

## Franks and Natives in the Crusader States: the State of the Question

In one of the most celebrated, but also least well understood passages in his extraordinary chronicle of the 1<sup>st</sup> Crusade and early establishment of the Crusader States, Fulcher of Chartres considers the meaning and significance of the settlement of Franks in the holy Land:

For we who were Occidentals have now become Orientals. He who was a Roman or a Frank has in this land been made into a Galilean or a Palestinian. He who was of Rheims or Chartres has now become a citizen of Tyre or Antioch. We have already forgotten the places of our birth; already these are unknown to many of us or not mentioned any more. Some already possess homes or households by inheritance. Some have taken wives not only of their own people but Syrians or Armenians or even Saracens who have obtained the grace of baptism. One has his father-in-law as well as his daughter-in-law living with him, or his own child if not his stepson or stepfather. Out here there are grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Some tend vineyards, others till fields. People use the eloquence and idioms of diverse languages in conversing back and forth. Words of different languages have become common property known to each nationality, and mutual faith unites those who are ignorant of their descent. Indeed it is written, "The lion and the ox shall eat straw together" [Isai. 62: 25]. He who was born a stranger is now as one born here; he who was born an alien has become as a native.

This piece of writing, multi-valent, elusive, in some respects contentious, conveys something of the complexities of Frankish identity in the East, the social and economic imperatives underlying immigration, as well as the aspirations of a particularly thoughtful and articulate member of the 'new' Frankish community in the East. It also, I think, serves as a warning to historians attempting the task I have been set for today: to offer an overview of the encounter between Franks and the indigenous peoples of the eastern Mediterranean in the context of the Crusades.

Fulcher's coinage of the term *occidentales*, while not quite a neologism, appears to be one of the most striking early usages of a generic term to represent 'those coming from the west'. The passage was probably written in the 1120s, in reflective mental stock-taking on Fulcher's part about the first generation of Frankish settlement in Outremer. A cursory search on the *Corpus Christianorum* database reveals only a couple of significant earlier examples of such a self-consciously drawn contrast between *Occidentales* and *Orientales*: both, tellingly, in relation to the Crusades. Guibert de Nogent, writing his *Dei gesta per Francos* in 1108/9, argues for the logical circularity of the Crusade, in which the *occidentales* whose racial and spiritual identity originally came from the east, accomplished the restoration of Jerusalem to its rightful ownership. Elsewhere, Guibert contrasts supposed cultural attributes of *orientales* – specifically 'the science of the stars' – with the more tenuous knowledge of such things among *occidentales*. Sigebert of Gembloux likewise, and also in the context of the first crusade, uses *occidentales* as a collective noun for people from 'Hispania, Provence, Aquitaine, Britannia, Scottia et Anglia, Normnady, Francia, Lotharingia, Burgundy, Germany, Lombardy, and Apulia'.

Fulcher's usage of the term in this passage calls to mind his preoccupation, earlier in the chronicle, with the forging of a common purpose from multifarious communities. One thinks, for example, of his claim, in his account of the siege of Antioch in 1097, that despite the clamour of different languages, crusaders could easily understand each other because of the common purpose they shared. The linguistic dimensions of Fulcher's contrast between *occidentales* and *orientales*, who form a single political and social identity in the East, are prefigured in first crusade chroniclers' usage of terms such as *francigeni* (Bull). Alan Murray has suggested, in a brilliantly astute essay, that the first crusade functioned for contemporaries and later 12<sup>th</sup> century writers as a kind of *origo gentium* myth. A new state required an identity created from, but substantially different to, the individual elements of its composition. The new *gens* created by the Frankish settlement in the east was characterised, in Fulcher's view, by intermarriage between Franks and indigenous peoples. Intermarriage produced children in the next generation who were genuinely products both of the cultural environment and of a mixed cultural and religious heritage. If this was clear to Fulcher as early as the 1120s, it must have been a distinctive and well-established dimension of Outremer already by the middle of the twelfth century. If Fulcher is right, then any consideration of how the Frankish settlers dealt with the indigenous subject peoples must be coloured by this biological factor.

The problem is that historians have quite rightly, been cautious of taking Fulcher at his word. For one thing, the passage I quoted is framed within a larger tour d'horizon of Outremer in which the chronicler wants to depict sunlight rather than shadow: his theme is the prosperity and stability of crusader society, the benefits of settlement in the east, and the greater wealth to be enjoyed there than in the west. It is, in short, a recruiting poster for new settlers from among the 'old occidentals'. Another problem, however, lies in the paucity of source material from the twelfth century that can confirm Fulcher's idealised picture of racial harmony. The episode Fulcher uses to introduce this discussion – the appearance in the sky of a comet shaped like a hyacinth bloom – occurred in 1124. Only four years earlier, the Council of Nablus had decreed harsh penalties for Franks who were found to have engaged in sexual relations with Muslims – so unusually harsh, indeed, that they seem to have no parallel in contemporary western law. Fulcher, it is true, is careful to specify that marriages could only take place with native Christians. Nevertheless, the extent of such mixed-race marriages between Franks and indigenous Christians is impossible to determine. By the time of the third Crusade Angevin crusaders were openly mocking a category within crusader society in Outremer they called *poulains* ('pullani') – but whether this referred specifically to offspring of mixed-race marriages or more generically to Franks who had been born in the East is unclear. At the top of society – in the royal house and the higher aristocracy – marriages for political purposes between Frankish princes or nobles and Byzantine or Armenian princesses were not uncommon. Human nature would seem to suggest that such marriages also occurred at those levels of society that remain unrepresented in the records. Charter evidence from the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries gives us some names that clearly represent Francophone versions of Greek or Syrian originals, but no systematic survey of these has been undertaken. Moreover, human nature will only work as a guide to the question, in the absence of sufficient data, if we are prepared to accept a model of crusader society in which there were opportunities for such marriages – in other words, if a sufficient degree of integration existed between Franks and native peoples. [Although of course there were doubtless unmarried liaisons between Franks and Syrians, whether Christian or Muslim, that produced illegitimate offspring].

The question of whether such integration could have occurred brings us up against historiographical positions that are entrenched not only in debates about how to

interpret a variety of written and unwritten sources, but in the national politics of historians who have engaged with the problem. A generation of French historians – Emmanuel Rey, Louis Madelin and Gaston Dodu in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, and René Grousset in the 1920s and 30s inherited assumptions made on the basis of a combination of contemporary politics and perceptions of French historical traditions. The French role in the historiography of the Crusades is paralleled by its role in the politics of Syria in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The protectorate established by Napoleon III over Christian communities in Syria and Lebanon in 1860 called upon a crusading heritage that was understood to be peculiarly French: Napoleon told French troops to ‘show yourselves the dignified children of those heroes who gloriously brought the banner of Christ to that land’; the crusaders. Emmanuel Rey’s *Les colonies franques de Syrie aux douzieme et treisieme siecles*, published in 1883, made explicit the perceived relationship between French crusading traditions and the study of crusader society. Rey set out in the preface his intention to study ‘the causes favouring their establishment and development in the midst of an Oriental population of all races: Syrians, Greeks and Armenians.’ Here we see a manifesto for the ‘benevolent colonialism’ that the French hoped to establish in Syria in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century – Rey even invokes, for the first time in crusader historiography, the term ‘colony’ to make the connection explicit. Rey coined the phrase ‘une nation franco-syrienne’ to emphasize the relationship between Franks and colonised peoples. Rey also assumed that Franks and natives lived alongside each other in towns and countryside indiscriminately.

If this ‘benevolent colonial model’, which remained influential until the 1950s, owed a great deal to continuing French political aspirations in the Middle East, it also derived from the examination of a small number of written sources that appeared to support the model of integration between Franks and natives. Naturally, sources from a ‘native’ perspective were particularly valuable, and highest on the list were two Arabic texts, Usama ibn-Munqidh’s *Kitab al-I’tibar (Book of Contemplation)*, translated into English in 1929 as *The Memoirs of an Arab-Syrian Gentleman and Warrior*, and Ibn Jubayr’s *Rihlab/ Travels*, translated by Ronald Broadhurst in 1952. Both texts represented the views of pious 12<sup>th</sup>-century Muslims; and both appeared to describe the Crusader States as an essentially harmonious and mature society in which integration between Franks and natives was the norm. Both texts will be all too familiar to students and teachers of courses on the Crusades: a measure of the reliance placed on them by generations of historians to provide colour and human figures for a canvas that can otherwise appear abstract. Herein also lies the problem: neither can be said to typify the situation they are usually taken to represent; Usama because it was his unique political position, as an Arab territorial lord occupying a position between Seljuqs and Franks, that enabled him to develop friendly relations with the Frankish nobility; Ibn Jubayr because his description of the favourable treatment of Muslim peasants by their Frankish lords is based on a mere glimpse of a specific region during a three-week stay in the Holy Land. Both sources, taken out of context, appear to characterise the relationship between Franks and Muslims as one of accommodation; in fact both, read in totality, leave us in no doubt about the author’s view that war against the Franks was meritorious – indeed Ibn Jubayr, an Andalusian, thinks the Muslims of Syria are rather too soft on them.

Usama provides numerous examples of Franks who appear to have ‘gone native’: they eat only food prepared by native cooks, use bath-houses, permit Usama himself to pray in the al-Aqsa mosque after its conversion to the headquarters of the Templars, and so on. The post WWII generation of crusader historians was on the whole unimpressed by such anecdotal details. R.C. Smail dismissed Usama’s evidence of Franks adopting local customs as being irrelevant to the question of integration. Habits of living were less

signs of cultural assimilation than of appropriation; or, at least no more than sensible accommodation to external conditions. Supporting Joshua Prawer's conclusions about the ethnic stratification of crusader society on the basis of an urban/rural divide in which, in Prawer's words, Franks were 'townees, without roots in the countryside', Smail distinguishes between two opposing and mutually incompatible models of crusader society:

'on the one hand are the scholars who have regarded the orientalising of Frankish manners ...as evidence of the creation of a Franko-Syrian civilisation; on the other hand are those who have assigned greater importance to other aspects of social organization...They consider that the Franks remained a ruling class, separated from their Syrian subjects by language and religion, with force as the ultimate sanction of their domination.'

Smail, writing his seminal study on *Crusading Warfare* in 1956, thought it was time to reject the French 'assimilationist' model as an historical artefact appropriate to the age that had first produced it. At that point this model was still dominant, notably among the first generation of American crusade historians of the prewar period such as Frederic Duncalf and Marshall Baldwin, and in the first works emerging in the 1950s from Grousset's pupil Jean Richard. But if it was easy for Smail to dismiss the French 'benevolent colonialists' as trapped in the political values of their own day, it is no less clear to us that Smail's view can be taken as representative of a post-imperial generation in Anglophone historical scholarship. Smail had no doubt that what he saw when he looked at crusader castle-building was the brutal and systematic repression of a native society; the Franks were a minority military aristocracy whose only chance of surviving in a hostile environment was through the domination and exploitation of the indigenous peoples. It was time to own up to Europe's medieval colonial past, just as his generation was taking responsibility for the European imperialist legacy in Africa and the Middle East.

Smail's emphasis on segregation as the main theme in Frankish-native relations found willing allies in the first generation of post-independence Israeli scholars. Identification with the indigenous peoples, and thus the targets of crusader conquest, led Joshua Prawer and his followers to emphasise Frankish segregationism and to reject the assimilationist ideas of previous scholarship. This tendency reached its height in 1972, when Prawer's *Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, subtitled *European Colonialism in the Middle Ages*, deployed the term 'apartheid' to the judicial system developed in the Crusader States. Like Smail, Prawer saw parallels between European – specifically British – colonialism in the Middle East in the first half of the twentieth century and the Crusader States. As an émigré to Palestine under the British Mandate, Prawer was only too aware of how ephemeral such colonial rule could, in the long run, prove. Prawer's main historical legacy is a body of detailed work that sought western origins and precedents for the laws, tenurial customs and financial structures established by the crusaders in Outremer; that, one might say, denied any say to Fulcher of Chartres' perspective. Most Anglophone historians of the crusader states who reached maturity in the generation after Prawer and Smail – Riley-Smith, for example - were influenced to some degree by their approach to the social, legal and political structures of the crusader States.

But Prawer, and to some extent his followers Benjamin Kedar and David Jacoby, have also seen the danger that the failure of the state of Israel to create an integrated society in relation to its own non-Jewish subjects, could be seen as a parallel to the Crusader settlement of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries – an invitation that has,

not unexpectedly, been taken up by Arab scholars. The first real challenge to the postwar segregationalist approach, indeed, came only in the 1990s, with the work of the archaeologist and historical geographer Ronnie Ellenblum. Ellenblum took issue with the fundamental premise of Smail and Prawer that Franks occupied the towns, leaving the rural hinterland to the native peasantry over which they exercised watchful control by means of strategically-placed castles. Ellenblum's data from the study of place-names, and comparisons of archaeological surveys with Ottoman tax census records, offered an alternative reading of Frankish society. According to this, the deliberate re-settlement of displaced urban Muslim communities in the central rural hinterland of Palestine resulted in areas that were distinctively Muslim, surrounded by larger areas of land dominated by Christian villages. Central to Ellenblum's view are two fundamental points: first, that the original Arab conquests of the seventh century did not result in the large-scale Islamicization of society, which did not in fact occur until the Seljuq conquests of the eleventh century; and second, that Frankish rural settlement merged almost imperceptibly with existing native Christian village communities. Churches in some villages were shared, Byzantine churches being enlarged and new altars installed to accommodate Latin rites. The village of 'Abud, north of Jerusalem, which had an important Syriac-speaking Christian community, is one example known from archaeological evidence of a shared church; another, known from a literary source, is 'Ain Karem, just to the west of Jerusalem, where the Greek church of St John the Baptist was given to the Hospitallers in the 12<sup>th</sup> century and shared by both clergy.

Ellenblum's rejection of the segregationalist view and his optimistic espousal of assimilation differs from the French colonialist school in one important respect: he sees Frankish assimilation with indigenous society as operating wholly in respect of Christians. The Muslim population, for Ellenblum, is almost a negligible quantity – occupying the central highlands of the kingdom of Jerusalem as successors of the Samaritans, but at the same time living in a kind of conceptual penumbra, beyond the pale. Here Ellenblum, while apparently rejecting the assumptions of Prawer, and implicitly the Zionist nationalism that informed them, is in fact no less able than he to escape contemporary political dynamics in his view of the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries. For Ellenblum, the problem was the Muslim population, which he characterizes as largely the result of a 'new' wave of Islamicization imposed on and upsetting the balance of a society in which native Christian communities had already established a *modus Vivendi* with their political masters; the Franks fitted neatly into this pattern, and their treatment of the Muslim natives – enforced resettlement as an agricultural labour force, enslavement in some cases – restored the balance to the situation prevailing before the Seljuq conquest.

The most recent attempt at a synthesis of crusader/native dynamics, Christopher MacEvitt's *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East*, published in 2008, is heavily informed both by Ellenblum's historical geography and, in his pursuit of a *modus Vivendi*, by contemporary aspirational multiculturalism. MacEvitt, indeed, coins a new term, which forms the subtitle of his book: 'rough tolerance'. MacEvitt's horizon extends farther than his predecessors' in one important respect: he deals not only with the kingdom of Jerusalem, where the documentary evidence is already mostly well known, but with the northern frontier state of Edessa, where a systematic study of chronicle evidence from both Latin and Syrian sources was lacking. MacEvitt's conclusion is that the Levant, for the indigenous population, was both less Frankish than historians have supposed, and at the same time more so. Less in that its institutionally Frankish character was less rigid and less thorough than Prawer, Smail, Riley-Smith and others have led us to believe; this is particularly so, he argues, in Edessa, which was less a state than a rather disparate collection of fiefs in which Frankish lords, including the counts of Edessa,

behaved in much the same ways and using much the same tools as their Armenian, Seljuq and Syrian counterparts. Even in the more fully-developed kingdom of Jerusalem MacEvitt finds evidence of local Christians serving as marshals, holding fiefs and acting as local agents for Frankish lords. In a cultural sense, however, this means, in MacEvitt's view, that Frankishness pervaded more fully among indigenous peoples than has been supposed, particularly among local elites who were prepared to see the advantages offered by the new regime. One thinks here of the hegoumen of the Greek Orthodox monastery of St Sabas becoming a *confrater* of the Hospital of St John in the mid 12<sup>th</sup> century; or, indeed, of the interest shown by Michael, Syrian Orthodox patriarch of Antioch, in the western Military Orders in his great chronicle.

Part of the difficulty acknowledged by MacEvitt is that the twelfth century across the Levant presents, rather than a model, a series of impressions from which no overall picture emerges. Let me take as an example the question of reciprocal cultural influences. An episode in Michael the Syrian's chronicle – not found in MacEvitt's book – tells the story of a young Frankish boy and his family in Antioch in 1152. The boy fell from a tree in the garden of his house, and became paralysed and comatose. The boy's mother prayed, in desperation, to the Syrian Orthodox saint Bar Sauma, who appeared to her in a vision and told her to found a church dedicated to him in the city. The Syrian bishop and a delegation from the monastery of Bar Sauma, far to the northeast in the Euphrates basin, arrived at the boy's house; as soon as they started to sing the saint's office, the boy awoke from his coma, got up and began to walk unaided. A crowd of Franks, Armenians and Syrians soon gathered at the place of the miracle, and the Frankish princess of Antioch, Constance, gathered dust from the house as a relic of the saint's presence. The church is duly built and consecrated amid general celebrations in which most of the Christian communities of Antioch participate.

What are we to make of this episode? Clearly the Frankish family's familiarity with the Syrian saint Bar Sauma needed some explanation in the first place, for Michael tells us that the name of the saint had become well known as a result of the war fought over the monastery of Bar Sauma by the Euphrates between Count Joscelyn II of Edessa and the Seljuq Artuqids, during which both attempted to sack it. Part of Michael's agenda is obviously the aggrandisement of the saint and the sway of his spiritual authority even in a city with a Frankish ruling aristocracy. It is also notable that the climax of the story, in Michael's eyes, was not so much the miracle but its result: the founding of the church and the public ritual associated with its consecration in 1158, in which the Syrian Orthodox community enjoyed its hour of glory, to the confusion of the Greeks, who, as Michael records, boycotted it through jealousy. For Michael, the whole affair is about competition for political patronage among the indigenous Christian communities; on this occasion, the Syrian saint Bar Sauma trumps the Greeks – but it is surely significant that the episode ends in 1158, the year in which a Byzantine army invaded Syria and forced the submission of the Frankish prince.

From the Frankish viewpoint, grieving parents will obviously take help for their child from whatever source they can find it; nevertheless, the familiarity of Bar Sauma among the settler community in Antioch is striking. The willingness of Franks to adopt indigenous devotions may be taken as one aspect of the kind of cultural assimilation first noticed by the French 'colonialist' school of scholarship. Nor is this an isolated incident. A 12<sup>th</sup> century liturgical calendar in a breviary produced by the scriptorium of the Latin canons of the Holy Sepulchre shows that the feast of the sixth-century Greek monastic saint Sabas was celebrated by the canons in collaboration with the Greek monks of St Sabas monastery, who maintained a *metochion* in Jerusalem, to which the Latin canons

processed. Sabas and other desert fathers celebrated in the Orthodox liturgy but virtually unknown in the West, such as Onuphrios, are found in the column paintings of the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem – a Latin cathedral with Latin bishop and canons – in the 1160s. More surprising is the evidence of the early 12<sup>th</sup> century redaction of the *typikon* of St Sabas monastery, in which the admission of Franks as monks is treated as a distinct possibility. I've landed myself into trouble before now for suggesting that the early Carmelite hermits a hundred years later may have been following an existing pattern of Greek Orthodox monastic settlement on Mt Carmel; a rash suggestion, perhaps, for the early 13<sup>th</sup> century, but one that is far from being out of place in the earliest years of Frankish settlement in the East. The differences between Latin and Orthodox practices were largely related to custom, not theology, at the beginning of the twelfth century. Wrangling over papal primacy and the inclusion or exclusion of names in the diptychs of Santa Sophia in Constantinople may have exercised popes and cardinals, but not the Frankish laity. Fruitful contacts between the Orthodox patriarchate of Jerusalem and communities in the West can be found in the tenth and eleventh centuries, as is borne out by the visit of Abbot John III of Monte Cassino and some of his monks to the Holy Land in the 990s, by the Greek monks from Jerusalem and Sinai who brought the cult of St Katharine to Normandy in ca.1030, and the various pilgrimages by Frankish and German Benedictines to Jerusalem from the 1020s onward, some of which resulted in substantial gifts of land to the patriarchate in the West.

A surviving charter of the early 12<sup>th</sup> century tells in lapidary outline the story of a Norman crusader who after the siege of Antioch in 1098 professed as a monk at the Greek Orthodox monastery of St Paul, there being as yet no Latin house for him to join. This might have been the act of a man *in extremis* and therefore not to be taken as indicative of a meaningful lack of distinction on the part of westerners. But the *Descriptio translationis reliquiarum et miraculorum* of St Katharine, which survives in a 13<sup>th</sup> century manuscript, hints at a similar disregard for confessional precision in its account of the founding of the Norman monastery of Holy Trinity in Rouen in 1030 by Goscelin and his wife Emmelina: the noble Norman couple provided the funds, but the work of establishing the community was done by a Greek monk from Sinai, Stephen, who had accompanied Symeon of Trier from Egypt and remained behind in Normandy at Goscelin's invitation. The monastery became Benedictine; but what rule and customs did Stephen provide for it at the start? Perhaps it was the Rule of Benedict – the *Dialogues of Gregory the Great*, Book II which of course comprises the *Life of St Benedict*, survives in an 11<sup>th</sup> century Greek manuscript from one of the Holy Land monasteries.

These are small hints on which to base any general picture. Nor can anecdotal examples of Frankish tolerance for local religious practices by themselves necessarily advance the 'assimilationist' theory. As MacEvitt shows, when it suited them, the Frankish settlers behaved with no more favour to local Christian communities than to Muslims. The case of the property of the Syrian Orthodox monastery of St Mary Magdalene in Jerusalem, seized in 1099 and eventually returned to the monastery in the 1130s after involved negotiations, has, since the details were discovered by Andrew Palmer in 1991 in a Syriac manuscript, become a *cause celebre* for illustrating the power dynamics between Franks and indigenous communities. The nature of this evidence, however, tells its own story; a chance discovery in the colophons of a manuscript, uncovered by a scholar of eastern Christian philology. There is no comprehensive body of evidence to tell us what normative relations, treatments or attitudes might have been on either side; the Latin charter evidence is patchy, comprising cartularies from only four great religious houses, the crown of Jerusalem and the Hospitallers, and there are no legal records from the twelfth century. Such Latin documentary records as presumably once

existed did not survive 1187, when we know that the statutes and case law of the kingdom were lost in Saladin's conquest of Jerusalem. Whether the indigenous communities ever recorded their impressions of the Franks or their dealings with them is questionable. What can be pieced together from chronicles such as those of Michael the Syrian, Matthew of Edessa and his continuator, or those of Gregory Ebreo, Dionysus bar Salibi and others, are remarks and asides made by individual observers, often made in the context of theological polemic. The substantial quantity of Christian theological literature in Arabic, and the material in manuscripts copied by Greek, Arabic and Syriac-speaking monks in Syria and the Holy Land – most of which is largely untapped by western historians of the crusades and Crusader States – has little to offer of a systematic nature. Such evidence as it supplies, moreover, tends to be conflicting. As against the report of the welcome given to the Seljuq conqueror of Edessa, Zengi, by the Syrian Christians in 1146, or the apparent role played by a Melkite in suborning the local Christian community in Jerusalem to Saladin's side in 1187, we have the evidence of the help provided to Richard I in locating pieces of the True Cross by the hegoumen of St Sabas, or the dirge composed by an anonymous eastern Christian poet at the defeat of 'our people' at Saladin's hands in 1187.

Moreover, the Franks clearly made another kind of textual impression on local communities. To give just one – so far unnoticed – example, the Coptic *History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria* begins its brief account of the 1<sup>st</sup> crusade with story about a pilgrimage apparently made by Baldwin I to Jerusalem before the preaching of the crusade. This is an alternative version of the story of Peter the Hermit familiar from Albert of Aachen's Chronicle, that presumably reached the Coptic chronicler in Alexandria via the large Syrian Orthodox community in Egypt; it must in origin reflect a tradition emanating from Baldwin's circle in Edessa, where the population was dominated by Armenians and Syrian Orthodox. There may be other witnesses to the reception of Frankish traditions in local Christian writing.

Both those groups of historians I have characterised as 'segregationalists' and 'assimilationists' have dealt largely with the period up to ca.1187. Emphasising the separation between pre and post 1187 situations is to some extent unavoidable. The conquest of Jerusalem by Saladin brought about a shift in the balance of population. Large tracts of rural territory where the Franks had been a minority were lost and never fully recovered; for most of the thirteenth century, the subject Muslim population shrank as the borders of the Crusader States themselves contracted, and the overall ratio between Franks and native peoples must have come closer to, while clearly never reaching, parity. Another reason why the 13<sup>th</sup> century presents a different picture from the 12<sup>th</sup> is the more intensive – invasive, perhaps – role of the papacy in the affairs of the Church in the Crusader States. From the start of the pontificate of Innocent III in 1198 onwards we hear rumblings of discontent about the latitude given to native Christian communities under Frankish rule in Syria, Cyprus and eventually in Greece: priests instead of bishops bless cemeteries; ordinations to the priesthood are being carried out uncanonically; the Orthodox priesthood, both Greek and Syrian, do not practise auricular confession; the Latin laity attend Orthodox churches indiscriminately; Latins practise Islamic ceremonial marriage customs, and so on. These concerns are, if we grant the addition of local colour, essentially the same pastoral concerns that characterised the age of IVth Lateran elsewhere in Christendom. The eastern 'colonies', if we can call them that, of Christian Europe, were beginning to experience the same degree of centralised governance as the 'centre'.



It is also from the late 12<sup>th</sup> century onward that we start to see textual categorizations of the subject peoples. Latin pilgrimage accounts had already from mid-century drawn attention to the multiplicity of confessions and faiths to be found in the Holy Land. A text probably written in response to a request for information about the current state of the Holy Land from the papal curia in the 1180s, the *Tractatus de statu et populo terrae sanctae*, lists the indigenous Christian peoples according to theology, language, custom and also to some extent appearance: hair styles and head-coverings being particularly significant. One is reminded of the legal prescriptions against the English settlers in Ireland adopting indigenous hair-styles – the authorities needed to be able to tell who was who, and how people fitted into legally prescriptive categories of identity. This text was adopted and expanded upon by Jacques de Vitry, bishop of Acre 1216-29 in his *Historia Hierosolymitana*. For Jacques, distinctions among the indigenous peoples are primarily confessional. Thus he treats the Arabic-speaking Greek Orthodox Christians – the Melkites or ‘Suriani’ separately from the Syrian Orthodox – or ‘Jacobites’ – although the main distinction between them was one of theological observance rather than ethnicity or racial identity. But Jacques’ taxonomy of the indigenous peoples, Muslims as well as Christians, developed apparent connections between theological or confessional identity and ethnic characteristics. Thus, the Syrian Orthodox were not only theologically in error by virtue of being Monophysites, they were also to be despised for their failure to establish polities of their own; a failure to be explained, in Jacques’ eyes, by their inferiority in war. A combination of classical stereotypes about Greeks and Syrians – one thinks of Juvenal’s ‘graeculus esuriens’ – and the insecurities posed by Arabic-speaking Christians in one’s own diocese – they don’t even have their own language, Jacques points out, but use Greek in the liturgy and Arabic in everyday speech – placed them on the margins of the Christian world, in much the same ways as the Irish are characterised by Bernard of Clairvaux as being only nominally Christian because of their irregular marriage customs. In support of this apparently ‘segregationalist’ textual tradition stands such evidence as the 13<sup>th</sup> century legal sources provide. In the *Assises de Jerusalem* and the *Assises des Bourgeois*, all non-Franks, whether Muslim, Christian, or indeed Jewish, are lumped together as an indistinguishable second tier, ‘those not of the rule of Rome’, and subject to different penalties from Franks for the same offences.

The 13<sup>th</sup> century – also the period in which we see the large-scale appropriation of property in Cyprus and its transfer from native land-owners to conquering Franks – thus appears to present consistent evidence for the disruption of the *modus Vivendi* of the 12<sup>th</sup> century. But a critical distinction, as always, must be made between ‘what happened’ and ‘what was going on’. Contrary to the impression given by legal sources, ecclesiastical or civil, what was going on included a new kind of cultural synthesis between Frankishness and eastern Christianity. Beni Kedar has drawn attention to what he characterises as ‘intercultural careers’ such as that of the Syrian Christian physician Theodore of Antioch, who moved with apparent ease between western and Muslim patrons. The survival of a late 13<sup>th</sup> cent. Old French-Arabic vocabulary, first published in 1888 but largely overlooked by historians, suggests intensive interaction between Arabic-speaking Copts and Franks in the kingdom of Jerusalem. A further – and final, for today – category of evidence is visual culture. I have alluded already to the Bethlehem column paintings of the 1160s, which must themselves be seen in the context of a full-scale redecoration of the church that included mosaic cycles in the nave and apse. The use of mosaic is itself a mark of a certain kind of cultural influence – or, pace Smal, of Frankish aristocratic taste. The Bethlehem redecoration should be viewed alongside, for example, the heavily Byzantinising Melisende Psalter of twenty years earlier, or this Gospel book of the 1160s – both from the scriptorium of the Holy Sepulchre – to give a further

indication of how 'Byzantine' such taste was by the mid-12<sup>th</sup> century. Visual culture has not yet been fully deployed by followers of either the segregationist or assimilationist models of Frankish society in Outremer. R.C. Smail might well have argued that it proves little other than that Frankish settlers in Outremer enjoyed fine Byzantinising painting in much the same way as they took to sugar or carpets, or glass, as products of the East that made life more pleasant. I'm not sure this argument stands up, especially when we consider the large number of icons apparently made for Frankish use by eastern Christian or Byzantine-trained craftsmen from the late 12<sup>th</sup> century onwards. This example, from 1180s, shows 'universal' saints in the upper register – Paul, James, Stephen – with more specifically western saints below them, including St Martin of Tours and St Leonard of Limoges. The icon in triptych featuring the BVM and Child from 1250s made probably either at St Katharine's or at a workshop of the monastery in Acre combines Byzantine and western iconographic motifs, while stylistic comparisons have been made with the Arsenal Bible, made for Louis IX at Acre in 1250s. The same combination of Byzantine and western motifs is seen in this icon of SS George and Theodore – notably the crusader-style pennants on the staffs and the western saddle – although the patron, George Parisi, is probably Greek. More curious is the icon with the Deesis and five saints, also late 13<sup>th</sup> cent, in which the text is Greek but the saints appear to show a mixture of eastern and western attributes - the central figure wears the omophorion and polystaurion with crosses typical of Orthodox bishops, whereas the figure to his left wears what appears to be a Cistercian belted tunic, and all five have western-style tonsures. The identity of the figures is uncertain, but the manner of representation suggests a multicultural artistic milieu of both artists and clients. More telling is the question of the uses of these icons. If they were made for Greek Orthodox patrons, then the western iconographic and stylistic influences are revealing evidence of either the entry of western artists into a typically eastern field of artistic production, or of the insertion of western influences into local art. But if the patrons were western, then the question turns on what the icons were used for. Why were Franks or Italians commissioning icons in 12<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> centuries, and what did they use them for? Is the existence of such objects a further indication of the influence of devotional practices comparable to the Bar Sauma incident? Or does it suggest, more simply, generically eastern cultural taste on the part of the Frankish aristocracy, and the loss of the original theological purpose of the icon?

In this survey I have done little more than sketch some of the main lines of enquiry and types of evidence that have been used – and overlooked – by historians of the crusader States. I hope it is apparent that the question of colonial mentalities is central to the cultural history of the crusader States, and I venture to suggest that such a cultural history may also have a role in understanding the wider processes of conquest, settlement, and identity with which the Norman Edge project is concerned.