The attempt of the emperor Frederick II to rule the kingdom of Jerusalem ended with the surrender of Tyre by the brothers Filangieri and their departure from the country. Thenceforward the kingdom was to be governed according to the lawyers' strict interpretation of the constitution, which meant that the land continuously hovered on the edge of anarchy.

The chief collections of relevant sources are: Vincenzo de Bartholomaeis, Poesie provenzale storiche relative all' Italia (FSI, LXXXI-LXXII, Rome, 1931); J. Bongars, Gesta Dei per Francos (2 vols., Hanover, 1614); E. Martène and U. Durand, Thesaurus novus anecdotorum (5 vols., Paris, 1717); Martène and Durand, Vetereum scriptorum et monumentorum amplissima collectio (9 vols., Paris, 1727-1733); Louis de Mas Latrie, Histoire de l'île de Chypre sous le règne des princes de la maison de Lusignan, II, III: Documents et mémoires (Paris, 1852-1855); Louis de Mas Latrie, "Nouvelles preuves de l'histoire de Chypre," Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes, XXXII (1871), 341-378; XXXIV (1873), 47-87; and XXXV (1874), 99-138; J. F. Michaud, Bibliothèque des croisades, IV: Extraits des historiens arabes, ed. M. Reinach (Paris, 1829); and G. L. F. Tafel and G. M. Thomas, Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig mit besonderer Beziehung auf Byzanz und die Levante (Fontes rerum Austriacarum: Österreichische Geschichtsquellen, 2 abt., Diplomataria et acta, XII, XIII, XIV, Vienna, 1866-1857).

The kingdom of Jerusalem was by 1243 reduced to a narrow strip stretching up the coast from Ascalon to Beirut. Besides the coastal strip it included Jerusalem and Bethlehem, won back by Frederick's treaty of 1229, with a precarious corridor leading up to the holy city from Jaffa. Jerusalem itself, which had already been sacked by the Moslems in 1239, was without defenses, apart from the Tower of David. Farther north, the whole of Galilee had recently been recovered by the diplomacy of Richard of Cornwall. The county comprised the coast-lands as far as Valania and extended inland to the castles of 'Akkār and Krak des Chevaliers, on either side of the plain of the Biqā'. Still farther to the north, and separated from the county by the Moslem ports of Jabala and Latakia and


the Iṣmāʿīlīte strongholds in the Ṣuṣārīr mountains, was the
principality of Antioch, which consisted of little more than the
plain of Antioch, with an outlet to the sea at St. Simeon.

The lawful king of Jerusalem was the Hohenstaufen Conrad, son
of Frederick II and Isabel of Brienne (Yolanda), who had died
giving birth to him. Conrad had arrived at his legal majority, at the
age of fifteen, on April 25, 1243. This had removed the juridical right
of his father, the emperor, to govern in his name and had provided
the lawyers of “Outremer” with the occasion for ridding themselves
of his nominees. The young king at once sent Thomas of Aquino,
count of Acre, to be his representative; but at a meeting of the
high court, held in the patriarch’s palace at Acre on June 5, 1243,
and attended by all the barons and bishops of the kingdom as well
as the officials of the commune of Acre and the presidents of the
Venetian and Genoese colonies, the lawyer Philip of Novara argued
that homage could not properly be paid to Conrad until he came in
person to receive it, and that in the meantime the regency ought to
be entrusted to the next available heir to the crown. Odo of Mont-
béliard, who led the moderate faction amongst the barons, sug-
gested that Conrad should be sent an official invitation to visit his
kingdom and that no further action be taken until he replied. But
Philip, with the Ibelin family backing him, won his point. 1

The next heir was Alice, dowager queen of Cyprus, the eldest
surviving daughter of queen Isabel I and Henry of Champagne.
She and her third husband, Ralph of Nesle, were accepted as
regents, and the members of the high court swore allegiance to them,
saving king Conrad’s rights. As we have seen in the preceding
chapter, this action legally entitled them to strip Filangiери of his
authority. But when Tyre was recaptured from him, it was not
handed over to the regents, as they expected, but was allotted by
the high court to Philip of Montfort, lord, in his wife’s right, of
Toron and son of an Ibelin lady. Ralph of Nesle saw that his regency
was intended to be purely nominal, and soon retired to France. Alice
remained titular regent until her death in 1246, with her cousin
Balian of Ibelin, lord of Beirut, acting as her bailie. When she died,
the high court gave the regency to the next heir, her son king
Henry I of Cyprus, in spite of a protest from her half-sister Meli-
send, dowager princess of Antioch, the daughter of queen Isabel I
and Aimery of Cyprus, who claimed that, as she was a generation

1 Geites des Chirois, 225–226 (RHC, Arm., II), pp. 730–732; Estoire d’Ericles (RHC,
Occ., II), p. 240; Amadi, Chronique, pp. 190–191; Assises de Jerusalem, II, 399; Tafel-
Thomas, Urkunden, II, 351–389, giving an account written by a Venetian eye-witness,
Marsiglio Giorgio.
nearer to the absentee king, she ought to have precedence. King Henry retained Balian of Ibelin as his bailie, and confirmed Philip of Montfort in the possession of Tyre. When Balian died in 1247 he was succeeded as bailie by his brother John, lord of Arsuf. King Henry, who was indolent and immensely fat, seldom stirred from his kingdom of Cyprus, leaving the mainland kingdom to govern itself.

The high court was dominated by the great family of Ibelin, whose connections covered the whole lay nobility of Outremer. The head of the house was Balian of Beirut, eldest son of John, the “old lord” of Beirut. His brother John, who succeeded him as bailie, was lord of Arsuf. A cousin, another John, was the leading lawyer in the kingdom, and was soon to acquire the fief of Jaffa. Two younger sons of the “old lord” of Beirut, Baldwin and Guy, were the most prominent nobles in Cyprus. Balian, the late lord of Sidon and Belfort, his half-brother Philip of Montfort, lord of Tyre and Toron, and John, the late lord of Caesarea, were sons of sisters of the “old lord”. Odo of Montbéliard was a close relative of Balian of Ibelin’s wife Eschiva. Every lay tenant-in-chief was a member of this one clan, which for the moment worked in unison.

There was less unity between the military orders, which now controlled as much of the country as the lay baronage. The Hospital and Temple had come together to oppose Frederick II, but latterly the Hospital had supported Filangieri and advocated Frederick’s policy of friendship with Egypt rather than with Damascus, while the Templars, who favored alliance with Damascus, worked in with the Ibelins. The Teutonic Knights tended to back the Hospital against the Temple, but played a smaller part in the politics of the kingdom.

The quarrels between the orders were paralleled by the quarrels between the Italian commercial colonies, whose power had been enhanced by the years of comparative peace that had followed the Third Crusade. The Genoese tended to ally themselves with the Hospital, and the Venetians with the Temple. The Provençal merchants regularly opposed the Genoese, and the Catalans opposed the Provençals. The Pisans stayed between the two parties.

---

2^ *Gesta des Chiprois*, 257 (p. 741); Rühricht, *Regesta*, pp. 315–316; *Les Registres d’Innocent IV*, II, 60 (no. 4427). Innocent told Odo of Châteauvieux to investigate Melisend’s claim, but did not pursue the matter.


4^ For the Ibelin family connections, see Ducange, *Les Familles d’Outremer*, under “Gar- nier”, “Ibelin”, “Montfort”; also Runciman, *History of the Crusades*, III, appendix III (genealogical trees). Balian’s son Julian was now lord of Sidon; and John’s son-in-law John l’Aleman of Caesarea.
The final defeat of the imperialists meant the triumph of Templar foreign policy. The Ayyūbid world was divided between ʿal-Shāliḥ Ayyūb of Egypt and his uncle, ʿal-Shāliḥ Ismāʿil of Damascus, with his cousin an-Nāṣir Dāʾūd of Kerak as an unstable third party in their disputes. The Templars at once offered their friendship to Ismāʿil, and obtained from him and an-Nāṣir the withdrawal of the Moslems from the Temple area at Jerusalem and its restoration to the order. Ayyūb, in his anxiety at losing the friendship of the Franks, announced that he would confirm the arrangement. The re-entry of the Templars to their original home was triumphantly reported by the master to pope Innocent IV.6

Next spring (1244) war broke out between Ayyūb of Egypt and Ismāʿil of Damascus, who was supported by an-Nāṣir of Kerak and by the young prince of Homs, al-Manṣūr Ibrāhīm. The Templars persuaded the barons to offer their alliance to Ismāʿil, and the prince of Homs came in person to Acre to complete the negotiations and to offer the Franks a share of Egypt when Ayyūb should be defeated. He was received with honor and entertained sumptuously by the Temple. But Ayyūb too found allies. Since the death of the Khorezm-Shāh Jalāl-ad-Din in 1231, his army, some ten thousand strong, had been wandering leaderless through the Jazira, ready to hire itself to the highest bidder. The Khorezmians gladly accepted Ayyūb's offer to enter his service against Ismāʿil and the allies of Damascus.8

It had been arranged that the Franco-Damascene forces should assemble outside Acre in the summer of 1244. While they were gathering, the Khorezmians flooded into Syria from the north. They swept down past Homs and Damascus, ravaging the countryside but not venturing to attack the cities till they came into Galilee. There they captured and sacked Tiberias and passed on to sack Nablus. Early in July they appeared before Jerusalem. The Franks realized the danger too late. The patriarch, Robert, hastened to the city with Armand of Périgord and William of Châteauneuf, masters of the Temple and the Hospital, and reinforced the garrison in the Tower of David, but slipped away just before the enemy arrived.

---


8 Joinville, Histoire de St. Louis, ed. Wailly, p. 290; Matthew Paris, Chronica majora, IV, 301 (Frederick II blames the barons for provoking the Egyptian-Khoreziman alliance); Abū-l-Fidāʾ, Kitāb al-mukhtar (RHC, Or., I), p. 119; al-Maqrīzī, Akhḍār Miṣr (ROL, X), p. 356; Kamāl-ad-Dīn, Taʾrīḫ al-Halab (tr. Blochet, ROL, VI), pp. 3-6, 15. On the Khorezmians, see below, chapter XIX, pp. 668-674.
On July 11 the Khorezmians burst into the city. There was some fighting in the streets and a massacre of all the inmates of the Armenian convent of St. James. But the citadel held out. When no help seemed to be coming from Acre, the garrison sent a desperate appeal for help to an-Naṣir of Kerak, the nearest ally of the Franks. An-Naṣir disliked the alliance, but he sent some troops towards the city. The Khorezmians, anxious to avoid a battle, then offered the garrison a safe-conduct to the coast in return for the surrender of the citadel. On August 23 the Tower of David was handed over to the Khorezmians, and the Frankish population of the city, some six thousand men, women, and children, marched out on the road to Jaffa. When they paused to take a last look at Jerusalem, they saw Frankish flags waving from the towers. Thinking that somehow rescue had arrived, most of the armed men turned back, only to fall in an ambush beneath the walls. Two thousand of them perished. The remainder journeyed painfully towards Jaffa, continually harassed by brigands. Only three hundred survivors reached the coast.

Meanwhile the Khorezmians sacked Jerusalem. The churches were burnt, including the shrine of the Holy Sepulcher, where the tombs of the kings of Jerusalem were desecrated, and the few Latin priests who had stayed behind were murdered. Houses and shops were pillaged. Then, when the city was desolate, the Khorezmians rode on to join the Egyptian army before Gaza.7

So Jerusalem passed finally from the Franks. But it was thought at Acre that the city would soon be re-occupied after the coming victory. Meanwhile al-Manṣūr Ibrāhīm arrived before Acre at the head of the armies of Damascus and Homs, and an-Naṣir brought up his troops, who were mostly beduins. On October 4, 1244, the allies began to march southward. The Christian army was the largest that Outremer had put into the field since the Third Crusade. The cavalry numbered about a thousand, six hundred provided by the lay barons and the remainder by the military orders. The Hospital and the Teutonic Knights, though they disapproved of the war, sent all the men that they could spare. The infantry was probably about five thousand strong. The army was under the command of Philip of Montfort, lord of Tyre, Walter of Brienne, count of Jaffa, and the three masters. The patriarch Robert, archbishop

Peter of Tyre, and bishop Ralph of Lydda and Ramla accompanied
the troops; and Bohemond of Antioch sent his cousins, John and
William of Botron (al-Batrūn), and Thomas, constable of Tripoli.
The Moslem troops were rather more numerous but lightly armed.
There was perfect fellowship between the Franks and the men of
Homs; but an-Nāṣir and his beduins kept themselves apart.

The Egyptian army was commanded by a young mamlik emir,
Rukn-ad-Dīn Baybars. It consisted of about five thousand picked
troops, mostly infantry, the cavalry arm being provided by the
Khorezmians.

The armies made contact at the village of Ḥarbiyah (La Forbie),
a few miles northeast of Gaza, on October 17. The allied com-
manders held a council of war, at which the prince of Homs recom-
mended that they should fortify their camp and remain on the
defensive. He knew that the Khorezmians disliked attacking a
strong position, and inaction soon made them restless. As the Egyp-
tians were too few to attack without them, it was probable that the
Khorezmians would soon melt away and the Egyptians be forced
to retire. But Walter of Brienne urged an immediate attack. The
allied army was the stronger, and it would be wrong to miss an
opportunity of destroying the Khorezmian menace. After some
discussion he had his way, and orders were given to advance. The
Franks were on the right flank, the armies of Damascus and Homs
in the center, and an-Nāṣir and his beduins on the left.

While the Egyptian troops held the Frankish attack, the
Khorezmians counterattacked the Damascene army. The Damas-
cenes could not stand the shock and turned and fled, followed by
an-Nāṣir and his beduins, who had never liked the war. The army
of Homs, which had held its ground, found itself between the
fleeing armies of Damascus and Kerak and had to cut its way out.
The Franks were isolated, and the Khorezmians then wheeled
round to attack their flank and drive them on to the Egyptians.
Though they fought bravely, they were hopelessly trapped. Within
a few hours the army was destroyed. Philip of Montfort and the
patriarch escaped to Ascalon, where they were joined by the
survivors of the military orders: thirty-three Templars, twenty-
seven Hospitalers, and three Teutonic Knights. The dead were
said to number well over five thousand, and included the master
of the Temple, the archbishop of Tyre, the bishop of Lydda and
Ramla, and the two young lords of Botron. Eight hundred prisoners
were taken by the Egyptians, including the master of the Hospital
and the constable of Tripoli. The count of Jaffa was captured by the
Khorezmians, who hurried with him to Jaffa, threatening to kill him unless the garrison surrendered. But he shouted to his men to hold firm, and the Khorezmians were awed by the strength of the fortifications. They retired, sparing the count’s life because of the ransom that he would bring. He was taken with the other captives to Egypt. The Egyptian army meanwhile marched on Ascalon, which was now garrisoned by the Hospital. The first attempts to take it by storm failed. The Egyptians therefore encamped before it, hoping soon to bring up a fleet and to blockade it into surrender.  

The losses suffered by Outremer at Harbīyah were surpassed only by those at Hattin. But, fortunately for the Franks, Aiyūb was in a less formidable position than Saladin had been. He still had to conquer Damascus and establish himself over his cousins, and he had to deal with his embarrassing mercenaries, the Khorezmians. They had hoped to be rewarded by the grant of lands in Egypt, but he refused to allow them across the isthmus of Suez. They contented themselves meanwhile in raiding the Frankish countryside, and then joined the army that Aiyūb sent against Damascus in the spring of 1245. Damascus surrendered to Aiyūb in October, Iṣmā‘īl being compensated with the principality of Baalbek. An-Nāṣir’s lands west of the Jordan, including Jerusalem, had already passed to the Egyptians, and by 1247 the Aiyūbid princes of the north recognized Aiyūb’s suzerainty. The Khorezmians joined Iṣmā‘īl in an attempt to recover Damascus in 1246, but al-Manṣūr Ibrāhīm of Homs and an-Nāṣir Yūsuf of Aleppo, subsidized by Aiyūb, sent an army to its relief, and this army routed the Khorezmians near Baalbek. They were almost annihilated, and their few survivors disappeared back into the east.  

In the summer of 1247 Aiyūb was able to resume operations against the Franks. An Egyptian army moved into Galilee and attacked Tiberias, which Odo of Montbéliard had recently refortified. The town and castle were soon captured, and Mt. Tabor and the castle of Belvoir were occupied a few days later. The Franks were too short of manpower to defend their outlying fortresses. From Galilee the Egyptians moved to the siege of Ascalon, while their fleet sailed up from Egypt to blockade it from the sea. The Hos-
pittailers of the garrison appealed to Acre and to Cyprus for help. King Henry sent eight galleys and a hundred knights under his seneschal, Baldwin of Ibelin, and Acre sent seven galleys and fifty light vessels. The Egyptian fleet of twenty-one galleys set out to meet them, but was scattered by a sudden storm, and many of the ships were wrecked. The relieving force was able to reach Ascalon and land the knights and supplies, but the weather was too bad for the ships to remain in the open roadstead. They returned to Acre. Meanwhile the Egyptians, who had lacked wood for siege engines, were able to use the timber from their own wrecks. They constructed a great battering-ram, which at last, on October 15, broke a way through the walls, and the Egyptians passed within. The defenders were taken by surprise, and were all slaughtered or made prisoner. At Aiyûb's orders the fortress was dismantled and the town deserted.¹⁰

The occupation of Ascalon and eastern Galilee satisfied Aiyûb for the moment. He was too unsure of his Moslem vassals to go farther. The Franks had a breathing-space, which they badly needed. The disaster at Ḥarbiyâh had seriously reduced their manpower. Few fresh colonists arrived to fill the depleted ranks of the baronage. Only the military orders could obtain recruits in the west, and as a result more and more of the defenses of the kingdom were given over to them. The mutual jealousies of the orders were in no way diminished, while the absence of a royal or baronial militia removed the only effective curb on the Italian colonies, whose rivalries were even more intense.¹¹

Farther north Bohemond V, prince of Antioch and count of Tripoli, tried to keep out of his neighbors' troubles. Through his wife, Lucienne of Segni, great-niece of Innocent III and cousin of Gregory IX, he kept on good terms with Rome, but he sought to please Frederick II also by giving asylum to Thomas of Acerra and Lothair Filangiæri. He was friendly with Henry of Cyprus, but had been openly hostile to the Armenians ever since the death of his brother Philip there. But the pope forbade him to go to war, and there was a gradual reconciliation after the marriage of Henry to the Armenian princess Stephanie in 1237. His only military enterprise during these years was to send a contingent, probably


¹¹ The situation as regards manpower and discipline in Syria must be viewed in connection with the whole history of the military orders, the Italian colonies, and the Frankish enterprises in Greece and elsewhere, for all of which see above, chapters VI and VII, and chapters in forthcoming volume IV.
at the request of the pope, to join in the disastrous campaign of 1244. His relations with his vassals were good, though his wife was beginning to fill the county of Tripoli with her Roman relatives, which was to cause trouble later. He seldom visited Antioch, preferring to live at Tripoli. The city of Antioch was almost entirely administered by its commune, in which the Greeks were powerful, and Bohemond seems to have been friendly with the Greek church. During these years Rome decided to try to solve the religious problems of Antioch by encouraging uniate churches, which could be self-governing and use their own language and ritual so long as they recognized the supreme authority of Rome. The Greek patriarch of Antioch, Symeon II, whom Bohemond seems to have allowed to reside at Antioch, would have nothing to do with the scheme. But his successor, David, submitted to the pope in 1245 and for two years was the only patriarch in Antioch, the Latin, Albert, having retired to Europe to complain of the arrangement at the Council of Lyons, where he died. The next Latin patriarch, the pope’s nephew Opizone, reached Antioch in 1248. Soon afterwards he quarreled with David’s successor, Euthymius, who rejected papal supremacy and was banished from the city. A similar attempt to make the Jacobite church uniate was only partly successful, as half the Jacobites refused to follow the Jacobite patriarch Ignatius when he submitted to Rome. The work of conciliation was conducted by Franciscan and Dominican friars, whose orders the patriarch Albert had greatly favored. On the other hand the Latin patriarchate had considerable trouble with monasteries recently established in the principality by the Cistercian order. Bohemond V died in 1252, when the government of Outremer was in the hands of king Louis of France.

Louis IX came to the east in 1248. During the six years that he remained there he was entrusted with the administration of the kingdom of Jerusalem. Though his unhappy Egyptian campaign cost Outremer more men than it could now afford, his administration, particularly during the four years of his residence at Acre, gave the kingdom peace and security. He also intervened usefully in Antiochene affairs on Bohemond V’s death, to end the unpopular

---

12 For Bohemond V’s reign, see the general summary in Cahen, La Syrie du nord, pp. 650–652.  
14 Cahen, La Syrie du nord, pp. 681–684, a fully referenced account.  
16 Ibid., p. 702.
regency of the dowager princess Lucienne, and to arrange the marriage of the young prince Bohemond VI with Sibyl, a daughter of king Hetoum of Armenia, which resulted in a close political alliance between Bohemond and his father-in-law. Louis could not, of course, remain permanently in the east, and his departure left Outremer in a precarious position. King Henry of Cyprus, regent of Jerusalem, died in January 1253, leaving a child of a few months to succeed him, under the regency of the dowager queen, Plaisance of Antioch. The infant king, Hugh II, could not act as regent of Jerusalem, and queen Plaisance was accepted as regent, though she did not come to Acre to have oaths of allegiance sworn to her. The bailie in the kingdom of Jerusalem was John of Ibelin, lord of Arsuf, till 1254 and again from 1256 to 1258. John of Ibelin, count of Jaffa, was bailie from 1254 to 1256, when John of Arsuf was probably in Cyprus. To help in the government Louis left behind one of his most trusted captains, Geoffrey of Sargines, with a regiment of soldiers paid for by the French crown. Geoffrey was appointed constable of the kingdom.

The death of Conrad of Germany in May 1254, when Louis was on his way home, gave the crown of Jerusalem to his two-year-old son Conradin, whose nominal rights were scrupulously regarded by the lawyers of Outremer, though there was no change in the government of the kingdom.

While Louis was still in Egypt, the situation in the Moslem world had been altered by the Mamluk revolution in Cairo, which gave Egypt to a series of rulers far more bellicose and intolerant than the Ayyubids. Meanwhile Damascus had passed to the Ayyubid ruler of Aleppo, Saladin’s great-grandson an-Nasir Yusuf. He was desperately nervous of the Mamluk sultan Aybeg and was therefore eager to keep on good terms with the Franks. Since Aybeg had no wish to drive them into a close alliance with Damascus, they found themselves in an advantageous position. Shortly before he left Acre, Louis arranged a truce with Damascus, to last from February 21, 1254, for two years, six months, and forty days. The next year Aybeg made a ten years’ truce with Acre, from which he excluded the town of Jaffa, whose reduction he considered necessary if he were to hold Palestine against an-Nasir Yusuf. The Franks therefore used Jaffa as a base for raiding Mamluk caravans, and an

17 For Louis’s policy with regard to Antioch, see above, chapter XIV, p. 507.
18 See La Monte, Feudal Monarchy, pp. 74–75.
20 Matthew Paris, Chronica majora, V, 522; Ms. of Rothelin, p. 630; Annales de Terre Sainte, p. 446.
attempt by the governor of Jerusalem, in May 1256, to punish the raiders ended in disaster. When on its expiry the truce was renewed for ten years, Jaffa was included.\textsuperscript{21}

The forebearance of the Moslems was also largely due to the imminence of Mongol invasions. The caliph at Baghdad, al-Musta‘sim, who saw himself in the front line, made every effort to maintain peace in Islam. His anxiety was well founded, for in January 1256 a vast Mongol army, under Hulagu, brother of the Great Khan Möngke, crossed the Oxus on its westward march.\textsuperscript{22}

The respite did not bring peace to Outremer, where the rivalry of the Venetian and Genoese colonies flared up in a civil war that involved the whole kingdom. The Venetian and Genoese districts in Acre were divided by the hill of Montjoie, which belonged to the latter, except for its summit, occupied by the old monastery of St. Sabas, to which both colonies laid claim. One morning early in 1256, while the case was before the courts, the Genoese, with the prearranged support of the Pisans, suddenly occupied the monastery, and when the Venetians protested, they rushed down into the Venetian quarter, sacking the houses there and burning the ships tied up at the quay. It was only after heavy fighting that the Venetians drove them out. When the news reached Tyre, Philip of Montfort, who had been contesting the right of the Venetians to certain neighboring villages, forcibly ejected them from the third of the town that was theirs by the treaty of 1124.

The government at Genoa, unwilling to start a war with Venice, offered to mediate all around, but by then it was too late. The Venetian consul at Acre, Marco Giustiniani, was a man of resource. He managed to persuade the Pisans that the Genoese were untrustworthy allies. He then made friends with the Ibelins. John of Arsuf, the bailie, and John of Jaffa both opposed Philip of Montfort’s anti-Venetian action, the former because he feared that Philip intended to declare Tyre independent of Acre, the latter because of its shocking illegality. Moreover, a Genoese had recently tried to assassinate John of Jaffa, which naturally strengthened his preference for Venice. The fraternities of Acre, nervous lest Philip should make Tyre a successful commercial rival to their own city, joined the Venetian camp, as did the Templars and the Teutonic Knights, whereat the Hospitallers supported the Genoese. The Provençal colonists inevitably opposed Genoa, and the Catalan

\textsuperscript{21} Ms. of Rothelin, pp. 631–633; Annales de Terre Sainte, p. 446; Abū-l-Fidā’, Kitāb al-mukhtasar (RHC, Or., 1), pp. 133–134.

\textsuperscript{22} See below, chapter XXI, pp. 717, 736.
colonists the Provençals. Farther north, Bohemond VI tried to remain neutral and forbade his vassals to take part. But his Embraco cousins of Jubail remembered their Genoese origin and defied his ban, thus earning his hatred and turning his own sympathies towards the Venetians. The only other neutrals were the queen-regent in Cyprus and Geoffrey of Sargines, who had neither the position nor the material means to restore order. There was no patriarch at hand. James Pantalcéon (later pope Urban IV), who was appointed in December 1255, did not reach Acre till 1260.

Most of the fighting in the so-called war of St. Sabas was done by the Italians. When the Pisans deserted them, the Genoese overran their quarter of Acre, which gave them command of the harbor. But a large Venetian squadron arrived and landed men who cleared the Genoese from the Venetian and Pisan quarters and captured the hill of St. Sabas, but could not dislodge them from their own quarter, which was protected on the rear by the Hospital. During the next two years the Genoese and Venetians preyed on each other's shipping and brought the foreign trade of Outremer almost to a standstill. In June 1258 there was a great sea battle off Acre, in which the Genoese were severely defeated. A simultaneous attempt by Philip of Montfort to march on Acre was halted by the militia of the fraternities. As a result the Genoese decided to abandon their quarter in Acre and to concentrate on Tyre. But the acts of reciprocal piracy continued.²³

There had been several attempts to restore peace. Queen Plaisance of Cyprus had crossed to Tripoli, and come with her brother Bohemond VI to Acre in February 1258 to receive oaths of allegiance as regent. But when Bohemond put forward her claims as her son's guardian, and the Ibelins and Templars and Teutonic Knights concurred, the Hospitallers and Philip of Montfort suddenly became conscientious about Conradin's rights. Nothing, they said, should be done in his absence. Plaisance was eventually accepted by a majority vote, but she had unwillingly been forced to take sides in the conflict, and was powerless to stop it.²⁴ Next, the absentee patriarch appealed to Rome on Plaisance’s behalf; and pope Alexander IV ordered two Venetian and two Pisan delegates to sail to Syria in a Genoese ship and two Genoese in a Venetian ship, to make peace. Both parties sailed in July 1258, but on their

²⁴ Assises de Jérusalem, II, 401; Estoire d'Éracles, II, 443; Ms. of Rothelin, p. 643; Gestes des Chiprois, 268, 271 (pp. 742–744).
way they learnt of the sea battle off Acre, and returned to Italy. In April 1259 the pope sent a special legate, Thomas Agni of Lentini, to Acre to settle the quarrel. The bailie, John of Arsuf, having died, Plaisance came again to Acre to appoint as bailie the less controversial Geoffrey of Sargines (May 1, 1259). Neither he nor the legate could achieve anything at first. It was only after the arrival of the patriarch James the next year that negotiations could seriously proceed. Eventually, in January 1261, plenipotentiaries from the Venetians, the Pisans, and the Genoese attended a meeting of the high court at Acre and were officially reconciled, together with the quarreling nobles and the military orders. It was agreed that the Genoese should have their establishment at Tyre and the Venetians and Pisans theirs at Acre. Neither Venice nor Genoa regarded the arrangement as final. Occasional acts of piracy continued. But the main interest of both cities was now centered farther north, where the Greeks of Nicaea, who were negotiating an alliance with Genoa, were planning the stroke that would recover Constantinople and end the Latin empire, in which Venice had so large a stake.

Bohemond of Antioch had been able to do little to help his sister Plaisance as he was by now involved in a feud with the Embriaco family. Its head, Henry of Jubail, rejected Bohemond’s suzerainty and ruled as an independent lord, with the help of the Genoese. Meanwhile the other native barons of the county of Tripoli were offended by the favor shown to the Roman friends of Bohemond’s mother Lucienne. In 1258, led by Bertrand Embriaco, head of the younger branch of the family, and his son-in-law John, lord of Botron, they marched on Tripoli in open revolt. Bohemond was defeated just outside the gates and wounded by Bertrand himself, and Tripoli was saved only by a contingent of Templars. A few weeks later Bertrand was murdered in one of his villages by some armed peasants, whom everyone believed to have been instigated by Bohemond. His death cowed the rebels, who retreated, but the whole Embriaco clan burned for revenge.

Queen Plaisance died in 1261. Her son, Hugh II of Cyprus, was now eight years old, and a new regent was needed for Cyprus

---

25 For references, see above, note 23.
26 Tafel-Thomas, Urkunden, III, 39–44; Gestes des Chipois, 290 (p. 748); Annales de Terre Sainte, pp. 448–449.
27 See above, chapter VI, pp. 229–233.
and Jerusalem. Hugh’s father, Henry I, had had two sisters. The elder, Mary, had married Walter of Brienne, and was now dead, leaving a son, Hugh. The younger, Isabel, was married to Henry of Antioch, Bohemond V’s brother, and was still living with a son, also called Hugh, who was slightly older than his cousin of Brienne. Isabel had brought the two boys up together after her sister’s death. If the children of a deceased elder sister ranked above a living younger sister and her children, Hugh of Brienne was heir to the Cypriote throne and second heir, after Hugh II, to the throne of Jerusalem, and was therefore entitled to the double regency. But he was unwilling to compete against his aunt. The high court of Cyprus accepted the claim of Isabel’s line but, preferring a male to a female regent, gave the regency to her son Hugh. The high court of Jerusalem took longer over its deliberations. It was not till 1263 that Isabel and her husband came to Acre, and were formally recognized as regents, though the barons showed scruples that had hitherto been ignored, and refused her an oath of allegiance because of the absence of king Conradin. Isabel appointed her husband bailie, while Geoffrey of Sargines returned to his old post of seneschal.

Isabel died the next year in Cyprus. Hugh of Antioch, regent of Cyprus, then claimed the regency of Jerusalem as her heir. But now Hugh of Brienne put in a counter-claim. After some discussion, in which he maintained that by the custom of France, which was followed in Outremer, the children of an elder sister took precedence over those of a younger, the high court decided that the decisive factor was kinship to the last holder of the office. Isabel had been regent, and her son took precedence over her nephew. Hugh of Antioch was unanimously accepted, and the barons paid him the homage that they had refused to his mother. The Italian colonists offered him fealty, and the military orders gave him recognition. There was a superficial atmosphere of reconciliation all round. Hugh removed his father from the post of bailie, preferring to spend half his time himself at Acre. During his absences in Cyprus the seneschal Geoffrey acted for him.29

During these years the neighbors of Outremer had been undergoing a long and serious crisis. In February 1258 the Mongols under Hulagu sacked Baghdad, ending forever the long history of the Abbāsid caliphate. From Iraq they moved on into Syria. In January 1260 they captured Aleppo and came into direct contact

---

29 See La Monte, Feudal Monarchy, pp. 75–77, and Hill, History of Cyprus, II, 151–154, for discussions of the legal points and for references.
with the Franks.\textsuperscript{30} He\-toum I, king of Armenia, had long been an advocate of alliance with the Mongols. In 1254 he had himself visited the Great Khan Möngke at Karakorum. In return for calling himself the Khan's vassal he was promised increase of territory and protection against the Anatolian Turks.\textsuperscript{31} He persuaded his son-in-law Bohemond VI, who seems in some way to have regarded him as overlord, to follow his policy. When Hulagu appeared in northern Syria, He\-toum and Bohemond hastened to pay a deferential visit to his camp. They were both rewarded with some of the spoils taken by the Mongols at Aleppo. He\-toum was further given back territory that he had lost to the Turks in Cilicia, and Bohemond received towns and forts that Antioch had lost to the Moslems in Saladin's time, including the port of Latakia. In return, Bohemond was requested to admit the Greek patriarch Euthymius back into Antioch. When the Mongol army moved on southwards towards Damascus, under the Nestorian Christian general Kitbogha, the king of Armenia and the prince of Antioch accompanied it; and when Damascus was captured in March 1260, the three Christian potentates rode side by side in triumph through the streets.\textsuperscript{32}

To the Franks at Acre Bohemond's friendship with the Mongols seemed disgraceful. The recovery of Latakia was unimportant in their minds in comparison with the insult done to the Latin church by the reintroduction of the Greek patriarch. The pope hastened to excommunicate Bohemond, while the barons at Acre wrote a letter to king Louis's brother, Charles of Anjou, to describe the dangers, political and moral, of the Mongol advance and to ask for his help. It is probable that the barons were influenced by the Venetians, who saw with growing concern how the Genoese were strengthening their hold on the Far Eastern trade through their friendship with the Mongols, and through their new monopolies in the Black Sea since the Greek recapture of Constantinople in July 1261. But a general fear of the Mongols was not unreasonable. They seemed to be determined to achieve world-conquest, and experience showed that they could not tolerate the existence of independent states: their allies had to be their vassals. Moreover, though there were Christians amongst them, such as Hulagu's wife, Toqüz Khâtûn, and the general Kitbogha, these Christians were

\textsuperscript{30} See below, chapter XXI, pp. 717-719, 726.
\textsuperscript{31} See below, chapter XVIII, pp. 652-653.
\textsuperscript{32} *Gentes des Chiprois*, 302-303 (p. 751); letter to Charles of Anjou in *ROL*, II, 213; Bar Hebraeus, *Chronography*, p. 436. The cession of Latakia is never specifically recorded, but it must have been part of the unspecified territory returned to Bohemond. When next mentioned, it is in Frankish hands.
"heretic" Nestorians and showed an unwelcome sympathy with the Greek church. Nor were accounts of the sack of Baghdad calculated to give a high impression of Mongol civilization. When therefore it seemed likely that there was to be a clash between the Mongols and the Mamluks, sympathy at Acre was given to the latter.33

The Mongols had no intention of attacking the Franks, and the government at Acre sought to avoid provocation. But one of the more irresponsible lords, Julian of Sidon, could not resist the temptation to conduct a raid into the Biqā‘. The Mongols, who had just taken over the district, sent a small company to drive him back, but its leader, who was Kitbogha’s nephew, was ambushed and killed by Julian. Kitbogha angrily sent troops which penetrated to Sidon and sacked the town. A raid into Galilee led by John II of Beirut and the Templars was severely punished by the Mongols. John was captured and had to be ransomed.34

The Mongol capture of Damascus impelled Kutuz, the Mamluk sultan of Egypt, to take action to stem the Mongol conquest. He put to death an ambassador sent by Hulagu to demand his submission, and in July 1260 his army crossed the Egyptian frontier into Palestine. The moment was well chosen, for news had reached Hulagu that his brother Mōngke had died and civil war had broken out in Mongolia, four thousand miles to the east, and he felt obliged to move with the greater part of his forces to the eastern confines of his government. Kitbogha was left to hold Syria with an army far smaller than that which the Mamluks could muster.

From his camp at Gaza Kutuz sent envoys to Acre to ask permission to march through Frankish territory and to obtain provisions there and even military aid. When the high court met, the barons were inclined to offer the sultan all that he requested. But the master of the Teutonic Knights, Anno of Sangerhausen, opposed the decision, warning them that it would be foolish to trust the Moslems far, especially if they were elated by victory. His order had strong Armenian connections, and he probably sympathized with Hēchoum’s pro-Mongol policy. His words so far moved the assembly that the military alliance was rejected, but the sultan was given authority to pass through Frankish lands and to buy food there. In August the Egyptian army marched up the coast and encamped

33 For a defense of the Frankish attitude, see Cahen, La Syrie du nord, pp. 708–709.
34 Gestes des Chiprois, 323–327 (pp. 752–753); Annales de Terre Sainte, p. 449 (dating the raids, wrongly, after the battle of ‘Ain Jālūt); Hēchoum, Flor des espoires, p. 174.
for some days in the orchards outside Acre. Many of the emirs were hospitably entertained within the city, and one of them, Baybars, pointed out to Kutuz how easily it could be taken by surprise. But the sultan considered such treachery inopportune. The Franks had been slightly alarmed by the size of the Egyptian forces, but were cheered by a promise that they should buy at reduced rates the horses that would be captured from the Mongols.

The decisive battle of 'Ain Jálút, on September 3, 1260, when the Christian Kitbogha was defeated and slain by the Mamluks, produced exactly the results that Anno had feared. The whole Syrian hinterland passed into Egyptian hands, and treacherous murder and replacement of Kutuz by the energetic and fanatical Baybars led to a determined policy of aggression against the Franks. None of the spoil of 'Ain Jálút found its way to Frankish hands.³⁵

When in 1261 John of Beirut and John of Jaffa visited the new sultan's camp to arrange for the release of Frankish prisoners in Egypt and for the cession of the little fort of Zir'in in Galilee, which the sultan Aybeg had promised a few years before, Baybars refused to listen to them, and merely sent the prisoners to labor camps.³⁶ In February 1263 John of Jaffa, whom Baybars seems to have liked, interviewed him at Mt. Tabor and secured the promise of an exchange of prisoners. But the Moslems owned by the Temple and the Hospital were useful trained craftsmen; and the orders refused to give them up. Baybars, expressing disgust at such mercenary greed, canceled the arrangement. Instead, he invaded Frankish territory, sacking Nazareth in April and then marching on Acre. It was suspected that he had been promised help by Philip of Tyre and the Genoese, but if so, at the last moment their consciences were too strong for them. After wounding Geoffrey of Sargines in a skirmish outside the walls, he retired.³⁷

The Franks were now thoroughly alarmed. In 1261 Balian of Arsuf leased his fief to the Hospital, fearing that he could not defend it himself. Julian of Sidon had already in 1260 mortgaged his castles of Sidon and Belfort to the Templars, who had since foreclosed. But the orders were almost as impotent as the lay lords. In 1264 the Hospital and the Temple united to capture the little

³⁵ For the battle of 'Ain Jálút, see below, chapter XXI, pp. 718-719. For the Frankish attitude to the campaign, *Gestes des Chiprois*, 308-310 (pp. 733-754); Ms. of Rothelin, p. 617.

³⁶ *Annales de Terre Sainte*, p. 450; Badr-ad-Din al-'Aini, *Iqâd al-jamân* (RHC, Or., II, 1), pp. 216-217, saying that a truce was made all the same.

fort of al-Lajjûn, the ancient Megiddo, and a little later raided Moslem territory as far south as Ascalon, while Geoffrey of Sargines' French regiment penetrated to Baisan. But such fruitless excursions only served to irritate the sultan.38

Early in 1265 Baybars set out from Egypt at the head of a great army. He had been alarmed by news of a Mongol invasion of northern Syria, but his troops at Aleppo had held it. He could therefore attack the Franks in the south. After feigning to go on a hunting expedition, he swooped on Caesarea. The town fell to him on February 27 and the citadel a week later. From Caesarea he crossed Mt. Carmel to Haifa, which was hastily abandoned by its inhabitants. Next, after an unsuccessful attack on the Templar stronghold of Château Pèlerin (Athlith), he marched on Arsuf. The garrison of 270 Hospitaler Knights fought well, but lost too many men to continue the defense for long. Their commander surrendered on April 29, on the promise that the survivors should go free. Baybars broke his word and took them all into captivity. The sultan then moved towards Acre. The regent Hugh, who had been in Cyprus, hastened across the sea with all the troops that he could muster; and Baybars found the defenses too well manned for an attack to be worth while. After garrisoning the newly conquered territory he returned to Egypt. His frontier now ran within sight of the Frankish capital.39

The sultan’s main animosity was directed against the Mongols’ allies, Hetoum of Armenia and Bohemond of Antioch. His opportunity to punish them came in 1266. Already in 1261, soon after ‘Ain Jâlût, his troops had ravaged their territories, sacking the port of St. Simeon. In February 1265 their protector Hulagu died in Azerbaijan. Both Hetoum and Bohemond had remained his faithful vassals, though the latter offended him in 1264 by banishing the Greek patriarch Euthymius and reintroducing the Latin Opizan. Hulagu was succeeded as Il-khan, or governor of the Mongol provinces of southwest Asia, by his son Abagha. But Abagha’s authority was not established for some months, and then he was involved in a war with his cousins, the khans of the Golden Horde, the Kipchaks, with whom Baybars, himself a Kipchak Turk

39 Geste des Chifrois, 328 (pp. 758-759); Annales de Terre Sainte, pp. 451-452; Estoire d’Eracles, II, 450; Badr-ad-Dîn al-‘Aínî, ‘ijd al-jamān (RHC, Or., II, 1), pp. 219-221; Abâl-Fida’, Kitâb al-mukhabbar (RHC, Or., I), p. 150; al-Maqrisî, Al-khitât, I, ii, 7-8. The loss of the fortresses inspired a bitter poem by the Templar Ricasul Bonomel, printed in Vincenzo de Bartholomaeis (ed.), Poëte provençale storiche relative all’ Italia, II (FSI, LXXII), 222-244: “Ir’ e dolores s’es e mon cor asseza . . . .”
by birth, was in diplomatic relations. The Il-khan could not afford to give his vassals much assistance.\textsuperscript{40}

In the early summer of 1266 two great Mamluk armies set out from Egypt. The first, under the sultan, marched on Acre. Geoffrey of Sargines had recently received reinforcements from France, and the city was well garrisoned. So Baybars turned into Galilee. After demonstrating in front of the Teutonic castle of Starkenburg, he suddenly appeared before the huge Templar castle of Safad, which dominated the whole district. The garrison was numerous, but consisted largely of Syrian and half-breed troops. After his first assaults, on July 7, 13, and 19, failed, the sultan offered an amnesty to any native soldiers who would surrender. The Templar knights were at once suspicious. There were recriminations between them and the native troops, and the latter began to desert. The Templars soon found that they could no longer man the defenses. They sent a native sergeant called Leo to arrange terms of surrender, and trusting his word that their lives would be spared, they yielded up the castle. Baybars had them all decapitated, while Leo promptly became a convert to Islam. The capture of Safad gave Baybars control of all Galilee. Philip of Montfort’s castle of Toron surrendered to him without a struggle. He then proceeded to massacre the inhabitants of various Christian villages. When envoys came from Acre to ask leave to bury the Christian dead in Galilee, he retorted that they would find enough to bury nearer home, and marched down to the coast, slaughtering every Christian that he met. But once again he found Acre strongly garrisoned, and retired towards Egypt.\textsuperscript{41}

While the sultan thus diverted the main attention of the Franks, his second army, under the emir Kalavun, assembled at Homs and entered the county of Tripoli, where it captured the forts of al-Qulai‘ah and Ḥalbah and the town of ‘Arqah, thus isolating the coast from the valley of the Buqai‘ah and the Hospitaller castles of ‘Akkār and Krak des Chevaliers. Kalavun then turned north to join the army of the prince of Hamah, al-Mansūr II, and to march with him to Aleppo. From there he turned west to cross the Amanus mountains into Cilician Armenia. King Hethoum was away begging for help from the Il-khan. When he returned, he found that his sons had been routed in a battle near Sarvantikar; Toros was dead, Leon a prisoner. His capital, Sis, and all his chief cities

\textsuperscript{40} See below, chapter XXI, p. 722.

had been thoroughly sacked and the whole country devastated. It was a blow from which the Cilician kingdom never recovered.42

The victorious army was ordered by Baybars to move next against Antioch. But the soldiers were tired and sated with loot. A little judicious bribery from Bohemond and the commune of Antioch induced the commanders to retire towards Damascus.43

Early in 1268 Baybars set out once more. The only Christian possessions south of Mt. Carmel now were Château Pèlerin, which the sultan considered too strong to attack, and Jaffa, which belonged to the lawyer John of Ibelin’s son Guy. Guy’s hope that his father’s prestige and the personal truce that he had made with Egypt would spare the town were disappointed. It fell to the sultan after twelve hours’ fighting on March 7. Most of the citizens were slain, but the garrison was allowed to go unharmed. The castle was destroyed, and its wood and marble were sent to Cairo for the great mosque that Baybars was building there. From Jaffa Baybars moved into Galilee, to attack Belfort. After a bombardment of ten days, the Templars there surrendered on April 15. The women and children were sent to Tyre, but the men kept as slaves. On May 1 the Mamluk army was before Tripoli, but the city was well garrisoned, and Baybars turned northward. The Templars of Chastel Blanc and Tortosa sent to beg him to spare their territory. He agreed, and moved inland, down the Orontes valley.44 On May 14 he was within sight of Antioch. There he divided his forces. While one detachment was sent to capture St. Simeon and cut the city off from the sea, and a second to guard the passes over the Amanus and prevent help coming from Cilicia, the sultan and the main force launched an attack on the walls of Antioch.

The siege began on May 14. Prince Bohemond was at Tripoli, and the city was commanded by its constable, Simon Mansel. On the first day’s fighting he led an unsuccessful sortie and was captured outside the walls. At his captors’ request, he tried to arrange for the surrender of the city, but the officers within the walls would not listen to him. The defense was gallant, but there were not enough troops to man the whole circuit of the fortifications. There was a general assault on May 18, and after a fierce struggle a breach was made in the walls on the slope of Mt. Silpius, through which the Moslems poured into the city.

42 See below, chapter XVIII, pp. 653–654.
43 See Cahen, La Syrie du nord, p. 716, citing a ms. of Muḥt-ad-Din ibn-‘Abd-ar-Raḥīm.
The horrors of the sack of Antioch shocked even the Moslem chroniclers. The sultan remembered the crusaders’ sack of Jerusalem nearly two centuries before and the recent sack of Baghdad by the Mongol allies of Antioch. He showed no mercy. He closed the city gates, that no citizen might escape. Anyone found in the streets was slaughtered. Those who cowered in their houses were either slain or made slaves. Some thousands, with their families, had fled for refuge to the huge citadel on the mountain-top. They were parcelled out among the leading emirs. The riches found in the city were astounding. The commercial prosperity of Antioch had been declining recently, but its stores of treasures were untapped. The sultan’s officers carefully collected the loot, and it was distributed next morning to the soldiers. Coin was so plentiful that it was handed out in bowlfuls. Every soldier acquired at least one slave, and so many remained over that the price of a boy fell to twelve dirhems and of a girl to five. A few notables were allowed to ransom themselves, but many of the leading citizens and ecclesiastics perished without a trace.\footnote{Gestes des Chiprois, 365 (pp. 771-772); Estoire d’Eracles, II, 456-457; Bar Hebraeus, Chronography, p. 448; Abū-l-Fida’, Kitāb al-mukhtasar (RHC, Or., I), p. 152; al-Maqrizi, Al-khiqat, I, ii, 52-53; Badr ad-Din al-Ahmar, ‘Iqd al-jamān (RHC, Or., II, 1), pp. 229-234. See other references in Cahen, La Syrie du nord, p. 717 and notes.}

The principality of Antioch, the oldest of the Frankish states in the east, had lasted for 171 years. Its sudden destruction in 1268 was a bitter blow to the prestige of the Christians, and it was followed by a rapid decline of Christianity in northern Syria. The Franks were ejected, and the native Christians, suspect to the Moslems because of their support of the Mongols, fared little better. The sultan made no attempt to repopulate Antioch. Its commercial value was no longer great enough, and it was useful to him only as a fortress. The city quickly dwindled till it was little more than a village. The eastern patriarchs, Greek, Armenian, and Jacobite, soon moved their headquarters to Damascus.\footnote{Bertrand de la Broquière, who visited Antioch in 1432, reported that the walls were intact but there were only about three hundred houses standing within, almost entirely inhabited by Turcomans (Paysage d’Outremer, ed. Schéfer, pp. 84-85).}

On the fall of Antioch, the Templars abandoned their castles in the Amanus mountains, Baghras and La Roche de Russle. All that was left of the principality was the enclave of Latakia, which Hulagu had won back for Bohemond, and the castle of Qusair, whose lord was a friend of the local Moslems; it was allowed to remain undisturbed for seven more years.\footnote{Gestes des Chiprois, 365 (pp. 771-772); Estoire d’Eracles, II, 457; Cahen, La Syrie du nord, p. 717, note 17.
After his triumph Baybars was ready to make a truce. The Mongols showed signs of stirring, and there were rumors that Louis IX was returning to the east. At the regent Hugh’s request an Egyptian embassy arrived at Acre to discuss a truce. When Hugh tried to impress the ambassador by displaying his troops in battle array, the Egyptian retorted that the whole army was not as numerous as the Christian captives at Cairo. A year’s truce was arranged between Acre and Cairo, and Bohemond, though offended at being addressed by Baybars merely as count, not prince, was by his wish included in it.⁴⁸

Hugh was grateful for the peace. He had not been able to end the fighting between the Venetians and Genoese, which had flared up again in 1267.⁴⁹ His one reliable lieutenant, Geoffrey of Sar- gines, was mortally ill and died in the spring of 1269,⁵⁰ and his own position, though nominally greater, was insecure. Young king Hugh II of Cyprus died in December 1267, aged fourteen, and he succeeded to his throne. This gave his authority a more permanent basis, but he found the Cypriote barons less willing to cooperate with a king than with a regent. They reminded him that they were not obliged to follow him overseas. If he wanted an army to fight on the mainland, it had to be composed of volunteers.⁵¹ In October 1268 Conradin, titular king of Jerusalem, was put to death after an attempt to wrest back the kingdom of Sicily from Charles of Anjou, who had, with papal approval, conquered it from Frederick II’s bastard, Manfred, less than three years before.⁵²

On the news of Conradin’s death Hugh assumed the title king of Jerusalem. His cousin, Hugh of Brienne, who had gone to Greece and married the heiress of Athens, Isabel de la Roche, did not contest his claim. But now a new claimant appeared, whom Hugh did not at first take seriously, but who was to cause him far more trouble. Of queen Isabel I’s four marriages Conradin was descended from the second and Hugh from the third. But a daughter of the fourth, Melisend, had been the second wife of Bohemond IV of Antioch, and had left a daughter Mary of Antioch. She now declared that, as she was a generation nearer than Hugh

⁴⁹ Gestes des Chiprois, 354 (pp. 768–769); Estoire d’Eracles, II, 455–456.
⁵⁰ Gestes des Chiprois, 368 (p. 772).
⁵² Gestes des Chiprois, 363 (p. 771), reports festivities at Acre when the news of Conradin’s death arrived. They were held in order to please the church.
to their common ancestress Isabel I, she took precedence over him. The case was brought before the high court. Hugh’s argument was that his grandmother Alice had been accepted as next heir and regent, and after her her son Henry of Cyprus, then Henry’s widow Plaisance, acting for his infant son, then Hugh’s own mother Isabel, Henry’s sister, then Hugh himself. Mary answered that there had been a mistake; her mother Melisend should have succeeded Alice as regent. Mary’s only supporters were the Templars. Hugh had just reconciled himself with Philip of Montfort and the Hospital, and they were annoyed. No one else was prepared to admit that a mistake had been made in 1246 or in 1264. Moreover, a vigorous young man was obviously better suited to be monarch than a middle-aged spinster. Hugh was crowned in the cathedral at Tyre, the traditional coronation-place of the kings, on September 24, 1269, by bishop John of Lydda, acting for the patriarch William. Mary issued a formal protest, and hurried off to plead her cause at Rome.\textsuperscript{53}

Hugh had been able to go to Tyre because of his reconciliation with Philip of Montfort, whose pride had been humbled by the loss of Toron. The older Ibelins had died, John of Arsuf in 1258, John of Beirut in 1264, and John of Jaffa in 1266. As a result of Baybars’s conquests, the only lay fiefs left on the mainland were Beirut, which had passed to John of Beirut’s elder daughter Isabel, and Tyre. To cement the general pacification king Hugh married his sister Margaret, the loveliest girl of her time, to Philip’s elder son John, while Philip’s younger son, Humphrey, married Isabel of Beirut’s sister Eschiva. The king himself married one of the Ibelins of Cyprus.\textsuperscript{54}

For the moment all seemed well. Baybars was quiescent. The Il-khan was said to be sympathetic to the Christian cause. Louis IX was known to be planning another crusade. In September 1269 king James I of Aragon sailed from Barcelona at the head of a great squadron to go crusading, but ran into so fearful a storm that he turned back home. Only two of his bastard sons continued the journey. They arrived at Acre in December, to find that Baybars had just broken his truce with the Franks. He made a demonstration in front of Acre, while others of his troops lay hidden in the hills, where they ambushed the French regiment, which had been raiding in Galilee. The princes of Aragon, who had arrived eager

\textsuperscript{53} Gestes des Chiprois, 369 (pp. 772-773); Assises de Jérusalem, I, 415-419. See La Monte, Feudal Monarchy, pp. 77-79, and Hill, History of Cyprus, II, 161-165.

\textsuperscript{54} Gestes des Chiprois, 370-371 (pp. 773-774); Liguage, p. 465.
to fight the enemy, now counseled caution, and soon went home having achieved nothing. But Baybars withdrew his army, for fear of Louis’s crusade.\textsuperscript{55} The year 1270 was full of tragedy. Louis’s crusade set out, not for Palestine but for Tunis, where the king and most of his army died of disease.\textsuperscript{56} Baybars, too prudent to go campaigning till he knew of the movements of the French, arranged for his friends of the Ismā‘īlite sect to assassinate Philip of Montfort at Tyre.\textsuperscript{57} Next spring Baybars knew that he could safely attack the Franks again. In February he marched into the county of Tripoli and appeared before the Templar castle of Chastel Blanc. After a short but spirited defense, the garrison was advised by the Templar commander at Tortosa to surrender. The survivors were allowed to retire unharmed. The sultan then turned against the huge Hospitaler fortress of Krak des Chevaliers, where al-Manṣūr II of Hamah joined him. The siege began on March 3. Heavy rains at first prevented the Moslems from bringing up siege engines, but on March 15, after a short but heavy bombardment, they broke into the outer enceinte. The inner enceinte held out for another fortnight and the great south tower till April 8. On its surrender the few survivors were given a safe-conduct to go to Tripoli. Krak, which had defied Saladin, had been considered the strongest fortress in the east. Its loss was a severe blow to Frankish prestige. ‘Akkār, the Hospitaler castle on the south side of the Buqai‘ah, was attacked next and fell on May 1, after a fortnight’s siege.\textsuperscript{58} Prince Bohemond, who was at Tripoli, sent to beg the sultan for a truce. Baybars mocked him for his cowardice, and insulting ordered him to pay the expenses of the Mamluk campaign. Bohemond refused. But, after a failure to capture the little island fortress of Maraclea, whose lord had gone to seek help from the Mongols, Baybars suddenly offered a ten years’ truce, which Bohemond accepted. The Mamluk army moved southward, pausing only to besiege the Teutonic fortress of Starkenburg, which surrendered on June 12. There were now no inland castles left to the Franks. But a naval expedition sent from Egypt against Cyprus failed, owing to bad seamanship. Eleven ships ran

\textsuperscript{55} Gesta des Chiprois, 350–351 (pp. 766–768) (wrongly dating the episode 1267); Etoire d’Eracles, II, 457–458; Annales de Terre Sainte, p. 454.
\textsuperscript{56} See above, chapter XIV, pp. 514–516.
\textsuperscript{57} Gesta des Chiprois, 374 (pp. 775–777).
aground near Limassol, and the crews fell into the hands of the Cypriotes. 59

Baybars’s willingness to make a truce was due to the arrival in the east of a small but efficient crusading army led by Edward of England, eldest son of king Henry III. Edward had left home in the summer of 1270, intending to join Louis IX, but had arrived too late at Tunis, and had spent the winter in Sicily. He had about a thousand men from England with him, and a small number of Flemings and Bretons. His brother, Edmund of Lancaster, followed close behind with a few reinforcements.

Edward arrived at Acre on May 9, 1271. He was horrified by the state of affairs. The hopes raised at the time of Hugh’s coronation had been disappointed. Hugh was unpopular with the commune at Acre, which he seems to have offended by his arrogance and tactlessness. The Templars and the Teutonic Knights resented his reconciliation with the Montforts and the Hospitallers. His friend Philip of Montfort was dead, leaving two untried sons, and the Hospital, crippled by the loss of Krak, could give him little support. The Cypriote nobles still refused to serve on the mainland, and were angered by his high-handed attitude towards them. It was only in 1273 that they agreed to follow him abroad for four months in the year, provided that the king or his heir led the army in person. The Venetians and Genoese were still quarrelling, and both were trading freely with the enemy, with licenses from the high court to do so. The Venetians provided the Mamluks with arms and the Genoese furnished slaves. Edward with his tiny army found that he could do nothing. Even his attempt to capture the little Moslem fortress of Qâqûn on Mt. Carmel came to nothing. His only success was diplomatic. His envoys persuaded the Mongol Il-khan to send an expedition into Syria in the autumn of 1271. An army of Mongol horsemen swept across the Euphrates, past Aleppo, from which the garrison fled, and penetrated as far south as Apamea. But Baybars, who was at Damascus, gathered a large army and marched to meet them. The Mongols knew that they would be outnumbered and retired swiftly back over the river-frontier, laden with booty. Abagha apologized to Edward that he had not been able to spare a larger force.

Edward soon saw that he was wasting his time. He advised the Franks to make peace with Baybars, and his agents arranged a

treaty guaranteeing the integrity of the remaining lands of the kingdom of Jerusalem for ten years and ten months. It was signed at Caesarea on May 22, 1272. As a special concession, pilgrims were to be allowed free passage to Nazareth. Edward then prepared his departure. On June 16 an Assassin, disguised as a native Christian, attempted to murder him in his tent. It seems that Baybars feared him sufficiently to wish to see him eliminated. But he recovered from the wound, and sailed from Acre in September. He arrived back in England to find his father dead and himself king.  

Edward was the last crusader prince to come to Palestine. It was not for lack of crusading propaganda that no others followed. Among Edward's companions had been the archdeacon of Liége, Theobald Visconti, who returned home soon after his arrival, on the news that he had been elected pope. As Gregory X he took a deep personal interest in the east, and did all that he could to encourage the crusading movement, collecting advice and reports from every appropriate authority, and placing the question of the crusade at the head of the agenda to be discussed at the great council that he summoned to Lyons in May 1274. But though expressions of good-will came from every side, no one offered to set out himself. Gregory was sadly disappointed but could do nothing.  

While the council was meeting, Mary of Antioch, claimant to the throne of Jerusalem, came to lay her case before it. She seemed to have enjoyed the sympathy of the pope, who had probably formed a poor impression of king Hugh when he met him in Palestine in 1271. The high court of Jerusalem sent representatives to say that it alone could decide on the succession to the throne. The council therefore did not intervene. But Mary continued to enjoy the pope's favor, and he suggested that, as she was unlikely to establish herself at Acre, she should sell her rights to Charles of Anjou. It was questionable whether such rights could be sold, but the pope doubtless thought that, as he was protector of the kingdom, such a transaction done with his approval would be legal. The sale was

---

60 Gestes des Chiprois, 376, 379-382 (pp. 777-779); Estoire d'Eracles, II, 460-464; Annales de Terre Sainte, p. 455; Assises de Jérusalem, I, 347, 626; II, 427-434; Dandolo, Chronicon Venenum, p. 380; al-Maqrizi, Al-khitaft, I, ii, 102; Badr-ad-Din al-Ainì, 'Iqd al-jamâin (RHC, Or., II, i), p. 207. See Powicke, King Henry III and the Lord Edward, II, 597-603, also Hill, History of Cyprus, II, 168-170. Powicke (II, 603) discusses the legend of Edward's wife Eleanor suckling the poison from his wound. It was first told by Ptolemy of Lucca a century later.

61 For Gregory X's crusading activities and the reports which he received, see Throop, Criticism of the Crusades, passim.
not completed till 1277, after Gregory X’s death. Mary received a thousand gold pounds and the promise of an annuity of four thousand livres tournois, and Charles assumed the title king of Jerusalem.62

The papacy had reason to encourage the transaction. Charles of Anjou, king of Sicily and Naples, was proving as formidable as the Hohenstaufens whom the papacy had called him in to replace. He sought to dominate Rome and all Italy, and his particular ambition was to conquer Constantinople. The Byzantine emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus had offered the submission of his church to Rome at the Council of Lyons; and the pope knew that the slender hope of the Byzantine people accepting the union depended on the protection that he provided against Charles. It was desirable to distract Charles’s attention elsewhere. Moreover, the actual government at Acre left much to be desired. Hugh was proving very unsuccessful as a king. In 1273, for example, he had lost control of the fief of Beirut. Its heiress, Isabel of Ibelin, had been married as a child to the child-king of Cyprus, Hugh II. On his death she remained unmarried for some time, enjoying a liaison with Julian of Sidon. Then she married Hamo the Stranger, who seems to have been one of Edward of England’s knights. He mistrusted king Hugh, and on his deathbed, in 1273, put his wife and her fief under the protection of Baybars. When Hugh tried to take the widow to Cyprus to marry her to a man of his choice, Baybars protested. The high court gave Hugh no support, and Isabel returned to Beirut with a mamluk guard to protect her.63 Baybars’s protectorate ended with his death, and Isabel married two more husbands, of her own choice, before she died in 1282, when the fief passed to her sister Eschiva, wife of Hugh’s friend Humphrey of Montfort.64

Hugh’s next rebuff was over Tripoli. Bohemond VI died in 1275, leaving a son Bohemond VII, aged fourteen, and a daughter Lucy, a few years younger. Hugh at once claimed the regency as the next adult heir to the house of Antioch. But custom gave the regency to the ruler’s mother, and the dowager princess Sibyl at once assumed the office, naming Bartholomew, bishop of Tortosa, as her bailie. When Hugh arrived at Tripoli, he found the bishop administering the government, and the young prince in Armenia, under the protection of king Leon III, his uncle. No one supported Hugh, as Bartholomew was extremely popular at the moment, being the

62 Geste des Chiprois, 375 (p. 777), and references in note 53 above.
64 Lignager, p. 462; Ducange-Rey, Familles d’outremer, pp. 235-236.
known enemy of the hated Roman faction introduced by Lucienne of Segni, Bohemond V’s widow, and headed by her brother Paul, bishop of Tripoli. Hugh’s only success was to preserve Latakia from an attack by the Mamluks. He arranged a treaty which spared the town in return for a tribute of twenty thousand dinars annually and the release of twenty prisoners.

In 1276 Hugh quarreled openly with the Temple. Its master since 1273 had been William of Beaujeu, a cousin and friend of Charles of Anjou. He was staying with Charles at the time of his election and only came to the east in 1275. In October 1276 the order purchased a farm called La Fauconnerie from its lay lord, and deliberately omitted to secure Hugh’s consent to the transaction. Hugh’s complaints were ignored, and he obtained no sympathy from the high court or the fraternities of Acre. In his rage he packed up his belongings and moved to Tyre, intending to sail to Cyprus and never to return. The Templars and the Venetians were delighted, but the patriarch, the commune, the Hospitallers, the Teutonic Knights, and the Genoese sent to Tyre to beg him at least to appoint a bailie. After some hesitation he consented, and named Balian of Ibelin, son of John of Arsuf. He also nominated judges for the courts of the kingdom. Then he sailed secretly for Cyprus, and wrote from there to the pope to justify his actions.

Balian had a difficult task. Hostilities broke out again between the Venetians and the Genoese. There were riots in the streets of Acre between merchants from Bethlehem supported by the Temple and merchants from Mosul supported by the Hospital. He could count on the good-will only of the patriarch, the former legate Thomas Agni of Lentini, and the Hospital. But before he had been in office for a year the government was taken out of his hands.

As soon as his purchase of Mary’s rights was completed, Charles of Anjou sent a small armed force to Acre under Roger of San Severino, whom he named as his bailie. With the help of the Venetians and the Temple, Roger was able to land at Acre, where he produced credentials signed by Charles of Anjou, by Mary of Antioch, and by the pope, John XXI. The bailie Balian, finding that the Temple and the Venetians were ready to use force to support Roger, and that neither the patriarch nor the Hospital would promise to intervene, admitted the Angevins into the citadel.

---

under protest. There Roger raised Charles’s standard, and ordered all the barons to give him oaths of allegiance as the king’s bailie. The barons hesitated, unwilling to admit that the crown could be transferred without a decision by the high court. They sent to Cyprus to ask Hugh to release them from their oath, so that they could consider the throne vacant. Hugh refused to receive their envoy. Roger then threatened to confiscate the fiefs of anyone who did not pay him homage. As the fiefs all now lay in the suburbs of Acre or were money-fiefs attached to the city’s revenues, Roger could have carried out his threat. He allowed the barons to make one more fruitless appeal for guidance to Hugh. They then acknowledged him. It is doubtful whether he received homage from the Montforts of Tyre or the lady of Beirut; but even Bohemond of Tripoli recognized him as de facto ruler of Acre.68

Roger’s government lasted for five years. It was a period of comparative peace. Baybars died in 1277, and it was not till the summer of 1280 that the emir Kalavun was securely established as sultan of the Mamluk empire.69 In September 1281 there was another great Mongol invasion of Syria. Kalavun was seriously alarmed, but in October he managed to defeat the invaders in a fierce battle near Homs. The more responsible statesmen of western Europe, such as Edward of England, advocated alliance with the Mongols, but the only allies that the Il-khan found in Syria were the Armenians of Cilicia and the order of the Hospital, which sent a contingent of knights from its headquarters at al-Marqab to join in the battle at Homs.70 Charles of Anjou had always been on good terms with Egypt; and Roger carried out his instructions. When Kalavun sent in May 1281 to suggest the prolongation of the truce with Acre for another ten years, Roger’s government gladly agreed, and Bohemond of Tripoli made a similar truce two months later. Kalavun was delighted, as a Frankish attack on his left flank would have seriously embarrassed him. After his victory at Homs he received a visit from Roger, who came in person to his camp to congratulate him.71

Roger’s policy was short-sighted. But that Bohemond should

68 Estoire d’Éracles, II, 478–479; Gestes des Chipois, 398 (pp. 783–784); Sanudo, Liber secretorum fidelium crucis (Bongars, Gesta Dei, II), pp. 227–228; Amadi, Chronique, p. 214; John of Ypres, Chronicon, in Martene and Durand, Thesaurus anecdotorum, III, col. 755.
69 See below, chapter XXII, p. 751.
70 Gestes des Chipois, 407–408 (pp. 786–787); letter of Joseph de Cancy to king Edward I and the king’s reply, in Palestine Pilgrim’s Text Society, V (London, 1896): Joseph apologizes because king Hugh and prince Bohemond were unable to arrive in time to help the Mongols. See also the references in chapter XXI below, pp. 715, 722.
71 Al-Maqrizi, Al-khifat, II, i, 28–34; Rohricht, Regesta, p. 374.
wish for a truce was understandable, for he was in trouble with his vassals in Tripoli. He had returned from Armenia to take over the government in 1277, when he was sixteen. His bailie, bishop Bartholomew of Tortosa, had been popular as the enemy of the Roman faction. But the leader of the Roman party, Paul of Segni, bishop of Tripoli, had attended the Council of Lyons and there made friends with the new master of the Temple, William of Beaujeu. The Templars therefore turned against the prince's government. Guy (II) Embriaco, lord of Jubail, had been ready to be friendly with Bohemond as the opponent of the Romans, but Bohemond infuriated him by refusing to let his brother John marry a local heiress, giving her instead to a nephew of bishop Bartholomew. Guy and John then kidnapped the girl and retired with her to the protection of the Templars. There they were joined by members of the younger branch of the Embriaco family, who had not forgiven the murder of their father Bertrand by Bohemond's father.

Bohemond retorted by burning the Templars' buildings at Tripoli, and cutting down a forest that they owned nearby. The Templars made a demonstration outside Tripoli and burned the castle of Botron but failed to take the fort of Nephin, where twelve of their knights were captured by Bohemond's men. Bohemond then marched to attack Jubail, but was defeated near Botron. The combatants numbered only about two hundred on each side, but the carnage was tremendous. Bohemond accepted a truce, and the Templars recovered their quarters in Tripoli.\textsuperscript{72}

In 1278 Guy of Jubail and the Templars attacked Tripoli again. Bohemond was defeated outside the walls, but twelve Templar galleys that tried to force the harbor were scattered by a storm, while fifteen of Bohemond's galleys succeeded in doing some damage to the Templar port of Sidon. A truce was arranged by the master of the Hospital, Nicholas Lorgne. But three years later, in January 1282, the Embriaco brothers and their distant cousin William smuggled themselves into Tripoli, hoping to take the town with the help of the Templars. The plot had been mismanaged, however, and the Templar commander, Reddecoeur, was away. The conspirators panicked and fled to the buildings of the Hospital. Bohemond was warned and sent troops against the Hospital, which surrendered the refugees on condition that their lives be spared. Thereupon, Bohemond took Guy of Jubail, his brothers John and Baldwin, and his kinsman William to Nephin, where they were buried in the sand up to their necks and left to starve. He claimed

\textsuperscript{72} Etoire d'Eracles, II, 481; Gestes des Chifroy, 392-393 (pp. 781-783).
that he had not himself put them to death. The less important
conspirators were blinded. The Genoese, who regarded Guy as a
compatriot, became openly hostile to Bohemond, and John of Mont-
fort, the devoted ally of the Genoese, planned to march on Jubail,
but Bohemond arrived there first.\footnote{Gestes des Chiprois, 409–413 (pp. 787–789).}

Roger of San Severino’s government at Acre was more tranquil,
though it was resented by the local nobility. It was the Templar
master, William of Beaujeu, who kept the country loyal to Roger.
William managed to reconcile John of Montfort with the Venetians,
who were allowed to return to their old premises at Tyre. But when
in 1279 king Hugh suddenly arrived at Tyre, hoping to recover
his mainland kingdom, only John offered him support. The king
remained for four months at Tyre; then as he could not force his
Cypriote vassals to stay longer away from their island he returned
to Cyprus, rightly blaming the Templars for his failure.\footnote{Ibid., 401 (p. 784).}

The massacre of the Sicilian Vespers, on March 30, 1282, forced
Charles of Anjou out of Sicily and put him on the defensive. He
could no longer afford to keep many troops in the east. At the end
of the year Roger was summoned back to Italy with most of his
forces. He left as his deputy the seneschal Odo Polechien, a
Frenchman in the Angevin service who had come with him to the
east.\footnote{Ibid., 418 (p. 789); Sanudo, Istoria del regno di Romania, in C. Hopf, Chroniques
greco-romanes inédites ou peu connues (Berlin, 1873), pp. 138–139, 165: "... mister Otto de
Pillicino, il qual si dice ch’era nipote di papa Martino [IV] ..." Cf. Mas Latrie, "Nou-
velles preuves," Bibliothèque de l’École des chartes, XXXIV (1873), 47–48.}

No one at first challenged Odo’s power, but he was insecure.
When, in June 1283, envoys came from the sultan to confirm the
renewal of the truce, he gladly accepted the proposal, but had the
treaty signed by the commune of Acre and the Templars of Château
Pèlerin and Sidon. It guaranteed the integrity of the Frankish coast
from Mt. Carmel to the Ladder of Tyre, and of Château Pèlerin
and Sidon. Tyre and Beirut were excluded. The right of pilgrimage
to Nazareth was confirmed.\footnote{Al-Maqrizî, Al-khiṭat, II, i, 60, 179–185, 224–230.}

In 1283 king Hugh took advantage of Roger’s departure to
come once again to the mainland. His friend John of Montfort’s
brother Humphrey had just succeeded in his wife’s right to Beirut,
and the moment seemed opportune. He was obliged by the weather
to land at Beirut, where he was received as king. But when he sent
his troops by land to Tyre, they were mauled by Moslem raiders,
instigated, he suspected, by the Templars of Sidon. When he
himself landed at Tyre, the omens were unfavorable. His standard fell into the sea, and the great cross carried by the clergy who met him broke off and killed his Jewish court physician. No one moved in his favor at Acre. After four months his Cypriotes returned home, but he stayed on at Tyre. His favorite son Bohemond died there, then his friend and brother-in-law, John of Montfort. Tyre officially passed to John’s brother Humphrey of Beirut, who was made to promise to sell it if required to the crown. But Humphrey died in February 1284. His widow, Eschiva, was left to govern Beirut; she later married Hugh’s youngest son, Guy. Tyre was left to John’s widow, the princess Margaret.77

Hugh himself died at Tyre on March 4, 1284.78 He was succeeded by his eldest son John, a delicate boy of seventeen, who was crowned king of Cyprus at Nicosia on May 11 but was recognized on the mainland only at Tyre and Beirut. He died in Cyprus on May 20, 1285, and was succeeded by his brother Henry, who was crowned king of Cyprus next month but for the moment did not venture to cross to the mainland.79

Meanwhile Kalavun prepared to attack the Frankish possessions not covered by the recent truce. The ladies of Tyre and Beirut hastened to make their own truce with him, and the sultan concentrated his efforts against the Hospital, which he wished to punish for its constant support of the Mongols. Its one great remaining castle was al-Marqab, on a high hill overlooking Valania, on the coast north of Tortosa. On April 25, 1285, the Mamluk army arrived below the castle, and toiled up the mountainside with the greatest number of siege engines that had ever been seen in the east. But the castle was superbly sited and well equipped. It held out for a month before a mine under the north salient made further defense impossible. On their surrender the knights of the Hospital were allowed to leave fully armed on horseback with all their portable possessions, and the lives of the rest of the garrison were spared, as a tribute to their gallantry.80

The fall of al-Marqab alarmed the citizens of Acre. They had recently learned of the death of Charles of Anjou, and the whole west was distracted by the war of the Sicilian Vespers. The time had come to compose differences, and accept a monarch nearer at

77 Gestes des Chiprois, 419–423 (pp. 789–791); Amadi, Chronique, pp. 214–215.
78 Gestes des Chiprois, 444 (p. 791); Amadi, Chronique, p. 216.
79 Gestes des Chiprois, 435, 437 (pp. 791–792); Amadi, loc. cit.
80 Gestes des Chiprois, 429 (pp. 791–792); Amadi, loc. cit., al-Maqrizi, Al-khitaṭ, II, i, 80; Abū-l-Fīdā‘, Kitāb al-mukhtasar (RHC, Or., I), p. 161; Muḥi-ad-Dīn, Sīrat al-mālik as-Zāhir (Michaud, Bibliothèque, IV), pp. 548–552.
hand. On the advice of the Hospital young king Henry sent an envoy from Cyprus to Acre to negotiate for his recognition there. The commune, the Hospitallers, and the Teutonic Knights at once offered their support, and the Templars followed suit after a little hesitation. But Odo Poilechien, with the sole support of the French regiment (still paid for by the king of France) refused to resign his office. King Henry landed at Acre on June 4, 1286. The representatives of the three orders cautiously did not come to welcome him, but when they saw with what impatient enthusiasm he was received by the citizens, who threatened to take up arms to drive Odo out of the citadel, they persuaded Odo to hand it over to them, and they handed it on to the king. Odo and his Frenchmen were allowed to leave unharmed with all their possessions.\textsuperscript{81}

On August 15 Henry was crowned at Tyre by the archbishop, Bonnacorso, acting for the patriarch Elias. The court then moved to Acre, where there was a fortnight of frivolous festivity, with tournaments and pageants and banquets. The fifteen-year-old king, who had not yet begun to suffer from the epilepsy that crippled his life, was immensely popular. His advisers were his uncles Philip and Baldwin of Ibelin. On their advice he soon returned to Cyprus, leaving Philip as bailie. It seemed to them clear that Acre preferred an absentee monarch.\textsuperscript{82}

The hopes raised by the new reign were not fulfilled. Next spring (1287) war broke out between the Genoese and Pisan colonies all along the coast, and the Genoese, who had obtained the friendly neutrality of the sultan, blockaded the seaports and, after a victory over the Pisans and the Venetians who had joined them, planned to force their way into Acre. Only the intervention of the masters of the Temple and the Hospital persuaded them to raise the blockade and withdraw to Tyre.\textsuperscript{83}

While this war was raging, the sultan annexed the last remnant of the principality of Antioch. The Moslem merchants of Aleppo had long complained of the inconvenience of having to send their goods through the Christian port of Latakia. In March 1287 its defenses were seriously damaged by an earthquake. Kalavun took advantage of this and, claiming that Latakia, as part of the principality of Antioch, was not covered by his truce with Tripoli, sent an army to take over the town. It fell at once, and the garrison,
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which had retired to a fort at the end of the mole, surrendered a few days later, on April 20.84

Bohemond VII did not long survive its loss. He died childless on October 19, 1287. His heir was his sister Lucy, who was married to a former grand admiral of Naples, Narjot of Toucy, and lived in Apulia. She was unknown to the citizens of Tripoli, who therefore decided to invite the princess-mother, Sibyl of Armenia, to take over the government. But her one idea was to restore to power the discredited bishop of Tortosa, Bartholomew. Her letter inviting him to be bailie was intercepted. After an angry scene, when the nobles told her that he was unacceptable, they and the merchants of Tripoli declared the dynasty dethroned, and set up a sovereign commune, whose mayor was Bartholomew Embriaco, son of the Bertrand whom Bohemond VI had had murdered and brother of the William whom Bohemond VII had starved to death.

Princess Sibyl retired to Armenia, but early in 1288 Lucy arrived at Acre, intending to take up her inheritance. The Hospitallers received her with honor and escorted her to Nephin, the frontier town of the county. There she issued a proclamation of her rights. The commune countered by a proclamation citing its grievances against the dynasty, and put itself under the protection of Genoa. While messengers went to Genoa to inform the council, who ordered their admiral in the east, Zaccaria, to proceed to Tripoli to make arrangements with the commune, the masters of the three orders visited Tripoli to plead Lucy’s cause. The Templars and the Teutonic Knights joined chiefly because of their alliance with Venice, the enemy of Genoa. Their mission was in vain. When Zaccaria arrived at Tripoli, he would recognize the commune only on condition that Genoa was granted a larger quarter there and the right to have a podestà. Meanwhile Bartholomew Embriaco, who planned to secure the county for himself, sent secretly to Cairo to ask the sultan for support if he should proclaim himself count. Public opinion in Tripoli grew suspicious of both Bartholomew and the Genoese, and Lucy was invited to the city. She tactfully informed Zaccaria, who was in Cilicia, of her invitation and secured his approval. A general compromise was reached. The Genoese were allowed their additional streets and their podestà. The privileges of the commune and its right to administer the city were admitted, and Lucy became countess of Tripoli.85

84 Gesites des Chirocis, 462 (pp. 799–800); Abū-I-Fīdā’, Kitāb al-mukhtāzar (RHC, Or., I), p. 152.
Her reign was brief. In the winter of 1288 two Frankish envoys came to Cairo and warned the sultan that, if the Genoese were allowed to control Tripoli, they would dominate the whole Levant, and the export trade of Egypt would be at their mercy. It was thought that the envoys came from the Venetians, but they may have been Bartholomew Embracio’s men. The sultan, whose policy was to play Venice off against Genoa, was delighted with the excuse for intervention. In February 1289 he moved a great army into Syria. One of his emirs who was in the pay of the Templars went to the master, William, to tell him that the objective was Tripoli. But when William tried to warn the governments of Acre and Tripoli, no one believed him. They had faith in the treaties that Kalavun had made with them. When in March the Mamluk army marched down the Buqa’iah towards Tripoli, nothing had been done for its defense. The Temple and the Hospital hastily sent detachments under their marshals, and the French regiment came up from Acre under its commander, John of Grailly. From Cyprus King Henry sent his young brother Amalric, whom he appointed constable of Jerusalem, with some knights and five galleys. The Genoese admiral Zaccaria had four galleys in the port, and the Venetians two, and there were various smaller boats, some local and some Italian. There had been others, but they sailed, with many civilians on board, to Cyprus.

Medieval Tripoli stood on the peninsula where the modern al-Mina now stands. It was detached from the castle of Pilgrim Mountain, which rises above the modern town. The castle was undefended, and in the last days of March 1289 Kalavun moved his whole army up to the city walls. The Christians commanded the sea, and could pour provisions into the harbor. But the land fortifications could not stand up against the sultan’s pitiless bombardment. When two of the towers on the southeastern wall crumbled, the Venetians decided that further defense was useless and retired with their portable possessions to their ships. The Genoese then followed suit, fearing that the Venetians might steal some of their ships. The Italians’ defection threw the defense into disorder. When the sultan ordered a general assault that morning, April 26, 1289, there was no organized opposition. His troops poured into the city, and a panic-stricken horde of soldiers and civilians fled before them to the harbor. The countess escaped in a Cypriote

88 *Gesta des Chiproi*, 473 (p. 802) (the author says that he knows the envoys’ names but prefers not to tell); abū-l-Mahāsin, *An-nafījūn al-zuḥirah* (Michaud, Bibliothèque, IV), p. 561, says that they were sent by Bartholomew.
galley with prince Amalric and the two marshals, but there were few other survivors of the general massacre that followed. A few refugees rowed across to the tiny island of St. Thomas, off the point, but the Mamluk cavalry crossed the shallow water after them and slew them all. Their corpses were left to rot in the sun.  

A few days later the sultan’s troops occupied Botron and Nephin. All that was left of the county of Tripoli was Jubail, whose lord, Peter Embriaco, was allowed to remain there under strict Moslem supervision for another eight or nine years.

The fall of Tripoli presaged an attack on Acre. Yet its citizens could not believe that the sultan would really eliminate a center which was of commercial convenience to everyone. King Henry had gone to Acre, and there he received envoys from Kalavun, who reproached him for having broken his truce by going to the rescue of Tripoli. He replied that, if Tripoli had been included in the truce, the sultan had no right to attack it. His excuse was accepted, and a new truce, in which the lady of Tyre joined, was signed for ten years, ten months, and ten days. But Henry had lost confidence in the sultan’s word. Before he returned to Cyprus in September, leaving his brother Amalric as bailie, he sent John of Grailly to the west to beg for urgent help.

John of Grailly obtained sympathy but no material response in the west. The Genoese, who had suffered serious losses at Tripoli, had countered by attacking Egyptian merchant shipping and raiding the Delta village of at-Tinah. But when Kalavun closed Alexandria to them, they hastened to make peace. When their envoys came to Cairo, they found embassies from both the German and the Byzantine emperors waiting upon the sultan. The Venetians had not much regretted the fall of Tripoli but were nervous for Acre, where they held the commercial hegemony. They agreed to send twenty galleys, under Nicholas Tiepolo. The pope entrusted him and John of Grailly and Hugh of Sully, who sailed with him, with a thousand pieces of gold each. His fleet was joined by five galleys sent by king James of Aragon. The only other answer to the
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appeal that the pope sent out after hearing John of Grailly's tale came from a rabble of peasants and unemployed townsmen from Lombardy and Tuscany, men eager to find adventure and loot and the reward of spiritual merit. The pope had little confidence in them, but he put them under the command of Bernard, the refugee bishop of Tripoli, who, he hoped, would keep them under restraint. These reinforcements arrived at Acre in August 1290.91

The truce between the sultan and king Henry had restored confidence at Acre. There was a good harvest that year in Syria. Trade was booming, and Acre was full of merchants from the interior. But the arrival of the Italian crusaders at once caused trouble. They were drunken, disorderly, and irrepressible. One day at the end of August a riot started between them and some Moslem merchants. Soon the Italians were rushing wildly through the streets of Acre slaughtering everyone that they saw who wore a beard or eastern dress. Many local Christians perished along with the Moslems. The barons and the knights of the military orders were horrified. They managed to give refuge to a few Moslems within the castle, and eventually stilled the riot and arrested the ringleaders.

When Kalavun heard of the massacre, he decided that the time had come to eradicate the Franks. The government at Acre hastened to send him apologies. He replied with an embassy demanding that the ringleaders should be handed over to him. The bailie Amalric called a council, at which William of the Temple suggested that all the criminals in the jails of Acre should be sent to Cairo as being the guilty men. But no one else supported a proposal to send Christians to certain death. Instead, there was an attempt to persuade the ambassadors that Moslem merchants had started the riot. Receiving no satisfaction from Acre, Kalavun consulted his qadis, who told him that he would be justified in breaking the truce. He gathered together his army.

Once again Templar agents at the Mamluk court warned William of Beaujeu, who sent a personal envoy to Cairo. Kalavun offered to spare Acre in return for as many Venetian sequins as the city had inhabitants. But when William put this proposal before the high court, it was scornfully rejected, and he himself was insulted as a traitor.92

---
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Kalavun no longer hid his intentions. On November 4 he left Cairo at the head of his troops. But he suddenly fell ill, and six days later he died. The people at Acre considered that their troubles were over.93

But there was not the usual disputed succession in Egypt. Kalavun’s son al-Ashraf Khalil dealt at once with the inevitable palace conspiracy, and within a few days was firmly established on his father’s throne. But it was now too late in the year to start the campaign against Acre. The government there hoped to find the new sultan more pacific and sent an embassy to congratulate him and ask for peace terms. The ambassadors were thrown at once into prison, where they died.94

After careful preparations the Moslem army moved from Egypt in March 1291. On March 6 the sultan left Cairo for Damascus, where he deposited his harem. Meanwhile men and siege machines were gathered from all over his empire. The army from Hamah was so heavily laden that it took a month to travel over the muddy roads from Krak down to Acre. The sultan collected almost a hundred machines, including two vast catapults called the Victorious and the Furious, and a new efficient type of light mangonel called the Black Oxen. His forces were said to number 60,000 horsemen and 160,000 infantrymen. However exaggerated these numbers may be, the Moslems must have outnumbered the Christian forces by about ten to one. On April 5 this huge army encamped before the walls of Acre.

By now the Franks had realized their plight. The military orders summoned all their available members from Europe, to serve under their respective masters, the Templar William of Beaujeu, the Hospitaller John of Villiers, and the Teutonic Conrad of Feuchtwangen, whose predecessor Burkhard had made a bad impression by choosing to resign his office a few months before. There were a few English knights sent by Edward I under the command of the Swiss Otto of Grandison. King Henry, who was ill, sent troops from Cyprus and promised to follow with reinforcements as soon as he could. Meanwhile his brother Amalric was in command. Every able-bodied man in Acre was enlisted for the defense. In all, the garrison numbered about a thousand horsemen and twelve to fourteen thousand foot-soldiers. The defenses were in good condition. The government had never neglected them, and visiting
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pilgrims had helped to pay for their upkeep and repair. On the west and south the city was protected by the sea. On the north and east a double line of walls ran encasing both the city and its northern suburb Montmusart. The two quarters were separated by a single wall and the castle. The north and east walls met at a salient, at the end of which jutted out a great tower recently built by king Henry II, opposite the so-called “accursed tower” on the inner wall. Projecting from king Henry’s tower was a barbican built by king Hugh. This salient was considered the most vulnerable section of the defense. It was therefore entrusted to the bailie Amalric and the royal troops. On his right were the French and English knights, under John of Grailly and Otto of Grandison, then the Venetian and Pisan troops, and, next to the sea, those of the commune of Acre. The Teutonic Knights supplemented the royal troops, and on their left, along the walls of Montmusart, were the Hospitalers, then the Templars. The army of Hamah was opposite the Templars, that of Damascus opposite the Hospitalers, and the Egyptian army stretched from the salient to the bay of Acre, with the sultan’s tent pitched near the shore.

The Christians had command of the sea. Many women and children had already been transferred to Cyprus, and the ships had returned laden with provisions. A considerable flotilla lay off the harbor and at the quays. It was later believed that many able-bodied men had slipped away with the refugees. But the taunts of cowardice that were freely exchanged afterwards seem to have had small foundation.

The siege began on April 6 with a bombardment from the sultan’s catapults and mangonels that was maintained day and night, while his archers poured their arrows at the galleries on the walls and over them into the town. On April 15 the Templars made a moonlight sortie into the camp of the Hamah army, which began well, till the knights and their horses became entangled in the tent ropes and were forced back in confusion. A sortie by the Hospitalers in pitch darkness a few days later failed completely. It was then decided that sorties were too expensive, for the defense realized that men and armaments were both running short. Meanwhile the sultan’s sappers were at work. There were said to be a thousand employed against each tower of the enceinte.

King Henry arrived on May 4, with a hundred horsemen and two thousand infantrymen, and with John Turco, archbishop of Nicosia. In a last effort to make peace he sent envoys to the sultan, who merely asked them if they had brought the keys of the city.
He added that as a tribute to the king, who was so young and so ill, he would spare the lives of the defenders. All that he wanted was the place. As he spoke, a stray catapult-stone fell among the bystanders. Al-Ashraf in his rage wanted to kill the envoys, but was persuaded to send them back to Acre.

By May 8 the barbican of king Hugh was so badly damaged that it had to be abandoned. On May 15 the outer wall of the tower of king Henry collapsed, and the Mamluks passed in over its ruins. The towers on either side, that of St. Nicholas to the south and those of the English and the countess of Blois on the west, were already undermined. The defense was forced back to the inner enceinte. A fierce attack on St. Anthony’s gate, where the wall of Montmusart met the city wall, was beaten back by the Templars.

The sultan ordered a general assault for the morning of Friday the 18th. It was launched against the whole length of the walls from St. Anthony’s gate to the bay of Acre on the south, but concentrated on the “accursed tower” at the salient. Wave after wave of turbaned assailants were hurled against the walls to the din of trumpets and drums and battlecries. It was not long before the tower fell and the royal troops were pushed back on to the Templars. There they made a stand. The Hospitallers came up to their support, but neither Templars nor Hospitallers could recover any lost ground. The enemy poured into the city, cutting off John of Grailly and Otto of Grandison on the eastern wall. There was furious fighting in the streets, but Acre was lost. King Henry and his brother Amalric managed to reach a ship at the quay. The master of the Hospital was carried wounded and protesting by his followers to another ship. The master of the Temple was taken mortally wounded to the buildings of the Temple. John of Grailly was severely wounded, and led by Otto of Grandison to a Venetian ship. There was a ghastly panic on the quays. The aged patriarch, Nicholas of Hannapes, was rowed out towards a ship in the roadstead, but he allowed so many refugees to crowd into his boat that it sank and he was drowned. The Templar Roger de Flor managed to seize a ship and made a fortune out of the money that he extracted from the noble ladies to whom he gave refuge. No one knew how many people perished, drowned or slaughtered by the Moslems. Very few lives were spared. The number of prisoners taken was comparatively small.

By evening all Acre was in the sultan’s hands, except for the Templar building which jutted out into the sea at the southwest corner of the city. There several knights and a number of civilians
had taken refuge, and ships that had landed refugees in Cyprus came back to its aid. After a week of fruitless attack the sultan offered to let the inmates go free if the building were surrendered to him. His offer was accepted, but the Moslem soldiers who entered the building began to molest the Christian women and boys. The Templars in their fury turned them out and prepared to renew the fight. The Mamluks laid mines, and on May 28 the landward walls began to crumble. The Moslems were rushing in through the widening breach when the whole edifice collapsed killing defenders and assailants alike.85

Tyre had already fallen. When Mamluk troops appeared there on May 19, the garrison abandoned the town without a struggle, for all that it was the strongest fortress on the coast and had successfully defied Saladin. Sidon was occupied at the end of June, though its Castle of the Sea was held by the Templars till July 14. Beirut surrendered on July 31, after the commanders of the garrison had been tricked into placing themselves in the Mamluks’ power. The Templars did not attempt to hold either of their great castles, Château Pèlerin and Tortosa. The latter was evacuated on August 3 and the former on August 14.86 All that was left to them now was the waterless island of Ruad, two miles off the coast opposite Tortosa. They held it for twelve more years.

When the whole country was in his power, the sultan al-Ashraf ordered the systematic destruction of every castle on the coast, so that the Franks might never again establish a foothold in Outremer. Nor did they.
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