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It is generally assumed that Jaffa was first separated from the royal domain of the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem and assigned to a vassal in about 1118, namely to Hugh II of Le Puiset, Viscount of Chartres (Hugh I of Jaffa).¹ This assumption is predominantly based on the report in the chronicle of Archbishop William of Tyre, but it is in conflict with the charter evidence. Since the county of Jaffa was one of the most important lordships of the kingdom, the problem is worth reexamination.

The charter evidence shows, as we shall see, that there was a constable of Jaffa as early as 1115.² This office must be regarded in the light of a theory developed by Jean d'Ibelin, one of the most renowned of the many excellent feudal lawyers of the Latin East, that in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem there were four baronies and several other

---

* I should like to express my sincere gratitude to the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, where I was a Fellow during the winter of 1983/1984, for giving me the opportunity to write this study. I also thank Prof. B.Z. Kedar of the Hebrew University for his constructive criticism.


² It is, perhaps, appropriate to explain a few Crusader offices mentioned in this paper. The constable was the king's (or a great baron's) chief military officer. The marshal was in all respects the lieutenant of the constable. The seneschal (plural seneschaux) was the chief financial and judicial officer of the king or the great barons. Theoretically he was the first in rank among the grand officers, but in Jerusalem the constable generally superseded him in political influence. The viscounts were the principal local and regional administrators of the king or the great barons, acting as financial agents and as chairmen of the lower courts. The castellans were appointed and removable commanders of individual castles (or citadels in cities and, therefore, military commanders of those cities) belonging to the king or a lord. The magistri were multi-purpose functionaries without a titled office but holding the academic degree of Master of Arts. The chaplains conducted the religious services for the king and the seigneurs but also frequently drew up the charters of the latter.
It must, however, be noted that there is no evidence of either constitutional theory or political practice, apart from Jean’s lawbook, which would point to four baronies having ever existed. Certainly, the use of the word baro (‘baron’) in the charters, and even their distinction from more simple homines regis (‘vassals of the king’), does not yield any indication that Jean’s four baronies existed as a special category in the social hierarchy of the Latin Kingdom.4

According to Jean, the four baronies were: (1) the county of Jaffa–Ascalon together with the lordship of Ramla; (2) the principality of Galilee; (3) the lordship of Sidon, Caesarea and Bethsan; (4) either the county of Tripoli or the lordship of Transjordan and Hebron. With regard to the fourth case, Jean said, opinion was divided as to which of the two constituted a barony. The characteristics of a barony were, according to Jean, that it furnished 100 knights to the royal army and (because of this substantial military service) had a constable and a marshal, i.e. the two chief military officers.

In the county of Tripoli we find a marshal in 1142 but two constables officiating simultaneously as early as 1106. In the principality of Galilee we meet with both a constable and a marshal in 1121. For Caesarea there is no evidence of either office, although senechaux are attested already in 1129 and 1131. Neither a constable nor a marshal is mentioned for Bethsan, while in Sidon a constable is found in 1158, a marshal in 1228. In Transjordan and its later subsidiary Hebron there is no evidence for either a constable or a marshal. Though the archives of the lords of Transjordan are no longer extant, chance has preserved a few charters by lords of Transjordan or their family. In none of them is a constable or a marshal named, although they give us evidence for castellans, viscounts, chaplains, magistri and even senechaux.5 If the mighty lords of Transjordan had such a highly developed range of seignorial offices, it is hard to believe that they did not also have a constable and a marshal, or at least one of these offices. However, this is what Jean d’Ibelin says.6

In the county of Jaffa a marshal is met with in 1133 (RRH, No. 147). However, a constable of Jaffa, to which Ascalon was not added until after its conquest in 1153, occurs rather early in 1115 (RRH, No. 80). He is no other than the famous Barisan-le-Vieux, the founder of the house of Ibelin. He is described as constable of Jaffa from 1115 to 1130 and he styles himself so in 1126.7 He had been appointed before 1115;

---

6 Livre de Jean d’Ibelin c. 269, RHC. Lois, I, p. 418.
7 RRH, Nos. 80, 90, 102a, 112 (by Barisan himself), 113, 134, 137a; cf. RRH, No. 120. RRH, No. 100, is a forgery; see H.E. Mayer: Carving up Crusaders: The early Ibelins and Ramlas, in B.Z. Kedar et al. (eds.): Outremer: Studies in the History of the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem Presented to Joshua Prawer, Jerusalem, 1982, pp. 109–114.
ORIGINS OF THE COUNTY OF JAFFA

RRH, No. 80, a royal confirmation of the possessions of St. Mary in the Valley of Josaphat, records that before this date he, as constable of Jaffa, had made a donation to Josaphat. William of Tyre also lists him as constable of Jaffa. He is last mentioned alive in 1150 and must have died shortly thereafter.8

It has always been assumed that Barisan was the constable of Counts Hugh I and Hugh II of Jaffa;9 indeed, this follows from RRH, Nos. 102a, 113 and 134. But if Hugh I did not receive Jaffa until 1118, whose constable was Barisan in 1115 in RRH, No. 80? It is unlikely that a royal constable would have been called constable of Jaffa, even if one allows for the fact that originally Jaffa was one of the most important places of the kingdom. Up to the conquest of Acre in 1104 the open roadsteads of Jaffa furnished the only port of the kingdom, since Caesarea after its conquest in 1101 apparently never became viable as a port. While the importance of Jaffa might have warranted the appointment of a special royal constable, his task could equally well have been performed by a royal castellan such as can be shown to have existed in Jaffa. The kingdom had at any time only one constable who was styled constabularius regis (constable of the king); the constable of Jaffa would be the only exception to this rule. And while we have seen that in Tripoli two constables held office simultaneously, this was exceptional and surely could not have been a practical arrangement, as it was bound to lead to conflicts of competence which were most undesirable in the office of the chief officer of the army.

Let us look then at the scanty evidence for the early history of Crusader Jaffa. It was conquered in either the summer or the autumn of 1099. Godfrey of Bouillon took it under his administration, repaired its fortifications and established a hospital there.10 On

---


2 February 1100 Godefrey ceded one quarter of Jaffa to the Holy Sepulchre. At Easter 1100 he seems to have given the remaining three quarters of Jaffa to the Patriarch Daimbert of Jerusalem but retained the usufruct for life. Before Godefrey died on 18 July 1100 he confirmed these concessions in his will; however, this was entirely disregarded by his vassals, who brought his brother Baldwin I from Edessa and established him as King of Jerusalem. When Baldwin came to Jaffa in November 1100 on his march to Jerusalem to claim the rulership, the population cheered him and allowed him to proceed as if he were already their king.

There can be no doubt that during at least part of Baldwin's long reign (1100–1118) Jaffa belonged to the royal domain; in 1110 the king confirmed to the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem his gift of a good oven as well as of lands and houses in the city of Jaffa (RRH, No. 57). Since the gift also included possessions in Acre, it must have been made after the conquest of Acre in 1104. Other charters unfortunately add little to this picture. In 1115, according to RRH, No. 80, the Abbey of Josaphat possessed four carrucatae of land in Jaffa and two in Acre (one carrucata is about 35 hectares). In 1120 this was confirmed by King Baldwin II, who stated that King Baldwin I had given, among other property in Beirut as well as in a suburb of Acre, four carrucatae of arable land in the territory of Jaffa. The original charter by Baldwin I donating this land is lost. The donation cannot be dated either by the conquest of Acre in 1104, because the land was not in the city but in a suburb, or by the conquest of Beirut of 1110, since for reasons I have explained elsewhere the Beirut gift must have been made in a separate charter. While theoretically the gift in Jaffa could have been made at any time between the accession of Baldwin I late in 1100 and the confirmation of 1115, it can be shown that actually it was a donation to the church of St. Mary in the Valley of Josaphat before it received monastic status in 1110/1111. It follows then from the charter evidence discussed here that Jaffa remained a royal possession at least until the conquest of Acre. Actually it remained in the royal domain beyond this year.

In August 1105 a certain Litardus of Cambrai is found with other followers of Baldwin I in the royal army. But when on 27 August 1105 the king rode into the third battle of Ramla, he left Litardus, quia prudent et fidelis erat (since he was prudent and faithful), with 300 men in Jaffa to defend it against assaults by land or by sea. Litardus was thus the king's military commander of Jaffa; one may well doubt that he was appointed ad hoc because Jaffa needed a permanent royal official, a castellan in other words, to see to its security.

---

11 Mayer (above, n. 1, Bistümer), pp. 11–24, 37–43.
13 RRH, No. 90. This was reduced in RRH, Nos. 134, 291, as well as in the papal charters, JL Nos. 9847, 10030a, Registre d'Alexandre IV, No. 129, to two carrucatae.
14 Mayer (above, n. 1, Bistümer), pp. 322, 360.
16 Albert of Aachen (above, n. 10), IX, 48–49, pp. 621–622.
However, castellans could be changed. One year later, in 1106, we find that the garrison of Ramla, upon an invasion by the Egyptians, rode to Jaffa in order to advise Roger of Rozoy-sur-Serre in the diocese of Laon, qui urbi Japhet praeerat (who was in command of the city of Jaffa), that the Egyptians had occupied the vicinity of Ramla. At first it was decided to take them on in battle, but finally the advice of a certain knight called Gerard, qui partem reditus civitatis Japhet pro militari obsequio obtinebat (who held part of the revenues of the city of Jaffa in return for military service), prevailed and they all retreated to Jaffa.\(^{17}\) Roger was a knight who may have gone on the Crusade as a follower of the count of Flanders. In any event he marched with the count from Marash to Artasia and fought there with the Turks. At Easter 1102 he was, together with other noblemen, with the king in Jerusalem and remained there after the ceremonies. Most of the nobles listed then were participants in the Crusade of 1101. As for Roger, it is not clear whether he was still in the Holy Land or had returned with the Crusaders of 1101. Roger then took part in the second battle of Ramla in 1102 and fled from the battlefield to Jaffa.\(^{18}\) Theoretically he may have been a royal or seignorial castellan of Jaffa, but the former is most likely. The Gerard mentioned above, who had a money fief in Jaffa, seems at this time to have still been a royal vassal, since Albert of Aachen describes him as *eques de domo regis* (a knight from the royal household). If this was so, then Litardus of Cambrai was also a royal castellan. It is therefore reasonably certain that Jaffa still belonged to the royal domain in 1106.

However, Roger's position had changed by 1115. At this date the king confirmed in *RRH*, No. 80, the possessions of St. Mary in the Valley of Josaphat. Before this Rogerius de Roseth had given a peasant in monte Beterico with his belongings to Josaphat concedente supra dicto Bariano (with the approval of the above-mentioned Barisan). This refers back to *Barianus constabularius Ioppe* (Barisan constable of Jaffa), i.e. to Barisan-le-Vieux, who had also made a gift to Josaphat now confirmed by the king. While Roger's gift had been made before 1115, it was made after the status of Josaphat had been changed to that of a monastery in 1110/1111 because it occurs in the part of the royal diploma that refers to this period.\(^{19}\) If Barisan's consent had been given to Roger's donation, the latter must have been Barisan's vassal and no longer a royal official.

Unfortunately, there is no indication whether Roger's office had come to an end because the king had decided to appoint someone else or because Jaffa had been given...

---

\(^{17}\) *Ibid.*, X, 10, 12, pp. 635–637. Riley-Smith (above, n. 10), p. 729, n. 4, following older authors, suggests that alternatively Roger may have come from Rozay in Thiérache which is, however, identical with Rozoy-sur-Serre, Dépt. Aisne, arrond. Laon.

\(^{18}\) Albert of Aachen (above, n. 10), III, 28–29, IX, 1, 4, pp. 358–359, 591, 593; Riley-Smith (above, n. 10), p. 729. See however C. Cahen: *La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche*, Paris, 1940, p. 209, n. 11, who argues that he was a companion of Baldwin of Boulogne rather than of the Count of Flanders.

as a fief. Let us therefore look at the evidence in William of Tyre’s chronicle concerning the first grant of Jaffa as a fief.20 According to William, Hugh II of Le Puiset (Hugh I of Jaffa) went on a pilgrimage together with his wife Mabilia in the days of King Baldwin II of Jerusalem (1118–1131). Actually, he joined the Crusaders whom Boemund I of Antioch enlisted in France in 1106 for his attempt against the Balkans in 1107/1108.21 In Apulia (before or after the Balkan war) his wife gave birth to a son called Hugh, the later Hugh II of Jaffa and future rebel against King Fulk of Jerusalem. Because the infant was too tender to travel, he was left in Apulia with Boemund I of Antioch, whom William called a consanguineus (blood relative) of Hugh I of Jaffa. In fact Boemund was not related to Hugh I but rather to his wife Mabilia, who was a daughter of Boemund’s half-sister and the count of Roucy (Dépt. Aisne, arrond. Laon). From the Balkans Hugh I travelled on to the Holy Land, where before 1110 he made a donation to the Hospital of Jerusalem which was then confirmed by the king (RRH, No. 57).22

William says that Hugh I arrived under a King Baldwin who was related to him according to the flesh (secundum carnem propinquum). Immediately upon Hugh’s arrival (statim post introitum suum) he received from the king, as a hereditary fief for him and his heirs, the city of Jaffa with its appurtenances.

William clearly states that Hugh I of Jaffa arrived under King Baldwin II. He believes that Hugh received Jaffa under the same king because only Baldwin II was related directly to Hugh, as their mothers were sisters, whereas King Baldwin I was not related to him according to the flesh but only remotely through three marriages. But if the king under whom Hugh I of Jaffa arrived was Baldwin II, there is a conflict with RRH, No. 57. The charter shows that Hugh I was present in the Holy Land before 1110, while Baldwin II did not become king until 1118.

The most important clause in William’s report is that Hugh I received Jaffa statim post introitum suum. If one accepts at face value William’s statement that Hugh arrived under Baldwin II but interprets the clause in question to mean that he received Jaffa immediately following his arrival, classical grammar would require that William write statim post introitum eius. However, this grammatical rule was certainly not strictly observed in the Middle Ages, even by good stylists. William of Tyre himself writes of Hugh II of Jaffa that during his three-year exile de reditibus possessionum suarum omne eius debitum... persolveretur (of the revenues of his [reflexively used possessive pronoun] possessions all his [not reflexively used possessive pronoun] debts be paid). Here both suarum and eius refer to Hugh II. There would also be a chronological

20 William of Tyre (above, n. 8), XIV, 15, pp. 627–628.
22 In 1108 Roger of Rozoy is listed without any office among the witnesses of RRH, No. 52. If this indicates that his royal office had expired because Jaffa had been given to Hugh I, the date of RRH, No. 52, confirms 1108 as the time of Hugh I’s arrival in the Latin East.
difficulty, pointed out already by La Monte. In 1120 Hugh I's son Hugh II was *nondum miles*, 'not yet a knight' (*RRH*, No. 90) and therefore less than 15 years old. In 1123 he married the widow of Eustace Grenier, Lord of Caesarea and Sidon, who died on 15 June 1123. However, according to William of Tyre, Hugh I went straight from Apulia to the Holy Land after the birth of Hugh II. Had this happened under Baldwin II, who was made king at Easter 1118, the earliest date for the birth of Hugh II would be the autumn of 1117 when shipping to the East came to a halt, thus detaining his father in Apulia until at least the spring of 1118. In this case Hugh II would have been no more than six years old when he was married, a clear impossibility. In addition, there would be no solution for the problem that the charters show Hugh I to have been in the Holy Land by 1110, while William says that he did not arrive until 1118 or later.

When Mas Latrie studied the counts of Jaffa, he clearly saw this impasse but extracted himself from it in an arbitrary fashion by simply dismissing the charter evidence. He refused to believe that the Hugo de Puzath (= Le Puiset) mentioned in *RRH*, No. 57, both as a donor and as a witness was identical with Hugh I of Jaffa. But it is evident that Mas Latrie was driven to this solution because the charter contradicted his case, built exclusively on William of Tyre, that Jaffa was not granted to Hugh as a fief before 1118. Few scholars shared Mas Latrie's position, though the date of 1118 was not challenged.

The alternative interpretation of William's account is that of La Monte, namely that Hugh I arrived between 1107 and 1110 but that the king did not give him Jaffa until *statim post introitum suum*, i.e. immediately after the king's accession to the throne at Easter 1118. This year would have afforded an occasion for Baldwin II to bestow Jaffa on Hugh I; at Easter 1118 Baldwin II is said to have subjected Nablus, Samaria (Sebaste?), Jaffa, Haifa, Hebron, Acre, Sidon, Tiberias and other places in the kingdom to his rule (*suo subiecit imperio*) and to have granted the revenues of some of them to his vassals while assigning others to the royal domain. If this report by Albert of Aachen is correct at all, this was perhaps no more than an examination of the titles of his vassals to land and money fiefs, such as Baldwin I had attempted to undertake in 1100. Alternatively, however, it may have been a basic separation of royal domain and baronial fiefs. In either case such an act was a political necessity. It has been shown that the accession of Baldwin II was a very difficult one which brought the country to the brink of a civil war. The dispute over Baldwin I's accession took place in two
successive phases. In the first, immediately following the old king’s funeral, the legitimists favouring Eustace III of Boulogne carried the day and reached a decision to send an embassy to Eustace to offer him the crown. This embassy must have consisted of Eustace’s principal supporters in the East and must have removed them from the scene, because at Easter, when the embassy had apparently already left, the remaining nobility and clergy suddenly raised Baldwin II to the throne and had him anointed, although not crowned. The ambassadors were unaware of this act and clearly did not expect it; when they had persuaded Eustace with some difficulty to accept the crown and had come with him as far as Apulia, they learnt for the first time what had happened in Jerusalem and were furious. They argued that the event was illegal and could not possibly stand, and even William of Tyre concurred in their judgment. Civil war was avoided by Eustace III turning back to Boulogne. When he was anointed, Baldwin II must have known that this act carried with it the distinct danger of civil war and must have prepared for it. The obvious thing to do was an examination such as Albert of Aachen describes, which would have resulted in the dispossession of Eustace’s followers; this may explain why in Apulia they seem to have been much more disturbed by the news than was Eustace III. It would also have been of paramount importance for Baldwin II to create vassals loyal to him rather than to the Boulogne family. Who, in this case, would have been a more obvious candidate on whom to settle a large fief than his own cousin Hugh I of Jaffa?

But can statim post introitum suum be construed to mean, as La Monte believed, immediately after the accession of Baldwin II? One must examine not only whether suum (his) refers to the king or to Hugh but also the meaning of introitus. In William of Tyre’s parlance the latter means, in the majority of cases I have found, simply physical entry into the kingdom.31

However, William said of King Baldwin II that he seemed to have gained the throne in a somewhat irregular fashion: Videtur tamen minus regularem habuisse introitum

---

31 When Hugh II of Jaffa was exiled after his revolt for three years, he was given assurances that after this time in regnum iterum... ei liceret introire (he should be allowed to enter the kingdom again). Of Manasses of Hierges it is said that Queen Melisende appointed him constable statim post eius introitum (immediately upon his arrival). Of Thierry Count of Flanders, William writes that cuius introitus in regno (his arrival in the kingdom) was very useful and necessary. A legate sent by Pope Alexander III who wished tanquam legatus in regnum introire (to enter the kingdom in his capacity as legate) requested that he be informed by the king, the clergy and the nobility how they felt de ingressu eius (concerning his entry). When on one occasion the Count of Tripoli wanted to travel south to Tiberias, the king was persuaded by his advisers comitem sinistre intentione in regnum velle introire (that the count wanted to enter the kingdom with a sinister design). William of Tyre (above, n. 8), XIV, 17, XVII, 13, XVIII, 16, XVIII, 29, XXII, 9, pp. 630–631, 780, 846, 870, 1078. Cf. William’s dating of events from the Latin conquest, ab introitui (ingressu) Latinorum (from the entry of the Latins into the Holy Land), ibid., IX, 17, XI, 16, XI, 27, XX, 3, XXII, 16, pp. 389, 480, 501, 944, 1094. I owe these references to the kindness of Prof. Robert Huygens of the University of Leiden, a member of the Crusaders study group of the Hebrew University’s Institute for Advanced Studies.
(Nevertheless he seems to have had a somewhat irregular introduction [to the kingship]). In his opinion, it was certain that those who promoted Baldwin’s accession thereby fraudulently excluded the legitimate heir of the kingdom from the rightful succession. In this case introitus clearly refers to accession to the throne, although it should be remembered that even here a physical entry into the kingdom was involved. Baldwin II, hitherto Count of Edessa, had arrived in Jerusalem on the day of Baldwin I’s funeral and just in time to participate in the debate on the old king’s succession which led in a matter of weeks to his own accession. It is therefore difficult to interpret statim post introitum suum in William’s account about the grant of Jaffa to Hugh I as referring to the accession of the king, apart from the fact that there would be then an insolvable dichotomy within William’s own story. On the one hand Hugh I would have arrived under Baldwin II, i.e. after the latter’s accession; on the other hand he would have received Jaffa immediately upon the king’s elevation. This would be possible only if by chance Hugh I arrived precisely at the time of Baldwin II’s accession, which was indeed my assumption when I first wrestled with this problem.

It is quite clear that there must be a mistake somewhere in the source material and that, to correct it, it is not plausible that Hugh I arrived under Baldwin I but was enfeoffed under Baldwin II, as La Monte proposed. The difficulties can only be solved if it is assumed that the mistake was that of William of Tyre and that the chronicler confused Baldwin I and Baldwin II on both occasions. Only if Hugh I arrived between 1108 and 1110 can William’s report be reconciled with RRH, No. 57. And only then would one arrive at a defensible age for Hugh II of Jaffa on his marriage in 1123, as he would have been born shortly before his father’s journey to the East, i.e. between 1106 and 1110, and would consequently have been between 13 and 17 years old when he was married.

There would be no obstacle to the assumptions that Hugh I was given Jaffa (1) after 1106 (Roger of Rozoy still royal castellan of Jaffa; Hugh I of Jaffa not yet in the Holy Land); (2) before 1115 (Roger of Rozoy is already vassal of the constable Barisan of Jaffa); (3) after 1108 (earliest date for Hugh I’s arrival in the East); (4) before 1110 (latest date for the same event). In fact only thus does other evidence, hitherto unnoticed, fall into place. We know from William of Tyre’s story that after the death of Hugh I of Jaffa, the king married his widow (whether she was Mabilia or Adalasia of Corbeil, who had formerly been married to Hugh I’s brother Evrard III of Le Puiset) to Albert, a brother of Count Godefrey of Namur. Together with Hugh’s widow, Albert received Jaffa. Both of them died within a short time. Upon their demise Hugh’s son Hugh II of Jaffa came from Apulia to the East, claiming and obtaining Jaffa as his paternal inheritance. This had occurred by 31 January 1120, because in RRH, No. 90, he is then listed as Hugo de Ioppe filius Hugonis de Puteolo nondum miles (Hugh of

---

32 Ibid., XII, 3, p. 515.
33 Mayer (above, n. 1, Bistümer), pp. 149–150.
34 Ibid., p. 299 (RRH, No. 36c).
Jaffa [= Hugh II], the son of Hugh of Le Puiset [= Hugh I, not yet a knight). Hugh I seems to have been dead by mid-1112, thus leaving a maximum (if Hugh II received Jaffa only late in 1119 or in January 1120) of seven and a half years for Albert's interlude. This is more plausible than the very short one year and a quarter (or less if Hugh II was enfeoffed earlier than stated above and as Hugh I died before Albert's installation) imposed by La Monte's retaining 1118 as the year of the grant of Jaffa to Hugh I. On 20 June 1112 King Baldwin I issued a charter which includes among the witnesses Signum Alberti, 'the sign [= signature] of Albert' (RRH, No. 68a). Given that this Albert appears among the king's trusted followers and two years after the last reference to Hugh I of Jaffa as being alive, and given also that Albert (who did not survive Hugh I very long) appears only here, we must almost certainly identify him with Albert of Namur who held Jaffa from the king.

We must still examine one problem: between 1106(?) and 1120 Hugh I of Jaffa is mentioned four times only as Hugo de Puzath or Hugo de Pute?lo?5 Likewise Albert in RRH, No. 68a, is not called 'of Jaffa'. However, Hugh II of Jaffa is never mentioned by his family name of Le Puiset but is from the beginning (RRH, No. 90) called after his fief of Jaffa, even where he is given no title such as dominus, comes, consul or princeps of Jaffa. Are we to conclude from this that there was a difference in status between Hugh I and Albert on the one hand and Hugh II on the other? A conceivable, though not demonstrable, explanation would be that Baldwin I bestowed on Hugh I and on Albert only the revenues of Jaffa as a money fief. This would certainly contradict William's statement that Hugh I received civitatem Ioppenn cum pertinentis suis (the city of Jaffa with its appurtenances). However, it would explain why neither Hugh I nor Albert are known as lords of Jaffa in charter evidence and it would tally with the fact that in 1106 the king had given only a money fief in Jaffa to Gerard. While this explanation is tempting, it must be pointed out that Eustace Grenier, Lord of Caesarea and Sidon, who according to William of Tyre certainly received Sidon in 1110, was never called in the charters anything but Eustachius Granarius without any lordship attached to his name. Yet it would be difficult to assume that he received the two cities only as a money fief, since Fulcher of Chartres already revealed that he possessed the two cities.36 In view of the example of Eustace Grenier it would seem that Hugh I and Albert held Jaffa as a land fief, as William of Tyre says.

We therefore arrive at the following reconstruction of Jaffa's early Crusader history. It was a royal possession until at least 1106 when Gerard de domo r?gis held a money fief there. Since Hugh I was still in the Balkans in 1107, we must assume that Jaffa remained royal until Hugh arrived in the Holy Land between 1108 and 1110. He then received Jaffa as a fief but was dead by the middle of 1112, when Albert of Namur is seen serving the king and must therefore already have succeeded Hugh I both as a husband and as a vassal for Jaffa. If Jaffa had been granted as a fief to Hugh by 1110,

---

35 RRH, Nos. 36c, 57, 90.
36 William of Tyre (above, n. 8), XI, 14, p. 478; Fulcher of Chartres (above, n. 12), II, 16, pp. 660–661.
then, of course, the *Barianus constabularius Ioppe* in *RRH*, No. 80, who had made a
donation to Josaphat between 1110/1111 and 1115, was not the royal constable but the
constable of the lord of Jaffa. This would be an additional confirmation that Jaffa,
contrary to accepted opinion, was first granted as a fief a considerable time before
1118. Given the great role which Barisan-le-Vieux was to play in the affairs of the
county of Jaffa as well as in the history of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem in general, it
may well be that this constableship became the example on which other great crown
vassals modelled their appointment of a constable.