THE WAR OF THE ANTIOCHENE SUCCESSION. LEWON I'S GAME OF DIPLOMACY[1]

DAVID-LINUS-EMANUEL NEAGU
(University of Bucharest)

The year 1198 marks the renaissance of the Armenian kingship for the last time. After only a year from his coronation, Lewon I sent a letter to Innocent III trying to secure his help in a war for the Antiochene succession which opposed his nephew, Raymond-Rupen, to Bohemond IV, count of Tripoli. The present article seeks to present and analyse Lewon's foreign policy during this conflict, especially his diplomatic approaches towards the papacy.

Keywords: Lewon I, Bohemond IV, Cilicia, Antioch, Innocent III.

On 6th January 1198, Lewon II, *prince of the Mountains*[2], was crowned "Dei et Romani imperii gratia, rex Armenie"[3], an event which marked the rebirth of the Armenian kingship for the last time. A year after his coronation, Lewon sent a letter to Innocent III, complaining about a problem regarding the right of his nephew, Raymond-Rupen, to the governance of Antioch. At first glance it seemed to be a small local problem, but it was just a glimpse of a much more complex war which monopolized Lewon I's whole reign.

In 1193, Lewon, still just an Armenian prince, lured Bohemond III of Antioch to the castle of Baghras. When the Latin prince arrived there, Lewon seized him and sent him to prison in Sis. Henry of Champagne[4] intervened and convinced Lewon to release Bohemond in exchange for a marriage between Alice, daughter of Lewon's deceased brother, Rupen III, and Raymond, Bohemond's

[1] This article is an improved version of a chapter from my master's dissertation, *The Kingdom of Cilician Armenia and the Papacy (1198–1226)*, coordinated by Lect. univ. Marian Coman.

[2] Lewon appeared bearing this title in the German chronicles of the Third Crusade, *see The History of the Expedition of the Emperor Frederick*, in *The Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa. The History of the Expedition of the Emperor Frederick and Related Texts*, G.A. Loud (trans.), Farnham and Burlington, 2010, p. 114; *The Chronicle of Magnus of Reichersberg*, in G.A. Loud, *op. cit.*, p. 163; *The Chronicle of Otto of St. Blasien 1187–1197*, in G.A. Loud, *op. cit.*, p. 180.

[3] Victor Langlois, *Le trésor des chartes d'Arménie ou cartulaire de la chancellerie royale des roupéniens*, Venise, 1863, V, p. 115 (Hencefort-Victor Langlois…). This phrase appeared in many other documents issued by the royal chancery during Lewon's rule.

[4] Henry of Champagne was married to Isabella I of Jerusalem, but had never been crowned as *king of Jerusalem*, see Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, vol. III, *The Kingdom of Acre and the Later Crusades*, Cambridge, 1995, p. 82–83.

oldest son and heir to the Antiochene principality. If this union produces a male child, he would have inherited the principalities of Armenia and Antioch[5].

Raymond married Alice, but soon he died while his wife was pregnant with a boy, who was named Raymond-Rupen. Bohemond III died too in 1201 and his son, Bohemond IV, seized the power in Antioch[6]. In that moment, Lewon considered that the latter usurped Raymond-Rupen's right to inherit Antioch, thus starting the War of the Antiochene Succession.

Although it was a local conflict, its impact on the Latin politics in the Orient drew also the involvement of the pope, the German emperor, and even the Muslim rulers from the Levantine territories. The Papacy was preparing another crusade, thus a war in Syria might have endangered this future expedition. Also, usually, every oriental crusade was conducted together with the Christian forces from the Levant[7]. Thus, Innocent III wanted to conclude peace between Lewon I and Bohemond IV as soon as possible[8].

The War of the Antiochene Succession has captured the attention of historians. Leonce Alishan (Ghevond Alishan) mentioned different episodes of this war in his work, *Léon le Magnifique*[9], which was focused on Lewon I's reign. Claude Cahen presented the evolution of this war in a chapter of his book, *La Syrie du nord à l'époque des croisades*[10]. Steven Runciman resumed the conflict in a few pages when he spoke about the political situation of the Principality of Antioch at the beginning of the thirteenth century[11]. Mary Nickerson Hardwicke presented this war as part of the history of the crusader states in the first half of the thirteenth

[5] Smbat Sparapet, *Chronicle*, Robert Bedrosian (trans.), New Jersey, Long Branch, 2005, p. 41, online at: http://attalus.org/armenian/cssint.htm last accessed on 14.03.2019 (Henceforth – Smbat-Bedrosian…); Smbat Sparapet, *Chronique du royaume de la Petite Arménie*, in *RHC. Documents arméniens*, tom. I, Paris, 1869, p. 631–632 (Henceforth – Smbat-RHC…); Smbat Sparapet, *Taregirk*, Venetik, 1956, p. 206–207 (Henceforth – Smbat-Armenian…): *Annales de Terre-Sainte*, Reinhold Röhricht and Gaston Raynaud (eds.) in *Archives de l'Orient latin,* tom. II, Paris, 1884, p. 434 (Henceforth – *Annales de Terre-Sainte…*); *Chronique de Terre-Sainte,* in *Les Gestes des Chiprois. Recueil de chroniques françaises écrites en Orient aux XIII^e & XIV^e siècles*, Gaston Raynaud (ed.), Genève, 1887, p. 15 (Henceforth – *Chronique de Terre-Sainte*…); *Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le Trésorier*, M.L. de Mas Latrie (ed.), Paris, 1871, p. 321 (Henceforth – Ernoul…).

[6] *Annales de Terre-Sainte*, p. 435; *Chronique de Terre Sainte*, p. 16; Smbat-Bedrosian, p. 99; Smbat-Armenian, p. 214; Ernoul, p. 321.

[7] During the Second Crusade, the Western kings (Conrad III and Louis VII) had united their armies with the Jerusalemite forces and had laid siege to Damascus, see Christopher Tyerman, *God' War. A New History of the Crusades*, London, 2007, p. 329–335. Theoretically, the Westerners had coordinated their actions with the Latins from Outremer during the Third Crusade, although this cooperation was disturbed by the conflicts between Guy of Lusignan and Conrad of Montferrat, on the one hand, and between Richard I and Philip II, on the other hand, see Christopher Tyerman, *op. cit.*, p. 403–474.

[8] Innocent III lamented in his bull *Post miserabile* that the European kings and princes were busy living a sinful life and waging war one against the other, while nobody seemed to be moved by the loss of the Holy Land, *see* Jessalynn Bird, Edward Peters and James M. Powell (eds.), *Crusade and Christendom. Annotated Documents in Translations from Innocent III to the Fall of Acre, 1187–1291*, Philadelphia, 2013, p. 32.

[9] Leonce M. Alishan, *Léon le Magnifique, premier roi de Sissouan ou de l'Arménocilicie*, George Bayan (trans.), Venise, 1888.

[10] Claude Cahen, *La Syrie du nord à l'époque des croisades*, Paris, 1940, p. 596–623, 624–635.

[11] Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, vol. III, p. 135–139.

century[12]. Sirarpie der Nersessian spoke briefly about this matter in an article which overviewed the history of the Kingdom of Cilician Armenia[13]. Claude Mutafian[14] and Jacob Ghazarian[15] presented briefly this conflict in their books on the Kingdom of Cilician Armenia. Christopher Tyerman only mentioned this war when he spoke about the situation of Outremer in the thirteenth century[16]. Joschen Burgtorf discussed about the military history, the legal debates and the alliances of this war[17]. All these works presented this conflict from different perspectives as part of the Armenian kingdom orof the Crusader states. In this study, I want to offer a new perspective on this war, analysing it as Lewon I's game of diplomacy, emphasizing the involvement of Western power-brokers and how the Armenian king used various instruments in his search for allies.

Lewon had not been at good terms with Bohemond III of Antioch since he succeeded his brother, Rupen III, as ruler of the Armenian principality of Cilicia. Smbat Sparapet noted that „he took for a wife the daughter of the brother of the wife of the prince of Antioch [...] Lewon gladly took her since he feared the prince and had always distrusted him and felt that having a wife who was the prince's relative would preserve him from any wickedness on the prince's part. And indeed, this turned out to be the case"[18]. Maybe, Lewon suspected that Bohemond wanted to extend his authority over the Armenian lands. According to Vahram of Edessa, the prince of Antioch had seized Rupen by treachery and had held him as prisoner because he had desired to conquer Cilicia[19].

Joschen Burgtorf emphasized that Lewon inherited his brother's conflict with the Principality of Antioch. Regarding the fight for influence and power in Northern Syria between Lewon and Bohemond III, both have developed royal ambitions. The Latin prince payed homage in 1190 to Frederick VI of Swabia, which consolidated the links between Antioch and Western rulers. Lewon became nervous, because he realized that Bohemond's power was growing, thus, in 1191, he seized the castle of Baghras. Also, in 1193, he imprisoned the Latin prince in Sis, to revenge

[12] Mary Nickerson Hardwicke, *The Crusader States, 1192–1243,* in *History of the Crusades,* Kenneth M. Setton (ed.), vol. II, *The Later Crusades,* Robert Lee Wolf and Harry W. Hazard (eds.), Madison, Milwaukee and London, 1969, p. 522–556.

[13] Sirarpie Der Nersessian, *The Kingdom of Cilician Armenia,* in *History of the Crusades,* Kenneth M. Setton (ed.), vol. II, *The Later Crusades,* p. 630–659.

[14] Claude Mutafian, *Le royaume arménien de Cilicie, XII^e-XIV^e siècle,* Paris, 1993, p. 45–50. Unfortunately, I did not have the opportunity to read Mutafian's book *L'Arménie du Levant (XI^e–XIV^e siècle),* Paris, 2012.

[15] Jacob G. Ghazarian, *The Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia during the Crusades. The integration of Cilician Armenians with the Latin, 1080–1393,* London and New York, 2014, p. 126–128.

[16] Christopher Tyerman, *op. cit.,* p. 716.

[17] Joschen Burgtorf, *The Antiochene War of Succesion,* in *The Crusader World,* Adrian J. Boas (ed.), London and New York, 2016, p. 196–211.

[18] Smbat-Bedrosian, p. 91; Smbat-RHC, p. 629–630; Smbat-Armenian, p. 201.

[19] Vahram d'Edesse, *Chronique rimée des rois de la Petite Arménie*, in *RHC. Doc.arm.,* tom. I, p. 510. These chronicles were written in the thiteenth century. Thus, the relation between Bohemond III and Lewon II before 1193/94 might have been presented in the light of the War of the Antiochene Succession.

Bohemond's kidnaping of Rupen III[20]. Therefore, the War of the Antiochene Succession had its roots in the fight for power and influence between the Armenian princes of Cilicia and the Latin princes of Antioch.

The actors of this war can be placed on multiple levels. At the centre of this war were Lewon and Raymond-Rupen, on the one hand, and Bohemond IV, on the other. Their stake was represented by asserting control over the Principality of Antioch. On the next level were the military orders: the Templars were Bohemond's allies, while the Hospitallers and the Teutonic Knights sided with Lewon and Raymond-Rupen. The Templars wanted to reassert their control over the castle of Baghras[21], while the Hospitallers and the Teutonic Knights considered this war as an opportunity to receive properties in Cilicia as a reward for supporting Raymond-Rupen's cause. The inhabitants of Antioch can be placed on the same level. According to Joshua Prawer, the Latin burgesses had religious reasons for supporting Bohemond against Lewon, regarding that they considered the Armenian Church as being autonomous, not being submitted for real to the authority of the pope, while the Greeks were not at good terms with the Armenians[22]. On the same level may be placed too the local Muslim rulers, like the Emir of Aleppo or the Seljuk Sultan of Rûm, who exploited the weaknesses of the Armenian kingdom and the Antiochene principality in order to conquer new territories. Also, they wanted to check the potential ascension of either Lewon I or Bohemond IV, thus, at certain moments, they allied with one of them against the other[23]. On the last level are the popes, the kings of Cyprus and the German emperors. Innocent III wanted to keep the Armenian Church under his authority, but did not want to encourage a war between Christians, regarding his preparations for the Fourth and the Fifth Crusades[24]. Although he did not have claims to material gains, unlike Lewon, Bohemond, the military orders or the Muslims rulers, he was actively involved in this conflict, as it appears from his letters, thus emphasizing his parental role for the Christians. Henry VI and Otto of Brunswick supported Lewon I in an attempt at maintaining a faithful vassal in the Orient, in order to block any attempts of the Byzantine emperors to recover Cilicia or reinstate their influence there[25]. Also, they wanted to emphasize

[20] Joschen Burgtorf, *op. cit*¸ p. 198–199.

[21] In 1191, Lewon occupied the fortress of Baghras, which had been controlled by the Templars, and because of its strategical importance, the Armenians could have endangered the security of the principality, thus Bohemond IV determined the military order to side with him in order to retrieve their castle, *see* Claude Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 582.

[22] Joshaw Prawer, *Crusader Institutions*, Oxford, 1980, p. 69.

[23] Az-Zahir of Aleppo supported Bohemond IV against Lewon I until he received news about a new crusade, which determined him to unite with nal-Adil I, Sultan of Egypt, against their common enemy, see Claude Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 620–621.

[24] As Steven Runciman said, it was essential for Innocent III to settle this conflict as soon as possible, because it might have endangered the crusading movement, *see* Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, vol. III, p. 135.

[25] For Henry VI's reasons for offering royal crowns to Amalric of Lusignan and Lewon II, *see* Edgard Johnson, *The Crusades of Frederick I and Henry VI*, in *A History of the Crusades*, Kenneth M. Setton (ed.), vol. II, *The Later Crusades*, p. 116–119.

the power and prestige of the empire and to consolidate their authority[26]. The kings of Cyprus were only episodic actors in this conflict. For instance, Amalric I chose to support a Latin prince who rebelled against Bohemond IV[27].

As I have said earlier, in 1193/94 Lewon imprisoned Bohemond III in Sis and Henry of Champagne mediated this conflict by concluding a marriage between Bohemond's heir, Raymond, and Lewon's niece, Alice[28]. According to Ernoul, Lewon was freed from his vassalage owed to Bohemond, while the latter had to pay homage to the Armenian prince[29]. Before Henry of Champagne mediated this conflict, Lewon had sent some nobles to occupy Antioch, but the population rejected the Armenians and constituted a *commune*, supported by the Latin burgesses and the Greeks[30]. It seemed that the conflict was over, but in 1198, Bohemond IV of Tripoli, one of Bohemond III's sons, casted his father away from Antioch, identified with the commune and determined its members and the military orders, especially the Templars, to support his rule[31]. Thus, he violated the agreement between Lewon and Bohemond III.

The Templars chose to support Bohemond IV of Tripoli, because by doing this, they hoped to reassert their control over the fortress of Baghras. They had received this castle, alongside Darbsak and La Roche Guillaume, from Raynald of Châtillon, after his victory against Thoros II, Lord of Cilicia between 1144/45–1169, in 1155[32]. Saladin conquered Baghras and demolished its walls in 1191, and in the same year Lewon seized the castle and fortified it, but did not retroceded to the Templars[33]. Baghras, Darbsak and La Roche Guillaume guarded the gorges which linked Cilicia with the Principality of Antioch and the Emirate of Aleppo[34]. Thus, in the context of the conflict between Lewon and Bohemond III, whoever controlled Baghras might have easily invaded either Cilicia, or Northern Syria. Thus, it is understandable that as the War of the Antiochene Succession has developed, Lewon has continued to assert his control over this fortress[35].

[26] *Ibidem*.

[27] Claude Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 609.

[28] Smbat-Bedrosian, p. 94; Smbat-RHC, p. 631–632; Smbat-Armenian, p. 206–207; *Annales de Terre-Sainte*, p. 434; *Chronique de Terre-Sainte*, p. 15; Ernoul, p. 321.

[29] Ernoul, p. 321: *Li pais fu tele que li princes quita l'omage al segnor d'Ermenie et devint ses hom*.

[30] Claude Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 583–584; Joshua Prawer, *op. cit.*, p. 69. Some barons accepted the Armenian rule, given that they were not fond with Bohemond and many of them might have had Armenian blood, *see* Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, vol. III, p. 88.

[31] Joshua Prawer, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

[32] Marie-Anna Chevalier, *Les forteresses des ordres militaires en Arménie: un atout indispensable dans l'accomplissement de leur mission*, in *Castelos das Ordens Militares*, Isabel Christina Ferreira Fernandes (ed.), vol. II, Lisbon, 2014, p. 206.

[33] Claude Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 582.

[34] Marie-Anna Chevalier, *Les forteresses des ordres militaires en Arménie: un atout indispensable dans l'accomplissement de leur mission*, p. 208.

[35] The first fief-holder from the coronation list which appeared in Smbat Sparapet's chronicle is Adam of Baghras, *see* Smbat-Bedrosian, p. 96; Smbat-RHC, p. 636; Smbat-Armenian, p. 209: *իշխանն Պաղրասայ Ատանն*. If the enumeration of the fief-holders was based on their rank in the kingdom, this may prove that, at least for Lewon, Baghras was, maybe, the most important fief from the Armenian kingdom. Still, there is the possibility that the order in which the ranks were presented was based on other criteria.

Bohemond IV's gesture to occupy Antioch was perceived by Lewon as a violation of Raymond-Rupen's right to inherit the Latin principality. He sent a letter to Innocent III in 1199 asking for the pope's judgement regarding the Antiochene succession. According to it, Raymond-Rupen, who had been baptized by the archbishop of Mainz, was acknowledged as Raymond's successor by the Antiochene nobles. However, the count of Tripoli, together with the Templars and the Hospitallers, have occupied Antioch, thus violating Raymond-Rupen's right as heir to the principality, and they might have even wanted to invade the Cilician kingdom[36]. Innocent III replied to Lewon's letter, saying that he could not judge this matter in the absence of a representative from the other party. Thus, he urged Lewon to wait for the judgement of the papal legates and refrain from any military action against his fellow Christians. Rather, he should have concentrated his war effort against the Saracens, placing the cause of the Cross above his own problems[37]. It is worth mentioning that Lewon followed a trend in Latin Europe, namely, to address succession problems to the papacy. For example, Blanche of Navarre acted in the same way when she tried to secure the County of Champagne for her son. Thus, she asked the papacy to investigate Isabella I's subsequent marriages to Conrad of Montferrat and Henry of Champagne in order to exclude her daughters, Alice and Philippa, from the inheritor's line of the county[38].

It is worth mentioning that before this letter, Lewon had sent another one where he spoke about his desire to bring all Armenians under the authority of the Roman Church: „In vestri vero luminis gratia salutaribus monitis reverendissimi patris nostri archiepiscopi Maguntini instructi et informati, omne regnum nobis a Deo commissum amplissimum et spatiosum et omnes Armenios huc illuc in remotis partibus diffusos, ad unitatem sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae, divina inspirante clementia, revocare cupimus et exoptamus"[39]. This letter is dated on 23 May 1199 and Innocent replied to it on 8 December 1199. Lewon's second letter, about the Antiochene succession, is not dated, but the pope wrote his reply to it on 16 January 1200. Most likely, Lewon sent these two letters one after the other and I think that he said in the first one that he wanted to unite all Armenians with the Roman Church because he was trying to pave the way for the second one, hoping that in this way he would have convinced Innocent to support Raymond-Rupen's claim to Antioch.

It seems that Innocent III was favourable to Lewon's cause, as it appeared in his letter: „cum etsi etiam nobis de veritate constaret"[40]. Still, for the pope it was more important to settle this problem and to convince Lewon not to attack the

[36] *Innocentii III romani pontificis. Regestorum sive epistolarum*, lib. II, CLII, in *Patrologia Latina*, tom. CCXIV, J.P. Migne (ed.), Paris, 1891, p. 810–812 (Henceforth – *Innocentius III…*).

[37] *Ibidem*, CCLIII, p. 813–814; In English, *see The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, James M. Powell (trans.), Washington D.C., 2004, p. 206–208 (Henceforth – *The Deeds of Innocent III*…).

[38] Sara McDougall, *Royal Bastards. The Birth of Illegitimacy, 800–1230*, Oxford, 2017, p. 244.

[39] *Innocentius III*, lib. II, CCXIX, in *PL*, p. 778.

[40] *See* note 37.

count of Tripoli. Innocent's attitude is explainable. Cilician Armenia had enjoyed a prestigious position in the Levant at the end of the twelfth century, as can be seen from a letter which Clement III addressed to Lewon, encouraging him to help the Christians in their attempts to free the Holy Places[41]. Innocent III has continued to consider the Armenians as crusaders, thus he sent to Lewon the standard of Saint Peter and offered the Armenians the remission of sins in exchange for their effort to fight against the enemies of the Cross[42]. Still, the pope offered only the spiritual privileges of the crusade. The absence of the material ones may be explained by Innocent's reluctance not to further complicate this war[43]. If Lewon had received a guaranty from the Church regarding the safety of his kingdom, he would have used it against Bohemond IV: any attack conducted by the latter against Lewon would have been perceived as an action against crusaders, thus Bohemond would have been excommunicated. Regarding that Lewon did not received the privilege of having his kingdom protected by the Church, he had to be more careful and had to avoid any reckless attack against the Latins.

After Saladin had captured Jerusalem, Bohemond III concluded a truce with him[44]. The Prince of Antioch did not have any contribution to the Third Crusade

[41] It seems that this letter was preserved only in its Armenian translation, see Zara Pogossian, *The Letter of Love and Concord. A Revised Diplomatic Edition with Historical and Textual Comments and English Translation*, Leiden – Boston, 2010, p. 14, n. 30. Leonce Alishan published this letter in French in his work, *Léon le Magnifique*, p. 162–165, n. 2. According to it, Clement III encouraged Lewon to fight against the enemies of the Cross: "Que Dieu t'épargne, toi, à qui il a confié un peuple ignorant, en te plaçant comme une lumière au milieu de ce pays afin que tu les éclaires! Observe ce douloureux et terrible événement et viens-lui en aide chaque jour par ton énergie; réconforte le peuple qui t'a été confié, afin qu'en te voyant zélé, tous les peuples de l'Arménie qui sont placés sous ta tutelle se préparent à la délivrance des Lieux-Saints, soit par l'aide de leurs armes, soit par des dons sur leurs biens, soir par l'appui de leurs personnes, pour vaincre et abaisser les fiers dans des batailles". Moreover, Clement III offered the remission of sins to the Armenians who were ready to fight for the deliverance of the Holy Land: "Nous qui sommes le vicaire de Jésus-Christ et qui avons le pouvoir de remettre les péchés à tous les Chrétiens de faire pénitence pour leurs péchés".

[42] *Innocentius III*, in *PL*, tom. CCXIV, lib. II, CCLV, p. 815; *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, CXII, p. 208–209.

[43] For the material privileges, *see* Christopher Tyerman, *How to plan a crusade*, London, 2016, p. 138: […] *crucesignati*, their families and possessions received ecclesiastical protection and were allowed to postpone litigations in courts, avoid repayment of debts, acquire interest-free loans, enjoy certain tax exemptions, and freely sell or mortgage property.

[44] Bohemond met with Saladin and asked the sultan to give him Antioch. Saladin agreed and, moreover, provided him with food for himself and the Antiochene citizens. Smbat-Armenian, p. 203: „Եւ նա ասէ. խնդիրս ունիմ առ քեզ, եթէ կատարեսցես՝ Նստայց. և ասե՝ կատարեալ է զոր խնդրես, ասա. և ասե բրինձս. խնդրեմ ի քէն պարգեւել ինձ զԱնտիոք: Եւ ասէ սուլտանն՝ պարգեւեալ է, և ի վերայ այդորիկ զ ամաց կերակուր քեզ և քաղաքին քո ես տաց: Եւ արար սէր կատարեալ և դարձաւ յԱնտիոք, և լցաւ քաղաքն առատութեամբ և կերակրոք". In English, Smbat-Bedrosian, p. 92: «And [the prince] said: `I have a request to make of you, and will be seated if you grant it` [The sultan] answered: `What are you requesting will be granted. Say what it is. The prince spoke: `I request that you grant me Antioch.` The sultan replied: `I grant that. And further, I will give three months' worth of food to you and

and in 1192 signed a ten-year truce with Saladin[45]. Thus, it seemed that Lewon was the only Christian ruler from the East, besides the Syrian nobles and the king of Cyprus, who could have helped the crusaders against the Muslims. It is important to say that besides the two letters mentioned above, by which Innocent advised Lewon not to go to war against Bohemond IV and sent him the standard of Saint-Peter, there is one more, addressed to the nobles, soldiers and common people from the Armenian kingdom. This last papal letter praised the effort of the Armenian Christians in their struggles with the unbelievers and granted them the standard of Saint Peter and the remission of sins[46]. In this way, Innocent III wanted to convince the Armenians to continue their fight against the Muslims and, most likely, to support the new crusade which was in preparation. It is very interesting how Innocent handled all these matters. The pope wanted to speak about the Antiochene succession in a private letter, addressed only to Lewon. But when it was about exhorting the Armenians to fight against the Muslims, Innocent addressed the letter to all the Armenians from the Cilician kingdom. It is important to emphasize that the pope sent two different letters to Lewon: one was about the Antiochene succession and the other one offered him the standard of Saint-Peter, encouraging him to use it against *inimicos crucis*. Thus, Lewon had to wait for the judgement of the papal legates and in the meantime, he should have fought against the enemies of the Cross, regarding that the Armenians received the standard of Saint-Peter and the remission of sins. Innocent hoped that by doing this, he would have convinced the Armenian king to refrain from any military activity in northern Syria. For the moment, the pope's policy worked.

In 1201, Bohemond III died, and his son, Bohemond IV of Tripoli, became prince of Antioch[47]. Some Antiochene nobles left Antioch and took refuge to the Cilician court. Their names are the following: Olivier the Chamberlain; Roger du Mont; Louard; Thomas Masleburn; Bohemond Lair; Guillaume de l'Isle[48]. It is interesting that in Smbat's coronation list appeared a Latin name, Tancred, prince of Kapan[49]. But *Tancred* seems to have been a Norman name, thus it is possible that he might have left Antioch before Lewon's coronation in 1198. Soffredus, Cardinal of Santa Prassede and one of the papal legates who have mediated the Antiochene Succession said that Bohemond IV „had unjustly occupied Antioch and with the help of a majority of the citizens had ejected the nobles from most of the city, because they were unwilling to violate the oath of fidelity that they had sworn

the city` [Bohemond] made complete friendship [with the sultan] and returned to Antioch, and the city filled up with plentitude and food`».

[45] Malcom Barber, *The Crusader States*, New Haven – London, 2012, p. 354; Peter Lock, *The Routledge Companion to the Crusades*, London – New York, 2006, p. 78.

[46] *Innocentius III*, lib. II, CCLIV, in *PL*, tom. CCXIV, p. 814–815; *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, CXII, p. 208–209.

[47] *Annales de Terre-Sainte*, p. 435; *Chronique de Terre Sainte*, p. 16 ; Smbat-Bedrosian, p. 99; Smbat-Armenian, p. 214; Ernoul, p. 321. Steven Runciman considered that Bohemond IV had reconciled with his father before his death, see Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, vol. III, p. 100.

[48] Smbat-Bedrosian, p. 97; Smbat-RHC, p. 639; Smbat-Armenian, p. 211.

[49] Smbat-Bedrosian, p. 96; Smbat-RHC, p. 636; Smbat-Armenian, p. 209: իշխ. Կապնուն Տանկրի

to the firstborn son of their prince"[50]. Most likely, these were the nobles who took refuge at Lewon's court. There were also other Antiochene nobles who had entered Rupen III's service in 1180, when Bohemond III married with Sibyl. Regarding that she was suspected to be one of Saladin's spies, some members of the nobility did not agree with this marriage and moved to Cilicia. According to William of Tyre, these nobles were Giscard of Lille, Bertrand, son of Count Gislebert, and Garinus Gainart[51]. Most likely, Tancred had also left Antioch with this group of discontented nobles.

Lewon sent another letter to Innocent III, lamenting about the anti-Christian actions undertaken by the count of Tripoli, who had allied with Rokn ed-Din Soleiman II, sultan of Konya, against the Cilician kingdom. The Armenian king wanted to create two opposite images: a *bad* one, represented by the count of Tripoli who worked with Muslims against Christians, and a *good* one, represented by himself, who asked for troops to fight off the Saracens, regarding that they were battling each other, thus the Christians would have had the upper hand over them. Lewon emphasized that failing to fight the Muslims would have increased their power, because they might have concluded peace among them and in this context, the Christians wouldn't have a chance to resist them[52]. Thus, the Armenian king created this anti-thesis between him and the count of Tripoli, because it seemed that he was concerned more with the fate of the Levantine Christians, than with the Antiochene Succession.

Furthermore, the Armenian king agreed with Innocent's idea of judging this matter via his legates, but he mentioned that he would have been very happy if Conrad of Wittelsbach, the archbishop of Mainz, would have received this task[53]. Moreover, Lewon said that he knew about a letter which Innocent had sent to Bohemond asking him to withdraw *from the right of another*[54] and he thanked the pope for his attitude. The archbishop of Mainz had crowned Lewon in 1198[55] and had baptized Raymond-Rupen in the same year[56]. Thus, Lewon was trying to

[50] *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, CXVIIII, p. 221.

[51] William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, Emily Atwater Babcock and A.C. Krey (trans.), vol. II, New York, 1943, p. 454–457. Andrew Buck considered that these nobles who left Antioch in the rebellion, which took place between 1180–1182, were, actually, Bohemond's allies and were forced to leave by the rebels. Their departure represented a clause in a resolution concluded between the prince of Antioch and the rebellious barons, see Andrew D. Buck, "The Noble Rebellion at Antioch, 1180–82: A Case Study in Medieval Frontier Politics", *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 60, 2016, p. 112–113.

[52] *Innocentius III*, lib. III, XLIII, in *PL*, tom. CCXIV, p. 1003–1006; *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, CXIII, p. 209–213.

[53] *Innocentius III*, lib. III, XLIII, in *PL*, tom. CCXIV, p. 1005; *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, CXIII, p. 211.

[54] *Innocentius III*, lib. III, XLIII, in *PL*, tpm. CCXIV, p. 1005: „Scripsistis etiam nobis quod per litteras vestras misistis comiti Tripolitano, ut de alieno jure se subtraheret"; *The Deeds of Pope Innocent*, p. 211.

[55] *Annales de Terre Sainte*, p. 435; Florio Bustron, *Chronique de l'Île de Chypre*, Réne de Mas Latrie, Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1884, p. 54 (Henceforth – Florio Bustron…); *Chronique de Terre Sainte*, p. 16.

[56] *Innocentius III*, lib. II, CCLII, in *PL*, tom. CCXIV, p. 811.

convince Innocent to send as papal legate a bishop which could have supported Raymond-Rupen's claim to the Antiochene principality.

In order to fight the Muslims, Lewon hoped that the Templars would help him, regarding that they had possessions in Cilicia valued up to 20.000 bezants. He received from the Grand Master some letters which Innocent had sent to the Templars by which he demanded Lewon to hand over Baghras to its former masters. In order to solve this problem, he met with the Grand Master and proposed him to send embassies to the Holy See, but he refused. Lewon made another offer: he would keep Baghras and would have helped the Templars to acquire the castle of Darbsak. Still, the Grand Master refused this proposal and, moreover, he ordered the retreat of the Templars from Cilicia, regarding that he heard that a Muslim army was preparing to invade the kingdom[57].

Lewon combined the crusading rhetoric and the refusal of the Templars in an attempt to carve out a positive image of himself, a victim of the plot mastered by Bohemond IV and the Order of the Templars against the Armenian kingdom. Thus, he allowed himself to ask for a favor from the papacy, namely, to place the kingdom under Innocent's direct authority, such that nobody else could have excommunicated him or the Armenian Christians from Cilicia[58]. Most likely, Lewon did this because he was afraid that he might have been excommunicated by the clerics from Bohemond's entourage[59]. It is important to say that Lewon was not the only monarch who wanted to place himself under the authority of the pope. Peter II of Aragon[60], Emeric of Hungary[61], Johannitsa[62] and John Lackland[63] became also vassals of Innocent III.

Lewon started to gather allies, thus by two chrysobulls he offered various privileges to the Genoese[64] and Venetians[65]. Most likely, this decision had the purpose of countering Bohemond IV's support of the Italian cities, regarding that on 26th August 1199, he had offered privileges to the Pisans[66]. Lewon had also the support of the Antiochene nobles who took refuge in Cilicia, thus it seems that he was preparing for a future clash with Bohemond IV. However, Innocent III hoped

[57] *Innocentius III*, lib. II, XLIII, in *PL*, tom. CCXIV, p. 1005–1006; *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, p. 211–212.

[58] *Ibidem.*

[59] Marie-Anna Chevalier, *La correspondance entre les élites arméniennes et la papauté pendant la régne de Lewon premier*, in „Eurasian Studies", nr. XI, 2013, p. 238.

[60] Achille Luchaire, *Innocent III. Les royautés du Saint-Siége*, Paris, 1908, p. 50–58.

[61] *Ibidem*, p. 66–67.

[62] *Ibidem*, p. 104–105.

[63] *Ibidem*, p. 223–224.

[64] Victor Langlois, I, p. 105–108.

[65] *Ibidem*, II, p. 109–112.

[66] *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani*, Reinhold Röhricht (ed.), Oeniponti, 1893, 758, p. 202 (Henceforth-*Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani*…): „Boemundus IV, princeps Antiochiae, comes Tripolis, DCCC bisantiis acceptis, indemnitatem pro variis damnis ipsi et civibus illatis concedit Pisanis et jura ac privilegia sigillo confirmat".

that Lewon would refrain from attacking the Latin prince and sent him a letter in 1202, offering him the privilege of not being excommunicated but by the pope, his legate or a special mandate[67]. Also, in the same year, the Roman pontiff sent another letter to the Armenian catholicos, asking him to explain to Armenians the remission of sins and to exhort them to fight against the enemies of the cross[68]. Although Innocent did not send Conrad of Wittelsbach as papal legate, he still fulfilled one of Lewon's desire. It seems that the Armenian king formulated two requests: the Antiochene Succession to be judged by the archbishop of Mainz – this was the maximal request; to receive the privilege of being excommunicated but by the pope – this was the minimal request. Most likely, he knew that it was difficult to convince Innocent III to send Conrad of Wittelsbach as his legate in the Orient, but Lewon hoped that by formulating these two requests, he could have obtained at least the minimal one.

In the fall of 1202, a papal legate, Soffredus, cardinal priest of Santa Prassede, arrived at Acre with the mission to end the conflict between Lewon and Bohemond. But he did not manage to bring this conflict to an end, regarding that Bohemond had been excommunicated by the patriarchs of Jerusalem and Antioch because of a disagreement regarding the Hospitallers' revenues earned from the usage of Krak des Chevaliers[69]. In this context, Bohemond said that as an excommunicated man, he couldn't speak with the legate about the Antiochene Succession[70] The situation got complicated, because in 1203 some groups of crusaders arrived in Syria. John of Nesle and Nicholas of Mailly had changed their mind and did not travel to Constantinople, to meet with their master, Baldwin of Flandre, and moved instead to Syria[71]. There, John of Nesle sided with Lewon, while Nicholas of Mailly supported Bohemond IV[72]. According to a letter written by Soffredus and Peter of St. Marcellus, it seems that Lewon had begun to ignore Innocent's advice to not start a war. Soffredus arrived at Antioch right on time, because the Armenian king had already invaded the territories of the principality,

[67] *Innocentius III*, lib. V, XLIV, in *PL*, tom. CCXIV, p. 1007: „Unde petebas tibi per litteras apostolicas indulgeri ut, praeter Romanum pontificem nullus Latinus in te vel regnum tuum vel homines regni tui, sive Latinos, sive alios cujuscunque conditionis, excommunicationis aut interdicti possit sententiam promulgare"*; The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, CXIV, p. 213.

[68] *Innocentius* III, lib. V, XLVI, in *PL*, tom. CCXIV, p. 1012: „Monemus igitur fraternitatem tuam et exhortamur attentius et per apostolica tibi scripta mandamus quatenus, in divini nominis timore persistens et in apostolicae sedis reverendia perseverans, praedictum regem et universam Armeniorum Ecclesiam in lege Domini et nostra devotione confirmes, et eis, sicut per alias litteras nostras mandavimus, formam apostolicae remissionis exponas, et exhorteris ipsos attentius, ut se murum pro domo Domini opponant ascendetibus ex adverso nec dubitent, si opus fuerit, pro illo fundere saguinem, qui pro eis crucis non dubitavit subire tormentum"*; The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, CXV, p. 215.

[69] Joschen Burgtorf, *op. cit.*, p. 204; Claude Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 601.

[70] Claude Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 601.

[71] *The Chronicle of Geoffry de Vilehardouin*, T. Smith (trans.), London, 1829, p. 47–48.

[72] Ernoul, p. 353: John of Nesle met with Lewon while the latter was besieging Antioch: „Jehans de Niele ala au signeur d'Ermenie, a .I. siege qui fu devant Antioce ; et furent veus ses banieres sour les murs d'Antioce, si comme aucunes gens disent".

thus he was threatening its capital. The papal legate managed to conclude an armistice for nine days, waiting for the arrival of the king of Jerusalem[73].

In his letter, Soffredus noted that Lewon promised to send 20.000 soldiers to fight against the Muslims, but this proposal was opposed by the ones whom the papal legate hoped to support his mediation[74]. Soffredus did not achieve anything and his place as Innocent's legate was taken by Peter, cardinal priest of St. Marcellus. In the meantime, Lewon has attacked again the principality and has even entered Antioch but did not manage to hold it for more than three days[75]. Moreover, he intensified his attacks and assaulted the Templar possessions in Cilicia, producing damages worth of 50,000 besants[76].

Lewon sent a letter to Innocent III to justify his actions, saying that the Templars had attacked him and had allied with the count of Tripoli, the Antiochenes and the sultan of Aleppo, az-Zahir I, and they shed Christian blood, thus acting against their own mission as a military order. Therefore, he seized their properties and chased them away from Cilicia[77]. In this context, Peter of St. Marcellus organized a council and promulgated a sentence of excommunication on the Armenian kingdom. The confessions of the sick, the baptism and the burial of the dead were the only religious services which could be practiced[78]. But as it appears in a letter written by the catholicos to the pope, there couldn't have been any ecclesiastical council on a matter which concerned the Armenian Church in the absence of its patriarch or one of his representatives[79]. Thus, this excommunication was fruitless. In the end, the Armenian king concluded peace with the Templars by Soffredus's mediation but asked the pope to exclude Peter from any judge panel concerning the Antiochene Succession[80].

According to the letter written by the two papal legates, Peter of St. Marcellus obliged Lewon and Bohemond to submit themselves to their judgement; otherwise, they would have been excommunicated[81]. Theoretically, Lewon had already been

[73] *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, CXVIII, p. 221–222; *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani*, 794, p. 211–212.

[74] *Ibidem.*

[75] *Annales de Terre Sainte*, p. 435; *Chronique de Terre Sainte*, p. 16.

[76] *Innocentius III*, lib. VI, CLXXXIX, in *PL*, tom. CCXV, p. 504. „Gravem in praesentia nostra dilecti filii…magister et fratres militiae Templi, deposuere querelam, quod tu, quaedam casalia eorum sine rationabili causa succendens, bestias et bladum suum ipsis per violentiam abstulisti, damnum eis ad valens quinquaginta millia bisantiorum pro tuae voluntatis arbitrio inferendo" […].

[77] *Innocentius III*, lib. VIII, CXIX, in *PL*, tom. CCXV, p. 689–690; *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, CXVI, p. 218–219.

[78] *Ibidem.*

[79] *Innocentius III*, lib. VIII, CXX, in *PL*, tom. CCXV, p. 692: „et in conciliis cismarinis interesse, et quod in eisdem ecclesiastica celebrari, nobis absentibus, vel nuntio nostro, concilia non deberent, ab utraque parte statutum est"; *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, CXVII, p. 220.

[80] Lewon accused Peter of St. Marcellus of siding with the Templars against him and working in every way to eliminate him from the Antiochene Succession: „quamquam, dominus P. cardinalis ab ea nos eliminari laboret", *see Innocentius III*, lib. VIII, CXIX, in *PL*, tom. CCXV, p. 691; *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, CXVI, p. 219.

[81] *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, CXVIII, p. 224–225.

excommunicated by Cardinal Peter, thus the presence of this threat meant that in the meantime, he was received back in communion with Rome[82].

It is worth mentioning that Lewon thought that the Templars should not be his enemies, regarding that he was fighting for his nephew's right, thus they should have followed the example of the Hospitallers and other religious men, who were not opposing his effort to achieve justice for Raymond-Rupen[83]. This would imply that the Hospitallers might have already been supporting Lewon in the War of the Antiochene Succession. They received properties in Cilicia in 1210[84], but it is possible that they might have supported the Armenian king since the first years of this war and they were awarded with properties later[85]. The fact that in 1207, Raymond-Rupen, as *princeps Antiochenus*, offered to the Hospitallers *civitatem Gibel*[86], might indicate upon closer links between the Armenians and the knights which might have been established from the beginning of the thirteenth century. It is important also to mention a letter from 1205, written by Innocent III and addressed to Philip II of France, where the pope mentioned the War of the Antiochene Succesion: „inter comitem Tripolitanum et regem Armeniae variae contentiones exortae sint, templarii et Antiocheni priori, hospitalarii et patriarcha Antiochenus alteri faveant, ac filius Saladini, soldanus Aleppiae, partes prioris sequitur"[87]. Thereby, while in 1199 Lewon had complained to Innocent III that the Hospitallers, together with the Templars, had helped Bohemond III to enter Antioch[88], around 1205, they changed sides and allied with the Armenian king. It is worth mentioning that throughout the different conflicts from the Levant, the Hopistallers had a legitimist policy and supported the ones who had a stronger claim based on their legitimacy. During the war of the Antiochene succession, the knights chose to side with the group which had a better support, namely the Armenians, regarding that the nobles from the Principality of Antioch and the pope sided with Raymond-Rupen[89]. Also, the knights had a dispute with Bohemond IV regarding some revenues[90], thus this might have been another reason which determined them to side with Lewon and Raymond-Rupen.

[82] Claude Cahen, *op.cit.*, p. 607, n.19. Most likely, this happened because, as I have just said, the Armenian catholicos had the right to participate at every ecclesiastical council where would have been discussed problems regarding the Armenian Church. Regarding that Peter of St. Marcellus had excommunicated Lewon at a council to which the catholicos had not been invited, this sentence was not available.

[83] *Innocentius III*, lib. VIII, CXIX, in *PL*, CCXV, p. 691: „Et ut Templariis per apostolica scripta mandando praecipitatis, ne de facto Antiocheno justitiae et dricturae nepotis nostri sint adversarii, sicuti non sunt Hospitalarii, nec alii viri religiosi".

[84] Victor Langlois, III, p. 112–114; IV, 115–117.

[85] Marie-Anna Chevalier, *L'Ordre de l'Hôpital et la défense de l'Arménie: Enjeux d'une présence et moyens mis en œuvre*, in Claude Mutafian (ed.), *La Méditeranée des Arméniens : XII^e–XV^e siécle*, Paris, 2014, p. 54–55.

[86] *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani*, 841, p. 224–225.

[87] *Ibidem*, 808, p. 216.

[88] *See* note 36.

[89] Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The Knights Hospitaller in the Levant, c. 1070–1309*, Basingstoke, 2012, p. 54–55.

[90] See note 69.

Bohemond IV had been excommunicated earlier by the patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem, but it did not appear to have been affected at all[91]. In 1204, Marie of Champagne, wife of Baldwin I, arrived in the Levant and the count of Tripoli paid homage to her[92], placing the principality of Antioch under the protection of the Latin Empire of Constantinople. However, Lewon did not appeal to his suzerain, the German emperor, except for the embassy from 1210 which went to Germany and Rome to request a crown for Raymond-Rupen[93]. Joschen Burgtorf considered that by placing the principality under the authority of the Latin Emperor, Bohemond forced the Germain suzerain of the Armenian kingdom to take part in this conflict[94]. It is possible that Lewon might have waited for the opportunity to request a crown for Raymond-Rupen, thus placing his nephew under the suzerainty of the emperor. In this context, he answered to Bohemond's challenge only in 1210. It is worth mentioning that Lewon tried to consolidate his links with the German Empire by strengthening his ties with the Teutonic Knights[95]. Thus, instead of negotiating directly with the emperor, he sent the Teutonic Knights as his ambassadors. Most likely, by paying homage to Marie of Champagne, the count of Tripoli tried to encircle Lewon by gathering allies in Syria and Asia Minor. And, as Steven Runciman said, Bohemond did this to prove to the pope that Antioch was outside papal jurisdiction[96].

Up to this point, Lewon has achieved almost whatever he had wanted. Of course, he did not convince Innocent III to support unconditionally Raymond-Rupen's claim to the throne of Antioch. However, he obtained the privilege of not being excommunicated but by the pope, his legates or a special mandate. Also, it seems that one way or another, his desire of replacing the legates, especially Peter of St. Marcellus, was fulfilled. Innocent sent Peter and Soffredus to Constantinople and the Antiochene Successions was committed to a new court panel, formed up by

[91] As Alexander Murray pointed out, the excommunication was a very complex problem the Catholic Church had to cope with, and in the High and Late Middle Ages, this punishment lost its power. This is why there were many cases when the excommunicated Christian despised this decision and continued to live as nothing happened, *see* Alexander Murray, *Conscience & Authority in the Medieval Church*, Oxford, 2015, p. 163–197.

[92] Albericus de Trium Fontanum, *Ex Chronico Alberici Trium-Fontanum Monachi*, in *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, Léopold Delisle (ed.), tom. 18, Paris, 1879, p. 769: "Cum Imperator Balduinus Comitissam Flandriae mandasset, et illa ad eum venisset, facta de eo gravida, ad partes transmarinas abiit, ubi cum esset in Acra, Princeps Antiochiae ad eam venit, et ibi vice mariti sui tamquam Imperatrici Constantinopolitanae homagium fecit: quo recepto, illa in Acra obiit".

[93] Smbat-Bedrosian, p. 101; Smbat-Armenian, p. 217.

[94] Joschen Burgtorf, *op. cit.*, p. 205.

[95] The first contacts between Armenians and the Teutonic Order may be dated in 1190', when the knights established in the Levant, see Marie-Anna Chevalier, *Les chevaliers teutoniques en Cilicie : «les maccabées» du Royaume arménien*, in „Bizantinistica. Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Slavi", 2004, series secunda, anno VI, Spoleto, Fondazione Centro Italiano di Studi Sull'alto Medioevo, p. 139. Lewon even became a *confrater* of the order, a practice followed up by his successors. The good relations between the Armenian monarchs and the Teutons were part of their policy of consolidating their alliance with the German emperors, see *ibidem*, p. 150–151.

[96] Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, vol. III, p. 136.

the abbot of Mount Tabor and two nobles, the count of Katzenellenbogen and Gerard of Furneval[97]. According to a papal letter addressed to Lewon, Innocent wanted to fulfil his desire[98], namely, to commit the Antiochene Succession to other legates. It is important to say that Peter and Soffredus were not proper judges, but, rather, mediators. Thus, instead of judging this matter in order to decide who was the legitimate heir of Antioch, they tried to solve it as not to harm either Lewon, or Bohemond.

This new court panel did not achieve anything, thereby Peter of St. Marcellus returned in Syria as papal legate in 1205[99]. In the meantime, Bohemond had tried to gather new allies, thus he offered privileges to the Genoese in 1204[100] and 1205[101] and encouraged the Hospitallers to attack Latakia[102], and in 1206 offered them some properties[103]. This time, the Latin prince seems to have acted as to determine the knights to support his cause, instead of siding with Lewon[104]. The Armenian king tried to counter his enemy's plans, thus he supported Renoard of Nefin, a noble from the County of Tripoli, who rebelled against Bohemond[105]. Peter's return to Syria proved to be favourable to Lewon. The papal legate conflicted with Peter of Angoulême, the Latin patriarch of Antioch and he excommunicated the latter. Bohemond IV took profit from this and pillaged or seized the ecclesiastical properties, regarding that he was not at good terms with the Latin patriarch[106]. In this context, Peter of Angoulême sided with Lewon, thus in 1208, he led a revolt against Bohemond IV and forced him to retreat to the citadel. However, the count of Tripoli managed to reassert his control over Antioch[107]. Mary Nickerson Hardwicke considered that Lewon took part in this revolt and entered Antioch with some of his troops[108]. However, it is interesting that in *Annales de Terre Sainte* and *Chronique de Terre Sainte*, Lewon's contribution was not mentioned at all[109]. Paul

[97] *Innocentius III*, lib. VIII, I, in *PL*, tom. CCXV, p. 555–557; *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, CXIX, p. 226–228.

[98] *Innocentius III*, lib. VIII, II, in *PL*, tom. CCXV, p. 558: „Petitioni tuae satisfacere cupientes".

[99] Claude Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 611.

[100] *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani*, 792, p. 210–211.

[101] *Ibidem*, 807, p. 215–216.

[102] Claude Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 608–609.

[103] *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani*, 816, p. 218.

[104] *See* note 87 for Innocent's letter to Philip II of France where it is written that the Hospitallers were Lewon's allies.

[105] Claude Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 609.

[106] *Ibidem*, p. 611–613.

[107] *Ibidem*, p. 613; Jochen Burgtorf, *op. cit.*, p. 201. Claude Cahen considered that this rebellion took place in 1207, *see* Claude Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 613.

[108] Mary Nickerson Hardwicke, *op. cit.*, p. 535–536.

[109] *Annales de Terre Sainte*, p. 436 : "En l'an M. CC et VIII, se revela le commune d'Antioche contre le prinche, et fu par le consel le patriarche" ; *Chronique de Terre Sainte*, p. 17 : "A M. CC. VIII, desconfist le prince Baymont d'Antioche les chevaliers & la coumune qu'il avéent faite, & prist la patriarche qui estoit lor consentant, & le mist en sa prizon où il morut, & vindrent les chevaliers à sa mercy".

Bedoukian studied some coins minted at Sis in 1208 and considered that the presence of Latin inscriptions together with Lewon's name on them might indicate upon the king's desire to annex Antioch, rather than placing Raymond-Rupen on its throne[110]. Still, as I will argue a few pages below, it would have been too dangerous for Lewon to add Antioch to his possessions, given that he couldn't have legitimised this action at all.

After the rebellion was over, Bohemond IV threw Peter of Angoulême in prison, where he died[111]. Innoncent III condemned Bohemond's actions[112], but did not have any power to act against him. In a letter written in 1209, the pope tried to persuade the count of Tripoli to refrain from any actions against the patriarch of Antioch and he did this by using a rhetorical and philosophical discourse, which is a proof that he did not have any instrument at his disposal which could have helped him to force Bohemond to obey his commands[113].

Lewon attacked against the Antiochene territories in 1209 and continued to do this for the entire year, trying to force Bohemond to give up his claim to Antioch, but all was in vain[114]. In the same year, the Armenian king designated Raymond-Rupen as successor and he made all the nobles to pledge their support to his nephew. To be sure that there weren't any other contenders to the Armenian throne, he blinded Gorg, Mleh's illegitimate son[115], „who was a brave man and liked by many"[116]. In this period, Raymond-Rupen became an adult[117] and this explains why Lewon appointed him officially as heir to the Armenian throne. Also, in 1210, the king and his heir offered to the Hospitallers territories and privileges[118]. The fact that Raymond-Rupen appears next to Lewon in documents, means that the king wanted to create a link between the military order and his new heir, thus ensuring that the alliance with the knights will hold even after his death.

[110] Paul Z. Bedoukian, "A Unique Billon of Lewon I of Cilicia Armenia and Its Historical Significance", *The Numismatic Chronicle* (1966–), ser. VII, II, 1967, p. 189–197, here p. 194.

[111] Claude Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 613.

[112] *Innocentius III*, lib. XI, CX, in *PL*, tom. CCXV, p. 1428: "Quasi non suffecissent Antiochenae provinciae impietatum scelera sclerumque impietates quibus graviter iram Domini provocavit, apposuit Tripolitanus comes mittere manum suam in christum Domini, piae memoriae patriarcham Antiochenum patrem ac dominum suum carceri mancipando, in quo tandem miserabiliter exspiravit. O nobilis Antiochia, urbs perfectae decoris, et terrae quasi gaudium universae, quam graviter esse cerneris per tam grave ignobilitata flagitium, quam turpiter per tam turpe facinus offuscata".

[113] *Innocentius III*, lib. XII, XXXIX, in *PL*, tom. CCXVI, p. 48: "Caput Ecclesiae Jesus Christus, qui se honorari fatetur in membris et etiam molestari, tunc feliciter diriget actus tuos cum piis locis et viris ecclesiasticis, qui ejus sunt obsequio specialiter deputati, tuum exhibueris auxilium et favorem. Sic utique Regi regum, qui dominatur a mari usque ad mare et a flumine usque ad terminos orbis terrae, gratum te ac devotum ostendis, si ad nominis ejus gloriam et utilitatem Ecclesiae sponsae suae commissa tibi usus fueris potestate. Si enim gloriam tuam quaeris et finem tui laboris ponis commodum temporale, formidare non immerito poteris ne, quod absit ! is te reddat inglorium qui te fecit successibus temporalibus gloriosum".

[114] Smbat-Bedrosian, p. 101; Smbat-Armenian, p. 217.

[115] Mleh was prince of Cilicia before Rupen III.

[116] Smbat-Bedrosian, p. 101; Smbat-Armenian, p. 216.

[117] Claude Cahen, p. 615.

[118] Victor Langlois, V, p. 115–117.

In this way, Raymond-Rupen had a personal relation with the Hospitallers, without the mandatory mediation of his uncle.

As I have said earlier, Lewon supported Renoard's rebellion against Bohemond. It is important that Aimery of Cyprus, who was both King of Cyprus and Jerusalem, did the same thing, regarding that he disliked Bohemond's claim to autonomy in the County of Tripoli and the Principaliy of Antioch[119]. Thus, most likely, this political choice created some sympathies between Lewon and Aimery of Cyprus. In this context, the relations with the Cypriote monarchy were consolidated by two marriages[120]: Lewon took as wife the sister of the king of Cyprus, Sybilla, and her sister married Raymond-Rupen[121]. According to Claude Mutafian, Lewon's second marriage, which happened after he had repudiated his first wife, Isabella, marked the end of the privileged role of Antioch compared to Cilicia in Outremer. Its place was occupied by Cyprus and the Lusignans from there started to strengthen their links with the Cilician royal dynasty[122]. It is important to mention that Helvis, who became Raymond-Rupen's wife, had been married to a noble from Cyprus, Eudes de Dampierre and was taken or fled from him and married to the Armenian prince. Innocent III wrote a letter to the patriarch of Antioch and said that Eudes accused Raymond-Rupen of having sexual relations with Helvis while she was still married with her former husband[123]. However, I haven't found yet other documents which would suggest an investigation regarding the validity of the marriage between Helvis and Raymond-Rupen. It is worth mentioning that according to Sara McDougall, in the 13th century appeared many accusations of illegitimacy. The purpose was to disinherit and discredit potential claimants to royal or noble titles, as well as property. This type of accusations was new and, usually, had a far more limited impact than it is credited for[124]. It is possible that the above-mentioned letter falls in this category of new accusations. By marrying the sister of the Cypriote king, maybe Raymond-Rupen could have reclaimed the throne for himself, regarding that in 1210, Hugh has just been crowned king of Cyprus and he was still minor and did not have any heirs until

[119] Mary Nickerson Hardwicke, *op. cit.*, p. 534.

[120] Natasha Hodgson, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

[121] Smbat-Bedrosian, p. 101; Smbat-RHC, p. 643; Smbat-Armenian, p. 217; Kirakos Gandjakets'i, *History of the Armenians*, trans. Robert Bedrosian, New York, 1986, p. 123, online at: http://attalus.org/armenian/kg1.htm, last accessed on 14.03.2019 (Henceforth – Kirakos-Bedrosian…); Kirakos de Gantzac, *Histoire d'Arménie*, M. Brosset (transl.), lib. I, St. Petersburg, 1870, p. 79 (Hencefort – Kirakos-Brosset).

[122] Claude Mutafian, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

[123] *Innocentius III*, lib. XIV, CV, in *PL*, tom. CCXVI, p. 466: "Querelam dilecti filii nobilis viri O. de Dempera recepimus continentem quod, licet ipse nobilem mulierem E. sororem charissimi in Christo filii nostri Hugonis Cypri regis illustris legitime duxerit in uxorem, et inter eos matrimonium consummatum exstiterit commistione carnali, nobilis tamen vir. R. nepos illustris regis Armeniae sibi eamdem illicite copulans, in animae suae periculum ispam detinere praesumit".

[124] Sara McDougall, *op. cit.*, p. 236.

1218[125]. Also, maybe Bohemond IV gained the support of Eudes, and by accusing Raymond of committing adultery, he hoped to discredit him. But there are no proofs for these ideas, thus it is also possible that Eudes was just angry that Helvis married Raymond-Rupen.

As I have said earlier, in 1210 the Armenian king made his first donation to the Hospitallers. The knights received the city of Saleph[126], the castles of Norbert and Camardiensum[127] and the city of Laranda[128]. In the case of Laranda, they had the right to start a war and make peace[129]. In 1207, Raymond-Rupen had offered them, as *princeps Antiochenus*, the castle of Giblet, a donation which was confirmed by Lewon[130]. How could Raymond-Rupen offer territories to the Hospitallers regarding that he was not controlling Antioch? Raymond-Rupen entered Antioch only in 1216[131], but he has used the title of *princeps Antiochenus* since 1207 in order to legitimize his claim over the principality. In 1198, Raymond-Rupen was recognized as Bohemond III's heir in a council of the Antiochene nobles[132], thus he had a solid argument for his claim and considered that he was the legitimate prince of Antioch. Of course, in 1207, as the document says[133], he was not sole ruler, Lewon acting as unofficial regent, but this did not stop him from offering privileges to the Hospitallers. By using this rhetoric, he hoped to forge a stronger claim over Antioch. The syntagma „nondum suae potestatis" disappeared from the documents written from 1210 up to 1216. As I have said above, Raymond-Rupen became an adult in 1210, thereby his name started to appear in Cilican royal documents next to Lewon I[134]. Moreover, he styled himself as *princeps Antiochenus*, as he had done in 1207, and granted two

[125] When Hugh died, in 1218, his son, Henry, was eight months old *see* Elizabeth Chapin Furber, *The Kingdom of Cyprus, 1191–1291,* in *A History of the Crusades*, Kenneth M. Setton (ed.), vol. II, *The Later Crusades*, Robert Lee Wolff and Harry W. Hazard (eds.), Madison, Milwaukee, and London, 1969, p. 605.

[126] The Hospitallers attributed significant importance to these new acquisitions. In the following years, Selefke became the headquarter of the knights in Cilicia and started to represent a springboard for a future career in the order, see Judith Bronstein, *The Hospitallers and the Holy Land. Financing the Latin East, 1187–1274*, Woodbridge, 2005, p. 18.

[127] *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani*, 841, p. 224-225.

[128] *Ibidem*, 843, p. 225.

[129] *Ibidem*: "ut bellum et pacem cum Laranda et aliis marchiis facere possint et, quaecunque bello ceperint, cum aliquo partiri nullatenus cogantur".

[130] *Ibidem*, 820, p. 220.

[131] Smbat-Bedrosian, p. 102; Smbat-Armenian, p. 219; *Annales de Terre Sainte*, p. 436; *Chronique de Terre Sainte*, p. 19. It is interesting that the edition of Smbat's *Chronicle* from *Recueil des historiens des croisades. Documents arméniennes* noted only how Lewon captured Antioch and it did not say anything about Raymond-Rupen; see Smbat-RHC, p. 643.

[132] Jonathan S.C. Riley-Smith, *The Templars and the Teutonic Knights in Cilician Armenia*, T.S.R Boase (ed.), *The Cilician Kingdom of Armenia*, Edinburgh – London, 1978, p. 99; Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The Knights Hospitaller in the Levant, c. 1070–1309*, p. 54.

[133] *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani*, 820, p. 220: "Rupinus, Antiochiae princeps nondum suae potestatis".

[134] Victor Langlois, V, p. 115.

castles to the Hospitallers in 1210[135]. I think that up to this point, Lewon considered Raymond-Rupen as prince of Antioch, but acted as his regent. Once the latter reached full age, the king did not need any more to be his official guardian, thus Raymond-Rupen granted privileges from the office of prince of Antioch, without Lewon's confirmation. This did not mean that he acted on his own, but rather that Lewon wanted to promote him, at least in an official way, as sole ruler of Antioch. Also, at this point, he couldn't confirm anymore the documents without weakening his authority. However, the king appeared in some documents among the witnesses[136]. It is important that in this case, but also in subsequent documents, Raymond-Rupen appears along his wife, Helvis of Cyprus[137]. In my opinion, he wanted to legitimize his claim over Antioch, and by adding his wife's next to his, he created a link with Aimery of Lusignan, king of Cyprus and Jerusalem.

In this context, I will analyse the documents issued by the princes of Antioch, in order to see if it was customary to mention their consorts or not. Bohemond I[138], Tancred of Hauteville[139], Roger I[140] and Bohemond II[141] appeared as sole issuers of documents. Fulk I of Jerusalem was regent for Constance of Antioch, thus he appeared along her[142]. Raymond of Poitiers became prince of Antioch through his matrimonial alliance with Constance, thus she appeared along him in documents[143]. Raynald of Châtillon did the same thing, regarding that he too became prince by marrying Constance[144]. He was followed by Bohemond III, who, in most documents, appeared as sole issuer[145], except for those in which appeared his wife's name, Orgueilleuse of Harenc[146]. From 1181, the name of his third wife was mentioned next to his in documents[147]. Sibylla is linked only with documents by which the

[135] *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani*, 845, p. 226.

[136] Victor Langlois, XII, p. 132–133; XIII, p. 133–134.

[137] *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani*, 845, p. 226*: Raymundus Rupinus, princeps Antiochenus, Hospitalis socius ac frater factus, assensu uxoris Helovisiae filiae Hemerici II, regis Hierosolymitani et Cypri*; *Ibidem*, 877, p. 236: *Ropinus, princeps Antiochiae, Raimundi principis filius, consensu uxoris Helois* [...]; *ibidem*, 878, p. 237: *Ropinus, princeps Antiochiae, consensu uxoris Heluise* [...]. Even after Raymond-Rupen entered Antioch, in 1216, he continued to add his wife's name next to his in documents, *see Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani*, 885, p. 238: *Rupinus, princeps Antiochiae, consensu uxoris suae Heluisae, Leonis II regis Armeniae, avunculi, Ugonis, regis Cypri, sororii* [...]. *See also*, Victor Langlois, XII, p. 132–133; XIII, p. 133–134; XIV, p. 135–136; XV, p. 136–137; XVI, p. 138–139.

[138] *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani*, 10;12;14;16, p.2.

[139] *Ibidem*, 35, p. 5; 36, p. 5–6; 53, p. 11.

[140] *Ibidem*, 76, p. 17; 86, p. 20.

[141] *Ibidem*, 119, p. 29–30.

[142] *Ibidem*, 149, p. 37.

[143] *Ibidem*, 195, p. 48–49; 228, p. 57; 253, p. 63–64.

[144] *Ibidem*, 282, p. 72; 292, p. 74; 314, p. 81; 347, p. 91.

[145] *Ibidem*, 387, p. 101–102; 388, p. 102; 392, p. 104; 424, p. 110; 428, p. 111–112; 434, p. 113; 451, p. 118; 471, p. 124; 478, p. 125–126; 493, p. 130; 511, p. 135; 523–524, p. 139; 550, p. 146; 555, p. 147–148; 574, p. 152; 586, p. 156; 610, p. 162; 632, p. 167; 632–633, p. 167–168; 649, p. 171–172; 663, p. 176; 680, p. 181–182.

[146] *Ibidem*, 478, p. 125–126; 493, p. 130; 511, p. 135; 523, p. 139; 524, p. 139.

[147] *Ibidem*, 629, p. 166–167; 689, p. 183; 695, p. 185; 753–754, p. 200.

prince offered privileges. I think that Bohemond linked her with these privileges or donations in order to secure her position as consort of the prince of Antioch. Some Antiochene nobles were against the marriage between them, thereby she was not so popular in Antioch. But also, it is possible that Bohemond III did this only to continue a tradition, regarding that he had mentioned in documents also the name of his second wife, Orgueilleuse of Harenc. Bohemond IV, for the most part, appeared alone in documents[148], the only exception being the ones issued in 1198 and 1199, where he included his wife's name, *Paceltiae/Plazentiae*[149]. As Joschen Burgtorf said, his marriage with Plaisance Embriaco secured his legacy in Tripoli[150]. Most likely, Bohemond chose to appear together with his wife in his first documents issued in order to consolidate his authority over the principality and show to the Antiochenes that he had the backing of the Tripolitans. Thus, Raymond-Rupen only chose to follow in the footsteps of the previous princes of Antioch. He really needed a strong claim, regarding that he wasn't in control of the city, being a prince in exile.

In 1210, Lewon sent an embassy headed by Hethum of Lampron to the Pope and the German emperor, requesting a crown for Raymond-Rupen, which he received it[151]. Wilbrand of Oldenburg, who travelled to the Holy Land and passed through Cilicia, said that Rupen was even crowned[152] and named him *iunior rex*[153]. This means that Raymond-Rupen became, as Lewon had done, a vassal of the German emperor. Moreover, the prince had been baptized in 1198 by Conrad of Wittelsbach, the papal legate who brought Lewon the royal crown[154]. Rupen's coronation was meant, probably, to counter-balance Bohemond's gesture of paying homage to Baldwin of Flander's wife, in 1204, thus placing himself under the authority of the Latin emperor of Constantinople. It is important that Lewon did not have any relation with the new Latin empire. Moreover, in 1212, he concluded a matrimonial alliance with Theodor I Laskaris, the emperor of Nicaea[155]. According to Claude Cahen, Lewon established connections with the Empire of Nicaea to counterbalance Innocent's excommunication from 1211[156] It seems that the Armenian

[148] *Ibidem*, 758–759, p. 202; 769, p. 205; 772, p. 206; 792, p. 210–211; 799, p. 213; 807, p. 215–216; 839, p. 224.

[149] *Ibidem*, 742, p. 197–198; 757, p. 201–202.

[150] Joschen Burgtorf, *op. cit.*, p. 198.

[151] Smbat-Bedrosian, p. 101; Smbat-Armenian, p. 217.

[152] Wilbrandi de Oldenborg, *Peregrinatio*, in *Peregrinatores medii aevi quator*, J.C.M. Laurent (ed.), Leipzig, 1864, p. 174: "Cuius nepotem Otho Imperator ad petitionem Leonis, senioris regis, coronauit".

[153] *Ibidem*, p. 178: "Quem dominus Rupinus, iunior rex, quem, ut ante dixi, Otho Romanorum Imperator ad petitionem seriori regis nuper coronauerat, cum nobilibus terre illius et cum multis militibus pulchre indutis subsequebatur".

[154] *Innocentius III*, lib. II, CLII, in *PL*, tom. CCXIV, p. 811: "[…] filium nomine Rupinum genuisse, quem in honore Dei venerabilis Maguntius arhiepiscopus baptizavit"; Marie-Anna Chevalier, *La correspondance entre les élites arméniennes et la papauté pendant la régne de Lewon premier*, p. 241.

[155] George Akropolites, *The History*, Ruth Macrides (trans.), Oxford, 2007, p. 148.

[156] Claude Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 617–618.

king was, somehow, *conservative* in his politics. He preferred to maintain relations with his German suzerain and the emperor of Nicaea, maybe because he perceived the latter as the continuator of the Byzantine *basileis*.

Up to this point, Innocent III had been at good terms with Lewon. Although the Armenian king had been excommunicated earlier, the pope said in a letter from 1205 that this had been done for a minor reason and still named him *our beloved son in Christ*[157]. Moreover, in the papal letters wherever is mentioned something about Bohemond IV, the latter is named only count of Tripoli[158], although he presented himself as prince of Antioch[159] and even the master of the Hospitallers, Godefroy, named him *B(oamnudo IV), principe Antiocheno et comite Tripolitano*[160]. This might indicate that up to a certain point, Innocent III favoured, indirectly, Raymond-Rupen's claim to Antioch. However, Lewon did something that angered the pope. He seized the Templars' possessions from his kingdom and attacked them, wounding the Grand Master and some knights and even killing a Templar. Therefore, Innocent asked the patriarch of Jerusalem to publish the excommunication against Lewon[161]. Innocent sent similar letters to the patriarch of Antioch[162] and John of Brienne, king of Jerusalem[163]. Lewon was not impressed by the pope's threats and even expulsed the Latin clerics form Cilicia[164], because they had applied the excommunication against him[165]. In this context, Innocent threatened the Armenian king with the extension of the excommunication over his nephew, Raymond-Rupen[166]. This proved to be fruitful, because Lewon backed down and made peace with the Templars, which determined the pope to raise the sanctions and to receive him back in communion with Rome[167]. Lewon did not want the excommunication to be extended over Raymond-Rupen, because this would have prevented him from being ordained prince of Antioch. When the two of them finally entered Antioch, the Latin patriarch took Rupen to the cathedral of St. Peter and ordained him prince, an act which determined everybody to swear obedience to

[157] *The Deeds of Innocent III*, p.227; *Innocentius III*, lib. VIII, I, in *PL*, tom. CCXV, p. 556: "charissimum in Christo filium nostrum Leonem regem Armeniorum".

[158] *Innocentius III*, lib. VIII, CXXV, tom. CCXV, p. 698–699; lib. XI, CX, tom. CCXV, p. 1148; lib. XII, VIII tom. CCXVI, p. 18; lib. XII, VIII, tom. CCXVI, p. 18–19; lib XII, XLV, tom. CCXVI, p. 54–56; lib. XIII, CXXIII, tom. CCXVI, p. 510; lib. XVI, VII, tom. CCXVI, p. 792; lib. XVI, VII, tom. CCXV, p. 792–793; *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani*, 802, p. 214; 805, p. 215; 842, p. 225.

[159] *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani*, 792, p. 210–211; 799, p. 213; 807, p. 215–216; 839, p. 224.

[160] *Ibidem*, 816, p. 218.

[161] *Ibidem*, 851, p. 227.

[162] *Innocentius III*, lib. XIV, LXV, in *PL*, tom. CCXVI, p. 431–432.

[163] *Ibidem*, lib. XIV, LXVI, in *PL*, tom. CCXVI, p. 432. John of Brienne had the task of assuring that no pilgrim or local Christian would have helped Lewon. It seems that even in the thirteenth century, the king of Jerusalem had the task to solve the problems which appeared in Northern Syria, thus continuing a tradition which had developed in the twelfth century.

[164] *Ibidem*, lib. XVI, II, in *PL*, tom. CCXVI, p. 785: „et Latinis clericis expulsis penitus ab eadem, in ipsa Graecos quosdam intrudere praesumpsisti".

[165] Claude Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 519.

[166] *Innocentius III*, lib. XVI, II, in *PL*, tom. CCXVI, p. 784–786.

[167] *Ibidem*, lib. XVI, VII, in *PL*, tom. CCXVI, p. 792–793.

him[168]. Although Bohemond had controlled Antioch for some years, he failed to determine the patriarch to do this for him. After all, Peter of Angoulême died because he refused to write a statement legitimizing Bohemond's occupation of Antioch and presenting him as rightful prince of the city[169].

But there was also another reason which determined Lewon to conclude peace with the Templars. Alexander Murray studied the subject of excommunication and said that this sentence could have been extended from a person to his or her whole family. The problem is that according to a bull from 1198, a heretic's descendants were disinherited, if the excommunication was extended over them. Although heresy and excommunication were not the same thing, they overlapped[170]. Thus, Rupen's excommunication would have excluded him from the inheritance of the kingdom. At that moment, Lewon was childless, thus if anything would have happened to him, the kingdom would have remained without a king.

As I have said earlier, among the ones who had the task to enforce the excommunication against the Armenian monarch was the king of Jerusalem. Most likely, this is one of the reasons which determined Lewon to conclude a matrimonial alliance between his daughter from his first marriage, Rita/Stephanie, and John of Brienne, in 1213[171]. Also, as Charles A. Frazee said, he wanted to prove to the pope his enthusiasm towards a new crusade and his availability to fight against the Muslims[172]. Elizabeth Chapin Furber said that when Amalric I of Cyprus died, the throne was occupied by his minor son, Hugh, thus the latter needed a regent. This office was occupied by Walter of Montbéliard, who was constable of Jerusalem. When Hugh reached majority, he demanded from Walter an accounting of his administration, but the latter refused to do so, fled Cyprus and decamped with his family and valuables to Acre, where he was welcomed by his cousin, John of Brienne, the king of Jerusalem[173]. Lewon had concluded, as I have said earlier, a double marriage with the king of Cyprus in 1210. Thus, by allying with the Cypriots, he may not have been perceived as a friend by John, regarding his cousin's problem with Hugh. Corroborated with Innocent's letter by which he asked the king of Jerusalem to enforce the excommunication against Lewon, John of Brienne might have been a dangerous opponent for the Armenian monarch[174].

[168] Smbat Sparapet, p. 102; Smbat-Armenian, p. 219.

[169] *Chronique de Terre Sainte,* p. 17; *Annales de Terre Sainte,* p. 436; Claude Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 611–613.

[170] Alexander Murray, *op. cit.*, p. 172–173.

[171] Smbat-Bedrosian, p. 102; Smbat-Armenian, p. 218.

[172] Charles A. Frazee, "Church and State in the Kingdom of Cilician Armenia, 1198-1375", *Byzantine Studies* 3, part 2, 1976, p. 36. Jean of Brienne doubted that the truce from 1211 with the Muslims would hold and asked for a new crusade; see Christopher Tyerman, *op. cit.*, p. 612.

[173] Elizabeth Chapin Furber, *op. cit.*, p. 605.

[174] According to Jonathan Riley-Smith, John of Brienne received from the pope the right to lead a punitive expedition against the Armenians. But he did not do this. Rather, John sent 50 knights to fight under the banner of the Templars, who devastated the Armenian territories together with the Antiochene troops, *see* Jonathan S.C. Riley-Smith, *The Templars and the Teutonic Knights in Cilician Armenia*, p. 106.

Thus, by arranging a marriage, Lewon solved some of his problems: he became a *friend* of John of Brienne and presented himself as a Christian ready to fight against the enemies of the Cross[175]. Claude Cahen considered that the reconciliation between Lewon and John was part of Innocent's plan of subordinating the oriental politics of the papacy to this goal: a new holy expedition that he began to organize since the failure of the Fourth Crusade in 1202-1204[176]. Indeed, in *Quia maior*, Innocent pleaded for good relations between Christians: „Therefore, dearly beloved sons, changing dissensions and fratricidal jealousies intro treaties of peace and goodwill, let us gird ourselves to come to the aid of the Crucified, not hesitating to risk property and life for him who laid down his life and shed his blood for us; likewise certain and sure, that if you should be truly penitent, through this temporal labour, as if by certain shortcut, you will arrive at eternal life"[177]. But his hopes were in vain, because neither Lewon I, nor Bohemond IV ended the war between them[178]. It is important to mention that although the pope approved and encouraged this marriage, according to Smbat Sparapet[179], Lewon was the one who engaged in negotiations with John of Brienne in order to conclude it. Thus, the Armenian king might have had the initiative in consolidating his links with the Latin monarch.

At this point, Lewon was in a better position than Bohemond IV. He secured a friendship with John of Brienne. By offering territories and privileges to the Hospitallers, he gained their support. Also, he got close to the Teutonic Knights and offered them various territories in Cilicia[180]. It is important to say that a brother of the Teutonic Order acted as Lewon's emissary in 1209, speaking on the behalf of the Armenian king during a meeting with Innocent III[181], and Lewon himself

[175] Lewon did not have enough money for Rita's dowry, thus he leased the port of Canamella to the Hospitallers for two years and received from them 20.000 Sarasin besants. Also, he gave them the castle of Vaner and the surrounding territories near the port of Mallos, gaining another 10.000 besants, *see* Marie-Anna Chevalier, *L'Ordre de l'Hôpital et la défense de l'Armenie: Enjeux d'une présence et moyens mis en ouvre*, p. 55.

[176] Claude Cahen, *op. cit*., p. 620.

[177] Jessalyn Bird, Edward Peters, and James M. Powell (eds.), *op. cit.*, p. 109. This was not the first time when Innocent III wanted to solve a conflict between Christian rulers. The pope sent a decretal letter, *Novit ille*, to the French king claiming that he had the task of arbitrating the conflict between the French monarchy and the English one. In this way, Innocent III articulated clearly the rhetoric of papal primacy, see Andrew Jotischky, *Crusading and the Crusader States*, New York, 2013, p. 210.

[178] Innocent prepared carefully the new crusade. He even said that crusading vows may be commuted or redeemed, thus increasing the numbers of the *crucesignati* and assuring that there would be enough money to support the crusade, in case that some of the crusaders couldn't fight in this endeavour, *see* Christopher Tyerman, *op. cit.*, p. 614. Also, according to canon 71, *Ad liberandam*, of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215), all the Christian princes should have observed mutual peace for four years, and those who would not have obeyed this command would have been excommunicated, *see* Jessalyn Bird, Edward Peters and James M. Powell (eds.), *op. cit.*, p. 129; Christopher Tyerman, *op. cit.*, p. 617.

[179] Smbat-Bedrosian, p. 102; Smbat-Armenian, p. 218.

[180] Victor Langlois, VI, p. 117–120.

[181] Jonathan S.C. Riley-Smith, *The Templars and the Teutonic Knights in Cilician Armenia*, p. 113.

became a *confrater* of the order[182]. Above all, as I have shown, the Armenian king escaped Innocent's excommunication and was received back in communion with the Roman church. If fate started to smile him, the situation was different in Bohemond IV's case.

Bohemond's son, Raymond, bail of Antioch, was killed by the Assassins, and he attacked them. The Assassins asked for help from as-Zahir of Alep and he offered to assist them and even created a diversion, attacking Latakia. Thus, the alliance between the prince of Antioch and the emir of Aleppo went cold. Also, the news of a new crusade determined the Muslim rulers to unite themselves[183]. Thus, this offered Lewon a chance to occupy Antioch.

In 1216, Raymond-Rupen entered Antioch with the help of Acharius, the seneschal of the principality[184]. If in 1203 and 1208 the Antiochenes did not accept to be governed by Armenians, now they were exhausted by this conflict and even the garrison from the citadel surrendered when it understood that Bohemond couldn't help them[185]. The Latin prince did not even live in Antioch, but preferred to stay in Tripoli[186], thus it was very difficult to organize an attack which would have helped the Antiochene garrison. It is worth mentioning that Honorius III named Raymond *princeps Antiochenus*[187], a title which Bohemond IV had never received. Moreover, the same pope named him *legitimus Armeniae regni successor*[188]. Thus, Lewon's plan was fulfilled: with Raymond-Rupen as prince of Antioch, he could have united, unofficially, Armenia and Antioch. I consider that Honorius III' using of the syntagma *princeps Antiochenus* for Raymond-Rupen, and the absence of it from the letters addressed to Bohemond IV, means that, up to a certain level, the papacy supported the cause of the Armenian prince. Most likely, Raymond-Rupen was recognized as legitimate heir of Bohemond III. The fact that the count of Tripoli managed to ally with the Templars is explained only by the problem between the Order and Lewon, namely the castle of Baghras. After the knights received back the castle, they were no longer enemies for Lewon or Raymond-Rupen. The military orders did not side with Raymond-Rupen or Bohemond only because they had a strong claim over Antioch. As Joschen Burgtorf said, there were also pragmatic reasons at stake. The war could have

[182] *Ibidem.*

[183] Claude Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 620–621.

[184] Smbat Sparapet, p. 102; Smbat-RHC, p. 643; Smbat-Armenian, p. 219; *Annales de Terre Sainte*, p. 436: "En l'an M. CC et XVI, fu rendue Antioche à Rupin par le senescal d'Antioche"; *Chronique de Terre-Sainte*, p. 19 : "en sel an fu rendue Antioche à Rupin par le trait de Acairye, seneschau d'Antioche".

[185] Joschen Burgtorf, *op. cit.*, p. 202.

[186] Claude Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 621.

[187] *Regesta Honorii Papae III*, Petrus Pressutti (ed.), vol. I, Rome, 1888, 675, p. 118. Raymond-Rupen minted some coins which were analysed by Gustave Schlumberger, see Gustave Schlumberger, *Numismatique de l'Orient latin*, Paris, 1878, p. 55.

[188] *Regesta Honorii Papae III*, vol. I, 677, p. 118.

affected the economical or strategical interest of the knights. Thus, the Templars fought against Lewon until Raymond-Rupen retroceded Baghras to them[189].

This victory came at a cost for the Armenian monarchy. In 1216, the Seljuks of Rum attacked the western territories of Cilicia and conquered them[190]. Lewon gathered an army and placed it under the command of Constantin of Lampron, the constable of Armenia, but the Christians were defeated, and the commanders captured. In order to free them, the king had to surrender some fortresses to the Seljuks[191]. The relationship between Lewon and Raymond-Rupen went cold in the following years. The Armenian king had an argument with his nephew and had to leave Antioch, ironically, with the help of the Templars[192]. In this context, Raymond-Rupen lost the support of the Armenian monarchy. Thus, Lewon named another heir: his new-born daughter, Zabel. Smbat Sparapet presented this event in a positive way. The Armenian nobles from Cilicia approved Lewon's idea of naming Zabel as heir: "When the Lord God grants you a child, make it your heir, and we shall dissolve the compact which we made with Ruben and establish one with your daughter, and we shall serve her as though she were a man. What you have done for Ruben is sufficient, since you have established him on the throne of their [Rubenid] patrimony"[193]. Most likely, this story had the purpose of covering a conflict between Lewon and Rupen, but still, it offers an interesting perspective about naming Zabel as heir: by invoking the divinity and saying that the child was a gift from God, Smbat wanted to legitimate Zabel's position and the act of her father, namely annulling Raymond's right as heir. The latter had been baptized by Conrad of Wittelsbach and crowned with a crown sent by Otto VI[194]. Thus, Smbat wanted to create a rhetoric which could have rivalled with Raymond-Rupen's support from the German emperor. Next, the nobles said that they would have served Zabel "as though she were a man"[195]. This might indicate that the nobles favoured a man to rule over them[196] and Lewon, most likely, knew about this

[189] Joschen Burgtorf, *op. cit.*, p. 207–208.

[190] Smbat-RHC, p. 644–645.

[191] Smbat-Bedrosian, p. 103; Smbat-Armenian, p. 221–222; Smbat-RHC, p. 645.

[192] Claude Cahen, *op.cit.*, p. 630.

[193] Smbat-Bedrosian 102; Smbat-Armenian, p. 220.

[194] See n. 26, 133.

[195] Smbat-Bedrosian 102; Smbat-Armenian, p. 220 „և մեք ծառայեմք նմա որպէս արու զաւակի".

[196] In the Kingdom of Jerusalem, there were queens who ruled the state, or associated Latin princes to the reign. For example, queen Melisende appeared along Fulk I of Jerusalem: *Fulco, rex Hierosolymitanus, consensu Milesendis reginae sigillo confirmat* (*Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani*, 174, p. 43–44). Guy of Lusignan did the same thing, regarding that he was Sibilla's king-consort: *Gwido de Lysanan, rex Hierosolymitanus, et Sibilla uxor regina* (*Regesta regni Hierosolymitani*, 650, p. 172–173); *Guido, rex Hierosolymitanus, assensu Sibillae uxoris* (*Regesta regni Hierosolymitani*, 653, p. 173–174). The queen Melisende is the best-know example of a female-ruler in the Kingdom of Jerusalem. Still, after her husband's death, she associated her son, Baldwin, to the throne, because the Latin barons couldn't accept her sole rule, *see* Steven Runciman, *History of the Crusades*, vol. II, *The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frakish East, 1100–1187*, Cambridge, 1995, p. 233. Most likely, it was the same situation in Armenia. Zabel was the legitimate heir, but she could not rule alone.

weakness regarding Zabel's legitimacy. This explains why he wanted to conclude a marriage with the son of the Hungarian king in 1219[197]. Lastly, Smbat Sparapet said that Rupen was established on the "throne of their [Rubenid] patrimony"[198]. This implies that Antioch was part of the patrimony of the Rubenid family, although there are no arguments to support this idea. It is intriguing that by using this phrase, Smbat wanted to create a separation between Lewon and Rupen. Although the king was a member of the Rubenids and it seems that he was not linked to their patrimony. Smbat was a brother of Hethum I, thus a member of the Hethumid family and the latter became king through the marriage with Zabel, in 1226[199]. Thus, I think that Smbat deliberately separated Lewon, and implicitly Zabel, from the Rubenids: she became a Hethumid for him and the Hethumids ascension to power started from the moment when Zabel was named Lewon's heir. For Smbat, this marked the end of the Rubenid domination in Cilicia. Up to the end of the chronicle, Smbat did not include anymore the Rubenids in his story. He did not even say that Raymond-Rupen contested Zabel's legitimacy and tried to conquer the Armenian throne. Rather, he chose to present the War of the Armenian Succession as a rebellion of some Armenian and Greek princes from Cilicia[200].

Natasha Hodgson suggested that Lewon decided to name another heir in Armenia because he did not want to unite the Cilician kingdom with the Principality of Antioch[201]. This is a strategy employed by Amaury I of Cyprus. He was king of Cyprus and king-consort of Jerusalem, but he ruled the two kingdoms as separated monarchies. He never accepted to use the revenues from Cyprus for different

[197] Smbat-Bedrosian p. 103; Smbat-Armenian, p. 221 „զի տացէ զորդին իւր փեսայ թագաւորին Լեւոնի՝ լինել ժառանգ աթոռոյն նորա". According to this fragment, Lewon's son-in-law would have become his heir. Honorius III approved this marriage, *see Regesta Honori Papae III*, Petrus Pressutti (ed.), vol. I, Roma, Typographia Vaticana, 1888, p. 316, 1912: „<<A(ndreae) regi Vngarorum illustri.>> Adprobat matrimonium inter filium ipsius et filiam L(eonis) regis Armeniae ita pactum ut eidem regi Armeniae ratione filiae prout haeres succedat in regnum" (Henceforth – *Regesta Honorii Papae III*).

[198] Smbat-Bedrosian, p. 102; Smbat-Armenian, p. 220: „և բաւական է Հռովբինի զոր արարեր և հաստատեցեր զնա յաթոռ հայրենեաց իւրոց".

[199] Smbat-Bedrosian, p. 105; Smbat-RHC, p. 648; Smbat-Armenian, p. 225; Kirakos-Bedrosian, p. 151-152; Kirakos-Brosset, p. 93; Kirakos Gandjakets'i, *Patmut'yun hayots*, K.A. Melik Ohanjanyan, Erevan, Haykakan SSD Gitut'yunneri Akademiayi Hratarakjut'yun, 1961, p. 189; Vardan Arewelts'i, *Compilation of History*, Robert Bedrosian (trans.), ch. 84, online at: http://attalus.org/armenian/va4.htm, last accessed on 29.04.2019; Vartan le Grand, *Extrait de l'histoire universelle*, in *RHC. Doc. Arm.*, tom. I, p. 443; Samuel of Ani, *Extrait de la Chronographie*, in *RHC. Doc. Arm.*, tom. I, p. 460; *The Chronography of Bar Hebraeus*, E.A. Wallis Budge (trans.), London, p. 454–455, online at: r.bedrosian.com/BH, last accessed on 28.02.2018; Jean Dardel, *Chronique d'Arménie*, in *RHC. Doc. Arm.*, tom. II, Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1906, p. 10; Michael the Syrian, *Extrait de la chronique de Michel le Syrien*, in *RHC. Doc. Arm.*, tom. I, p. 408. None of the Latin chroniclers mentioned this marriage. In *Annales de Terre Sainte* Het'um appeared as king only in 1252, see *Annales de Terre Sainte*, p. 445. Philippe de Navaire mentioned Hethum I as king in 1232, see Philippe de Navaire, *Récit*, in *Les Gestes des Chiprois. Recueil de chroniques françaises écrites en Orient aux XIII^e & XIV^e siècles*, Gaston Raynaud (ed.), Genève, 1887, p. 105. Florio Bustron mentioned a king of Cilician Armenia only in 1266, see Florio Bustron, p. 111.

[200] Smbat Sparapet, p. 104; Smbat-Armenian, p. 223–224.

[201] Natasha Hodgson, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

projects in the Kingdom of Jerusalem[202]. Natasha Hodgson's hypothesis may be plausible, if there are proofs that Lewon adopted Aimery's policy. But I think that Lewon wanted to unite, unofficially, the two states. This did not mean that he hoped to become prince of Antioch. Although he was powerful, Lewon did not have any legitimacy which could have helped him to impose as ruler of Antioch. Paul Z. Bedoukian analysed some coins minted in Sis in 1203 and ascertained that they were probably meant to legitimate the Armenian annexation of Antioch[203]. This is available also for coins issued in Armenia around 1208 which had Latin inscriptions and Lewon's name on them. The presence of the name of the Armenian king on these coins suggests, as Bedoukian said, that Lewon wanted to annex Antioch for himself, rather than securing the throne for Raymond-Rupen[204]. Bedoukian's argument has a weakness, namely that in 1203 and 1208, Raymond was still minor and even if he would have remained in Antioch, he would have needed a regent. His hypothesis might be confirmed, but from another perspective. Rather than saying that Lewon wanted to rule Antioch, most likely, he hoped to be recognized as Raymond-Rupen's suzerain.

In 1216, Raymond-Rupen was an adult, but it is possible that Lewon wanted to act as regent for him and this was the reason which led to the conflict between the king and his nephew[205]. He always said that he wanted to fight for Rupen's cause, not for his own interest. If he would have tried to impose his will over Raymond and even stay in Antioch, maybe his reputation would have been damaged and he would have been rebuked by the Latin Church. When the Antiochenes formed a commune in 1193 and blocked an Armenian occupation of Antioch, they had several reasons: they considered the Armenian Church as being autonomous and the Greeks, who were a political force within the principality, were not at good terms with the Armenians[206]. It is possible that Lewon might have acknowledged the antipathy of the Antiochenes towards Armenians and might have decided not to push forward his intentions. Although Raymond-Rupen was half-Armenian and the war had been fought, from the Armenian perspective, in his name, Lewon was the one who conducted all the military actions against the principality. Thus, the king was not popular in Antioch.

Raymond-Rupen continued to gather support to consolidate his authority in Antioch. In 1216, he offered privileges to the Genoese[207] and confirmed some to

[202] Elizabeth Chapin Furber, *op. cit.*, p. 604; Jonathan Phillips, "The Latin East, 1098–1291", in *The Oxford History of the Crusades*, Jonathan Riley-Smith (ed.), New York, 2002, p. 126.

[203] Paul Z. Bedoukian, *op. cit.*, p. 192–193.

[204] *Ibidem*, p. 192–194.

[205] Claude Cahen said that Lewon I and Raymond-Rupen had a dispute, which determined the king to leave Antioch. This meant that Rupen lost the support of the Armenian monarchy. Still, Cahen did not provide a reason for this conflict. He only said that „dans des conditions mal connues, le jeune prince se brouilla avec Léon, qu'il aurait arrêté si les Templiers, en le prévenant, ne lui avaient permis de fuir", Claude Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 630.

[206] Joshua Prawer, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

[207] Victor Langlois, XV, p. 136–137.

the Pisans[208]. It is important that in both documents appeared Lewon's name. Most likely, they were written before the Armenian king left Antioch for Cilicia. Raymond-Rupen did not manage to last long in his new position as prince of Antioch. Bohemond IV married in 1218 with Melisande of Lusignan, thus strengthening his links with the Cypriote monarchy[209] and after he realized that the young man did not have many allies, he reoccupied Antioch in 1219 with help from a certain Guillaume Farabel[210]. Now Raymond-Rupen was left without his principality and his kingdom, because Lewon had appointed Zabel as his heir. Still, Raymond-Rupen was named in 1220 *princeps Antiochiae*[211], although Antioch was governed at that time by Bohemond IV[212].

The documents by which Raymond-Rupen offered privileges to the Genoese and Pisans may answer to the following question: was Lewon recognized officially as suzerain of Antiochene prince? In the first one, Lewon I appeared along the Latin patriarch of Antioch as guarantors: "[…] et ut hec donation mea atque confirmatio rata et stabilis omni tempore permaneat, presens privilegium in presentia domini patriarche Antiochie et domini regis Armenie, sigillo meo plumbeo jussi roborari, attestatione proborum virorum partier et muniri […]"[213]. In the second document, Lewon seems to have had an elevated position, along Rupen's wife, Helvise: "[…] Rupinus, Dei gratia princeps Antiochie, Raimundi principis filius, voluntate et consensu domine Helvise uxoris mee principisse, nec noc et domini Leonis, illustrissimi regis Armenie, avuncoli mei, et rogatu piisimi domini Hugonis, illustris regis Cypri, mei sororii, atque consilio hominum meorum, dono, concedo et confirmo in perpetuum hereditatem et juramento Pisanorum […]"[214]. The syntamga *voluntate et consensu* seems to indicate Lewon I's position as suzerain of Antioch. Still, in a document from, 1214, by which Lewon granted the castle of Vaner[215] to the Hospitallers, appeared the same phrase: "Ego Leo, Dei gratia rex Armenie […] consensu etiam et voluntate domini Rupini, principis Antiochie […]"[216]. This did not mean that Rupen was Lewon's suzerain[217]. Rather, it may imply that this was a writing formula used by the local chanceries. Also, there is the possibility that Raymond-Rupen appeared along Lewon in this

[208] *Ibidem*, XVI, p. 138–139.

[209] Joschen Burgtorf, *op. cit.*, p. 208.

[210] *Annales de Terre Sainte*, p. 437 ; *Chronique de Terre Sainte*, p. 20.

[211] *Regesta Honorii Papae III*, vol. I, 2876, p. 476.

[212] Bohemond IV's excommunication was lifted only in 1233, *see* Joschen Burgtorf, *op. cit.*, p. 206. This explains why Raymond-Rupen was still named *princeps Antiochiae* in 1220, although he had lost the control of the principality.

[213] Victor Langlois, XV, p. 137.

[214] *Ibidem*, XVI, p. 138.

[215] Vaner was a castle located in the royal plain of Cilicia; see Victor Langlois, p. 122, n. 1. Also, this castle appeared in Lewon's coronation list; see Smbat-Bedrosian, p. 98; Smbat-RHC, p. 637; Smbat-Armenian, p. 210.

[216] *Ibidem*, p. 122.

[217] There are many documents in which Lewon presented himself as „rex gratia Romani imperii"; see Victor Langlois, p. 105; p. 112; p. 115; p. 117–118.

document, because the king wanted to consolidate his nephew's authority and to create a strong link between him and the Hospitallers.

In this context, there are two possible hypotheses. The first one is that Lewon was acknowledged officially as Rupen's suzerain. The second one is that *voluntate et consensu* was a writing formula used by the Armenian and the Antiochene chanceries. Paul Z. Bedoukian's analysis may imply that the first hypothesis is available. Still, he did not speak about Raymond-Rupen's coins. According to Gustave Schlumberger, on these coins appeared only his name, RVPINVS, and the name of the city, ANTIOCHIA[218]. Thus, it seems that initially, Lewon wanted to present himself as suzerain of Raymond-Rupen. This would fit Bedoukian's conclusion regarding the coins form 1203 and 1208. After 1216, Raymond-Rupen presented himself as sole ruler of the principality. Thus, the syntagma *voluntate et consensus* may represent just a writing formula, and not a proof of Lewon's suzerainty over Antioch. However, given the conflict between the Armenian king and Raymond-Rupen, it is possible that, somehow, Lewon might have wanted to assert his authority over Antioch even after 1216, although the Antiochenes might have not accepted this and the papacy might have considered that the king had lied about his intentions to wage this war, a fact which would have worsened the relations between Cilician Armenia and the Holy See. Still, I don't think that Lewon wanted to annex Antioch and rule it by himself, as Paul Bedoukian said. As it happened in 1193, the Antiochenes would have rebelled against the establishment of the Armenian rule. Also, the king did not have any legitimacy to act as sole ruler of the Latin principality. However, the fact that Raymond-Rupen had been Lewon's heir until 1216 may indicate that the Armenian king had hoped to unite Cilician Armenia and the Principality of Antioch under the rule of his nephew and to respect the agreement from 1193/94. As I have said earlier, most likely, in 1216, Raymond-Rupen might not have accepted Lewon's suzerainty, because he wanted to rule alone. Thus, this determined the king to choose another heir and to abandon his plan of uniting his kingdom with the Antiochene principality.

Lewon fought a war that affected both Cilicia and northern Syria but did not achieve so much. He hoped to unite the Cilician Kingodm with the Latin principality, or, at least, to exert a certain degree of authority over Antioch, but Raymond-Rupen did not seem to agree with this plan. The Armenian king used all instruments at his disposal to secure Raymond the position of prince of Antioch, but all was in vain. His nephew governed the principality for roughly three years, being the last representative of the Rubenids in Antioch, because from 1219 and until 1268[219], the principality was governed only by Latin princes. His policy of matrimonial alliances only strengthened the links between his kingdom and the Cypriote monarchy. Ironically, after his death, the war of the Antiochene succession was succeeded by a war of Armenian succession. Zabel, under the

[218] Gustave Schlumberger, *op. cit.*, p. 55.
[219] In 1268, the Mamluks conquered Antioch.

regency of Adam of Baghras and Constantin of Lampron, Raymond-Rupen and John of Brienne[220] fought for their rights, hoping to secure the throne of Armenia. This game of diplomacy was almost fruitless for Lewon. Maybe his only profits were the close relations with Cyprus, the Hospitallers and the Teutonic knights and Innocent III's good opinion about him, regarding his stated desire to fight against the enemies of the Cross.

The war of the Antiochene succession ended, practically, in 1219, when Bohemond IV occupied Antioch. Still, in the following decades, there were a few more clashes between Armenians and Antiochenes. In 1225, Bohemond IV attacked Cilicia to revenge Philip's death, his son which had been married with Zabel between 1222–1224/5[221]. Theoretically, the conflict ended in 1254, when through the mediation of Saint Louis, Bohemond VI married Sibylla of Armenia, daughter of Hethum I[222].

Lewon proved that he could be an important political actor in the Orient and a skilful diplomat and rhetorician. He used every instrument at hand to gather as many allies as possible. It is important to say that Lewon had a dynamic diplomacy, which indicate that he did not set his foreign policy from the beginning, but rather acted as the war developed and his enemy gathered more allies. His correspondence with the Holy See shows that although he was a new member of the Latin family of kings and princes, he knew how to exploit Innocent III's sensitivities towards the crusades in order to convince the pope of his most honest intentions regarding his involvement in the War of the Antiochene Succession. And he managed to carve out a positive image of himself, regarding how careful have Innocent III mediated this conflict, trying to do everything so as not to be accused by Lewon of supporting Bohemond's claim to the Antiochene principality. Of course, when the Armenian king attacked the Templars in 1211, Innocent had to act as an uncompromising father, thus he punished Lewon. Still, Lewon had attacked the Templars before, but Innocent had tried to temper him without appealing to the toughest penalty. This is Lewon's merit: he knew how to employ such a rhetoric as to determine Innocent to have this attitude.

neagulinus@gmail.com

[220] John of Brienne took part in the Fifth Crusade and when he heard that Lewon had died, he left the crusade and went to Armenia to claim the throne, see Oliver of Paderborn, *Capture of Damietta*, in Jessalynn Bird, Edward Peters and James M. Powell (eds.), *Crusade and Christendom*, p. 198–199.

[221] Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The Knights Hospitaller in the Levant, c. 1070–1309*, p. 56–57.

[222] Steven Runciman, *History of the Crusades*, vol. III, p. 278.