

XXII. *Memoir on the Vicissitudes of the Principality of Antioch, during the Crusades. By F. Damiani. Communicated by the Rev. Samuel Henley, A.M. F. A. S. in a Letter to the Rev. John Brand, Secretary.*

Read June 21, 1804.

To the Rev. John Brand, M. A. Secretary to the Society of Antiquaries.

DEAR SIR,

I HAVE the pleasure to transmit to you the following discussion, which contains a very interesting memoir of Antioch during the Crusades. In it the writer, Mr. Damiani, has discovered much accuracy of research and acuteness of conjecture. On these accounts it will obtain the notice of the Society, and, I flatter myself deserve its attention. I remain,

Dear Sir,

Very truly your's,

Howland Street, Fitzroy Square,
May 24, 1804.

SAMUEL HENLEY.

THE memoir which I have the honour of presenting to the Society, was occasioned by an inaccuracy of Denina, who, in his *Rivoluzioni d' Italia*, Book x. Ch. 10, maintaining with a quotation from

from Summonte, that, on the death of William, Duke of Apulia, in 1127, without issue, the inheritance of that mighty state fell to Boemond the II. prince of Antioch, and son of the illustrious conqueror of that name, in the first crusade; and by a still greater inaccuracy of the authors of *an Universal History*, who, in the twenty-eighth volume, 8vo. edition, of the modern part of their compilation, page 144, state, on the authority of Giannone, Rainaldi, and Nangis, that “Mary, daughter of the prince of Antioch, made a formal renunciation of her rights to the kingdom of Jerusalem and the principality of Antioch, in favour of Charles of Anjou.” With respect to the former article, it seemed surprising to me that (after a careful research into the vicissitudes of the south of Italy, in the middle ages) a fact of such a magnitude, as the primitive usurpation of a powerful monarchy, should have escaped my notice: and the quotation of Summonte increased my doubts; the work of that writer having been familiar to me more than any other of the same class. In respect to the other fact, I indeed recollected to have seen it stated by Giannone, on the authority of Rainaldi and Chioccarelli, in the same way as it is reported by the writers of *an Universal History*: and it was likewise in my remembrance, that Costanzo, in the second book of his *History of Naples*, had already given the same statement of Giannone. But this circumstance was of no weight! By long experience, I was taught to appreciate those two writers from their proper standard; and I had formerly remarked, that, on the very authority of Rainaldi, the abbé Vertot, in his *History of the Order of Malta*, book the third, confined the renunciation of Mary, in favour of Charles, to the kingdom of Jerusalem alone.

The questions, however, appeared to me of much importance, and worthy of a proper solution. I was aware that some of the

Several successions of the Norman conquerors, in Apulia, had been tumultuous and irregular; that the elder line of Robert Guiscard still existed in Antioch, when his Italian dominions were devolved on the great Count of Sicily; and that, during two centuries, an intimate connection had subsisted between the Sicilian monarchy and the Latin dominions in Syria. I consequently fancied that some particulars relative to that connection might have been overlooked, or improperly noticed, by modern compilers, and that the two facts in question were among them. With a view of setting these in their proper light, I consulted many historians, and those especially whom I considered as the fountain-head of information.

The ultimate solution of the former question cost me no considerable trouble. In Muratori's *Annals of Italy* (ann. 1126, ad. ann. 1130), by a reference to Cardinal Baronius and to Pagi, I found that, although, on the death of William, Duke of Apulia, Boemond the Second of Antioch did not claim the succession to that state; he had been generally considered as its lawful sovereign, by his own Apulian subjects and by the remainder of the Italians; and that the great Count, afterwards King, Roger of Sicily, for violently usurping the vacant dukedom from his relation, then in Syria, had been excommunicated by Pope Honorius the Second. I soon presumed that Denina, who acknowledges Muratori as his chief guide, in the revolutions of Italy, had borrowed his statement from that immortal writer, and that, relying afterwards too much on his memory, or inadvertently misplacing his papers, he had quoted Summonte by mistake. Neither this, nor any other Neopolitan historian could ever mention such a scandalous fact! They were not sufficiently free or liberal to acknowledge that the mighty founder of their monarchy.

that

that glorious hero who was so much overpraised by his contemporary sycophants, had begun his career with one of the most infamous spoliations ever recorded in the annals of Europe.

The latter question was as easily solved. I could not procure the *Life of Philip the Bold* of France, or the subsequent chronicle, written by the Benedictin William de Nangis, to either of which, I fancy, the writers of *an Universal History* refer, in their quotation: and in the fifth volume of Du Chegne's collection of French chronicles, there only exists the *Gesta G. Ludovici IX. Francorum Regis* by the same monk, which ending with the life of that monarch, in 1270, could not come so low as the epoch of the conveyance. In the first appendix to the same volume, I have, however, found the chronicle of Andrew, chaplain to Stephen king of Hungary, in which it is clearly stated, that, "filia principis Antiocheni, Maria, de Jerusalem in Francia exularis, jus regni Jerusalem quod sibi competebat, Carolo, regi Siciliae contulit;" as clearly and unequivocally is the fact related in other chronicles; inserted in the several volumes of Muratori's *Rer. Ital. Scriptores*; and as, in the course of this memoir, the pedigree of princess Mary will be incidentally noticed, and thus the character of her deed will be indirectly brought to its clearest light, I desist from quoting for it farther authorities in this place.

As in similar cases it often happens, these inquiries have undesignedly led me to two more important discoveries in the annals of the principality of Antioch. I have found a contradiction of three generations in the series of its sovereigns, descendant from the Norman conqueror; and three individuals of that dynasty, celebrated in the history of Italy, who are utterly unnoticed in that of the several crusades. On these two historical deficiencies, I have instituted a methodical disquisition; and the result of it constitutes the subject of my
memoir.

memoir. No positive information will be derived from my labours: my conclusions will rather be of a sceptical nature; and both the articles will remain, I apprehend, in the same uncertainty as they have hitherto been. Yet, as the detection of an error, in some measure, answers the same end as the discovery of a truth; in this point of view, my time will not, I trust, have been totally misemployed. I expect that future writers will either ascertain the two points better than I have done, or be less inaccurate and positive in their statements respecting them.

My inquiries having carried me through the whole maze of the Antiochean history, from the foundation of that principality, in 1098, to the extinction of it, in 1268, it was natural that some peculiar facts and anecdotes in the chain of events should occur to me, which had been omitted, misrepresented, or slightly noticed, by those who had not directed their exclusive attention to such an object. Some of those facts and anecdotes, which appeared valuable and interesting to me, have been noticed in the course of the memoir. They are indirectly and shortly related in their respective places: they fill, in a proper gradation, the back ground of the historical picture; and no violation, by their admittance, is, I trust, anywhere effected of the laws of unity, in the performance.

The powerful principality of Antioch, previously to the conquest of Jerusalem by the knights of the first crusade, was, as it is known, chiefly taken by the exertions of the valiant prince Boemond of Tarento, son of Guiscard, one of the most remarkable individuals of that expedition, and justly denominated the Latin Ulysses. After obtaining the possession of that state, by the unanimous consent of his companions, and overcoming the difficulties started against him by the Byzantine emperor, who,
from

from a preliminary engagement of the crusaders, claimed the paramount dominion upon any of their intended conquests over the infidels, Boemond kept that station with a view of defending it against some attack of the enemy, while the other princes were besieging Jerusalem. In 1101, he was made prisoner by the Turks, in an ambuscade, whilst, at the request of the Armenian prince, Gabriel, lord of the city of Melitine, he was marching into Mesopotamia, to protect it from an imminent aggression of the Persians. No sooner was this event related to the chiefs of the Antiochean state, than they invited to their provisional government that illustrious cousin of Boemond, the gallant, amiable, and religious, Tancred, who, in the conquest of the holy city, had just made those unrivalled exertions which procured him the title of Prince of Galilee, and are little less celebrated in history than adorned in poetry.

This invitation was chiefly founded on the consideration, that, in case Boemond should never return to Antioch, that principality was to devolve on Tancred, by right of inheritance. Besides some eminent services in the internal affairs, the administration of this prince was distinguished by the additional conquest of two of the four illustrious cities of Syria, Laodicea and Apamea, with their extensive territory so renowned in antiquity, for its fertility, and for the number of elephants which were fed in it by Seleucus. As soon as Boemond, by means of a ransom, was set at liberty, in 1103, and, on his return to Antioch, informed of the signal services of his cousin, he bestowed on him and his heirs the greatest part of the new conquests; and when, in the subsequent year 1104, he returned to Apulia, in order to pass, as he did, to France, and conclude his marriage and that of Tancred with king Philip's two daughters, Con-

stantia

stantia and Cecilia, he again committed the government of Antioch to the prince of Galilee.

Boemond never returned to Asia, but, remaining in Apulia, and seeing the incorrigible perfidiousness of the Greek emperor, Alexis, towards the expeditions to the holy land, in 1108, he again invaded Greece with an army of five thousand horse and forty thousand foot, destroyed many maritime cities, ravaged Epirus, besieged Durazzo, and compelled the enemy to conclude a treaty that no crusaders, for the future, should be molested in their passage. His domestic concerns obliged him still to remain in Apulia, where he died in the year 1111, when he had already prepared to remove to his eastern dominions. He left, by his wife, a young prince, called likewise Boemond.

The year after, (in 1112,) Tancred also died, in Antioch, and, as he was not sure that the lawful heir would repair to that place, he desired, on his death bed, his princess Cecilia to take, as she did, for a second husband one of the sons of the Count of Tripoli, his intimate friend; and ordered that the principality entrusted to him, with all his dependencies, should be given to his cousin Roger, son of Richard, prince of Capua, and great marshal of Apulia, on condition of restoring it, without objection, to Boemond the second, whenever this prince might claim it by right of inheritance. Roger took possession of the principality, and, in defiance to Tancred's last will, kept it in his own name, till the year 1119, where he fell in a battle with the Turks. I saw these particulars in William of Tyre only; and I thought it proper to notice them, as an implicit confutation of other historians who represent Roger as a *regent of the lawful heir*.

In 1126, however, the young prince of Tarento, then eighteen years of age, by the patronage of king Baldwin the II. of Jerusalem,

Jerusalem,

Jerusalem, whose younger daughter Alix, had become his wife, recovered the possession of Antioch, and kept it till the year 1131, when he also was killed by the Turks in Cilicia, in the 24th year of his life. Before his departure from Apulia, he had made an arrangement with his second cousin, William, Duke of that extensive country, that either of them should be the successor of him who happened to die first. The latter prince dying in 1127, Boemond, as I have already stated from Muratori, could claim his succession not only by right of inheritance, but upon a peculiar agreement of both parties. He does not, however, appear to have taken any steps towards the attainment of this object.

Roger, great count, and afterwards king, of Sicily, who certainly, as usurper, had succeeded his nephew, William, in the dukedom of Apulia, laid, on the contrary, a claim to the principality of Antioch, when it became vacant. Boemond the II^d, by his princess Alix, had left only a daughter, of the name of Constantia; and his nearest relation in the male line was the great Count. To him, according to the Salic law, implicitly adopted by the Normans, the succession to the vacant principality ought to have been conferred; a ferment, however, which took place in Antioch, and a misunderstanding which arose also between the princess dowager and the king of Jerusalem, her father, gave a different direction to the affair. The princess meant to usurp the principality for herself; and the king intended to preserve it for her daughter. In the end of the contest, the king took Antioch, and confirmed the young princess in its possession. When she was arrived at puberty, by the unanimous consent of the Antiochean states, and under the authority of Foulques, the subsequent king of Jerusalem, Constantia was married to Raymond, son of the Count of Poitiers.

Roger could not then engage in a particular war for the succession: but other facts evince that he constantly asserted his rights to it. The most conspicuous person who had favoured the party of Raymond, in Antioch, was the Latin patriarch, Raoul. Being subsequently disaffected to the prince's government, the prelate fell a prey to powerful enemies; who, intriguing against him at the court of Rome, obliged him to undertake a journey, for his justification, to that metropolis. One of his enemies was a Calabrese priest, of the name of Arnulphus, afterwards archbishop of Cosenza, who, being informed of the circumstance, made haste to Sicily, to prevail with king Roger that the patriarch should be arrested in his passage through Apulia. "I deliver to thee, most gracious monarch," said *the honest Calabrese*, "thy most pernicious enemy, the patriarch of Antioch, who has despoiled thee and thy heirs of that principality, *sublimato in ea viro ignoto, contra juris ordinem.*" The patriarch was actually seized, on his landing at Brindisi, put in chains, and consigned to the same *honest Calabrese*, in order to be led to the king, in Sicily. On his arrival, he exerted his abilities to gain the friendship of Roger, and promised that monarch a better conduct for the future. He was suffered to continue his journey to Rome, and, on his return from that metropolis to Sicily, he entered into negotiations with the king, about the recovery of Antioch. The *honest Calabrese*, Arnulphus, then still in Sicily, informed prince Raymond of what had been concluded. The patriarch, on his arrival at Antioch, was exposed to a greater persecution, in consequence of which, in 1141, under the authority of Cardinal Alberic, bishop of Ostia and legate a latere, he was first deposed from his dignity and then shut up in a convent. These details likewise are not found in any other historian but in William!

Raymond

Raymond was killed in a battle between his army and that of sultan Nouredin, in 1148, (the thirteenth year of his reign,) leaving behind him, according to father Paoli, his princess Constantia with two male and as many female children; in consequence of which event, Nouredin occupied the whole principality of Antioch, except the metropolis. Baldwin the III^d, anxious to preserve for the Christians that superb city, so near his own dominions, and afraid lest, for want of proper administration, it should fall into the hands of the infidels, earnestly desired the dowager princess to take, from among her noble subjects, a second husband to assist her in the government. Constantia, who by the historian is represented as a careless and libertine woman, did not condescend: to enforce his will, the king convoked the general assembly of the Latin princes at Tripoli, to which he also invited his queen, and the countess of the place, both aunts to the princess, the patriarch of Antioch, and all his suffragans: and neither the influence of authority, nor entreaties of friendship, could prevail on her to change her mind. What, however, she had then declined from that powerful influence, she afterwards accomplished from her own caprice. In 1152, she married Reginald of Castillon, a common soldier, according to William of Tyre, and a man of some military talents and of a brutal temper; but, according to Sanutus, a son of the lord of Chatillon sur Marne; and, according to Bernard the treasurer, of such unassuming manners, that, during his subsequent administration, he never wore the insignia and the dress of a prince.

Reginald assumed the government of the principality for his young son in law, Boemond the III^d, and, in the course of it, had the opportunity of distinguishing himself by many brilliant exertions. With the promise of a suitable reward, he was commissioned by

the Greek emperor Manuel to check, as he actually did, the insolence of the prince of Armenia, Thoros, who ravaged the province of Cilicia. Being afterwards disappointed in his expectation, he invaded and conquered the island of Cyprus, as an indemnity. The emperor, resenting the affront, sent an army against him. On the report of this expedition, and, as William states, from his remorse too, he resolved to ask pardon, to give satisfaction, and to renounce any right to the island. Not long after, in 1160, he was made prisoner in a battle with Nouredin's troops, sent to Aleppo, and there detained till the year 1175, in which he was set at liberty. His princess, Constantia, having died in this interval, in 1176, by the king's authority, he married the repudiated wife of the Lord of Krach and Montregal, who by her own right possessed those lands and their appendage, which were two of the Latin conquests beyond the river Jordan, and depending on the kingdom of Jerusalem. It is generally known, that, in the administration of his second wife's dominions, he often harassed the neighbouring Arabians, and thus occasioned the second war with Saladin, and the famous battle of Tiberias, in 1187, in which he himself, together with Guy, king of Jerusalem, was made prisoner, and afterwards killed by the Sultan with a stroke of his sabre. It was necessary to expatiate on the adventures of this extraordinary man; as no historian has remarked that *he was the first of the Latin princes in Asia, who attempted a direct conquest on the dominions of the eastern empire!*

As early, however, as the year 1163, Boemond the III^d, surnamed *the hambe*, had become of age, and, by his lawful title, assumed the government of Antioch. His reign was remarkable for its long duration and uncommon events; and his character was of the most exceptionable sort. Soon after his
accession,

accession, he sought to strengthen himself by a powerful alliance, and, with this view, he caused his sister Mary, like him, daughter of Raymond, to be married to the Greek emperor, Manuel, who had just then lost his empress Irene—a fact unaccountably omitted by the authors of the *Art de Verifier les Dates*, as likewise by Moreri and other biographical lexicographers, who state, on the contrary, *a Greek princess, niece of Manuel, had been his wife.* The alliance soon proved beneficial to him; as, being made prisoner by Nouredin in 1165, and sent to Aleppo, by the intercession of his brother in law, he was not suffered to remain twelve months in that situation.

A disorderly passion, some years after, threw Boemond into great troubles, and his principality into much confusion. He had married Theodora, according to William, a niece of Baldwin the IVth, king of Jerusalem; (although, as I have mentioned, the authors of the *Art, &c.* give her as a niece of the Greek emperor Manuel, and his second wife after the death of the former, of the name Orgueilleuse,) and in the year 1180, he left her in order to give his hand to his concubine Sibilla. A great disturbance, in consequence of this, arose among the Latin princes in Asia, a serious commotion took place in the Antiochean state, and he himself was branded with a solemn excommunication by his own patriarch. In return, he soon excited a persecution against that prelate and his suffragans, and confiscated their estates; a measure which occasioned the emigration of the most respectable individuals from Antioch, and a general interdict on the principality. By the intercession of Reginald, his ancient tutor, of the king of Jerusalem, of the count of Tripoli, of the great Masters of the Templars and Hospitalian Knights, and especially of the patriarch of Jerusalem, it was at last agreed that Boemond should restore to
his

his clergy the places and estates they had forfeited, on which the ecclesiastical interdict should be repealed; and, as to himself, he should patiently endure the excommunication launched against him, till he should dismiss the concubine and recal his lawful princess. He seems, however, to have been obstinate to the last.

From William of Tyre we have no farther account of this prince than his assistance at the election of the young king, Baldwin the Vth, in 1183; and as here ends the history of the holy war, by that prelate, we do not find, in its continuation, any particular concerning the vicissitudes of the principality of Antioch, during the four subsequent years which preceded the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin. It is, however, a fact generally known, and stated by the continuator of the archbishop, as well as by Bernard the treasurer, and by Biondi, although with some mistakes in the names, that, after the battle of Tiberias, and the capture of king Guy, by the treason of the count of Tripoli, the son of the prince of Antioch, Raymond (improperly called Raynald) attended by his troops, followed the treacherous count in his flight to Tyre; that, after the entrance of Saladin's army into the county of Tripoli, he also accompanied the count to that place, by sea; and that, on the demise of the latter, he was appointed his successor by the last will of the deceased, with the approbation of the states.

From this period we begin to find darkness and uncertainty, and very often contradiction of statements, in the history of Antioch. In the continuation of the archbishop's history, we discover a fact of great importance little known to modern compilers. After the unsuccessful siege of Tyre, by sea and land, in which siege he had been baffled by the superior abilities of Conrad, marquis

marquis of Montferrat, and Margarit, admiral of Sicily, Saladin passed into the Antiochean territory, and, in three months time, took above twenty-five cities and villages, almost the whole principality, except the metropolis, which he intended to conquer by famine or by treason. The latter scheme was executed! By a large bribe offered to the patriarch, Saladin obtained the surrender of the castle, and the admission of his garrison. The inhabitants were allowed either to remain in the city, on the same footing as before, or to go elsewhere, according to their own choice. The historian remarks that, by the avarice of the patriarch, Antioch was lost ninety years after, and in the same month of June, in which it had been taken by the valiant son of Guiscard. But he does not notice the prince who reigned in it, at that time, and how he so tamely suffered himself to be dispossessed of his dominions.

It is likewise little known that Frederic of Suabia, who, in 1190, had succeeded his father Barbarossa in the command of the Latin armies in Syria, had, in his way to Acri, reconquered Antioch, without any opposition from the enemy: and here also we wish that the historian had informed us of the subsequent fate of the city, and whether it were or not restored to its former sovereign.

From the following facts, however, we may presume that a part of the principality at least was restored to Boemond the III^d. We are told by Sanutus, that this prince reigning in Antioch, in 1194, had some contests with the lord of Armenia, Livon, until then considered as his vassal. Boemond had sent for him, and had been answered that he would not repair to the appointed place for fear he should undergo the same fate as his brother and predecessor, Rupin; who being, some time before, summoned in
a similar

a similar way, and afterwards confined in prison, had seen all his states invaded. It was agreed that the prince of Antioch should be found in the place without military forces. But Livon, not relying on this promise, took with him a detachment of two hundred horse, which he concealed in a neighbouring forest, and gave to his valet the proper instructions how to act in case of need. He then advanced to the prince's presence, and soon perceived his surmises well founded; as, in the sequel of the conversation, he was ordered to remain in prison. As soon as he made a sign to his valet, a signal was given, by blowing a horn, and the cavalry lying in ambush appeared. He was not only delivered, but enabled to take Boemond himself prisoner, and to effect a happy revolution in his own situation. By the efforts of Henry, count of Champagne, who, by our king Richard the Ist, had been left governor of the Holy Land, prince Boemond was set at liberty, on condition that he should free Livon from his vassalage, and leave him the possession of the lands he had occupied in the district of Antioch,—that the prince himself should in his turn become a vassal of the lord of Armenia, and give his son, named also Boemond, (this is Raymond,) in marriage to the Armenian princess, Alix, daughter of the late Kupin.

Sanutus does not mention, that about this time any change took place in the Antiochean dominions in respect to their relation with the infidels. But the continuator of William states, that, in 1197, when the German princes, under the direction of the emperor Henry the Vith, passed into Syria, and retook Joppa, Sidon, and Berytus, “the prince of Antioch, returning to his state, recovered many places in it which the Saracens, on hearing of the successes of the Christians, had relinquished.” The anachronism of this report is palpable! The fact could not take place
in

in 1197; as, according to the writer himself, it was contemporary with the death of Saladin and that of Guy, king of Cyprus, both which happened in the year 1194; and, from the coincidence of this epoch with that of the contests between Boemond and Livon, I am inclined to think that the same events, which by Sanutus are justly represented, have been incorrectly noticed, or rather disfigured by the continuator of William.

The former of these historians likewise states, that, in the same treaty in which the relations between the Armenian and Antiochian dominions were settled, Livon had been constituted king; from the notion that royal titles, at that time, could not be given by other potentates than the pope or the emperor. I adopt in this last respect the statement of the other historian, that, “on the expedition of Simon of Monfort, and at the very time of emperor Henry’s death, Conrad of Witspach, archbishop of Mentz, then in Syria, accompanied by Rodolph, bishop of Verdun, “terrestri itinere in Armeniam tendit, ubi Leonem, jussu Henrici, regio diademate insignivit, ac pace sequuta, inter eundem regem, principem que Antiochiæ, controversias composuit.”

The subsequent history of Antioch, from 1200 to 1230, was, till lately, in the greatest uncertainty and confusion. In that part of the *Alliance Chronologique* of father Lalobé, which relates to this subject, and in that section of the *Tables Chronologiques* which, by that guide, Mr. de Guignes exhibits in the first volume of his excellent *History of Huns and Tartars*, the age, name, and dignity of the sons of Boemond the III^d were misrepresented. The continuator of William of Tyre (ad ann. 1216) had mistaken even the immediate ancestors of one of these princes; and, what is hardly credible, Bernard the treasurer, ch. 201, had, among other things, made an anachronism of no less than eighteen years,

in the same respect. These uncertainties have been in a great measure removed by the learned archbishop of Lucca, John Dominic Mansi, in his notes to the annals of Baronius and their continuation by Rainaldi, edited by himself at Lucca, in 1740. The indefatigable authors of the *Art de Verifier les Dates* have adopted Mr. Mansi's corrections; and some parts of Sanutus's reports would not materially differ from the two last authors, if he had not constantly mistaken the names of the two young princes above mentioned. With such guides I am now proceeding.

The reconciliation between Boemond and Livon, as far as it may be judged by subsequent facts, seems to have been sincere. In the year 1200, prince Raymond died, leaving, by his Armenian princess, a son called Rupin, from his grandfather. Boemond soon designed this young child as his successor, and caused him to be acknowledged as such by the Antiochean states. In the mean while, the regency of the state of Tripoli, an inheritance belonging also to Rupin, by his father's death, was conferred on his uncle, the younger son of the prince of Antioch, and like him, called also Boemond; in respect to which fact, the authors of the *Art de Verifier les Dates*, on excellent authorities, maintain that the count himself, on his death bed, had appointed his brother regent, and even bestowed on him the county, on condition that he should support the pupil, Rupin, in his right on the Antiochean state, whenever the demise of his grand-father should happen. No sooner was this regent informed of the deed of his father than he openly revolted against him, and, after a regular declaration of war, and with the assistance of the Templar and Hospitalar knights, he drew him out of Antioch. He would have preserved his conquest, had he not been at length abandoned
by

by his allies, and had not his father, in consequence of this accident, been re-established in the principality.

Boemond III. died in the year after, 1201; and his death occasioned the renewal of the contest, under another shape. None of the above-mentioned historians give a clear and satisfactory account of this new event! but, on combining their partial and scattered hints, and weighing the whole in the scale of probability, I am enabled to state, that, soon after the prince's death, Boemond regent of the county of Tripoli, invaded and actually conquered the principality of Antioch, to the prejudice of his pupil and nephew, Rupin. A powerful resistance to this usurpation was opposed by king Livon, who then considered, or affected to consider, the young prince as the presumptive heir of the crown of Armenia. Whether the king, in the first instance, claimed for his nephew the county of Tripoli, or the principality of Antioch, I have not been able to ascertain; the authors of the *Art de Verifier les Dates*, under the head of the princes, Tom. I. page 449, and under that of the kings, page 461, contradicting themselves on this article. But, howsoever these rights may have been asserted, it is incontestable that Livon, in 1203, had conquered Antioch.

Facts of the greatest authenticity evince that this conquest was not preserved. From Sanutus we know that, in 1206, Boemond (improperly, as usual, called Raymond,) by a decree of his great court, dispossessed of their estates the lords of Nephin and Sybelatars, his vassals, for contracting marriage without his licence; and that, in 1208, he persecuted and imprisoned the patriarch of Antioch, for having fomented a rebellion against him in that metropolis. From the continuator of Archbishop William, we are informed, that in 1216, at the expedition of Andrew of

Hungary, "Tripolitanus Boemundus patre nihil sincerior," (an instance of mistakes,) "obsidionem in monte Thabor diffuadet;" and from Bernard the treasurer (making allowance for the already mentioned anachronism) it is equally known, that, after the capture of Damiata in 1219, Boemond, entering into Antioch, drew away "Rupinum confanguineum faum" from that principality, for which an excommunication was launched against him, and an interdict cast on his dominions, by the legate of the holy see, in that expedition.

We have also the best evidence for stating that Livon did not choose to retain Antioch from a disaffection towards Rupin his nephew. This young prince, no historian says why, had been utterly disgraced. Having lost his paternal dominions, he had repaired to his uncle in Armenia, in hopes of being the successor to that crown. He was not only excluded from the succession, but sent into exile; and Livon, on his death, in 1219, appointed his own daughter Isabella, of tender age, to be his successor, under the regency of Constant, his relation, and constable of the kingdom. Rupin, excluded from two sovereignties which belonged to him in full right, applied to the legate Pelage at Damiata, for obtaining that which then was just vacant. He was granted a small army, and by it enabled to enter Tarsus: but being surprised by the regent, he was shut up in a prison, where he died in 1222. By his wife, Helvis, daughter of Amaury, king of Cyprus, whom in 1210 he had ravished, he left to Eudes of Dampiere, her lawful husband, two daughters, Eschive, who died unmarried, and Mary, wife of Philip of Monfort, Lord of Tyre. Thus ended the elder branch of the descendants of Boemond the IIIrd, but the connections between the Antiochean and Armenian princes were not entirely broken by this event.

The

The regent, Constant, as the authors of the *Art de Verifier les Dates* state, on the authority of father Monnier, gave his pupil, Isabella, in marriage to Philip, the third son of Boemond, of whom I am speaking; and, as I shall after notice, Sibilla, daughter of Ayton the IId, husband of the same Isabella, about 1270, was likewise married to Boemond the VIth.

The county of Tripoli and the principality of Antioch being combined in the person of Boemond IV, it is recorded of him after this consolidation, that he behaved with such insolence towards the inhabitants of Antioch, and still worse towards the knights of the hospital, to whom the guard of the castle had been entrusted by the pope's legate, that he was branded with ecclesiastical censures, and, according to Rainaldi, not absolved before the year 1226.

The annals of the united dominions of Tripoli and Antioch, from the death of Boemond IV, in 1233, to the dispossession of the last individual of his descendants, in 1288, are even at the present day in the utmost confusion and uncertainty. They exhibit, not for years, but for whole generations, so extraordinary and singular a chain of contradictory statements in facts and persons, as it seems impossible to conciliate. The several historians of all ages and nations, whom I have consulted for this object, seem to be divided into two contending parties.

From Bernard the treasurer, Sanutus, Paoli, the authors of the *Art de Verifier les Dates*, the most celebrated biographical Lexicographers, and numberless other writers who have either directly or indirectly treated the subject, we know that Boemond the IVth, from his first wife, Plaiffance of Gilblet, had two daughters who died in infancy, and three sons; Boemond, who was his successor; Philip, who, as I have accidentally mentioned, became
king

king of Armenia; and Henry, who, by marrying Isabella, daughter of Hugues I. king of Cyprus, gave, after the extinction of the male descendants of the latter, a long series of monarchs to that island. From the same source, we likewise know that the second wife of Boemond was Melissende, daughter of Amaury, king of Cyprus, [a] and of Isabella, queen of Jerusalem, and that she gave him two daughters; Helvis, who died at an early age, and Mary, (an enormous mistake!) wife of Frederic, bastard of the emperor Frederic II.—“that princess, who, in 1277, sold her claims on the kingdom of Jerusalem to Charles of Anjou:” and, in the sequel of these historical positions, the following vicissitudes are related concerning the combined dominions of Antioch and Tripoli.

Boemond V. was reigning in both states, in 1244, when, on the invasion of Syria by the Karismians, he was obliged to become their tributary; he also had an obstinate war with Ayton I. king of Armenia, which terminated in a truce, managed by St. Lewis, in 1250; and, on his death, which took place in 1251, he left by his wife, Lucy, a Roman lady, Boemond, who was his successor, and Plaisance, who married Henry I. king of Cyprus.

Boemond VI. in 1253, only 16 years old, had the honour of being created a knight by St. Lewis, at Jaffa. In 1257, on a journey to Acre with his sister, the queen of Cyprus, he imprudently sided with the Venetians against the Genoese, and thus cherished those dissensions which ultimately occasioned the ruin

[a] Father Lusignan, in his chronicle of Cyprus, pretends that Melissenda was daughter of Isabella, by her first husband, Conrad of Montferrat. But this object is now out of the question; as, in either case, our arguments would be of the same weight.

of

of the Christian affairs, in the Holy Land. It was under his reign, in 1258, that Bendocdar, or Bibars, sultan of Babylon, as it is well known, took Antioch, with the slaughter of seventeen, and the captivity of more than one hundred thousand, of its inhabitants. The prince then retired to Tripoli, where he died in 1275, leaving by his princess Sibilla, daughter of Ayton, king of Armenia, a young son, called from him Boemond, and a daughter of the name Lucy, who, in 1280, was married to Nargat or Najare de Toucy, great admiral of Sicily.

Boemond VII. was left by his father under the tuition of his mother and the bishop of Tortosa, a charge which was contested with them by the king of Cyprus, Hugues III. the nearest relation, by his father Henry, to the young prince. During the minority of this Boemond, Charles of Anjou, in consequence of Mary's conveyance, had sent to the Holy Land his admiral, Roger of Sanseverino, with the character of governor, and with instructions to exact, in his name, a corresponding homage from all princes and knights depending on the crown of Jerusalem. An acknowledgement of Charles's paramount sovereignty on the county of Tripoli (perhaps also, on those places of the principality of Antioch, which had not yet fallen into the infidels) was accordingly made to his vicar, in the name of Boemond. Some contests, in subsequent years, arose between this prince and the Templar Knights, supported by the bishop of Tripoli, which produced most serious disturbances in that city. In 1287, the sultan of Egypt, Kelaoun, took the noble city of Laodicea, and ordered it to be razed to the ground. The same year put also an end to Boemond's life: and, as he had no issue, a contest arose between Sibilla his mother, and Lucy his sister, about the succession. The sultan Kelaoun soon terminated all disputes,

by taking Tripoli in 1288, and ordering it to be burned to ashes, an event which occasioned the loss of all other places of that county, as well as of the principality of Antioch; and reduced the possessions of the crusaders to three towns, Acre, Tyre, and Sidon.

Some of these last particulars might have been omitted, without any prejudice to my object. I chose, however, to say something more than it was strictly necessary, with a view of representing soon after a more striking contradiction between the preceding and the following picture. By the details and circumstances here exhibited, from the historians of the former class, the annals of the Antiochean state, during three generations, bear such marks of truth and accuracy, that no doubt could be at first entertained of their authenticity. The whole, however, of their contents is confuted by the historians of the second, the continuator of William of Tyre, and that numerous class of respectable writers, from whom, on the back of his title page, he professes to have derived assistance.

In this opposite system, about 1229, "*obierat jam diem suum Antiochiæ, princeps nullo herede legitimo superstite. Cypri rex urbis imperium nescio quo jure poscebat, quum Fredericus, imperatoris, ex sorore Antiochiæ principis nothus, in Asiam mittitur.*" "This young prince was received by Raynald of Bavaria," (the authors of the *Art de Verifier les Dates*, call him Richard Felingher,) "who, by Frederic the emperor, on his return to Italy, had been appointed governor of Syria. He was also received with great joy, and acknowledged as their sovereign by the inhabitants. A war soon arose between him and the king of Cyprus, in the course of which, Raynald, in the name of his pupil, invaded that island, approached Famagosta, her capital, and displayed his
troops

troops in the field of St. Nicholas, before the royal palace, and in the fight of the alarmed king himself. He was unsuccessful in the siege of that city, but he conquered, in return, all the places contiguous to the river *Paedicum*, and advanced towards *Nicoſa*. By the superior number of the king's troops, and from the disadvantage of the places, he was at length compelled to evacuate the island and to reembark. He left the eastern part of it almost desolated by fire and depredations; and the rich booty which he brought with him, on his return to Syria, was such, that people might fancy he had rather been victorious, than defeated.

“ Prince Frederic reigned in Antioch about the year 1240, the time of the expedition of Theobald, king of Navarre. In the year 1268, Bendoenam assaulted the city, and found it almost defenceless. Prince Conrad, who had succeeded to his father Frederic in the principality, had then passed to the Sicilian dominions, for the purpose of assisting Couradin. He was afterwards seized by Charles of Anjou, who first ordered that his eyes should be put out, and then that he should be hanged. On his departure from Antioch, he had committed the care of that city to its patriarch, Opizo Fiefchi of Genoa.”

“ In 1277, his sister Mary, daughter also of Frederic, prince of Antioch, and bastard of the emperor of that name, maintaining that, by law of inheritance, the royal rights and title to the kingdom of Jerusalem had descended to her from her grandfather, conveyed them to Charles of Anjou, although Hugues, her nephew by her brother's side, and prince of Antioch, had been solemnly acknowledged as king, and was actually receiving, by hereditary right, whatever emoluments belonged to the crown.

“ When the Christians in the Holy Land were reduced to the

sole possession of Acre, and contests arose, between seventeen different powers, about the sovereignty of that place, Hugues, prince of Antioch, among them claimed it as a dependence of his crown, and an inheritance of his ancestors. The count of Tripoli asserted his descent from Raymond of Toulouse, and thus became also a competitor."

The latter two statements are so evidently erroneous, that nothing more than the following hints are required for their destruction. 1st. Mary was no descendant of the emperor Frederic; she was, according to what I have already detailed, a daughter of Boemond IV. by his second wife, Melissenda of Cyprus. 2dly. The crown of Jerusalem which she intended to convey to Charles of Anjou, was by her considered as an inheritance of her grandmother, the queen Isabella. 3dly. Hugues, her nephew, was no prince of Antioch; he was the third king of that name in Cyprus; acknowledged also in 1269 as king of Jerusalem, by the right of his great grandmother. 4thly. The same monarch was he who asserted the sovereignty of Acre, as an appenage of the crown of Jerusalem. 5thly. And the person under the name of count of Tripoli, concerned in that affair, if really in existence, was Boemond of Antioch.—The descendants of Raymond of Toulouse, in Syria, had been already extinct at the death of the traitor Raymond II. in the preceding century. This complication of blunders is infinitely more remarkable than the insulated error of the authors of the *Art de Verifier les Dates*, and others, who give *Mary as a wife of the bastard Frederic of Suabia!*

The former two statements, on the contrary, are so generally admitted that I cannot see how they might be confuted. Independently of the authorities already mentioned, they are sanctioned
by

by the best Italian, German, and other historians. Among his several wives and concubines, the emperor Frederic II. unquestionably had, in their number, a princess of Antioch, known under the name of Beatrix, and we have for this fact the authority of Cuspinian, Zurita, Bartholomew of Neocastro, and others. It is still more certain, that from such an union a prince was born, who bore the name of his father. From the same Neocastro, as well as from Ptolemy of Lucca, Ricordano Malaspina, and Ligonius, we know, that, between the years 1246 and 1248, the bastard Frederic was his father's vicegerent in Tuscany, and also designed king of that country, "*sed propter mortem patris supervenientem, in regem non potuit filius publicari.*" The emperor himself, in one of his letters to our Henry III. reported by Matthew Paris, under the year 1246, acknowledges his beloved sons, Henry king of Sardinia, and Frederic of Antioch, president of the Etrurian states; and what sets these facts beyond any possible doubt, is the diploma of Conrad IV. inserted in the letters of Peter delle Vigne, (the most authentic book of the actions of Frederic II.) in which diploma the prince of Antioch and president of Etruria is called "Fredericus Augustus, frater noster." By the Italian historians it is full as certain, that from this prince a son had issued of the name Conrad, who suffered in Sicily that misfortune which is related of him by the writers of the crusades. In the *memorial* of the governors of Reggio, in the chronicle of Ptolemy of Lucca, and in that of Ricordano Malaspina, we find that, on the unfortunate defeat of Conradin, the prince of Antioch, Conrad was captured. Jamfilla and Saba Malaspina state, that, so early as the reign of king Mainfroy his uncle, he had married Beatrix, the daughter of a lord of the name Galvan Lancia, taken the additional title of count of Alba, and been

appointed governor of the Marche, with the assistance of his father in law. By Zurita, Cuspinian, and others, we are lastly informed, that, from the union of Conrad and Beatrix, three princes were born, who also bore the name of Antioch, and whose offspring lasted for some time in Sicily, with the greatest splendour.

In vain have I sought to conciliate this extraordinary, and perhaps singular contradiction, in the history of the middle ages! Besides all the writers occasionally mentioned, I have consulted many others, from whom I fancied I could reap some information on the matter. Among these I shall only mention the chronicles of the Paduan Monk, of the Anonymous, of the Vatican, of Richard of St. Germain, the five contemporary writers contained in Gale's collection, and the *Galvani Flammæ Manipulus Florum*, in the eleventh volume of Muratori's *Rer. Ital. Scriptores*. I felt a surprise, on seeing in the last-mentioned work, col. 1251, the stupendous blunder that Beatrix (evidently mistaken for Constantia, Frederic's first empress) was *daughter of the king of Arragon*,—a surprise equal to that which I had felt before on looking into Anderson's *Tables*, page. 454, where the bastard Frederic is given as *a son of the same Blanca who was mother of Manfred, and as husband of Mary, daughter of the king of Armenia!*

The whole, however, of the contradictory statements, if seen in one point of view, may give rise to some rational conjectures: and I am inclined to believe, that the mere misstatement of a name, and a want of accuracy in distinguishing two places, may have occasioned the whole confusion. Most likely, that daughter of Rupin, who, by one class of historians, is called *Eschive*, and
 stated

stated to have died unmarried, was the same person, who, by the same class, is noticed under the name of Beatrix, and as the concubine of the emperor. And most likely, also, whilst the bastard, prince Frederic, and his son Conrad, reigned in Antioch, from 1233 to 1268, the younger branch of Boemond III. was confined to the dominions of Tripoli alone.

Rupin had married Helvis of Cyprus, in 1210. Eschive, the first fruit of this marriage, when supposed to be the same person as Beatrix, must have been from 15 to 17 years of age at the arrival of Frederic II. at Syria, in 1228, and consequently of an age most likely to win his heart. The union not being lawful, and the princess having continued in the same circumstances during the remainder of her life, or perhaps having soon after died, she may have been represented as having died unmarried. If these conjectures be right, it will follow that *Eschive*, or *Beatrix*, really was, as she is stated to have been, the genuine princess of Antioch; she was, by her father's right, the representative of the elder branch of Boemond III. which had been improperly dispossessed.

Proceeding on this supposition, I find the ground on which the crown of Cyprus was entitled to the succession of the Antiochian state; and I detect another inaccuracy in the continuator of William of Tyre, when stating that the king who then reigned in that island *urbis imperium nescio quo jure poscebat*. This king was Henry I. by his father Hugues I. grandson to Amaury, and consequently the cousin, and the nearest relation, of Eschive. Admitting then that the principality of Antioch, on the death of this princess without lawful issue, ought to have been conferred on some of her collaterals, Henry was better entitled to it than any other pretender.

My conjectures acquire an additional force from the authority of Sanutus and of Abulfeda, quoted by des Guignes. These writers relate, that in 1268, (Abulfeda incorrectly says the 666th year of the Heg.) when sultan Bendocnar, or Bibars, took Antioch, prince Boemond resided at Tripoli; a circumstance which would be unaccountable, if he be supposed to have kept the possession of the former place, then so much in need of defence.

I must, however, not omit, that in the name of the patriarch who governed the Latin church of Antioch, at the time of its destruction, there are some equivocations which seem to impair the statement of the continuator of William of Tyre. On the authority of this historian, I have already said, that, when Conrad passed to Italy, the defence of his state was by him committed to the patriarch Opizo de Fieschi of Genoa. In the *Art de Verifier les Dates*, on the contrary, I find that, according to Bollandus's description, the ninth and last patriarch of Antioch was a Dominican friar of the name Christian, who, on the capture of the city, was slaughtered by the Mussulmans, in a church belonging to his order; and I do not see any way to conciliate this incidental contradiction, unless by fancying that, as the candidates for monastic life, on taking the religious habit, generally changed their secular names, most likely the same prelate has been promiscuously noticed by the name he bore in the world, and that which he bore in the cloister.

As long as my conjectures are not confirmed, the history of Antioch will evidently exhibit two great desiderata. First, to ascertain who was that princess Beatrix, so much noticed by the western, and so much overlooked by the eastern, historians; and, secondly, who were the real possessors of that state, from 1233

to 1268. I hope that some others may be more successful than I have been in this research, or that the two facts in question may be brought accidentally to light. I do not see, in effect, how any farther disquisitions could be regularly instituted on this subject, when all the works which I have directly or indirectly mentioned, and which indeed contain almost the whole historical repository of the thirteenth century, have eluded my zeal towards the discovery.

F. DAMIANI.

London, March 19, 1804.