

ANDREW PALMER

The History of the Syrian Orthodox in Jerusalem, Part Two: Queen Melisende and the Jacobite Estates

1. Preface: Use of the term 'Jacobite' and summary of Part One

This is the second part of a three-part article which began to appear in this journal in 1991 under the umbrella-title of "The History of the Syrian Orthodox in Jerusalem".¹ It is prefaced by a justification of my use of the term "Jacobite". In the sixth century this name became attached to those Christians in Syria and in Egypt who rejected the "double-nature" Christology which the majority of Mediterranean Christians had received from the synod held at Chalcedon in 451. Their present-day successors prefer the name of "Syrian Orthodox", which asserts that they represent the loyal disciples of the Nicene Fathers in Syria. But their aversion from the name of Jacobites is demonstrably of recent date. It will be less confusing here to use this name, as our sources concerning Jerusalem usually do, distinguishing, where appropriate, between the Syrian and the Egyptian Jacobites, the latter being the Copts.² The Jacobites, while they understood, or perhaps misunderstood, the definition of Christ "in two Natures" as an offence against the personal integrity of which He is the model, never rejected the belief that Christ is fully the Child both of God and of a woman. The term "monophysite" is better avoided, if it suggests a diminishment of Christ's Humanity by the affirmation of His Divinity.³

1 *OC*, 75 (1991), 16-43. The references to Appendix I of Part 2 in notes 54-58 and to Appendix II of Part 2 in notes 46 and 73 are based on a concept of the sequel which was subsequently rejected; they should be read as references to Part 2, section 5, and to Part 3, respectively.

2 In our western sources, "Syrian" is often used of the non-Greek Byzantine Orthodox community; e.g. Huygens (1960), p. 96: "The Syrians, like the Greeks, say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone; as for the Nestorians [...] (they deny that Mary is the Mother of God); the Jacobites say there is only one Nature in Christ and one Will conformably with one Nature; as for the patriarch of the Maronites [...] he has submitted himself to the Catholic Church of Rome" (James of Vitry, my translation).

3 The Church, I suggest, is like a tree, with greater and lesser limbs, which find their unity in their common dependence on apostolic tradition and in their common origin in the seed that is Christ; the seed, the sapling and the growing tree find nourishment in the humus of extinct cultures while growing out into the life-giving atmosphere of new insights. But the glory of this tree resides equally in all its parts and the loss of one of its oldest branches, however fragile,

The presence of the Jacobites in Jerusalem serves even today to remind the world of their existence; but their monastery is first and foremost a "home from home" to Jacobite pilgrims. In the first part of this article, we found that the pilgrimage to Jerusalem had been an important instrument of religious expression among the autochthonous Christians of Roman Mesopotamia (the homeland of the Jacobites) as early as the fifth century; evidence was lacking for earlier pilgrimages, but the sources which pointed to the fifth century did not suggest that the custom was first introduced at that time (section 2). Records made between the late fourth and the late fifteenth century were found to indicate that coastal ferries carried travellers for a large part of the way from Palestine to Mesopotamia and, conversely, that Mesopotamian pilgrims normally travelled first to the port of Antioch, embarking there for a coastal city near Jerusalem (section 3). This explains the presence of Jacobite churches in coastal cities under the metropolitan jurisdiction of Jerusalem, at first in Tyre and, later, also in Tripoli and in Acre.⁴

Once they arrived in the Holy City, where did the Jacobite pilgrims lodge and pray? The pious fraudulence and the competition for space endemic to all places of pilgrimage have caused some interference in the signals we receive from the past; yet some little-known facts about the property of the Jacobites in Jerusalem (section 4) and their rights at the Holy Sepulchre (section 5) were discovered by the careful collation of accounts from sources of different dates in various languages. The establishment of the Jacobite bishop of Jerusalem guaranteed this Church's foothold on that narrow rock where the eye of the world seeks a microcosm of the universal Church.⁵ From what date did the Jacobites have their own metropolitan bishop at Jerusalem (section 6)? The earliest clear evidence is the signature of a Jacobite bishop in a manuscript colophon dated 750; the colophon is credibly quoted by a generally reliable scholar, Dōlabānī (1928).⁶ How much further the succession reaches back is unknown; the Jacobite list goes back to the apostle James, but it presents problems in the first centuries of schism and is unlikely to be verifiable. In their authentic register are found the names of the bishops

could put its very life in jeopardy. On this analogy, all Christians should have a care for the Jacobites.

4 The Jacobite presence in the coastal cities seems to have been strengthened after the twelfth century and eventually upgraded to an episcopal presence; further research is needed in order to establish all the facts and to decide how this development is connected to the decline of Crusader Jerusalem and the rise of Tripoli and Acre.

5 The bishop's main task is to maintain a presence which faithfully reflects the real importance of the Jacobites in Christendom; his besetting difficulty is to prevent this reflection from being muddled by the very struggle to maintain its material conditions.

6 With the exception of the new titles in notes 7, 10, 45 and 66, the bibliography to the present paper is printed at the end of Part One.

from 793 until the second half of the twelfth century, after which fragmentary evidence turns up haphazardly in manuscript colophons and inscriptions. If a register of bishops was kept at Jerusalem, it is one of the many secrets of the library of St Mark's.

No claim was made in Part One to have completed the programme of the title. Restricted access to the Jacobite manuscripts at Jerusalem is one of the reasons for this. Part Two will trace the relations between the Jacobites and the Franks, particularly with regard to land-ownership, from the time of the First Crusade up to 1187, citing in a new translation three manuscript colophons in Syriac which make the twelfth century come alive in a way that has been too little appreciated. On close inspection, these colophons suggest that there was consistency in the relations between the Jacobites and Queen Melisende from 1138 to 1148; the inference can be made from a Latin document that this probably continued until her death in 1161. Part Three, "Documents Concerning the Jacobites in Jerusalem", is projected for a subsequent volume of this journal; it will give new editions of the colophons which are the main sources of the present paper, publications (in collaboration with the Arabist G. J. van Gelder) of the inscriptions in Syriac and in Arabic at St Mark's and a description of St Mark's MSS 32, 46, 47, 60, 201, 203 and 211. The bibliography for the whole trilogy has been printed at the end of Part One; addenda, corrigenda and an index will be appended to Part Three.

2. Introduction

Before the Crusades, the characters in the history of the Syrian Orthodox in Jerusalem are either vivid figures of legend, such as Saint Barṣawmō, or mere shadows attached to names. At last, in the twelfth century, a number of Jacobites step into the centre of our stage, at a time when the infrastructure of the Jacobite establishment in Jerusalem is seriously endangered. The company is worthy of the dramatic metaphor. Fulk of Anjou, the father of Geoffrey Plantagenet, has been persuaded by his "beautiful, wise, sweet and compassionate" consort, in other words, the vigorous, proud and ambitious co-ruler of Frankish Jerusalem, Melisende, to mediate between the Jacobite bishop and a chieftain of the First Crusade.⁷ This man, Geoffrey of the Tower of David, has spent half a lifetime in an Egyptian dungeon, out of sight and out of mind as far as politics is concerned, though his wife never

⁷ The description of the queen is from William of Tyre: *Guillaume de Tyr et ses continuateurs*, ed. P. Paris, 2 vols. (Paris, 1879, 1880), XV 26 ("bone dame, sage, douce et pieuse"), qualified by Mayer (1988), p. 84 f. ("a woman of extraordinary vigour and driving ambition").

seems to have forgotten him. The Jacobite community, having recovered in his absence the lands which they had lost to him at the time of the conquest, now have to contend, as do the king and queen, with the awkward claims of a returning hero.

Two Syriac authors, both writing in 1138, preserve for us the perspective of the Jacobite establishment on these events. The first, the monk Michael, is one of those who accompanied the metropolitan when he went to present his case before the king at Bayt Ġibrīn. Michael finished his account after returning to Jerusalem, on Thursday, 10 February, seven days after the case had, as he thought, been resolved. His visual impressions and his recall of the actual words spoken in his hearing by the bishop, the king and the vassal Geoffrey are as authentic as the succeeding emotions of optimism, dejection, tense expectation and relief which he registered in himself and in his companions. The second, a priested monk called Romanus, shared Michael's monastic and Jacobite interests. It is probable that he had been the third member of the episcopal party which met Geoffrey at Bayt Ġibrīn in February. He was a close confidant of the old bishop, whom he hoped to succeed. By the time he had finished writing, the bishop was dead and his succession was secure. He writes, more than six months after the resolution of the case, omitting the drama but adding some important details which Michael had apparently suppressed. His account (finished on 25 August) was inserted, like Michael's, into the colophon of an ecclesiastical manuscript.⁸

3. *The first Syriac colophon*⁹

There was at this time a certain Frank, one of the chieftains who first conquered Jerusalem and seized power over it and over its territory by the Will of God, expelling the Muslims and killing in it an innumerable quantity of them¹⁰. Each of the chieftains took control of lands commensurate with his rank and with the strength of his army. At that time our monastery, that is the holy church of the orthodox Jacobites, was weak and derelict, without inhabitants, because the reigning metropolitan had fled to Egypt out of fear, under compulsion from the Muslims. Only three feeble old men were left in the monastery. Then this chieftain of whom we are speaking, whose name was Geoffrey, seized the settlements and the whole territory

8 The two texts are published, translated and annotated by Martin (1888, 1889) and further investigated by Nau (1899, 1900); new editions are projected for Part Three.

9 Lyon, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS No. 1, foll. 1b-3a (more correctly 318b-320a); described in *Catalogue* (1900), p. 1. I have examined this manuscript in detail and will describe it more fully in Part Three; my translation anticipates my edition and is independent of both the text and the translation published by Martin (1889), pp. 39 ff., 70 ff.

10 Nothing quite comparable to this Crusader propaganda can be found in the Syrian Orthodox tradition: see A. Palmer, "The Victory of the Cross and the Problem of Christian Defeat: Crusade and Jihad in Byzantine and Syrian Orthodox Eyes" (in Dutch), in H. Bakker and M. Gosman, eds., *Heilige oorlogen* (Kampen, 1991), pp. 84-109.

around our villages of Bayt 'Arīf and 'Adasiyya — may God preserve them! When he saw how fine and lovely they were and that they had no manager or lord, he summarily appropriated the said places. He was, after all, close to the king of that time — indeed he was his son-in-law. His power lasted a short time, then he was taken by the Muslims and made a captive in Egypt. After that the late sainted patriarch, My Lord Athanasius, came to Jerusalem on this account and My Lord Cyril, the metropolitan, returned from Egypt, and together they presented themselves to the king. They exhibited the deeds of sale of the said villages and they brought some of the old men of the place as witnesses, both believers and Muslims, so that the king and his chieftains were convinced that these places belonged to the Church and that he (Geoffrey) had taken them unlawfully.¹¹ The king gave back those places to our blessed Father, the aforementioned bishop, though our Father had to pay out a great deal of gold to the king and to many others for this reason.

After the aforementioned persons had died and the king whose name has been written above arose — he was the *third* on the throne after the king who did these things, just as our Father Ignatius was the *third* (bishop of Jerusalem) after the aforementioned Cyril; and the interval was more or less *thirty-three* years¹² — the Armenians acquired influence in Egypt and the Armenian bishop of Jerusalem went down to Egypt to bribe them for some necessary thing. When the head of the Armenians saw the bishop, he was very glad and, since he had administrative authority over the whole of Egypt, he promised to do whatever he should ask.¹³ The aforementioned Geoffrey — perish his memory! — was still alive and in prison, though he had become a very old man. Many kings had neglected his plight¹⁴ and he had not yet obtained his release. So that bishop requested from him this man, so that he might do well out of him and obtain some high secular rank (for himself). Moreover, his (Geoffrey's) wife and relatives had assured him (the bishop) here (at Jerusalem), that if he should obtain his release they would give him a village. When they told him in prison what had happened and what was going to happen, he swore most solemnly to do more than this for the Armenians, if he were released. For these reasons the Armenians asked for him and the governor of Egypt gave him to them.

When he arrived, many people were very sorry indeed at his coming, because his territory had been made up of lands seized from various people and because of the length of time that had passed. We suffered just about as much as anyone, because during all the time since he had departed and until the present time, which is noted above, the metropolitans, including our Father, had not ceased from building and settling in 'Adasa (apparently a variant of the name 'Adasiyya) and he (the present bishop) had built there two churches and

- 11 This was an important precedent; Romanus specifies (see below) that the villages were liberated from Geoffrey's nephew, who had held them in his absence.
- 12 My italics emphasize the symbolic nature of the final number, which is therefore not a serious problem for Mayer (1977), p. 77, who, contradicting Nau (1899, 1900), would identify the "chieftain" with Geoffrey of the Tower of David. He does not, however, explicitly confirm or contradict Michael's statement that the "chieftain" was son-in-law to the first Crusader king of Jerusalem (I leave this nut for Crusader prosopographers to crack); and he is mistaken in thinking that either Michael or Romanus gives the date of Geoffrey's death.
- 13 The Armenian Bahram, vezir of the sword to the sultan of Egypt from 1135, who was entitled "Sword of Islam" and "Crown of the State", elevated a great number of his fellow-Armenians to public office before suddenly falling from power in February, 1137: for sources and bibliography see M. Canard, art. "Bahram", *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., vol. 1 (Leiden/London, 1960), p. 939 f.
- 14 Why Baldwin I, Baldwin II, Melisende and Fulk had all neglected the plight of a son-in-law of the first is a question that I am not equipped to answer.

had assembled a splendid monastic community — God preserve it! — composed of many monks from every part. But when Geoffrey presented himself to the king and his chieftains, he seemed to them like one who had returned from the grave to visit them. They were delighted to see him, partly because of his age and partly because he was one of the famous first generation. The king ordered that everything that had been his before his imprisonment should be returned to him.

Michael then describes how the king went to Bayt Ġibrīn (formerly Eleutheropolis, some distance to the south-west of Jerusalem), leaving a viceroy to carry out his orders. The viceroy's representatives appeared on the doorstep of the monastery of 'Adasa and ordered it to be vacated forthwith, which was allegedly a cause of pleasure to "those envious people and haters of the Orthodox Faith, who are called Melkites" (at this date, autochthonous Christians of the Byzantine Communion), for their own property had long ago been confiscated from them.

Then he (bishop Ignatius) sent word to the queen — long may she live and enjoy favour deservedly! — who [had learned] the fear of God from her mother the queen¹⁵ and who [was full] of mercy for our Church and for [all our people]. [The queen] gave herself much [trouble] on account of what had occurred.¹⁶ She was much saddened by the affair, not [only] because our places had been taken from us, but [also because of the distress] and the labour which it caused our Father on account of the absence of the king. She [sent] him a true account of the affair, of the labour and expense we had put into our building and of how these villages had been ours since Muslim times. She wrote to him at Bayt Ġibrīn, urging him to help us as much as he could; for he had commanded all who wanted a case heard concerning Geoffrey to assemble there. She also instructed the king's chieftains and negotiators that whoever should help that bishop would earn her deepest gratitude.¹⁷

So when the appointed time arrived, our Father and his companions (Michael himself and, most probably, Romanus) set off for Bayt Ġibrīn, where we were received by the king on the eve of the Monday with which the Fast of Nineveh commences, on the first day of the blessed month of February. When he saw our Father, he welcomed him like an angel, praising his way of life and his faith in front of all his chieftains and promising him to do all he could in word and deed to help him. We came out rejoicing from his presence to go to our

15 This suggests, as many historians of the Crusades have suspected, that Melisende was brought up in the Faith of her anti-Chalcedonian Armenian mother, Morphia of Melitene, rather than in that of her father; for Baldwin's marriage, see Mayer (1988), p. 73.

16 It is important to realize that Melisende was designated by her father's testament as heir to his kingdom and co-ruler with her consort, Fulk of Anjou. To begin with, Fulk had acted as if he was sole ruler and had even usurped the title of heir; but about 1134 the joint kingdom — and the marriage — went through a crisis from which Melisende emerged as the winner. After that, says William of Tyre, even in trivial matters, Fulk never did anything without his wife's consent. See Mayer (1988), pp. 82, 84 f., paraphrasing William of Tyre, XIV 15: "Dès celui tens fu li rois du tout à la volenté de sa femme, que il se penoit d'apaier son cuer et conforter en toutes manieres" (the Latin has "ut ejus quam prius exacerbavit mitigaret indignationem"). The king's viceroy had, however, acted against the Jacobites without the queen's consent and that offence must be no small part of the real explanation for her zeal in their cause.

17 Considering her constitutional power and her known pride, this must have been taken as a veiled threat.

tent. The following morning our adversary arrived in haughty spirits and entered the king's presence. Immediately the king and the patriarch of the Franks and the others who were present began to urge him to accept gold from us and to relent; but he refused, saying, "Let them give me such-and-such a sum of money or else let them leave that place; for they have been drawing profit from [my land] for such-and-such a number of years".¹⁸ All that they managed to gain at that time was (the assurance) that he would contain himself until they were back (in Jerusalem), so that this case might be brought in the presence of the queen; for they knew that she would be on our side in this affair.

With this the court was dissolved on the Tuesday after the holy Feast of the Entrance. We were greatly perturbed, not knowing how we could be delivered from him. On the Wednesday, after we had performed, in a state of despondency, the morning prayers of the feast of My holy Lord Baršawmō (3 February), our Father arose and we went to receive the signal for our departure from the patriarch and from the king. But when we were nearing the patriarch's tent, the king himself looked up and saw us coming towards him; leaving all who were with him, he came up to us, took hold of our Father gently and said, "You will never be delivered from this man for nothing. It would be better for you to do now whatever you are ready to do at a later stage. You may be sure of my support. Do not play for time"! By God's intervention and the prayers [of the above-mentioned] saint our Father entrusted the affair to the king personally, telling him, "After God, I am your man and the queen's in this land. Whatever you command me, I will do". Then he (the king), leaving our company with a light heart, came upon Geoffrey. He spoke with him, now persuasively, now chidingly, until he had brought him to the point of promising, "I will do whatever Your Majesty says and I will not cross you". At this they sent for us. We were still in the place where the king had spoken with us, standing between the tents, when they said to us, "Come to the king"! We found them mounted, their horses immobile, on a patch of level ground, and there we greeted them. And the manner of our meeting with our adversary was such that there was no need for the exchange of many words between us. As soon as he saw our Father, he rode up to him and greeted him peaceably and he swore with oaths in front of the king and his great men, "From this day onwards the fortress is free from all coveting".¹⁹ Nevertheless, our Father promised in charity to give him two hundred dinars. Thus, by God's intervention, we obtained deliverance after the distress, the labour and the expense we had suffered from this affair.

This account is all the more credible for its lack of literary sophistication, for its function as a quasi-archival record not destined for publication and for its exact quotation of Geoffrey's oath in ignorance of the fact that it may have left him a loophole, as we shall see. The narrative reveals that the king could not simply override the wishes of his vassals, certainly not those of an elder, but had to negotiate a settlement with him as man with man. We perceive furthermore a situation typical of Jerusalem, where the different Christian

18 The Jacobites had repossessed the estates about 30 years before Geoffrey's release, so perhaps he demanded 300 dinars for himself, since the sum eventually settled on was 200 dinars for Geoffrey and the same again for the king and his chiefs; Romanus tells us of the latter payment, but Michael suppresses it and admits only that 200 dinars were given to Geoffrey by way of "charity".

19 The reference is to the monastery at 'Adasiyya, which was distinguished by its defensive tower, as we shall see.

communities have always had to compete with each other for the political favour on which their economic survival depended: the protégés of Byzantium are the losers in this Latin kingdom, so that the chief rivals of the Jacobites are their closest relatives, in terms of Christian tradition: the Armenians. It was galling to the Jacobites that Armenian diplomacy had led to the release of Geoffrey. The village with which the Armenians were to be rewarded is left unnamed; but this promise no doubt made Geoffrey all the more determined to drive a hard bargain over the Jacobite estates. Michael congratulates himself that the queen, the daughter of an Armenian noblewoman, has been effectively engaged as an ally of the Jacobites. This gave him a reason to suppress those aspects of the process which show that the Jacobites' allies, too, were calculating their advantages. The real triumph, after all, was to have manoeuvred the queen into identifying the preservation of her own prestige with the success of the Jacobites in this dispute.

It was an enormous advantage to the Jacobites that Melisende was predisposed by her origins to favour the Oriental Orthodox Churches; and it may have been a bonus that her mother had been the daughter of a governor of Melitene.²⁰ Melitene was the key to the prosperity and the political influence of the Jacobites at this time.²¹ It is the new prosperity of Jacobite Melitene after the Byzantine reconquest of that city in 934 which best explains the ability of the Jacobite community to buy churches and estates in Jerusalem in the subsequent period and to invest in them so dearly.²² No doubt this was the secret of Bishop Ignatius' good relationship with the queen. Like his adoptive father, the patriarch, and many other Jacobite prelates at that time, he was from Melitene. Besides, the gold necessary for bringing even a just case to judgment is unlikely to have been raised from the estates of Bayt 'Arif and 'Adasiyya, which were derelict for a good many years after the Crusader conquest of Jerusalem; and, while St Mary's is likely to have engaged in long-distance trade through the coastal cities, the lack of evidence for this suggests it was not a major source of income for the monastery.

The author of the second Syriac colophon, Romanus, is also writing at Jerusalem. He gives us more of the technicalities of the case and describes the disputed properties themselves, adding details about the Jacobite buildings inside the city walls. At the beginning of his notice he seems anxious to indicate exactly how much the Jacobites in Jerusalem owed to his aged master — not least, perhaps, with an eye to confirming by this tribute Bishop Ignatius's opinion that he, Romanus, was worthy to be his successor; for it is the bishop

20 Hintlian (1976), p. 25.

21 Tinnefeld (1975); Dagron (1976).

22 Palmer (1986).

who has commissioned the codex. Before the notice is completed, Ignatius dies. As designated bishop and manager of the ecclesiastical establishment at Jerusalem, of which the country estates and the coastal churches are all dependencies, Romanus now has a different interest in setting the record straight, particularly since the Jacobite claim to the two estates is still contested. He goes further than Michael in naming the bishop who first bought these estates, which might be seen as an indication of a fact suppressed by Romanus, namely that there was a continuing need to defend the Jacobites' title to the land.

4. *The second Syriac colophon*²³

Seeing that I have mentioned the Tower, I consider it my duty to make a record of the villages 'Adasēh and Bayt 'Arīf, which were from of old the inheritance of the monastery, having been bought for a great sum by God's elect, My Lord Thomas, the metropolitan of Jerusalem.²⁴ But in the time of our present Father,²⁵ in 1448 (AD 1137), they were subjected to a great ordeal by a Frank who had been liberated from captivity in Egypt. This Frank was one of those who had first conquered Jerusalem. Since there were none of our believers in them, nor indeed inside,²⁶ all of them having fled to Egypt to get away from the Turks, together with the metropolitan, My Lord Cyril, who is called "of ŠM'PWLZE", and (since) these villages of ours shared their boundaries with him, his authority was established over them and for a certain time he reaped the profits from them, until he was taken into captivity in Egypt.²⁷ Then his brother's son took them over as if by right of inheritance.

After the Franks had seized power, My Lord Cyril returned, but he was unable to accomplish anything. At this point the patriarch My Lord Athanasius²⁸ came and presented himself to King Baldwin (I) and gave him no small sum of silver to liberate the villages from Geoffrey's nephew, while Geoffrey himself was in captivity. They were ruined and no one was able to dwell in them for fear of the accursed Muslims, until the accession of My Lord Ignatius Ḥesnūn. He found (the Church's property) both outside and inside (the walls of Jerusalem) in ruins, without even a residence suitable to the dignity of a bishop for him to dwell in. First of all, with great dedication, he rebuilt the monastery in the city and peopled it and by his spiritual care this brotherhood of unity was established in Jerusalem.²⁹ He made

23 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, syriacque 51, foll. 117b-118b; described in Zotenberg (1874), pp. 16-19. I have examined this manuscript in detail and will describe it more fully in Part Three; my translation anticipates my edition and is independent of both the text and the translation published by Martin (1889), pp. 50 ff., 57 ff.

24 Probably Thomas III; see Part One, section 6.

25 At the time these words were written, the old bishop was evidently still alive, although in February Michael had already revealed, in a part of his notice not translated above, considerable anxiety about his health.

26 Understand: "in the two villages at the time of the First Crusade, nor indeed inside the city-walls".

27 Geoffrey of the Tower of David was taken prisoner in 1106, which fits closely enough Michael's approximation of 33 years before 1138: Mayer (1977), p. 76 f. (compare note 12).

28 December, 1090 - June, 1129.

29 Romanus seems to be saying that, whatever the Jacobite monastic presence in Jerusalem had been before, it acquired at this date a more formal structure as an economic and a spiritual community.

a canonical decree that there should be no (Jacobite) monk in Jerusalem outside (this) community, since he was a watchful and an energetic shepherd. After this he took it upon himself to rebuild (our property) outside (the walls) as well.³⁰ He found two old cisterns, around which he laid a complete foundation. When (the building) had been raised to the height of what had been there formerly, the Lord, who loved him, took him unto himself, leaving those who survived him in great sorrow and inconsolable grief.

When this bitter news reached the above-mentioned patriarch, he sent us our Father, My Lord Ignatius, son of Busayr of Ġāḍina [...].³¹ Because of the jealousy (of certain people) he (the patriarch) made him a metropolitan and appointed him for Edessa.³² He became a bishop in AG 1430 (AD 1118/9), at which time Bar Ṣabūnī was (bishop) in Edessa;³³ although he had been deposed, he sent our father to Amida, to his own see. There he performed the duties of a bishop for five years [...].³⁴

He reached Jerusalem at the beginning of '37 (AD 1125), on Monday, 12 October. To the building that he found (in the city) he added twice as much again; he constructed three large cisterns at the gate of the monastery with a fine circle (of buildings) in a quadrangle above them as a hostel for pilgrims and (other) guests to rest in and to utter a prayer for him and for his parents. Outside the city he completed the tower, on the fourth storey of which he built a church.³⁵ Around the foot of the tower he constructed great cisterns with rooms above them and so made it into a famous monastery or convent.³⁶ In the south-east corner he built and perfected a big church, furnished with all that is necessary, but above all with priests, deacons and monks, all of whom expended great energy in building the place.³⁷

After all this was completed [...] the Frank of whom we have spoken was freed by the intervention of an Armenian bishop and came to oppress all Jerusalem and us more than most, on account of our weakness. To begin with, it was decreed that we should abandon everything and that the Frank should take over the monastery; after that we might approach him³⁸ and he would hear our case in law. But because our Father found grace, thanks to God's favour, with everyone and especially with the king and the queen and the chieftains, it

30 An inscription bears witness to this; see Part Three.

31 The part omitted tells at some length how the reigning patriarch had taken over the upbringing of this man from his parents.

32 Cf. *Register*, XLI.43; this explains why this man was not recorded in the *Register* as having been appointed for Jerusalem, although he does appear in the list of the bishops of Jerusalem which follows the *Register*.

33 On Basil Abū Ġālib Bar Ṣabūnī, see *Register*, XLI.7 and Abbeloos and Lamy (1872-77), vol. 2, cols. 467-76.

34 In the section omitted we are told how he became sick and spent a winter in the monastery of Anabad near modern Severeke, before setting out for Jerusalem in June, ordaining on the way many priests and deacons at the patriarch's behest.

35 The bishop foresaw times of danger, when the community at 'Adasiyya would retreat into the upper storeys of the tower, drawing up the ladder after them; this explains why Geoffrey referred to the monastery as "the fortress" (see note 19).

36 Presumably the underfloor cisterns provided a pleasant coolness in the rooms above, as well as making it possible to draw water without going out of doors.

37 The big church was for the men; the nuns (see note 41) were therefore housed in the tower, where they made use of the church on the fourth storey (see note 35). The nuns' quarters in the present Jacobite monastery of Qartmīn are known as "the fortress", even though not actually built to function as a stronghold. Many of the rural towers of Greece were built not only to guard the most valuable possessions, but also to house the most vulnerable inhabitants of a farming community, the women and the children.

38 Presumably the author of the decree, that is the king.

was decreed, after much trouble, that we should give him two hundred dinars and the same again to the king and to his chieftains. Then we were made free of him (i.e. of Geoffrey's claim), in token of which we received from him a document in French with the royal seal.

In the remaining part of his notice, Romanus relates events which had not yet occurred when he began his notice, ending with the death of bishop Ignatius in Acre on the Thursday before Pentecost, 1138, and the arrival of his embalmed body in Jerusalem on the day after Pentecost. At the time of completion (25 August) Romanus knew that he would have to "follow in the footsteps" of Ignatius. He could not yet be ordained a bishop, since there would be a vacancy on the patriarchal throne until December of that year.³⁹

Ignatius had been concerned to provide the churches in Jerusalem with "all that was necessary", including the book of liturgical chants copied in his own frail hand, at the end of which Michael had placed his notice; he had supervised Romanus's efforts in making a Gospel lectionary for the monastery of the Tower outside the city and had no doubt dictated part of his own biography to the scribe. Michael refers in one place to Ignatius's work in preserving "our holy monastery and all its estate", which suggests that the monastery of the Tower was a dependency of St Mary Magdalene's.⁴⁰ He also refers to "the nuns of the two monasteries", by which we should understand that of St Mary Magdalene in the city and that of the Tower outside. If he had meant separate nunneries we should expect to find these among the buildings mentioned by Romanus.⁴¹

It is arresting to find Michael referring to Fulk as "victorious",⁴² to his family as persons "preserved by God" and to his subjects as "the believing people of the Franks". In this context the prayer which follows can only be called ecumenical: "May the Lord cause His Peace and Safety to rule His Church and His believing People in the four quarters of the world for ever!" This is important evidence that conditions were favourable for the movement towards unity which was given impetus in 1237 by a Jacobite patriarch's personal submission to the Pope, followed, in 1246, by his detailed proposal

39 *Register*, XLIII, 2nd of 34: "Ignatius, metropolitan of Jerusalem, who is Romanus, a monk from Melitene, of the same monastery (in which the bishop of Jerusalem resides)"; according to Cerulli (1943), p. 17, this Ignatius (whom Cerulli calls Ignatius III) reigned from 1139 until 1183, a period of 44 years.

40 This is confirmed by the Latin record of *ca* 1161 quoted at the end of section 5.

41 This is the earliest evidence known to me of the arrangement found still today in Jacobite monasteries, whereby the community is made up of both monks and nuns, the nuns presumably living separately within the same complex, then as now (see note 37), but cooking, washing and cleaning for the monks; see Gülcan (1977) and Anshütz (1984). At Jerusalem these nuns derived their function from that of the bishop's housekeepers in the days before his establishment had become a full-scale monastery; so, at least, I infer from the colophon of 750 which I cited from Dölābānī (1928), p. 438 f., in Part One, note 40.

42 An epithet of kings considered Orthodox by the writer.

for corporate unity, but which was broken off as a consequence of the departure of the Crusaders from Syria.⁴³ Later Latin pilgrims would remark on the similarity of the Jacobites and the Romans, both in doctrine and in liturgy.⁴⁴ This was, admittedly, after the thirteenth century, a period of widespread Roman pedagogy among the Jacobites; yet the two churches never really became alike. Perhaps the supposed similarity was due partly to the contrast with the icon-veneration so prominent in the Byzantine Liturgy.

At the least it is clear that the Jacobites were political friends of the Franks in the Crusader States. One reason for this was that the Franks held power in much of the territory where Syrian Jacobites lived; another was that they shared with the Jacobites and the Gregorian Armenians a deep distrust of the Greeks. The fact that Queen Melisende, who was, as far as her maternal education was concerned, of the oriental Orthodox Faith, consistently interceded for the Jacobites in their disputes with the Franks over property was probably as important as any other single factor in removing Jacobite inhibitions about ecumenism where the Latins were concerned. A Gospel lectionary, which was completed in Jerusalem on 15 September, 1149, contains a notice by the scribe, Sōhdō, a monk from Edessa, which confirms that the queen's support continued after her husband's death.

5. *The third Syriac colophon*⁴⁵

In AG 1455 (AD 1144) the famous city of Edessa was taken by the Turkish people, who put many of the inhabitants to the sword, though some of them survived to dwell in the city with

43 See Hamilton (1980), pp. 347-55, from which (p. 355) I quote the following: "The holy see had not tried to impose corporate reunion on the Jacobites, but had encouraged individual conversions. The converts had not been required to leave their own church, but had been allowed to remain in its communion and to act, as it were, as a unifying leaven. Real religious unity might in time have been achieved by this method, but it was of necessity a much slower process than corporate reunion, and time was not on the side of the Latins".

44 Meinardus (1960), p. 25.

45 Damascus, Syrian Orthodox Patriarchate, MS 12/4, *olim* Jerusalem, St Mark's, MS 27 (cf. Baršawm (1943), p. 399, note on No. 217), described in the Syriac catalogue (by Ḥanna Dōlabānī) at the Patriarchate (on the Arabic translation of this catalogue, of which a photocopy was given to me by Sebastian Brock, see B. Behnām, in *OrChr* 62 (1978), p. 203, no. 18, and R. Macuch, in *Geschichte der spät- und neusyrischen Literatur* (Berlin/New York, 1976), p. 441, n. 94). The Syriac catalogue is partially known to me through Hubert Kaufhold (see A. Palmer, "The Syriac Letter-Forms of Ṭūr 'Abdīn and Environs", *OC* 73 (1989), pp. 68-89, p. 73, n. 11), who also gave me the reference to Baršawm. The codex is illustrated in Hatch (1946), plate LXXXII. An apparently competent handwritten copy of the colophon is published by Taylor (1931), pp. 125-30, with a seriously inaccurate translation; I have not yet seen the original manuscript and translate therefore from the copy made for Taylor. Sōhdō worked at "the holy and sacerdotal abbey of Lord Simon the Pharisee and of Saint Mary Magdalene in Jerusalem" and he refers to Ignatius, "the metropolitan of that same abbey and

them. These events ushered in great tragedy and cruel suffering for all Christians. Two years after the Turks gained control of the city, the king who had taken it, whose name was Zengi, was killed by his own eunuchs at night while he slept. Then the Franks came to Edessa under cover of night and scaled the wall by stealth. The Muslims, hearing the sound of their horns, realised that they had gained control of the wall. In their fear of them they fled and went up into the strongholds that are in the city,⁴⁶ sending messengers throughout their dominion to muster a great host from every quarter. The Franks stayed in the city for five days only; for when they saw what a multitude of Turks had been mustered against them, they were terrified and made ready to fly. As for the Christian inhabitants of the city, when they saw what had happened, they too were afraid of the Muslims and made ready to leave with the Franks. But after they had left, an army of Turks kept them surrounded throughout the night, from Saturday evening until Sunday afternoon. In the end the Franks were overcome and routed, while the Edessenes, who found that they had jumped out of the frying pan into the fire, were all taken captive without exception.

This ruin of Edessa was the cause of an expedition of the kings and the armies of the Romans. When they heard that the population of Edessa had been taken captive by the Muslims and that they had gained possession of the city, they put on divine zeal and prepared an expedition in the name of Christ and for the sake of the Christian nation, both in order to avenge Edessa and the rest of the Christians who had perished, and in order to keep these countries in Christian hands; above all, however, for the sake of that Holy Sepulchre of Christ and the rest of the holy places in Jerusalem. The Romans who set out on this expedition were of two great and terrible kingdoms. One of these, a sturdy and a mighty kingdom, was that which possesses the royal throne of Rome, the chief of all kingdoms, the occupant of which is the King of Kings;⁴⁷ and the kingdom which possesses Rome is (that of) the Germans (the German ruler at this date was Conrad III), a nation without its equal for hardness in all God's Creation, whose army numbered 930,000 men. The other king was he of the French (at this time Louis) and he had with him 600,000 men. When they reached the royal city of Constantinople, the king of the Greeks (at this time Manuel I Comnenus) and all his armies were in fear of them; but by their tricks and their wiliness they caused them to cross over to the other side, into Greater Romania;⁴⁸ then they deceived them and sent them by ways which led to arid deserts without settlements or inhabitants, where many of them died from hunger and thirst. As for the survivors, they returned to their own countries, their hearts broken, having lost their gold, their silver and their horses.

There follows a paragraph relating the failed Crusader siege of Damascus in AD 1148, in the course of which Sōhdō commits a potentially significant

of Jerusalem and all the coastal region"; the lectionary was made at the expense of Ignatius for the church of St Mary Magdalene in Tyre. What follows is not the entire colophon; the parts omitted will be translated in Part Three. Note that Chabot (1920-74), vol. 2, pp. 137 ff. (trans. vol. 4, pp. 103 ff.) and Chabot (1899-1910), XVII 4-6 (text 633-38; trans. III 267-78) contain detailed accounts of the events described in this colophon.

46 Edessa contained two fortified hills, one on either side of the original river-bed of the Dayṣōn.

47 This statement is unfriendly towards Byzantium, which claimed the title of "King of Kings" for its emperor.

48 This is a name for Asia Minor, as opposed to Lesser Romania, which designates the Byzantine territories in Europe. "Romania" was what was left of the Byzantine Empire after the Arab Conquest. The name of the first Seljuk state in Asia Minor, "the Sultanate of Rum", demonstrates that this toponym survived the Turkish Conquest without changing its application.

omission in failing to specify that by "the patriarch" he means not his own Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, but the Latin patriarch of Jerusalem. He continues:

In the same year (1148) Jerusalem was flooded with endless droves of paupers and there was such a shortage of bread and of everything that many paupers died of starvation. The hungry people pressed at the gates of all the abbeys and monasteries, demanding nourishment. These divinely fortified monasteries of ours, however, did not have estates or villages to provide pulses⁴⁹ and bread over and above their own needs for subsistence. Yet the poor and the needy, especially those Edessenes who had been the victims of plundering and whose (adult male) relatives were in captivity, put them under great pressure. For they had in this land no place where they could lay down their heads and find relief except in our monasteries; and they expected all their needs to be fulfilled by these same monasteries, whether it was gold with which to ransom the captives, or bread to eat, or clothes to cover their nakedness.

Our holy Father fulfilled all their needs with joy; but he was deeply distressed on account of the Frankish beggars and paupers as well. He desired to satisfy and relieve them all, but was in sorrow and anguish because he did not have enough supplies. Then God, who saw his good intentions, caused him to remember a certain village which had belonged formerly to the same monastery in the time of the Muslims, Dayr Dakariyya by name, and which had come into the possession of the original Frankish conquerors of the land.

He arose courageously, relying on God, his Helper, and obtained an audience with the victorious king,⁵⁰ Sire Baldwin, the son of Fulk, and with the holy⁵¹ queen Melisende, the king's mother. He explained the matter to them and they, by God's inspiration and by the true faith which they had in God's bishop, helped him to the utmost. They persuaded the owner of the village to return it to the church of Mary Magdalene and they counselled our Father to give the owner of the village gold and so to buy it back from them anew, for which he had to pay a great deal of gold: approximately one thousand red dinars. And he obtained the deeds, reliably witnessed and sealed with the royal seals, that is with the seal of the victorious king and with that of his mother the queen.⁵² But God, Who saw to all these things for the sake of the love which would be shown towards Him by the execution of His Commandments, since He desired him to nourish those who were hungry, assembled and directed into his hands the price of this village from sources which he had not been counting on at all. Then, relying on God's aid, he began to build a defensive tower in it with a church and houses surrounding the tower.⁵³

49 The name 'Adasiyya/Adasēh suggests that this village was known for its lentils.

50 It is difficult to imagine this epithet being written without irony so soon after the disastrous failure of July 1148, even if it is intended as a synonym for "good Christian".

51 Probably in the sense of "continent", because she did not remarry after her husband's death.

52 Melisende and her consort, Fulk, shared the kingdom from the outset, according to the instructions of Baldwin II, with his grandson, their son, Baldwin III; but he was first crowned, together with his mother, after his father's death in 1143, at the age of thirteen years. By 1148 he had attained his majority, but his mother's regency was still a burden to him. This may have been his main reason for persuading Conrad III of the Germans and Louis of France to join him in his stupid attack on Damascus; for Melisende was excluded from the interview between Baldwin and Conrad: Mayer (1988), p. 102 f.

53 After this comes a prayer for the bishop.

Sōhdō can have had little idea, on 15 September, 1149, that he would eventually be “Metropolitan Ignatius VI of Jerusalem” himself, for this did not come about until 1193⁵⁴; but it made sense even at such an early date for an ambitious man to praise his bishop, as that bishop, Romanus, had earlier written his bishop’s *res gestae* in the hope of promotion. Romanus was a young man at his succession (the Gospel lectionary from which our extract comes was the first major manuscript that he had written out: Martin (1889), pp. 50, 70 f.), yet no one could have told that he would live on until 1183. As we shall see, Sōhdō’s ambition was foiled even then by the imposition of an outsider closely related to the reigning patriarch; Sōhdō would have to serve under another bishop for ten years, though with the office of abbot to console him.⁵⁵

Sōhdō’s praise of the Crusaders is fulsome; he exaggerates their strength, as well as reproducing their anti-Byzantine propaganda. The Edessenes, as their subsequent flight with the Franks suggests, aided and abetted the ill-starred Frankish raid on Edessa in 1146; so they would not have been impressed by Sōhdō’s extraordinary claim that the Second Crusade was intended to avenge his and their city. The Germans are “unequalled for hardness” (a compliment that could equally be a slur), but easily outdone in intelligence by the wily Byzantines. Moreover, Sōhdō claims that internal divisions among the Crusaders made them abandon the siege of Damascus and return to Jerusalem “in deep disgrace”. Irony injurious to the Germans, who actually entered an alliance with the Byzantines against the Normans about the time this was written, may have been indirectly flattering to Melisende; for she could perhaps have claimed, with Baldwin’s complicity, that her immature son had been led astray by Conrad III and that the Germans were actually to blame for the disastrous idea of besieging Damascus.⁵⁶ Yet we must remember that a Syriac colophon was not intended for Frankish readers. Considering the old understanding between the Jacobites and Melisende, the irony should probably be seen as the rehearsal of a partisan version of events inspired by the queen, by which the scribe hoped to ingratiate himself with his bishop.

No one will believe that the memory of a village which, like ‘Adasiyya and Bayt ‘Arīf, had been unjustly appropriated by the Franks in the First Crusade, can have slumbered until 1148, when it was awakened miraculously in the mind of a man who was not even as old as the Conquest. Dayr

54 Chabot (1920-74), vol. 2, p. 200 (translation, vol. 4, p. 150); Baršawm (1943), p. 398 f., No. 217.

55 There is no evidence before this date of double leadership by a bishop and an abbot in the monastery at Jerusalem, but it is occasionally attested for the Jacobite monastery of Qartmīn from the eighth century onwards: Palmer (1990a), p. 94 f.

56 On the siege of Damascus, see Mayer (1988), pp. 102-4.

Ḍakariyya was more probably an estate confiscated from the Melkites, as the first colophon describes other Melkite estates having been confiscated before 1138, an estate which lay uncultivated, perhaps. Not only the name, which suggests a monastic estate, but also the elaborate fiction by which Dayr Ḍakariyya was “restored” to its “original owners”, indicates this;⁵⁷ for a counter-claim can hardly have been anticipated from any other quarter. Besides, French hostility towards the Byzantines was growing at this time. The injustice could be justified as a “punishment” for the “treachery” of which Constantinople was accused.

Hungry Frankish mouths there must have been and the Franks lacked sufficient institutions such as the Jacobite monasteries to minister to their daily needs; the bishop may have been approached by the Latin clergy with the request to care for the Frankish poor as he was caring for his own. He exploited his advantage to gain from a passing crisis a permanent endowment for his monastery. Acting like a canny businessman, he played down the income from the estates attached to the extramural monastery at ʿAdasiyya, which he claimed was sufficient only for the community’s subsistence in a normal year. He was able to obtain credit without asking for a loan in advance, presumably from rich Jacobites elsewhere⁵⁸ who thereby gained shares of some kind in the new investment. At the same time he could disguise it as a venture of faith, inspired by God for charitable purposes which went beyond the demands of blood-relationship, with reliance only on the “just” claims of the Jacobites and with no conception, at first, of the financial dimension that would be involved!

The acquisition of Dayr Ḍakariyya may have been seen by the Jacobites, too, as an “insurance policy” against an unfavourable outcome to the continuing dispute over the other two villages. None of our Syriac colophons alludes to this problem; the evidence for it comes from the other side. About 1161 a Latin record attests “that the dispute between the two convents of, on the one hand, the Canons of the Holy Sepulchre and, on the other hand, the

⁵⁷ Conspicuously absent is a statement like that made in the first colophon with reference to the other estates, namely that the original deeds of sale were exhibited as proof of the claim; and we note that the price was much higher than the total paid out in reappropriating the other villages. The queen may have seen Dayr Ḍakariyya as a way of ensuring the gratitude of the Jacobites, whatever should happen after her death, since, as we shall see, their claim to the other estates was still contested. According to Mayer (1988), p. 175, she also gave them endowments. It is possible that she so compensated them in advance, that whatever concessions they might have to make after her death would be acceptable.

⁵⁸ Not only Melitene, but also the coastal cities must have contained a Jacobite mercantile community, which explains the establishment and growth of the churches there; these merchants were no doubt descended from opportunistic pilgrims, for, as we saw in Part One, pilgrimage was combined with trade, even if the combination was officially frowned upon by the Church.

monks of the Jacobite church of St Mary Magdalene, concerning the estates of Ramath and Hadessa (presumably Bayt 'Arīf and 'Adasiyya), which had continued for a long time, has been brought to a harmonious conclusion (*ad finem concordiae*). The Canons had other estates in the area of these two villages, which were situated north of Jerusalem on either side of the Nablus road (Prawer [1980], p. 126). These may originally have belonged to Geoffrey of the Tower of David, since both Michael and Romanus, the authors of our first two Syriac colophons, describe the Jacobite estates as an enclave within Geoffrey's fief. The laws of the kingdom seem to have allowed — though a legal suit about 1140 contested — an exchange of land between the Canons and a vassal, so the Canons may have derived their claim from some sort of deal with Geoffrey or his heirs. Geoffrey's familiarity with the Latin patriarch and the Canons of the Holy Sepulchre is attested (Prawer [1986], p. 304 f., reading "Geoffrey de la Tour" for Prawer's "Geoffrey of Tours").

As the Jacobite author of the first Syriac colophon reports, with an accuracy guaranteed by his crucial obliviousness of the alternative interpretation, Geoffrey had sworn, on 3 February, 1138, "with oaths in front of the king and his great men", in the following terms: "From this day onwards the fortress is free from all coveting". This left technically open the question of the estates as opposed to the monastic buildings from which they were managed. It was, I suggest, this loophole which allowed his claim to these lands to be revived, albeit after the claim had been acquired by the Canons of the Holy Sepulchre. So long as Queen Melisende lived, she will have wanted to maintain her credibility with the Jacobites. The most recent editor of the cartulary of the Holy Sepulchre dates the Latin document around 1161. This independently established date makes it probable that Melisende's influence prevented the resolution of the dispute to the satisfaction of the Canons until her death in that year. By the time of her death the Jacobites may have been sufficiently compensated for whatever concessions they had to make to the Canons, which would justify the implication of mutual satisfaction in the phrase *ad finem concordiae*. Possession of the Tower itself, at any rate, cannot have been disputed without contravening the terms of Geoffrey's oath.⁵⁹

6. *Saladin's Conquest of Jerusalem in 1187*

Such is the history of Queen Melisende and the Jacobite estates outside Jerusalem up to the time of the queen's death in 1161. Whatever estates the

⁵⁹ Rozière (1849), pp. 120, 221, Nos. 49 and 119; Röhrich (1893, 1904), pp. 96, 200, Nos. 268 and 365; Cerulli (1943), p. 14; Prawer (1980), pp. 96 ff., 333; Bresc-Bautier (1984), No. 131, p. 257 f.

Jacobites retained after that date were surely lost when Saladin took Jerusalem in 1187, though they may have been recovered for a short period when the Crusaders returned in the thirteenth century. As we saw in Part One, section 4, the Jacobite title to the monastery at 'Adasiyya was adapted in 1532 to support their claim to another property within the city-walls. Evidently the Jacobites had by then long abandoned any hope of recovering the country estates managed from the monastery properly designated by this name.

Seven years after Melisende's death the recently elected patriarch of the Jacobites, Michael I,⁶⁰ made his first pilgrimage to Jerusalem. He arrived there on Thursday of Holy Week, 1168, and went straight to the Holy Places to pray; that same evening he repaired to Mary Magdalene's to consecrate the Holy Chrism.⁶¹ In his own record of this visit Michael speaks simply of "our monastery at Jerusalem",⁶² but this need not imply that St Mary Magdalene's had already lost its monastic fortress at 'Adasiyya and the fortress built after 1148 at Dayr Ḍakariyya, which was presumably also occupied by monks and nuns (*cf.* notes 37 and 41). The third Syriac colophon uses the plural "monasteries" to refer to St Mary's and the Tower of 'Adasiyya, but since the latter and its twin at Dayr Ḍakariyya were offshoots of the city monastery, the whole concern could presumably be identified with that centre and so referred to as one "monastery".

On Easter Saturday, Michael visited the Latin patriarch, Amaury, who received him with honour. The relevant part of Michael's own chronicle is missing and we do not know what passed between the two men.⁶³ The Jacobite ownership of the country estates had been contested, perhaps successfully, by the Canons of the Holy Sepulchre, but whatever the "harmonious solution" of 1161 had been, it is unlikely that the subject could have been reopened by the Latin patriarch in 1168, even at the request of the Jacobite patriarch. The evidence presented in Part One, section 6, suggests that one result, if not the object, of Michael's visit may have been the concession of the chapel of St James in the Holy Sepulchre, which the

60 This is the famous "Michael Syrus" whose unsatisfactorily published *Chronicle* is a mine of unique historical evidence.

61 Abbeloos and Lamy (1872-77), vol. 2, col. 545 f.; French translation: Chabot (1899-1910), vol. 3, p. 332.

62 He uses the same phrase in the note described by Nau (1914b), p. 379.

63 John of Ibelin, in his *Book*, written about 1261, recorded the tradition that the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem in the twelfth century "si a suffragant l'arcevesque des Ermins qui est au reiaume de Jerusalem, et l'arcevesque des Jacopins" (*RHC, Lois*, I, p. 416); Bernard Hamilton, who told me this in his letter dated 2 vii 1990, adds: "It seems to me improbable — all the evidence suggests that the Jacobite archbishops were responsible to their own Patriarchs alone and were protected by the Frankish kings". Probably John's information is coloured by the thirteenth-century situation, on which see the reference in note 43.

Jacobites appear to have been granted between 1165 and 1173. But there was probably a political reason for doing the Latin patriarch of Jerusalem the honour of a visit, while pointedly not showing the same respect to the Greeks. For when Michael visited the Latin patriarch of Antioch in the following year, he complacently recorded in his *Chronicle* that this was interpreted by the Greeks as a snub.⁶⁴ The Emperor Manuel I Comnenus was eager to reunite the Oriental Orthodox Churches with the Church of Constantinople and sent repeated invitations to Michael in the 1170s to negotiate directly with him or with his envoy, but Michael always sent a delegate instead.⁶⁵ He submitted a statement of the Jacobite Faith, composed in Greek, but he showed no desire for the proposed Union. This reluctance contrasts with that openness towards the Latin Church which we have observed in Jacobite records of the twelfth century and which was to lead the Jacobites ever closer to Rome in the course of the century that followed.

One of Michael's representatives in the abortive discussions with the Byzantine imperial envoy was his secretary and godson, Theodore bar Wabhūn, a scholar of Syriac, Greek, Armenian and Arabic. This very obstinate man appears to have sabotaged the negotiations by insisting that they be conducted on the basis of Aristotelian logic.⁶⁶ At some date after his clandestine consecration as alternative patriarch in 1180 Bar Wabhūn, who had rebelled in that year against the nepotistic Michael, was disappointed of Saladin's support for his rival claim to Michael's title. He then approached the Latin patriarch of Jerusalem and tried to secure possession of St Mary Magdalene's and its estates. Michael immediately sent representatives to prevent this. In his *Chronicle* he describes the Jacobite monks who were harassed at that time by Bar Wabhūn as "a remnant". He may be distinguishing a loyal minority in the Jerusalem community from the rest. Michael's brother, Athanasius Šlibō, had not been well received by the monastic community when he was transferred from Mardin to the see of Jerusalem, perhaps because Sōhdō, the author of our third colophon, was considered to be in line for the succession.⁶⁷ Nevertheless, the anonymous Syrian author of the *Chronicle to AD 1234*, who was himself in Jerusalem at the time, remarks

64 "Michael's visit to Aimens of Limoges surely was a snub to the Orthodox Patriarch, who was enthroned in Antioch cathedral at the time as a result of Manuel Comnenus' intervention" (Bernard Hamilton, letter of 2 vii 1990).

65 E.g. Abbeloos and Lamy (1872-77), vol. 2, col. 549 f.; French translation: Chabot (1899-1910), vol. 3, pp. 333-6.

66 On the negotiations between the Jacobites and the Byzantines and especially on Bar Wabhūn, see now H. Kaufhold, "Zur Kirchengeschichte des 12. Jahrhunderts: neue Quellen über Theodoros bar Wabhūn", *OC*, 74 (1990), pp. 115-151.

67 Chabot (1899-1910), XXI 2, vol. 3, p. 394 (Syriac text, pp. 727-8); Abbeloos and Lamy (1872-77), vol. 2, col. 595 f.

that Šlībō was good-natured enough to be able to persuade Bar Wabhūn to give up his campaign against legitimate authority;⁶⁸ and he seems to have been willing to delegate his authority over the community itself to Sōhdō (see note 55). But after this Bar Wabhūn committed a *volte-face*: according to Michael himself, his dispute with him dragged on until the Muslims captured the city in 1187.⁶⁹

In forcing an entry to Jerusalem, Saladin concentrated on the North-West corner, where he eventually succeeded in breaking down the wall. Not far from the breach, as we saw in Part One, was St Mary Magdalene's. The large institutional buildings and the cisterns must immediately have been requisitioned by the conquerors. After the conquest all male and female Christians who could pay a ransom of ten and five dinars, respectively, were given a safe conduct away from the city; the rest, except for the very old, were kept behind to rebuild the walls and then to be sold as slaves. The clergy and the monks were shown no more respect than laymen and the nuns were systematically raped (Chabot 1920-74, vol. 2, p. 201; trans. vol. 4, p. 171). Šlībō, the Jacobite bishop, was obliged to abandon his post. Some Jacobite monks, carrying with them manuscripts from St Mary Magdalene's, fled to Cyprus, where they were seen by Johann van Cootwyck.⁷⁰ Michael himself, adding to his *Chronicle* between 1193 and 1196, speaks of "the monastery of Mary Magdalene which we used to possess".⁷¹ As for Sōhdō, he succeeded at last, in 1193, to an impoverished bishopric in exile; if he ever returned to the city, he certainly did not reoccupy his monastery.

Yet St Mary Magdalene's did not disappear from history, nor was it destroyed, as were so many other churches, by Malik al-Mu'azzam in 1224/5.⁷² Thanks to its conversion after 1187 into a Muslim school (the "Maymūniyya") it survived into the second period of Crusader rule, when the magnificent

68 Chabot (1899-1910), XXI 1, vol. 3, pp. 382-8 (Syriac text, pp. 721-5); Chabot (1920-74), vol. 2, p. 200 (translation, vol. 4, p. 150).

69 Chabot (1899-1910), vol. 3, p. 394, Syriac text, pp. 727-8; Abbeloos and Lamy 1872-77, vol. 2, col. 595f.

70 Cobham (1908), p. 197, cited by Meinardus (1960), p. 16. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, syriaque 64, a Syriac philological manuscript containing a note by the patriarch Michael dated 1179, at the Jacobite monastery of St Mary Magdalene in Jerusalem, was subsequently taken to Cyprus, whence it reached the library of Colbert: Nau (1914b), p. 379. The inference that there were Jacobite mercantile interests in Acre, Tyre and Tripoli, along the pilgrimage-route (see note 58) suggests that these looked towards the prosperous island of Cyprus as well; nor was the legendary Baršawmō the only pilgrim to be diverted there by an adverse wind (see Part One, section 3). Being thus apparently at the hub of an economic community shared with lay merchants which included the pilgrimage-industry, agriculture and trade, the monks from Jerusalem will have belonged to a network which extended at least as far as Cyprus.

71 Chabot (1899-1910), XXI 1, 5 and 7 (Syriac text, pp. 723, 734f. and 737).

72 Chabot (1920-74), vol. 2, p. 228 (translation, vol. 4, p. 171).

early twelfth-century church-building enjoyed a new lease of life as the Jacobite cathedral. The monks may even have been blessed through the loss of their wealth and through their exile in Cyprus, already perhaps invigorated by the youthful ideals of the Dominican Order, which was to make so many disciples among the Jacobites in the following fifty years.⁷³ For by 1236, according to the Syriac chronicler Bar Hebraeus (died 1286), the community of St Mary Magdalene's counted seventy monks.⁷⁴ Probably the country estates attached to the city-monastery had become, under Islamic law, religious endowments of the *Maymūniyya*; if so, they will have reverted irrevocably to the "New *Maymūniyya*" when the Crusaders finally abandoned the Holy City, since an Islamic religious endowment, or *waqf*, is regarded as God's inalienable property and can, in theory, never be sold or exchanged. This must remain a likelihood until documentary evidence of such an endowment shall be recognized. In the meantime, somebody may perhaps discover, near a Palestinian village in the Zionist-occupied hills north of Jerusalem, the sturdy lower storeys of a twelfth-century tower with Syriac and Arabic inscriptions.

73 The story of the relations between the Jacobites and the Dominicans, and through them with the Bishop of Rome, is well told by Bernard Hamilton (reference in note 43). The only correction which I can make in his account (p. 349, with note 5 there) is that Bar Hebraeus's name for the Dominicans has nothing to do with "Syria", but is derived, parrot-fashion, from the French name, "*frères prêcheurs*", to which is added the Syriac adjectival plural "-ōyē".

74 If indeed the monks were made holier by their exile, the same did not apply to the merchants: sectarianism in Jerusalem society, which of course had consequences for business networks as well as for holy shrines, continued unabated. In the Book of the Assizes of the Burghers' Court, written in 1243-44, we read that no Nestorian can take a Jacobite to court without two Jacobite witnesses, no Jacobite a Samaritan without two Samaritan witnesses, and so forth, which implies that co-religionaries were expected to give false witness against a person of another denomination. See Beugnot (1843), p. 55, cited by Cerulli (1943), p. 18 f., who also refers to Grandclaude (1923) and Recoura (1924/5). Jacobite and other oriental merchants had long been burghers of Jerusalem. The franchise had been extended by Baldwin II and enhanced by free trade in agricultural goods specifically for the purpose of attracting the local population (William of Tyre, XII 15).