

PASCHAL II AND THE CRUSADER STATES OF OUTREMER, 1099-1118

REBECCA RIST*

Abstract: *There exists a vast amount of scholarship on the role of Pope Urban II in organising the First Crusade which led to the creation of the four crusader states of «Outremer». Much less has been written about the role of his successor Paschal II (1099-1118). Through an in-depth analysis of his correspondence, this article examines Paschal's role in continuing to uphold the crusading message of his predecessor and the various ways in which he supported the nascent crusader principalities in the East. This was despite the fact that, in the West, Paschal was beset by political struggles with Holy Roman emperors and antipopes which severely weakened his ability to maintain control of the throne of St Peter. The article argues that it was therefore a remarkable achievement that throughout his pontificate Paschal was able to make such an important contribution to the development of the crusader states in the early twelfth century.*

Keywords: *crusader states; Outremer; papal correspondence; Paschal II; Urban II.*

Resumo: *Existe uma vasta produção historiográfica sobre o papel do Papa Pascoal II na organização da Primeira Cruzada, a qual conduziu à criação dos quatro estados cruzados do «Outremer». Muito menos tem sido escrito, contudo, acerca do papel do seu sucessor, Pascoal II (1099-1118). Através de uma análise aprofundada da sua correspondência, o presente artigo examina o papel de Pascoal na continuidade da mensagem cruzadística do seu predecessor, bem como as diversas formas pelas quais apoiou as nascentes entidades políticas cruzadas no Oriente. Tal ocorreu apesar de, no Ocidente, Pascoal se encontrar confrontado com intensas disputas políticas com os imperadores do Sacro Império Romano-Germânico e com antipapas, as quais debilitaram significativamente a sua capacidade de manter o controlo da Sé de São Pedro. O artigo sustenta, por conseguinte, que constitui um facto notável o facto de, ao longo do seu pontificado, Pascoal ter conseguido dar um contributo tão relevante para o desenvolvimento dos estados cruzados no início do século XII.*

Palavras-chave: *Estados cruzados; Outremer; correspondência pontifícia; Pascoal II; Urbano II.*

Historians have long discussed the role of Urban II (1088-1099) in the First Crusade (1096-1099) and the creation of the four crusader states of «Outremer» — «the land beyond the sea» — which were established as a result of the First Crusade: the Kingdom of Jerusalem, the Principality of Antioch, the County of Edessa, and the County of Tripoli — but much less has been said about how that role was continued by his lesser-known successor Paschal II (1099-1118). For an in-depth overview of Paschal's pontificate, all of which discuss his role in the Near East, we have Carlo Servatius's famous monograph, *Paschalis II. (1099-1118): Studien zu seiner Personen und seiner Politik*, written in 1979 (Servatius 1979, *passim*, especially pp. 253-259)

* University of Reading. Email: r.a.c.rist@reading.ac.uk. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9556-5754>.

and seminal books by Glauco Maria Cantarella (Cantarella 1997, *passim*, especially pp. 33-50; Cantarella 1987, *passim*; Cantarella 1982, *passim*). For a recent important work on the eleventh- and twelfth-century papacy's role in steering the direction of the Latin Church in the crusader states, which includes discussion of the policies of Paschal II regarding Outremer we have Miriam Rita Tessera's *Orientalis ecclesia: Papato, Chiesa e regno latino di Gerusalemme (1099-1187)*. Tessera also discussed the letters of Paschal II in terms of their biblical imagery in Elizabeth Lapina and Nicholas Morton's *The Uses of the Bible in Crusader Sources* (Tessera 2017, pp. 179-205; Tessera 2010, *passim*).

With the exception of these notable scholars, however, much less has been said about Paschal's relations with the crusaders and western settlers of the crusader states of «Outremer». It is well known that near the end of his pontificate, in 1116, Paschal called for a crusade in the Iberian peninsula following a petition from Raymond Berengar III (1086-1131) to aid him in his assault on Barcelona, thereby marking an important milestone in the papal contribution to the *Reconquista* against Muslims in Spain (Servatius 1979, pp. 139-140). But in general what has been written about Paschal has tended to concentrate on his long stand-offs with the Holy Roman emperors Henry IV (1084-1105) and Henry V (1111-1125) over lay investiture and his dealings with no less than four antipopes during his troubled pontificate. This has meant that emphasis has often been placed on his struggles, his vacillation, and the weakness of his position in Rome. It has led to him being often seen in a negative light as a weak and vacillating pontiff in comparison to more robust-seeming predecessors such as Leo IX (1049-1054), Gregory VII (1073-1085) or Urban II (1088-1099).

Thus we aim in this investigation to examine anew and in detail Paschal II's correspondence concerning the crusader states, and the decrees of several Church councils in the West discussing the flourishing of Outremer over which he presided. Hence this contribution will analyse the impact of Paschal's papacy on the development of these kingdoms between the conquest of Jerusalem (1099) and the end of his pontificate (1118), while bearing in mind both older and more recent historiography on his papacy and the crusader states.

In his recent seminal article, *The Papacy and the Establishment of the Kingdoms of Jerusalem, Sicily and Portugal: Twelfth-Century Papal Political Thought on Incipient Kingship*, in the *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* (2017), Simon John examined the establishment of the Kingdom of Jerusalem by comparing it with the also nascent Kingdoms of Sicily and Portugal (John 2017, pp. 223-259). He used his investigation of all three kingdoms in order to analyse what twelfth-century popes' expectations were for monarchs living on the borders of Christendom. He argued that although the successors of Gregory VII (1073-1085) continued his powerful rhetoric when

addressing secular rulers in these territories, they were in fact much more cautious in how they dealt with them (John 2017, pp. 258-259).

Although there is much to praise in Simon John's findings, nevertheless, examining Paschal's correspondence afresh reveals the valuable and indeed crucial role that he played throughout his pontificate in steering and overseeing events with regard to the newly-established crusader states. The significance of his role was emphasised in an important article by John Gordon Rowe as early as 1957 in the journal *Speculum* entitled *Paschal II and the Relation between the Spiritual and Temporal Powers in the Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Rowe 1957, pp. 470-501). Rowe argued that, despite many difficulties, Paschal remained true to the eleventh-century «Gregorian» reform ideals concerning the correct relationship between *regnum* (kingship) and *sacerdotium* (priesthood), while embracing a flexible approach to particular circumstances and keeping in mind at all times the key aim of providing judicious government for Latin Christians living in Jerusalem (Rowe 1957, pp. 500-501).

In another article, *The Papacy and the Ecclesiastical Province of Tyre (1100-1187)*, published in 1960, Rowe further argued that despite criticism of the twelfth-century papacy's often apparently inconsistent approach to problems in the relationship between rulers and Patriarchs in the crusader kingdoms, we must remember the immense difficulties which popes, including Paschal, faced when attempting to make correct judgements for their wellbeing. Not least were those of communication over the vast distances involved and often a dearth of up-to-date information at their disposal (Rowe 1960, pp. 160-189). Yet even Rowe, in his later 1966 article *Paschal II, Bohemund of Antioch and the Byzantine Empire*, implied at times that Paschal had no real policies in the crusader states and was unsure of what the papal agenda should be in that region (Rowe 1966, pp. 165-202).

Indeed in the past the scholarly consensus tended to be that although Paschal II maintained interest in the affairs of the Latin East throughout his pontificate, nevertheless his understanding of these matters was insufficient to the complexities of the internal politics of Outremer. By contrast, in this article I will demonstrate that, despite continual political difficulties both at home and abroad, in regard to the crusader states Paschal proved himself both sensitive and flexible in responding to a wide range of demanding personalities and complex issues. Hence, as argued by a growing number of recent scholars of his pontificate, I argue that we should see Paschal, however beleaguered and even vacillating at times, in a much more positive and proactive light than he has often been portrayed. Thus through examining afresh Paschal's correspondence to the crusader states the goal is not only to make his contribution to the development of the crusader states better known, but to help to rehabilitate his reputation in this arena.

In particular my aim is to contribute further to our understanding of Paschal II's complex and developing relationship with Outremer by seeking answers to the following questions: To what extent did Paschal's letters to the Christian faithful in Europe provide them with useful information on the development of the crusader states? What papal appeals were made for fresh military and financial aid from the West? What letters of Paschal to leaders, clergy, Military Orders, and laymen and women living in Outremer and hoping to carve out and maintain new territories, dealt with the challenges and opportunities facing those who remained in Outremer after the First Crusade? What was Paschal's understanding of the religious and political implications of the imposition of the Latin rite in areas which were traditionally Greek Orthodox? Did Paschal attempt to build relations with non-Latin Christians in the crusader states? As already indicated, Paschal's letters will be contextualized with contemporary conciliar legislation where appropriate.

Before examining his correspondence, we need to say a few words about what is commonly known about Paschal and Outremer to give the letters some historical context. Originally Ranierius, a monk from Cluny, Paschal was consecrated pope following the death of Urban II on 14 August 1099 and had an exceptionally long pontificate of almost twenty years (Servatius 1979, pp. 40-41). In response to the success of the First Crusade and the establishment of the crusader states, he continued his predecessor Urban's call for crusading, including preaching the crusade of 1100-1101 which was minor compared to the First, and comprised three separate movements, organised in 1100 and 1101 (Servatius 1979, pp. 253-259). This served, however, to cement the importance of Outremer in western imagination and to allow the crusader states to survive after the initial waves of crusaders had returned home.

Although his Register does not survive, we have many of Paschal's letters from which we can piece together his interest in these crusader states, which were of course only one of his many concerns in office (Blumenthal 1998, pp. 1-18). The extent to which popes were actively involved in the composition of papal letters, the degree to which we can discern a pope's voice through his correspondence, and the amount of input of the scribes and notaries at the papal curia who wrote and manufactured the letters, are all matters of continuing historical debate. Yet an examination of their language is nevertheless instructive as it informs us of the contemporary rhetoric circulating at the papal curia and — even more importantly — the «direction of travel» of a particular pontiff in terms of ideas, intentions, and policies. Let us now examine our questions in the light of those letters which we possess.

PASCHAL II, THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CRUSADER STATES, AND FRESH APPEALS TO THE WEST

Right at the beginning of his pontificate, in 1099, Paschal sent a general letter *Omnipotentis Dei miserationibus* to the archbishops, bishops and abbots of France in which he gave thanks for the success of the First Crusade and urged further help for the Latin Church in the crusader states with the promise of the remission of sins (Paschal II 1901, pp. 174-175; Smith 2024, pp. 131-134; Tessera 2010, pp. 62-68; Robinson 1990, pp. 333, 337, 345). News of the conquest of Jerusalem soon spread in the West (Hagenmeyer 1901, pp. 175-176). Then, in 1100, he sent another general letter, *Quod per prophetam* in which he congratulated the bishops, clergy, procurators, soldiers and all the people of the Christian militia — i.e. the crusaders — on the success of the First Crusade and commended to them his legate Maurice, cardinal-bishop of Porto, whom he was now sending to the Holy Land (Paschal II 1901, pp. 178-179; Smith 2024, pp. 142-149; John 2017, pp. 244-245; Tessera 2017, pp. 179-181, pp. 184-187; Tessera 2010, pp. 62-68; Robinson 1990, p. 351, p. 354; Rowe 1957, pp. 478-479).

Following the success of the First Crusade, Maurice became apostolic legate in the Holy Land from 1100 until his death in 1102 (Barber 2012, p. 62; Tessera 2010, pp. 81-82; pp. 406-407). As we shall see, from late 1101 he also acted briefly as Patriarch of Jerusalem. Meanwhile Paschal began to preach a new crusade, calling for reinforcements for the newly-established Kingdom of Jerusalem, urging those who had taken the crusade vow but never departed now to set out to the East, and exhorting those who had, for whatever reason, turned back from the First Crusade, to depart once more.

PASCHAL II AND PAPAL CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE INHABITANTS OF OUTREMER

Of particular importance to those who remained in charge in Outremer was the simmering tensions over who should be Patriarch of Jerusalem. This appointment had traditionally been under the control of the Greek Orthodox Church. After the fall of Jerusalem, however, the Crusaders had established a Latin hierarchy — i.e. a Latin clergy — with a Latin Patriarchate centred on the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

In a letter, *Gloria in altissimis*, composed somewhere between 1100 and 1101 to the consuls of Pisa, Paschal took steps to settle an ongoing dispute about the Patriarchate which had been bubbling since the days of his predecessor (Paschal II 1901, pp. 179-181; Smith 2024, pp. 149-152). In 1099 Arnulf of Choques (d. 1118), despite his purported loose living and the fact that he was the son of a priest, had been appointed as the first Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem (William of Tyre 1986, pp. 421-422; William of Tyre 1844, p. 365; William of Tyre 1976, pp. 380-381). He was, however, subsequently deposed on the grounds that his election was uncanonical,

and with the crusader Bohemond of Taranto's support, a certain Daibert of Pisa (d. 1105), possibly a former legate of Urban II, was elected Patriarch instead (Edgington 2019, pp. 95-98; Skinner 2009, p.164; Murray 2000, p. 92; Matzke 1998, pp. 156-162; Robinson 1990, p. 352; Rowe 1957, pp. 472-477). We possess two of Daibert's letters (Hagenmeyer 1901, pp. 167-174; pp. 176-177; Smith 2024, pp. 123-131, pp. 139-142). Godfrey of Bouillon and Bohemond were both invested with their respective territories of Jerusalem and Antioch, but Baldwin did not pay homage to Daibert for his County of Edessa and their relations remained strained. Daibert was keen to establish the religious and political power of the Patriarchy and on Easter day 1100 Godfrey, although retaining possession of the Holy City, officially appointed Daibert as Patriarch. When Godfrey died, Daibert offered Jerusalem to Bohemond (Rowe 1957, p. 478). Realising Daibert's power, backed by the Pisan fleet, Baldwin, Godfrey's brother, now confirmed Daibert in his see, paid him homage and was duly crowned king of Jerusalem at Bethlehem on Christmas Day 1100 (Edgington 2019, p. 98; John 2017, p. 230; Barber 2012, p. 379, note 92; Skinner 2009, pp. 164-165). Nevertheless, relations between Baldwin and Daibert remained uneasy (Barber 2012, pp. 73-74; Rowe 1957, pp. 479-484).

In the same letter *Gloria in altissimis* Paschal praised the consuls of Pisa that they had so successfully organised that help be shipped for the defence of Jerusalem. Then, referring to the ongoing dispute between Daibert and Arnulf, he commended to them Daibert, their former archbishop, as «now Patriarch of the city of Jerusalem». He emphasised that he supported Daibert against Arnulf whom he declared an «invader of that seat» (i.e. of the Patriarchy), and commended him to the protection to Godfrey of Bouillon and the other crusade leaders who remained in the Near East. He also recommended to the consuls of Pisa his legates who were about to set out for Sardinia on 1 January.

Nevertheless, this was not the end of the matter since the arrival of a Genoese fleet in 1101 weakened Daibert's position. When Paschal's legate, Maurice, arrived to enquire about the legality of Daibert's appointment, Baldwin, now king of Jerusalem and wishing to control the revenues of the Latin Church, accused Daibert of treachery for urging Bohemond to oppose his succession. Although Daibert bribed Baldwin to drop the complaint, that same autumn he retained the whole of a donation partly intended for the king's army, which resulted in Maurice depriving him of his position and briefly ruling as Patriarch of Jerusalem as an interim candidate (1100-1101) (Barber 2012, pp. 73-74; Rowe 1957, pp. 478-479).

Tancred, nephew of Bohemond, and now ruler of Antioch, welcomed Dambert to the city, and when Maurice died in the spring of 1102, and Baldwin needed Tancred's military help, insisted on Daibert's restoration as a condition of his assistance. Baldwin agreed, but on the arrival of the new papal legate, Cardinal Robert of Paris, Baldwin

and Arnulf of Chocques charged Daibert with attacking fellow-Christians by raiding Byzantine islands on his journey to the Near East, with plotting to provoke civil war between Bohemond and Baldwin, and with purloining money intended for pilgrims (Barber 2012, pp. 73-74; Rowe 1966, pp. 172-173). Robert subsequently deposed Daibert. In response Tancred again welcomed Daibert to Antioch but decided not to press his claim further. In 1102 with the agreement of legate Robert, a certain priest Evremar, apparently from the same village as Arnulf, was appointed as Patriarch of Jerusalem in his stead (1102-1105/7) (Edgington 2019, pp. 103-105).

The matter, however, was still not put to rest (Rowe 1957, pp. 485-490). In 1104 Daibert accompanied Bohemond to the West, journeyed to Rome and appealed to Paschal, who responded positively (Fulcher of Chartres 1913, pp. 464-467; Fulcher of Chartres 1866, p. 408; Fulcher of Chartres 1969, p. 177; Barber 2012, p. 388, note 93). In Rome, the Lateran Synod of 1105, over which Paschal presided, decreed that Daibert should be restored to his seat and office in Jerusalem and that Evremar should be removed — to which he had acceded with the support of the papal legate, while it was vacant (Lateran Council (March 1105) 1775, cols. 1183-1184). In accordance with this decree Paschal issued a further letter in March 1105, ordering that Daibert be restored to the Patriarchate (Paschal II 1885, no. 6009; William of Tyre 1986, p. 500; William of Tyre 1844, pp. 456-457; William of Tyre 1976, pp. 466-467; Skinner 2009, pp. 165-166; Robinson 1990, p. 355). He also, however, conceded to Evremar that if another see became vacant, or if after the death of Daibert he was required to fill the see, he should be allowed to exercise his episcopal rights there. In the event, despite Paschal's interventions, Daibert was never re-installed; he died in 1105 on his way back to reclaim the Patriarchate (Fulcher of Chartres 1913, p. 467; Fulcher of Chartres 1866, p. 408; Fulcher of Chartres 1969, p. 177; Tessera 2010, pp. 98-99; Skinner 2009, p. 165).

Meanwhile, in response to Paschal's decision Evremar travelled to Rome to plead his case (Fulcher of Chartres 1913, pp. 512-514; Fulcher of Chartres 1866, p. 417; Fulcher of Chartres 1969, pp. 190-191). Although Baldwin I preferred Evremar to Daibert, he was not happy that he was the right candidate for the Patriarchate and so he too sent a delegation to Rome calling for Evremar's deposition. Paschal, confused by the conflicting information he was receiving and unsure whether or not Evremar was the best candidate, sent another letter, *Ecclesie vestre scandalis* of 1107 to the clergy of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, to Baldwin, and more widely to the people of the Kingdom (Paschal II 1985, pp. 104-107; John 2017, p. 245; Tessera 2017, pp. 187-188; Barber 2012, pp. 74-75; Tessera 2010, pp. 102-103; Robinson 1990, p. 355; Rowe 1957, pp. 486-490). Again he confirmed that it had been decreed at the recent Lateran Council (1105) that Daibert should be restored to office, and that Evremar, unless chosen to succeed after his death, should give up the Patriarchate. Paschal added that

he had sent a legate, Gibelin, archbishop of Arles, to Outremer to settle the matter, emphasising that if, despite the Lateran Synod's decision, the Jerusalem Chapter had elected Evremar, then he should be obeyed; if otherwise he should give up his claim. Thus he wisely left the final decision to the relevant local clergy.

The following year (1108), at a church council held at Jerusalem, Gibelin of Arles declared Evremar's election invalid, was elected Patriarch in his place, and retained the Patriarchate until 1112 (Edgington 2019, p. 105; Murray 2000, pp. 195, 202; Robinson 1990, pp. 355-356; Rowe 1957, p. 488). Hence by facilitating the removal of Evremar and the election of Gibelin, Paschal both preserved the canonical freedom of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem and re-established harmony between the Patriarch of Jerusalem and the king of Jerusalem, Baldwin I (Rowe 1957, p. 489; William of Tyre 1986, pp. 512-515; William of Tyre 1844, pp. 472-474; William of Tyre 1976, pp. 481-484). This was no mean feat (Tessera 2010, pp. 103-106).

Indeed Paschal's correspondence reflects his continual concerted diplomatic engagements with Baldwin I (1100-1118) regarding the actual establishment of the Patriarchate. In 1110 he wrote *Pro negotiis* to the clergy and people of Arles in which he stated that, since Gibelin was now the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, they should choose another archbishop (Paschal II 1854, col. 282; Tessera 2010, pp. 106-107). Then, in 1111, he sent *Ecclesiarum quae in* to Baldwin, conceding to him that because «on behalf of the exultation of the Church of Jerusalem he should have devoted his person to extreme danger», and because he had captured certain cities of the «infidels», i.e. Muslims, he should put his rule and dignity under the obedience of that same Church of Jerusalem; indeed all the bishops of those territories should ensure they showed obedience to the Patriarch of Jerusalem, as to their own metropolitan (Paschal II 1854, col. 289; William of Tyre 1986, p. 537; William of Tyre 1844, p. 502; William of Tyre 1976, pp. 508-509). In other words all the territories which Baldwin gained as king of Jerusalem immediately became subject to the Patriarch of Jerusalem (Robinson 1990, pp. 356, 359; Rowe 1960, p. 166). And in another letter, *Secundum mutationes*, in accordance with the recent Councils of Auvergne and Antioch, Paschal also conceded to Gibelin, the eventual Patriarch of Jerusalem and to his successors, the «ius metropolitanum» (metropolitan law) concerning all those territories which had been or should in the future be subjected by Baldwin (Paschal II 1985, pp. 108-109; William of Tyre 1986, p. 538; William of Tyre 1844, pp. 502-503; William of Tyre 1976, pp. 509-510; Fulcher of Chartres 1913, pp. 742-745; Fulcher of Chartres 1866, pp. 466-467; Fulcher of Chartres 1969, pp. 269-270; Robert of Torigni 2020, pp. 244-247; Robinson 1990, p. 359). Thus he was careful to ensure that through the Patriarchate of Jerusalem the Kingdom of Jerusalem remained under the ultimate authority of the Latin Church.

This was not the end of the story (Tessera 2010, pp. 108-117). In 1112, after Gibelin's death, Arnulf of Choques was re-appointed as Patriarch (Edgington 2019, pp. 106-107). The chronicler William of Tyre recorded that as Patriarch Arnulf reformed the canons of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, but brought his office into ill repute through his «unchaste life» and his allowing Baldwin I to marry Countess Adelaide of Sicily despite still being married to Arda, his second wife (William of Tyre 1986, p. 519; William of Tyre 1844, p. 479; William of Tyre 1976, p. 489). According to William, Arnulf contracted this marriage between Baldwin and Adelaide, a widow of substantial means who had been previously married to Roger, a brother of Robert Guiscard, in order to increase the wealth of the Kingdom of Jerusalem (William of Tyre 1986, pp. 525-527; William of Tyre 1844, pp. 487-489; William of Tyre 1976, pp. 496-497). Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres also record the marriage between Baldwin and Adelaide but do not mention that Arnulf had any part in it (Albert of Aachen 2007, pp. 842-845, 856-859; Fulcher of Chartres 1913, pp. 575-577; Fulcher of Chartres 1866, p. 428; Fulcher of Chartres 1969, p. 209; *Secunda Pars, Historiae Hierosolymitanae* 1844, p. 571).

Furthermore, again according to William of Tyre, Arnulf's scandalous lifestyle and misdeeds were eventually reported to Paschal II who sent bishop William of Orange as legate to enquire into the matter; the legate then called a council of the bishops to which Arnulf was called to answer for his misdemeanours and at which he was deposed (William of Tyre 1986, p. 534; William of Tyre 1844, p. 499; William of Tyre 1976, p. 505; Barber 2012, p. 115). In response Arnulf journeyed to Rome and persuaded Paschal to reinstate him through conciliatory words and gifts which looked very much like bribes (William of Tyre 1986, pp. 534-535; William of Tyre 1844, p. 499; William of Tyre 1976, pp. 505-506; Cantarella 2020, pp. 32-33). Fulcher of Chartres notes only that he was deposed by the bishop of Orange, went to Rome and was reinstated (Fulcher of Chartres 1913, pp. 590-591; Fulcher of Chartres 1866, p. 431; Fulcher of Chartres 1969, pp. 214-215).

As a result Paschal II's general letter of July 1116, *Pro sedandis ecclesie*, addressed to the suffragan bishops, abbots, priors, clergy, king, princes and people of the Church of Jerusalem confirmed that Arnulf should now be given the pallium and restored to the Patriarchate (Paschal II 1985, pp. 124-126; *Secunda Pars, Historiae Hierosolymitanae* 1844, p. 573; Tessera 2017, pp. 188-190; Barber 2012, p. 115, 373, note 91; Murray 2000, p. 83, Rowe 1957, pp. 497-500). This was despite the fact that Arnulf, as we have noted, had originally been forbidden to hold this priestly office by his legate. It was also despite the fact that Paschal II made it clear in the letter that he was aware of allegations about Arnulf's illegitimacy, about his election as the result of royal influence, and about his purportedly scandalous lifestyle which included mistresses.

At this time, Baldwin I appears to have repented of the marriage (Fulcher of Chartres 1913, pp. 600-601; Fulcher of Chartres 1866, p. 433; Fulcher of Chartres 1969, pp. 217-218) and explained to Adelaide that he was already married, after which she returned to Sicily (William of Tyre 1986, pp. 542-543; William of Tyre 1844, pp. 505-506; William of Tyre 1976, pp. 513-514). According to Albert of Aachen, it was Arnulf, on Paschal's orders, who advised Baldwin to set Adelaide aside, and at a special council in Acre the king was released from the marriage (Albert of Aachen 2007, pp. 860-863; Rossi 2020, p. 43; Barber 2012, p. 115). Arnulf would remain Patriarch until 1118 — i.e. until the death of Baldwin and the end of Paschal's pontificate (William of Tyre 1986, p. 552; William of Tyre 1844, p. 518; William of Tyre 1976, p. 523; Fulcher of Chartres 1913, p. 608; Fulcher of Chartres 1866, p. 436; Fulcher of Chartres 1969, p. 221; Rowe 1957, p. 500).

As well as intervening over the rival candidates for the Latin Patriarchate of Jerusalem, Paschal also made other important contributions to the establishment of the Latin ecclesiastical hierarchy in the crusader states of Outremer. Although the Principality of Galilee was one of the four major seigneuries, or vassal states of the Kingdom of Jerusalem — having been established in 1099 when Tancred was granted the cities of Tiberias, Haifa and Bethsan by Godfrey of Bouillon — no diocesan structure had been established there. To deal with this, in a letter of 1103 *Propheta domini*, Paschal confirmed the Diocese of Tiberias as a significant Latin bishopric in the Principality of Galilee (Paschal II 1985, pp. 92-99). He also granted archiepiscopal powers over the whole of Galilee and the region of Tiberias to abbot Gerald of Tabor and his successors and bestowed on him the pallium, ensuring that he was in an extremely powerful position since immune from all other ecclesiastical authority apart from the pope. This situation would continue until a Latin bishop was installed in Nazareth in 1109 and was given episcopal jurisdiction throughout Galilee (Tessera 2010, pp. 409-413, 435-436; Hamilton 1980, p. 60).

Another important group of Paschal's letters for those who remained in the crusader states was addressed to religious houses. Hence, for example, in the letter *Propheta domini* of 1103 already cited, Paschal undertook the patronage of the monastery of Saint Salvatore on Mount Tabor and confirmed the possessions of its monks (Paschal II 1985, pp. 92-99). The crusader Tancred had captured Nazareth in 1099 and in 1100 had founded this Benedictine monastery on Mount Tabor, the pilgrimage site of the Transfiguration (Hamilton 1980, p. 60). Again, also in 1103, in a letter *Piae postulatio* in response to the petition of its abbot Atgerio, Paschal put under his protection the monastery of Saint Mary of Ferrara or of Bethlehem and confirmed its goods and laws (Paschal II 1854, cols. 118-119). Later, in 1113, in *Redemptori omnium gentium* he placed under his guardianship and confirmed the privileges of yet another religious house, the monastery of Saint Mary of the Valley

of Josephat, and its possessions, which had been originally donated by Godfrey of Bouillon and Baldwin I (Paschal II 1985, pp. 117-119). The same month, following a petition from abbot Hugh, in a further letter *Possessiones et bona* he reiterated his patronage of the monastery and confirmed the goods of the house which were located far away in Sicilia and Calabria (Paschal II 1880, pp. 24-26).

What about letters to the Military Orders? Of particular note is Paschal's encouragement of the establishment of the Order of St John of Jerusalem. Long before the First Crusade, in 1080 Gerard Sasso (c. 1040-1120), a lay Benedictine, had been appointed rector of the hospice which was joined to the monastery of Maria Latina in Jerusalem. As a result of the conquest of the city, the hospice began to receive significant benefactions from the West and Gerard petitioned Rome for the establishment of the Order of the Hospital (Luttrell 2011, pp. 5-11). Paschal seized the initiative to declare the hospice independent of Maria Latina's abbot. On 15 February 1113, he issued the letter *Pie postulatio*, confirming papal recognition of and protection for the Order of the Hospital of Saint John of Jerusalem as a religious order and established Gerard as its first Grand Master (Paschal II 1854, cols. 314-316; Demurger 2013, pp. 55-64; Barber 2012, p. 107). It later became known as the Knights Hospitaller and today is known as the Sovereign Military Order of Malta. The letter also ratified the Order's acquisitions and donations in Europe and the Near East, confirmed certain privileges already conceded to it, and exempted it from all authority save that of the pope himself. Thus Paschal paved the way for the Order to benefit from ecclesiastical patronage, for subsequent popes, such as Calixtus II (1119-1124), to bestow on it gifts, and eventually for its militarisation in the thirteenth century so that it became the other major Military Order, besides the Templars, whose purpose was to defend the crusader states (Hamilton 1980, pp. 104-105).

Furthermore, Paschal's correspondence reflects his spiritual and political interventions not only regarding the Kingdom of Jerusalem, but also pertaining to the neighbouring Principality of Antioch (Tessera 2010, pp. 460-470). Again we see Paschal seeking to control the religious and political implications of the imposition of the Latin rite in areas which were traditionally Greek Orthodox. Following the conquest of Antioch in 1098 by the First Crusaders, the papal legate Adhémar of le Puy had re-installed John the Oxite, the former Greek Orthodox Patriarch. After Adhémar's death, however, Bohemond of Taranto established himself as prince of Antioch against the wishes of the Byzantine emperor Alexios I Comnenus (1081-1118). This forced John to leave and ushered the Latin hierarchy into the conquered territories (Rowe 1966, p. 168). It appears that the new papal legate, Maurice of Porto, did nothing to prevent John's expulsion (Rowe 1966, p. 168). Bohemond now chose Bernard of Valence (d. 1135), a Frankish cleric, as the first Latin Patriarch of Antioch (1100-1135). Bernard had been in the crusading army of Raymond of

Saint-Gilles and was bishop of Artah for six months in 1100. As Patriarch of Antioch he now held the fourth most important Patriarchate after Rome, Constantinople and Alexandria.

PASCHAL II AND THE IMPOSITION OF THE LATIN RITE IN THE CRUSADER STATES

Paschal was fully aware of the importance of this new Latin Patriarchate and the power wielded by its holder. When, by 1110, Sidon, Beirut and Acre fell to Baldwin I, they became part of the province of Tyre (Rowe 1960, p. 165). Baldwin, however, did not want Tyre to be under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Antioch — which would entail it was no longer under his control. Baldwin and Gibelin of Arles, now Patriarch of Jerusalem, appealed to Rome. In response, as we have noted, in 1110 Paschal stated that the ecclesiastical boundaries of Jerusalem and Antioch should follow political frontiers recently established between the Frankish states (Paschal II 1985, pp. 108-109; William of Tyre 1986, p. 538; William of Tyre 1844, pp. 502-503; William of Tyre 1976, pp. 509-510; Fulcher of Chartres 1913, pp. 742-745; Fulcher of Chartres 1866, pp. 466-467; Fulcher of Chartres 1969, pp. 269-270; Robert of Torigni 2020, pp. 244-247; Robinson 1990, pp. 359, 364; Hamilton 1980, p. 27). Possibly Paschal did not realise the ramifications of the huge powers that he was giving to the Patriarch of Jerusalem. Or alternatively he wished to show the power he held as pope to decide the fate of the Patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem (Rowe 1960, pp. 166-167).

Following Paschal's decision, Gibelin nominated a Latin bishop of Beirut. This bishop, however, was not consecrated because Bernard of Valence appealed to Rome, arguing that Tyre had traditionally been part of his Patriarchate. In a letter of August 1112, *Quamuis inter*, Paschal replied as tactfully as he could (Paschal II 1985, pp. 116-117; William of Tyre 1986, p. 539; William of Tyre 1844, p. 503; William of Tyre 1976, pp. 510-511). He apologised that the «extensive prolixity of places and the commutation of ancient names» which accrued to certain cities or provinces guaranteed great ambiguity or ignorance on his part. Furthermore, he reassured Bernard that he had observed no weakening of the Patriarchate of Antioch and that if he thought anything pertaining either to the Patriarchate of Antioch or of Jerusalem was otherwise than fitting, he would have written about the boundaries of their respective parishes. He emphasised that he in no way wanted to debase the rights of the Patriarchate of Antioch, while at the same time reiterating his earlier judgement. Thus, he stressed both that he wished to preserve the peace between the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem and also asserted the papacy's right to alter the boundaries of such Patriarchates if it wished to do so (Rowe 1960, p. 167). This was a significant statement (Rowe 1957, pp. 490-494).

Bernard, however, remained unhappy. In 1113 he once more sent envoys to the papal Synod of Benevento to raise the issue of jurisdiction (Rowe 1960, p. 167; Tessera 2010, pp. 40-42). He and Roger of Salerno again complained of the usurpations of the Patriarch of Jerusalem and urged that the rights of the Patriarchate of Antioch be reinstated. Nevertheless, the synod, over which Paschal presided, reiterated what had been promulgated by his predecessor Urban II at the Council of Clermont (1095): namely that whatever princes should conquer provinces or states from Muslim forces, those principalities, with the customs of the Muslims eliminated, should pertain to the restored (Latin) Church (Council of Benevento (February 1113), 1881, p. 205; Rowe 1960, p. 168; Rowe 1957, pp. 494-496). Thus Paschal upheld his original ruling. Baldwin was to keep control of churches in his kingdom which came under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Jerusalem. But in turn Bernard should control those churches which clearly belonged to the church of Antioch — a reference to the diocese of Tripoli and other previously Greek Orthodox dioceses.

Nevertheless, despite Paschal's decision, Bernard continued to claim the province of Tyre. In response to such pressure, Paschal now strikingly reversed his decision, recalling perhaps how in the West, in relation to the Holy Roman emperor Henry V, in 1112 he rescinded his notorious *Privilegium* of 1111 (Lubich 2024, p. 186; Rowe 1957, pp. 496-497). In an attempt to placate Bernard, in a letter *Sicut aliis* of 1113 Paschal confirmed that the privilege concerning the territories which had been conquered by Baldwin should not be conceded to Gibelin, the former Patriarch of Jerusalem, if that threatened any injury to his see (Paschal II 1985, pp. 121-122; William of Tyre 1986, pp. 539-540; William of Tyre 1844, pp. 503-504; William of Tyre 1976, pp. 511-512). And in a further letter of 1113, *Concessio illa*, Paschal emphasised to Baldwin that he should not for the sake of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem invade the territories of the ancient Patriarchate of Antioch (Paschal II 1985, pp. 122-123; William of Tyre 1986, pp. 540-541; William of Tyre 1844, pp. 504-505; William of Tyre 1976, pp. 512-513). Rather he should respect the traditional rights of Antioch's Patriarch. Territories and cities should only be assigned to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem if they had formerly done so, or if there was no firm ancient ecclesiastical allegiance. By contrast, if Baldwin overran a city which was traditionally part of the Patriarchate of Antioch it was to remain under the jurisdiction of the Antioch Patriarchs (Murray 2000, p. 185; Rowe 1960, p. 169).

We may observe in all this, however, that Paschal did still insist that the Patriarch of Jerusalem control any reconquered land which did not fit into the traditional division between the Patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem (Rowe 1960, p. 170). Hence to some extent we see that Paschal did hold his ground. Nevertheless, despite his final decision, the Patriarchs of Antioch continued to retain the County of Tripoli and the Patriarchs of Jerusalem continued to claim

their jurisdiction over Beirut, Sidon and Acre, thereby showing the real limit of papal power to affect such jurisdictional issues (Rowe 1960, pp. 170-172). Paschal's successors Gelasius II and Calixtus II, and particularly Honorius II (1124-1130) and Innocent II (1130-1143) would be left to deal with the continuing standoff between Jerusalem and Antioch (Tessera 2010, pp. 162-167; Rowe 1960, pp. 172-185). And we should note that they were no more successful than Paschal had been in quelling the feelings of the Patriarchate of Antioch that it had been unjustly treated by Rome (Rowe 1960, p. 179).

PASCHAL II AND RELATIONS WITH NON-LATIN CHRISTIANS IN THE CRUSADER STATES

We have one letter of Paschal, *Sicut ex vestris* of 1117, in which he confirmed once more the bishopric of the Melkites to a certain bishop Julian and commended him to the Melkite clergy (Paschal II 1881, p. 295). Julian, having been held in prison by Muslim forces for seven years, had been declared dead, with the result that another bishop had been wrongly elected in his place. The Melkites in this period were Arabic-speaking Greeks who observed the Byzantine rite but had their own clerical hierarchies distinct from the Greek Orthodox. We should note that Paschal therefore made a point of reaching out to an important minority Christian group in the crusader states of Outremer.

Even more significantly for inter-Christian accord, Paschal, like his predecessor Urban II, continued diplomatic efforts with Alexios I, the Byzantine Emperor, despite his support for Bohemond's crusade against the Empire in 1107-1108 (Fulcher of Chartres 1913, pp. 518-521; Fulcher of Chartres 1866, pp. 417-418; Fulcher of Chartres 1969, p. 192; Barber 2012, p. 83; Tessera 2010, pp. 96-97). This may have been in part because Paschal's standoff with Henry V encouraged him to look to improve relations with Byzantium (John 2017, p. 235). Any rapprochement, however, between Latin and Greek Orthodox Churches came to an abrupt end in 1112 when in a letter *Omnipotentis Dei* Paschal insisted that the Patriarch of Constantinople recognise once again the primacy of Rome before any progress could be made (Paschal II 1885, no. 6334). The Orthodox Patriarchs Nicholas Grammaticus and John Agapetus, fearing opposition from their clergy and laity, refused. Hence there was no end to the schism between East and West, which Urban II had hoped to heal through the First Crusade. Nevertheless, Paschal had attempted to discuss both the reunion of the Greek and Latin churches and the possibility of Alexios unifying the imperial crowns of the Byzantine Empire and the West (Rowe 1966, p. 198). Perhaps more might have been achieved in the future had not relations worsened in the thirteenth century after the Sack of Constantinople by the Fourth Crusaders in 1204.

CONCLUSION

Our analysis of Paschal II's letters to the crusader states of Outremer has enabled us to increase our understanding of how he both continued the ideas of his predecessor Urban II in relation to crusading to the Near East and developed his own policies with regard to the newly-formed crusader states. Historians have rightly pointed out that Paschal, in his support of these newly-burgeoning states had no intention of creating kingdoms which were papal vassals, nor of establishing an ecclesiastical patrimony in Jerusalem (Rowe 1957, p. 471). They have, however, tended to underplay the significant contribution Paschal made to both directing and organising the establishment of these crusader states during the early part of the twelfth century in a wide variety of ways: through continuing to call for crusading to support Outremer, through his diplomatic correspondence with the rulers of Jerusalem, through his clear support for the newly-formed Latin Patriarchates of Jerusalem and Antioch, through his keen patronage of monastic foundations and in particular the Hospitallers, through his positive relations with Melkite non-Latin Christians, and through his attempt — however ultimately unsuccessful — to continue dialogue with the Greek Orthodox (Tessera 2010, pp. 523-524).

Furthermore, despite his predecessor Urban II's idea of crusade being so new and revolutionary to western medieval Europe, Paschal II continued to uphold its original message and intent. Indeed considering his frequent stand-offs with the Holy Roman emperors and ongoing struggles with a succession of antipopes in Rome, it remains a remarkable achievement that through his correspondence to Outremer Paschal was able to make such important contributions to the development and flourishing of the crusader states in both the spiritual and secular sphere. Hence although in the West Paschal was beset throughout his pontificate by problems of factionalism and schism, with regard to the East he proved himself a faithful and able successor to Urban II.

BIBLIOGRAPHY¹

Primary Sources

ALBERT OF AACHEN, S. B. Edgington, 2007. *Historia Ierosolimitana: History of the Journey to Jerusalem*. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press. ISBN 9780199204861.

COUNCIL OF BENEVENTO (February 1113), J. Pflugk-Harttung, 1881. *Acta pontificum Romanorum inedita*. Tübingen: F. Fues, 2, p. 205.

¹ For Paschal II's surviving letters to the crusader states see the critical editions *Papsturkunden für Kirchen im Heiligen Lande*, ed. R. Hiestand (Göttingen, 1985) and/or *Epistulae et chartae ad historiam primi belli sacri spectantes. Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Hildesheim, New York, 1901). If a papal letter is not in either of these editions then see *Epistolae et Privilegia, Patrologia Cursus Completus Latina*, vol. 163, comp. J.-P. Migne (Paris, 1854), (henceforward PL) 163, which is my next choice (rather than other older and contemporary to Migne editions), unless the letter is also not in Migne, in which case I have cited yet another edition.

- DAIBERT OF PISA, H. Hagenmeyer, 1901. *Epistulae et chartae ad historiam primi belli sacri spectantes. Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100*. Hildesheim; New York: Georg Olms Verlag, pp. 167-174; pp. 176-177. ISBN-10 0265288673.
- FULCHER OF CHARTRES, 1866. *Historia Iherosolymitana. Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, 3, Historiens Occidentaux*. Paris: l'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, pp. 311-485.
- FULCHER OF CHARTRES, F. R. Ryan and H. S. Fink, 1969. *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem, 1095-1127*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press. ISBN 0870490974.
- FULCHER OF CHARTRES, H. Hagenmeyer, 1913. *Historia Hierosolymitana*. Heidelberg: C. Winters.
- LATERAN COUNCIL (March 1105), G. D. Mansi, 1775. *Sacrorum concilium nova et amplissima collectio*, 20. Florence: Antonium Zatta, 1775, cols. 1183-1184.
- MANASSES OF RHEIMS, H. Hagenmeyer, 1901. *Epistulae et chartae ad historiam primi belli sacri spectantes. Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100*. Hildesheim; New York: Georg Olms Verlag, pp. 175-176. ISBN-10 0265288673.
- PASCHAL II, Concessio illa (18 March 1113), R. Hiestand, 1985. *Papsturkunden für Kirchen im Heiligen Lande*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 122-123. ISBN-10 3525824173.
- PASCHAL II, Concessio illa (18 March 1113), R. B. C. Huygens, 1986. William of Tyre, *Chronique*, 1. Turnholt: Typographi Brepols Editores Pontificii, Book 11, Cap. 28, pp. 540-541. ISBN 2-503-03633-3.
- PASCHAL II, Concessio illa (18 March 1113), 1844. William of Tyre, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum. L'Estoire de Eracles Empereur et la Conqueste de la Terre d'Outremer*. In: *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Vol. 1: Historiens Occidentaux*. Paris: l'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Book 11, Cap. 28, pp. 504-505.
- PASCHAL II, Ecclesie vestre scandalis (4 December 1107), R. Hiestand, 1985. *Papsturkunden für Kirchen im Heiligen Lande*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 104-107. ISBN-10 3525824173.
- PASCHAL II, Ecclesiarum quae in (8 June 1111), J.-P. Migne, 1854. *Epistolae et Privilegia, Patrologia Cursus Completus Latina*, 163. Paris: Apud Garnier Fratres, Editores et J.-P. Migne Successores, col. 289.
- PASCHAL II, Ecclesiarum, que in (8 June 1111), R. B. C. Huygens, 1986. William of Tyre, *Chronique*, 1. Turnholt: Typographi Brepols Editores Pontificii, Book 11, Cap. 28, p. 537. ISBN-10 3525824173.
- PASCHAL II, Ecclesiarum quae in (8 June 1111), 1844. William of Tyre, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum. L'Estoire de Eracles Empereur et la Conqueste de la Terre d'Outremer*. In: *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Vol. 1: Historiens Occidentaux*. Paris: l'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Book 11, Cap. 28, p. 502.
- PASCHAL II, Gloria in altissimis (14-25 August 1100), H. Hagenmeyer, 1901. *Epistulae et chartae ad historiam primi belli sacri spectantes. Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100*. Hildesheim; New York: Georg Olms Verlag, pp. 179-81. ISBN-10 0265288673.
- PASCHAL II, No incipit (March 1105), P. Jaffé, 1885. *Regesta pontificum Romanorum*, 1. Leipzig: Veit et Comp., no. 6009.
- PASCHAL II, No incipit (March 1105), R. B. C. Huygens, 1986. William of Tyre, *Chronique*, 1. Turnholt: Typographi Brepols Editores Pontificii, Book 11, Cap. 4, p. 500. ISBN-10 3525824173.
- PASCHAL II, Omnipotentis Dei miserationibus (December 1099), H. Hagenmeyer, 1901. *Epistulae et chartae ad historiam primi belli sacri spectantes. Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100*. Hildesheim; New York: Georg Olms Verlag, pp. 174-175. ISBN-10 0265288673.
- PASCHAL II, Omnipotentis Dei (15 November 1112), P. Jaffé, 1885. *Regesta pontificum Romanorum*, 1. Leipzig: Veit et Comp., no. 6334.
- PASCHAL II, Piae postulatio (11 November 1103), J.-P. Migne, 1854. *Epistolae et Privilegia, Patrologia Cursus Completus Latina*, 163. Paris: Apud Garnier Fratres, Editores et J.-P. Migne Successores, cols. 118-119.

- PASCHAL II, Piae postulatio (15 February 1113), J.-P. Migne, 1854. *Epistolae et Privilegia, Patrologia Cursus Completus Latina*, 163. Paris: Apud Garnier Fratres, Editores et J.-P. Migne Successores, cols. 314-16.
- PASCHAL II, Possessiones et bona (3 January 1113), H.-François Delaborde, 1880. *Chartes de Terre Sainte provenant de l'abbaye de N.-D. de Josaphat*. Paris: Ernest Thorin, pp. 24-26.
- PASCHAL II, Pro negotiis (2 January 1111), J.-P. Migne, 1854. *Epistolae et Privilegia, Patrologia Cursus Completus Latina*, 163. Paris: Apud Garnier Fratres, Editores et J.-P. Migne Successores, col. 282.
- PASCHAL II, Pro sedandis ecclesie (19 July 1116), R. Hiestand, 1985. *Papsturkunden für Kirchen im Heiligen Lande*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 124-126. ISBN-10 3525824173.
- PASCHAL II, Propheta domini (29 July 1103), R. Hiestand, 1985. *Papsturkunden für Kirchen im Heiligen Lande*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 92-99. ISBN-10 3525824173.
- PASCHAL II, Quamuis inter (7 August 1112), R. Hiestand, 1985. *Papsturkunden für Kirchen im Heiligen Lande*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 116-117. ISBN-10 3525824173.
- PASCHAL II, Quamvis inter (8 August 1112), R. B. C. Huygens, 1986. William of Tyre, *Chronique*, 1. Turnholt: Typographi Brepols Editores Pontificii, Book 11, Cap. 28, p. 539. ISBN-10 3525824173.
- PASCHAL II, Quamvis inter (8 August 1112), 1844. William of Tyre, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum*. L'Estoire de Eracles Empereur et la Conqueste de la Terre d'Outremer. In: *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Vol. 1: Historiens Occidentaux*. Paris: l'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Book 11, Cap. 28, p. 503.
- PASCHAL II, Quod per prophetam (28 April 1100), H. Hagenmeyer, 1901. *Epistulae et chartae ad historiam primi belli sacri spectantes. Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100*. Hildesheim; New York: Georg Olms Verlag, pp. 178-179. ISBN-10 0265288673.
- PASCHAL II, Redemptori omnium gentium (2 January 1113), R. Hiestand, 1985. *Papsturkunden für Kirchen im Heiligen Lande*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 117-119. ISBN-10 3525824173.
- PASCHAL II, Secundum mutationes (9 June 1110), R. Hiestand, 1985. *Papsturkunden für Kirchen im Heiligen Lande*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 108-109. ISBN-10 3525824173.
- PASCHAL II, Secundum mutationes (8 June 1111), R. B. C. Huygens, 1986. William of Tyre, *Chronique*, 1. Turnholt: Typographi Brepols Editores Pontificii, Book 11, Cap. 28, p. 538. ISBN-10 3525824173.
- PASCHAL II, Secundum mutationes (8 June 1111), 1844. William of Tyre, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum*. L'Estoire de Eracles Empereur et la Conqueste de la Terre d'Outremer. In: *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Vol. 1: Historiens Occidentaux*. Paris: l'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Book 11, Cap. 28, pp. 502-503.
- PASCHAL II, Secundum mutationes (8 June 1111), Fulcher of Chartres, 1866. *Historia Iherosolymitana. Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*, 3, *Historiens Occidentaux*. Paris: l'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Bk 3, Cap. 35, pp. 466-467.
- PASCHAL II, Secundum mutationes (8 June 1111), H. Hagenmeyer, 1913. Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana*. Hiedelberg: C. Winters.
- PASCHAL II, Secundum mutationes (June 1111), T. N. Bisson, 2020. *Robert of Torigni, The Chronography of Robert of Torigni*, 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 244-246. ISBN 9780198837381.
- PASCHAL II, Sicut aliis (18 March 1113), R. Hiestand, 1985. *Papsturkunden für Kirchen im Heiligen Lande*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 121-122. ISBN-10 3525824173.
- PASCHAL II, Sicut aliis (18 March 1113), R. B. C. Huygens, 1986. William of Tyre, *Chronique*, 1. Turnholt: Typographi Brepols Editores Pontificii, Book 11, Cap. 28, pp. 539-540. ISBN-10 3525824173.
- PASCHAL II, Sicut aliis (18 March 1113), 1844. William of Tyre, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum*. L'Estoire de Eracles Empereur et la Conqueste de la Terre d'Outremer. In: *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Vol. 1: Historiens Occidentaux*. Paris: l'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Book 11, Cap. 28, pp. 503-504.

- PASCHAL II, Sicut ex vestris (1 October 1117), 1881. *Neues Archiv der Gessellschaft fur altere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, 6. Hannover: Hahn'sche Buchhandlung, p. 295.
- ROBERT OF TORIGNI, T. N. Bisson, 2020. *The Chronography of Robert of Torigni*, 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press. ISBN 9780199682126.
- Secunda Pars, Historiae Hierosolymitanae, 1844. *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*, 3, *Historiens Occidentaux*. Paris: l'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 545-585.
- WILLIAM OF TYRE, R. B. C. Huygens, 1986. *Chronique*, 1. Turnholt: Typographi Brepols Editores Pontificii. ISBN 2-503-03633-3.
- WILLIAM OF TYRE, 1844. *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum. L'Estoire de Eracles Empereur et la Conquete de la Terre d'Outremer*, *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*, 1, *Historiens Occidentaux*. Paris: l'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres.
- WILLIAM OF TYRE, E. A. Badcock, and A. C. Krey, 1976. *A History of Deeds done beyond the Sea*, 1. New York: Octagon Books. ISBN 0374903204.

Secondary Literature

- BARBER, Malcolm, 2012. *The Crusader States*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. ISBN 9780300113129.
- BLUMENTHAL, Uta-Renate, 1998. Bermerkungen zum Register Papst Paschalis II. In: Uta-Renate BLUMENTHAL. *Papal Reform and Canon Law in the Eleventh and Twelfth Century*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 1-18. ISBN 0860786951, 9780860786955.
- HAMILTON, Bernard, 1980. *The Latin Church in the Crusader States: the Secular Church*. London: Variorum. ISBN 0860780724.
- CANTARELLA, Glauco Maria, 2020. *Ruggero II*. Roma: Salerno Editrice. ISBN 9788869735271.
- CANTARELLA, Glauco Maria, 1997. *Pasquale II e il suo tempo*. Naples: Liguori. ISBN 8820726432.
- CANTARELLA, Glauco Maria, 1987. *La costruzione della verità: Pasquale II, un papa all strete*. Rome: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo.
- CANTARELLA, Glauco Maria, 1982. *Ecclesiologia e politica nel papato di Pasquale II: linee di una interpretazione*. Rome: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo.
- DEMURGER, Alain, 2013. Chapitre 3 – De l'hôpital à l'Hôpital. La bulle *Pie postulatio voluntatis* de Pascal II (15 Février 1113). In: Alain DEMURGER. *Les Hospitaliers: de Jérusalem à Rhodes, 1050-1317*. Paris: Tallandier, pp. 55-64. ISBN 9791021000797.
- EDGINGTON, Susan, 2019. *Baldwin I of Jerusalem 1100-1118*. London: Routledge. ISBN 9780367662370.
- JOHN, Simon, April 2017. The Papacy and the Establishment of the Kingdoms of Jerusalem, Sicily and Portugal: Twelfth-Century Papal Political Thought on Incipient Kingship. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 68(2), 223-259. ISSN 0022-0469.
- LUBICH, Gerhard, 2024. *Der letzte Salierkaiser*. Darmstadt: Theiss in der Verlag Herder GmbH. ISBN 3534610199, 9783534610198.
- LUTTRELL, Anthony, 2011. A Jerusalem Indulgence, 1100/3. In: Helen J. NICHOLSON, ed. *On the Margins of Crusading: The Military Orders, the Papacy and the Christian World*. Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 5-11. ISBN 9781409432180.
- MATZKE, Michael, 1998. *Daibert von Pisa: zwischen Pisa. Papst und erstem Kreuzzug*. Sigmaringen: J. Thorbecke. ISSN 0933-4467; eISSN 2364-4273.
- MURRAY, Alan 2000. *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: A Dynastic History 1099-1125*. Oxford: Prosopographica et Genealogica. ISBN 1900934035.
- ROBINSON, Ian Stuart, 1990. *The Papacy, 1073-1198: Continuity and Innovation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0521319226.
- ROSSI, Luigi, June 2020. Il Regno normanno e il Mediterraneo nell'età di Ruggero II. Alcune puntualizzazioni (The Norman Kingdom and the Mediterranean in the Age of Roger II. Some

- clarifications). *Rivista dell'Istituto di Storia dell'Europa Mediterranea*. Cagliari: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche Istituto di Storia dell'Europa Mediterranea, **6**, 37-53. ISSN 2035-794X.
- ROWE, John Gordon, 1966. Paschal II, Bohemund of Antioch and the Byzantine Empire. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, **49**(1), 165-202. ISSN 2054-9318.
- ROWE, John Gordon, 1960. The Papacy and the Ecclesiastical Province of Tyre (1100-1187). *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, **43**(1), 160-189. ISSN 2054-9318.
- ROWE, John Gordon, July 1957. Paschal II and the Relation between the Spiritual and Temporal Powers in the Kingdom of Jerusalem. *Speculum. A Journal of Medieval Studies*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, **32**(3), 470-501. ISSN 0038-7134.
- SERVATIUS, Carlo, 1979. *Paschalis II. (1099-1118): Studien zu seiner Person und seiner Politik*. Stuttgart: Hiersemann. ISBN 3777280038.
- SKINNER Patricia, 2009. From Pisa to the Patriarchate: Chapters in the Life of (Arch)bishop Daibert. In: Patricia SKINNER. *Challenging the Boundaries of Medieval History. The Legacy of Timothy Reuter*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, pp. 155-172. ISBN-13 9782503523590.
- SMITH, Thomas W., 2024. *Rewriting the First Crusade: Epistolary Culture in the Middle Ages*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press. ISBN 9781837651757.
- TESSERA, Miriam Rita, 2017. The Use of the Bible in Twelfth-Century Papal Letters to Outremer. In: Elizabeth LAPINA, and Nicholas MORTON, ed. *The Uses of the Bible in Crusader Sources*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, pp. 179-205. ISBN 9789004284920.
- TESSERA, Miriam Rita, 2010. *Orientalis ecclesia: Papato, Chiesa e regno latino di Gerusalemme (1099-1187)*. Milan: Vita e Pensiero. ISBN 9788834318492.