

INTRODUCTION

The end of the seventh/thirteenth century was a period of momentous change in the Near and Middle East. Following the Mongol conquests earlier in the century, Hülegü and his successor Ilkhans created a new, expansionist, state, based in northern Persia; another, rival, Mongol khanate, that of the 'Golden Horde', was formed in the steppelands to the north of the Caucasus and the Black Sea. Dominated by the Mongols of Persia, and threatened by the growing power of Türkmen confederations, the Seljuk Sultanate of Rūm was in steep decline, heading towards its eventual oblivion. Having to deal with these changes to its north and east was the remnant of the old Byzantine Empire, once again centred on Constantinople. As the Romans regained their city, so another ancient dynasty, the 'Abbāsids, finally lost their own, Baghdad. The Caliphate was revived, as a shadow of its former self, in Cairo. Even without the residence of the Caliph, Cairo had become the focus of Muslim rule throughout the region, with the rise of the Mamluk Sultanate. In Egypt, the Mamluks deposed their Ayyūbid Sultan, but in Syria they were able to occupy the vacuum caused by the Mongol destruction of the Ayyūbid states there (although some Ayyūbid princes survived for a while). The Mamluks consciously sought the mantle of the defenders of the *dār al-islam*, the leaders of the *jihād* against the infidels.

These were difficult times for the Christian states of the eastern Mediterranean. At first, there was uncertainty and difference of opinion as to how to react to the new Mongol and Mamluk neighbours, and when the Mongols came to be seen as the Great Hope, it was perhaps too late. Riven by internal tensions, and confronted by the full awesome power of the Mamluks, the Crusader States—the legacy of Bohemond, Tancred, Baldwin, Raymond and Godfrey—collapsed. Antioch fell to the Mamluks in 1268; Tripoli in 1289; and Acre and the last few remaining coastal towns in 1291. The more secure kingdom of Cyprus, which sought to regain toeholds in Syria through continued alliance with the Ilkhans, was nevertheless equally affected by the same sort of factionalism that had dogged the last century of the other Frankish states of Outremer.

The kingdom of the Armenians established in 1198 in Cilicia and

the area north of Syria, its development hitherto closely bound to its neighbouring Frankish states, remained, alone, surrounded by the Seljuks and Türkmén of Anatolia to the north and west, the Ilkhans of Mesopotamia and Persia to the east, and the Mamluks of Syria and Egypt to the south. The kingdom's future looked bleak, yet it survived, three-quarters of the way through the eighth/fourteenth century. The end of the seventh/thirteenth and the beginning of the eighth/fourteenth century was an important, and interesting, time in the affairs of the Armenian kingdom, as it struggled to find its place in the drastically altered circumstances of the region.

This was also the great period of Mamluk expansion. The Mamluks were proud of their achievements, and—perhaps as a consequence of being a 'dynasty' of constant usurpation—sought to promote them, and themselves. The Mamluk era produced many great, and many lesser, historical writers, and we are learning an ever-growing amount about the historiography of the period. The work of these Arabic writers is becoming increasingly available, through modern editions, and modern scholarship.

On the other hand, one problem with tracing the affairs of the Armenian kingdom in the period after the fall of the Crusader States is the comparative paucity of the Armenian sources available to the modern student.¹ It seems a promising approach, therefore, to seek to make use of the historiographical production of the Mamluk Sultanate to investigate the affairs of the Armenian kingdom in this period. Given the nature of the Mamluk attitude to the Armenian kingdom, much of the material I am presenting here deals with military and diplomatic contacts between the Armenian king and the Mamluk Sultan. Nevertheless, this is in itself revealing of the changed status and position of the Armenian kingdom; and it also shows that the Arabic sources, frequently neglected by scholars working on the history of the kingdom, can actually be used to uncover or illuminate details concerning its internal affairs.

¹ It should be noted that the surviving work of several important Armenian writers—Kirakos Gandjakec'i (work ending 1266, died 1271); Vardan Arevelc'i ('the Great', ending 1267, died 1271); Smpad Sparapet (the Constable, ending 1271, died 1276); Grigor Akanec'i (ending 1271)—finishes before the end of the seventh/thirteenth century, and that they are followed by chroniclers of lesser quality or stature.

Previous Scholarship

Since its publication in 1978, the most prominent work in English on the Armenian kingdom has been T.S.R. Boase's *The Cilician Kingdom of Armenia*.² In truth this is not a monograph but a collection of chapters by various authors on topics related to the history of the kingdom, prefaced by a historical introduction and concluded by a list of place-names provided by Boase himself.³ Other chapters deal with two castles, and with the Military Orders and the Armenian kingdom.⁴ While all the chapters are in their way useful, the historical introduction really provides only that: there is little room to go into any kind of detail. The period covered in the present work, from the rise of the Mamluk Sultanate to the murder of King Het'um II in 1307, is essentially covered in four pages, and much of this is not strictly to do with what was happening, but about the culture of the time as well.⁵ Boase relies on the articles of Canard⁶ and Der Nersessian, and on the sources gathered in the *Recueil des historiens des croisades* volumes, the sources that have been behind much of the work produced by 'Crusade historians' that touches on the Armenian kingdom. Boase makes little use of Arabic sources, and, where he does, the use may not be first-hand: he clearly is not too well aware of the basics of Arabic historiography, to the point where he can cite a wholly fictitious source.⁷

² T.S.R. Boase (ed.), *The Cilician Kingdom of Armenia* (Edinburgh 1978).

³ 'The History of the Kingdom', and 'Gazetteer'.

⁴ A.W. Lawrence, 'The Castle of Baghras'; J.G. Dunbar and W.W.M. Boal, 'The Castle of Azgīt'; J.S.C. Riley-Smith, 'The Templars and the Teutonic Knights in Cilician Armenia'; A.T. Luttrell, 'The Hospitallers' Interventions in Cilician Armenia: 1291–1375'.

⁵ Boase, 'History', 26–29.

⁶ Even when citing the article by Canard discussed below (M. Canard, 'Le royaume d'Arménie-Cilicie et les Mamelouks jusqu'au traité de 1285', *REA* iv (1967): 217–59), Boase is not always accurate in his information, for example in relation to the truce of 684/1285: see below, p. 57, n. 53.

⁷ Boase cites one "Imad Abu Charna" ('Gazetteer', 172), making reference to "*RHC.Or.*, p. 212". I take it that this refers to volume IV, and that the source in question is actually the *Kitāb al-Rawdatayn* by Abū Shāma (called *Abou Chamah* by the translator, A.-C. Barbier de Meynard). Abū Shāma makes extensive use of *al-Barq al-shāmī* by 'Imād al-Dīn al-Kātib al-Isfahānī, prefacing his abridgements from this work by reference to "al-'Imād". This may itself be the route of Boase's confusion, but Boase also cites a footnote from Cahen's *La Syrie du nord*, which refers to the relevant passage from Abū Shāma's abridgement of al-'Imād, and it is possible that this invented "Imad Abu Charna" derives not from use of the actual source itself, but merely from a misreading of Cahen's footnote.

The other standard work in English on the Armenian kingdom, which is used by Boase, is Sirarpie Der Nersessian's chapter in the multi-volume account of the crusades edited by Setton.⁸ While this chapter stands independently as a history of the Armenians in Cilicia, it must also be seen in the context of the aims of the whole work that contains it, a history of the crusades. Der Nersessian covers the period from the rise of the Mamluks to 1307 in six pages, and concentrates more on the political and military events than does Boase. While there is the occasional misconception, or chronological confusion, by and large the chapter seems accurate, and Der Nersessian gives the impression of knowing the sources very well. Indeed, Der Nersessian provides a list of the "principal Arabic sources", which consists largely of those in the *Recueil des historiens des croisades: Historiens orientaux*, and other translations from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.⁹ The main criticism to be made of this chapter is perhaps the lack of understanding of the history of the wider Middle East, and especially of the Mamluk Sultanate.¹⁰ As a summary of the basic history of the kingdom Der Nersessian's chapter is fine, but it does not obviate the need for a much more in-depth look at the sources for this period.

Robert Edwards' mammoth study on the fortifications from the Armenian period that survive in Cilicia also includes an introductory chapter on the 'Historical Background'.¹¹ Edwards' stated aim

⁸ S. Der Nersessian, 'The Kingdom of Cilician Armenia', in K.M. Setton (gen. ed.), *A History of the Crusades*, vol. II, *The Later Crusades, 1189–1311* (second edition, Madison 1969), 630–659. Der Nersessian has also produced a work on *The Armenians* (London 1969), on which, see below.

⁹ 'Kingdom', 630–31, n1. The list of sources is not free from errors. Incomprehensibly, Quatremère's translation of al-Maqrīzī's *Sulūk* is described as a translation of the *Kh̄itāʾ*, an entirely different work.

¹⁰ This can perhaps be seen in the frequent references to "the Egyptians" or to "Egypt" when the Mamluks and their Sultanate are intended. References to the Ayyūbid ruler of Ḥamāh as the "ally" (654) of the Mamluks, rather than their subject, and to a raid by "the emir of Aleppo", perhaps also reveal a lack of understanding of the political structures of the Mamluk state. A reference to T'īl Hamdun as being one of three "fortresses on the eastern front" (656) when in fact it is in Cilicia itself may reveal perhaps too great an emphasis on the written sources, and too little attention to the geography of the region.

¹¹ Robert W. Edwards, *The Fortifications of Armenian Cilicia* (Washington, 1987); 3–10. This book is supplemented by two articles by Edwards, one on a fortress not dealt with in the later book, one explicitly intended to fill "important lacunae in [the] 1987 monograph". These are: 'Bağras and Armenian Cilicia: a reassessment', *REA* xvii (1983): 415–55; and 'Settlements and Toponymy in Armenian Cilicia', *REA* xxiv (1993): 181–249.

is to provide a “*brief* historical survey of the Armenian kingdom in Cilicia”, and he does “not attempt to reinterpret . . . any of the questions concerning chronology or political events”.¹² The whole last century of the kingdom is covered in a short paragraph.¹³ Nevertheless, the study as a whole proves an invaluable aid to understanding the history of the Armenians in Cilicia, and also proves a crucial service in assisting a visitor to the region to find, and comprehend, the sites he discusses, which are frequently well off the beaten track.

Claude Mutafian has written two books that deal with the history of the kingdom. One is exclusively concerned with the Armenians in Cilicia, while the other is a general history of Cilicia itself. The former, *Le Royaume Arménien de Cilicie*, is a large-scale, beautifully produced work, illustrated lavishly in colour with photographs and reproductions of art-works.¹⁴ The book is much more than a political history; it is also a presentation of the culture of the Armenian kingdom.¹⁵ As a consequence of this, some of the political happenings of the period are skated over with minimal notice,¹⁶ and some of the analysis is rather simplistic,¹⁷ as are some of the errors.¹⁸ The work is not intended as a serious academic record, and lacks a critical apparatus; additionally, few sources are cited. The same cannot be said of the other of Mutafian’s books on the subject. *La Cilicie au carrefour des empires* covers the history of the region from the classical period on, and a large chapter is devoted to the history of the

¹² Edwards, *Fortifications*, 4 (the italicisation is his).

¹³ Edwards, *Fortifications*, 10.

¹⁴ Claude Mutafian, *Le Royaume Arménien de Cilicie, XII^e–XIV^e siècle* (Paris 1993). The book contains a preface by Levon Ter-Pedrossian, President of the Republic of Armenia until February 3, 1998.

¹⁵ The final section, entitled ‘Civilisation’, contains chapters contributed by other scholars: a chapter on commerce, by Catherine Otten (119–26); on the arts, by Lilith Zakorian (127–39); on literature, by Krikor Chahinian (140–46); and on the Church, by SS Karékine II, catholicos of Cilicia (149–51).

¹⁶ For example, the assassination of Het’um II and Lewon III is only mentioned, rather than discussed: Mutafian, *Royaume Arménien*, 73.

¹⁷ The dichotomy between ‘pro-Latin’ and ‘Nationalist’ factions is perhaps over-emphasised, and leads Mutafian into some arguments of dubious value. Mutafian states that the reason for Het’um II’s visit to Constantinople at the occasion of his sister’s marriage to Michael Palaeologos was “without doubt to discuss further the union of the Churches”. In the meantime, Smpad usurped the throne, with the connivance of the Catholicos who was “probably considering that Smpad gave better pro-Latin guarantees” (than Het’um, who of course was periodically a Franciscan friar: *Royaume Arménien*, 71).

¹⁸ For example, over the date of Het’um II’s final abdication: Mutafian, *Royaume Arménien*, 73.

Armenian kingdom.¹⁹ The work is to some extent concerned with the historical geography of the area, and is abundantly accompanied by maps and illustrations, in a separate volume. While the amount of space given over to a survey of the political history of the period is impressive, the nature of the work is such that Mutaḡian appears more interested in the geographical effects of the events—changes in putative borders—than in discussing the course of the events themselves. One strength of the work is Mutaḡian’s willingness to make a full use of the Arabic sources available to him in French translation, especially Abū’l-Fidā’, al-Maqrīzī, al-Jazarī and Mufaḡḡal.²⁰ However, at times it seems that Mutaḡian is treating these editions as if they were the sources themselves, debating the significance of the French of the translation rather than the original Arabic.²¹ Mutaḡian has an advantageous knowledge of Armenian, and makes extensive use of both Armenian sources and modern Armenian writers. At times, his writing perhaps unfortunately reflects theirs, in that he presents an account of events slanted to give maximum prominence and status to the Armenians and their kings.²² Nevertheless, *La Cilicie au carrefour des empires* represents perhaps the most thorough modern account in a western language of the political history of the Armenian kingdom in this period.

¹⁹ Claude Mutaḡian, *La Cilicie au carrefour des empires* (2 vols., Paris 1988); chapter VIII is entitled ‘Le Royaume Arménien de Cilicie’ (i, 405–75).

²⁰ Using the translations of the *RHC Or.*, I, Quatremère, Sauvaget and Blochet respectively.

²¹ For example, when discussing the meaning of an “incoherent” passage from Quatremère’s translation of al-Maqrīzī: “l’erreur du manuscrit serait alors à chercher dans le «en passant par»” (*Cilicie*, i, 449).

²² A simple example of this may be found in Mutaḡian’s account of a Mongol rebel (it is Sülemish) crossing Cilicia: “he was captured, sent to Ghazan by the Armenian king, and put to death” (*Cilicie*, i, 463). This greatly inflates the rôle of the King in the affair: see below, pp. 128–36. Earlier, in the aftermath of Baybars’ invasion of Anatolia in 675/1277, and the subsequent execution of the Pervâne, Mutaḡian records the offer of the Seljuk state to Lewon II by Abagha; the Armenian “wisely . . . refused this offer: he was not capable of defending a kingdom of Cilicia-Cappadocia” (*Cilicie*, i, 451). Mutaḡian’s sources for this unlikely encounter are modern Armenian works and early-modern western European ones (*Cilicie*, ii, 336, n. 463). The murder of Het’um II and Lewon III is blamed on an anti-Latin party inciting Bularghu, although Mutaḡian acknowledges that the “explanation is not very satisfactory”, suggesting that Bularghu may have had an “ulterior motive . . . of making himself independent master of Cilicia” (*Cilicie*, i, 466). On the genealogy of this ‘treacherous incitement’ version, see Der Nersessian, ‘Kingdom’, 658, n. 50.

The same slanting that affects some of Mutafian's work can also be identified in general histories of the Armenians that deal with their southern outpost in Cilicia. This can be to such an extent that an accurate picture of the history of the kingdom is not provided. Some writers betray a lack of understanding even of the 'pro-Armenian' sources from the kingdom, and perhaps through reliance on passionately nationalistic later writers, may take an unrealistically positivistic approach to the history of the kingdom. Concentrating on the heroic (or anti-heroic) Armenian kings, these works often show a lack of understanding of the complexities of the *realpolitik* in the Middle and Near East during this period, and, thereby without being able to put the kingdom within its proper political context, may ascribe a disproportionate amount of importance to the rôle of these Armenian kings within the affairs of the day. An example of one such work is that of Hrand Pasdermadjian, described as professor at the University of Geneva, which was first published in 1949.²³ A general history of Armenia and the Armenians "from their origins to the Treaty of Lausanne" at the end of the First World War, it contains a chapter on the history of "New Armenia". In common with most other works on this topic, the amount of space given over to the period discussed in this work is very small (two and a half pages), but this short section nevertheless manages to be extremely interesting, if merely because of the level of inaccuracy shown. It may be useful to summarise Pasdermadjian's version of the years from roughly 1280 to 1307. Throughout this section the only source footnoted is a chapter on Armenia by Macler in the *Cambridge Medieval History*,²⁴ and while this is itself somewhat tendentious, it seems likely that Pasdermadjian's distortions have been influenced by other works.

Pasdermadjian explains how the battle of Homs results from Lewon III "marching on Syria", after "allying his forces with those of the Mongols"; the battle would have been won but for the Mongol general Mengü Temür ordering "inexplicable conduct", a retreat, for which he and his army were punished by the Ilkhan.²⁵

²³ H. Pasdermadjian, *Histoire de l'Arménie: depuis les origines jusqu'au traité de Lausanne* (Paris 1964).

²⁴ Frédéric Macler, 'Armenia', chapter VI of J.R. Tanner, C.W. Previté-Orton and Z.N. Brooke (eds.), *The Cambridge Medieval History, vol. IV: The Eastern Roman Empire (717-1453)* (Cambridge 1927), 153-182.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 215. Macler ('Armenia', 176) explains that Lewon "was bound by his

The Mamluks attacked Hromgla in 1292, and captured it and the Catholicos, but

Het'um II managed finally to drive off the troops of the Sultan of Egypt. This latter, obliged to recall his troops in order to face the Crusaders who had laid siege to Alexandria, released the Catholicos and concluded peace.²⁶

Some years later the viceroy of Damascus, Susamich, attacked New Armenia at the head of his army, but he was defeated by Het'um II and constrained to withdraw.²⁷

Then the king of New Armenia, allied to the Mongols commanded by Ghazan Khan, invaded Syria. The aim of this invasion was to take as far as Palestine and to deliver Jerusalem. The Mongol Khan soon returned to Persia with his army in order to put down a revolt there. The Armenian army, abandoned to its own forces, gained some success, but had finally to abandon the enterprise before the numerical superiority of the Muslim forces and serious losses were incurred.²⁸

Towards the end of the reign of Het'um II the equilibrium of the opposing forces was modified, to the detriment of Armenia, by the gradual conversion of the Mongols to Islam. Thus in 1303 the successor of Ghazan Khan, Öljeitü, attacked New Armenia with his Mongols. The plain of Cilicia was reduced to ruins and the king and his army were obliged to go to entrench themselves in the Taurus

alliance to go to the help of the Mongols", which is a very different emphasis. He also uses the phrase "inexplicable conduct" to describe Mengü Temür's actions, which were the cause of the defeat.

It is interesting to note that neither Macler nor Pasdermadjian make mention of the truce between Qalawun and Lewon of 684/1285.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 216. On the Mamluk capture of Hromgla, see below, "The Conquests of al-Ashraf Khalil", pp. 71–93. The mention of crusaders presumably refers to the raids against Alexandria made in 1292 by a mixed Papal-Genoese-Cypriot fleet, on which, see P.W. Edbury, *The Kingdom of Cyprus and the Crusades, 1191–1374* (Cambridge 1991), 102. Macler ('Armenia', 177) also refers to "the Christians, who at the Pope's instigation laid siege to Alexandria". Rather than having Het'um "drive off" the Mamluks, Macler states that he "gained peace and the release of the Catholicos at the price of several fortresses". Macler dates this episode to 1289–90, so clearly Pasdermadjian must have used some other source, in order to get the correct date, but perhaps also the incorrect analysis.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 216. Macler is (incorrectly) cited for this information by Pasdermadjian, and indeed the former's account is very similar, although he has Het'um handing "Susamish" over to Ghazan ('Armenia', 177–78). This may be an obscure reference to the passage of the Mongol rebel Sülemish through Cilicia, and his defeat by the army of the Ilkhan. On Sülemish's rebellion, see below, pp. 128–36.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 216. On the Armenian involvement with Ghazan in Syria, see below, "Ghazan's Invasions of Syria", pp. 136–53. While Macler may seem to imply a greater Armenian involvement with the campaign than was actually the case, he does take care to mention the fact that Qutlugh-Shāh remained behind with a force of Mongols ('Armenia', 178).

mountains. After the departure of the Mongols, the Seljuk Turks of the Sultanate of Ikonium and the Mamluks of Egypt occupied the country to continue the pillaging. But Het'um II at the head of his army attacked the enemy troops who were preparing to quit the country, loaded with booty, and inflicted on them a bloody defeat, killing 7,000 of their men. The Sultan of Egypt along with the Turks of Ikonium were thus reduced to conclude peace.²⁹

As a response to the loss of the Mongol alliance, Het'um turned to the West for assistance, and was prepared to submit the Armenian Church to that of Rome.

But the Armenian people, always fiercely attached to the independence of their Church, then rose up, in a moment of insane aberration called on the Mongols who occupied the country and put Lewon IV and Het'um II to death.³⁰

This is, as I intend to demonstrate in this book, for the most part positivist fantasy embroidered by the occasional (but not too frequent) oblique reference to the truth. The implication of much of the text is that it was the Armenian king who was taking the lead in the fight against the Mamluks, with the Mongols merely following, allied to the Armenians. In fact, the Armenians were the subject nation, and were obliged to contribute, at some considerable cost, to the Ilkhan's expeditions against Syria. The Mongols are implicitly blamed for the failure of these Armenian-inspired expeditions, by their "inexplicable conduct", or their precipitate withdrawal. These expeditions were, of course, Mongol-inspired and Mongol-led; the Armenian influence on their course being small or insignificant. The Sultans of Konya had long since faded from importance, and it was in fact at about this time that the Seljuk Sultanate simply disappeared.³¹ In 1303, when the Mongols are supposed to have invaded Cilicia under Öljeitü, Ghazan was still Ilkhan, and the Mongol alliance, for what it was worth, still held: the above seems to be a reference to what

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 216–17. This may refer to the invasions of Cilicia by the Mamluks between 1302 and 1306, on which, see below, pp. 153–171. Again, Macler is cited: his account is very similar, except he refers to the death of Ghazan in 1302, and does not identify the "Turks" as specifically Seljuks ('Armenia', 178).

³⁰ This is again very similar to the account of Macler ('Armenia', 178), although he goes into more detail, mentioning the ecclesiastical Council of Sis, and naming Bularghu. On the murder of Het'um and Lewon, see below, pp. 171–80.

³¹ See Claude Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey* (London 1968), 301. The last accession of a Sultan was that of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Mas'ūd, who was put back on the throne by Ghazan in 702/1303. His death, or replacement, was not noted by contemporaries.

was actually a Mamluk raid. It was, in fact, with Mongol assistance that the Armenian king was able to gain the victory referred to above. This victory did not force the Mamluk Sultan to peace: rather, the Armenian king rushed to apologise to the Mamluks, and caved in to their demands, helping to recover captives from the Mongols, in order to stave off a further, more serious, Mamluk raid.³² The idea that the Mamluk Sultans would ever have been forced by Armenian military action to conclude a peace with the Armenian king is ridiculous. The truces between the Mamluks and the Armenians were all largely dictated by the Mamluks' terms, with the Armenian king merely hoping to get away with the least worst possible deal. The murder of Het'um and Lewon was not part of some general uprising, or a Mongol invasion, but was the act of a Mongol commander, who was executed as punishment by the Ilkhan.³³

It may seem unfair and disproportionate to devote such time to an analysis of this work, but it should be noted that this is not merely a critique of the scholarship of this one individual. Pasdermajian's work is representative of one strand of writing on the topic, of which echoes may be found even in otherwise scholarly work on the Armenian kingdom.³⁴ While more sober writers on the history of the kingdom do not suffer from the failings revealed in Pasdermajian's work, there is still a need for a thorough account of the history of the Armenian kingdom in Cilicia in this period that shows awareness of the wider context of the politics of the Near and Middle East, and awareness of the 'non-traditional' (that is, not western European or Armenian) sources.

Not all such general histories of the Armenians are quite so problematic when dealing with the Armenian kingdom in Cilicia. For example, Jacques de Morgan's history of the Armenian people also includes a chapter on the Armenian kingdom in Cilicia.³⁵ His account is, per-

³² On this, see below, pp. 164–71.

³³ See "The Murder of Het'um" below, pp. 171–80.

³⁴ Echoes of this positivist attitude to the history of the Armenian kingdom can even be detected in a work such as Paul Z. Bedoukian's *Coinage of Cilician Armenia* (revised edition, Danbury, Conn. 1979). One example of this deals with Baybars return from Anatolia to Syria in 676/1277, and his subsequent death in Damascus: "on his return [from Anatolia], he was harrassed by Levon's forces and died near Damascus" (*Coinage*, 12).

³⁵ Jacques de Morgan, *Histoire du Peuple Arménien, depuis les temps les plus reculés de ses annales jusqu'à nos jours* (Paris 1919).

haps inevitably, brief,³⁶ and is well illustrated with pictures of coins and seals. The quality of what is there is generally very high, and large extracts from Quatremère's translation of al-Maqrīzī's *Sulūk* are given (although with some inaccuracies, for example with the Arabic names). Nevertheless, given the brevity, there is no attempt to deal with the sources for the history, not even the Armenian sources upon which de Morgan is reliant, and there is little attempt to contextualise the history of the kingdom within that of the Middle East.

Tournebize's work on the political and religious history of the Armenians provides one of the more detailed descriptions of the history of the mediæval Armenian kingdom.³⁷ Het'um II's reign is very densely covered in nine large pages, and the ecclesiastical history of the period is dealt with separately.³⁸ While some of the information presented derives from later Armenian historians rather than from the contemporary sources,³⁹ and some of the basic facts are inaccurate,⁴⁰ this is arguably the best widely available introduction to the period. Tournebize even shows awareness of the relevance of the wider politics of the Middle East to the Armenian kingdom,⁴¹ and he makes interesting use of al-Maqrīzī and Abū'l-Fidā'.⁴² However, since Tournebize was writing, more sources (and more information about them) from the Mamluk Sultanate have become available, and the use Tournebize made of these can be extended greatly.

A more recent introduction to the history of *The Armenians*, by Sirarpie Der Nersessian, also has a chapter on the mediæval kingdom.⁴³ This nine-page chapter gives only "the main outlines of the turbulent history" of the kingdom, and also looks at its culture, and, interestingly, at its place within 'Europe'. The account of the period

³⁶ The period dealt with in this work is covered in nine pages (*Peuple Arménien*, 206–14).

³⁷ Collected as: Fr. Tournebize, *Histoire politique et religieuse de l'Arménie, depuis les origines des Arméniens jusqu'à la mort de leur dernier roi (l'an 1393)* (Paris 1910).

³⁸ *Histoire politique et religieuse*, 220–28, 300–11.

³⁹ For example, the theory that a faction of rebellious Armenians incited Bularghu to murder Het'um II (*Histoire politique et religieuse*, 228). On this, see Der Nersessian, 'Kingdom', 658, n. 50; and below, p. 173, n. 486.

⁴⁰ For example, the date of al-Ashraf Khalīl's assassination is given as in 1294 instead of 1293 (*Histoire politique et religieuse*, 221); or, the date of the murder of Het'um II and Lewon III, which was, according to our sources, on November 17, 1307, he places a year and a day late (228).

⁴¹ For example, he discusses the internal politics of the Mamluk Sultanate, and the effect of that on the Armenian kingdom: *Histoire politique et religieuse*, 225.

⁴² One example of the latter: *Histoire politique et religieuse*, 227.

⁴³ Sirarpie Der Nersessian, 'The Kingdom of Cilicia', in *The Armenians* (London 1969), 44–53.

under discussion in this work is very brief: the last century of the kingdom is covered schematically, rather than chronologically. Nevertheless, it is an excellent summary of the history of the realm, and Der Nersessian is very perceptive in her relation of the kingdom's history with that of the Mongols. The book is intended for a popular audience, and this, and its extreme brevity, entail there being no discussion or analysis of sources, and no investigation into the historiography, be it 'pro-Armenian', or Arabic.⁴⁴

Recent years have seen an increased interest in the study of the crusading movement after 1291.⁴⁵ The fall of Acre and the expulsion of the Franks from Syria has come to be seen, as it was at the time, as merely one event in a whole series: it was not necessarily to be an ending, but also the beginning of a new phase in crusading. Crusades still left western Europe, and crusading propaganda received a new impetus. Norman Housley, introducing his study on *The Later Crusades*, argues that while the "classical period" of crusading (1095–1291) will probably always exert a greater appeal to both historians and readers . . . the 'post-classical period' . . . can assuredly no longer be relegated to concluding chapters or appendices".⁴⁶ Just as the Armenians of Cilicia are involved in the course of the earlier crusades, so the history of their kingdom has had to be considered for this later period by historians of the later crusades. While scholars of the Crusades are indeed increasingly looking beyond the fall of Acre, there is often a lack of understanding of the history of the

⁴⁴ Another, more recent general history, A.E. Redgate's *The Armenians* (Oxford 1998), should also be mentioned. This is primarily concerned with the history and culture of the Armenians before the late eleventh century, dealing with the following nine centuries only very briefly. Redgate, while paying attention to the Cilician kingdom, is predominantly concerned with Armenia proper, the lands to the north, and also pays a great deal of attention to literary, artistic or religious developments and achievements. Only four short sentences deal with the politics of the period dealt with in this work, yet Redgate manages to place the affairs of the kingdom well in the context of the currents of Middle Eastern history, and the Mamluk and Mongol empires (261).

⁴⁵ Mention should perhaps be made of one work that deals with the region up until the Mamluk conquests. Claude Cahen's *La Syrie du nord, à l'époque des croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche* (Paris 1940), as its title suggests, deals with the history of the region before the capture of Antioch by Baybars. Apart from providing an interesting background survey to a study of a later period, it also provides a long and very useful discussion of the country and the historical and archaeological topography of the period (105–76).

⁴⁶ Norman Housley, *The Later Crusades: From Lyons to Alcazar, 1274–1580* (Oxford 1992), 6.

Armenian kingdom, and its place in the network of political relations in the Near and Middle East.

Housley, reasonably enough, deals with the Armenian kingdom in a chapter shared with the kingdom of Cyprus. Inevitably, the affairs of Cyprus dominate, with the history of the Armenian kingdom dealt with summarily in four pages.⁴⁷ The political history of the period dealt with in this work is covered in little more than one page, and while the account is an excellent summary, Housley makes some assumptions that need to be tested by more detailed study, such as his emphasis on “the great invasion of 1266”, when others may have been quite as traumatic.⁴⁸ As is too frequently the case with works written from the point of view of the crusades, rather than the Middle East itself, there are confusions when dealing with aspects of the history of the region and the Armenian kingdom.⁴⁹

This can be seen much more seriously in an important (and more detailed) recent work on crusading policy from 1274 to 1314 by Sylvia Schein.⁵⁰ Some of Schein’s confusion is simply a matter of getting basic facts wrong: for example, within the space of four pages, two different dates are given for Het’um II’s assassination.⁵¹ Nevertheless, some of the problems are due to a more serious misapprehension of the nature of events.⁵² A lack of awareness of the long-term internal politics of the Armenian kingdom is also revealed,

⁴⁷ Housley, *Later Crusades*, 178–82.

⁴⁸ Housley, *Later Crusades*, 180.

⁴⁹ Two rather petty but nevertheless indicative example of this are: his inaccurate date for Ghazan’s conversion to Islam, and his rather too obvious identification of this with a deterioration of relations between the Ilkhan and the Armenian king (Het’um’s murder is almost presented as the direct result of Ghazan’s conversion); and an imprecision in the use of “Mongols” and “Tatars” in opposition to each other—indeed, from the context it may be that he means “Türkmen” where he uses “Tatars” (Housley, *Later Crusades*, 180).

⁵⁰ Sylvia Schein, *Fideles Crucis: The Papacy, the West, and the Recovery of the Holy Land 1274–1314* (Oxford 1991).

⁵¹ Schein, *Fideles Crucis*: “Hetoum II of Lesser Armenia, murdered on 13 August 1307 . . .” (211); “the assassination of Hetoum II and Leo IV (17 November 1307)” (214). The latter date is that given in the sources.

⁵² Schein (*Fideles Crucis*, 214) writes of “the coup of the Mongol chieftain Bilargou, a Moslem fanatic, which ended in the assassination of Hetoum II and Leo IV (17 November 1307), put an end to the friendly relations between Lesser Armenia and the Mongols of Persia which existed under Hetoum II.” This is to some considerable extent a simplification: while Bularghu’s faith may have sparked off his murder, there were other factors involved, and his actions can hardly be called a ‘coup’. The murder itself by no means ended the “friendly relations” between the Ilkhans and the Armenian kings: it was Öljeitü himself who punished Bularghu. See below, “The Murder of Het’um”, pp. 171–80.

for example in a discussion of attempts by Het'um II to move the Armenian Church into line with that of Rome.⁵³ At times the interpretation of the history of the kingdom is infected by an unrealistically positive spin on events, perhaps because of a lack of sophistication in dealing with the sources, or a reliance on the 'pro-Armenian' sources without the balance provided by the Arabic ones.⁵⁴ At one point, "Arab chroniclers" are cited as being in support of an absurd claim made by a late Armenian source, but on inspection of the citations, they do no such thing.⁵⁵ It is clear that a better understanding of the history of the Armenian kingdom, and of its place in the Middle East, and, perhaps most importantly, of the nature of the available sources, including those written from the Mamluk point of view, would be desirable.

⁵³ Schein (*Fideles Crucis*, 195) writes of "the emergence of a unionist party in the kingdom" around 1306–7, ignoring the previous century of debate of the issue.

⁵⁴ For example, Schein, *Fideles Crucis*, 195:

After the death of Ghazan (17 May 1304), the Egyptians renewed their raids against Armenia. Between the years 1300 and 1304, William of Villaret the master-general of the Hospital twice brought aid to Lesser Armenia. In the summer of 1305 an Egyptian army of 3,000 men advanced as far as Tarsus, but was defeated and cut to pieces by King Hetoum near Ayas (17 July 1305). Thereupon the sultan hastened to conclude a truce with Armenia.

Ignoring the rather confused chronology of the passage, one can identify clearly the influence of Hayton's 'Flor', which is, indeed, cited here as Schein's source. While it is true that the death of Ghazan does mark a lessening of the Mongol threat to Syria, the Mamluks had not ceased raiding Cilicia during his lifetime. The victory referred to was primarily the work of Het'um's Mongol protectors, and the subsequent truce was the result of Het'um's anxiety at possible Mamluk repercussions: it was he, not the sultan, who "hastened to conclude a truce" (on this, see below, "The Mamluk raid into Cilicia (704–5/1305–6)", pp. 164–71).

⁵⁵ Schein, *Fideles Crucis*, 163: "According to an Armenian source confirmed by Arab chroniclers, Hetoum II with a small force reached the outskirts of Cairo and then spent some fifteen days in Jerusalem visiting the Holy Places." The Armenian source cited is the *RHC Arm.*, I version of the 'Chronicle of the Kingdom', but this passage was in fact inserted into the translation of the chronicle by its editor, Dulaurier, and originates in the (unreliable) work of Nersēs Balienc' (on Nersēs' treatment of this episode, see below, pp. 112–13, and n. 351). The "Arab chroniclers" cited are Mufaḍḍal (actually a Copt; the edition of Blochet), al-Maqrīzī (Quatremère's translation) and al-Nuwayrī. None of these sources confirm Nersēs' story in any way; in fact, as is not made clear in the relevant footnote, it is not the text of al-Nuwayrī that is cited, but D.P. Little's discussion of the writer in his *Introduction to Mamlūk Historiography* (Montreal 1970; 24–27), and in that there is absolutely no mention made of any Armenian involvement at all in the events of the year. It is disappointing to find such a cavalier attitude to the Arabic source material.

While the well-known Armenian sources have been available in the *Recueil des historiens des croisades: Documents arméniens*⁵⁶ since the beginning of this century, and have been well used, in some cases they have been over-relied on, or followed too closely. Echoes of Hayton's *Flor des estoires* especially can be found in many works that touch on the kingdom, while this is an extremely tendentious work, designed to be a piece of propaganda. One recent writer even confuses the author of the *Flor* with his namesake who was then king of the Armenians.⁵⁷

Unfortunately, the 'pro-Armenian' sources can be problematic, and, worse, the information they provide may be unclear or sparse. Many writers have sought to make use of some of the sources available from the 'other side', from the Mamluk Sultanate, if only relying on translations, some of which themselves are rather problematic. All too often, however, writers have privileged the 'pro-Armenian' sources over the Arabic ones, using the latter merely for supporting detail. While editions of Arabic historical works from the Mamluk period have continued to be produced, and the works themselves and the historiography of the period in general to be studied with ever greater attention,⁵⁸ many writers on the subject of Cilicia and its Armenian kingdom still rely exclusively on translations a century or more old. Nevertheless, the new studies and new editions can provide a new and largely unutilised body of source material. These sources can be mined for new information relevant to the history of the Armenian kingdom, to provide a greater breadth or depth to our knowledge of events, as well as, perhaps, new perspectives. The Arabic and 'pro-Armenian' sources can be used together, compared and contrasted, to provide what is hopefully a more reasonable and balanced view of the history of the relations of the Armenian kingdom in Cilicia and the Mamluk Sultanate.

⁵⁶ The second volume also contains works, such as Hayton's *Flor*, that by Jean Dardel, and the *Gestes des Chiprois*, in other languages, but closely aligned to the Armenian point of view. In this work, I have grouped together the sources written by or sympathetic to the Armenians as 'pro-Armenian'.

⁵⁷ Bruce T. Beebe, "Edward I and the Crusades" (Ph.D. Thesis, St Andrews 1971), 254: "King Hayton II of Armenia, for example, advocated the launching of limited expeditions from Cilicia and Asia Minor in order to secure advance bases for reconquest." In note 1 he cites: "King Hetoum of Armenia, 'La Flor des Estoires,' *RHC arm. ü*, pp. 243-276."

⁵⁸ A landmark work on the historiography of the Mamluk Sultanate is D.P. Little, *An Introduction to Mamlük Historiography: An Analysis of Arabic Annalistic and Biographical Sources for the Reign of al-Malik an-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalā'ūn* (Montreal 1970).

Two works, by Canard and Scott, have looked in detail at this topic. Marius Canard's 'Le royaume d'Arménie-Cilicie et les Mamelouks jusqu'au traité de 1285' appeared in 1967.⁵⁹ Canard makes use of a wide range of Arabic sources,⁶⁰ and Armenian sources in French or Russian translation. He is aware of the limitations of Armenian sources—such as Hayton's *Flor*⁶¹—and uses the Arabic sources both as a means of checking details given by the Armenians,⁶² and as of value themselves. His method is to compare the accounts of different Arabic sources from the Mamluk Sultanate, with each other and with pro-Armenian sources, and then to propose a synthesis. He shows great awareness of the wider history of the region, relating events of direct concern to the Armenian kingdom to events, for example, concerning the Mongols—the history of the Armenian kingdom's relations with the Mamluks is also firmly placed within the context of the wider Mamluk-Mongol conflict. Canard's methodology in this article has served as a model and as an inspiration for the present work.⁶³

Richard Scott's Master's thesis, "Mamlūk-Armenian Relations during the Baḥrī Period to the Fall of Sīs, 1250–1375", also looks at this topic, but for a longer period.⁶⁴ In his introduction, Scott notes the opinion of Dulaurier, the editor of the first Armenian volume of the *Recueil des historiens des croisades*, that "Arabic, Greek and Latin historians have left us much material on central and southern Syria, but little on Cilicia", but counters that "Arabic sources do indeed contain a good deal of information on Cilician Armenia, at least in

⁵⁹ *Revue des études arméniennes*, iv (1967): 217–59. The article finishes with a translation, but no detailed discussion, of the truce of 684/1285 (248–58). It has been reprinted as article VII in Canard's *L'Expansion arabo-islamique et ses répercussions* (London 1974).

⁶⁰ Arabic writers whose work is frequently cited include Ibn Shaddād, Ibn al-Shihna, Abū Shāma, Mufaḍḍal, Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, and al-Maqrīzī.

⁶¹ See, for example, 'Le royaume', 218.

⁶² For example, he is able to give dates for Het'um I's attempt to assist in a Mongol siege of al-Bīra by looking at al-Maqrīzī's *Sulūk* ('Le royaume', 225, and n. 39).

⁶³ Canard finishes the article by expressing the ambition that "we shall study these events up to the conquest of Cilician Armenia by the Mamluks in 1375 in another article" (my translation; 'Le royaume', 259). Unfortunately, this follow-up has not appeared. The second section of the present work ("From the Rise of the Mamluks to the Truce of 684/1285", below, pp. 43–61) covers the same period as Canard's article. I have sought to summarise his arguments, while adding supplementary details from recent secondary scholarship, or from sources not consulted (for example, the Hyderabad edition of al-Yūnīnī) or not available to Canard.

⁶⁴ Richard J. Scott, "Mamlūk-Armenian Relations during the Baḥrī Period to the Fall of Sīs, 1250–1375" (Master's thesis, McGill University, Montreal 1981).

as much as it came into contact with the Mamlūks".⁶⁵ Scott then continues to prove this point. His surveying of the primary source material is extremely impressive,⁶⁶ but the analysis of events, understandably, is much weaker and more simplistic than in Canard's article. His emphasis is on what the Arabic sources contain, not on trying to create a synthesis, or a conjunction between the Arabic and non-Arabic sources. While he does make use of the non-Arabic sources, his thesis is perhaps too reliant on the Arabic texts, and on occasion could be improved by an increased input from other sources, or from increased knowledge of the topography (and toponymy) of the region. At times this makes him unaware, or at least reluctant to deal with, problems in the Arabic sources.⁶⁷ His thesis reads like an overview of what the sources say, with little attempt to break up, and break down, the source material: he seems content to follow the path laid by each of the sources. At times he does not go into very great detail, and while he is very strong on the reigns of Baybars and Qalawun, the period from the death of the latter to the murder of Het'um II is covered in only twelve pages.⁶⁸

⁶⁵ "Relations", 11.

⁶⁶ As with this work, Scott confines himself to the published sources (see "Relations", 24). This means that certain editions published in the last twenty years were not available to him, such as, for example, Li Guo's edition and translation of an important section of al-Yūnīnī's *Dhayl*, in his *Early Mamluk Syrian Historiography: Al-Yūnīnī's Dhayl Mir'āt al-zamān* (2 vols., Leiden 1998).

One of these publications in particular has made the period of the reign of King Het'um II especially auspicious for a study of the relations between the Armenian kingdom and the Mamluks. The work of the historian al-'Aynī has become increasingly highly regarded by modern scholars, for the amount of material he provides, but also because of his fidelity to his own sources, and his habit of clearly citing them (see, for example, Little, *Introduction*, 80–87). An edition of his *Iqd al-Jumān* has been long overdue, and recently a start has been made on producing one: the published volumes so far only cover the period up to just after the death of Het'um II (M.M. Amīn (ed.), *Iqd al-Jumān fī Tārīkh Ahl al-Zamān*; 4 vols. to date, Cairo 1987–90). When later volumes appear, we will have much greater access to the study of the later fourteenth century.

⁶⁷ An example of this can be seen in his lack of awareness of the problems with "Qal'at Nujayma and Ḥumays" ("Relations", 138–39), on which, see below, pp. 118–20.

⁶⁸ Indeed, Scott deals with the murder of Het'um II in only one short sentence ("Relations", 143; on this assassination, see below, pp. 171–80). While he does deal with some campaigns in detail, the capture of Ḥromgla/Qal'at al-Rūm, for example, is dealt with in two paragraphs ("Relations", 133–34; on this campaign, see below, pp. 73–83). Scott gives a very brief account ("Relations", 73–83) of Ghazan's invasions of Syria, with only an occasional reference to Armenian involvement, even though their rôle was interesting, of significance, and discussed at length by the Arabic sources (for example, the sacking of al-Šālihiyya; on which, see below, pp. 141–46).

The Armenian kingdom did not exist in a vacuum, and it is important to consider the wider history of the region when considering *its* history.⁶⁹ The end of the seventh/thirteenth century and the beginning of the eighth/fourteenth was clearly a very important period in the development of the Middle East. The period saw the rise to superpower status of the Mamluk Sultanate; the disappearance of the Seljuk Sultanate of Rūm; the conversion of the Mongol Ilkhans, and the end of their policy of expansion into Syria; and the extirpation of the Franks from the mainland of the Middle East. These years saw the reign in Cilicia of Het'um II, which was a turbulent period even by the standards of the Armenian kingdom. It marks a confirmation of the Armenian kingdom's inherent weakness before the might of the Mamluks, and important developments in the relationship of the Armenians and the Mongols. A study of the history of the Armenian kingdom and its relations with the Mamluks in this period should clearly be rewarding.

Sources

In this study I have sought to demonstrate the potential value of the Arabic sources from the Mamluk Sultanate, and I have limited myself to those that are widely available in printed editions. These sources have been the subject of some recent study, and I do not propose to look at them here in superfluous detail.⁷⁰ Therefore, I will here only briefly introduce them, and the other sources I have consulted.

Foremost among the Arabic sources I have used is al-ʿAynī (762–855/1361–1451), a Cairene *qāḍī*, courtier and scholar. While a comparatively late source, his general history, the *Iqd al-jumān fī taʾrīkh ahl al-zamān*, reliably preserves the accounts of earlier writers, and at

⁶⁹ In this context it should be noted that recent years have seen the publication of important new accessible studies on the history of the Middle East, and especially the Mamluk Sultanate, in this period. Two such are Robert Irwin, *The Middle East in the Middle Ages: The Early Mamluk Sultanate 1250–1382* (London 1986); and P.M. Holt, *The Age of the Crusades: the Near East from the eleventh century to 1517* (London 1986). Another more detailed study, on Mamluk-Mongol relations but of much wider significance, is that by Reuven Amitai-Preiss, *Mongols and Mamluks: The Mamluk-Ilkhānīd war, 1260–1281* (Cambridge 1995).

⁷⁰ For example, see Little, *Introduction*. Most of the Arabic writers used here have entries in the new edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (Leiden 1960–present).

great length.⁷¹ He is not afraid to present versions of events that may be contradictory to each other, which allows us to reach our own conclusions. It is to be hoped that more volumes of the edition of the *Iqd* soon appear: fortunately, those already available just cover the period of the present work. Another, more famous, writer from the same era of use is al-Maqrīzī (766–845/1364–1442), a professional scholar in Cairo, and a rival of al-‘Aynī’s. His history of the Ayyūbid and Mamluk dynasties, the *Kitāb al-sulūk li-ma‘rifat duwal al-mulūk*, is available for the period covered by this work both in a well-respected twentieth century edition, and in a mid-nineteenth century French translation.⁷² Doubts have been raised about the ultimate value of the *Sulūk*, given al-Maqrīzī’s possibly questionable methodology,⁷³ but it still remains useful, if only because of the amount of material collected therein.

Closer to the period studied is Abū’l-Fidā’ (672–732/1273–1331), author of a universal chronicle, *al-Mukhtaṣar fī akhbār al-bashar*. His account, available in a recent English translation by Holt, is frequently that of an eyewitness: as an Ayyūbid prince, and later the ruler of Ḥamā, he accompanied many important Mamluk military expeditions.⁷⁴ It was not only his position that led to him being well-informed, but also it seems an innate interest in politics and history: for example, he shows a surprising degree of knowledge concerning the internal affairs of the Armenian kingdom.

Also contemporary to the events they describe were two Syrian writers, representatives of one of the important schools of Mamluk historiography, based in Damascus: al-Jazarī (658–739/1260–1338) and al-Yūnīnī (640–726/1242–1326). Their chronicles are inextricably linked, and of great value.⁷⁵ It is unfortunate that al-Jazarī’s *Ḥawādith al-zamān* is incomplete, and that al-Yūnīnī’s *Dhayl mir’āt al-zamān fī ta’rīkh al-a’yān* is only partially available, and that mostly in

⁷¹ M.M. Amin (ed.), 4 vols. to date (Cairo 1987–92).

⁷² M.M. Ziyāda and S.‘A.-F. Aṣhūr (eds.), 4 vols. (Cairo 1934–73); E. Quatremère (part ed. & tr.), *Histoire des Sultans Mamlouks de l’Égypte*, 2 vols. in 4 parts (Paris 1837–54).

⁷³ On this, and on al-Maqrīzī in general, see Little, *Introduction*, 76–80; and Amitai-Preiss, *Mongols and Mamluks*, 5 (“al-Maqrīzī often did his work in a haphazard manner, distorting the meaning of his source”).

⁷⁴ P.M. Holt (extracts tr.), *The Memoirs of a Syrian Prince: (672–732/1273–1331)* (Wiesbaden 1983). Also worthy of mention is his geographical work, the *Taqwīm al-buldān* (J.T. Reinaud and W. MacGuckin de Slane (eds.); Paris 1840).

⁷⁵ Al-Yūnīnī is notably included as among those sources Irwin suggests require publication: *Middle East*, page iii.

unsatisfactory editions.⁷⁶ Nevertheless, what is available is of some interest, and often appears to be a foundation for the versions of later writers, such as al-Maqrīzī.

Several other writers, all working in Egypt in the first half of the eighth/fourteenth century, deserve mention. Mufaḍḍal ibn Abī'l-Faḍā'il, a Copt, wrote a continuation to an earlier history entitled *al-Nahj al-sadīd wa'l-durr al-farīd fīmā ba'd ta'rikk Ibn al-'Amīd*, which covers the period 658–741/1260–1348.⁷⁷ We know little about Mufaḍḍal, but his *Nahj* contains much interesting detail, and is distinguished by a coherent organisation. Ibn al-Dawādārī is also a shadowy figure, but had connections with the Mamluk regime and may himself have been a Mamluk official. His universal chronicle, completed in 736/1335, the *Durar al-tijān*, is unpublished for this period, but his own abbreviation of it, the *Kanz al-durar*, has been edited.⁷⁸ Better known are two slightly earlier writers who were themselves sources for those writing after, but whose work is not fully available: Baybars al-Manṣūrī, and al-Nuwayrī. The former was a Mamluk general, who died in old age in 725/1325, the author of two main historical works, *Ḍubdat al-fikra fī ta'rikk al-hijra*, covering the period up to 724/1324, and the shorter *Tuḥfa al-mulūkiyya fī'l-dawla al-turkiyya*. Al-Nuwayrī (677–733/1279–1333) was an administrator and then a professional scholar, the author of a vast encyclopaedia, not all of which has been yet edited, *Nihāyat al-arab fī funūn al-adab*. Extracts from the work of both al-Nuwayrī and Baybars al-Manṣūrī, covering the years 694–98/1294–98, have been edited and published by Elham.⁷⁹

Izz al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād (613–84/1217–85), a biographer of Baybars, also wrote on the historical topography of Syria and the Jazīra, in *al-A'lāq al-khaṭira fī dhikr umarā' al-Shām wa'l-Jazīra*. Relevant sections

⁷⁶ On the problems with the editions of al-Yūnīnī, see Li Guo, *Early Mamluk Syrian Historiography: al-Yūnīnī's Dhayl*, i, 3–5. Al-Jazarī's *Hawādiṭh* has been summarised and partially translated by Sauvaget, *La Chronique de Damas d'al-Jazarī (années 689–698)* (Paris 1949). The first half of al-Yūnīnī's *Dhayl* was published in Hyderabad, 4 vols. (1954–61).

⁷⁷ The period from 1259–1317 was translated and edited by E. Blochet as 'Histoire des Sultans mamlouks', in *Patrologia Orientalis*, xii, xiv, and xx (1919–28). The rest of the *Nahj* is edited and translated by S. Kortantamer, *Ägypten und Syrien zwischen 1314 und 1341 in der Chronik des Mufaḍḍal b. Abī l-Faḍā'il* (Freiburg 1973).

⁷⁸ Volume 8 covers the period 648–698/1250–99, U. Haarmann (ed.) (Freiburg 1971); the reign of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad is in volume 9, H.R. Roemer (ed.) (Cairo 1960).

⁷⁹ M. Elham, *Kūbuḡā und Lāḡīn: Studien zur Mamluken-Geschichte nach Baibars al-Manṣūrī und an-Nuwayrī* (Freiburg 1977).

have recently been translated into French, by Eddé-Terrasse.⁸⁰ This has provided much background information on places mentioned in the sources, as well as some historical detail. Also of use have been the biographies collected by Ibn al-Ṣuqāʿī (died, in Damascus, in 726/1325), in the *Tālī kitāb wafayāt al-aʿyān*. This has also recently been edited and translated into French.⁸¹

Foremost among the Armenian sources for this period must be *La Flor des Estoires de la Terre d'Orient* of Hetʿum, or Hayton, of Goṛigos. This was actually dictated by Hayton in French, to a clerk who then translated it into Latin (*Flos Historiarum Terre Orientis*), for presentation to Pope Clement V, in August, 1307.⁸² The first three books describe the lands of the East, and deal with the history of the Mongols, including passages of some relevance for the history of the Armenian kingdom, many of which Hayton claims to be a witness to; the fourth book is essentially a treatise advocating a *passagium* aimed at recapturing the Holy Land.⁸³ The intended Papal audience, the 'political' aim of the work, and Hayton's own involvement in the politics of both the Armenian kingdom and Cyprus,⁸⁴ are all factors that lead the reader to question the reliability of the *Flor*. Nevertheless, bearing these problems in mind, the *Flor* does provide much information, which can in the least be compared with other sources. Hayton was also responsible for the brief and incomplete, though occasionally informative, entries in a 'Chronological Table', edited and translated into French from the Armenian by Dulaurier.⁸⁵

⁸⁰ A.-M. Eddé-Terrasse (tr.), *Description de la Syrie du Nord* (Damascus 1984).

⁸¹ Ibn al-Ṣuqāʿī, *Tālī kitāb wafayāt al-aʿyān*, J. Sublet (ed. & tr.) (Damascus 1974).

⁸² Both the French and Latin versions, with variants, are published, in the *Recueil des historiens des croisades: Documents Arméniens*, II, 113–253 [French], 255–366 [Latin]. Throughout the present work I have called this writer Hayton, rather than Hetʿum, in order to distinguish him from his namesake, the Armenian king.

⁸³ On this aspect of Hayton's *Flor*, and on other such treatises, see Schein, *Fideles Crucis*, especially 195.

⁸⁴ In 1307 Hayton was not only in exile from Cilicia, but was also acting as the Cypriot Regent Amaury's representative at the Papal Curia, in the controversy over Amaury's removal of his brother King Henry II. On this aspect of Hayton, see D.D. Bundy, 'Hetʿum's *La Flor des Estoires de la Terre d'Orient*: A Study in Medieval Armenian Historiography and Propaganda', *REA*, xx (1986–7):223–235.

⁸⁵ Éd. Dulaurier (ed. & tr.), 'Table Chronologique, de Héthoum, comte de Goṛ'igos', *RHC Arm.*, I, 461–90. R.W. Thomson (*A Bibliography of Classical Armenian Literature to 1500 A.D.* (Turnhout 1995), 139) attributes this work to King Hetʿum II himself, which seems unlikely, given the content of some of the entries, not least that concerning the murder of Hetʿum.

Another figure of some importance in the history of the Armenian kingdom who has left us, amongst other works, a chronicle based in part on eyewitness observation, is the Constable Smpad, the brother of Het'um I. There have been recent French and English translations of this chronicle, but these versions end in the 1270s.⁸⁶ Smpad himself died in 1276. The work was also translated by Dulaurier, in the *Recueil des historiens des croisades*, with an anonymous continuation up to the 1330s, as the *Chronicle of the Kingdom of Little Armenia*.⁸⁷ Many of the notices recorded by the continuer are very brief, but even these can be helpful.

Other Armenian sources furnish the occasional detail. I have made use of two continuations of the chronicle of Samuēl Anec'i, or Samuel of Ani. The details provided in the *Chronography* edited and translated by Dulaurier are generally, with the occasional exception, brief, but are much more full than the simple entries in the *Chronological Tables* translated by Brosset.⁸⁸ Of some interest is the collection of Armenian manuscript colophons translated by Sanjian.⁸⁹ These often help with points of dating and titles, for example, and by their nature give what are the frequently fascinating opinions on events of contemporary scribes. The shifting attitude of the Armenians to the Ilkhans is one area revealed by some of the extracts.

The *Gestes des Chiprois* also adds some information of interest, for example relating to the Ilkhans' invasions of Syria, and even the internal affairs of the Armenian kingdom.⁹⁰ The compiler of this, the

⁸⁶ S. Der Nersessian (tr.), 'The Armenian Chronicle of the Constable Smpad or of the "Royal Historian"', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* xiii (1959):143-68; G. Dédéyan (tr.), *La Chronique Attribuée au Connétable Smbat* (Paris 1980).

⁸⁷ Éd. Dulaurier (ed. & tr.), 'Chronique du royaume de la Petite Arménie, par le Connétable Sēmpad', *RHC Arm.*, I, 605-72. This edition also includes excerpts from the work of Nersēs Balienc', a writer from the later fourteenth century: these extracts are often very full, and are certainly very interesting, if of dubious accuracy. On Nersēs Balienc', see Dulaurier's introduction to Smpad's chronicle (*RHC Arm.*, I, 608-9, and n. 1), and Thomson, *Bibliography of Classical Armenian Literature*, 178 (transliterated as if standard, or classical, Armenian, as *Nersēs Palienc'*).

⁸⁸ Éd. Dulaurier (ed. & tr.), 'Extrait de la Chronographie de Samuel d'Ani', *RHC Arm.*, I, 445-68; M. Brosset (tr.), 'Samouel d'Ani, Tables Chronologiques', in *Collection d'historiens arméniens*, II (St. Petersburg 1876), 339-483.

⁸⁹ A.K. Sanjian (tr.), *Colophons of Armenian Manuscripts, 1301-1480* (Cambridge, Mass. 1969). It is unfortunate that Sanjian's selection begins so late.

⁹⁰ Two editions of the *Gestes* were consulted: G. Raynaud (ed.), *Les Gestes des Chiprois: recueil de chroniques françaises écrites en orient aux XIII^e et XIV^e siècles* (Société de l'orient latin: série historique; Geneva 1887, reprinted, Osnabruck 1968); and G. Paris and L. de Mas Latrie (eds.), *RHC Arm.*, II, 651-872. Throughout the text, unless specifically stated, references to the *Gestes des Chiprois* are to the former.

author of the later section relevant here, who may have been a Templar, lived in Cyprus at the time covered in this work. Given this contemporary status, and the close relations between the Armenian and Cypriot kingdoms, it is well worth paying attention to his account. Another contemporary account is provided by the important Jacobite ecclesiastic known as Bar Hebraeus, who, from his studies and his posts, knew the Middle East well. He died in Maragha in 685/1286, but his Syriac *Chronography* was continued, perhaps by his own brother, until 696/1297, and has been translated by Budge.⁹¹ The accounts of visitors to the eastern Mediterranean, such as Jean de Joinville or Marco Polo, have also provided the occasional detail.⁹²

While ‘historical’ written sources are inevitably the mainstay of research into the Mamluks and the Armenian, other sources of information can also prove useful. The physical remnants of the Armenian kingdom can also contribute to an understanding of its history. It is clear that visiting the region, observing the terrain, and inspecting many of the important centres of the Armenian kingdom, can provide many important insights, and contribute extremely positively to an understanding of the written sources. Also of some use in assessing the impact of the conflict with the Mamluks on the Armenian kingdom is the work of scholars looking at the coinage of the kingdom, notably Paul Bedoukian.⁹³

Of the literary sources discussed here, the latter, ‘pro-Armenian’, ones are those traditionally used by historians of the Armenian kingdom. In this present work I am seeking to demonstrate the great potential value of other sources, the work of Arabic writers from the Mamluk Sultanate.⁹⁴

⁹¹ E.A.W. Budge (ed. & tr.), *The Chronography of [Gregory Abū'l Faraj, the son of Aaron, the Hebrew Physician commonly known as] Bar Hebraeus, being the first part of his Political History of the World, I* (translation) (London 1932).

⁹² ‘The Life of Saint Louis’, in Joinville and Villehardouin, *Chronicles of the Crusades*, M.R.B. Shaw (tr.) (Harmondsworth 1963); R.E. Latham (tr.), *The Travels of Marco Polo* (Harmondsworth 1958). Marco Polo was in Ayas at the time of Baybars’ invasion of Cilicia of 673/1274–5 (Latham, *Travels*, 39).

⁹³ See, for example, P.Z. Bedoukian, *The Coinage of Cilician Armenia* (Danbury 1979).

⁹⁴ Another likely supply of information on the affairs of the Armenian kingdom may seem to be through Persian sources, especially those produced in the Mongol Ilkhanate, the ally or overlord of the kingdom. Foremost among Persian chroniclers of the period under study was Rashīd al-Dīn, Ghazan’s chief minister: his history provides only little information, however, directly regarding the Armenian

The Geography of the Armenian Kingdom

The area settled by the Armenians emigrating from their ancestral homelands, the mountainous country in the southern Caucasus and to the north of Lake Van, in the tenth and subsequent centuries was much wider than the area later covered by the Armenian kingdom of the ʔupēnids and Hetʔumids, even when at its height. By the later eleventh century Armenian governors controlled a vast area, which included Malatya, Marash, Edessa and Antioch. Much of this territory later came under the control of the crusaders, but some was later included in the lands of the Armenian kingdom in the thirteenth century. Especially in the later thirteenth century, after Hülegü's conquests and distribution of lands, it is perhaps misleading to refer to the Armenian kingdom, centred in Cilicia as it was, as being merely "of Cilicia", or "Cilician": the Armenian king ruled lands away in the eastern Taurus mountains, to the banks of the Euphrates, in what is the extreme north of Syria.

Throughout this thesis I have tried not to use these terms, and especially the 'Cilician Kingdom of Armenia' construction. I have sought to avoid the problem of the lack of a single geographical designation for the area covered by the kingdom by calling it the "Armenian kingdom". It should be noted that, of contemporary sources, only the 'Western' name the kingdom as "Armenia", such as the *Gestes des Chiprois*' reference to the "royaume d'Ermenie". Jean Dardel calls the region of the kingdom "la basse Armenye", as opposed to "la haulte Armenye", the Armenian homeland. Hayton, very interestingly, calls the kingdom Cilicia, but states that "verily, this province of Cilicia is known as Armenia".⁹⁵ Armenian writers, such as Samuel of Ani or the Constable Smpad, call the region Cilicia (*Kilikia*, *Giligia*, etc.), although the ruler himself may be termed "king of Armenia". The writers of the colophons collected by Sanjian, even those in Cilicia itself, call the province Cilicia, and its ruler the "king of the Armenians"; the legend on coins from the kingdom describes the ruler in the same way, or even as "king of all the Armenians".⁹⁶ The Arabic writers used in this work never call the king-

kingdom. While I have made occasional use in this work of Persian sources, they have not contributed greatly: this serves to further emphasise the strengths of the Arabic sources from the Mamluk Sultanate.

⁹⁵ 'Flor', 134 [French], 273 [Latin].

⁹⁶ See Bedoukian, *Coinage*, 87, etc.

dom ‘Armenia’, but always *bilād sīs*, the “land of Sis”, and at times merely *sīs* itself serves for the whole kingdom as well as its capital (a not uncommon, but potentially confusing practice); occasionally there is a reference to “the territory of the Armenians”. While they are aware that he and his subjects are Armenians, the king is called *ṣāhib sīs*, “lord of Sis”, or even *takfūr malik sīs*, “Takfūr [doubtless a derivation of the Armenian for king, *t’agawor*] king of Sis”.⁹⁷

On this topic, it should be noted that it is difficult to establish which national or religious groups were resident in the Armenian kingdom. Hayton describes the inhabitants of his “kingdom of Syria”, of which Cilicia is the fourth part, as “Greeks, Armenians, Jacobites, Nestorians, Saracens [in the Latin version only], and another two Christian nations, . . . Syrians and Maronites”, the latter two groups explained as Arabic-speaking, and following the Greek and Jacobite rites respectively;⁹⁸ but this does not help us with regard to the Armenian kingdom alone. The Arabic writers seem to refer only to Armenians as inhabitants of the kingdom: Armenian soldiers took part in the Mongol raids; Armenian ambassadors were sent to the Sultan; the nobles of the kingdom were the “amirs of the Armenians”,⁹⁹ castles are “in the land of the Armenians”,¹⁰⁰ or are garrisoned by Armenians. While these are all references to nobles or soldiers, the Arabic sources also refer to Armenians, presumably civilians, who gather in or near a castle in the face of Mamluk attack,¹⁰¹ and prisoners massacred by a Mamluk raiding party returning from Cilicia are those who had been “captured from the Armenians”.¹⁰² The kingdom was the “land of the Armenians”, its population the “Armenian people of Sis”.¹⁰³

Cilicia, nevertheless, was the main, and most important, part of the kingdom. Cilicia lies around and to the north and west of the Gulf of Alexandretta/İskenderun, and the very north-eastern corner of the Mediterranean Sea. To its north is the Anatolian plateau, Syria to the south and east. The Cilician plain (Classical *Cilicia Pedias*,

⁹⁷ For example, al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, I: iii, 949.

⁹⁸ ‘Flor’, 134–35 [French]; 273 [Latin].

⁹⁹ For example, al-‘Aynī, *‘Iqd*, iv, 301.

¹⁰⁰ For example, al-‘Aynī, *‘Iqd*, iii, 422.

¹⁰¹ Al-Maqrīzī (*Sulūk*, I: iii, 840) describes a valley “full with Armenians”.

¹⁰² Al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, I: iii, 839–40.

¹⁰³ For example, al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, I: iii, 784: a reference to the holders of Behesni, in the eastern Taurus.

in Turkish Çukorova) is fertile, and in summer very hot: the climate is characteristically Mediterranean, and modern irrigation programmes have led to citrus plantations, and cotton is still a major product. The plain is drained by two main rivers and their tributaries, the Seyhan (Arabic Sayhān, Classical Sarus) and the Ceyhan (Armenian Chahan, Arabic Jayhān, Classical Pyramus). The main cities of the area lie in this plain, Tarsus, Adana (farther west, on the Seyhan), Msis (Turkish Misis, Arabic al-Maṣṣīṣa, Classical Mopsuestia or Mamistra, on the Ceyhan), Sis (today Kozan, to the north), and Ayas (Classical Aigai, Turkish Yumurtalık) on the west side of the Gulf of Alexandretta.¹⁰⁴ However, at the time of the Armenian kingdom, it seems that these cities, with the possible exception of Ayas, were often little more than trading depots, with only small populations sheltering within dilapidated walls:¹⁰⁵ it is likely that the kingdom was overwhelmingly rural in its population, and that this was more concentrated in the mountain valleys than the plain.¹⁰⁶ It is possible that it was the small population of the Cilician cities that enabled them to be so repeatedly sacked by Mamluk armies: they only maintained a low level of urbanisation, that was easier to revive than would have been a more sophisticated settlement.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁴ Alexandretta (Arabic Iskandarūna, Turkish İskenderun) itself, on its east coast of its gulf, and the modern port city of Mersin/İçel at the south-western corner of the Cilician plain, were not of such importance during the period of the Armenian kingdom as they are today.

¹⁰⁵ In the course of the thirteenth century, the Genoese and Venetians were granted rights to warehouses in Tarsus, Sis, and Msis, and Msis only, respectively, but it seems that their settlement was concentrated overwhelmingly in Ayas. The account of the thirteenth century traveller Wilbrand von Oldenburg implies that of the Cilician cities, only Tarsus had any substantial population; this may have been predominantly Greek, rather than Armenian (see Edwards, *Fortifications*, 43–45). Marco Polo describes Ayas as a “busy emporium” (Latham, *Travels*, 46).

¹⁰⁶ On this point, see Edwards, *Fortifications*, 43–46.

¹⁰⁷ It is also conceivable that the plain was unattractive for settlement not only because of the insecurity caused by the Mamluk menace, but because of the threat of malarial disease in the marshy lowlands. It should be stressed that I have discovered no evidence to support this argument, but it is clear that other areas of the Mediterranean littoral were depopulated for this reason in the post-Classical period, so this process could at least be considered for Cilicia as well. Marco Polo does refer to Cilicia as having a humid and “far from healthy” climate (Latham, *Travels*, 46), which may support the theory of malaria contributing to the lack of urbanisation in Cilicia in this period.

Stephen Hill (*The Early Byzantine Churches of Cilicia and Isauria* (Aldershot 1996), 6–10) discusses the decline in urban populations in Cilicia in the early Medieval period, and the conversion of the townspeople, over time, into transhumant mountain-dwellers. This process he relates to a decline in the size and quality of churches being built in hitherto urban areas.

While the Cilician plain is largely flat, with only the occasional outcrop (as at Anawarza/Anavarza/‘Ayn Zarba/Anazarbos), the mountains that separate it from the rest of what is today Turkey are imposing, densely forested, and difficult to cross. In the west of Cilicia the Taurus mountains extend close to the coast, and the main settlements occur where a valley enters the sea, as with the Göksü/Calycadnus at Silifke (Seleucia). Other important ports in this region include Anamur to the west and Kızkalesi (Armenian Goṛigos, Classical Korykos or Corycus) just to the east of Silifke. This mountainous area is very isolated, and even the modern road that skirts the coast from Alanya to Silifke is extremely winding, and still in places very rough, doubtless where landslides have caused damage or diversion. While a road from Silifke heads north up the canyon of the Göksü towards Karaman and Konya (Ikonion), the main road into Cilicia from the north-west, in the historical period as well as today, runs through the “Cilician Gates” (or *Pylæ Ciliciæ*) north of Tarsus.¹⁰⁸ Sis itself is at the southern end of another, minor, route across the mountains, north past Vahga (one of the earliest fortresses of the Rūpēnids in Cilicia, today Feke Kalesi). The great rivers that cut through the mountains from Cappadocia run through steep gorges, and the viable passes, then as now, often avoid what might seem the obvious routes along the river valleys.¹⁰⁹ To the east of Cilicia, the mountains, while still imposing, are not so impassible, and there are minor routes through the eastern Taurus, such as that from Kadirli, east of Sis, to Marash and thence to Göksun or Elbistan.¹¹⁰ The Amanus range (the Nur Dağları or Jabal al-Lukkām),

¹⁰⁸ In fact, the modern highway between Tarsus and Pozanti runs through a cutting just to the east of the historical Cilician Gates, which are at Gülek Boğazı, a name possibly derived from the Armenian name for the Cilician Gates, the pass of Guglag.

¹⁰⁹ D.G. Hogarth points out that the rivers that rise north of the main chain of the Taurus “strike straight through the hills by gorges often impassible even on foot”, at the end of the nineteenth century (‘Passes of the Eastern Taurus and Anti-Taurus’, *Royal Geographical Society—Supplementary Papers* iii, part V:I (1893): 643–78; 656–57).

¹¹⁰ Hogarth (‘Passes’, 657) states that “through the whole system [that is, the Taurus and the Anti-Taurus] from the Bulgar Dagh [the Bolkar Dağları, the range at the west end of Cilicia] to the Euphrates, nature and man have rendered only six roads practicable for anything less agile than a goat or a Zeitunli Armenian [a nation then famous for indomitable bravery and independence of spirit]”. These six routes are listed as: the Cilician Gates; the pass from Sis north into the Anti-Taurus, which bifurcates to Vahga/Feke and Hajin; from Marash to Göksun/Coxon; Marash to Zeytun/Süleymanlı; Marash to Elbistan; from Marash or Samsat, via Behesni/Besni north towards Melden/Meltime/Malaṭya.

though less impressive than the Taurus, still acts as a barrier to the south-eastern side of Cilicia. While there are other routes, under ideal conditions, across these mountains from Syria, in practice there are only two important passes. The pass of Belen or the “Syrian Gates” is the southerly of the two, and is guarded on its eastern side by the castle of Baghras, from which comes the name often given the pass by Arabic writers.¹¹¹ In order to enter Cilicia proper from this pass, a traveller must also go through the Portella, a defile between the mountains and the coast north of Alexandretta.¹¹² At the northern end of the range is the pass called the “Amanian [or ‘Amanus] Gates” (or *Pyle Amanide*), known to the Armenians as the pass of Maṛi, and containing the important castle of Saruantik‘ar (Savranda). The modern equivalent to this pass, slightly to the north of the mediæval route, contains the main highway between Adana and Antep.¹¹³

While the mountains are breached by these passes, they also contain remote valleys, accessible by narrow winding roads through the forested slopes. One such valley, significant in the history of the Armenians of Cilicia as the base of the Het‘umid rivals to the Rūpēnids, is that dominated by the castle of Lampron (Namrunkale), south-west of the Cilician Gates, but divided from them by the mountains. The Taurus mountains contain many such castles, more isolated even than Lampron.¹¹⁴ The castle-towns in the valleys of the eastern Taurus, such as Marash and Behesni, were also important outposts of the Armenian kingdom at the end of the thirteenth century, and, as with many of even the most isolated fortresses, these were on important routes of communication and trade. Within the Cilician plain itself, other castles are to be found on isolated outcrops, as at

¹¹¹ The modern road through the pass of Belen does not pass by Baghras. William Ainsworth, writing early in the nineteenth century (‘Notes Upon the Comparative Geography of the Cilician and Syrian Gates’, *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London* (1838): 185–95; it should be noted that Ainsworth’s “Cilician Gates” are actually the Amanus Gates), calls this (the “Beilán Pass”) the “only pass commonly practicable from Cilicia into Syria” (185).

¹¹² Edwards (*Fortifications*, 39) points out that it was this secondary pass that marked the southeastern boundary of the Armenian kingdom for most of its existence, with Baghras held usually by the Franks, and then the Mamluks. For a picture of Baghras today, see Plate 11, below.

¹¹³ The pass itself on the modern E–90 highway is between Osmaniye and Fevzipaşa. For a picture of Saruantik‘ar today, see Plate 10, below.

¹¹⁴ On all matters relating to Cilician castles, see Edwards, *Fortifications*. The castle of Lampron is above a recently developed settlement called Çamlıyayla, north-west of Tarsus.

Anawarza, Yılan Kalesi, T'ıl Hamdun, or Tumlu Kalesi. These dominate the country, and are intervisible, obviously a potential aid to communication in the case of invasion. The castle of Sis itself is perched on an outcrop just south of the mountains proper, and other castles—Tumlu and Anawarza, for example—are visible from it.¹¹⁵

Quite apart from the fertility of the Cilician plain, a major source of income for the Armenian kingdom derived from the trade that passed through.¹¹⁶ Caravans using the passes into Cilicia could be taxed, but Cilicia also, more importantly, provided Ayas, the port that for a time, after the decline of the Crusader states, and before the disintegration of both the Mongol Ilkhanate and the Armenian kingdom itself, was the terminus of the great trade routes to the East. At the other end of the plain, Goṛigos (Korykos), like Ayas defended by both land and sea castles, was much less important. In the Mediæval period it is likely that at times Tarsus, and even Adana and Msis, may have been accessible to boats sailing up each city's river. Given the build up of land caused by silt deposits from the great rivers these cities would then have been closer to the sea, but the lower reaches of these rivers were then even more marshy and shallow than now, and it seems that, especially in the period covered in this work, Ayas was by far and away the most important port.¹¹⁷

Much of what we know of the commercial life of the Armenian kingdom comes from surviving documents from the Italian mercantile cities.¹¹⁸ The Genoese and Venetians were granted trading

¹¹⁵ For illustrations of some of these castles, including Sis, Lampron, Anawarza, Yılan, and T'ıl, see the photographs below, between pages 196 and 197. For the location of these and other places in the Armenian kingdom mentioned in the text, see the map, below, p. 197.

¹¹⁶ Catherine Otten describes the important trade routes that crossed Cilicia ('Les Échanges Commerciaux', in Mutaſian, *Royaume Arménien*, 119): from Syria (Aleppo or Antioch) across to Konya (and Constantinople beyond); a branch of this, coming from the direction of Marash and the middle Euphrates; and perhaps the most important for the period of the kingdom dealt with in this work, the route from Ayas north, either to Trebizond/Trabzon and the Black Sea, or to Sebasteia/Sivas, Tabriz and beyond to Central Asia and China.

¹¹⁷ For pictures of the ports and fortifications of Ayas and Goṛigos today, see Plates 14–16, below.

¹¹⁸ See Otten, 'Échanges Commerciaux'; C. Otten-Froux, 'L'Aïas dans le dernier tiers du XIII^e siècle d'après les notaires génois', *Asian and African Studies* xxii (1988): 147–71; Cornelio Desimoni, 'Actes passés en 1271, 1274 et 1279 à l'Aïas (Petite Arménie) et à Beyrouth par devant des notaires génois', *Archives de l'orient latin*, i (1881): 434–534. On the position of the Armenian kingdom in the trade of the time, see also W. Heyd, *Histoire du Commerce du Levant, au Moyen Âge* (2 vols., Leipzig 1923), especially ii, 73–92.

privileges in the kingdom from the beginning of the thirteenth century, and each had a representative (a ‘consul’ or ‘bayle’) in the kingdom. Ayas was also frequented by traders from Sicily, Catalonia, Montpellier, and Pisa, and housed representatives of the great Tuscan commercial companies.¹¹⁹ Perhaps inevitably, Ayas had especially close links with Famagusta in Cyprus, and it seems much of Ayas’ trade flowed through that city also.¹²⁰ The Western merchants exported not only the spices carried overland from India and the far East (such as pepper, ginger, indigo and brasil wood), but also the produce of Cilicia itself, such as cotton. When not forbidden by the Papal embargo on trade in military supplies with the Mamluks, the Italians also carried wood and iron, the products of the Taurus forests, to Syria and Egypt. From the West the merchants carried finished cloth to Cilicia, for re-export to Konya, Tabriz and beyond, and also grain, oil, and wine.¹²¹ Famous Italian merchants that passed through Cilicia include Marco Polo, and Francesco Balducci Pegolotti (as late as 1336).

The topography of the Armenian kingdom was extremely varied. The high forested mountains, drier in the east, with steep-sided valleys, provided the home and place of refuge for the majority of the Armenian population. As in the Armenian homeland, the Armenian nobility resided in their castles, rather than in towns. This is in marked contrast to the Frankish settlers in the Crusader States, and, even, Turkish immigrants to the *dār al-islam* such as the Mamluks themselves, for example. While a source of strength, the mountain base for the kingdom, and the scattered settlement of the nobility, may have contributed to their fissiparous tendencies, and may have militated against coordinated defence. The far-flung nature of some of the kingdom’s outposts would also have contributed to these defensive problems. The hot, fertile plain was a source of wealth, but its exposure to enemy incursions prohibited much development: the kingdom followed a “non-urban strategy”,¹²² based on control of fortified outcrops, and on retreat to the mountains.

¹¹⁹ Otten, ‘Échanges Commerciaux’, 123–24.

¹²⁰ Otten, ‘Échanges Commerciaux’, 126.

¹²¹ On Cilicia’s imports and exports, see Otten, ‘Échanges Commerciaux’, 124–26.

¹²² The term is used by Edwards, *Fortifications*, 37–50 (a chapter entitled “The Role of Military Architecture in Medieval Cilicia: The Triumph of a Non-Urban Strategy”).