Orient. However, the Patriarch Aimery of Antioch refused to attend, alleging that the threatening power of the infidel prevented him from participating in the council. He even ordered his suffragans not to attend, lest they seem to desert their churches in the hour of danger. Aimery had some justification for his stand: Raymond of Antioch had been killed in battle on 27 June 1149. However, John of Salisbury states that many suspected the patriarch of hiding a basic contempt for the legate's authority under the plea of the Saracen peril. Yet although Guy was angered by the patriarch's attitude, he vented his displeasure, not on Aimery, but on the bishop-elect of Tripoli for his refusal to attend the council. At the council, the legate quashed the bishop's election. The bishop at once appealed to Rome. When he appeared before the papal court, Pope Eugene III had the prerogatives of the Roman Church read to him. This recital of papal powers overwhelmed the bishop who submitted himself without delay to the judgement of Eugene and his cardinals. His submission was rewarded with confirmation in his episcopal dignity. Eugene evidently thought that Guy's action had been somewhat unjust, and he wrote a strong letter of rebuke to his legate.¹

In this report, we can find no indication that the Papacy was still concerned with the problem of Tyre. The concern of the legate was with papal authority over the patriarchate of Antioch,

¹ John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, ed. R. L. Poole (Oxford, 1927), pp. 74-7. The current state of our knowledge of the bishops of Tripoli prevents us from identifying this ecclesiastic more closely. See Cahen, *op. cit.* pp. 321, 505.

and that this concern was shared by many at the papal court is confirmed by evidence given in Otto of Freising.¹ Yet even here the Papacy was not prepared to take strong measures. Eugene wished to avoid any unnecessary disturbance in the Latin Orient lest the Papacy add to the burdens already carried by the Latins in their unending struggle against the infidel.

Indeed, Eugene was so determined to keep peace in the Latin Orient that he may even have gone so far as to give formal sanction to the division of Tyre between the two patriarchates. There is a phrase in a letter of Innocent III which suggests this.² Certainly, when the Maronites of Tripoli were reconciled to the Papacy, they became so through the good offices of the patriarch of Antioch.³ In the confirmation of the rights and possessions of the church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, granted by Pope Lucius III in July 1182, we find evidence which suggests that the Papacy considered the bishops of Tripoli to be outside the patriarchate of Jerusalem.⁴ It may be mentioned in this connection that after the collapse of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem in 1187, the county of Tripoli was united to the principality of Antioch.⁵ The return of Tripoli to Antioch, spiritually and temporally, was thus completed by the end of the twelfth century.

This is not to suggest that the Jerusalem patriarchs and the archbishops of Tyre accepted with good grace the loss of Tripoli. In 1184, the Patriarch Heraclius re-opened the problem with Lucius III. Nothing came of this.⁶ Nevertheless, the controversy continued in sporadic fashion long after the fall of Jerusalem

¹ *Chronicon*, vii. 33, MGHSS, xx. 266.

² Potthast, 556; PL, 214, 466-7. This is opposed to the suggestion in Cahen, *op. cit.* pp. 316-17, that Eugene supported Antioch and ordered Jerusalem to surrender the entire province of Tyre into the hands of the patriarch of Antioch.

³ WT, xxii. 8, 1076.

⁴ JL, 14681, Pflugk-Harttung (*op. cit.* iii. 293-5) lists the possessions of the Sepulchre: ". . . . que in toto archiepiscopatu Nazareno et in Aconensi episcopatu atque in toto Tyri archiepiscopatu, et omnia nihilominus, qui in universo patriarchatu et regno Ierosolimitano rationabiliter possidetis vel possessuri estis; item quicquid iuris apud montem Peregrinum, et in toto episcopatu Tripolitano habetis, et in Antiochia. . . ."

⁵ Runciman, *op. cit.* iii. 99 f.

⁶ See note 2 above. The letter of Innocent III refers to these discussions.

and even into the reigns of Popes Innocent III and Innocent IV.¹ By that time, it had lost whatever meaning it had once possessed and had become only a grim memorial to those destructive passions and rivalries which had been chiefly responsible for the collapse of Latin power in Syria-Palestine.

In conclusion, it is important to record the opinions of William of Tyre, who became metropolitan of Tyre in 1175. The great historian considered Tyre to be a ruined church, whose suffragans were divided, whose integrity was destroyed. Although William clearly emphasizes the sinister role played by the two patriarchs in the division of his province, he places the chief onus of blame on the Papacy for its failure to preserve the unity of Tyre. There were probably many in the Latin Orient who shared his opinion.²

Is William's critique of the Papacy justified? In reviewing the material presented above, we might agree, at least to this extent, that the Papacy by its hesitation, vacillation and inconsistency had helped to prolong the controversy beyond any useful purpose. However, William's judgement does less than justice to the Papacy. He ignores the ordinary difficulties which the Papacy encountered in its dealings with the Latin Orient: the uncertainties in communication due to the great distances involved; the frequent lack of information necessary for the formulation of policy. Further, he fails utterly to take account of the complicated nature of the problem which Tyre and its suffragans posed for the Papacy. Apart from the simple fact that the boundaries between the Latin states did not coincide with the ancient division between the patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem, there were too many special circumstances which each

¹ As a guide to the controversy in the thirteenth century, see RR, no. 171. Additional references to those listed there are, for Innocent III, Potthast, 3265, 3454, 4650, 4878, 4954, 5224. These show Tyre under Jerusalem and Tripoli under Antioch. So also do Potthast, 5891, 7058, 8431 for the reign of Honorius III. For Gregory IX and Innocent IV, see in the *Registres des Papes*, published by the Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome: Gregory IX, ed. L. Auvray (Paris, 1896-1907), i, no. 324, p. 190; Innocent IV, ed. E. Berger (Paris, 1884-1921), i, nos. 51, 2801, 2803, 3286, pp. 15, 417-18, 494; ii, no. 4225, p. 433.

² WT, xiii. 23, xiv. 14, 593, 626-7.

antagonist was able to use, not only to his own advantage, but also against any papal decision which ran contrary to his own interests. The patriarchs of Antioch had at least three potent weapons on their side : the ambitions of the princes of Antioch ; the restlessness of the counts of Tripoli in their relationship as vassals to the kings of Jerusalem ; the possibility that any curtailment of Antioch's power by the Papacy might drive Antioch to seek better treatment from the Greeks. On the other hand, the strength of Jerusalem lay in its prestige as the holiest shrine of Christendom and in its superior military and political importance in the Latin Orient. All of these special circumstances combined to place the most rigorous limits on the efficacy of any action taken by the Papacy in its dealings with Tyre.

Yet the real injustice of William's charge lies in his curious failure to see that the Papacy could resolve the controversy over Tyre to the satisfaction of all concerned only by bringing peace and harmony to the crusaders themselves. Mindful of the limited scope of this article, we are naturally reluctant to proffer any general opinion on the total effectiveness of the Papacy's relationship with the Latin Orient. Nonetheless, the papal failure with regard to Tyre points to the fact that the transformation of the mutual jealousy and animosity existing between the Latin states into peace and harmony, even for the sake of the crusade, was a task beyond the Papacy's power. We may therefore conclude with this, one of the great ironies of twelfth-century history. The initial success of the crusade movement had been both a demonstration and a validation of the papal claims to hegemony in Western Christendom. Yet, for all its power, the Papacy was unable to bestow upon its sons, labouring in the East, and upon the Christian churches, which they there established in the face of the heathen, that " peace which is the tranquillity of order ".¹

¹ Augustine, *De civ. dei*, xix. 13.