The period of forty years or so which followed the death of King Fulk began and ended in defeat. In 1144 Edessa (Urfa) fell. Jerusalem was taken by Saladin in 1187. Yet for the three states, Antioch, Tripoli, and Jerusalem, the intervening years were prosperous and brought to fruition their development as western European “colonies”. Western usages, political, religious, economic, and military, modified to suit eastern conditions, were successfully implanted in Palestine and Syria, and the European conquerors reached a modus vivendi with the native population, both Moslem and Christian.

Since this chapter is concerned with the political history of the kingdom of Jerusalem and the other Latin states, the following select bibliography does not include works on strictly economic, religious, or institutional developments.

The standard Latin source for the period from 1143 to 1174 is William of Tyre, Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum (on which cf. the bibliographical notes to earlier chapters); the Latin text with an Old French version is given in RHC Occ., I. A. C. Krey has discussed William’s life and work thoroughly in his introduction to the English translation and in “The Making of an Historian in the Middle Ages,” Speculum, XVI (1941), 149–166. In 1167 William was commissioned by King Amalric to record his Egyptian campaigns and in 1170 a more ambitious history of the kings of Jerusalem was undertaken. He was also tutor to the king’s son, the future Baldwin IV, and was as a rule well informed regarding important developments. The period covered in this chapter was probably written after 1180.


The Byzantine historians John Cinnamus and Nicetas Choniates can be found in RHC, Grcc, I, as well as in Migne, and the Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantine. Gregory the Presbyter continued the Armenian chronicle of Matthew of Edessa to 1163 (RHC, Arm., I). Michael the Syrian’s chronicle is edited and translated by J. B. Chabot (4 vols., Paris, 1899–1900) and (in part) in RHC, Arm., I.
By the middle of the twelfth century the Latin states had reached a point in their development where each could manage its own affairs. There was, as a consequence, a tendency to disregard such feudal ties as had earlier bound the three states together. Rare, for example, were the instances when the counts of Tripoli recognized the suzerainty of Jerusalem. At most, the king of Jerusalem possessed a superior dignity as primus inter pares. His intervention in Tripoli or Antioch — as also the intervention of northern princes in Jerusalem — usually resulted from ties of blood relationship or followed a formal request for aid from the local curia. Common danger was the most important element in uniting the forces of the three states. But even in times of crisis cooperation was disappointingly difficult to secure. Without a common policy the Latin states were at best a loose federation.

The greatest problem confronting the Syrian Latins was military security. They were a minority in an alien land and the number of troops which the various baronies and military orders could provide was limited. Native auxiliaries were occasionally useful but not consistently reliable. Numerical inferiority was in part offset by certain other factors. To natural barriers of mountain, river, and desert, the crusaders added formidable fortresses at critical points along the frontier. In the later years of the twelfth century most of these were garrisoned by Templars and Hospitallers. Command of the sea was maintained by the Italians.

These sources can be supplemented by a number of other chronicles, letters, and documents which are cited in the standard secondary reference works. For the details of narrative history the most important of these are: R. Grousset, Histoire des croisades et du royaume françois de Jérusalem, vol. II, Monarchie franque et monarchie musulmane: l'équilibre (Paris, 1935); R. Rohricht, Geschichte des Königreichs Jerusalem, 1100–1291 (Innsbruck, 1898); S. Runciman, A History of the Crusades, vol. II: The Kingdom of Jerusalem (Cambridge, 1952); and W. B. Stevenson, The Crusaders in the East (Cambridge, 1907). Institutional history is covered by J. L. LaMonte, Feudal Monarchy in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1100–1291 (Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy, 1932).

and although reinforcements from Europe were never adequate, supplies were assured.

From years of experience the Syrian Latins had learned their own capacities and limitations. Especially had they become familiar with the weaknesses of their opponents. The divisions in Levantine Islam which had facilitated the original conquest were an important element in their continuing security. Judicious alliances with friendly Moslem powers — a procedure never understood by crusaders fresh from Europe — helped to maintain a Levantine balance of power. This advantage was destined to be lost during the second half of the twelfth century as Near Eastern Islam was progressively unified under able leadership.

Partly as a consequence of the military and political successes of Islam, the role of Constantinople in the grand strategy of the Levant became more significant. John Comnenus, it will be recalled, had revived Byzantine power in Cilicia and northern Syria. At his death in 1143 Franco-Byzantine relations were severely strained. Manuel Comnenus (1143-1180) added to his predecessors’ claims over Antioch an ambition to extend Byzantine influence southward and westward in the Mediterranean. In the face of a resurgent Islam the Latins were forced to solicit his aid and make concessions which earlier crusaders had refused. For a number of years Manuel was a kind of arbiter of Near Eastern politics.

Frequent mention will also be made in the following pages of Cilician Armenia. Although there were occasional border conflicts with Antioch, Armenia was generally friendly to the Latins, as the number of prominent intermarriages testifies. The kingdom was formally a vassal state of Byzantium. To maintain some sort of independence against Constantinople and against its Moslem neighbors was its hope. Its efforts to do so form part of the complex pattern of contemporary Near Eastern diplomacy.

When king Fulk died, his son Baldwin was only thirteen years old, and the high court (the Haute Cour of the Assises de Jerusalem) devised a somewhat unusual arrangement for the succession. On Christmas day, 1143, queen Melisend and her son were both crowned. Melisend’s government, therefore, was less a regency than a joint rule. Like most divisions of power, it was not an unqualified success once Baldwin reached an age where he could fend for himself. It was especially unfortunate in the period of crisis following the fall of Edessa. The loss of Edessa, which was described in two previous chapters, was a grievous blow to the
Latin orient. Not only was the capital of a Christian principality captured — and the remaining towns east of the Euphrates could not survive long — but the possibility of menacing communications between Aleppo and Mesopotamia was removed. Christian loss was Moslem gain and the union of Moslem Syria was a step nearer.

Fortunately for the Franks, Zengi was not able to follow up his initial successes and within two years (September 1146) he was assassinated. His lands were partitioned between two of his sons, Saif-ad-Din Ghazì, who took Mosul and the east, and Nur-ad-Din, to whom fell the western territories and Aleppo. It was Nur-ad-Din, therefore, with whom the Latins had to reckon. Although he was deprived of the strength Zengi had derived from Mesopotamia, Nur-ad-Din was also free of many political complications which had plagued his father. Thus he could concentrate on creating a power in Moslem Syria capable of challenging the Latins without help from Mosul. Nur-ad-Din was admired as well as feared by his enemies. William of Tyre generously described him as “a wise and prudent man and according to the superstitious traditions of his people, one who feared God.” The Franks were soon to test his strength in a second and final siege of Edessa.

Encouraged by the news of Zengi’s death the Armenian residents of Edessa communicated with its former count, Joscelin II, and plotted the recovery of the city. Sometime in October 1146 Joscelin and Baldwin of Marash appeared before the city, but they were not adequately equipped. Before they could reduce the inner citadel, Nur-ad-Din had surrounded the town with ten thousand men. In a desperate sortie some Christians escaped, among them Joscelin, but Baldwin of Marash fell, and thousands of luckless native Christians were massacred. Thus the second siege of Edessa proved far worse than the first and the city never recovered its former prominence.

An immediate consequence of the fall of Edessa was the added danger to Antioch. Although Raymond of Poitiers, the prince of Antioch, had not assisted his fellow Christians of Edessa, he now realized his predicament and sought a rapprochement with Manuel Comnenus. No Byzantine troops came to his assistance, however, and in the course of the years 1147 and 1148 Nur-ad-Din captured Artah, Mamulah, Basarfut, and Kafarlatha. Most of the principality’s possessions beyond the Orontes, therefore, were lost.

3 For the development of Nur-ad-Din’s power see above, chapter XVI.
With losses sustained in the north, the security of the Latin Levant depended more than ever on the relations between Jerusalem and those Moslem states, notably Damascus, which still resisted the southward advance of the Aleppans. Earlier chapters have described Frankish relations with Damascus; and it will be recalled that Muṣṭaḥrād-Allāh, the governor of Damascus, who had been appointed by King Fulk. On Zengi’s death, Unur had quickly occupied Baalbek and entered into negotiations with the governors of Homs and Hamah. At the same time his astute sense of diplomacy had prompted him to appease Zengi’s successor. In March 1147 Unur’s daughter married Nūr-ad-Dīn. But he had ample reason to continue his friendly dispositions toward Jerusalem, which a characteristic loyalty to treaty obligations dictated. It seems obvious too that the most elementary diplomatic and strategic considerations should have led the Latins to avoid any actions which might endanger this Levantine balance of power. Yet this was precisely the error committed by the leaders of the Second Crusade.2

Our fifteenth chapter has described in detail the Second Crusade of 1147–1149. To Christian Europe the failure represented a tragic shattering of high hopes. To the Latin east it was more than a military defeat. Christian prestige in the Orient had been dangerously weakened. The one thing the Moslems feared most, a powerful expedition from Europe, had arrived and been repulsed. Further, the breach with Damascus, so long well disposed toward Jerusalem, upset the Levantine equilibrium and paved the way for the eventual union of Aleppo and Damascus.

After the Second Crusade, the Moslems, emboldened by success and assisted by continued quarrels in Christian ranks, pressed their advantage and made new gains in northern Syria. Count Raymond II of Tripoli actually sought Moslem assistance in dislodging Bertram, grandson of Raymond of St. Gilles, from al-ʿArimah, the citadel of which was destroyed, and Bertram, along with others, was captured.3 When Raymond of Antioch advanced to thwart Nūr-ad-Dīn’s moves east of the Orontes, a bold attack with a small force won him an initial advantage. But on the night of

---

2 Even before the Second Crusade, the bellicose elements in the king’s council forced a similar error. In the spring of 1147 the authorities in Jerusalem accepted the tempting offer of a rebellious emir in the Hauran. The campaign proved to be a dismal failure redeemed only by the courageous conduct of Baldwin III and a well disciplined retreat. Cf. Runciman, History of the Crusades, III, 241–243.

3 Bertram with Languedocian troops from the Second Crusade had besieged the castle. Raymond had then asked the assistance of Unur, who came with Nūr-ad-Dīn. Apparently Unur signed a truce with the kingdom in May 1149. Cf. Runciman, Crusades, II, 287–288.
June 29, 1149, his troops were surrounded, and Raymond with Reginald of Marash perished in the battle. The atabeg then advanced toward Antioch ravaging the countryside as far as the coast where he exultantly bathed in the Mediterranean. The defenders of Antioch, directed by the patriarch Aimery, were accorded a short truce. Moslem troops were kept on guard, however, and Nūr-ad-Dīn returned to complete the capture of Ḥārim.

These Moslem successes and Raymond of Poitiers’ death produced a situation which required intervention from Jerusalem. In Antioch the government had fallen to Raymond’s young widow, Constance, who had been left with four children. Although the patriarch Aimery had rallied the discouraged defenders and messages had been sent to Europe, immediate reinforcement was vital. In fact, when Baldwin III arrived to assist Antioch, all the possessions of the principality east of the Orontes had been lost. An attempt to recapture Ḥārim failed, but Nūr-ad-Dīn was for the moment satisfied with his conquests, and a truce provided a much needed respite. It was possible, therefore, to put Antioch’s defenses in order.

The king was also able to salvage, at least temporarily, the vestiges of the county of Edessa. The final liquidation of Edessa could not, however, be long delayed. On May 4, 1150, Joscelin was ambushed on the way to Antioch. His Turkoman captors were willing to set him free on payment of ransom, but the atabeg quickly sent a corps of soldiers who brought the count to Aleppo where he died nine years later. Despite threats of injury he refused to abjure his faith and, since he was unable to obtain a Latin priest, received the last rites at the hands of a Jacobite bishop.

On the news of Joscelin’s capture, Mas‘ūd, Selchūkīd sultan of Iconium (Konya), advanced into Latin territory and in May 1150 took Kesoun, Behesnī, Raban, and other outlying possessions of Edessa. Considerable numbers of the inhabitants made their way to Tell Bashir where Joscelin’s wife, Beatrice, was valiantly holding out. Meanwhile, Nūr-ad-Dīn took ‘Azāz, which with Ḥārim made him master of the hinterland of Antioch.

These events brought Baldwin once again to Syria accompanied by Humphrey of Toron and Guy of Beirut. He was joined by Raymond II of Tripoli and his troops. When the royal party reached Antioch, the king found that although Mas‘ūd had been

---

4 Apparently Raymond of Antioch had the assistance of a Kurdish Assassin leader who also was killed. Cf. above, chapter IV, p. 120, and XVI, p. 515. See also chapter XVI, pp. 515–516, for an analysis of Nūr-ad-Dīn’s own conception of his “mission” at this time.
called away, Nūr-ad-Din had invested the entire region of Tell Bashir. Some hope, however, was afforded by the intervention of Manuel Comnenus. He had offered financial support to Beatrice and her children in return for the surrender of the fortresses still in her possession. The matter was referred to king Baldwin, and when Byzantine envoys further explained the emperor’s purpose to Baldwin, the latter decided to agree to the transfer. The magnates of both Antioch and Jerusalem who were present were divided in their opinion, but the king sided with those who argued that further delay would be fatal. Moreover, it was evident that with both northern states deprived of their rulers, there was not adequate strength in the Latin east to maintain authority beyond the now shrunken confines of Antioch. And if the territory were eventually lost, the failure would be attributed to the emperor and not to Jerusalem. Therefore, with the consent of the countess and her children, Tell Bashir and the other remaining possessions of the county — Ravendan, Aintab, Duluk, Bira, and Samosata — were surrendered to the Greeks. As many had predicted, the Byzantines were able to maintain their new acquisitions only a few months. The lands of the former county of Edessa were eventually divided among the Selchūkids of Iconium, the Artuksids, and Nūr-ad-Din.5

Busy though he was in the north, Baldwin did not neglect the defenses of Jerusalem. Probably during the winter of 1149–1150, Gaza, an important defense position against Ascalon, was rebuilt and assigned to the Templars. Twice, early in 1150 and again in the spring of 1151, Nūr-ad-Din’s moves on Damascus were checked by Latin troop movements. Thus the king and barons of Jerusalem maintained and even improved the position of the kingdom to counteract the disasters in the north.

Throughout the years following the Second Crusade it was becoming evident to many that Baldwin had attained a political maturity which justified a full assumption of royal authority. Although Melisend had governed well and had firmly upheld the rights of the crown, her interests were too narrowly local, whereas the activities of her son bespoke a wider view of the needs of the Latin orient. For some time Baldwin had cooperated successfully with his mother, but the joint rule had been prolonged well past the customary age of majority, for in 1150 the king was twenty years old. A most unfortunate rift which had grown between the

5 For a more detailed discussion of Moslem movements see above, chapter XVI, pp. 516–517.
mother and son was widened when Melisend appointed her cousin, Manasses of Hierges, as constable. Manasses was haughty, intolerant, and generally unpopular, but connected by marriage with the important Ibelin family, and so the queen was not without considerable support among the nobility. A number of barons, however, urged Baldwin to take the crown. Some, it is true, and among these was the patriarch Fulcher, counseled the young man to include his mother in the ceremony of coronation. But he preferred the advice of others and, after postponing the ceremony, was crowned alone two days after Easter 1151 (or 1152). Partly as a consequence of his precipitate action, the rift between the supporters of the queen and those of Baldwin degenerated into civil war.

Following the coronation, the king summoned the high court. He then asked his mother to divide the kingdom and concede at least part of his rightful inheritance. This was done. The king received the coastal cities of Tyre and Acre with their dependencies, while Jerusalem and Nablus were left to the queen. Manasses, the queen’s favorite, was deposed, and Humphrey II of Toron appointed constable. The division of authority satisfied no one and was soon followed by hostilities. Manasses was successfully besieged in his castle of Mirabel and forced to renounce his lands. Nablus was likewise taken, and Melisend sought refuge in Jerusalem. As Baldwin advanced in force, the queen with a few of her adherents, notably Philip of Nablus, Amalric, count of Jaffa and the king’s brother, and Rohard the elder, retired to the citadel. Several days of furious assault followed before either side would accept mediation. Then Melisend agreed to relinquish Jerusalem, and Baldwin took a solemn oath to respect his mother’s tenure of Nablus. Thus peace was restored, and the king could proceed with the important affairs of government.

During the years following king Baldwin III’s assumption of full royal responsibility two developments stand out. First, the king frequently found it necessary to intervene in the concerns of Tripoli and Antioch. Sometime in 1152 Raymond II of Tripoli was attacked and killed at the city gates by a band of Assassins. The king was in Tripoli at the time, having come with his mother in an attempt to reconcile the count with his wife, the countess

---

6 The date is not certain. According to the order of events as related by William of Tyre, XVII, 13, 14 (RHC, Occ., I, 779–781), the coronation preceded the trip north for the final liquidation of Edessa (1150). There is reason to believe, however, that the rupture with Melisend occurred in 1151 or even in 1152. See Stevenson, Crusaders, p. 152; Röhrich, Königreich, pp. 265f.; LaMonte, Feudal Monarchy, pp. 16–18; Krey, William of Tyre, II, 205, note 9; Runciman, Crusades, II, 333–334.
Hodierna. It was under the king’s direction that the Tripolitan barons now swore allegiance to the countess and her children, Raymond III, then only twelve, and his younger sister Melisend. In Antioch, Byzantine pressure was still very evident, and Manuel Comnenus sought in various ways to extend his power southward. Both the emperor and king Baldwin had tried to induce the princess Constance of Antioch to remarry. Manuel urged her to accept a Byzantine prince. Baldwin suggested various noblemen whom he thought capable of shouldering the heavy responsibility of defending the exposed frontiers. At a council of notables held at Tripoli, everyone earnestly besought the young woman to take a husband if only for the sake of the principality. But Constance persistently refused. A more romantic solution was soon to present itself, and was perhaps already in her mind. Jerusalem and Constantinople were not, however, always in conflict. There were to be important periods of cooperation. And both were worried about the gradual encirclement of Christian Syria by Nur-ad-Din. The second great concern of Baldwin’s reign was the grand strategy of frontier expansion and defense against the menacing advance of Aleppo. Although these two major concerns, the northern states and the frontiers of Jerusalem, were clearly related, it will be convenient to consider first the frontier policy as it affected the kingdom of Jerusalem.

In previous years the intermittent skirmishes along the southern frontier, far less serious than in the north and east, had not greatly worried the Franks. But after the retreats in northern Syria, Baldwin wisely sought to counteract Moslem advances there by pushing southward. Moreover, in so doing, he was formulating a strategy which was to continue under his successor. The key to the situation was Ascalon, whose capture, long considered desirable, now seemed a necessity. Ascalon, the “bride of Syria,” was highly prized by the Egyptians and provided a bulwark against the Latins. Hence it had been their policy to send supplies and reinforcements to its already large population four times a year. Situated on a semicircular area sloping toward the sea, it was surrounded by artificial mounds additionally fortified by heavy walls upon which many towers were mounted. Its four gates were also defended by massive towers. An outer line of solidly constructed fortifications added to the city’s strength. Indeed, Ascalon was generally regarded as impregnable.

But although Ascalon itself was strong, the government at Cairo which stood behind it was weakening. The Fatimid caliphs
had been largely supplanted by their vizirs. Assassinations were not infrequent. In fact, such was the decadence of the Fatimid dynasty that outside intervention seemed inevitable, if not from Christian Jerusalem, then from Moslem Syria. The Christian army which assembled before Ascalon in January 1153, augmented when a full siege was finally decided upon, contained the flower of Latin Syrian knighthood. William of Tyre mentions by name: Hugh of Ibelin, Philip of Nablus, Humphrey of Toron, Simon of Tiberias, Gerard of Sidon, Guy of Beirut, Maurice of Montréal (ash-Shaubak), and Walter of St. Omer, the last-named serving for pay. Bernard of Tremelay, master of the Temple, and Raymond of Le Puy, master of the Hospital, were also present. Five bishops in addition to the patriarch Fulcher of Jerusalem accompanied the troops and escorted the sacred relic of the True Cross. The city was speedily blockaded, and Gerard of Sidon, in command of some fifteen ships, was ordered to prevent exit and all attempts at reinforcement by sea. But such was the vigilance and strength of the defenders that two months passed without progress.

During the spring the Christian army was reinforced by a number of knights and foot-soldiers who had recently arrived on pilgrimage, but this advantage was counterbalanced, toward the end of the fifth month of siege, by the arrival of a powerful Egyptian fleet of seventy large vessels and a number of smaller craft. Gerard of Sidon’s squadron was easily routed and substantial reinforcements in both men and supplies were safely delivered. Notwithstanding this change in fortune, the attackers pressed on and succeeded in causing serious losses. They fought from a huge movable tower which they had managed to bring up against the wall in the face of heavy arrow fire. Attempts to burn the tower failed, and with a shift in wind a large fire set between the tower and the wall was blown back against the defenders. As a consequence, a section of the wall collapsed, permitting the master of the Templars, Bernard of Tremelay, and about forty men to enter the breach. They were soon cut off, however, and the breach mended. The corpses of the fallen were suspended over the walls and their heads severed and sent as trophies to the caliph.

Thoroughly discouraged by this new reverse, Baldwin summoned his men to council in the presence of the True Cross. The king and almost all the lay barons were ready to end the siege. But the patriarch, the archbishop of Tyre, the master of the Hospital, and the bulk of the clergy strongly contended that what had been commenced and carried forward so long should not be aban-
doned. This view prevailed and was ultimately accepted unanimously.

Accordingly, with the fury of desperation — for all must have realized that this was the last chance — the attack was resumed. The defenders suffered such heavy losses that after three days a truce was requested in order that the dead might be exchanged and properly buried. Shortly afterward, a huge stone hurled by a Frankish siege machine killed forty citizens carrying a heavy beam. This seemed to crown the misfortunes of the defenders, for they agreed that envoys be sent to negotiate terms of surrender. Three days were granted the inhabitants to leave, and military escort was promised as far as al-'Arîsh.

The city fell on August 22, 1153, and a considerable booty in the form of money, supplies, and war material was collected. King Baldwin and his retinue entered the city amidst great jubilation. The Cross was born in solemn procession to the principal mosque, a beautiful structure later dedicated to St. Paul, where services of thanksgiving were offered. The government of Ascalon was entrusted to Æmalric, count of Jaffa, the king's brother.

Thus it was that a half century after the First Crusade the conquest of the Palestinian sea coast was finally completed. Defeat in the north had apparently been counterbalanced by a great victory and a new southward orientation of policy inaugurated. This was to become especially evident after the new count of Jaffa and Ascalon succeeded his brother as king.

Important as was the strategic advantage won by the Christians at Ascalon it was offset within a few months by Nūr-ad-Dīn's success at Damascus. In April 1154 he appeared in force, blockaded the city, and began to advance through the outskirts. Once again Damascus appealed to Jerusalem, and in desperation Mujîr-ad-Dīn offered Baalbek and part of the Biqâ' in return for assistance. But Nūr-ad-Dīn moved first, and took Damascus on April 25 before a Frankish army could swing into action. As a consequence Moslem and Christian Syria now consisted of two long narrow bands of territory lying adjacent to each other. From Cilicia to Ascalon the coast was Christian. The hinterland was for the first time under a single Moslem government.

For a number of years after 1154 Nūr-ad-Dīn was inclined to maintain peaceful relations with the Christian states. He needed time to assimilate his conquests and consolidate an authority still far from perfect. Apparently he was even willing to continue the tribute paid to Jerusalem by the previous regime. Baldwin was
also disposed to avoid hostilities. Not only was he then unable to
take the initiative, but aggressive moves from Egypt, principally
costal raids by the Egyptian fleet, occupied his attention for a
few years. Accordingly in 1156 a truce which had been negotiated
in June 1155 by mutual agreement was extended for another year,
and Nūr-ad-Dīn bound himself to pay eight thousand Tyrian
dinars.\(^7\)

However, the truce was broken in the following year by de-
predations from Jerusalem in the region around Banyas, where it
had been the custom for nomadic Arabs and Turkomans to drive
their cattle. Nūr-ad-Dīn replied by attacking Banyas. The outer
city was destroyed, and the defenders under Humphrey of Toron
forced to take refuge in the citadel. The king arrived in time to
force Nūr-ad-Dīn’s withdrawal, and the city was restored. But a
part of the king’s army was ambushed at Jacob’s Ford (June 19,
1157). With great difficulty the king escaped to Safad and thence
to Acre with a handful of companions. Almost all his knights were
captured, among them Hugh of Ibelin, Odo of St. Amand, king’s
marshal, Rohard of Jaffa and his brother Balian, and Bertrand of
Blancfort, now master of the Temple.

A second attempt on Banyas was repulsed by king Baldwin
with the assistance of Reginald of Châtillon, recently installed, as
we shall see, as prince of Antioch, and the young Raymond III
of Tripoli. These men joined the king at Noire Garde near Chastel-
Neuf (Hūnīn) whence they could see the besieged city. Nūr-ad-Dīn
was unwilling to risk an engagement and withdrew. About a year
later (July 15, 1158) a series of movements by the king’s army and
by Nūr-ad-Dīn in the Sawād east of Lake Tiberias culminated in a
brilliant victory for the Christian forces on the plain of al-Baṭīḥah.

In 1158, therefore, the situation between Damascus and Jeru-
usalem remained much as before. None of the actions described
amounted to a serious campaign any more than did the raids of
the Egyptian fleet at the same period. The really significant de-
velopments were in the north where Byzantine intervention pro-
foundly altered an already difficult situation. To these events we
must now turn, considering first the king’s activities in Syria after
the fall of Ascalon.

During the early weeks of the siege of Ascalon, a time when the
king was too preoccupied to give proper attention to the affairs of
northern Syria, Constance of Antioch finally decided to marry.

\(^7\) Cf. above, chapter XVI, pp. 530–531.
Having spurned all the princes who had been suggested and who might have advanced the development of the principality, she chose Reginald of Châtillon, a knight who had recently arrived in the east and entered the king’s service. The choice was unfortunate. Reginald’s lack of standing caused considerable gossip and subsequently complicated his dealings with those whose superior rank was well established. It soon became evident, too, that Reginald was of a turbulent and unruly disposition. An adventurer to the end, he was destined to waste his good qualities and to bring disaster to the Latin east, but he was a brave and dashing warrior and a handsome man. It is not difficult to understand why the young widow preferred him to less attractive men of higher estate.

Although the romantic pair were secretly betrothed, Constance was unwilling to celebrate the marriage publicly without the permission of king Baldwin. Reginald presented his case to the king when he was engaged before Ascalon (January 1153). No doubt Baldwin was too occupied to give the matter much consideration and Antioch would now have a protector. At any rate he consented and the marriage took place in the spring of 1153.

Among those who resented Constance’s marriage was the patriarch of Antioch, Aimery. Not without ambition himself, he may have hoped Constance would prolong a regency which gave him considerable authority. Aimery’s criticism eventually reached Reginald’s ears. Aimery also refused Reginald’s demands for money. Unable to control his wrath, the prince had the patriarch seized, brutally humiliated, and thrown into prison. King Baldwin was astounded as well as angered and sent the chancellor, Ralph, bishop of Bethlehem, and bishop Frederick of Acre to reprove and warn Reginald. Reluctantly the prince released Aimery and restored his property. But the patriarch decided to quit Antioch for Jerusalem, where he remained for some years.

Reginald displayed the same truculence in his early dealings with Manuel Comnenus, who was also far from pleased at Reginald’s marriage. In return for campaign expenses, the prince had agreed to suppress a revolt in Cilician Armenia. Toros II, a son of Leon I, who had once been a prisoner at Constantinople, had defeated Andronicus Comnenus and by 1152 had brought under his control the important Cilician cities. In 1155 the region of Alexandretta (Iskenderun) was the scene of hostilities. Although there seems to be some doubt concerning the outcome, Toros ceded areas along the gulf to the Templars in Antioch. Since the cam-
campaign benefited Antioch and not Byzantium, Manuel found reasons for postponing the promised payment. Whereupon Reginald turned in anger against the emperor and, apparently accompanied by Toros, raided the island of Cyprus. The Greek governor, John Comnenus, Manuel's nephew, and his lieutenant, Michael Branas, vainly attempted to oppose the landing. Both were captured and the island so effectively pillaged that it never entirely recovered. An indefensible act, the raid was so much energy wasted in an enterprise of no military significance whatever.

Since Reginald had thus far accomplished nothing toward improving the position of his principality, the initiative fell to the king of Jerusalem. Toward the end of the summer of 1157 count Thierry of Alsace had arrived in Jerusalem with a considerable retinue. Moreover, in July and August several Moslem cities had been badly damaged by earthquakes. It was with great expectations, therefore, that Baldwin and the count moved northward and, together with Reginald and Raymond III of Tripoli, assembled a formidable army in the Buqai'ah valley in the vicinity of Krak des Chevaliers (Hîšn al-Akrâd). Thence an advance was made into the Orontes valley. Chastel-Rouge resisted successfully, and on the advice of Reginald the armies moved toward Antioch.

Meanwhile Nûr-ad-Din advanced to Inab, probably with the intention of crossing the Orontes and marching against Antioch. At Inab, however, he was taken so ill that his life was despaired of. This was probably in October of 1157. Having arranged for the disposition of his territories if he should die, he was carried on a litter to Aleppo while Shirkûh went to defend Damascus. Sensing a perfect opportunity to strike, Baldwin and the other Christian leaders dispatched a message to Toros urgently requesting his assistance. The Armenian responded promptly and led a considerable force to Antioch. The combined armies then marched on Shaizar. Shaizar was a city which, somewhat after the manner of Damascus, had escaped the full power of the Zengid dynasty. After the death of a pro-Frankish ruler in August 1157 and the destruction of part of the city in the earthquake of the same month, Shaizar had fallen into a sort of anarchy. Thus the situation was highly favorable to the Christians.

Capture of the lower city proved comparatively easy. Tight blockade forced the citizens within the walls, and well placed siege machines battered down the defenses. Not, apparently, warlike folk, the inhabitants abandoned the walls after several days and retreated to the citadel. This presented no great problem, but
a most inopportune controversy over the disposition of the newly conquered territory stalled the Latin attack. The king intended to concede Shaizar to count Thierry, knowing that his strength, backed by the resources of a prominent European family, would be more than sufficient to maintain the city. Perhaps he envisaged a new Latin state beyond the Orontes, a buffer state to replace the lost Edessa. At any rate the plan was applauded by everyone except Reginald, who argued that since Shaizar was a former tributary of the principality, anyone who held it must swear fealty to him. But a count of Flanders could hardly be expected to do homage to a minor French baron. Thierry, therefore, refused such a condition. Unfortunately for the Franks this quarrel became so serious that the siege had to be abandoned. 8

Nūr-ad-Dīn sent an emir to take over the city. Later, when his health was fully restored, he visited Shaizar in person, saw that the damage caused by earthquake and siege was repaired, and had the defenses put in order. Thus Shaizar, the last of the towns of middle Syria to maintain some degree of autonomy, and one which might have become a Christian principality, fell to the all-embracing power of Aleppo. Although Shaizar was lost, it was agreed that the opportunity presented by the atabeg’s illness should not be entirely wasted. Accordingly Ḥārim was besieged and taken after a siege of two months (February 1158). The city was returned, this time without dispute, to the jurisdiction of Antioch. The king and the count of Flanders returned to Jerusalem, count Raymond accompanying them as far as Tripoli. Later in the same year Thierry and Baldwin raided the Damascus region, forced Nūr-ad-Dīn to raise the siege of Ḥabis Jaldak, southeast of Lake Tiberias, and soundly defeated his troops. A truce followed.

Not long before the northern campaign an embassy had been sent to Constantinople for the purpose of seeking a consort for king Baldwin. It had been felt for some time that the royal dynasty should be carried on, but the decision to approach Byzantium at this juncture was especially significant. European aid was manifestly inadequate and not to be relied upon. It was, therefore, imperative to seek assistance elsewhere. It was probably shortly after the arrival of count Thierry in the autumn of 1157 that the envoys set out for the Byzantine capital. After some time was consumed in discussion it was agreed that Theodora, Manuel’s niece, should

8 Apparently Assassins of Maṣyāf defended the citadel. On this and on Nūr-ad-Dīn’s illness see above, chapter XVI, pp. 521–522.
be sent as a bride for the king. Though only thirteen she was exceptionally beautiful. A large dowry was provided, a magnificent trousseau, and high-ranking attendants to accompany the bridal party to Jerusalem. On his part Baldwin had sent a written guarantee accepting whatever his envoys arranged and further promising Acre as a marriage portion in the event of his own death. The bridal party landed at Tyre in September 1158 and journeyed directly to Jerusalem where Theodora was married to Baldwin and solemnly crowned. Aimery, patriarch of Antioch, who had sought refuge from Reginald in the holy city, performed the ceremonies. The king was much taken with his young bride and remained a devoted husband.

If Baldwin’s purpose in seeking a Byzantine alliance is clear, it seems equally evident that Manuel was ready to resume pressure on Antioch. In the fall of 1158 he entered Cilicia with a sizeable army. His first objective, the recovery of Cilicia, he achieved without great difficulty, for Toros was so completely taken by surprise that he had barely time to escape to the mountains. When Reginald learned of the emperor’s approach, he consulted his barons as to how he might justify his recent conduct. He may also have appealed to Baldwin. But Manuel arrived too quickly for the king to intervene. Reginald, therefore, set out for the emperor’s camp at Mamistra (Misis). Bishop Gerard of Latakia and a few barons accompanied him.

In the presence of the emperor’s court, where there were to be found not only a number of Byzantine dignitaries, but envoys from various Moslem rulers and from the king of Georgia, Reginald publicly repented his misdeeds. Barefooted and clad in a short-sleeved woolen tunic, he presented his sword to the emperor, holding it by the point. He then prostrated himself on the ground. Restored to favor by this abject submission, Reginald swore allegiance and promised to surrender the citadel of Antioch on demand. He also agreed to admit a Greek patriarch whom the emperor should designate. Thus Manuel amply avenged the pillage of Cyprus and obtained a clear recognition of his suzerainty over Antioch. Further, the installation of a Greek patriarch would symbolize a victory for the Byzantine church.

It was not long before Baldwin arrived at Antioch accompanied by Amalric, his brother, and by several distinguished nobles. An embassy was sent to Manuel, who responded through his chancellor by inviting the king to his presence and by directing that he be met by his nephews, John, the protosebastos, and Alexius, the
chamberlain, and a suitable retinue of nobles. Thus Baldwin was received with considerable ceremony. He was saluted with the kiss of peace and seated by the emperor’s side in a place only slightly lower than that of the emperor himself. For ten days the two rulers held important conversations, and Baldwin won the respect and esteem of the imperial court. Precisely what was decided at these conferences has not been recorded. Presumably some sort of pact was arranged whereby Manuel agreed to participate in a crusade against Islam. Apparently Baldwin was also able to effect a reconciliation between the emperor and Toros. The Armenian agreed to surrender one fortress, was fully restored to favor, and took an oath of fealty. This diplomacy reflected great credit on the king of Jerusalem and won him the gratitude of both Greeks and Armenians.

The imperial entry into Antioch which took place shortly after Easter (April 12, 1159) was a veritable “triumph”. Wearing the diadem of the empire, Manuel was welcomed by the king, Reginald, their respective followers, and the city notables. He was escorted first to the cathedral and then to the palace. For eight days the imperial standard floated over the citadel, and gifts were distributed liberally among the population. There were tournaments and hunting expeditions and Manuel distinguished himself in both. When Baldwin was thrown from his horse and broke his arm, the emperor amazed everyone by ministering to the king with his own hands. Manuel prided himself on his medical knowledge and skill. Although these events heralded a period of almost twenty years during which Byzantium was to dominate Syrian politics, the emperor’s actual power in Antioch must not be exaggerated. There is no trace during these years of any direct administration in Antioch comparable, for example, to that in Cilician Armenia. Nor did Manuel insist at this time on the installation of a Greek patriarch. Moreover, Baldwin’s part in the negotiations should not be underestimated. As a consequence of his marriage and through the use of considerable diplomatic finesse he had secured the Byzantine alliance.

Although there is a clear recognition of the emperor’s suzerainty over Antioch, the ceremonies implied no claim to or recognition of suzerainty over Jerusalem in the western feudal sense. See especially LaMonte, “To what Extent was the Byzantine Empire the Soverain of the Latin Crusading States?” Byzantium, VII (1932) 248–260, where the arguments of Chalandon, Les Comnène, II, 447–449, are discussed. See also Cahen, La Syrie du nord, pp. 400–402, who contends that the king’s position as Reginald’s suzerain “à titre personnel” mitigated the humiliating character of his vassalage to the emperor. On the possible conspiracy of the emperor, Baldwin, and the patriarch Aimery to remove Reginald see Krey, William of Tyre, II, 277, note 71; LaMonte, Feudal Monarchy, p. 195, note 3; Grousset, Croisades, II, 405.
All these celebrations were merely preliminaries to the serious business of planning a joint expedition against Nūr-ad-Din. Meanwhile the Moslems began preparations to resist the expected attack. The atabeg ordered all his emirs and governors of fortified places to make their defenses ready. He then moved with the bulk of his forces toward the middle Orontes. If he really expected an attack in the region of Shaizar, Homs, or Hamah, he was deceived. It was the intention of Manuel and the Frankish leaders to strike at Aleppo, the heart of Nūr-ad-Din’s empire. Machines and engines of war were assembled and the entire army proceeded to the ford of Balana some forty miles northwest of Aleppo.

At this juncture, Nūr-ad-Din, evidently concerned at the size of the forces arrayed against him, entered into negotiation with Manuel. The result was the liberation of a number of Christian prisoners, including Bertram of Toulouse and the master of the Temple. Since the mere appearance of the Christian armies opened the prison gates, the consequent and expected military operations might have achieved decisive results. But to the disgust of the Franks and for reasons not adequately explained, Manuel returned to Constantinople. There was nothing left for the king to do, except to withdraw likewise and to return to Jerusalem. The great combined Graeco-Latin crusade, from which so much had been expected, thus failed to materialize.

To understand this defection on the part of Manuel it is necessary to emphasize that the emperor’s journey into Syria had as its purpose the recovery of Cilicia and the reassertion of suzerainty over Antioch. Success in these matters, and particularly in the latter, was in part owing to Nūr-ad-Din’s pressure against the Franks. Without the atabeg’s recent conquests, Baldwin and Reginald would probably have been unwilling to admit Manuel’s claims. The atabeg must, therefore, be restrained but not crushed. Further, peace with Nūr-ad-Din fitted in with the emperor’s plans for a reckoning with Iconium. Under the command of John Contostephanus troops from Antioch, Jerusalem, and Cilicia — evidently the alliance was still in force — routed a part of Kilij (or Kilīch) Arslan’s army in the autumn of 1161. As Manuel moved south the sultan was encircled and sought peace. After restoring certain captured towns and engaging to attack the empire’s enemies Kilij Arslan went in person to Constantinople and was received as a vassal and ally. Byzantine diplomacy was grounded on an oriental balance of power in which
Moslem states were to be played against each other and against the Franks.10

It should, however, be added that the basileus evidently had no intention of breaking completely with the Latins. Sometime in 1160 (or 1161) an imperial embassy approached king Baldwin requesting as a future consort for the emperor one of the king’s kinswomen, either the sister of the count of Tripoli or Constance of Antioch’s daughter. Perhaps in order to avoid strengthening the emperor’s claims over Antioch the king and his advisers suggested Melisend, Raymond of Tripoli’s sister. The bride-elect was provided with a suitable retinue and expensive adornments. The king and a number of barons assembled at Tripoli to wish her Godspeed. But the Byzantine envoys, constantly in communication with Manuel, delayed a year. At length a messenger was sent to Constantinople who returned with the information that the emperor had decided against Melisend. Count Raymond was so enraged that he ordered a pillaging expedition along the Greek coast. The king was equally disgusted, but important developments at Antioch required the utmost in diplomatic finesse.

In November 1160 (or 1161), perhaps somewhat after the Byzantine embassy had left Constantinople, Reginald was ambushed and captured. Sixteen years’ imprisonment was to be the consequence of a futile marauding foray, sixteen years during which the Latins were at once deprived of a valiant warrior and relieved of the embarrassment of an intemperate adventurer.

Reginald’s capture again created a vacancy at Antioch. The barons, apparently fearing Constance’s leanings toward Byzantium, appealed to Baldwin, who was then at Tripoli. The king came directly, assumed charge of the principality as bailli, and before he returned to Jerusalem rebuilt a fort at the “iron bridge” over the Orontes. The patriarch, Aimery, who had evidently returned, was temporarily placed in charge of the administration.

While he was at Antioch the king was surprised to discover the same imperial envoys with whom he had been negotiating at Tripoli. It had been supposed that they had gone back to Constantinople. Instead, they had commenced discussions with Constance regarding her daughter, Maria. It is also possible that Constance had appealed to the emperor when her husband had been captured. Although the king feared Manuel’s designs over Antioch, he gave his consent, being unwilling to break completely with

---

10 Cf. also above, chapter XVI, p. 523.
Byzantium. Manuel and Maria were married at Constantinople on December 25, 1161.

Actually the situation in Antioch was not stabilized until 1163, probably shortly after Baldwin’s death. At that time the barons of the principality, still suspecting Constance of complicity with Constantinople, solicited the aid of Toros, expelled the princess, and installed her son, Bohemond III, who had come of age.

King Baldwin’s days were numbered. He had been saddened by the death of his mother, queen Melisend, on September 11, 1161. While at Antioch he was taken seriously ill and was first removed to Tripoli, where he remained several months. Then, realizing that recovery was not likely, he asked to be transported to Beirut where he summoned the nobles and clergy of the realm. Having confessed his sins he died on February 10, 1163. His body was borne to Jerusalem and buried in the church of the Holy Sepulcher. As the funeral cortège passed from Beirut to Jerusalem, people came from the towns and countryside to pay their last respects. Moslems joined the faithful in grief. Nūr-ad-Dīn, it was reported, indignantly rejected a suggestion that the kingdom be invaded and spoke words of high praise of the departed king.

Baldwin III deserved well of his subjects. Faced in the early years with the consequences of two disasters, the loss of Edessa and the failure of the Second Crusade, he had preserved Antioch and pushed the boundaries of Jerusalem southward. At the time of his death there was still reason to hope that the Byzantine alliance, a product of his skillful diplomacy, might bear fruit. He was respected by his contemporaries, Moslem as well as Christian, Greek and Syrian as well as Latin.

To the historian William of Tyre, who probably knew him well, Baldwin was the ideal king. Directly following his account of Fulk’s death, William inserted into his history a detailed description which, though it pictures Baldwin as a youth, was composed later and contains many references to the king’s more mature years. Apparently he was unusually gifted. Tall and well formed, albeit somewhat heavy, he carried himself with dignity. His features were comely. His manners were perfect, and he was at once affable and vivacious. He was eloquent of speech and possessed of a keen intellect and an accurate memory which were no

11 On the date of Baldwin III’s death, see Krey, William of Tyre, II, 293, note 91, where reasons for rejecting 1162 are marshalled.

doubt sharpened by his devotion to reading and to converse with
men of learning. His conversation could be witty and he mingled
easily with people of varied backgrounds and gave audience when-
ever requested. Criticism he bestowed freely and publicly, but
never with rancor. Moreover, he could listen quietly to sharp words
directed at himself. His courage, steadfastness, endurance, his
foresight and presence of mind in war have been amply empha-
sized in the preceding pages. He was well versed in the laws of
the kingdom and older men often consulted him. A Godfearing
man, he respected the institutions and possessions of the church.
Though unusually abstemious in food and drink, he indulged,
during his early years, the desires of the flesh and was addicted to
gambling. But these failings diminished as he grew older and
crused altogether after his marriage. Baldwin III was one of the
great kings of Jerusalem and his reign was a distinguished period
in its history.

Since Baldwin III left no children, he was succeeded by his
younger brother, Amalric I (1163–1174).13 Totally unlike his
brother in temperament and character, Amalric, nevertheless,
possessed qualities which made him an admirable king. He was a
man of medium height and, despite his habitual moderation in
food and drink, excessively fat. He was more fond of active
amusements like the chase, than the performances of minstrels.
But he was singularly gifted intellectually and enjoyed reading and
discussion with such men as William of Tyre. In fact, it was at his
request that William, then archdeacon, commenced that record
of the king’s doings which he later expanded into a fullfledged
history. Brave, even daring, in battle, cool and decisive in com-
mand, well informed on the strategic problems of the orient,
Amalric was well suited to that military leadership so necessary
to a Levantine ruler.

With all his accomplishments, Amalric did not inspire the
affection or popularity which his brother had enjoyed. He lacked
Baldwin’s affability and was inclined to be taciturn and some-
times arbitrary. Married women were not safe from his advances.
Clergy complained that he illegally violated their rights and prop-
erties. Excessive taxes, never popular, he justified on the grounds

13 The standard work on king Amalric, R. Röhrich, “Amalrich I., König von Jerusalem,”
Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, XII (1891), 432–481, has
been reprinted as chapters XVII and XVIII of the same author’s Königreich Jerusalem. The
description of the king, from William of Tyre, XIX, 2–3 (pp. 884–888), is paraphrased in
Grousset, Croisades, II, 438–442.
of military necessity. Amalric’s succession to the throne was not unopposed. The clergy and people together with a few magnates approved, but a number of barons expressed objection, presumably because of the king’s wife, Agnes of Courtenay, whom they declared to be unworthy. Although no specific complaints were mentioned, it is true that in later years Agnes was to prove herself an accomplished intriguer and to exert a sinister influence on the affairs of the realm. Widow of Reginald of Marash, and sister of Joscelin III, she was related to Amalric; and a former patriarch, Fulcher, had opposed the marriage in the first place. Evidently Amalric regarded the barons’ opposition as serious, for he promptly obtained an annulment from the patriarch, Amalric of Nesle, and the papal legate, the cardinal John. Their two children, Baldwin and Sibyl, were recognized as legitimate and their succession rights guaranteed. The appointment of Miles of Plancy as seneschal also aroused antagonism. Miles was to marry Stephanie, widow of Humphrey of Toron, and thus control the fief of Montréal (1173–1174). Although the king may have felt it necessary to appease the magnates in order to assure his succession to the throne, legislation enacted in the first year of his reign strengthened his position measurably. By his Assise sur la ligece he required all rear vassals to render liege homage to the king directly. Thus the power of the tenants-in-chief was lessened since rear vassals could now seek redress in the king’s court. So long as a strong king stood at the center of this system, in fact so long as Amalric lived, this legislation fortified royal power in a manner more reminiscent of the Norman rulers of England than of their Capetian confrères. Amalric also appears to have established two new courts for maritime litigation, the Cour de la Fonde and the Cour de la Chaîne. Indeed, Amalric’s role in the legal development of Jerusalem is evidenced by a number of significant references to his name in the Assises of the kingdom. These matters will receive more extended treatment in a later volume.

The foreign policy of Amalric, largely a series of attempts to conquer Egypt, had been foreshadowed by Baldwin III when he captured Ascalon. And it was logical that Amalric, who had been entrusted with the government of Ascalon, should be interested in the south.14 The combination of circumstances which had motivated Baldwin still existed. The union of Aleppo and Damas-

---

14 On the Egyptian campaigns of Amalric, see G. Schlumberger, Campagnes du roi Amoury Ier en Égypte. For the career of Saladin, see Lane-Poole, Saladin, pp. 77–128; and below, chapter XVIII.
cus under Nūr-ad-Dīn made the whole matter more urgent. For if Egypt fell into the power of the Syrian Sunnite Moslems, the Latin states would be encircled. Add to these strategic considerations the immense commercial value of Egypt with its great port of Alexandria, and it is not difficult to understand why Amalric persistently pushed southward.

Unfortunately for the success of Amalric’s ventures, Nūr-ad-Dīn, as we have seen in an earlier chapter, was equally concerned over developments in Egypt. Moreover, the atabeg was able not only to intervene directly in Egypt, but also to hamper Latin action by creating diversions along the frontiers of the kingdom and the northern states. Indeed, these border attacks were often costly to the Franks. The heavy losses thus sustained must be considered in any estimate of Amalric’s Egyptian policy.

The king’s first venture was in September 1163. Taking as a pretext the non-payment of tribute promised in the time of Baldwin III, Amalric crossed the isthmus of Suez and besieged Bilbais. Only by cutting dikes were the Egyptians able to force a withdrawal. Meanwhile, Shavar, a former vizir recently ejected from Cairo by his enemies, had persuaded Nūr-ad-Dīn to support his cause. Accordingly, in April 1164 an expeditionary force under the Kurdish emir Asad-ad-Dīn Shirkūh set out with Shavar for Egypt. At the same time the atabeg provided an important diversion by continuing operations on the frontiers of northern Syria. As a consequence, Shirkūh reached Cairo safely and Shavar was restored to power (May 1164).

Once he was reinstated, Shavar proved recalcitrant and refused to pay a tribute which had been promised Shirkūh. The latter thereupon seized Bilbais and the entire province of Sharqiya to the east of the delta. Accordingly, Shavar, following a precedent set by his former enemies, appealed to the Franks, promising military support and financial aid. Since a number of crusaders arrived from Europe about this time, Amalric felt able to equip an invasion army without seriously depleting the kingdom’s defenses. He therefore took counsel with his barons, put Bohemond III of Antioch in charge of the realm, and set out a second time for Egypt. Junction with Shavar was made and Shirkūh was besieged in Bilbais. After three months (August–October, 1164) the city’s fall seemed near. But Amalric had learned of formidable attacks in northern Syria by Nūr-ad-Dīn and proposed to Shirkūh that both abandon their projects. Nearly at the end of his resour-

\[15\] Cf. above, chapter XVI, p. 523.
ces, Shirkuh agreed and returned to Syria. Thus an otherwise promising campaign ended in a stalemate owing partly to the king's overly optimistic judgment regarding the strength of the northern frontiers. Notwithstanding, prompt action had preserved the independence of Egypt.

Nur-ad-Din's activities which had so alarmed Amalric had commenced with a siege of Harim and an invasion of the plain of Buqai'ah southwest of Krak des Chevaliers. Forces composed of Greeks and Armenians from Cilicia and a number of Latin knights from the northern states at first routed the invaders. But not long after, Nur-ad-Din was able to divide the Christian troops and captured Bohemond III of Antioch, Raymond III of Tripoli, Constantine Coloman, Greek governor of Cilicia, Hugh of Lusignan, and Joscelin III, titular count of Edessa.16 Harim fell to the atabeg on August 12, 1164. Captured flags and the heads of fallen Christians were sent to Shirkuh with instructions to exhibit them on the walls of Bilbais to frighten the besiegers. Harim had been a bastion potentially menacing to Aleppo. Its capture opened the way for a Moslem invasion of Antioch.

Whether or not Nur-ad-Din could have taken Antioch is a question. Certainly its defenses were weakened and its ruler was a captive. But the atabeg countered the urgings of his own officers by pointing out that in an emergency the Franks would summon Byzantine aid. No such misgivings prevented him from attacking farther south. Moreover, since the king and the bulk of the Latin troops were still in Egypt, and Bohemond and other leaders were in captivity, the kingdom was vulnerable. After circulating a rumor that he would attack Tiberias, Nur-ad-Din besieged Banyas, the important stronghold some miles north of the city. Probably because of incompetence, although treason was suggested, the defenses failed and Banyas fell to the atabeg.

As soon as the king reached Jerusalem from Egypt and learned further details of the situation, he hastened northward accompanied by Thierry of Alsace, who had returned to the orient. Defenses were set in order, and arrangements were made for the liberation of Bohemond III in the summer of 1165. In Tripoli Raymond III had been able to designate Amalric as regent. Indeed, the king held the bailliage of Tripoli for the ten years of the count's captivity. Thus Amalric's forthright action and Nur-ad-

16 William of Tyre XIX, 9. According to other sources Joscelin was taken in 1160. Cf. Röhrich, Königreich, p. 318, note 3; Runciman, Crusades, II, 358.
Din’s fear of Byzantine intervention restored the balance of power in northern Syria.\textsuperscript{17}

In January 1167 the persistent Shïrkhûh set out once again to recoup his fortunes in Egypt. Amalric heard of his preparations and summoned an important assembly at Nablus where he publicly outlined the danger which threatened the kingdom. Indeed, his words so moved his hearers that they voted a ten per cent tax. Since a preliminary expedition into the southern desert failed to intercept Shïrkhûh, the king reassembled his forces at Ascalon. On January 30 a Christian army marched a third time toward Egypt and reached Bilbais without incident. Thence they moved south past Cairo and camped near Fustat (Babylon). At first Shavar, apparently unaware of Shïrkhûh’s movements, doubted Amalric’s intentions. Indeed, he received from Shïrkhûh an invitation to unite against the foes of Islam. But on learning more of the Turkish advance, he elected to renew his engagements with Amalric in a formal treaty. In addition to the annual tribute, the sum of four hundred thousand gold pieces, half to be paid at once, was agreed upon as adequate compensation to the Franks. The king, on his part, pledged himself not to leave Egypt until Shïrkhûh and his army had been destroyed or driven from the country. Hugh of Caesarea was chosen to head a delegation to ratify the treaty with the caliph.

In a remarkable passage, William of Tyre describes the amazement and wonder of the Frankish delegation as they saw for the first time the caliph’s magnificent palace, lavishly but exquisitely decorated.\textsuperscript{18} They were led past fish pools, cages of strange birds and animals, through even more beautifully appointed buildings to the caliph’s presence. There, to the consternation of all present and to the embarrassment of the caliph, Hugh insisted that the contract be sealed in the Frankish manner by each party holding the bare hand of the other. After considerable hesitation, the caliph offered his gloved hand. Still Hugh refused. At length the caliph, whom Hugh later described as “of an extremely generous disposition”, consented and repeated after him the words “in good faith, without fraud or deceit”.

\textsuperscript{17} On Raymond III and the regency in Tripoli, see Baldwin, \textit{Raymond III of Tripoli}, p. 11; Richard, \textit{Le Comité de Tripoli}, pp. 33–34. About this time (1164 or 1167) if we may believe Ernoul, \textit{Chronique} (ed. Mas Latour), pp. 27–30, Toros visited Jerusalem and suggested the colonization of a large number of Armenians. Amalric and the barons agreed, but owing to the opposition of the Latin clergy the project never materialized. Grousset, \textit{Croisades}, II, 603–604, discusses this development in detail.

\textsuperscript{18} William of Tyre, XIX, 18–19 (pp. 910–911). It is possible that the Templar Geoffrey Fulcher had more part in making the treaty than would appear from William’s narrative. See Krey, \textit{William of Tyre}, II, 351, note 11.
The following days were spent in various attempts to make contact with Shīrḵūh’s army which had, meanwhile, successfully crossed the Nile, and camped at Giza across the river from Fustat and Cairo. After a month of stalemated broken only by minor engagements, Shīrḵūh moved rapidly southward at night. Amalric crossed the river, pursued his enemy, and made contact at al-Bābain (March 18, 1167). Apparently the Christians were outnumbered. Nevertheless, Shīrḵūh hesitated to give battle and was only persuaded to do so by his more warlike officers, among whom was his nephew Saladin (Ṣalāḥ-ad-Dīn). In the ensuing engagement many Christian knights were killed or captured and a great deal of equipment taken, but the survivors retreated in good order. Moreover, when Amalric counted his forces he discovered only one hundred men lost as against an estimated fifteen hundred for the Moslems.

After the battle Shīrḵūh marched to Alexandria, where the citizens welcomed him, but where he was soon besieged by the Christian army. All means of entrance or exit were carefully guarded and a fleet blocked all river traffic. After about one month had elapsed and conditions within the city had deteriorated, Shīrḵūh managed to lead a small force secretly past the king into upper Egypt. Amalric at first pressed south in pursuit, but was dissuaded by the advice of an Egyptian nobleman who pointed out that Alexandria was in desperate straits and close to surrender.

Accordingly, reinforced by another contingent from the kingdom, the Christians began bombarding the city and making repeated assaults. Saladin, whom Shīrḵūh had left in command, desperately tried to stem the growing tide of defeatism and secretly informed his superior of the critical conditions within the city. At length Shīrḵūh, after one or two unsuccessful raids, decided to sue for peace. Arnulf of Tell Bashir, one of the Latin captives, was sent to negotiate with Amalric. The king was not unwilling to end hostilities. His own losses had been serious, and he was again concerned about Nūr-ad-Dīn’s movements in the north. It was agreed, therefore, that both armies would return prisoners, evacuate Egypt, and leave Shavar in possession of power. Shīrḵūh, disconsolate over his failures, reached Damascus in September 1167. The Christian army was permitted to “tour” Alexandria before departing for Palestine. The men marveled at the city’s magnificence and wondered that so small an army could shut up a city with so many able to bear arms. Amalric reached Ascalon in August 1167.
Before leaving Alexandria, Amalric had accorded the courtesies of war to Saladin, for whom he provided an escort, and, according to his original agreement with Shavar, raised his flag on Pharos island. Shavar also agreed again to an annual tribute and to the installation of a Frankish commissioner and guard in Cairo. Shirkuh had not been destroyed, but for the moment the Latins were in the ascendancy in Egypt.

If the events of the early years of Amalric's reign demonstrated the weakness of Egypt, they also brought into clear focus the precarious nature of Frankish defenses in northern Syria. As a consequence, the position of the Byzantine emperor Manuel Comnenus took on added significance. Indeed, he held the balance of power in the Levant, and the Latins, though fearful of the emperor's designs on Antioch, were coming to realize their dependence on his support. An ambitious ruler, whose far-reaching plans envisaged a reconciliation with Rome and an extension of Byzantine power westward as well as to the east and south, Manuel on his part showed a marked willingness during this period to cooperate with westerners. It was not long before these developments that Manuel had married Maria, sister of Bohemond of Antioch, and somewhat later that Bohemond married the emperor's niece, Theodora.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Bohemond should have hastened to Constantinople shortly after his release from captivity. When he returned with gifts which perhaps enabled him to pay off his ransom, he was accompanied by a Greek patriarch, Athanasius, whom he installed in Antioch. Aimery, the Latin patriarch, placed the city under an interdict and took refuge in the castle of Quasair some miles to the south. And although the Latin clergy continued their protests which were supported by Pope Alexander III, and echoed by the Jacobite Christians, Athanasius remained in Antioch until 1170 when he lost his life in an earthquake. Evidently Bohemond was sufficiently appreciative of Byzantine assistance to risk the opposition of his subjects.

There were also important relations between the emperor and Jerusalem. Following his separation from Agnes, Amalric had sent a delegation to Constantinople. And shortly before the close of the recent Egyptian campaign, Hernesius, archbishop of Caesarea, and Odo of St. Amand, the king's marshal, returned bringing with them Maria Comnena, daughter of John, Manuel's nephew and protosebastos. Amalric met the party at Tyre, and he and Maria were married there on August 29, 1167, just after his return from Egypt.
In the following months a plan for a joint Franco-Byzantine military expedition to conquer and partition Egypt was elaborated. It is possible that the project was first proposed by Amalric. But Manuel’s interest in the Egyptian situation is evident and the first discussions of which we have certain knowledge resulted from the visit of two imperial envoys in the summer of 1168. A formal treaty of alliance was drawn up and William, who had recently been named archdeacon of Tyre, accompanied the envoys on the return journey. He was empowered to ratify the agreement in the emperor’s presence. Since the negotiations were deemed urgent, William was taken to the emperor’s military headquarters in Serbia. His mission was successfully accomplished and he set out for Palestine on October 1, 1168. Before William reached home, however, Amalric had already started again for Egypt.

What prompted the king to proceed without Byzantine aid and to break his agreements with Shavar is not clear. Although in retrospect it is easy to understand William of Tyre’s disappointment, and to agree that the venture was a mistake, it is difficult to believe that Amalric would have jeopardized the Latin predominance in Egypt without adequate reason. Moreover, there are certain possible explanations. It appears that the tribute which Shavar had agreed to pay seemed even less palatable to the Egyptians after the immediate danger had past. More irritating was the presence of the Frankish commissioner and guard who, apparently, behaved with inexcusable insolence. As a consequence, certain negotiations were commenced between Cairo and Damascus, and disquieting rumors reached Jerusalem. An immediate invasion, opposed by the Templars under Philip of Milly, was vigorously urged by their Hospitaller rivals under Gilbert of Assailly. A warlike and greedy element among the barons, perhaps unwilling to contemplate a division of Egypt with the Greeks, added its pressure. It appears that the king withstood this pressure for a while, but the decision was ultimately made and the army set out for Egypt in October 1168.

Undeterred by the pleadings of Shavar’s emissaries the Christian army entered Egypt and took Bilbais on November 4. A shocking slaughter followed, and captives were taken indiscriminately. Many of the victims were native Christians. The siege of Cairo was commenced on November 13, but, according to William of Tyre, not pressed energetically because the king only wanted to force a money payment. It is, however, possible that Amalric realized that the city would resist to the end rather than suffer
the fate of Bilbaies. Further, on November 12, Shavar had inaugurred a scorched earth policy by ordering that Fustat be burned. The conflagration lasted fifty-four days, a horrible example of what might happen in Cairo. Thus a kind of haggling between the king and Shavar continued. The latter paid one hundred thousand dinars as ransom for his son and nephew, who had been captured, and gave hostages for the payment of another one hundred thousand. Accordingly Amalric withdrew to al-MAṭariyah and then proceeded to Siryāqūs about sixteen miles northeast of Cairo. Meanwhile, a Christian fleet appeared at the entrance to the Nile and occupied Tinnis. Further progress was blocked by Egyptian ships and before Humphrey of Toron and a detachment of the king’s army could seize the opposite shore, rumors of Shīrḵūh’s approach reached the king and he ordered the fleet home.

Amalric then hastily returned to Bilbaies, left a guard, and on December 25 marched out to intercept Shīrḵūh. But Shīrḵūh successfully crossed the Nile. Since Amalric knew that his enemies could now easily be reinforced, he elected to abandon the project entirely. By January 2, 1169, the army was on its return journey. Shīrḵūh, who was generously supported by Nūr-ad-Din, was able, therefore, to reach Cairo unhindered. There he was welcomed by the caliph and the citizens. Shavar was assassinated (January 18, 1169), and Shīrḵūh became vizir. Within two months, however, he had died and was succeeded by his nephew, Saladin. By August of the same year the young Kurd had replaced a number of the caliph’s officials, dispossessed Egyptian landowners and substituted Syrians, massacred the caliph’s negro guard, and, in short, made himself master of Egypt.

These events produced a revolution in the balance of power in the Levant. The Frankish protectorate over Egypt with all its advantages, economic as well as political, was ended. To all intents and purposes Moslem Egypt and Syria were united, and there began that encirclement of the Christian states which in future years was to prove so disastrous.19

The gravity of the situation was well understood in Jerusalem, and early in 1169 ambassadors and letters were sent to Europe. Western princes were too occupied with their own concerns, and the ambassadors returned without accomplishing anything. Fortunately for the Latins, Manuel Comnenus was still anxious to

---

19 For further details see above, chapter XVI. For the career of Saladin, see below, chapter XVIII.
fulfil his part of the agreement arranged by William of Tyre in September 1168. Indeed, the fleet and equipment which arrived at Acre in September 1169 were more imposing than had been stipulated, and restored Christian command of the sea.20

The Latins were overjoyed and obviously impressed by the Byzantine preparations. But since Amalric had to reorganize his forces after the previous Egyptian expedition and post sufficient troops to guard against any action by Nūr-ad-Dīn, prompt attack with the element of surprise was impossible. Byzantine food supplies, for some unexplained reason not sufficiently provided for, began to run short, and it was found necessary for the Greek troops to disembark at Acre and march overland with the Latins. On October 15, 1169, the combined armies left Ascalon and after nine days reached Pelusium (al-Faramā') near the sea on the eastern branch of the Nile where the fleet had preceded them. They were ferried across the Nile and by following the shore of Lake Manzala reached Damietta two or three days later.

Since Saladin had evidently not expected attack at this point, the city was inadequately defended. William of Tyre insists that a quick attack could have succeeded, and it appears that Saladin was worried. But there was a delay of three days. Moreover, although the river was blocked by an iron chain, it was open above the city. Thus Damietta was speedily reinforced by boats from the south. A full siege was, as a consequence, necessary, and the Christians had to construct war machines with considerable labor. At length a huge engine of seven storeys was built. But the defenders, now constantly reinforced, fought back with skill and bravery. Meanwhile, taking advantage of a strong onshore wind, the Moslems launched a fire boat which was blown into the Byzantine fleet riding at anchor in close array. Six ships were burned, and a disaster was averted only by the prompt action of Amalric, who roused the crews.

As the siege was prolonged, food ran short in the Christian camp. Torrential rains added to the discomfort. Finally, Andronicus, commanding the Byzantine forces, proposed a desperate all-out assault. Amalric was opposed, holding that the city’s defenses were too strong and needed further battering by the machines. Although he had been directed to obey Amalric, Andronicus made preparations to attack alone. But before he had started, the king’s

20 William of Tyre, XX, 13 (p. 961). Among the Byzantine vessels were ships with stern openings for unloading, and bridges for embarking and landing men and horses. The description strikingly resembles modern invasion ships.
messengers informed him that negotiations for withdrawal had begun. After a few days of fraternizing, during which the Christians were permitted to enter Damietta and trade as they pleased, war machines were burned and the withdrawal commenced. The Latin and Greek troops reached Ascalon on December 21, 1169. Less fortunate was the fleet. A violent storm wrecked many ships, and others were deserted by sailors who feared the emperor's wrath. Disappointment accentuated the mutual recriminations of Latins and Greeks as each blamed the other for the expedition's failure.

Although it was not apparent at the time, the failure of the combined Franco-Byzantine expedition of 1169 marks a turning point in Levantine history. Had Amalric not acted on his own in 1168, the alliance might have prevented the union of Egypt and Syria. With more careful preparation — and in the matter of food, the Byzantines were possibly to blame — the combined forces could perhaps have defeated Saladin before he consolidated his hold over Egypt. As it turned out, no other joint expedition was undertaken and the final victory lay with Saladin.

Although the Christian failure strengthened Saladin's position in Egypt, communication between Syria and Egypt was still endangered by Frankish possessions in the south, especially the fortresses of Kerak or Krak des Moabites, sometimes mistakenly termed by the crusaders Petra Deserti, and Krak de Montréal (ash-Shaubak). Moreover, a temporary lull in hostilities resulted from the terrible earthquakes of June 1170. A large part of northern Syria, both Christian and Moslem, was devastated; thousands were killed; and many churches and castles destroyed. But in December 1170 Saladin attacked Darum and Gaza. The outer defenses of Darum were breached. A number of persons, including women and children, refugees from the surrounding country, were killed at Gaza. Saladin, evidently unwilling to risk an engagement with the royal army, withdrew to Egypt on its approach.

Early in 1171 Amalric summoned the high court to discuss the critical problems which now faced the kingdom. Although Frederick, archbishop of Tyre, had not yet returned from the embassy of 1169, it was agreed that another appeal to western rulers should be made. Europe remained uninterested in the plight of the Holy Land. Frederick finally returned having accomplished nothing, and his companion, Stephen of Sancerre, on whose assistance the king had counted and who had been chosen as a prospective son-in-law, left after six months of disgraceful conduct. Indeed, there
is no further mention of the European legation, and the members of the high court realized that their only salvation lay in again securing Byzantine aid. The king insisted on leading an embassy to Constantinople himself. He set sail from Acre on March 10 with an impressive retinue and ten galleys.

Manuel, overjoyed though at first surprised, went out of his way to receive and entertain the royal party in a suitable manner. Daily conferences alternated with visits to churches and other places of interest. There were games and musical and dramatic performances at the circus. The visitors were shown the most precious relics and presented with costly gifts. Although Greek sources describe Amalric as performing a kind of homage, William of Tyre mentions only that at the initial reception, the king occupied a throne slightly lower than that of the basileus. Presumably, as in 1159, such gestures carried no implication of vassalage in the western feudal sense.\(^{21}\) At any rate Amalric succeeded, at whatever cost, in persuading the emperor of the necessity and feasibility of subjugating Egypt. As a consequence, the Franco-Byzantine alliance was renewed and put in writing over the seals of both parties. The king returned in July 1171, his mission accomplished, but with no productive results.

Manuel Comnenus, like his father John and his grandfather Alexius, had proved himself an able emperor, pursuing the best interests of his realm with single-minded determination, but his conception of the best method of accomplishing this was both less prudent and less favorable to the Franks than his predecessors had been. The unfounded accusations against Alexius and John, the bitter hostility common to Normans of Antioch and Latin Christians of western Europe, the failure to unite Christians of either high or low degree against the Moslems — all these were intensified during Manuel’s reign, with more basis in his own actions than had previously been the case.\(^{22}\) His obstructionism and other hostile relations with the Second Crusade have been examined in a previous chapter, while we have covered in some detail his ineffective alliance with Amalric against Egypt, as well as his fruitless purchase in 1150 of the remnants of the county of

\(^{21}\) William of Tyre, XX, 23 (p. 984). Grousset, Croisades, II, 577, following Chalandon, Les Conquér, II, 549—550, accepts this tentatively as vassalage. But in “The Later Commens,” Cambridge Medieval History, IV, 377, Chalandon notes that since the Greek chronicler Cinnamus’s statement cannot be verified, “it is impossible to speak decidedly.” The best discussion of this whole matter is LaMonte, “To What Extent was the Byzantine Empire the Suzerain of the Latin Crusading States?” Byzantium, VII (1932), 262—263.

\(^{22}\) The reign of Manuel, as well as those of his great predecessors and his miserable successors, is examined in a chapter of volume II.
Edessa and the devastation of Cyprus by Reginald and Toros II in 1156.

The recovery before 1150 of the Taurus fortresses by the Roupenid prince Toros had not seriously affected Greek power, but his conquest of Mamistra in 1151 and the rest of Cilicia in 1152 had necessitated the great expedition of 1158, which like John's two decades earlier won great renown but little of permanent value: control of Cilicia for a few years, suzerainty over Antioch effective only during the presence of a Byzantine army, a truce with Nūr-ad-Dīn which postponed the full onslaught of Moslem Syria against the Frankish littoral. His peace in 1161 with the Selçūkids of Iconium was more fruitful, but its effects were to be dissipated in 1176 at Myriokephalon, the absolute end of Byzantine control over any part of Anatolia except the coastal cities, since Meleh the Roupenid ex-Templar had reconquered Cilicia in 1173.

To return to Amalric's visit to Constantinople, however, we may note that it marks the climax of his reign. The situation in the Moslem world was serious, but so long as the rift between Nūr-ad-Dīn and Saladin continued, not yet hopeless. The Byzantine alliance should have insured power adequate to break Saladin's hold over Egypt. This project, however, so full of promise was destined never to be carried out. Events beyond the frontiers of Jerusalem and Byzantium delayed the expedition. On Amalric's death in 1174 the alliance lapsed.

Furthermore, in 1171, Saladin, at first reluctantly following Nūr-ad-Dīn's directives, had ordered that at Friday prayers in Egyptian mosques the name of the caliph of Baghdad be substituted for the Shi'ite, al-'Āḍid. Then, on September 13, al-'Āḍid had died, and no successor was named. The politico-religious revolution which had been thus quietly consummated in Cairo was of tremendous importance. A schism of centuries' duration which had contributed materially to the security of the Latin states had ended. Only the strained relations between Saladin and Nūr-ad-Dīn prevented the encirclement from being fully effective.

In 1172 Henry the Lion the Lion the Lion the Lion the Lion (Stevenson, Crusaders, pp. 200–201). In 1172 Henry the Lion the Lion the Lion the Lion the Lion (Stevenson, Crusaders, pp. 200–201). In 1172 Henry the Lion the Lion the Lion the Lion the Lion (Stevenson, Crusaders, pp. 200–201). In 1172 Henry the Lion the Lion the Lion the Lion the Lion (Stevenson, Crusaders, pp. 200–201). In 1172 Henry the Lion the Lion the Lion the Lion the Lion (Stevenson, Crusaders, pp. 200–201).
King Amalric’s reign was drawing to a close. In the summer of 1173, despite the Byzantine alliance, the king once again sought assistance from the west. Sometime in the fall of 1173 or early in 1174 Raymond III of Tripoli was released from captivity. The king, who had helped procure the ransom money, welcomed him and restored the county over which he had acted as baili. On May 15, 1174, Nūr-ad-Dīn died and Amalric immediately tried to take advantage of the discord which followed by attacking Ban- yas.24 After a short campaign he agreed to a truce. On his return he complained of illness. Neither oriental nor Latin physicians were able to give more than temporary relief and the king died on July 11, 1174, at the age of thirty-eight.

The death of Amalric came at a most unfortunate time for the Latins. It is impossible to say whether, had he lived, he could have averted the eventual union of Damascus and Cairo. In any event the Latins derived no advantage from the death of Nūr-ad-Dīn. Amalric’s own death caused the Franco-Byzantine alliance to lapse, and the field was left free for Saladin. Although the historian may thus reproach Amalric for the inopportuneness of his death, he was one of the best kings of Jerusalem, the last man of genuine capacity to hold the reins of government. In the years to come men were to see the resources of the kingdom — and they were still great — wasted through want of adequate leadership.

discipline the guilty member. B. Lewis (above, chapter IV, p. 123) suggests that this episode may reflect an actual rapprochement between the Assassins and Jerusalem.

24 For the immediate consequences of Nūr-ad-Dīn’s death, see below, chapter XVIII, pp. 566–567.