THE MILITARY ORDERS AND WOMEN OF THE NOBILITY IN THE CRUSADER STATES

KEYWORDS
history; the Middle Ages; military orders; women; nobility; Crusader states; charters; seals

ABSTRACT
To assess the interaction between the military orders and women of the nobility in the Crusader states neither the narrative sources’ scattered anecdotes nor the normative texts’ stipulations pertaining to women are particularly useful or representative. Focusing on the kingdom of Jerusalem and, to a lesser extent, the principality of Antioch and the county of Tripoli in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, this article considers examples from the charter evidence to appreciate the impact of queens, princesses, countesses, and noble ladies on the history of Templars, Hospitallers, and Teutonic Knights. The first part highlights the significance of consent-giving; the second part takes a closer look at activities where ladies functioned as primary agents, namely, as issuers of charters; and the third part presents a case study of Lady Juliana of Caesarea – a benefactress of both Hospitallers and Teutonic Knights in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries – whose husbands (despite their dominus/“lord” titles) only participated in the administration of her lordship iure uxoris (i.e., on the basis of Juliana’s legal title); who became a consoror (i.e., a “fellow sister”) and chose the Hospital of St. John as her final resting place; and whose second husband, Aymar of L’Ayron, later joined the Hospitallers and served as their conventual marshal during the Crusade against Damietta.

* ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4554-5288
In February 1261, several Templar garrisons in the kingdom of Jerusalem, accompanied by knights from Acre, went on a raid against a Turcoman encampment in Galilee. However, the expedition failed, and many of the Frankish participants – including John II of Ibelin, the lord of Beirut – were taken prisoner by the Turcomans. An Old French chronicle known as the *Gestes des Chiprois* blamed the Templar marshal Stephen of Cissey for the unexpected defeat: Stephen, it was said, had conducted the attack poorly and fled, either because he lacked courage or because he bore ill will against the lord of Beirut “due to an insane jealousy pertaining to a lady of this land” (*por envie d’une fol[e] je[louz]ie d’une dame de se païs*).

Who was the lady in question? Perhaps John’s wife, Alice of La Roche, whose family, like Stephen’s, hailed from France? The answer is unknown and ultimately does not matter because, according to the chronicler, the allegations had derived from hearsay. Scene change: in June 1310, Amalric of Tyre, the regent of Lusignan Cyprus, was assassinated. His widow, a lady named Isabella (Zabêl), the sister of King Oshin of Cilician Armenia, now had to be escorted back to her homeland in Asia Minor by boat, and the Hospitaller grand preceptor Guy of Sévérac was entrusted with this delicate international mission. Yet, as the Cypriot historian Florio Bustron informs us, Isabella delayed her departure by three days, allegedly...
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1 *Cronaca del Templare di Tiro* (1243–1314): *La caduta degli Stati Crociati nel racconto di un testimone oculare*, ed. Laura Minervini (Naples: Liguori Editore, 2000), 84 § 69 (305). On this text, see Laura Minervini, “*Les Gestes des Chiprois* et la tradition historiographique de l’Orient latin,” *Le Moyen Âge* 110 (2004): 315–326. The following abbreviations are used in this article: *Manosque* = Marseilles, Archives départementales (Bouches-du-Rhône), Ordre de Malte 56 H 68 (*Inventaire de Manosque, a. 1531*); *RRH* = *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani* (MVCVII–MC–CXCII), and *Additamentum*, ed. Reinhold Röhrich, 2 vols. (Innsbruck: Libreria Academia Wagneriana, 1893–1904) (cited by document number); *RRR* = *Revised Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani*, database, accessed 5 June 2023, http://crusades-regesta.com (cited by document number). I would like to thank Hans Eberhard Mayer (Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel), Laura Morreale (Fordham University), and Anne Latowsky (University of South Florida) for their valuable comments on various aspects addressed in this article; all remaining errors are my own.

out of malice against the king, namely, Henry II, her murdered husband’s brother, and out of hatred against the Hospitallers. When she was told that the galleys were ready to depart, she let it be known that she was not feeling well and therefore unable to embark. At this point, the Hospitaller grand preceptor informed her that she had been shown all the courtesy, kindness, and comfort she could ask for, but would, if necessary, now be brought on board against her will. To this, she replied that she would despise him unless he did his worst, because, as she put it, “I value you less than a pistachio” (*non t’apprecio quanto vale un’pistaccio*).³

These anecdotes of a reportedly jealous Templar and a supposedly scorned Hospitaller, as related in the narrative sources, have a certain entertainment value, but they are hardly representative of the interaction between members of the military orders and women of the nobility in the Crusader states.⁴ Neither are the statements concerning women in the military orders’ normative texts. The Templar rule instructed the brothers to refrain from recounting the sexual experiences they had had with women prior to entering the order; warned them against associating with women in general, “since the old enemy [i.e., the Devil] had led many astray from their path toward Paradise due to such company” (*quia antiquus hostis femino consortio complures expulit a recto tramite paradisi*); and forbade them from engaging in any close contact, particularly kissing, with women, including their

---


female relatives. Subsequent Templar statutes routinely repeated such warnings, reflecting ongoing concerns rather than merely formulaic reiterations, and the Teutonic Order’s corresponding texts later echoed them as well. The Hospitaller rule assumed, quite realistically, that the brothers would encounter women in the church or in houses and other places, and therefore warned them to guard their chastity and never allow women to wash the brothers’ heads or feet or make their beds. Later Hospitaller statutes repeated these stipulations. To be sure, the military orders’ normative texts suggest that prostitutes were seen as the greatest danger to the brothers, especially since the latter were routinely traveling and engaged in business beyond their houses and commanderies.

Dealing with women of the nobility, on the other hand, was an entirely different matter, because they were among the military orders’ main benefactors, which made interaction with them not just unavoidable but, indeed, advisable. To illustrate this, the present article utilizes the – admittedly uneven and fragmentary – charter evidence (i.e., legal documents) from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and it focuses on the “original” Crusader states, namely, the kingdom of Jerusalem, the county of Tripoli, and the principality of Antioch. For territories that lie beyond the scope of this investigation, such as Cilician Armenia, Frankish Greece, Cyprus, and Rhodes, there are recent studies by Marie-Anna Chevalier.

---


6 Règle, ed. Curzon, 156 § 236; 243 § 452; 309 § 594; 322 § 625; 346–347 § 679.

7 Die Statuten des Deutschen Ordens nach den ältesten Handschriften, ed. Max Perlbach (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1890), 50–51 § 28 (Regel); 80 § 36.2 (Gesetze). On the Teutonic Order’s normative texts, see Hubert Houben, “Regole, statuti e consuetudini dell’ordine teutonico: Status quaestionis,” in Regulae – Consuetudines – Statuta: Studi sulle fonti normative degli ordini religiosi nei secoli centrali del Medioevo, ed. Cristina Andenna and Gert Melville (Münster: LIT Verlag, 2005), 375–386.


9 Cartulaire, ed. Delaville Le Roulx, 2: 536–561 no. 2213, here 544 § 57; 545 § 64.

10 There is insufficient charter evidence for the county of Edessa. For the surviving archives and archival remnants of the Crusader states, see Burgtorf, Central Convent, 4–5.
and Nicholas Coureas that offer significant new insights. The examples discussed below pertain primarily to Templars, Hospitallers, and Teutonic Knights, and they provide largely qualitative impressions of the agency of queens, princesses, countesses, and other women of the nobility. While there is some charter evidence for interaction between non-noble women (burgesses) and the military orders, it is, overall, too sparse to be included here. Furthermore, due to the military orders’ “uneven” archival tradition as far as the Crusader states are concerned, it is unclear whether women – of the nobility or in general – favored communities whose professed members included women (such as the Hospitallers). The article’s first part addresses the ladies’ role as grantors of consent; the second part considers their significance as issuers of charters; and the third part presents a case study from the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries that focuses on Juliana, the lady of Caesarea, who interacted with both Hospitallers and the Teutonic Order as a benefactress.

I. Granting Consent

That the wives of kings, princes, counts, and lords in the Crusader states gave their consent, often expressly and prominently, to their husbands’ legal actions is evident from the documentary record. Yet, scholarly works on the military orders generally focus on the husbands’ agency and mention the ladies’ role as actual or potential grantors of consent only in passing, if at all. However, the granting of consent was more prestigious (as evidenced by its prominent position and elaborate wording in the texts) than the “mere” witnessing of an act and thus deserves our attention.

There is, unfortunately, no explicit evidence that Morphia of Melitene (Malatya), the wife of King Baldwin II of Jerusalem, was directly involved when quarters in the royal palace known as the Templum Salomonis (i.e., Jerusalem’s al-Aqsa Mosque) were transferred to the newly established Templar community in 1120.

---


12 Die Urkunden der lateinischen Könige von Jerusalem, ed. Hans Eberhard Mayer, Old French texts compiled by Jean Richard, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Diplomata regum Latino-
Morphia was a member of the Armenian nobility with close ties to the Crusader county of Edessa, and both she and Baldwin had been crowned together in Bethlehem on Christmas Day 1119. Thus, she was obviously present in the kingdom of Jerusalem when these quarters of the Templum Salomonis were transferred to the Templars and, as queen, certainly could have given her consent to this act. Even if the transfer took place in the context of the so-called “council” of Nablus, which is possible, there would have been no plausible reason to exclude her, since the “council” of Nablus was not, strictly speaking, an exclusively ecclesiastical assembly. While William of Tyre’s narrative only names the king as an agent in the transfer, albeit alongside the canons of the Templum Domini, it bears repeating that a chronicle is not a legal document. Yet, was a legal document (that could have contained Morphia’s consent) even issued in 1120? William claims that the quarters of the Templum Salomonis were, at least initially, only given ad tempus (“temporarily”), in which case there would have been no compelling reason to draw up a charter until such a time when the transfer became permanent (which it did). However, William also appears to be the only chronicler who speaks of a “temporary” arrangement, which may tell us more about his questionable attitude toward the Templars than about a historical event that predated his own birth by about a decade. That Baldwin II did indeed, on occasion, act with the express consent of his wife is evident, for example, from a charter issued in 1156 by his grandson (King Baldwin III of Jerusalem). This document relates that Baldwin II, during his reign, had issued a donation to the royal Hospital of St. John the Baptist in Nablus “with the consent of Queen Morphia, his wife, and their daughters” (concessu
etiam Morphye regine uxoris sue atque filiarum suarum). If one considers that the Templum Salomonis (like the royal Hospital of St. John the Baptist in Nablus) was a property belonging to the crown or royal domain, Morphia's consent to its transfer would indeed have been expected. Thus, there is a possibility – admittedly based on conjecture – that Morphia gave her consent when her husband favored the young Templar community. Baldwin's and Morphia's eldest daughter, Queen Melisende of Jerusalem, certainly came to be closely associated with the Templars. In a letter to her, the famous Cistercian Bernard of Clairvaux, a nephew of the Templar master Andrew of Montbard, attested that he had heard that Melisende “cherished the brothers of the Temple and treated them as confidants” (fratres de Templo diligas et familiares habeas).

A benevolent attitude toward the Templars continued in the royal family's subsequent generations and extended beyond the borders of the kingdom of Jerusalem. For example, in 1160, Princess Constance of Antioch (one of Queen Morphia's granddaughters) featured in a charter benefitting the Templars. Constance's husband, Reynald of Châtillon, a French nobleman who had made his way to the Holy Land during the Second Crusade in the entourage of King Louis VII of France, issued the document as “the Antiochene prince by God's permission” (Dei permissione Princeps Antiochenus) and, in his own words, “together with my Lady Constance, princess of the same territory [and] daughter of Bohemond the Younger” (una cum Domina mea Constantia eiusdem honoris Principissa, iunioris Boamundi filia). While the text then continues in the first person singular – i.e., “I give and I grant” (dono et concedo) rather than the first person plural, i.e., “we give and we grant” (donamus et concedimus) – Reynald had duly acknowledged his wife's position and ancestry. His contemporaries would have expected nothing less: after all, Constance was the only child and sole heiress of the late Prince Bohemond II of Antioch. But it gets better, because the document in question confirms the sale of a piece of land to the Templars conducted by the lord of Margat (Marqab), Reynald II Mazoir, the son of the former constable of the principality of Antioch, who, in turn, had acted “with the consent of his wife Agnes, the daughter of the Tripolitan count, and their children” (concessu uxor is sue Agnetis Tripoli-
Agnes’s parents were Count Pons of Tripoli (from the comital house of Toulouse) and his wife Cecilia, a daughter of King Philip I of France. While it is impossible to say with any certainty what may have been involved in obtaining Constance’s and Agnes’s consent to such legal transactions, the Antiochene chancery was certainly aware of their superior position and lineage, and it is safe to assume that the prestige of their consent would not have been lost on the Templars, many of whom had their own family ties to the nobility.

After the death of the aforementioned Agnes, the lord of Margat and his sons had to reconfirm the donations made to the Templars during her lifetime. A few years later, in 1178, an unnamed daughter-in-law of the same lord of Margat appeared at the side of her husband, Bertrand Mazoir, both as a grantor of consent and as a witness to a donation benefitting the Templars (Bertrandus, filius meus, et uxor ipsius testantur). This is remarkable, because noble ladies – and women in general – are rarely mentioned as witnesses in charters of the Crusader states. Nine years later, in 1187, Bertrand’s second wife, a certain Bermunda (or Raymonde), the daughter of Lord Walter II of Beirut-Brisebarre from the kingdom of Jerusalem, played a noteworthy role when the castle and lordship of Margat were transferred to the Hospitallers. As Bertrand Mazoir himself put it, he conducted this transfer, apart from other named reasons, “both on the admonition of and out of affection for the Lady Bermunda, my most beloved wife” (monitu pariter et affectu domine Bermunde, karissimi uxoris mee). Among those expressly listed as supporting the

10 Codice, ed. Pauli, 1: 206–207 no. 163.
11 Inventaire de pièces de Terre Sainte de l’ordre de l’Hospital, ed. Joseph Delaville Le Roulx (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1895), 27 no. 123; RRH, no. 535b; RRR, no. 957. In 1183, Reynald II Mazoir confirmed a donation to the Templars that had originally been made while his wife (Agnes) had still been alive: Inventaire, ed. Delaville Le Roulx, 33 no. 152; RRH, no. 626a; RRR, no. 1122.
13 That Bermunda (or Raymonde) was, in fact, Bertrand’s second wife and cannot have been identical with the unnamed spouse (i.e., Bertrand’s first wife) who had appeared as a witness in Reynald II Mazoir’s abovementioned 1178 charter, has been explained by Hans Eberhard Mayer, Die Kreuzfahrerherrschaften Beirut und Blanchegarde, Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins 50 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2022), 204. On Bermunda, see also Les familles d’outre-mer de Du Cange, ed. Emmanuel-Guillaume Rey (Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1869), 393; Emmanuel-Guillaume Rey, “Les seigneurs de Barut,” Revue de l’Orient latin 4 (1896): 12–18.
transfer, Bermunda ranked third, namely, after the prince of Antioch (the Mazoirs’ feudal lord) and the neighboring count of Tripoli, but still ahead of the bishop of Valenia (Baniyas) in whose diocese Margat was located. Templars and Hospitallers had been competing for properties in the area for decades, but the 1187 acquisition of the castle and lordship of Margat decided the matter in the Hospitallers’ favor. The charter evidence confirms that Bermunda had repeatedly served as a grantor of consent in this race between the two military orders, however, it is reasonable to suspect that she was less interested in showing any kind of preference for one or the other of these communities; rather, she was actively looking for an opportunity to remove herself and her family from an area that they were perceiving as increasingly inhospitable. And, indeed, by 1217, her husband, Bertrand Mazoir, had made his way to Cyprus, and by 1239/1240, her daughter Agnes (named after her grandmother, Agnes of Toulouse) had moved back to the ancestral hometown of Tripoli. Bermunda’s role in the 1187 transfer of Margat – and her strong personal motivation – deserves more attention than it has received thus far. After all, it helped facilitate the establishment of an independent Hospitaller lordship on the strategically important border between the principality of Antioch and the county of Tripoli, adjacent to the territory of the Nizari Ismailis (i.e., the “Assassins”) and near the Gap of Homs, the vital east-west corridor between the Orontes Valley and the Mediterranean coast.

The Templars’ older, privileged position in the diocese of Tortosa (Tartus) had, in many ways, set the precedent for the Hospitallers’ subsequent success at Margat.

(insert); Cartulaire, ed. Delaville Le Roux, 1: 491–496 no. 783 (insert); RRH, no. 647; RRR, no. 1202. For the dating of this transaction to 1187, see Hans Eberhard Mayer, Varia Antiochena: Studien zum Kreuzfahrerfürstentum Antiochia im 12. und frühen 13. Jahrhundert, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Studien und Texte 6 (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1993), 35–36, 182.


In 1152, Bishop William of Tortosa and the Templar master Everard of Barres had reached a landmark agreement with the consent of Count Raymond II of Tripoli, which bestowed upon the Templars considerable revenue and autonomy in exchange for their logistical and military efforts in the area.\textsuperscript{18} In this case, though, one peruses the respective charter in vain for any evidence of spousal consent. This is perhaps not too surprising, since the relationship between Raymond and his wife, Hodierna of Jerusalem – one of Queen Morphia’s daughters and, hence, one of Queen Melisende’s younger sisters – was allegedly akin to that between oil and water: according to the ever-so-suggestive William of Tyre, “animosity [between husband and wife] arose from marital jealousy” \textit{(ex zelo maritali orta simultas)}.\textsuperscript{19} When Count Raymond was murdered by a group of Nizari Ismailis later that same year, Hodierna took over the regency for the couple’s underage son, Raymond III, and the Templars had to wait until 1157 for the latter to confirm their rights in Tortosa. As he was still unmarried in 1157 (and would remain so until 1174), Raymond III’s confirmation of the agreement between the bishop of Tortosa and the Templars naturally features no spousal consent.

The issue of spousal consent would take center stage again in the earlier thirteenth century, namely, when the Teutonic Order acquired the so-called “Seigneurie de Joscelin,” a lordship in the kingdom of Jerusalem that consisted of various scattered territories in the royal domain to the north-east of Acre. The history of this inheritance of Joscelin III, the titular count of Edessa from the noble house of Courtenay, has been exhaustively discussed by Hans Eberhard Mayer.\textsuperscript{20} According to the charter evidence, Joscelin was well disposed toward both Templars and Hospitallers; in addition, in 1190, he witnessed a royal grant for the Hospital of St. Mary of the Germans outside of Acre (i.e., the future Teutonic Order).\textsuperscript{21}


\textsuperscript{19} Guillaume de Tyr, \textit{Chronique}, 2: 786 (17.19).


When he died – in or after 1190 and certainly before 1200 – he was survived by two daughters: the elder, Beatrice, was named after her grandmother (Beatrice of Saone, countess of Edessa) and her great-grandmother (Beatrice of Armenia from the Rubenid dynasty), and the younger, Agnes, was named after her mother (Agnes of Milly-Nablus, a noble lady from the kingdom of Jerusalem). Based on the legal customs of the realm, Beatrice was to inherit the lordship in its entirety (Agnes of Milly-Nablus, a noble lady from the kingdom of Jerusalem). Based on the legal customs of the realm, Beatrice was to inherit the lordship in its entirety and be responsible for its feudal obligations, but she was also expected to provide her younger sister Agnes with sub-fiefs. In addition, according to a marriage contract recorded in 1186, Beatrice should have married a brother (namely, William of Valence) and Agnes a nephew (unnamed) of Guy of Lusignan who was king of Jerusalem at that time (1186–1190/1192). This did not happen, however, because Beatrice decided to marry the German Crusader and minnesinger Otto of Henneberg-Botenlauben, albeit without obtaining the requisite permission of Guy’s brother, Aimery of Lusignan, the new king of Jerusalem (1198–1205). Aimery resented the marriage, but he was ultimately unable to prevent it. Beatrice’s sister Agnes, too, opted against marrying a member of the noble house of Lusignan: instead, she chose William of Amigdala (Mandelée) from Calabria who was at least one of Aimery’s supporters.

Whether this has anything to do with her husband’s favorable standing at court or is simply the result of the haphazard archival tradition, Agnes does feature several years earlier in the charters of the kingdom of Jerusalem than her older sister Beatrice. In three legal matters recorded in the year 1200, Agnes – referred to as “lady” (domina) and “daughter of Count Joscelin” (filia comitis Ioscelini) – gave her consent to her husband William’s actions: firstly, when he represented her

no. 412; RRH, no. 582; RRR, no. 1034; and Urkunden, ed. Mayer, 2: 728–730 no. 429; RRH, no. 613; RRR, no. 1095, Hospital of St. Mary of the Germans: Urkunden, ed. Mayer, 2: 822–824 no. 482; RRH, no. 696; RRR, no. 1285.
56 Urkunden, ed. Mayer, 2: 801–803 no. 475; RRH, no. 655; RRR, no. 1197.
rights and those of their heirs with regard to a casale (i.e., a rural estate) temporarily held by the patriarch of Jerusalem; secondly, when he transferred specified real-estate ownership (namely, a house and two charruées of land) in the area of casale Blanc (near Acre); and thirdly, when he made a land grant to the Teutonic Order. Interaction between Beatrice and the military orders was recorded eight years later, namely, in 1208, when she – referred to as “lady” (domina) or “countess” (comitissa) and “daughter of Count Joscelin” (comitis Ioscelini filia) – gave her consent to her husband Otto’s actions: firstly, when he made a real-estate grant to the Teutonic Order; and secondly, when he gave one half of casale Blanc to the Hospitallers. That the late Count Joscelin, Beatrice’s and Agnes’s father, is mentioned in all of these documents is to be expected; after all, his legacy was serving as the basis of the two couples’ livelihood and benevolence. It is perhaps noteworthy, though, that William’s and Otto’s grants for the Teutonic Order, issued with spousal consent, are written in the first person singular and, toward the end, announce the use of the (presumably male) issuer’s seal in the singular as well (sigillum meum); meanwhile, the grant for the Hospitallers, issued by Otto “with the venerable Countess Beatrice, my wife” (cum venerabili comitissa Beatrice, uxore mea), is consistently written in the first person plural (i.e., donamus, sumus, absolvemus, satisfaciemus, fecimus, roboravimus); they refer to themselves as “fellow siblings” (confratres) of the Hospital; and they announce the use of “their lead seal,” employing the possessive pronoun in the plural (sigillo nostro plumbeo). Taken together with the statement of confraternity, the consistent use of the plural in this

57 *Tabulae ordinis Theotonici ex tabularii regii Berolinensis codice potissimum*, ed. Ernst Strehlke (Berlin: Weidmann, 1869), 30 no. 37: dominum Willelmum de Amigdalea pro se et uxore sua domina Agnetis filia comitis Ioscelini [...] ad dominum W(illelmon) et uxor(em) suam et eorum heredes [...] domino G(illelmo) et uxori sue et eorum heredibus; *Urkunden*, ed. Mayer, 2: 1003–1005 no. 619; *RRH*, no. 773; *RRR*, no. 1471.

58 *Inventaire*, ed. Delaville Le Roulx, 39 no. 188: faite par Guillaume l’Amendelier, du consentement d’Agnès, sa femme, fille du comte Jaucelin; *RRH*, no. 774a; *RRR*, no. 1474.

59 *Tabulae*, ed. Strehlke, 31 no. 39: ego Guillelmus de la Mandelia concessione et voluntate domina Agnetis uxoris mee, illustris quondam comitissae Ioscelini; *RRH*, no. 777; *RRR*, no. 1477.

60 *Tabulae*, ed. Strehlke, 34–35 no. 43: ego comes Otto assensu et voluntate uxoris mee domine Beatricis, illustris quondam comitis Ioscelini filie; *RRH*, no. 828; *RRR*, no. 1605.


document would suggest that Otto’s and Beatrice’s ties to the Hospitallers were closer, at least in 1208, than their ties to the Teutonic Order.45

Yet, this was not to last. In 1217/1218, Beatrice announced a legal claim against the Hospitaller master Garin of Montaigu with regard to *casale* Manueth (Khirbat al Manawat) in Upper Galilee;44 however, King John of Jerusalem had already sold this *casale* to the Hospitallers back in 1212. Beatrice eventually waived her legal claim in the presence of the king and the royal court, and the respective document refers to her as the “noble lady Beatrice, daughter of Count Joscelin of pious memory” (*nobilis mulier Beatrix pie memorie comitis Iocelini filia*), and as the “general proctor of all goods, appointed by her husband” (*generalis procuratrix omnium honorum a marito constituta*),45 since Otto was temporarily traveling in the West.46

Apart from the fact that the term *generalis procuratrix* points to a remarkable case of female spousal agency, the whole affair indicates that Beatrice and the Hospitallers were no longer seeing eye to eye, and there was certainly no further talk of confraternity. Two years later, in 1220, when Otto, Beatrice, and their son Otto sold all of Beatrice’s inheritance in the kingdom of Jerusalem – the “Seigneurie de Joscelin” – to the Teutonic Order, they gave no reason for this spectacular transaction, and one looks in vain for one in King John’s confirmation of the sale.47 The family immediately relocated to Germany, and since Germany was Otto’s homeland, a desire to “return home” (and to get as far away as possible from the Fifth Crusade and the rumors of the advancing Mongols) may have been reason enough, at least for Otto.48 Beatrice’s sister Agnes, however, who remained in the East, was completely taken by surprise by the sale of her father’s inheritance, which affected her own rights to no small degree. The resulting legal dispute between her son James

---

41 Meanwhile, affinity for the military orders in general extended to the women in their entourage: in 1215, for example, the widow of Conrad of Schwarzenberg (a steward who, in 1208, had witnessed Otto of Henneberg’s and Beatrice’s donation to the Hospitallers: *Cartulaire*, ed. Delaville Le Roux, 2: 94 no. 1313) made a donation to the Teutonic Order: *Tabulae*, ed. Strehlke, 40 no. 48; RRH, no. 879; RRR, no. 1713.

44 Manueth (Khirbat al Manawat) was located in an area where Joscelin III had acquired extensive properties; for his potential rights with regard to this *casale*, see Urkunden, ed. Mayer, 3: 1034.

45 Urkunden, ed. Mayer, 3: 1033–1034, no. 634; RRR, no. 1774; and Urkunden, ed. Mayer, 3: 1034–1036 no. 635; RRH, no. 892; RRR, no. 1775. See also Manosque, fol. 2r h.


48 For details and references, see Urkunden, ed. Mayer, 3: 1048.
and the Teutonic Order would last for twenty-four years,\textsuperscript{49} which did not stop the Teutonic Order from constructing Montfort Castle on the former territory of the “Seigneurie de Joscelin.” That Beatrice had acted without Agnes’s consent in 1220 speaks volumes about the relationship between the two ladies.

In 1254, Lord Julian of Sidon, “with the leave and the consent and the will of Femi [i.e., Euphemia], my wife” (\textit{par l’otrei et l’assentement et la volonté de Femie m’épose}), sold casale Roberti (Kafr Kanna, located in Galilee between Nazareth and Tiberias) to the Hopitallers for \textit{24,000 besants} (i.e., gold coins).\textsuperscript{50} As Mayer has pointed out, this is the only surviving example among Julian’s charters featuring his wife, a daughter of King Hethum I of Cilician Armenia, as a grantor of consent, and he has suggested the following explanation for this remarkable incident: “Julian sold here a village, which belonged at least in part to Femi who may have invested her dowry there.”\textsuperscript{51} Thus, it certainly appears likely that explicit consent was necessary whenever a husband was making arrangements that involved his wife’s property or property-related rights,\textsuperscript{52} but there may have been other reasons for spousal consent, for example, a desire to display collective agency or an interest in enhancing a transaction’s prestige by pointing to a spouse’s noble lineage.

II. Issuing Charters

We now turn to the issuing of charters by women of the nobility who intended to support the military orders and, in turn, reap the benefits of being associated with these religious communities. Direct interaction with the military orders was, of course, not a prerogative of the nobility, as the following example illustrates: in 1129, King Baldwin II confirmed to the Hospitallers the donations they had received during the reign of his predecessor, King Baldwin I of Jerusalem, and up until that point in time during his own reign; this included the (unidentified) \textit{casale} Iebethza near Acre, half of which had been donated to the Hospitallers by a certain “Aldeburgis, the sister of Lambert, the money-changer”(\textit{dimidiam


\textsuperscript{50} \textit{Cartulaire}, ed. Delaville Le Roux, 2: 761–763 no. 2688, here 761; \textit{RRH}, no. 1217.


\textsuperscript{52} Hans Eberhard Mayer, letter to the author, 24 June 2023.
While this Aldeburgis “only” belonged to the kingdom of Jerusalem’s burgess class and was not a noblewoman, the document’s wording – “Aldeburgis has given” (donavit Aldeburgis) – serves as an important piece of evidence for female agency on behalf of the Hospitallers during the early years of this community’s history. In light of the uneven and fragmentary archival tradition of the Crusader states as well as Acre’s significance for the military orders’ activities in the thirteenth century, Aldeburgis’s donation may well have contributed to the flourishing of the Hospitallers’ future headquarters; thus, it is definitely worth mentioning, and it was by no means an isolated case.

To get a sense of the agency of noble ladies who issued charters for the military orders, either by themselves or in a leading capacity, we start with the female members of Jerusalem’s royal family. From 1131 until 1152, Melisende of Jerusalem, the daughter of King Baldwin II and Queen Morphia, played a key role in ruling the kingdom: first as crowned queen at the side of her husband, King Fulk of Jerusalem (until 1143); then as regent for her underage son Baldwin III (until 1145); and finally as joint ruler alongside the latter until her ouster (1152). However, from 1149 on, as Mayer has put it, the relationship between Melisende and her son Baldwin was more than icy, and the chancery of the realm disintegrated into rival scriptoria (i.e., writing offices) in support of the young king and his mother, respectively. In 1149, Melisende engaged in a real-estate exchange with the Hospitallers. Her document mentions Baldwin III’s consent and is dated according to his regnal years but, according to Mayer, this supposed affirmation of the unity of the realm was merely lip service. As for the real-estate exchange, the Hospitallers transferred baths in Acre’s St. Leonard’s quarter to the queen and, in return, received a loggia at the entrance of the city’s Basilica of St. John the Baptist as well


as houses that had belonged to the castellan of Acre and land on the road to casale Blanc; in addition, the queen confirmed that the Hospitallers had purchased a house and a tower from the city’s viscount. Thus, in the middle of the twelfth century, Melisende was playing an essential part in consolidating the Hospitallers’ properties in and around Acre, and in doing so, as her document tells us, she was “diligently fashioning herself after her eminent ancestors, who had endowed places dedicated to God with their gifts” (precedentium patrum, qui deo dicata loca suis ornaverunt donariis, industrie me conformans). The following year (1150), Melisende made a donation to the Hospitallers’ Church of St. John in Jerusalem, stipulating that, during her lifetime, the poor and those who cared for them should be given a meal at Easter; after her death, this meal should instead be served on the anniversary of her passing, on which day (i.e., the anniversary) a mass should also be celebrated in her memory. We have already heard that Melisende had close ties to the Templars. Her abovementioned charters, issued in 1149 and 1150, underscore that she was also cultivating a spiritual connection to the Hospitallers, and considering the smoldering leadership crisis in the kingdom of Jerusalem at this point in time, safeguarding her memoria would have been a particular concern of hers. In the words of Paul L. Sidelko, “[i]t is not unreasonable to assume that these powerful women used gifts of property as incentives to win the support of the Hospital, just as their male counterparts did.” This type of agency, whether it involved men or women of the nobility interacting with the military orders, was usually bidirectional and mutually beneficial.

In 1176, Melisende’s granddaughter Sibylla married William of Montferrat and became countess of Jaffa and Ascalon. The following year (1177), she donated four towers in Ascalon, a garden, and an annual income of 100 besants to the Spanish military order of Montjoie which had been founded just a few years earlier, specifically, to its founder, Count Rodrigo Álvarez of Sarriá. Sibylla’s charter only mentions her husband, William of Montferrat, insofar as the donation was being made for the sake of her and his salvation (in that order). Meanwhile, her late father, King Amalric of Jerusalem, appears much more prominently, namely, as part of Sibylla’s intitulatio, but her younger brother, King Baldwin IV of Jerusa-

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{58} Urkunden, ed. Mayer, 1: 351–354 no. 175, here 353.  
\textsuperscript{59} Urkunden, ed. Mayer, 1: 355–357 no. 177; Cartulaire, ed. Delaville Le Roulx, 1: 148–149 no. 191; RRH, no. 262; RRR, no. 499.  
\textsuperscript{60} Sidelko, “Acquisition,” 196.  
\textsuperscript{61} Urkunden, ed. Mayer, 2: 843–845 no. 493; RRH, no. 553; RRR, no. 977.
lem, merely supplies his regnal years to the document’s concluding date clause. By transferring some of Ascalon’s fortifications to this new military order, Sibylla certainly communicated the hope that the knights of Montjoie might contribute to the defense of this crucial Mediterranean coastal city that had only been conquered by the Franks in 1153 after a lengthy siege. While this hope would remain largely unfulfilled (due to this knightly community’s rather limited engagement in the Holy Land), Sibylla’s 1177 donation to the Spanish military order of Montjoie nonetheless shows a remarkable openness toward institutional alternatives to the Templars and Hospitallers. In 1190, Sibylla – now queen of Jerusalem – showed the same openness toward the Hospital of St. Mary of the Germans outside of Acre (i.e., the future Teutonic Order), because, as far as I am concerned, the much-discussed 1190 document for this new community owes its prestige not to Guy of Lusignan, who was the king of Jerusalem by marriage, a younger son of Poitevin nobility, and the “loser” of the Battle of Hattin, but, rather, to his wife, Queen Sibylla (domna Sybilla, uxor mea [...] venerabilis regina), whose father, grandparents, and great-grandparents had already worn the crown of Jerusalem and who, accordingly, acted as coissuer in 1190. All this to say, a female member of the nobility, Sibylla of Jerusalem, deserves credit as a primary agent for the establishment of the Teutonic Order, and her sister Isabella (alongside her respective husbands) would follow in her footsteps.

---


64 Mayer, Urkunden, ed. Mayer, 2: 822–824 no. 482, here 824: ego Guido per dei gratham in sancta civitate Ierusalem Latinorum rex VIII et domna Sybilla uxor mea, per eandem venerabilis regina. In 1192, after Sibylla’s death, Guy issued a document for the Hospital of the Germans “for the redemption and salvation of my soul, and for the salvation of the soul of my spouse of noble memory, Lady Sibylla, the venerable queen” (pro redemptione et salute anime mee et pro salute anime spouse mee bone recordationis domne Sibille venerabilis regine): Urkunden, ed. Mayer, 2: 852–855 no. 488, here 855; RRH, no. 701; RRR, no. 1527.

We now turn to Antioch, where the Hospitallers seem to have enjoyed the support of the princely family from the very beginning. In 1130, when Prince Bohemond II of Antioch was killed in an ambush in Cilicia, his widow, Princess Alice – another daughter of King Baldwin II and Queen Morphia, and a sister of the aforementioned Melisende and Hodierna – sought the regency for their two-year-old daughter Constance, but she was met with resistance and had to retire to Latakia, a town on the Mediterranean coast that was part of her dowry. However, she was by no means willing to accept defeat and, thus, proceeded to issue charters for a number of institutions in order to secure their support, including the Hospitallers who, at this time, were gradually developing from a charitable community into a military order. In 1134, Alice donated properties in Latakia and Jableh to the Hospitallers, and she introduced herself in the respective (heavily damaged) document – according to Mayer’s meticulous reconstruction of the text – as “Alice, daughter of Baldwin II, the Jerosolimitan king of the Latins, wife of the late Prince Bohemond, by the grace of God Antiochene princess” (Adelisia, Balduini regis Hierosolymitani Latinorum secundi filia, uxor quondam Boamundi principis, dei gratia principissa Antiochena). It was a donation with a significant long-term effect, as Latakia and Jableh would play a central role in the dispute between the Hospitallers and Templars well into the thirteenth century.

Due to the pressure exerted on the Crusader states in the course of the twelfth century, first by Zengi, the atabeg of Aleppo and Mosul, and subsequently by his son Nur ad-Din, a number of Frankish nobles – including several ladies in the...
county of Tripoli – transferred their properties to the military orders. In 1151, with the consent of Raymond of Margon as well as the comital family and barons of Tripoli, a certain Flandina donated a number of properties in Arqa and elsewhere to the Hospitallers, including those that, as Flandina put it, one William of Grillon “was holding in fief from us” (*a nobis in feodum tenebat*). The document suggests that Flandina was a vassal of the count of Tripoli, whose court officers served as witnesses, whose chancellor wrote the document, and whose lead seal confirmed the donation. At the same time, she was also the liege lady of the aforementioned William of Grillon. Apart from the plural phrase “from us” (*a nobis*), the document is written in the first person singular. Flandina’s husband is not mentioned in the document, her relationship to Raymond of Margon, who gave his consent, is not clear, and the text contains no indication of her possible widowhood.

In the same year (1151), the Hospitaller master Raymond of Puy confirmed that two *casalia* had been granted to his community by “Lady Armensende of Châteauneuf” (*a domina Armensendi de Castro Novo*). Like Flandina, Armensende had acted with the consent of the comital family of Tripoli, and this time, too, the count’s court officers acted as witnesses, his chancellor wrote the document, and the count’s lead seal corroborated the grant. We also learn that Armensende had conducted this legal transaction with the consent and advice of her two daughters and her son-in-law (*laude et consilio filiarum suarum, Ugone videlicet et Berengarie, et Leodogarii, mariti Hugone*). The text, like Flandina’s, contains no references to Armensende’s possible widowhood or, for that matter, to her husband at all. Considering the historical context, Jean Richard’s explanation that Flandina and Armensende may have been widows whose husbands had lost their lives in military engagements against Nur ad-Din is certainly plausible, however, it also raises the question why neither of these ladies even once referred to her husband’s *memoria*. For example in 1174, when Eschiva, lady of Tiberias (but *de facto* “princess” of Galilee), and her son Hugh, who was not yet of legal age, issued a donation to the Hospitallers, Eschiva expressly mentioned her late husband, Walter of Saint-Omer, who had just passed away, in the salvation formula (*ego Eschiva et Hugo, *
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72 *Cartulaire*, ed. Delaville Le Roulx, 1: 154–155 no. 199; *RRH*, no. 279; *RRR*, no. 517.
filius meus, pro salute animarum nostrarum, et pro anima domini mei Galteri, anima cujus vivat ante Deum). As for Flandina’s and Armensende’s husbands, there is another possibility that has yet to be considered: namely, at the time the documents were issued, their husbands may have been in captivity – a relatively common predicament in the Crusader period that affected, to name but a few, Bohemund I of Antioch, Baldwin II of Jerusalem, Joscelin II of Edessa, Reynald of Châtillon, Guy of Lusignan, and Louis IX of France, to say nothing of the many members of the military orders who spent time in captivity.

III. Juliana of Caesarea

The following case study focuses on Juliana of Caesarea to further illustrate the interaction between women of the nobility and the military orders in the Crusader states. Located on the Mediterranean coast and captured by the Crusaders in 1101, Caesarea became, in the course of the twelfth century, the seat of an archbishop and the center of a lordship in the kingdom of Jerusalem, administered by members of the noble house of Grenier who originally hailed from Flanders. Saladin’s troops took the city in July 1187 and destroyed its fortifications. When Walter II Grenier, lord of Caesarea, died childless during the Third Crusade’s siege of Acre (28 August 1189 – 12 July 1191), his sister Juliana inherited the fief which, as John L. LaMonte put it, “was purely titular at the time.” Although Richard the Lion-

75 *Cartulaire*, ed. Delaville Le Roulx, 1: 315–316 no. 459; *RRH*, no. 522; *RRR*, no. 924. On Eschiva’s agency as a widow in 1174, see Martin Rheinheimer, *Das Kreuzzügerfürstentum Galiläa* (Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang, 1990), 61 and 151, who emphasizes that the female title (“princess”) was not used in the principality of Galilee. See Sidelko, “Acquisition,” 195, who assumes (albeit incorrectly) that Eschiva – when she issued this 1174 charter – was already married to her second husband, Count Raymond III of Tripoli.


77 Pringle, “Caesarea,” 197.


79 LaMonte, “Lords,” 152.
heart retook Caesarea in 1191, Juliana herself apparently never resided there. This is not too surprising since the city’s fortifications would only be rebuilt around 1217/1218 in preparation for the Crusade against Damietta and well after Juliana’s death which occurred sometime after 1213. From her marriage to Guy, a younger son from the noble house of Beirut-Brissebarre, Juliana had four children, including the future lord of Caesarea, Walter III. Guy administered Caesarea – or what was left of it – only very briefly, if at all, and only iure uxoris (i.e., on the basis of his wife’s legal title). When Guy died, presumably toward the end of the Third Crusade, the heir of Caesarea, Walter III, was still a minor. Thus, Juliana married a certain Aymar of L’Ayron, a knight from France (probably Lusignan) who appears to have come to the Holy Land with the Third Crusade.

We first encounter Juliana in 1182 in a charter issued by her brother, Lord Walter II of Caesarea, when he sold a casale to the Hospitallers and gave them a tower on the Mediterranean Sea, as he put it, “with the consent and will of Lady Juliana, my sister” (assensu et voluntate domine Juliane, sororis mee). As Michael Ehrlich has shown, both Templars and Hospitallers sought to acquire properties in the lordship of Caesarea and consolidate them into coherent spheres of influence. Among those who gave their consent to the 1182 legal transaction benefitting the Hospitallers, Juliana ranked second, namely, after King Baldwin IV and before Juliana’s first husband, Guy of Beirut-Brissebarre, signaling – since Walter II was without children of his own – that Juliana was the heiress presumptive. The document also shows that Juliana was well acquainted with her family’s benevolence toward the military orders years before she became the lady of Caesarea. In the
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charts of the Crusader states, Juliana’s second husband, Aymar of L’Ayron, makes his first appearance as the witness “Aymar of Caesarea” (Azmarus Cesariensis) in the 1194 document by which Henry of Champagne – acting with the consent of his wife, Queen Isabella of Jerusalem – granted to the Church of the Germans in Acre (i.e., the future Teutonic Order) an exemption from all taxes in the crown domain on the purchase of clothing and food for personal use (in accordance with the same exemption that had been granted to both Templars and Hospitallers). As we shall see, this relatively early involvement of Juliana’s husband in supporting a nascent hospital community was indicative of things to come. In fact, according to the Narracio de primordiis ordinis Theutonici, Lord Aymar of Caesarea (Eymarus dominus Cesaree) was present on 5 March 1198, when the same hospital community was transformed into the Teutonic Order.

An original charter – issued in 1197 and confirming the gift of a casale to the Hospitallers that Lord Walter II of Caesarea had granted to them on his deathbed – shows that Juliana was significantly involved in the management of her lordship. In the document’s intitulatio, she introduced herself as, “I, Juliana, lady of Caesarea, daughter of the late Lord Hugh of Caesarea, [acting] with the consent and will of Lord Aymar, my husband” (ego Juliana, Cesaree domina, Hugonis quondam Cesaree domini filia, assensu et voluntate domini Ademari, mariti mei). She then continues in the first person singular (concedo et confirmo); the salvation formula is limited to Juliana and her own ancestors (pro remedio anime mee et animarum parentum meorum); and the announcement that a seal has been used to corroborate this legal transaction only mentions her own lead seal in the singular (sigillo meo plumbeo); unfortunately, this lead seal has not survived. Four years later, in 1201, when Aymar issued a charter as “lord of Caesarea in Palestine” (ego Ademarius Cesaree Palestine Dominus) with the consent and will of his wife...
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Juliana and her son Walter (cum assensu et voluntate Domine Juliane uxoris mee et Domini Gualerii Cesaree filii ejusdem Domine Juliane uxoris mee), the text continues, once again, in the first person singular (dono et in perpetuum concedo), but the announcement that a seal has been used then transitions to a verb form and possessive pronoun in the plural with the corresponding noun in the singular: “we have ordered it [i.e., the grant] to be confirmed by our lead seal” (nostro sigillo plumbeo [...] iussimus corroborari). We will return later on to the question of what kind of “collective” seal may have been used here.

Aymar, of course, also had his own seal. In a charter issued in 1206, “Lady Juliana of Caesarea” (Iuliana domina Cesaree) – acting with the consent of her husband Aymar and her son Walter – confirmed a number of properties to the Teutonic Order, including towers in Caesarea, under the condition that these towers would be relinquished to the lord of Caesarea (domino Caesaree) should he need them against his enemies (contra inimicos suos); after the conclusion of a peace agreement, these towers would then be returned to the Teutonic Order. Whether the lords of Caesarea did not wish to include the Teutonic Order in the defense of their city (with its still dilapidated fortifications), or whether they merely wanted to ensure control of their own fortifications in the case of an armed conflict, is not clear; the latter would seem to be more likely. When announcing the use of a seal, Juliana informs us that “her husband, Lord Aymar, had attached the testimony and protection of his seal to this privilege” (maritus meus dominus Aymarus sigilli sui testimonium huic privilegio apposuit et munimen). Had Aymar used his own seal because he – and not Juliana – was primarily expected to defend Caesarea? Did the responsibility for issuing this particular charter nonetheless fall to Juliana because Aymar only served as lord of Caesarea iure uxoris? We do not learn whether the seal Aymar used here was a lead seal. If it was his personal seal (i.e., a seal that did not specifically refer to him as lord of Caesarea), it may have been a wax seal.
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Be that as it may, both the Hospitallers and the Teutonic Order were recipients of Juliana’s and Aymar’s benevolence. In the same year (1206), Aymar was appointed marshal of the kingdom of Jerusalem, and he swore an oath guaranteeing the promise that the young Queen Maria of Jerusalem had made to marry King Peter II of Aragon; however, this dynastic plan came to naught.

From the following year (1207), we have two charters issued by Juliana of Caesarea for the Hospitallers: in both cases, she acted “with the consent and will of her husband, Lord Aymar” (cum assensu et voluntate domini Aymari, mariti mei); in both cases, the text of the document is in the singular (donavi et concessi); and in both cases, when the use of a seal is announced, Juliana speaks of her own seal (sigilli mei munimine) without mentioning its material (i.e., lead or wax).

Fortunately, the description of the seal used for the first of these charters can be found in a transsumpt of the document (i.e., an authenticated transcription) made by Thomas Agni of Lentino, the bishop of Bethlehem and a papal legate, in 1268, and a copy of this transsumpt was then made by the French scholar Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc (1580–1637) in the seventeenth century. According to Peiresc’s copy of the transsumpt, the original charter was “sealed with a lead bull hanging by a silk thread, on which bull Caesarea [was depicted] and on the other side [of which] appeared the impression of a knight with a shield and a lance, mounted on horseback, with a cross” (bullatum bulla plumbea cum serico pendenti, in qua bulla Caesarea et ex altera parte apparebat impressio militis cum scuto et lancea super equum cruce).

The second charter was evidently still available in its original form to Sebastiano Pauli (1684–1751) in the eighteenth century, and Pauli included a drawing of its attached bull in his Codice diplomatico. Not only does this drawing match the bull’s description in the first charter’s transsumpt, it also shows its respective circumscriptions, namely + IVLIANA DOMINA : CESAREE (“Juliana, Lady of Caesarea”) for the side depicting Caesarea (or, rather, its fortifications), and + S. ADEMAR. DE LERON (“[seal of] Aymar of L’ Ayron) for the side featuring the knight. This suggests that whenever Juliana referred to “my
seal” or “my lead seal,” and whenever Aymar in turn referred to “our lead seal,” we are most likely dealing with this particular “spousal” bull on which they are both named: Aymar on the obverse side (i.e., the front face) and Juliana on the reverse side (i.e., the back face), but only Juliana with her lordly title, which may be the reason why the transsumpt described the bull’s reverse side (i.e., Juliana’s side) first. To my knowledge, this is the only such seal known from the Crusader states.

Juliana’s second charter of 1207 includes the following statement:

“I also choose for myself [that my] place of burial [shall be] in the Hospital, like a fellow sister of the same house [i.e., the Hospitaller order] and [like] a friend, on whom the piety of the said house has always bestowed much good and honor. Truly, I cannot join myself to any other order but the Hospital, and the brothers of the house are bound, at my request – whether in life or in death – to grant me the habit of the Hospital kindly and charitably; and as long as I live, like a sister of the house, I neither can nor must want anything.”

All the favors that she and her husband had granted to the Teutonic Order since the end of the twelfth century notwithstanding, Juliana chose the Hospital as her final resting place. The total number and volume of donations made by the Grenier family to the Hospitallers since 1110 must have factored into this decision: they represented a material and spiritual connection that spanned almost a century. Or perhaps Juliana was considering the Hospitallers’ international prestige: it is noteworthy that her 1207 charters featured Hospitaller and Templar witnesses, but none from the Teutonic Order. Or perhaps she was picturing herself being laid to rest as an honored “fellow sister” (consoror) on the Hospitallers’ increasingly

101 Cartulaire, ed. Delaville Le Roulx, 2: 65 no. 1251: Elegi etiam mihi locum sepulture in Hospitali, sicut consoror eiusdem domus et amica, cui dicte domus pietas multum boni semper contulit et honoris. Ego vero non possum me conferre alteri religioni nisi Hospitali, et fratres domus tenentur mibi ad petitionem meam, in vita vel in morte, dare habitum Hospitalis benigne et caritativo; et, dum viscero, tamquam sorori domus mihi deesse nec poterit, nec debet.

102 For this early Grenier donation of a casale in the lordship of Caesarea, confirmed by King Baldwin I in 1110, see Urkunden, ed. Mayer, 1: 165–168 no. 42, here 167; RRH, no. 57; RRR, no. 114.
impressive conventual premises in Acre. Or perhaps she was craving some security in light of her husband’s impending journey to the West: according to the Estoire de Eracles, “a rich man of the land, named Aymar of L’Ayon, who was lord of Caesarea through his wife Juliana” (“un riche home de la terre, qui avoit nom Aymar de Lairon, qui estoit seignor de Cesaire de par sa femme Juliane”), and the bishop of Acre were about to travel to King Philip II of France on behalf of the spiritual and temporal lords of the realm to find a husband for Queen Maria. Their search for a bridegroom was successful and, thus, John of Brienne from Champagne came to the East and was crowned in Tyre on 3 October 1210, alongside his bride. Aymar of Caesarea (Aymar de Cesayre) attended the coronation as a guest.

The Estoire de Eracles’s characterization of Aymar as un riche home was either pure flattery, or the lord and lady of Caesarea found themselves in a financial crisis shortly thereafter. In any case, in November 1212, Aymar and Juliana (Aymard, seigneur de Césarée, et Julienne, sa femme) felt compelled to take out a loan of 2,000 Saracen besants, as well as 110 units of barley and 60 units of wheat, from the Hospitaller master. As collateral, they pledged their houses in Acre and Tyre, as well as the casale Turcarme (Tulkarm), located to the south-east of Caesarea. While this legal transaction has only survived in the form of early modern regestra (i.e., document summaries), it is nevertheless evidence for the couple’s collective agency. Barely a year later, in October 1213, Aymar and Juliana made another pledge to the Hospitallers, and this seems to be their only charter that is consistently written in the plural (i.e., mutuavimus, assignavimus, concedentes, obligamus).

As explained immediately after the intitulatio, they were “driven by poverty [and] urgent need” (compulsi penuria, incumbente necessitate) to secure another loan, this time for 1,000 Saracen besants. As collateral, they pledged three casalia to the Hospitallers, expecting that the loan would be repaid from these estates’ revenue. In case this should prove insufficient to repay the loan, they made
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“their entire movable and immovable goods” (omnia bona nostra mobilia et immobilia) available to the Hospitallers to the extent of the loan amount.\(^{108}\)

This loan pledge, issued in the fall of 1213, is the last piece of charter evidence for Juliana of Caesarea. Whether she did indeed place herself into the care of the Hospitallers before her death, as she had anticipated only a few years earlier, is unknown. By 1217, Wālter III – Juliana’s son from her first marriage – had succeeded her in the lordship of Caesarea and was serving as the constable of the kingdom of Cyprus.\(^{109}\) Meanwhile, Juliana’s second husband, Aymar of L’Ayron, had joined the Hospitallers. Building on his respective experience as a court officer in the kingdom of Jerusalem, he was entrusted with the office of marshal in the order’s central convent by early 1216.\(^{110}\) As Hospitaller marshal, he participated in the Crusade against Damietta where, at the end of August 1219, he was either taken prisoner or killed in action.\(^{111}\) In 1252, Caesarea was refortified during the Crusade of King Louis IX, but was eventually razed to the ground thirteen years later, in 1265, by the troops of the Mamluk Sultan Baybars.

***

The interaction between women of the nobility and the military orders in the Crusader states was deeply symbiotic. Firstly, as grantors of consent and issuers of charters, women of the nobility contributed significantly to the success of these institutions: as the charter evidence suggests, the Hospitallers owed their establishment at Margat at least in part to Bermunda of Beirut-Brisebarre/Mazoir; the Teutonic Order might have never built Montfort had it not been for Beatrice of Courtenay/Henneberg-Botenlauben and her consent to the sale of the “Seigneurie de Joscelin;” and it is fair to assume that the documents of the Templars’ lost central archive would have shown traces of similar agency by the ladies of Caesarea in the area of Atlit (Château Pèlerin). Secondly, focusing on the male issuers of charters in the Crusader states is misleading, especially since the wives of these male issuers often hailed from considerably more respected families and thus signifi-

\(^{108}\) Cartulaire, ed. Delaville Le Roulx, 2: 159 no. 1414. Sidelko, “Acquisition,” 144–145, has suggested that the loan must have been repaid eventually, since the respective casalia (at least Cafarlet/Kafr Lam, located to the north of Caesarea) were apparently still owned by the lords of Caesarea in the early 1230s.

\(^{109}\) Cartulaire, ed. Delaville Le Roulx, 2: 226–227 no. 1579; RRH, no. 896; RRR, no. 1746.

\(^{110}\) Cartulaire, ed. Delaville Le Roulx, 2: 185 no. 1462; RRH, no. 885a; RRR, no. 172.4.

\(^{111}\) For his career as a Hospitaller, see Burgdorf, Central Convent, 491.
cantly increased the prestige of the legal transactions to which they granted their consent; and it appears that the use of seals deserves more attention in this respect as well.\textsuperscript{112} Thirdly, when women of the nobility issued charters “by themselves,” their male reference persons (i.e., fathers, husbands, or sons) were usually – but not always – absent, namely, deceased, ill, imprisoned, or underage; yet, as we have seen, Juliana of Caesarea also issued charters in the presence and with the consent of her husband, and hers would not have been an isolated case. Fourthly, as far as the noble ladies’ motivations when dealing with the military orders are concerned, the documents reveal a remarkable range of such motivations and a distinct lack of mono-causality; thus, we encounter spiritual aspects (such as \textit{caritas}, \textit{consororitas}, and \textit{memoria}), family traditions, the building of alliances, military considerations, economic interests and constraints, and even exit strategies – both within \textit{Outre-mer} and beyond. Finally, what these noble ladies thought of the members of the military orders with whom they had direct encounters, or vice versa, transcends the evidence that is available to us – unless one places one’s trust in the ingenuity and imagination of medieval chroniclers.\textsuperscript{113}

\textbf{Primary sources:}

Carpentras. Bibliothèque Inguimbertine, Ms. 1848 (Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc, \textit{Regestes}, s. XVII).

Marseilles. Archives départementales (Bouches-du-Rhône), Ordre de Malte 56 H 68 (\textit{Inventaire de Manosque}, a. 1531).


\begin{itemize}
  \item It would enhance the quality of the \textit{RRR} if they were more specific with regard to the use of seals in the documents for which the \textit{RRR} provide summaries.
\end{itemize}


Tabulae ordinis Theotonici ex tabularii regii Berolinensis codice potissimum. Edited by Ernst Strehlke. Berlin: Weidmann, 1869.


Die Urkunden der lateinischen Könige von Jerusalem. Edited by Hans Eberhard Mayer. Old French texts compiled by Jean Richard. Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Dipo-


**Secondary sources:**


