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Abstract

Hayton’s *La Flor des estoires de la terre d’Orient* (1307) is typically viewed by scholars as a propagandistic piece of literature, which focuses on promoting the Ilkhanid Mongols as suitable allies for a western crusade. Written at the court of Pope Clement V in Poitiers in 1307, Hayton, a Cilician Armenian prince and diplomat, was well-versed in the diplomatic exchanges between the papacy and the Ilkhanate. This dissertation will explore his complex interests in Avignon, where he served as a political and cultural intermediary, using historical narrative, geography and military expertise to persuade and inform his Latin audience of the advantages of allying with the Mongols and sending aid to Cilician Armenia. This study will pay close attention to the ways in which his worldview as a Cilician Armenian informed his perceptions. By looking at a variety of sources from Armenian, Latin, Eastern Christian, and Arab traditions, this study will show that his knowledge was drawn extensively from his inter-cultural exchanges within the Mongol Empire and Cilician Armenia’s position as a medieval crossroads. The study of his career reflects the range of contacts of the Eurasian world.
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Note on Transliteration

This study relies on the Hübschmann-Meillet-Benveniste (HMB) transliteration system for the Armenian nomenclature.

The Mongol proper names are based on the UNESCO system while Arabic and Persian names largely follow *The Encyclopedia of Islam, 2nd edition*. 
Chapter 1

Introduction

In the cultural mosaic of the fourteenth century Eastern Mediterranean, Cilician Armenian Hayton (Hetʿum/Hetoum), Lord of Korykos (c.1240-c.1316), forged a remarkable career.¹ Scholars—both old and new—have presented Hayton as a cosmopolitan figure who bridged East and West during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. He was seen as a diplomat, Latin convert, historian, statesman, crusade strategist (and propagandist), and prince of the royal line of Cilician Armenia, located in south-western Asia Minor. An examination of Hayton’s extensive participation in East-West political, cultural, social and religious affairs, serves as a window into his world, illuminating the ways in which he operated during a moment of global politics enabled by the Mongol Empire.

Born in the mid-thirteenth century, Hayton forged a remarkable career in politics and diplomacy in his kingdom and abroad. As a member of the ruling Hetʿumid dynasty of Cilician Armenia, he served as a major actor in the political affairs of Cilician Armenia, rising as one of the main opponents of his kinsman, Hetʿum II (d.1307). Hayton’s activities were situated within the turbulent period of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, a period which witnessed the transformation of the Latin East, the Ilkhanid-Mamlûk conflict and the political fragmentation of the Armenian kingdom. Standing in line with the interests of the Cilician ruling class, Hayton acted as an

¹ He has predominantly become known as Hayton in scholarship.
enthusiastic promoter of Catholicism among the Apostolic Armenians, engaging in the wider debate between the Armenian elite and prominent clergy. His status also allowed him to forge a marriage to Isabella of the powerful Cypriot Ibelin branch in 1285 and participate in Cypriot political affairs during his time on the island in 1305. His offspring, including Ōšin of Korykos (d.1329), would continue to exercise political influence and serve as major forces in the affairs of the Eastern Mediterranean world.

As the political and social fabric of Cilician Armenia grew closely attached to the world of the crusaders and Mongols, Hayton became a seasoned participant in the Ilkhanid campaigns against the Mamlûks, taking part in Ilkhan Ghazan’s Syrian campaigns beginning in 1299. His experience in warfare rendered him a major supporter of the prospect of an Ilkhanid-Latin alliance, which he promoted to Pope Clement V. The last known stage of his life also seems to have been devoted to military interests, indicated by his role as dux generalis of the Armenian army c.1316.

Hayton is perhaps best known for his presence in the Latin West in 1306-07, which took place after his support of the political coup of Amaury de Tyre, brother of Henry II (1270-1324), as he was selected as the former’s delegate to the court of Clement V in Poitiers. The papacy, enthusiastic to organize a crusade to the East, also looked to Hayton as an expert on eastern affairs and for information on the Mongols, who were considered as potential military allies. Hayton was not only well-versed in warfare and diplomacy, but had developed an interest in historiography, which allowed him to serve as a source of authority on eastern affairs. While little is known about his later years and his return to the East, his activity from 1305-08 reveals his prominent role in political

---

2 Clemens Galanus, Conciliaionis ecclesiae Armenae cum Romana (Romae: Typis Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda fide, 1650), 504, 506.
3 Ibid.
mediation and the diplomatic dialogue between East and West during the early fourteenth century.

Hayton’s *La Flor des estoires de la terre d’Orient* (c.1307) has become predominantly known as a popular medieval text on the geography and ethnography of the East, even finding its way into Pantagruel’s fictitious visit to Satinland in Rabelais. While Hayton is largely known as a crusade theorist for the recovery of the Holy Land, his career was that of an influential political and cultural intermediary between East-West relations, one who became closely tied to the inner political circles of Cilician Armenia, Cyprus, the Latin West, and Ilkhanid Iran.

This dissertation will examine his career, with attention to his princely and martial background, acts of patronage in Cilician Armenia, authorship of *La Flor des estoires* and Armenian historiographical texts, and involvement in diplomacy and religious debate. By doing so, this study will show that he served as an influential actor in medieval Eurasian politics. It will be demonstrated that Hayton’s crusade strategy and plans for an alliance with the Ilkhanid Mongols reflected the complex politics of intermediation that structured Cilician Armenian relations as a small, independent, “diasporic” Christian kingdom in the Eastern Mediterranean facing Muslim Mamlūk incursions. While his accomplishments were undoubtedly exceptional in breadth and his ideas propagandistic in tone, his career can best be understood in the context of Cilician

---

Armenia’s geopolitical position as a medieval crossroads in the Eastern Mediterranean, a region which became integrated in Eurasian politics as a result of the Mongol conquests. This introductory chapter will discuss the ways in which scholarship has treated Hayton’s complex career and literary contributions in the context of his crusade plans and promotion of a Mongol alliance. It will trace the major historiographical works produced in the nineteenth century in European, North American and Armenian scholarship, as well as serve as a consideration of more recent studies.⁵ A discussion of the theoretical approach of this study and an overview of the principal sources employed, concluding with a thesis overview will follow. This introduction will underscore how Hayton’s background as a Cilician Armenian shaped his role in cultural and political intermediation based on the kingdom’s unique geopolitical position, which encouraged its immersion in Mongol imperial and Latin Eastern affairs, as well as its ties to the Armenians of the Caucasus. The overview of sources will emphasize the importance in considering evidence from diverse cultural traditions (Latin, Armenian, Eastern Christian and Muslim) in order to explore Hayton’s approach in regarding the complex politics of intermediation.

1.1 Historiographical Overview

Several important contributions were made during the nineteenth century, which shed light on Hayton’s involvement in the cross-cultural exchanges of the fourteenth century. While these studies have succeeded in placing Hayton as a key political agent in East-West relations during the medieval period, they have largely ignored the context in which he lived by omitting discussion of the Cilician Armenian kingdom’s

⁵ Unfortunately, the German scholarship is excluded from this discussion.
interconnected ties to the Latins, Armenians, and Mongols. Many of these studies have also failed to look at a more rounded portrait of Hayton’s career by exclusively focusing on La Flor des estoires, without considering the Armenian prince’s background and broader political dynamics of the Near East.

In 1842, Father Mkrtich Avgerian translated La Flor des estoires from Latin into classical Armenian. When this work was reprinted in 1951, it became accessible to Armenologists, who otherwise had limited knowledge of medieval French and Latin.6 Due to the problem of linguistic accessibility, it is, therefore, not surprising that the Armenian scholars produced fewer studies on Hayton vis-à-vis European and North American literature. While Avgerian’s Armenian translation served as a significant accomplishment by increasing the text’s availability to modern scholars, it omitted the crusade proposal (Hayton’s strategy on how to recover the Holy Land) as a result of the manuscript used for the translation. Additional shortcomings were also found in Avgerian’s liberal summarization of certain portions and persistent typographical errors.7

Subsequent scholarship also failed to learn of the extent of Hayton’s contributions because of Avgerian’s misattribution of Hayton as the author of a chronicle, which has now been attributed to King Het`um II. While both chronicles contain valuable information about the period in which they were produced, Hayton’s chronicle received minimal attention. This was because scholars were left in the dark when Avgerian

7 A valuable description of these errors has been made by Robert G. Bedrosian, in his online English translation of Avgerian’s classical Armenian text. http://rbedrosian.com/gatoc.html (accessed 10 October 2013).
published the *Chronicle attributed to King Het’um II* alongside the Armenian version of *La Flor des estoires.*

Avgerian’s misattribution seeped into European scholarship, as illustrated by Edouard Dulaurier’s French translation of the chronicle in *RHC doc. arm I* in 1869, where he attributes the chronicle to Hayton’s authorship. Mekhitarist Father Ghewond (Léon) Alishan addressed Hayton as the author of this chronicle in his seminal *Sissouan, L’Armeno-Cilicie.* Both western and Armenian historians thus perpetuated this misidentification based on Avgerian’s error. As a result, scholars were not aware of Hayton’s actual authorship of another important chronicle source of the period, known as the *Cronicon,* which came into the spotlight through the insights of Armenologist Vahram A. Hakobyan who produced a critical edition of the text based on a single manuscript copy housed in the Matenadaran collections in Yerevan.

Hakobyan published the *Cronicon* and the *Chronicle attributed to King Het’um II* separately in a two-volume collection of Armenian chronicles, where he provides a valuable overview of the extant manuscripts of both historiographical texts. Hakobyan’s contributions were groundbreaking as they revealed Hayton’s interests in historical writing, thereby providing a better context of his authorship of *La Flor des estoires* in Poitiers in 1307. Furthermore, Hakobyan argued that the Armenian text was basically a translation of various unnamed Frankish sources. This critical observation uncovers Hayton’s knowledge of Frankish sources, which stemmed from his close contacts to the Latins of the East, most especially from his ties to Lusignan Cyprus. As Hakobyan’s

---

8 Further information will be provided in sources section.
9 “Table Chronologique,” in *RHC doc. arm I,* 471-490.
broader interests focused on producing critical editions of various medieval and early modern Armenian chronicles, his discussion of the context in which the chronicle was produced remains rather minimal. This study will attempt to build on his insights in chapter three to show the ways in which the chronicle was intricately tied to Hayton’s worldview as a Cilician Armenian.

Prior to Hakobyan’s insights, most scholarship focused on *La Flor des estoires*. In 1869, Paulin Paris produced a valuable article on Hayton and *La Flor des estoires* in *Histoire littéraire de la France*, 12 Paris’s approach is largely synthetic, offering a general discussion of Hayton’s career, a useful summary of the contents of *La Flor des estoires* and an insightful discussion of its extant manuscripts, along with the early modern printings of the text. Paris showcases a somewhat naïve acceptance of Hayton’s assertions in *La Flor des estoires*, distorting the complexity of his career as it relies on the claims expressed by the Armenian prince himself. 13 The reliance on *La Flor des estoires* to gain information about Hayton’s life would be later mirrored by scholars, whose studies devote minimal attention to the sources outside of the text. Unfortunately, this approach accepts Hayton’s claims within the text as historical fact, largely ignoring other evidence and thus creating a simplistic account of his career.

---

13 Paris’s treatment of Hayton’s motivations in entering the Premonstratensian Abbey in Bellapais, Cyprus, perhaps best reflects this observation. Relying solely on *La Flor des estoires*, Paris speaks of Hayton’s long-held vow to lead a quiet, contemplative life, as expressed in the text. In contrast, modern scholarship has suggested that Hayton’s Cypriot sojourn was closely related to his political interests, which are fully discussed in the third chapter. Hayton unsympathetic portrait of the king in *La Flor des estoires* has also been noted as evidence of his long-held antagonism toward Het’um II’s kingship. Paris, 481.
These problematic issues aside, Paris’s article addresses the relationship of *La Flor des estoires* to other medieval texts, with a special consideration of the Cilician Armenian text’s position to that of Marco Polo. Paris points to the similar representations of Asia in both sources, suggesting that Hayton or his scribe may have been aware of a manuscript of Polo’s travels.\(^{14}\) The subject of inter-textual similarities was addressed by Charles Kohler in his publication of the critical edition of *La Flor des estoires* in 1906, which rendered a fuller treatment of Hayton’s principal text.\(^{15}\)

Their use of an inter-textual approach offers a valuable tool for this dissertation based on the parallels observed in Hayton’s geographical and historical interpretations and Latin and Armenian sources. This study will also build on their insights by suggesting that Hayton used his knowledge of Latin conventions in literature to inform his papal audience of the East. It will also emphasize that he was equally aware of the representations of the Mongols circulated in Eastern Christian sources, as will be discussed by an examination of Mongol imperial tactics and Mongol-vassal interactions.

Charles Kohler’s 1906 critical edition was a significant elaboration on Paris’s preliminary steps and serves as the basis for this dissertation. Kohler’s contribution of the text was not the first. It replaced Louis de Backer’s earlier publication of *La Flor des estoires*, which was based on the celebrated fifteenth century BNF MS 2810, known as the *Livre de merveilles*, celebrated for its rich illuminations.\(^{16}\) De Backer published Hayton’s text alongside other works pertaining to the East, which included the texts of Franciscan Odoric of Pordenone and Dominican Riccoldo of Monte Croce. Kohler’s

\(^{14}\) Paulin, 482.

\(^{15}\) *RHC doc. arm.* II, introduction, xxiii-cxlii.

edition replaced de Backer’s version based on the latter’s inclusion of numerous inaccuracies.  

Kohler’s critical edition of *La Flor des estoires* undoubtedly brought Hayton to the attention of scholars. This monumental work was published in the same volume containing the chronicle of Jean Dardel and *Les Gestes des Chiprois*. The said volume served as the second installment by the Académiie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, dedicated to Armenian sources pertaining to the crusades. Aside from presenting the text, the edition contains a detailed overview of Hayton’s career based on evidence found in papal documents, Cypriot historiography and Armenian sources. Perhaps most significant is Kohler’s attention to Hayton’s Cilician-Cypriot worldview, which shaped his diplomatic, social and religious interests; these will be discussed in chapter three on his biographical portrait.

By using a broader range of evidence, Kohler corrected erroneous insights pertaining to Hayton’s career, such as Edouard Dulaurier’s misidentification of the prince’s family lineage. In contrast, Kohler’s study on the Armenian prince relays the career of an active political agent in the politics of the Eastern Mediterranean and in the broader diplomatic exchanges between the Latin West and East. This dissertation will build on his main insights by situating them within the context of Eurasian politics.

While Kohler provides a thorough overview of Hayton’s career and the corpus of manuscripts of *La Flor des estoires* (which number approximately fifteen in French and
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17 A scathing review of the work is found in the literary magazine: *The Athenaeum* n. 2598 August 11 (1877):174-175. See also, John Larner, “Plucking Hairs from the Great Cham’s Beard,” in *Marco Polo and the Encounter of East and West*, eds. Suzanne Conklin Akbari and Amilcare Iannucci (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 2008), 151.
18 Dulaurier erroneously presented Hayton as a son of the Bailiff of Cilician Armenia, Adam of Gaston. See *RHC doc. arm.* I, cxviii.
thirty in Latin), there are limitations in his study. Most importantly, the 1906 edition was based on a partial selection of manuscripts (thirteen in French and eight in Latin).¹⁹ Scholars have further noted the critical edition’s reading of the used manuscripts and its favour towards certain copies over others.²⁰ Despite these shortcomings, Kohler’s work continues to serve as the critical edition for scholars until an improved edition is made available.

One of the best known critics of Kohler’s edition was Wesley Robertston Long who published a critical edition of a Spanish translation of *La Flor des estoires*, based on his study of the late fourteenth century MS Escorial Z I-2. In the Spanish manuscript, Hayton’s *magnum opus* appears alongside the texts of Marco Polo, *Rams de Flores*, and *Secretum secretorum*. This Spanish version was translated by Juan Fernàndes de Heredia, Master of the Hospitallers, who was well known for his numerous translations of historiographical works into the Aragonese vernacular. By bringing the Escorial manuscript to the attention of scholars, Long’s study underscores the influence of *La Flor des estoires* outside the papal court and the ways in which it was used as a source of intelligence on the East for the Kingdom of Aragon. For Long, the translation also reflects the close relations between the kingdom and the papacy during the fourteenth century.²¹ Long’s insights encourage this dissertation’s treatment of the later impact and influence of Hayton’s work, especially in the context of his geographical and crusade
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¹⁹ *RHC doc.arm.II, lxviii-lxxxiv.*  
²¹ Ibid, xliii. He particularly notes how the Master of the Hospital remained in Rome during the last years of his life.
treatises and the ways in which they shaped western knowledge in the late medieval and early modern periods.

In 1929, the very same year of Long’s study of the Spanish manuscript, Gustave Soulier wrote an insightful article on Hayton in French.22 His study focuses on the “legend” of the Cilician Armenian prince in medieval Tuscan Italian literature. Similar to Long, Soulier’s study demonstrates the popularity of Hayton’s text outside Poitiers and the ways in which it impacted later medieval and early modern writers. More specifically, Soulier highlights Florentine Giovanni Villani’s unsubstantiated portrait of Hayton as a member of an Armenian entourage that accompanied a Cilician Armenian princess to wed a Mongol khan.23 Soulier also underscores Villani’s esteem for *La Flor des estoires*, as revealed through the Italian banker’s request for his readers to consult Hayton, should they wish to know more about the East. Moreover, Soulier notes sixteenth century geographer Giovanni Battista Ramusio’s translation of selections of *La Flor des estoires* for his *Navigationi et Viaggi*.24 Soulier’s insights indicate an Italian interest in *La Flor des estoires* through the medieval and early modern periods. Both the scholarly contributions of Long and Soulier encourage this dissertation’s analysis of Hayton’s impact on the circulation of knowledge in the Latin West, providing the groundwork for evaluating Hayton’s role as a cultural intermediary between East-West, especially in the context of shaping knowledge.

New insights have come from David D. Bundy, whose scholarship has concentrated on the context of Hayton’s career within the political and religious milieu of
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23 This legend parallels the King of Tars.
Cilician Armenia. In a seminal article exclusively devoted to Hayton and *La Flor des estoires*, Bundy situates the text within the context of Cilician Armenian politics, namely as “a product of early fourteenth century crisis.” By highlighting the volatile political conditions in Cilician Armenia during the early fourteenth century, Bundy underscores the political agenda running through *La Flor des estoires*—the organization of a new crusade and Mongol alliance for much-needed assistance for the Armenian kingdom in response to its state of political crisis at the turn of the fourteenth century.

By situating Hayton’s activities within a wider framework, Bundy views *La Flor des estoires* as being analogous to the contributions of other Cilician Armenian figures including the pro-Catholic King Het’um II, whose rule Hayton seems to have ironically opposed despite their shared diplomatic and political interests. Bundy’s emphasis on the historical context of Cilician Armenia is important for this study, as it seeks to situate Hayton’s career within the dynamic and turbulent period of Armenian history.

While Bundy succeeds in placing Hayton’s activities within the political context of Cilician history, his study exclusively deals with *La Flor des estoires*, thereby omitting discussion of Hayton’s broader activities including his authorship of the Armenian *Cronicon*, his conversion as a Premonstratensian and social ties to the Lusignan Cypriots. While this dissertation will add to Bundy’s emphasis on the impact of fourteenth century political conditions in Cilician Armenia on Hayton’s worldview, greater attention will placed on his background in Eurasian politics based on the integrated conditions created by the Mongol Empire.
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26 Bundy, “Het’um’s *La Flor*,” 233.
27 Ibid.
While Bundy’s study focuses on *La Flor des estoires*, Claude Mutafian has taken into consideration a broader range of Armenian sources. Hayton’s princely background, his conflict with King Het`um II, his role in the diplomatic affairs in Cyprus, his involvement in the religious debate for Union with Rome, his military experience in the Ilkhanid campaigns against the Mamlûks, and his literary contributions, *La Flor des Estoires* and the Armenian *Cronicon*—are all presented as important facets of his career, revealing a more rounded biographical portrait of the Lord of Korykos.

Mutafian’s study largely focuses on the exceptional accomplishments of the Armenian prince and highlights his position as an influential actor in the politics of the Near East; a similar framework has been recently employed by Angus Donal Stewart. This dissertation will build on Mutafian’s insights by looking at the ways in which Hayton’s career paralleled those of his Cilician peers, who also served as intermediaries. While this study acknowledges the exceptional nature of his interests, it also suggests that his career was not necessarily unique, but rather, developed alongside those of influential members of the Het`umid dynasty in the context of the conditions created by crusades and the Mongol conquests. The similarities reveal the ways in which Cilician Armenia rose as a political and cultural intermediary, allowing for individuals like Hayton to engage in Eurasian affairs.

---

Aside from Mutafian, recent scholars have focused on Hayton’s interests vis-à-vis crusade plans. Most notably, Antony Leopold has analyzed the crusading strategy of *La Flor des estoires* as part of a corpus of recovery treatises, which served as counsel for crusade planning. Leopold situates *La Flor des estoires* among approximately thirty crusade proposals composed between 1290 and 1336. His study offers a comprehensive overview of the proposals and builds upon the major scholarly contributions of J. le Roulx Delaville, Aziz S. Atiya, Sylvia Schein and Norman Housley. A more detailed discussion of their insights will be made in the subsequent chapter on Hayton’s plans of a crusade strategy.

In Leopold’s comparative framework, Hayton’s crusade strategy is discussed in relation to a group of proposals commissioned for Pope Clement V, a major enthusiast for a crusade from the time of his consecration in 1305. By comparing the treatises, Leopold notes Hayton’s distinctive vision of an alliance with the Mongols and the use of Cilician Armenia as a crusader base. Leopold underscores how crusade theorists were often driven by their own political interests, and in Hayton’s case, by “an ulterior motive of bringing western assistance to the kingdom to protect it from the ravages of the Mamluks.”

This dissertation supports Leopold’s attention to Hayton’s political objectives of gaining assistance for Cilician Armenia. It will focus on the strategies he employed to gain support for his plans.  
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31 Stewart has also observed this tendency. Stewart, “The Armenian Kingdom and the Near East,” 526.  
achieve his goals, namely the ways in which he articulated his expertise as a Cilician Armenian and underscored his position as a political intermediary between East-West. While Leopold largely focuses on Hayton’s military strategy, this dissertation will focus on his ethnographical and historical approaches in conforming to the expectations of his audience, reading them alongside his plans for war.

1.2 Theoretical Considerations

This study will consider Hayton’s Cilician Armenian worldview as being a principal factor in shaping his interests in Eurasian intermediation. By referring to a Cilician Armenian worldview, this study suggests that Hayton and the Het’umid dynasty were aware of their unique position compared to the crusader states, Eastern Christian communities of Asia, and the Ilkhanid Mongols. The kingdom’s distinct situation in Eurasian politics can be better understood through the lens of three theoretical considerations, including the following: imperial, regional and “diasporic” contexts. These three levels of context reveal a better understanding of Hayton’s interconnected interests.

The exploration of each context hopes to shed light on the forces which shaped Hayton’s complex interests of intermediation and allowed his peers to follow similar paths. It will first consider Cilician Armenian identity in the context of Mongol imperial politics, because Cilician Armenia functioned as an important Ilkhanid vassal in the Eastern Mediterranean. This will be followed by a consideration of the regional factors which shaped Cilician identity, namely the kingdom’s contacts with the Latin East and
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ongoing wars with the Mamlûk Sultanate. These two factors played a definitive role in shaping Cilician Armenian society and culture during the fourteenth century. Lastly, this study suggests looking at Cilician Armenian identity as a “diasporic” community, implying that the kingdom’s links to Greater Armenia in the Caucasus region created another space for negotiation, especially as evidenced in the dialogue on Union with the Latin Church. The use of these three conceptual frameworks aims to produce new insights into Hayton’s career in Eurasian politics.

These three conceptual frameworks are inspired by the insights of Glenn Burger who produced an important study of Hayton’s worldview as a Cilician Armenian and his composition of *La Flor des estoires*. His study appeared as part of the well-known collection of essays in *The Postcolonial Middle Ages*, edited by Jeffrey Jerome Cohen. Burger’s own essay looks at how, “the very discontinuities and unexpected conjunctions of *La Fleur des histoires* bear witness to the complexities of Hetoum’s cultural location as part of a Cilician Armenian diasporic community precariously situated near the borders of European Christian, Islamic Egyptian, and Islamic Empires.”

Burger places great importance on the cultural plurality of the Eastern Mediterranean world, as Hayton was closely tied to the Frankish ruling class, to the Ilkhanate of Persia,
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and to the Armenians of Greater Armenia. Burger thus concludes that Cilician Armenia occupied a type of “middle-position,” based on its fluid exchanges with various cultural forces in the region. Burger states that this complex culture can be viewed as a type of métissage, which permitted a blurring of cultures, and in turn, offered a space for the Armenian kingdom to forge ties to both the Latins and non-Christian Mongols. His insights complement the recent scholarship on the high level of intercultural encounters and connectivity in the Eastern Mediterranean, including, *The Corrupting Sea* by Peregrine Horden and Nicholas Purcell, which stresses the connectivity in the region. Indeed, the multilingual and multi-ethnic composition of the Eastern Mediterranean world allowed for individuals, like Hayton, to bridge the gap of difference and serve as cultural and political intermediaries.

While Cilician Armenian identity can be characterized as fluid, it was also burdened by competitive forces and societal conflicts. It struggled to maintain relations with regional powers like the Templars and Mamlūks, underwent great internal dynastic struggles, and experienced a rift between its Latinized leadership and populace.

---


42 Ibid, 76.


44 Sara Nur Yildiz has closely analyzed the Seljuk-Cilician frontier region, highlighting the complex political relations and regional negotiations that took place during the reign of King Lewon I (II) based on his aggressive expansionist agenda along various frontiers. The Armenian king consistently sought to encroach upon Seljuk territory in the area known as Rough Cilicia, as well as to assert power over Antioch based on his claims as regent (to his great-nephew Raymond-Rouben, the son of his niece, Alice, and Raymond, eldest son of Bohemond III, Prince of Antioch). Moreover, Yildiz notes the Hospitaller Order as a crucial political power along the Seljuk-Cilician Armenian frontier. Lewon’s granting of several castles and lands to the Order, including Norberd (Castellum Novum) and Silifke (classical Seleucia) indicates their role in the defense of the area. Sara Nur Yildiz, “Reconceptualizing the Seljuk-Cilician Frontier: Armenians, Latins, and Turks in Conflict and Alliance during the early Thirteenth Century,” in *Borders,*
Ongoing debate on Union with the Latin Church also polarized the Cilician leadership from the religious leaders of Greater Armenia. This world of conflict and competition was the one Hayton inherited and came to be involved in. The complex interplay of cultural fluidity and conflict were all tied to the kingdom’s intermediation with different parties as it attempted to hold onto power in the turbulent political conditions of the early fourteenth century.

1.2.1 Imperial Considerations

Hayton’s status as an Ilkhanid vassal, role as an active supporter of a papal-Ilkhanid alliance, and experience in warfare can be situated in the broader relations between the Ilkhanate, Cilician Armenia and Latin West. Scholars have largely studied the kingdom’s history in the context of the Crusades, including the significant contributions of Sirarpie der Nersessian, T.S.R. Boase, and Claude Mutafian. Unfortunately, this emphasis downplays the kingdom’s equal engagement with the Mongol Empire. The Eastern Mediterranean, while being a stage for Latin-Muslim-Armenian exchanges, also became part of the Mongol conquests. Cilician Armenian
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vassalage to the Mongols in the thirteenth century produced a whole new set of intercultural exchanges which impacted Hayton’s career.

Bayarsaikhan Dashdondog’s *The Mongols and the Armenians (1220-1335)* has recently compared the political experiences of the Armenians of Greater Armenia to that of Cilician Armenia under Mongol rule. Her political analysis underscores the close ties forged between the conquerors and the Armenians, especially in the context of Cilician Armenia, where the Ilkhans found cooperative allies to fight the Mamlūk Sultanate and promote their interests to the Latin West. Mongol-Cilician Armenian contacts can thus be understood to have shaped the kingdom’s role as a political intermediary between the two powers.

Dashdondog’s study has been groundbreaking due to its re-interpretation of Mongol-Armenian relations, which has tended to be interpreted through a negative lens. As a “regressive force,” the Mongol conquests were typically noted for their destructive implications for the Transcaucasus region. Hakob Manandyan and Levon Khachikyan have highlighted the burdens (substantial death toll, heavy taxes, forced labor, and more) of the Mongol yoke upon the Transcaucasus. Khachikyan has even cited Karl Marx’s negative characterization of Mongolian rule to depict the harsh reality of living under the
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48 Dashdondog, *The Mongols and the Armenians*, 2-6. These pages provide an overview of the scholarship.

Empire. Robert G. Bedrosian has similarly addressed the difficult consequences of the Mongol conquests upon the nobility of the Transcaucasus. Historians of the Mongol impact on Russian history have highlighted the various negative implications of the conquests. While the harsh reality of a ‘Tartar Yoke’ should not be discounted, Dashdondog’s attention to the positive cross-cultural interactions within the Mongol Empire is also useful for understanding why Armenians like Hayton esteemed their relationship to their overlords. This study will build on Dashdondog’s insights, suggesting that Hayton’s enthusiasm for Mongol alliance and seasoned experience in the Ilkhanid-Mamlûk conflict reflected the distinct ties between the Ilkhans and Armenian kingdom. The relationship between these two powers stood apart from the Mongol treatment of the Seljuk Empire and Latin Eastern states, as will be explored in the following chapter on Hayton’s world. This study will also underscore that Mongol-Cilician relations were not static and evolved based on the changing political currents of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. A closer reading of La Flor des estoires will reveal growing anxieties concerning the fluctuating political currents in Near Eastern politics during the fourteenth century.

Building upon Dashdondog’s focus on the broad range of cross-cultural relations within the Mongol Empire, this study suggests that the foreign overlords encouraged their vassals to participate in a range of intermediation, whether cultural or diplomatic. Hayton’s career will be viewed within this context of Mongol policy. Unlike other
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53 Dashdondong, The Mongols and the Armenians, 3, ft. 2.
diplomats, Hayton’s case is distinctive in that he was able to participate in a range of cultural and political intermediation.

The emphasis on cultural intermediation draws from Thomas T. Allsen’s *Culture and Conquest in Mongol Eurasia*, which has explored the layers of cultural exchange within the Mongol Empire, made possible by the *pax mongolica*. Stabilization in travel and the political unification of regions under the Empire encouraged various forms of economic and cultural exchange. Allsen draws particular attention to the exchanges between Iran and China.54

As the numerical minority in the Empire, the overlords relied on their subjects to participate in various spheres of activity including diplomacy and warfare.55 As a Mongol vassal, Hayton was clearly aligned with Ilkhanid diplomatic interests, serving as an intermediary to persuade his Latin audience of the advantages of a joint alliance. Hayton’s role also reflected the interests of the Cilician kingdom, which served as a key


Mongol ally and promoter of alliance with the Ilkhans, as will be discussed in the following chapters.

Hayton was particularly well-suited for promoting Ilkhanid interests, based on his intimate knowledge of his papal audience’s expectations. Exchanges between the papacy and Cilician Armenia grew increasingly close during the fourteenth century, as part of the kingdom’s policy to align itself with the Latin Church. Regular contact between the kingdom and Latin West emerged as a result of the growing aggression of the Mamlûk Sultanate, coupled with the increasing penetration of Turcomen confederations. This dissertation will thus focus on Hayton’s awareness of the expectations and hesitations of his audience towards working with the Mongols in a crusade. The following chapter will consider the innovative ways with which he sought to overcome western reluctance to accept his plans, which stood in line with not only Cilician Armenian policy, but broader Ilkhanid strategy.⁵⁶

1.2.2 Regional Considerations

A consideration of Cypriot-Cilician ties is necessary for understanding Hayton’s intimate knowledge of western expectations and his own Latinized identity, which was reflected in his intermarriage with Cypriot nobility, his conversion as a Premonstratensian canon, and his role in the revolt against King Henry II of Cyprus (1270-1324). The close ties between the two kingdoms produced numerous intermarriages and encouraged Catholicism among the Cilician royalty, as will be explored in chapter three. This dissertation will look at the impact of ‘Latinization’ upon the Cilician Armenian upper
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⁵⁶ For a similar interpretation, see Sergio de la Porta, “The Armenian Episcopacy in Mamluk Jerusalem in the Aftermath of the Council of Sis (1307) and in the Wake of Ilkhan Ghazan s Last Invasion of Syria (1303),” JRAS 17 (2007), 99-114.
The intersected lives of the Cilician-Cypriot nobility thus produced the context in which Hayton became involved in the diplomacy and politics of the Lusignan kingdom, which survived as the remaining Latin state in the aftermath of the fall of Acre in 1291. Relations became so intertwined that the House of the Lusignan eventually took over Cilician Armenia in 1342. This study will build upon the important contributions of Nicholas Coureas who has particularly stressed the interwoven worldview of the Cypriot-Cilician nobility after the fall of the crusader presence on the mainland. At the same time, however, it is important to stress that both the Armenians and Cypriots seem to have developed their own identities, despite the close links between their nobility.

The Mamlûk Sultanate’s military dominance from the latter half of the thirteenth century onwards must also be considered when looking at Hayton’s politics of intermediation. As the principal enemy of the crusaders and Ilkhan, the Mamlûks targeted Cilician Armenia, launching attacks that resulted in major destabilization within the region. Hayton’s ardent promotion of a crusade was in response to the kingdom’s exposure to increasing Mamlûk aggression and its economic and territorial concessions to the Egyptians.
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The close consideration of the role played by the Mamlūks upon Cilician Armenian diplomacy will build upon the insights of Angus Donal Stewart and Marius Canard, whose studies have stressed the complex nature of the Sultanate’s interest in the Armenian kingdom.60 Their insights have shown that the antagonism between the kingdom and Sultanate was not merely a product of religious difference, but shaped by Egyptian commercial interests and conflict with the crusaders and Ilkhans over who would control Syria. A closer look at the Sultanate is equally necessary for understanding Hayton’s depiction of the ‘Egyptian enemy’ to his papal audience.

1.2.3 Diasporic Identity?

In addition to analyzing Cilician Armenian identity through an imperial and regional lens, its position as an Armenian polity must also be considered. This point has been stressed by Glenn Burger, whose study notes that Cilician Armenian identity was “also the embodiment of proud Armenian culture and history.”61 The kingdom’s heritage and ties to Historic Armenia formed a core facet of its identity.

This study also suggests applying Burger’s assessment of Cilician Armenia as a “diasporic” community as a framework for understanding the kingdom’s ties and exchanges with the Armenians outside its borders. While further study is needed to understand the ways in which Cilician Armenian leadership understood its identity and position among the wider Armenian community, Hayton and the Cilician leadership carried on regular exchanges with the Armenian clergy inside and outside of the borders.


of Cilician Armenia, indicating that the kingdom did not simply assimilate into the world of the Latin East and produce a hybrid society. In contrast, it maintained various links to the Armenians of the Caucasus region and elsewhere, evidenced in the religious debate over Union with Rome and their joint participation in Ilkhanid warfare based on their position as vassals. The framework of “diasporic” identity is used here as a tool for highlighting the significance of these links and exchanges.

Hayton’s own involvement in the religious debate between the Cilician leaders and prominent Orthodox clergy thus necessitates a closer investigation of the ways in which Cilician Armenia and the Caucasus were bound by a common religious heritage, but also found themselves in different political circumstances, with the most prominent actors of the Caucasus region being largely removed from the sphere of influence of the Frankish East. This study will address his correspondence with prominent Armenian clergy and look at the ways in which he attempted to promote Catholicism among Armenians.

His diverse interests were indeed a product of Cilician Armenia’s complex geopolitical position in the Eastern Mediterranean, which allowed for a high level of exchanges with the Latins, Mongols, Muslims and Eastern Christians. This study will serve as a lens through which to highlight the factors that shaped Cilician Armenian identity. It will argue that Hayton was representative of his age, not merely an exception.
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62 S. Peter Cowe has highlighted the development of the heated religious exchanges during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, revealing the rich exchanges between the Cilician leadership and prominent Orthodox clergy from the East. The Metropolitan of Siunik, Step’anos Orbelian (a staunch defender of Armenian Orthodoxy) visit to Cilician Armenia under the patronage of King Lewon II, as well as King Het’um I travels through Greater Armenia before visiting the court of Möngke Khan in Karakorum, serve as just a few examples of the range of interaction between the Cilician Armenians and Armenians outside of its borders. S. Peter Cowe, “Catholicos Grigor VII Anaverzetsi and Stepanos Orbelian, Metropolitan of Siunik, In Dialogue,” in Armenian Cilicia, eds. Richard G. Hovannisian and Simon Payaslian (Costa Meza, CA: Mazda Publishers, 2008), 245-60.
An examination of his career thus aims to reveal a heuristic window through which to better understand the dynamics of medieval Eurasian politics.

1.3 **Main Sources**

Hayton’s extensive activities as a political, religious and cultural intermediary can be inferred from a wide range of sources relied upon for this study. The following description of sources is not meant as a full, exhaustive record of the materials employed, but rather, intended to highlight the methodological framework of this dissertation, emphasizing that Hayton’s career in intermediation in a Eurasian context can only be understood through an examination of the records of Armenian, Latin and Eastern Christian, Ilkhanid and Muslim traditions, many of which have been made available in published critical editions and translations.

1.3.1 **Critical Edition of 1906 and Manuscript Tradition**

The 1906 critical edition of *La Flor des estoires* is not without its difficulties, due to its aforementioned reliance on a limited number of the extant manuscripts used and somewhat arbitrary reading of them, as discussed in detail by Wesley Robertson Long for his study of Grand Hospitaller De Heredia’s Spanish translation of the work.\(^\text{64}\) The Armenian translation, prepared by Mekhitarist Mkhtar Avgerian, based on the Latin translation of the work, was only prepared in the nineteenth century, and as previously
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\(^\text{64}\) Long, “La Flor de la Ystorias,” (1929), xxvii-xxx.
La Flor des estoires also experienced ongoing popularity during the medieval and early modern periods. There are fifteen extant manuscripts of the French redaction and thirty of the Latin. The Latin redaction surfaced almost immediately after the original French version. It was translated as Flos historiarum terre Orientis by the same scribe Nicolas Falcon in the same year (1307). The number of extant manuscripts indicates that it served as an important source for his contemporaries and continued as a popular source in the early modern period, including a sixteenth century edition, which added the history of Tamurlane.\footnote{65 Marcus Milwright, “So despicable a vessel: representations of Tamerlane in printed books of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.” (archnet.org/system/publications/contents/6755/original/DPC3617.pdf?) (accessed 1 September 2014).} To avoid being superfluous, the reader is referred to the list of all known manuscripts provided in the introductory chapter of the critical edition, where Kohler also includes a detailed overview of the omitted manuscripts, as well as information on those manuscripts now lost. Additionally, the 1906 edition provides a valuable discussion of the families of manuscripts in the French and Latin redactions.\footnote{66 Kohler, \textit{RHC doc. arm. II}, lvii-cxxii.}

Kohler’s detailed overview of the extant manuscripts further illustrates the interest of \textit{La Flor des estoires} for European nobility. For instance, the fourteenth century BNF MS 10050 (unused in the critical edition) has the signals of the Catalan family Cabrera appearing on each page. Fourteenth century BNF MS 12201 was given by the Duke of Burgundy, Philippe le Hardi (the Bold) to his brother, Duc de Berry, in 1403. Similarly,
fifteenth century BNF MS 1255 bears the signal of a lion of Limbourg, and appears to have been commissioned for the Luxembourg-Ligny nobility.67

In 1351, the Latin version was retranslated into French by Benedictine monk and future abbot Jean Le Long d’Ypres (d.1383). Le Long’s translation is extant in four known manuscripts known as Livre des Merveilles.68 Hayton’s text appeared alongside the cleric’s translations of William of Boldensele, Ricoldus of Montecroce, Odoric of Pordonene, Mongol correspondence to Pope Benedict XII and the Livre de l’estat du grant Caan—all of which highlight European interest in Eastern affairs. Perhaps the best known manuscript out of the five extant is BNF MS 2810.69 This well-known manuscript also contains the works of Marco Polo and Mandeville. Aside from Le Long’s contribution, another translation from Latin into French was made by an anonymous scribe.70

Additional printings also appeared during the same time based on the original French and Latin manuscripts; the Sensuyrent les fleur des histoires de la terre Dorient was the new title given to certain French editions.71 Le Long’s French translation was also published in the sixteenth century as L’Hystoire merueilleuse plaisante et recreative du grand Empereur de Tartarie.72 Most significantly, these printings reveal the continued interest in the text and its adaptability to contemporaneous political realities, such as the French editions’ inclusion of sixteenth century political affairs and the Turkish threat to
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68 For descriptions of the four manuscripts, Kohler, RHC doc. arm. II, cxix-cxx.
69 In this manuscript, however, Hayton’s text is based on the original French, rather than being Le Long’s version.
70 Ibid, cxx.
71 Ibid, cxxii-cxxiii.
72 Ibid, cxxvi.
Europe. According to Burger’s overview of these printings, they reveal that the “text was considered more than a historical curiosity,” and exhibited continued appeal to those interested in Eastern affairs.\(^7\)

As a further testament to the popularity of *La Flor des estoires*, the text was also translated into other European languages in both medieval manuscripts and early modern print editions. The late fourteenth century Spanish manuscript, MS Escorial Z-I- 2, as discussed by Wesley Robertson Long, is a prime example of the appeal of the text from an early period. Additionally, Hayton’s text was translated into several other European languages, including an anonymous English manuscript dated to the fifteenth century.\(^4\)

In early modern editions, *La Flor des estoires* was translated into Italian, Tudor English, German and Dutch throughout the sixteenth century.\(^5\) Hayton’s text also received attention during the seventeenth century, evidenced by its publication as part of the English cleric Samuel Purchas’s travel literature, *Hakluytus Posthumus, or Purchas his Pilgrimes*.\(^6\) The Armenian translation, as mentioned, only surfaced in the mid-nineteenth century.

### 1.4 Division of *La Flor des estoires*

Charles Kohler observed that the crusade proposal of *La Flor des estoires* was a later appendage to the three books, commissioned upon papal request for crusade strategy. It does not seem to have been originally planned as the fourth book of the work, especially when considering how the geographical and historical books better reflect the

---

\(^7\) Burger, “Cilician Armenian Métissage,” 67-68.

\(^4\) Ibid.

\(^5\) *A Lytell Cronycle: Richard Pynson’s Translation (c.1520) of La Fleur des histoires de la terre d’Orient, (c.1307)*, ed. Glenn Burger (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988). Kohler, cxx; cxxii-cxxx.

title of the work. Additionally, Kohler observed that the first three books were composed in French, while the crusade proposal was originally offered in Latin, but then translated into French and attached to the three books. Scholars largely accept Kohler’s conclusions, but also underscore that the four books were viewed early on as a unified, coherent text. It should also be noted that Hayton’s introduction also identifies the “four parts” of *La Flor des estoires.* While the four books were viewed as an integrated work, this study will explore the differences between the first three books and the crusade proposal, including the contrasting treatments of Jerusalem. These differences suggest that the fourth book was produced for a different purpose, as will be addressed in chapter six.

*La Flor des estoires* is thus made up of four parts, which together form a coherent narrative on the East, weaving together elements of geography, history and the military strategy on how to recover the Holy Land. The first book serves as a geographical treatise and covers the various kingdoms of Asia, beginning with Cathay and ending with Syria. The second book provides a historical narrative that treats the rise and fall of Arab and Turkish dynasties up to the twelfth century. The longest book is Hayton’s third part, covering a history and ethnography of the Mongols and their spectacular conquests across Eurasia. As Hayton’s main interest was to advocate a Papal-Ilkhanid alliance and crusade, it is not a surprise that the fourth book provides a substantial and detailed *recuperatione terrae sanctae* for Clement V’s dreams of organizing a crusade to the East.

### 1.5 Cronicon

As mentioned, most scholars provide exclusive focus on *La Flor des estoires,* particularly in the context of studying the later crusades. The methodological approach of

78 Hayton, 113.
this dissertation underscores the need to look at a fuller body of evidence. A closer look at Hayton’s authorship of the Armenian *Cronicon* will also contextualize his background as a Latinized Armenian and his immersion in western culture.79 This background will contribute to a clearer understanding of the context in which *La Flor des estoires* was produced.

The chronicle is found in an extant single manuscript, MS 1898 (folios 123v-167r), now housed in the Matenadaran collections in Yerevan, Armenia.80 The *Cronicon* constitutes part of a miscellany of medieval texts, which include the writings of the historian Samuel of Ani and a genealogical text also attributed to Hayton, which covers the dynasties of Cilician Armenia, Crusader Jerusalem, Cyprus, and Antioch.81 The examination of both texts will be made to indicate the ways in which they served Hayton’s interests in religious intermediation, namely in his efforts to push Catholicism upon his Armenian peers. The texts provide a fuller understanding of Hayton’s activities as an intermediary, as they reveal how he engaged in negotiations in the Latin West and in the East.

1.6 **Genealogical Text attributed to Hayton**

An Armenian genealogical text has also been attributed to Hayton.82 Vahram Hakobyan published its critical edition in the same volume as the *Cronicon*.83 This is because the genealogical text is also found in MS 1898 (168v-175r) of the Matenadaran

---

81 In *Minor Chronicles*, II, 94-111.
82 For manuscript information, see *General Catalogue of Armenian Manuscripts*, VI, 447-448.
83 Mutafian suggests that it was probably written by Hayton, but as no information on the authorship exists, the text can, at best, be attributed to him. “Héthoum de Korykos,” 164.
collections, following the Armenian *Cronicon*. The genealogical text highlights the pedigrees of the ruling families of Cilician Armenia, the kingdoms of Jerusalem and Cyprus, and the principality of Antioch. In his critical edition of the Armenian genealogical text, Hakobyan has suggested that Hayton relied upon the rhymed chronicle of Vahram Rabuni, the erudite scribe for Lewon II (III) (r.1270-89), for his detailed section on the Cilician families.

Marie-Adélaïde Nielen has highlighted that the Armenian translation also relied upon the important medieval work *Lignages d’Outremer*. The *Lignages d’Outremer*, in Old French, covers the history of the leading families of the Latin East. It comprised part of what is commonly referred to as the *Assises de Jérusalem*, a collection of medieval legal texts made for the crusader kingdom of Jerusalem. Like the *Cronicon*, the Armenian genealogical text reflects the author’s Latinized worldview. The first version of the *Lignages d’Outremer* appeared c.1265-70, while a later one was produced at the start of the fourteenth century in 1309. Subsequent versions covered the families of the fifteenth century. According to Nielen, the Armenian translation seems to have been made after the completion of Hayton’s *Cronicon*, between the years 1296-1306. This timeframe is supported as the genealogical text ends with the reigns of Het’um II in Cilician Armenia.

---

84 See footnote 72 for manuscript information.  
85 Hakobyan, *Minor Chronicles*, II, 96-97. Hakobyan notes that MS 979, *The Lectionary of King Het’um*, produced in 1289, also incorporates a similar account of Cilician history, which was also likely based upon Rabuni’s rhymed chronicle.  
and Henry II in Cyprus, without mentioning Hetʿum II’s assassination (1307) and Amaury de Lusignan’s uprising (1310).90

1.7 Religious Correspondence

The contours of Hayton’s religious negotiations can also be viewed through his correspondence with a prominent religious figure, Esayi Nšecʿi (1284-1338), the abbot of the prominent hamalsaran, or University of Glajor, at the beginning of the fourteenth century.91 Born in the Niš district of Sasun, Esayi became one of the most erudite intellectuals of his time, specializing as a grammarian and rhetorician among other scholarly pursuits.92 He took an active role in defending Armenian Orthodox traditions against the growing pressures from Cilician Armenia and the Latin missionaries in promoting Union with Rome. Several extant letters—one of which was addressed to Hayton—reveal his opposition to the pro-Union efforts.93

While Hayton’s original profession of faith remains unfound, there are extant manuscript copies of Esayi’s response, housed in the Matenadaran and Mekhitarist Venetian collections.94 By closely looking at the contents of Esayi’s response, we can speculatively rebuild the issues raised in Hayton’s original letter and better understand his intermediation in the religious debate on Union with Rome.

93 Further details will be provided in chapter three.
94 S. Petrosyan, “Esayi Nchetsu tghtere (Esayi Nchetsi’s Letters) “Ejmiatsin, no. 11-12 (1985); Matenadaran (cf. n.32) MS 579 ff. 316’-320’, which is a 15th century manuscript and Matenadaran MS 9622 which was copied in 1858. The Venetian MS 696/253 is the oldest. B. Sarkissian, Grand catalogue des manuscrits arméniens (Venice, San Lazarro, 1924), 732. M.-A. van den Oudenrijn, Linguae haicanae scriptores o.p., (Berne : Apud A. Francke, 1960), 21-22.
1.8 Additional Sources

Cypriot sources contain detailed information on Hayton’s political life, and thus represent invaluable sources in providing a sketch of his political activities in Cyprus and Cilician Armenia. The Cypriot texts of *Chronique d’Amadi*, Florio Bustron, and Leontios Makhairas offer relevant information pertaining to Hayton’s career as a diplomatic intermediary on behalf of Amaury de Lusignan. These sources also speak of the general diplomatic relations between Cilician Armenia and Cyprus during his lifetime, which supplement the evidence found in papal correspondence.\(^95\) Thus, they provide important evidence on both Hayton’s role as an intermediary and that of the Cilician Armenian kingdom.

Minimal information is known about the *Chronique d’Amadi*.\(^96\) It was composed in Italian in the sixteenth century and made extensive use of the *Gestes des Chiprois*.\(^97\) Undoubtedly, *Les Gestes des Chiprois* equally offers a rich window into the political affairs of the Eastern Mediterranean world, providing valuable information pertaining to the Cilician Armenian kingdom. More specifically, the third section of the chronicle, commonly attributed to the ‘Templar of Tyre,’ is of particular importance for this study, as it covers the political affairs of the Latin East during the late thirteenth and fourteenth
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centuries. It is temporarily, thus corresponds to Hayton’s lifetime and to the final chapter of the crusader states. The work of Florio Bustron, also composed during the sixteenth century, in turn, is heavily indebted to the Chronique d’Amadi. The Recital Concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus, a fifteenth century text by Greek Cypriot Leontios Makhairas, also provides relevant details pertaining to Hayton.

Given that La Flor des estoires is typically viewed as a propagandistic piece on the advantages of a Mongol alliance, Hayton’s historical, ethnographical and geographical interpretations are not considered vis-à-vis eastern literature. This study will provide a methodological comparison of his interpretations in relation to similar accounts circulated in the Near East, arguing that he drew from a shared repertoire of information exchanged within the Mongol Empire. Several noteworthy Armenian sources including historiographies, chronicles, colophons, letters, and poetry will thus be considered throughout the dissertation.

One significant source is undoubtedly the historical narrative of the Armenian priest Kirakos Gandzakec’i (1200-1271), which covers Armenian history up to the period

---

98 This section was recently translated by Paul Crawford as *The ‘Templar of Tyre.’ Part III of the ‘Deeds of the Cypriots.’* CTT 6 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003).
of his death. 102 It should be noted, however, that unlike Hayton’s perspective as a political statesman and someone seasoned by experience in battle, the erudite Kirakos was initially taken as Mongol prisoner, along with his mentor, Vanakan Vardapet. 103 It was in captivity that Kirakos served in the Mongol administration and consequently received access to Mongol sources. This experience (however negative at first) shaped his knowledge of Mongol political administration and history. His account thus incorporates a wide selection of Mongol vocabulary, a substantial knowledge of the Empire’s religious practices and administrative policy, as well as provides a comprehensive treatment of the Armenian nobility under Mongol occupation.104

Kirakos Gandzakec’i’s peer and fellow student of Vanakan, Armenian priest Vardan Arewelec’i/the “easterner” (c. 1200-1271) also forged close ties to the Mongols and the Cilician Armenians. Vardan became well-acquainted with the Ilkhanid court at Tabriz, Iran, as spiritual leaders of various faiths were generally favored by the Mongol rulers (he also visited the Cilician Armenian court based on his prestigious career). Vardan’s privileged position at both courts crystalized his understanding of Mongol-Armenian relations in the Caucasus and Cilician Armenia. Vardan’s Hawak’umn Patmut’ean (History Compilation)) devotes its final section to the Mongols and describes

102 Kirakos of Gandzak, Hayoc’ Patmut’yun, ed. Karapet Melik’ Ohanjanyan (Yerevan: Academy of Sciences Press, 1961) is the critical edition; Marie-Félice Brosset, Deux histoirens arméniens (St. Petersburg: Académie Imperiale des Sciences, 1870). An English translation of the historical sections (with the exception of the theological sections) has been prepared by Robert Bedrosian http://rbedrosian.com/kg1.htm.
103 Vanakan was a prominent vardapet, who mentored several well-known priests including Kirakos Gandzakec’i, Vardan Arewelec’i, and likely Grigor Aknerec’i. Vanakan’s now lost history also served as a source for his students for their own historical narratives.
his personal visit to Hülegü’s court in Tabriz.\textsuperscript{105} The text is an extraordinary source in light of its amazing provenance, especially when considering how the book was stolen from Vardan for a time, then remarkably found at a bazaar and completed upon its return to its rightful owner.

Vardan’s reputation as a renowned theologian and scholar is also evidenced through his wide ranging intellectual activities, which included his translation of Michael the Syrian’s \textit{Chronology}, biblical commentaries and grammar. Of special interest for this study is a geographical treatise that has been attributed to Vardan.\textsuperscript{106} A closer look at the \textit{Ašxaracʿoyscʿ} will be made in this study’s examination of Hayton’s geographical treatise.

Aside from the contributions of Vardan and Kirakos, a third major historiographical work is the \textit{T’at’aracʿ Patmutʿiwn (Patmutʿiwn vasn Azgin Netolac’)} (‘History of the Nation of Archers’, hereafter referred to as the \textit{HNA}) attributed to the Armenian priest Grigor Aknercʿi (c.1250-c.1335).\textsuperscript{107} Scholars have noted several


\textsuperscript{106} The geography’s manuscript recension is rather complex, as discussed in further detail in the subsequent chapter on Hayton’s geography. This study relies on the critical edition made by Haig Berberian (Paris, 1960).

problematic issues related to the *HNA* including its complicated authorship, as well as its “occasional confusion of dates and other alterations of history.”

At the same time, however, the *HNA* contains highly valuable information, based on the text’s exclusive focus on the Mongol conquests, covering the rise of Chinggis Khan and their political affairs until 1273. The text does not, therefore, begin from creation in the tradition of the aforementioned universal histories of Vardan and Kirakos. Another valuable asset of the *HNA* is its focus on the political affairs of Cilician Armenian—as the author was from the monastery Akanc’ (or Akner) in the Armenian kingdom. More specifically, the historical narrative provides a relevant discussion of King Het’um I’s negotiations with the Mongols and the Ilkhanid-Cilician partnership against the Mamlûk Sultanate.

A contemporary of Hayton, Step’ annos Orbelian, Metropolitan of Siwnik’(d.1304), from the southern part of Greater Armenia, produced a major historical work, *Patmutʼiwn Nahangin Sisagan* (‘History of the Siwnik’ Province,’) which also provides a window into Mongol-Armenian relations. Metropolitan Step’ annos devotes special attention to the Orbelian house which ruled the province of Siwnik’ and became an influential Mongol vassal. As the work provides an overview of the region’s political affairs under the Mongols until 1299, it will be compared to *La Flor des estoires*.

The methodological approach of this study also focuses on a range of ‘minor’ Armenian sources. More specifically, chronicle and colophon sources contain highly relevant historical material and will be used as evidence when looking at Hayton’s
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historical claims and expressions of anxiety concerning the future of Cilician Armenia vis-à-vis the Mongol Empire. Many of these sources have not been translated and have thus been largely omitted from European and North American scholarship.\textsuperscript{110} Fortunately, however, a great number of these works have been made available in critical Armenian editions, largely through the contributions of Armenologists: Vahram A. Hakobyan, Levon S. Khachikyan, A.S. Matevosyan and Avedis K. Sanjian.\textsuperscript{111}

Hakobyan published two volumes of a corpus of ‘minor’ chronicles including Hayton’s \textit{Cronicon}. While these chronicles are generally noted for their concise approach to historiography, they often include records of political events not found elsewhere. Hakobyan also published other important chronicles, including that of Step’annos Episkopos, which covers the period from 1193-1290.\textsuperscript{112} Covering the years 1076-1296, the \textit{Chronicle attributed to King Het’um II} also represents an important source—which despite suffering a complicated manuscript provenance—also contains relevant historical material on Cilician Armenia.\textsuperscript{113}

\textsuperscript{110} Robert Bedrosian has significantly contributed to the field of Armenian Studies through numerous translations of classical Armenian texts into English.


\textsuperscript{112} Step’annos Episkopos in \textit{Minor Chronicles}, I, 35-42.

\textsuperscript{113} \textit{Minor Chronicles}, I, 65-87.
The large corpus of thirteenth and fourteenth century colophons equally provide significant historical information. According to Avedis Sanjian, “the Armenian term for colophon is yişatakaran, which literally means “memorial,” “monument”; it is derived from the verb yişem, meaning “to remember,” “to recollect,” “to record.” These colophons typically reference the year a manuscript was copied, offer valuable information related to the names of the scribe, patron and concerning details on the place in which the manuscript was copied. While these details are invaluable themselves, the scribes often recorded additional historical information pertaining to the Ilkhanid and Cilician Armenia royalty, as well as offering eye-witness accounts of the Mamlûk campaigns and raids against Cilician Armenia. Extant colophons also help in serving as direct evidence of Hayton’s activities in Cilician Armenia and his background as a Cilician Armenian royal.

Translated sources from Arabic, Greek and Syriac traditions will also be incorporated in this study. Only a few major ones will be highlighted here, while the rest will be noted throughout the study. Arabic sources are particularly valuable as they contain information that is deliberately left out of Hayton’s historical narrative (and other Armenian texts). These texts can help signal the ways in which La Flor des estoires was filtering its information to its intended audience. Unfortunately, this study only relies on those sources available in translation in modern European languages, leaving out several

115 Sanjian, 3. For an in depth introduction to the study of colophons, 1-41.
other important works, including the well-known *Al-rawḍ al-zahir fi sīrat al-Malik al-āhir* of ‘Izz al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād (1217-1285), written by the biographer of Baybars.¹¹⁶

In addition, fifteenth century Egyptian historian Taqī al-Dīn Abu l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī al-Maqrīzī’s (d.1442) *Kitāb al-sulūk li-maʿrifa duwal al-mulūk* treats the history of the early Mamlūk Sultanate and the final days of the Latin East. Scholars have pointed out several shortcomings found in al-Maqrīzī’s narrative, specifically criticizing the author’s exorbitant reliance on Egyptian historian Nāṣir al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad Ibn al-Furāt (d.1405)—who represents a major source on Mamlūk history.¹¹⁷ Reuven Amitai-Preiss has demonstrated al-Maqrīzī’s general “carelessness” in copying Ibn al-Furāt, the more reliable source of the two historians.¹¹⁸

The Coptic Christian Al-Mufaḍḍal ibn Abī’l-Faḍā’il (d.1358) (also known as al-Moufazzal in the French translation of his work) produced a history of the Mamlūks, *al-Nahj al-sadīd waʾl-durr al-farīd fīmā baʿd taʾrīkh Ibn al-Amīd*, which includes significant information on the Mamlūk-Ilkhanid war. It covers the period from 1260-1348 and provides a relevant description of the Ilkhanid conquest of Damascus.¹¹⁹

Aside from the works of the Egyptian historians, Mamlūk Syrian sources also deserve attention. Quṭb al-Dīn Abu l-Faṭḥ Mūsā ibn Muḥammad al-Yūnīnī’s (1242-1326)
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*al-Dhayl mirʾāt al-zamān fī taʾrīkh al-aʾyān* serves as a major work on early Mamlûk history. A valuable partial translation was recently published by Li Guo, covering the years 1297-1302 of Ilkhan Ghazan’s reign, making the source particularly relevant for the timeframe of Hayton’s activities.\(^{120}\) Scholars have acknowledged al-Yūnīnī’s close reliance on the work of his contemporary Syrian, al-Jazarī (1260-1338), who was also a renowned historian from Damascus.\(^{121}\) Both of these Syrian historians provide detailed portraits of Ghazan’s Syrian campaigns, which in turn, help to contextualize (and challenge) Hayton’s depiction of the Ilkhanate.

Aside from the Arabic sources, the *Chronography* of the Syriac priest, Gregorius Abu l-Faraj Bar Hebraeus (d.1286), covers Ilkhanid-Cilician Armenian relations and eastern political affairs in a comprehensive manner. As the head or Maphrian of the Syrian Orthodox Church and native of Melitene (Malatya), Bar Hebraeus established close relations with the Armenians and Ilkhans, a position that facilitated the shaping of his profound understanding of Eastern politics. His chronicle was also valued by his contemporaries and was translated from Syriac into Arabic during his own lifetime. This dissertation relies on the English translation of the earlier Syriac version prepared by Sir E.W. Budge, as no translation of the Arabic has been made available thus far.\(^{122}\)

### 1.9 Thesis Overview

Chapter two will lay a foundation of another sort. It will focus on Hayton’s worldview as a Cilician Armenian. The chapter will explore how the kingdom’s

---


immersion in Eurasian politics set the stage for Hayton’s own development as an intermediary between East and West. It will give significant attention to the impact of the crusades, Mongol conquests, and Mamlûk incursions on shaping trends in Cilician society and politics in the early fourteenth century, including a process of ‘Latinization’ among the Armenian nobility. More specifically, it will argue that the kingdom’s alignment with the Mongols and crusaders against the Mamlûks resulted in its gradual political isolation, in the context of waning Ilkhanid power and the fall of the crusader states. The kingdom’s isolation ultimately rendered it unable to effectively negotiate with the Egyptian Sultanate. This political isolation will be shown to have contributed to Cilician Armenia’s increasing reliance on the Latin West for military support. The Armenian leadership’s overtures to the papacy, in turn, created a rift between Latinized Armenians like Hayton and the Orthodox majority. The kingdom was thus not only burdened by political strife, but by divisions along confessional lines. The chapter will underscore that all of these issues played an instrumental role in shaping Hayton’s worldview and diplomatic and writing efforts.

Chapter three presents a biographical portrait of the Cilician Armenian prince. While scholarship has largely focused on Hayton’s *La Flor des estoires* alone, this study presents his career through the lens of his Cilician Armenian identity. It will devote considerable attention to his background as a prince of the Hetʿumid dynasty, exploring how his position as an influential lord shaped his immersion in Ilkhanid diplomacy, interests in writing as a historian (patmicʿ), and close contacts to the Latins of Lusignan Cyprus. This background helps to contextualize his authorship of *La Flor des estoires* and broader efforts in promoting a crusade and alliance.
Given the popularity of the geographical book of *La Flor des estoires* in the Latin West, chapter four will explore the contours of Hayton’s geographical representation of the East. The chapter will argue that Hayton depicted the topography and ethnography of the East in such a way as to promote his unique authority as an easterner and experience as a Cilician Armenian. A closer look at the treatise reveals that his geographical representation of the East can also be read as having a distinctive perspective, one which relies on Latin traditions in scholarship and conforms to the expectations of his papal audience. It thus reveals both an intimate grasp of the political landscape of Mongol-occupied territories based on his background as an Ilkhanid vassal and his awareness of western expectations based on his ties to Latin society. This study will argue that this distinctive perspective was shaped by his intercultural experiences in the Eastern Mediterranean.

In a similar vein, chapter five will treat his historical approach in depicting the Mongol Empire. Once more, it will be argued that Hayton used his detailed knowledge of Mongol society to conform to the interests of Clement V in the context of papal deliberations for a joint crusade with the Mongols. The Armenian prince’s historical interpretation of the pro-Christian disposition of the Mongols will be given special consideration, showing the ways in which he situated the work within Latin-Ilkhanid dialogue and drew from contemporaneous reports circulated in the East. A close reading of Hayton’s historical treatment also highlights the changing relations between the Ilkhanate and Cilician Armenia during the early fourteenth century, which partly emerged as a result of the Mongol conversion to Islam and its gradual political decline. While scholars have largely depicted Hayton as a keen enthusiast for a crusade and alliance, this
chapter will underscore the ways in which his historical interpretation reveals increasing anxiety towards the future of the Ilkhanate and the implications of a political transition for the prospect of an alliance with the West and Armenians. It is because of this political uncertainty that Hayton defines Cilician Armenia as a critical intermediary in making a crusade viable and ensuring the protection of Ilkhanid support.

Cilician Armenia’s role as a key intermediary in the political negotiations between East and West is a theme observed in Hayton’s crusade proposal. Chapter six will thus explore Hayton’s vision for a crusade and his definition of the Armenian kingdom as a critical power for advancing military plans against the Mamlûk Sultanate. This approach hopes to expand the current understanding of Hayton’s crusade vision, which is typically viewed as a propagandistic account supporting Mongol alliance with the Latins and Armenians. The emphasis of this dissertation, in contrast, illustrates how Hayton’s views were reflective of the interconnected political links of the Eurasian world.
Chapter 2

Hayton’s World

Hayton is largely known by his epithet, “Historian,” and for his contributions as a crusade theoretician of the fourteenth century. His activities were remarkably extensive in scope, establishing him as an important figure in the courts of Cilician Armenia, Cyprus, Ilkhanid Persia and the Latin West. While Hayton’s career in political intermediation was exceptional, based on his influence in these various courts, his activities were also a reflection of Cilician Armenia’s position as a medieval crossroads and its complex ties to the world of the crusaders, Ilkhans, Armenians of the Caucasus, Byzantines, Turkic confederations and Mamlûks of Egypt and Syria. This geopolitical positioning allowed for Hayton to become both fully immersed in Latin culture and well-versed in the political affairs of the Near East during the early fourteenth century.

Hayton’s career as an intermediary was situated within a tumultuous time of political history, when Cilician Armenia experienced increasing isolation due to the loss of the crusader states, the weakening state of the Ilkhanate and the increasing dominance of the Mamlûk Sultanate and Turcomen invasions. The worldview of the ambitious Armenian prince was thus one of growing crisis, political isolation and uncertainty. Volatile conditions made it particularly urgent for the Cilician kingdom to gain military assistance. The Cilician leadership, including Hayton, was aware of this reality and pushed to receive assistance from the Latins by articulating alignment with the Roman Church and continued support of Ilkhanid alliance in hopes of Mongol aid. Ironically, these efforts added to the unstable conditions of the kingdom. The move towards
alignment with Rome polarized the kingdom while the reliance on Ilkhanid support isolated the Armenians based on the declining state of power of the Ilkhanate.

The early fourteenth century was indeed a transitional stage in which Hayton and his peers attempted to resurrect old allegiances and reverse Mamlûk aggression. This chapter seeks to highlight Cilician Armenia’s position as a crossroads among various political powers and the ways in which the early fourteenth century marked a new phase of relations for the kingdom. It will begin by examining the implications of the Third Crusade on establishing a new stage of Latin-Armenian ties. This will be followed by an overview of how the Armenian promotion of Union with Rome resulted in a heated debate among the pro-Catholic Cilician leadership and the opponents of Union. The study will also discuss the impact of the Mongol conquests, Cilician Armenia’s position as an Ilkhanid vassal, and the rise of the Mamlûk and Turkic presence in the Middle East. The chapter will end by looking at the kingdom’s relations to the main Christian powers in the East in the early fourteenth century, namely Cyprus, the Hospitallers and Byzantium. All of these stages of contacts and exchanges impacted Hayton’s worldview.

2.1 The Third Crusade and Diplomatic Precedents

Hayton’s awareness of papal interests and his own Latinized identity developed as a result of the contacts established between the Armenians and crusaders. The arrival of the crusaders in the East produced a range of exchanges between the two parties, ranging from military cooperation to marriage alliances and intermittent hostility based on competing interests. Both parties sought to consolidate their power in the East by applying realpolitik, meaning that diplomatic decisions were made based on material and
pragmatic incentives and changed according to the political fluctuations and the interests of individual rulers.

The Third Crusade (1189-1192) was critical in forging a diplomatic precedent between the papacy and Armenian leaders, as it became linked to Cilician ambitions to elevate the Armenian principality as a kingdom. The Armenian objective in becoming a kingdom partly extended from its inherited cultural memory, as it saw itself as the successor of the earlier Armenian kingdoms of the Caucasus. Its status as a kingdom would also raise it as an equal in Frankish eyes to the main powers of the East, including Byzantium, but definitely not in the Greek viewpoint. The outcome of the Latin-Armenian dialogue at the end of the twelfth century had significant implications for the kingdom’s religious alignment with the papacy and would impact later Latin-Armenian negotiations during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries.

Before looking at the context of the Third Crusade, an overview of the Armenian presence in Asia Minor deserves brief explication. Armenian settlement in the region had preceded the onset of the Crusades, having been tied to an earlier Byzantine imperial policy of securing the frontiers of the Empire. More specifically, Byzantine Emperors Basil I (r.867-886) and Nikephorous II (r.963-969) promoted the resettlement of Armenians from Greater Armenia into Asia Minor, as part of their strategic plan to colonize areas that were re-conquered from the Arabs during the ninth and tenth centuries. Armenian settlers were granted lands and titles in Asia Minor to facilitate this process of emigration, while their land holdings in Greater Armenia passed under Byzantine rule. This first wave of settlement largely took place in the frontier zones of
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the Empire, including Asia Minor, which were poorly controlled by the Byzantine Emperors. In addition to this first-wave of emigration under the Byzantines, the Seljuk Turkic conquests of the late eleventh century served as a major catalyst in driving Armenians westward into Asia Minor. The Turkic invasions in the Caucasus took place alongside continued Byzantine encroachment on Armenian domains, as illustrated by the Byzantine victory over Ani, capital of the Armenian Bagratuni kingdom, in 1045. The latter half of the eleventh century was thus characterized by Byzantine and Seljuk territorial wars in the Caucasus region. It was during this period that a second wave of Armenian emigrants found refuge in the Taurus and Anti-Taurus Mountains, in addition to moving into Northern Syria.

The arrival of the crusaders further altered the political landscape of Western Asia Minor at the end of the eleventh century. The intercultural exchanges between the crusaders and Armenians directly shaped the political future of Cilician Armenia. Marriage alliances created an Armenian ruling class that became immersed in Frankish culture and society, as will be discussed at length in chapter three of this study. These marriages were established early on including Joscelin of Courtenay’s, Count of Edessa

(1119-1131), marriage to Beatrice of the Armenian Rubenid clan, which controlled the principality before it was elevated to a kingdom at the end of the twelfth century.129 Even more importantly, the marriage of Baldwin II and Morphia of Melitene (daughter of the Armenian Gabriel) helped in producing the ruling families of Jerusalem, Antioch and Tripoli. Despite the high level of intermarriages, the crusaders and Armenians were both driven by expansionist agendas and became ruthless in extending their borders. Armenian control over Cilicia would only take place in 1183, long after the First Crusade. Intercultural exchanges were thus often marked by ambivalence in addition to moments of cooperation.130

The context of the Third Crusade would create conditions for a new stage of Latin-Armenian relations, which would impact later diplomatic exchanges. In 1187 Jerusalem’s fall to Saladin (r.1174-93), founder of the Ayyūbid dynasty, fuelled Western enthusiasm for a crusade. The papacy looked to the leadership among the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa (r.1155-90), King Richard I of England (r.1189-99), and King Philip II Augustus of France (r. 1179-80; 1180-1223). Rome also relied upon the aid of Cilician Armenia, as the principality had been spared from previous Ayyūbid incursions, and therefore, represented a relatively stable territory for the crusaders to pass through. Cilician Armenia’s location by strategic mountainous passes and outlets to the sea elevated its importance for the Latin armies.131

Thus Cilician Armenia’s geopolitical position and support of the crusades were particularly necessary for Latin interests in the context of Saladin’s presence in Syria. The fall of Jerusalem in 1187 made the situation in the Latin East particularly acute. This political situation encouraged Pope Clement III (r.1187-91) to write a letter to Prince Lewon II, the future Lewon I (r.1198-1219), and Catholicos Grigor VI (r.1194-1203) in 1189, formally asking for Armenian assistance. Lewon, a prince from the Rubenid feudal family and rival to powerful Het’umid clan, realized that this was an opportunity to see his barony rise as a kingdom. Lewon aimed at elevating the Armenian state in the context of the growing power of non-Christian political powers, including the Ayyūbids in Syria and the Seljuk Sultanate in Anatolia, as well as for exercising control over the Christian principality of Antioch.

Barbarossa was viewed as an ally by the Armenians based on his plans to embark on a land route from Anatolia to Cilician Armenia, whereupon his armies would pass into Syria while the other crusade leaders followed on a sea route. The dialogue between Frederick Barbarossa and Lewon opened a platform for diplomatic bargaining between

---

133 Léon Alishan, Léon le Magnifique, premier roi de Sissouan ou de l’Arméno-cilicie (Venice: St. Lazare, 1888), 162-65. Lewon was the first king of Cilician Armenia, and hence, he is refered to as Lewon I.
the Latin West and Cilician Armenia.\textsuperscript{136} Frederick Barbarossa supported Lewon’s political opportunism to be elevated to kingship in return for Armenian assistance for his military endeavors and his submission as vassal to the Holy Roman Empire. Barbarossa stood to gain from these exchanges as he was invested in extending German imperial ambitions in the region.

Becoming a vassal of the German emperor thus made alliance and commitments of mutual support that enhanced Lewon's political position.\textsuperscript{137} Unlike its political rivals, the pro-Byzantine Het’umid clan, the Rubenid dynasty kept its focus on the Latin West rather than its Greek neighbors who had ruled Cilicia from 1137-1175.\textsuperscript{138} This did not mean that Byzantium was entirely ignored by Lewon I. As part of the multilateral diplomatic exchanges of the period, ecumenical negotiations took place between the Chalcedonian Greek and non-Chalcedonian Armenian clergy in hopes of maintaining open relations.\textsuperscript{139} The Byzantines responded by sending Lewon a crown as part of their goal of bringing the Armenians under their sphere of influence, especially in light of the empire’s troubles with the Holy Roman Emperor.\textsuperscript{140}

Both Lewon and Barbarossa formed an alliance against the backdrop of Byzantine Emperor Isaac II Angelos’ (r. 1185-95; r.1203-1204) clashes with the Holy Roman

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
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Empire. This antagonism ran alongside lingering Greek disregard and suspicion for the Armenians. Byzantine animosities towards the German emperor had intensified when Frederick proclaimed himself “Emperor of the Romans” in 1155. Moreover, unlike the diplomatic policy of his father, Conrad III (r.1138-52), Barbarossa opposed the Byzantine offensive campaign against the Normans in Italy.\textsuperscript{141} In reaction to Barbarossa’s political decisions, Isaac II entered into an alliance with Saladin, thereby increasing German interest in working with the Armenians.

While Barbarossa’s drowning in the Saleph River (modern Göksu in Turkey) in 1190 interrupted his negotiations with Lewon, Henry VI (r.1191-97), his son and successor, supported Lewon’s coronation, which took place in Tarsus in 1198, among the company of the Syrian Jacobite catholicos, the Greek metropolitan of Tarsus and the papal envoy, Conrad of Mainz.\textsuperscript{142} The presence of the papal legate marked Rome’s support of Lewon’s elevation as king based on the Armenian acceptance of Union with Rome. The Union of 1198 would create a major precedent which would shape Latin-Cilician Armenian exchanges during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{143} As the papacy was interested in crowning a king of Latin religious identity, the Armenians nominally accepted union with Rome to promote their political interests. The use of religion as political currency would continue into the fourteenth century.

While earlier papal-Armenian exchanges for submission had taken place, as evidenced by the contacts between Catholicos Gregory IV (1173-1193) and Pope Lucius


\textsuperscript{142} Angus Donal Stewart, \textit{The Armenian Kingdom and the Mamluks}, 34; Cowe, “Inauguration of the Cilician Coronation Ritual,” 51; Pogossian, \textit{The Letter of Love and Concord}, 21-22.

\textsuperscript{143} The \textit{Chronicle} of Constable Smbat (1956), 208. Smbat notes that the king stood in obedience to the Roman Church and the German Emperor upon accepting the crown.
the context of the Third Crusade and Lewon’s political aspirations to be crowned king, resulted in Cilician Armenia’s proclamation of the Church of Rome as the “...mater omnium ecclesiarum” (mother of all churches). This proclamation was also made in the context of growing papal universal claims in the late twelfth century and which continued into the early thirteenth century.

What is important to highlight for this study is that Lewon’s acceptance of union to Rome and vassalage to the Holy Roman Empire were nominal at this point, allowing the newly founded kingdom to exercise its independence in political and religious affairs. The papacy and Cilician Armenian kingdom would negotiate the terms of Union over decades into the fourteenth century. The fluctuating political currents in the East played a critical role in shaping this dialogue. Hayton’s support of Union emerged at a time marked by political turbulence and the kingdom’s urgent overtures for western military support. It will later be shown how this issue created division among the Armenian leaders and clergy in both Cilicia and Greater Armenia.

2.2 Papal-Armenian Relations and the Debate on Union

Throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the papacy strove to unite the Latin and Armenian Orthodox churches while maintaining an interest in defending

---

144 The Byzantine annexation of Cilicia had encouraged the Armenians to engage in dialogue with the papacy. In 1184, Pope Lucius received a letter from Catholicos Gregory IV, which was a profession of faith. Bernard Hamilton explains that the papacy believed it to be an affirmation of their submission to Rome, when in fact it seems to have served as a plea for aid in the context of the growing threat of Saladin. See Bernard Hamilton, “The Armenian Church and the Papacy at the Time of the Crusades,” *Eastern Churches Review* 10 (1978), 68-69. On early Armenian-papal correspondence, see Poghos Ananiam, “Ašot Iškanin havanakan tltaksutujiun Nikołos A(rajin) papin het” (The Probable Correspondence of Prince Ashot with Pope Nicholas I). *Bazmaveb* 149 (1991): 332-45.


146 Armenian tradition held that the Apostles Bartholomew and Jude Thaddeus co-founded the Armenian Church, which esteemed St. Gregory the Illuminator (Grigor Lusavorich) as the first *catholicos*, head of the Armenian Church in the fourth century. A large number of later *catholicos* are claimed to have descended from Grigor’s line.
Cyprus and Cilician Armenia. While the papacy did not place ultimatums on the Armenian kingdom, the Cilician kings and catholicoi made repeated efforts to show their alignment with Rome during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries as a diplomatic strategy to ensure western military support. The Cilician leadership’s strategy focused on presenting themselves as papal allies and not simply as a community of Eastern Christians. The pro-Union gestures of the Cilician leadership ultimately caused a rift between those who supported Union and those who stood against it.

Ironically, as Cilician overtures became more aggressive, the papacy was increasingly burdened with internal problems in Europe and found itself in no position to organize major assistance to the Armenian kingdom. Cilician Armenia’s two major allies, the Ilkhans and Latins, were not able to adequately respond to the kingdom’s political crisis. The Cilician kingdom continued in its strategy of requesting western support, not realizing the extent of conflicts and financial strains burdening the Latins, or perhaps because of its own turbulent circumstances and urgency for gaining aid.147

While Hayton and his contemporaries clearly underscored their alignment with the papacy, they were building upon diplomatic precedents between Cilician Armenia and Rome, established with the Union of 1198. Alignment with the papacy, or more specifically, the acknowledgment of papal primacy (its authority over the whole church) became increasingly important for Cilician Armenia as the papacy required clearer definitions of the position of the Eastern Churches with respect to the Rome during the thirteenth century. As a result of increased contacts during the crusades, both churches

---

learned more of each other’s positions and ecclesiastical developments. The Armenians became gradually aware of the pope’s role as the Vicar of Christ (Vicarius Christii), which meant that he was to be seen as Christ’s representative on earth.\textsuperscript{148} The Vicar of Christ was, therefore, also seen to be responsible for bringing the schismatic Eastern Christians Churches back on the “right path.”

Facing political threats of the Hohenstaufen dynasty in Italy, Pope Innocent III (r.1198-1216) not only encouraged his role as the ‘vicarius Christi’ in dealings with Western rulers, but also extended it to the Eastern Churches. More specifically, Innocent stressed that “it was Peter alone whom the Lord established as his own substitute, both in the office of vicar and as his successor in teaching.”\textsuperscript{149} Pope Innocent IV’s (r.1243-1254) career devoted considerable efforts for strengthening the position of the papacy. His papal encyclical, \textit{Cum simus super} (late March 1245), urged Eastern Churches to affirm papal primacy and underscored his position as leader over all Christians.\textsuperscript{150}

The subject of papal primacy remained problematic for the Armenian clergy because such recognition would imply that the catholicoi needed to follow the teaching authority of St. Peter’s successors and turn to the Bishop of Rome for counsel on church matters.\textsuperscript{151} This was a hard pill to swallow as the Armenian Orthodox Church prided itself on its autocephalous and apostolic foundation laid by Bartholomew and Thaddeus. While the Armenians traditionally esteemed the pope as \textit{primus inter pares} (first among

equals), the catholicoi asserted their independence.\textsuperscript{152} Part of this pride may have emerged from the success of the Armenian Church in withstanding earlier Chalcedonian (Byzantine) pressures to convert.\textsuperscript{153} While the catholicoi had also made attempts to negotiate with the Byzantine Church in the twelfth century, the Armenian Church largely upheld its independence until its interactions with the Latins.\textsuperscript{154}

Cilician Armenia’s increasingly conciliatory position towards the papacy seems to have been deeply rooted in its understanding of the Bishop of Rome as the leader of the crusading movement regardless of the many difficulties burdening popes for organizing a crusade in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. While the popes provided official authorization and offered plenary indulgences, the growing authority of secular monarchs and domestic conflicts within Europe, like the Sicilian Vespers (1282-1302), challenged papal ability in launching a crusade. James Powell has underscored that the Fifth Crusade represented the last time the papacy succeeded in organizing a full-scale crusade, despite its role in later smaller expeditions.\textsuperscript{155}

Papal enthusiasm to organize a crusade and send military assistance to the East, however, continued to be voiced (in varying degrees) throughout the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. The liberation of the Holy Land, defense of the Christians of the East, and the blockade of the Mamlūks, held resonance for the papacy and crusading enthusiasts such as Edward I (r.1272-1307) of England. The organization of smaller

\textsuperscript{152} Pogossian. \textit{The Letter of Love and Concord}, 23-46.
\textsuperscript{153} Dadoyan, \textit{The Armenians in the Medieval Islamic World}, II, 175.
expeditions during the late thirteenth century likely encouraged the development of Cilician Armenian-papal diplomatic exchanges. Hayton took special note of Otho de Grandson’s expedition to the East in 1290. Having been a close participant in Edward I of England’s crusade plans, Otho was at Acre during the time of its fall and later spent time in Cilician Armenia and Cyprus before returning to England in 1294. 156 While such individuals were largely incapable of standing against the Mamlūks, their presence likely fuelled the hope among the Cilician royals that future assistance was imminent. Fourteenth century Armenian diplomatic missions to Avignon continued to reflect this positive outlook. 157

As Mamlūk and Turcomen raids debilitated Cilician Armenia during the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Armenian leaders made bolder pro-Latin statements to Rome in order to underscore their unity with the Latins and downplay their position as schismatic in the Catholic worldview. 158 The Armenian royals and catholicoi increasingly sought to underscore their position as loyal followers of the Latin Church, especially as their close affiliation to Mongols had been looked upon unfavorably by the West. Memories of the Mongol attacks against Eastern Europe and the pagan belief system of the foreign conquerors were not easily overlooked. 159 Thus the Cilician kingdom made consistent efforts to show its alignment with the Latin West.

158 Bernard Hamilton, “The Armenian Church and the Papacy at the Time of the Crusades,” 61. Hamilton explains that information about the Armenian Church had been largely gained from Byzantine sources in the earlier period. These sources were highly critical of the Armenian faith based on the long-standing acrimonious relations between the two churches.
Pro-Catholic catholicoi were subsequently elected including Catholicos Grigor VII Anawarzecʻi’s (1293-1307) who corresponded with Pope Boniface VIII (r.1294-1303) and pursued bold pro-Latin overtures. The catholicoi who were less than enthusiastic to become Latinophiles ran into trouble, as was the case with Catholicos Kostantin II (r.1286-89) who was deposed in 1289. The Cilician royals equally followed a pro-Roman position; King Hetʻum II became an enthusiastic supporter of Union with Rome, as evidenced by his letter to Pope Nicholas IV (r.1288-92) in 1289 and his peculiar choice to become a Franciscan, perhaps partly based on the pope’s own Franciscan identity and the flourishing activities of the missionaries in the East. Hayton’s entry into the Premonstratensian Abbey in Cyprus is also illustrative of this social reality. The phenomenon of pro-Latin Union was thus clearly evident in the social and political positions of the Armenian elite.

The convening of official councils also strove to promote union. The Council of Sis in 1307 asserted the pro-Latin positioning of the Cilician Armenian leadership by accepting the main differences which had separated Armenian and Latin ritualistic traditions. Changes included the accepting of the Latin date for Nativity (December 25th), the mixing of wine and water in the Eucharistic chalice, the Chalcedonian position on the two natures of Christ, in addition to changes in the liturgical calendar, fasting practices,

160 Pope Boniface’s letter to the catholicoi was dated on October 26th 1298, serving as a reply to the catholicoi. *Acta Romanorum Pontificum ab Innocentio V ad Benedictum XI (1276-1304)*, 206-08.
and to the Trisagion. The timing and decisions taken at the council underscore the heart of Cilician Armenia’s foreign policy during the fourteenth century.

The Cilician leadership used these councils as a means to subdue western skepticism about the sincerity of their Latin faith. A lack of confidence towards the sincerity of Cilician Armenia’s religious articulations had emerged from the past oscillations of its leadership. Earlier promises including that of Catholicos Gregory III (r.1113-1166) to push for Union with Rome in 1144 and Lewon’s proclamation of Union during his coronation in 1198 had achieved minimal results as most of the Armenian clergy held onto their traditional beliefs and rites. James D. Ryan has also observed that the fourteenth century popes placed greater pressures on the Armenians to accept union based on their increased knowledge of the practices of the Armenian Church. The papacy’s lack of confidence in Armenian claims may have also resulted from Cilician Armenia’s past avoidance in recognizing papal primacy.

By Hayton’s time, bolder statements from the Cilician Armenian leadership were being voiced. Articulations of the Cilician leadership’s alignment with the Latin Church unsurprisingly embittered the majority of clergy and prominent religious figures in Cilician and Greater Armenia. The contacts between Cilician and Greater Armenia were important as the kingdom was home to the catholicosate, which had transferred to Cilicia after the fall of the capital of the last Armenian Bagratid kingdom of Ani (located

---

166 ‘The Continuation of the Chronography of Samual of Ani,’ in RHC doc. arm. 1, 466; M.F. Brosset, trans., "Samouel d'Ani: Tables chronologiques", in Collection d'historiens arméniens, 2 (1876), 475.
in today’s Eastern Anatolia in the province of Kars) in 1045. Esteemed ecclesiastical figures from Greater Armenia actively participated in the election of the cathersoi and in various councils held throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Vardan Arewelç'i’s (the ‘Easterner) visit to the court of Het'um I and Hayton’s exchanges with the rector of the University of Glajor in Greater Armenia reflect the complex forms of exchanges between the Cilician kingdom and the Armenian communities of the Caucasus. While Cilician Armenia did not exercise political influence over the Caucasus, regular exchanges were facilitated because of the incorporation of both regions within the Ilkhanate.

It seems likely that the great majority of clergy opposed breaking the Armenian Church’s traditions because they were far removed from engaging in military planning and from the diplomatic exchanges with the West. Moreover, the Armenians of the Transcaucasus region were increasingly threatened by growing incursions of the missionary movement, which largely developed because of the Mongol leniency towards mendicant activity and the improved travel conditions within the Empire.

The polarized debate on the question of Union also meant that the decisions taken at the synods were hardly representative of the majority. Such was the case after the Council of Sis in 1307, where only twenty-two out of thirty-two participants agreed to the proposals. A counter-council convened two years later in direct opposition of the

---

decisions taken at Sis. In response, King Ōšin (r.1308-1320) convened the Council of Adana in 1316, where the Cilician leaders reiterated the decisions taken in 1307. The Council of Adana had a notable absence of representatives from outside of Cilician Armenia. The first quarter of the fourteenth century thus proved to be a volatile atmosphere, marked by the urgent overtures of the pro-Latin Cilician leadership and their efforts to quench the stubborn orthodoxy of the majority of the clergy. The clashes between the leadership and subjects also reveal the complexities of the population mix, indicating that Armenian religious identity was far from being homogeneous. This context of intense religious debate pulled in prominent individuals like Hayton, who were invested in the diplomatic policy of the Cilician kingdom

2.3 The Mongol Moment and Cilician Armenian Submission

The Mongol conquests in Anatolia in the 1240s served as the most important catalyst in defining the political future of Cilician Armenia. Incorporated as part of the Empire, the Armenian kingdom rose as both a military ally and political intermediary working on behalf of Mongol interests. This was the stage for Hayton to become involved in the Mongol campaigns in Syria and in the promotion of a ‘triple alliance’ between the Mongols, Latins and Armenians.

The kingdom’s submission to the Mongols took place after a wave of Mongol conquests including the fall of the Seljuk Sultanate of Rum at the battle of Köse Dagh in

---

171 Galanus, *Conciliationis Ecclesiae Armenae Cum Romana*, 474-507. The mixing water in the Eucharistic chalice proved to be a polemical issue for the Armenian clergy, for it had been part of an older debate and represented a thorny issue that would surface “almost daily” in the priests’ lives. David Bundy, “The Council of Sis,” in *After Chalcedon: Studies in Theology and Church History Offered to Professor Albert Van Roey for His Seventieth Birthday*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 18, ed. C.Laga et al (Leuven: Department Oriëntalistiek, 1985), 54.
1243. Following the battle of Köse Dagh, the city of Sivas (Sebastea) also offered a voluntary submission. The Seljuk defeat was significant as it marked the demise of Cilician Armenia’s powerful political rival. Het’um's subordination to the Seljuks had come recently in 1221, and was followed by Sultan Ala al-Dīn Kaykubād I’s (r. 1220-36) incursions into Cilician Armenia in 1225-6. According to Sara Nur Yildiz, this period of vassalage was a striking departure from the earlier expansionist wars between the Seljuks and Armenians along the frontier of the western part of Cilicia, known as Rough Cilicia or Cilicia Trachea.

The Mongol campaign to subjugate Anatolia was placed under the direction of the Mongol commander Bayjū, who defeated the Seljuk Sultan Ghīyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II Kaykubād (r. 1237-46) and his multi-ethnic army, which included support from the Ayyūbids, Greeks, and Franks. As a result, the Seljuk Sultanate was reduced to tributary status under the Mongols, thereby ending its political dominance in the Near East. The Anatolian conquest was just one facet of the wider Mongol plans for world conquest, which took place in several stages of war, including China, Korea, northern

174 A second defeat was incurred by the Seljuks near Aksaray (central Anatolia) following Köse Dagh. See Sara Nur Yildiz, “Reconceptualizing the Seljuk-Cilician Frontier,” 113-114.
175 Kirakos of Gandzak, 281-83; Vardan, 147; Dashdondog, The Mongols and the Armenians, 63.
177 Paul Z. Bedoukian, Coinage of Cilician Armenia (New York: American Numismatic Society, 1962), 84 and 228-35. Bedoukian provides a thorough description of the bilingual coins during Het’um’s reign, which in addition to having Armenian on one side, contain Arabic on the other “as a token of Hetoum’s nominal acceptanc of their suzerainty.” Bedoukian, 84. For a discussion of this period of submission, Yildiz, “Reconceptualizing the Seljuk-Cilician Frontier,” 110.
178 Yildiz, “Reconceptualizing the Seljuk-Cilician Frontier,” 96-105.
Iran, the Caucasus, central Russia, and Eastern Europe. Cilician Armenia avoided a similar fate based on King Het’um I’s swift negotiations, which were mediated through the intervention of Armenian princes from Greater Armenia including Prince Jalal of Xač’en, a Mongol vassal who rose in social standing within the Empire.

Het’um I distanced himself from the Seljuk Sultanate by surrendering female refugees of the royal Seljuk house who had escaped to Cilicia during the Mongol onslaught and found temporary sanctuary at Het’um's court. By doing so he distanced himself from the Seljuk Sultanate, overlords to whom he was a tributary. His surrender of the Seljuk women and his refusal to send troops in response to Seljuk pleas for support against the Mongols sent a message of his submission to the Mongols. Scholars have understood Het’um’s careful political maneuvering as a reflection of his negotiations for the peaceful submission of Cilician Armenia. His cautious approach must be understood in light of Het’um I’s awareness of the earlier experiences of Armenian and Georgian lords of the Caucasus region. Lords who had submitted voluntarily fared better than those who resisted.

---

184 Bayarsaikhan Dashdondog notes how voluntary submissions generally served as a means to avoid a Mongol siege. She further shows how Kars served as an exception. See The Mongols and Armenians, 58; 65-66.
Kirakos of Gandzak and Constable Smbat explain that Hetʿum’s conciliatory actions were made in response to Mongol requests. Kirakos of Gandzak provides a particularly apologetic depiction by emphasizing Hetʿum I’s grief over the order to submit the Seljuk women and his preference to surrender his own sons rather than his guests.\(^{185}\) The Chronicle of Constable Smbat similarly notes that a Mongol commander gave the Armenian king an ultimatum: the transfer of Seljuk women or face losing the “friendship” between Cilicia and the Mongols.\(^{186}\) In contrast to the Armenian sources, Bar Hebraeus explains that Hetʿum’s decision was a calculated move to avoid a siege by the Mongols, not one initiated by the invaders.\(^{187}\) Regardless of whether Hetʿum’s decision was forced upon him or not, the outcome served as the first step in solidifying Cilician-Mongol negotiations.

The second stage of negotiations was when Constable Smbat made the journey to the Mongol court in 1246, followed by the third stage, which was King Hetʿum I’s own visit to Karakorum in 1253/54. These visits served as necessary political protocol based on the expectations of the conquerors, who demanded clear demonstrations of their subjects’ inferior political positions. Bar Hebraeus addresses the importance of these courtly visits in his account of the imperial court of Güyük Khan (r.1246-48), where various political actors, both Christian and Muslim, gathered to gain the khan’s favor. Armenian rulers would continue making such visits to the Ilkhanid Mongol court to pay homage to newly elected rulers and present outstanding grievances.\(^{188}\)

---

\(^{185}\) Kirakos of Gandzak, 284-85.  
\(^{187}\) Bar Hebraeus notes, the sultan “became inflamed with anger, and he sent a multitude of troops to lay waste Cilicia, because they had handed his mother and sister over to the Tatars. Bar Hebraeus, 408-410.  
As a result of performing these three stages of submission, Bayarsaikhan Dashdondog underscores that Cilician Armenian proved successful in its quest to become a vassal and gained ability to negotiate the terms of the Mongol-Cilician relationship. Quite remarkably, King Het‘um I became acknowledged more along the lines of being an ally rather than a subject, as one who promised military cooperation and assistance for Mongol expansion in return for protection. The HNA relays the success of Cilician submission by noting Smbat’s acceptance of a Mongol bride and gaining of an exemption of taxes on his lands.\textsuperscript{189}

Bayarsaikhan Dashdondog offers a possible factor behind Mongol flexibility towards the kingdom by noting, “They (the Mongols) knew that Cilician Armenia was a small Christian state that was in conflict with surrounding hostile Muslim sultanates and that the Armenians needed an alliance with those who were more powerful.”\textsuperscript{190} The Mongols would have indeed been alerted to the political status of Cilician Armenia based on their skilled use of informants. The Mongols were also aware of the strength of the Seljuk Sultanate, which stood defiant as their political opponent.\textsuperscript{191} Seljuk opposition may have been based on their perceived security in their military strength as the Sultanate had served as a major political power in the Near East, to both Cilician Armenia and Byzantium.\textsuperscript{192}

\textsuperscript{189}HNA, 314-315. Bar Hebraeus, Chronography, II, 320-21. See for example, the brief note in The Chronicle of Constable Smbat (1956), 651; Hayton, “Cronicon,” 67. Constable Smbat was not the first Armenian lord to receive a Mongol bride. Such marriages occurred among the nobles of the Caucasus, Dashdondog, Mongols and the Armenians, 93-94.

\textsuperscript{190}Dashdondog, The Mongols and Armenians, 84.

\textsuperscript{191}Ibid.

Another factor seems to have shaped the positive relations between the Mongols and Cilician Armenians. The Mongols were astute in collecting information about potential threats. They would have known that Cilician Armenia was a small Christian power closely tied to the crusader states, not just one surrounded by the Muslim Middle East. A loyal vassal that could potentially influence neighboring Frankish states may have encouraged the positive relations between the Mongols and the Armenians. This was certainly the case with Cilician Armenia’s influence over crusader Antioch.

Bohemond VI (d. 1275), had been married to Hetʿum I’s daughter Sybille and followed his father-in-law’s pro-Mongol policy by becoming a tributary of the Empire. Claude Cahen has noted that Antioch developed into a dependency of Cilician Armenia based on the aforementioned family connections and aligned itself with the Armenian kingdom’s foreign policy vis-à-vis the Ilkhans. Antioch would later pay a heavy toll for its support of the Mongols as it became a major target of the Mamlûks in 1268.

Cilician Armenia was not merely a loyal vassal but also seen as a political intermediary. In fact, this role was espoused by the Armenians themselves and is most evident in the actions of Hayton and his presentation of La Flor des estoires. An early precedent of this pattern is evidenced in the extant letter of Constable Smbat, written in 1248 from Samarqand to his brothers-in-law, King Henry I of Cyprus (r.1218-1253) and John of Ibelin, Count of Jaffa. The letter was also intercepted by King Louis IX (r.1226-70) at Cyprus (before his Egyptian campaign). In the letter, Smbat emphasized the positive disposition of his overlords and the presence of Christianity within Mongol lands, perhaps as a way to foster diplomatic relations between the Franks and

193 Cahen, La Syrie du nord, 702. Bohemond VI was indeed excommunicated by the papacy for his collaborations with the Mongols.
The peaceful submission of Cilician Armenia allowed it to rise as a powerful ally in war for the Mongol conquests in the Middle East. While the kingdom, as a political subordinate, became obliged to participate in the Mongol campaigns, Hetʿum’s armies enthusiastically participated in the Mongol mission to destroy the Shiite Nizari Ismāʿīlī state of Alamut, a mountain fortress in the South Caspian region of Iran. Famous for their attacks against enemy Sunni Muslim leaders including Saladin, the Nizari Ismāʿīlīs, erroneously known as the Assassins or Ḥashāshīn, had positioned themselves as Mongol enemies.

In 1258, Cilician Armenia participated in the attack on the Abbasid Caliphate in Baghdad based on Caliph al-Mustasʿim’s (r.1242-58) refusal to submit to the Mongols. While the caliphate had lost much of its power by the third century, and in actuality, represented a mere figurehead of authority, the loss of Baghdad was a major coup for the Mongol armies, followed by campaigns against Aleppo and Damascus. The Mongol conquests in Anatolia, Iran and Iraq drastically transformed the political landscape of the Near East. The Armenian interest in allying with the Mongols against the Muslim powers of the Middle East would continue into the fourteenth century. Decades of military co-

---


operation made the Armenians well-versed in Mongol strategies in warfare. Hayton’s own expertise as a military tactician stemmed from his involvement in the Ilkhanid Mongol campaigns in Syria. Thus Ilkhanid-Armenian plans became interconnected based on their shared opposition to the main political rival in the Middle East, the Mamlûk Sultanate.

2.4 Cilician Armenia, Ilkhanid Vassal

The Mongol presence in the Near East was consolidated with the creation of the Ilkhanate of Persia. While scholars have debated the plans of Great Khan Möngke for his brother Hülegû in the Middle East, the latter paved the way for the emergence of a new dynasty in Iran, which would foster close relations with the Cilician Armenian rulers and exert control over the Seljuk Sultanate. Mongol rule in the Near East became known as the Ilkhanate, with its rulers being called Ilkhans (commonly translated as subservient khans in reference to their status vis-à-vis the Great Khan). The Ilkhanate developed as one of the Mongol imperial holdings, exerting rule over Persia, Asia Minor and the Caucasus.

Cilician Armenian support during the early Ilkhanid campaigns proved fortuitous for the kingdom in its early stages. In addition to witnessing the disintegration of Seljuk power, territorial rewards were bestowed upon the Armenian kingdom for their

---

199 For other possible translations Amitai-Preiss, Mongols and Mamluks, 14.
200 Aside from the power of the Great Khan in China and Mongolia, other imperial holdings included the Jochid line in the Pontic-Caspian Steppe in what came to be known as the Golden Horde and Chaghatai’s base in Central Asia.
participation in Hülegü’s expeditions. The *HNA* offers considerable praise of the distinguished honors bestowed upon the Ilkhanate’s Armenian and Georgian subjects as a result of their solid fighting skills. 201

More specifically, Het’um I temporarily conquered the castle in Behesni (Bahasnī/ā in Arabic) which held strategic value for both Armenians and Mamlûks, situated en route to Marash (Karaman Maraş). 202 Al-Jazarî notes the key location of Behesni, noting it as one of the most important fortresses in Cilician Armenia. 203 According to a manuscript of T’oros Ṛoslín, the celebrated thirteenth century Cilician manuscript illuminator, the conquest of Behesni was one victory amongst many. 204

Cilician Armenia’s victory over the Turcomen Karamanid dynasty in south central Anatolia in 1263 also marked an early success, one which was celebrated in Hayton’s *Cronicon* and contemporary sources. 205 The Mongols supported Het’um’s conflict with the Karamanids, as the latter had opposed Mongol control of Anatolia. 206 To both the Armenians and Mongol overlords, the Karamanid incursions into the frontiers of the Cilician kingdom and Seljuk Sultanate posed a threat to the security of the region, as revealed by the *Chronicle* of Constable Smbat, which provides a detailed overview of the Karamanid-Armenian conflict. 207 Founded by Nureddîn, known as

---

201 *HNA*, 343-45.
203 Al-Jazarî, 26.
204 Matevosyan, *Colophons, XIII century*, 317 no.261. The colophon is found in a gospel manuscript.
205 The victory is discussed in a number of Armenian sources including Hayton’s chronicle. *Cronicon*, (year 1262), 71; *The Chronicle* of Smbat, (year 1262); 239-40; *The Chronicle attributed to Hetum II*, (year 1263), 84.
207 The *Chronicle of Constable Smbat* (1956), 238. Smbat relays how the Karamanids had defeated Het’um I’s twice before the victory in 1262. Nonetheless, the royal chronicler takes great pride in emphasizing that
Karaman, the Turkic presence in the region intensified as the Seljuk Sultanate weakened under Mongol rule. As former Seljuk vassals, the Karamanids turned into a fierce independent force, having established their base in mountainous western Cilicia and their capital at Larande (known today as Karaman).  

In light of these early successes, contemporary Armenian sources applauded the territorial victories gained during Hülegü’s campaigns and praised the Armenian role in the military campaigns. These early victories would be remembered by Hayton to emphasize the advantages of military cooperation, even if they did not reflect the reality during the period in which he wrote. Indeed, by the early fourteenth century, the military alliance between the Ilkhans and Armenians accomplished minimal results.

While the early stages of Ilkhanid-Armenian alliance were successful, they were short-lived. Notwithstanding Hetʿum I’s victory of 1263, Mongol alliance failed to offer Cilician Armenia long-term assistance against Turkic penetration into the region, in addition to the subsequent Mamlūk aggression against the kingdom on account of its support of the crusaders and Mongols. Karamanid expansion in Western Asia was soon supported by the Mamlūks, who viewed the Turkic confederation as an ally in the region.

Cilician Armenia gradually became isolated as the Ilkhans could no longer offer

---

208 Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties*, 232-3. Karamanid power had grown as Seljuk power weakened in the region after the Mongols placed two rival sultans in power, Kaykaus II (d.1279/80) and Kilij Arslan IV (d.1266), as a way of dividing central authority in order to maintain weak power in the region. In addition, the Seljuk state had become destabilized as a result of the large flux of Khwarazmian Turks, who had fled westward as a result of the Mongol conquests. Large numbers of these pastoralists seem to have had a detrimental impact on the Seljuk countryside by increasing instability in the Sultanate. Yildiz, “Reconceptualizing the Seljuk-Cilician Frontier,” 112.

209 The Chronicle attributed to King Hetʿum II, 81-82. The chronicle notes how the king succeeded in retrieving fortresses from the Seljuk Sultan in 1245 and proved victorious over Seljuk troops in 1259.

210 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, 293. Sultan Qalawun relied on Karamanid assistance for his attack against Hromkla.
military alliance as they became increasingly burdened by inter-khanate feuding and their long-standing conflict with the Mamlûk Sultanate. Cilician Armenia’s exposure to Mamlûk and Turcomen attacks ultimately brought an end to the kingdom in the late fourteenth century. This reality was omitted by Hayton, who looked towards the earlier stages of Ilkhanid-Armenian alliance as an example for the Latin West of the rewards of cooperating with the Mongols. His historical and ethnographical perceptions, as will be discussed, reflected his focus on the past successes and his strategic downplaying of contemporary circumstances.

2.5 Target of the Mamlûk Sultanate

Notwithstanding the early successes of the Cilician Armenian kingdom under Ilkhanid lordship, the Mongols gradually failed to protect the Armenian kingdom against the dominance of the Mamlûk Sultanate, whose political strength posed a formidable threat to the crusaders, the Armenian kingdom, and Ilkhanid Mongols alike. The Mamlûk armies had proven themselves as a force over the Mongols at the battle of ‘Ayn Jâlût (translated as ‘Goliath’s spring’) in September 1260, halting the Mongol advance into Syria.

As a result of the Armenian kingdom’s military assistance to the Ilkhans, the Mamlûk Sultanate targeted Cilician Armenia, in addition to its wars against the Latins and Mongols. Jihâd and vengeance launched against the kingdom for being a supporter of the crusades and Ilkhanid campaigns rendered the kingdom a vulnerable target in the aftermath of the fall of the Latin East and weakening power of the Ilkhanate in the first

---

211 Kirakos of Gandzak ends his account with an interesting description of the feuding between Hülegü and Berke Khan, noting their ongoing wars from 1261-66. Kirakos of Gandzak, 394-95.
quarter of the fourteenth century. The Mamlūk sultans fashioned themselves as the “Guardians of Islam” by promoting jihād against the crusaders, Mongols, and Armenians upon their political rise in the mid-thirteenth century and targeted all threats in opposition to this image.

The Mamlūk Sultanate emerged from the military system organized under the Ayyūbids. The decade between the years 1250-1260 marked their rise to power, followed by a second stage, 1260-1293, which witnessed the Sultanate’s rapid conquests over Crusader Antioch, Tripoli, and Acre. Originally purchased as slaves for the Ayyūbid caliphate, the Mamlūks were largely recruited from the Turkic confederations including the Kipchak, located around the Black Sea. Forced to convert to Islam, these soldiers underwent rigid military training and established ties of loyalty between masters and their slaves, as well as forging solidarities among the mamlūk units. In particular, the elite Bahriyya regiment succeeded in consolidating political dominance by overthrowing their Ayyūbid lords, following the death of Sultan al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb (r.1240-49) during French King Louis IX’s invasion of Egypt during the Seventh Crusade. Baybars (r.1260-77), Qalāwūn (r.1279-90), al-Ashraf Khalil (r.1290-93), members of the Bahri regiment, posed the greatest threat to the Armenians, Crusaders and Ilkhans. Mamlūk power in Egypt and Syria would endure until the last decade of the fourteenth century until its replacement by the Circassian Mamlūks who ruled until the Ottoman conquests.

216 Ibid, 247.
Just as the Cilician Armenian kingdom forged close ties to the Ilkhans of Persia, the Mamluk Sultanate relied on the resources of Berke Khan (d.1266), leader of the khanate of the Golden Horde (Kipchak Khanate), rival of the Ilkhanate. Thus, complex multilateral diplomacy took place in the Near East as a result of the long-lasting inter-khanate feuding, which had primarily developed in the Mongol struggle over territorial control of the Transcaucasus region and over its revenues.\(^{217}\) While Berke Khan claimed legitimate rule over the valuable region ideal for Mongol fodder for horses and flocks, the Ilkhans exerted actual control over the area and refused to relinquish it to the Golden Horde.\(^{218}\) Religious animosities also intensified relations between the two Mongol leaders; Berke and some of his followers had converted to Islam from Mongol animism, whereas Hülegü, a Buddhist, had the last Abbasid caliph executed for political reasons and married a Nestorian bride who was celebrated by his Eastern Christian subjects.\(^{219}\)

For religious, political, and economic incentives, the Golden Horde and the Mamluks allied by engaging in a complex trading system, one which supplied the Sultanate its slave recruits. The slave trade was, moreover, facilitated through the assistance of Genoese merchants operating from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean.\(^{220}\) Crucial support was also lent by the Byzantines due to the empire’s control over the

\(^{217}\) Amitai-Preiss, *Mongols and Mamluks*, 78-79.
\(^{219}\) Muslim chroniclers viewed Berke’s conflict with Hülegü in a religious framework, in which the latter’s execution of the Muslim caliph at Baghdad is seen as the main cause in igniting the inter-khanate feud. Peter Jackson, “Hülegü Khan and the Christians: the Making of a Myth,” in *The Experience of Crusading: Defining the Crusader Kingdom*, vol. 2, eds. Peter W. Edbury and Jonathan Phillips. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 213.
Bosphorus Straits and their multilateral foreign policy, which aimed at allying with the Golden Horde, Ilkhanate, and Mamlûk Sultanate. 221

As the Mamlûk armies grew in force, punitive measures—ranging from raids to severe military campaigns—were directed against Cilician Armenia for its involvement in Ilkhanid campaigns. The rise of Mamlûk power in the Levant and Eastern Mediterranean created substantial intimidation as the Ilkhans were unable to offer protection to their client states. However advantageous the alliance with the Mongols initially appeared, Cilician support in the Mongol campaigns backfired as the Mamlûks pursued aggression against political threats to the security of the Sultanate.

Retributive measures were made explicit during Sultan Baybars’ (r. 1260-77) conquest of Antioch in 1268, which resulted in the Mamlûk slaughter of its population for its support of the Ilkhans and its position as a crusader state. 222 Bohemond VI’s (r.1251-75), Prince of Antioch and Count of Tripoli, pursuit of the Ilkhanid alliance because of Het‘um I’s advocacy backfired on the principality. 223 The Mamlûks launched

221 Reuven Amitai-Preiss underscores the importance of the Byzantine-controlled Bosphorus Straits in the slave trade, “as the alternative land route was now controlled by the Îlkhânids.” See Mongols and Mamluks, 91. The Byzantines, having recently reconquered Constantinople, negotiated with both the Ilkhans and Golden Horde.

222 In 1265, Bohemond attempted an unsuccessful offensive against the city of Homs, which incited Sultan Baybars to launch a retaliatory strike against Antioch in 1268. Simon Mansel, as constable of Antioch, failed to protect the city while Bohemond was away at Tripoli. Claude Cahen, “The Mongols and the Near East,” in The Later Crusades, 1189-1311, eds. Robert Lee and Harry W. Hazard, vol. 2 of A History of the Crusades, ed. Kenneth M. Setton (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969): 715-32. Various sources relay the details of the bloody massacre, including the ‘Templar of Tyre’, which notes: “when the city was taken, more than 17, 000 people who were inside it were slain, and more than 100, 000 people, both religious and lay—men, women and children—were taken captive. Gestes des Chiprois, 771-772; English translation, see ‘The Templar of Tyre: Part Three of the ‘Deeds of the Cypriots, trans. Paul Crawford (Crusade Texts in Translation; Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 59.

brutal assaults against Cilician Armenia for their support to the Ilkhans. Strikes were made in 1266, 1274-75, 1279, 1283, 1292, 1298, 1302, 1304, and 1305-6.\textsuperscript{224}

In particular, Sultan Baybars’ punitive assault of 1266 illustrates the depth of Mamlūk hostility towards Mongol allies. The attack occurred after Het‘um I’s involvement in a Mongol commander’s siege of the fortress al-Bīra along the Euphrates River in 1265, which according to Peter Holt was, “a bridgehead into Mongol-held territory, as a bastion to protect northern Syria.”\textsuperscript{225} The Mamlūk attack of 1266, in turn, resulted in the captivity of Lewon, one of Het‘um’s sons (along with Vasil Tatar, son of Constable Smbat and his Mongol bride) and the death of another son, T’oros. The attack of 1266 proved a major blow for the Armenian kingdom, one which would be lamented by contemporaries and later historians.\textsuperscript{226}

Hayton’s urgency for a crusade was thus made in relation to his intimate awareness of the successful Mamlūk military system. Sultan al-Ashraf Khalīl’s aggressive policy against the crusader states and Cilician kingdom had particularly resulted in the fall of Acre in 1291 and the sacking of Hромklа in 1292.\textsuperscript{227} Yet unlike the fate of Antioch and the remaining crusader states, Cilician Armenia somehow managed to survive, albeit in an extremely fragile political state. Its survival represents somewhat

\textsuperscript{225} P.M. Holt, The Age of the Crusades: the Near East from the 11\textsuperscript{th} century to 1517 (New York: Longman, 1986), 95. May, “The Mongol Presence and Impact,” 149. Cahen, La Syrie du Nord, 712. Al-Bīra was located along the Euphrates River. Claude Cahen has suggested that Het‘um’s quick retreat from al-Bīra may have been due to Ilkhan Hülegū’s death, which also took place in 1265; Molin, Unknown Crusader Castles, 142.
\textsuperscript{226} HNA, 356-359. The HNA provides a particularly detailed account of the Mamluk attack of 1266 and the grief it caused Het‘um. Details are also provided by Mxit‘ar Ayrivanec’i, History of the Armenians ed. M. Emin (Moscow: Lazar Institute Press, 1860), 68; Vahram Rabuni, 522. Thirteenth century chronicler Rabuni notes how Lewon ended up in the same prison as Joseph from the Old Testament; Hayton, Cronicon, 73; ‘Annals of Anonymous Sebastac’i,’ in Minor Chronicles, II, 145.
\textsuperscript{227} Irwin, The Middle East in the Middle Ages, 77; ‘Anonymous Chronicler,’ in Minor Chronicles, 1, 43; Chronicle attributed to King Het‘um II, 83.
of a peculiar case, one which contrasted with the Mamlūk treatment of the Latin Christian states.

In his analysis of Cilician Armenia’s unique fate vis-à-vis the crusader states, Angus Donal Stewart has pointed to four principal factors that may have allowed the kingdom’s longer survival: its mountainous terrain serving as a natural barrier; its status as a Mongol satellite, which meant that the Mamlūks took special consideration to plan their strikes in the wider context of the Ilkhanid-Mamlūk war; the Sultanate’s primary interest in controlling the trade and resources of the kingdom; and finally, the limited Mamlūk interest in settling in Cilician Armenia based on its remote location and in light of the growing Turcomen confederations and allies of the Mamlūks in the kingdom.228

Indeed, the Cilician Armenian kingdom proved to be a different kind of target of the Sultanate. As Stewart observes, the Sultanate did not conquer the Cilician kingdom after Crusader Tripoli and Acre fell in 1289 and 1291, allowing it to endure into the fourteenth century.229 The Sultanate did not express the same level of urgency to eradicate the kingdom, following the fate of the crusader states, whose presence in the East implied that a future crusade was possible. The crusader presence along the Levantine coastline, weak or strong, meant that their ports could potentially harbor future crusader ships. The Mamlūks thus targeted Levantine ports (while possessing the strongholds of the Military Orders in the interior) as a pre-emptive strategy for discouraging future European reinforcements. This was the case for towns like Caesarea

229 Cilician Armenia, however, experienced an attack on its patriarchal see, Hронkl, in 1292. Het’um II offered to double the tribute conditions set in the earlier treaty of Sultan Qalāwūn. Ibid, 11.
in 1265, situated on the coastal plain, which had been previously fortified by Louis IX in 1251.\(^{230}\)

While Cilician collaboration with the Latins and Mongols prompted Mamlūk assaults throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the Armenian kingdom did not represent the same level of threat as did the crusader states and Ilkhanate, especially as the regular launching of Mamlūk assaults ensured the limited power of the Armenian kingdom. Cilician Armenia was, therefore, not considered a major political rival as in the case of the two aforementioned powers.\(^{231}\)

Indeed, Cilician Armenia swallowed a bitter pill in joining the Mongols. The alliance strained its ability to act pragmatically in the long run. The kingdom was essentially caught between the rivalries of “superpowers” and paid a heavy toll for it. Quite interestingly, the \emph{Historical Compilation} of Varda\'{i} relays the vulnerability of Cilician Armenia as a vassal of the Ilkhanate, particularly noting how its subordinate status impacted its exchanges with the Sultanate. Right before the attack of 1266, Vardan notes that Baybars “demanded castles which Het\’um, the king of Armenia, had taken with the Tatars’ support. When he did not give them up, notably because of his fear of the Tatars, he (the sultan) was greatly enraged.”\(^{232}\)

A similar depiction is raised by Bar Hebraeus and by the Coptic historian, Mufaḍḍal. Bar Hebraeus notes how Het\’um’s negotiations with the Mamlūks ultimately failed because of his apprehension of Ilkhanid disapproval. As a result of this fear, the


\(^{232}\) Vardan Arewelc\’i, 162. English quote taken from Thomson’s translation, 223.
Armenian king “was unable to reply to him with words of a peaceful agreement.”

Mufaḍḍal similarly describes the Armenian hesitation in entering into negotiations with the Mamlūks without first gaining Mongol approval.

The Chronicle of Constable Smpat also relays how Hetʿum I had a “fear of the Archers,” a factor which shaped his negotiations with Baybars. This was evidenced when Hetʿum worked towards the release of his son, Lewon, who had been sent into captivity in the aftermath of the Mamlük attack on the kingdom in 1266. For his release, Baybars’ requested the surrendering of several fortresses, which had been taken during earlier Ilkhanid campaigns, and the release of one of his closest colleagues, Sunqur al-Ashqar, who was held prisoner by the Ilkhans. The royal chronicler underscores that the sultan mainly kept Lewon hostage so that the king could work towards the release of the esteemed Ilkhanid prisoner. The terms of this negotiation reveal just how deeply the Armenians became entangled in the wider Ilkhanid-Mamlük wars and were unable to pursue independent negotiations with the Egyptians, which might have been possible if they had not become Mongol vassals.

Thus, the Mamlūks clearly saw the Armenians as a middle power caught between the Ilkhanid-Mamlük wars. Peter Thorau has suggested that the kingdom’s status is why the Sultanate negotiated for the fortress of Behesni (Bahasnā in Arabic), as one of the several fortresses surrendered to Baybars. The aforementioned fortress was particularly important for facilitating communication between the Ilkhans and Armenians, a point
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233 Bar Hebraeus, Chronography, 445-46.
236 For discussion of Behesni, Stewart, The Armenian Kingdom, 46 footnote10; Amitai-Preiss, Mongols and Mamluks, 119.
which Reuven Amitai-Preiss also takes into consideration. The surrendering of the fortress would have been seen as an important strategy for breaking down Ilkhanid-Cilician communications, illustrating how the Mamlūks perceived their conflict with the Ilkhanate as the greater threat.

Hayton and his contemporaries continued to uphold the prospect of Ilkhanid protection perhaps because the kingdom had become so fully invested in serving as vassals and supporting the Mongol wars against the Mamlūks. There is a tone of confidence in several Armenian accounts that relay the kingdom’s pride in opposing the Mamlūks. This tone is perhaps suggestive of their continued (and unrealistic) belief in Mongol support. The *HNA*, for example, underscores how Hetʿum I looked at the sultan as a mere slave, revealing a false sense of security in Mongol support.

Indeed, Hayton and his contemporaries continued to rely on the prospect of Ilkhanid support based on the short-lived successes of the Mongol campaigns against the Mamlūks. Hayton was also particularly inspired by Ilkhan Ghazan’s Syrian campaigns in 1299-1300, and 1302, which aimed at reversing Mamlûk gains in the Levant. Hayton’s enthusiasm for a future crusade, supported by Mongol assistance, extended from his first-hand involvement in the Ilkhanid campaigns, as will be discussed at length throughout this study.

Despite Armenian enthusiasm, Ghazan’s campaigns achieved ephemeral success. The Mongol armies, with the help of Armenian and Georgian auxiliaries, initially seized Aleppo, celebrated a victory near Homs at the Battle of Wādī al-Khaznadār and

---

238 *HNA*, 354-55.
239 Ghazan’s first campaign fuelled the circulation of rumours in the Latin West, which spoke of the Ilkhanid liberation of the Holy Land.
Damascus in 1299 for a short while until the Mamlūks retrieved it. Subsequent Ilkhanid attempts to control Syria also failed.\textsuperscript{240} Shortly after, under the leadership of the Mongol general Qutlugh-Shāh, the Ilkhanid armies unsuccessfully allied with the Cilician king and Count Guy of Jaffa and John of Jubail, while failing to incorporate the support offered by the Cypriot kingdom and the Military Orders.\textsuperscript{241} In 1303 Ghazan oversaw an unsuccessful Syrian expedition around the Damascene plains of Marj al-Ṣuffar, which ultimately resulted in heavy Mongol and Armenian losses.\textsuperscript{242} Ghazan, plagued by ill-health, was prevented from organizing another offensive into Syria and died in 1304.

Mamlūk raids further debilitated the kingdom in 1305-06 during the time of Hayton’s sojourn in Cyprus. According to Hayton, the Egyptian Sultan did so due to this hatred of the Christian king and realm.\textsuperscript{243} The Egyptian historian, Al-Maqrīzī, on the other hand, points out that the raid was organized because the sultan had not received his tribute payment.\textsuperscript{244} Regardless of the motives behind the attack, the vulnerable political position of Cilician Armenian meant very little to the later Ilkhans, who failed to offer future assistance based on their own political instability and weakening interest in pursuing war with the Mamlūks.

As the Mamlūk Sultanate does not appear to have viewed Cilician Armenia as a major threat, the Egyptian sultans benefited from the forging of truces with the kingdom, just as they had conducted with the crusaders earlier on. The Sultanate capitalized on its

\textsuperscript{242} \textit{Gestes des Chiprois}, 849-50.
\textsuperscript{243} Hayton, \textit{La Flor}, 331 (Latin).
\textsuperscript{244} Al-Maqrīzī, \textit{Histoire}, II, 254.
own military dominance by forging truces to cater to its commercial and territorial interests (in addition to negotiating for the return of prized captives).\footnote{245}{Abu‘l-Fidā’, \textit{Annals}, 152, 157.} As Angus Donal Stewart has indicated, the Mamlūks were thus not solely driven by the concept of \textit{jihad} but also sought to secure their control over resources and mercantile interests.\footnote{246}{Robert Irwin, \textit{The Middle East in the Middle Ages}, 69. Negotiations were also made between Sultan Qalāwūn and Byzantine Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologus (r.1259-61; 1261-82) in 1281, with the goal of securing the safe massage of Mamlūk merchants and slaves.\footnote{247}{One well known example of a truce was the one made by Sultan Qalāwūn with King Lewon III in 1285 after the Armenians had assisted the Mongol leader, Mōngke Temūr, Il-khan Abaqa’s brother, in launching an unsuccessful battle against Homs in 1281. According to Mamluk historian, Ibn’ abd al-Ẓāhir, the terms of the truce included the payment of 500,000 silver \textit{drahms} by weight and Cilician consent to refrain from future attacks and the building of fortifications. The length of the truce would start from 7 June, 1285 and last for “ten years, ten months, ten days, and ten hours,” following the model used in the truces forged between the Mamlūks and the Franks. Qalāwūn’s truce was conditioned by economic incentives aimed at improving the sultanate’s trading activities. Mamlūk mercantile interests were thus protected in the truce, as merchants and their merchandise (including slaves) were promised safe passage through Armenian lands. In 1292, Het‘um offered to double the tribute conditions after the Mamlūk sack of Hṙomkla. Holt, \textit{Early Mamluk Diplomacy}, 92-105; Canard, “Le Royaume d’Arménie-Cilicie,” 244, 248; 257-58; Stewart, \textit{The Armenian Kingdom}, 56; Northrup, \textit{From Slave to Sultan}, 132-33; P.M Holt, “The Treaties of the Early Mamluk Sultans with the Frankish States,’’ \textit{BSOAS} 43 (1980):67-78; Stewart, “The Logic of Conquest,” 11.\footnote{248}{Mufaḍḍal, vol.14, 559.}}}

This was primarily because the Sultanate maintained their military strength through the regular flow of slave recruits and war materials from abroad. Cilician Armenia came to exercise an important economic function based on its prosperous position in transit trade and possession of an abundant supply of iron, slaves, timber among other resources.\footnote{247}

The Cilician kingdom, therefore, was gradually rendered an exploited, vulnerable state throughout the fourteenth century, a reality picked up by Coptic historian Mufaḍḍal who relays the fearful state in which the “prince of Sis” lived because of the Mamlūks.\footnote{248} Yvonne Friedman has also noted how the Mamlūk Sultans were generally quite skilled in “assiduously scrutinizing each document for any loopholes or irregularities on the Frankish part, they did in fact keep the truces only when it suited them and then usually
for a price.”249 While the terms of the truces were often burdensome for Frankish and Armenian parties, they allowed the safeguarding of Mamlūk mercantile interests as evidenced in their earlier treatment of Acre, where a major Muslim fundūq was located, being a place to store goods and engage in trade. 250 The Mamlūk strategy of employing truces served as a temporary respite for the Armenian kingdom, which became increasingly isolated, exposing itself to further Turcomen settlement, as will be discussed below.

2.6 Ilkhanid-Armenian Relations during the 14th century: A Turning Point

Both the Ilkhanate and Armenian kingdom gradually espoused a compliant position toward the Mamlūk Sultanate, which clearly stood out as the dominant political power in the Ilkhanid-Mamlūk wars. Waning Ilkhanid-Armenian contacts also emerged as a result of the gradual disintegration of the Ilkhanate itself and the eventual forging of Ilkhanid-Mamlūk peace. Hayton thus lived during a transitional period, especially evident during the career of Ilkhan Öljëitü (r.1304-1316), which directly corresponded to Hayton’s diplomatic efforts in Europe and attempts for an Armenian-Latin-Mongol alliance. Weakened Ilkhanid-Armenian ties would indeed become more pronounced during the career of Abu Sāʿīd Bahādor Khan (1316-1335), the final Mongol Ilkhan before the state’s fall into the hands of competing factions.

While Ilkhanid-Mamlūk peace was not formally achieved under Öljëitü, his reign represented a transitional period in which the long-standing conflict between the two superpowers diminished. Öljëitü served as the last Ilkhan to launch a campaign against the Sultanate in 1312-13. Therefore, the Ilkhan’s campaign would mark the final Mongol

250 Ibid, 102; Northrup, From Slave to Sultan, 156-57.
invasion of Syria, signaling a major shift in policy from his predecessor Ghazan’s three campaigns. Öljeytü’s last Syrian campaign proved to be a lack-luster plan, one which had his armies retreat before the arrival of the Mamlûks. Aside from the growing threat of Mongol factions within the Ilkhanate, the long standing conflict between the Ilkhan and rival khanates monopolized Ilkhanid interests.

While the Ilkhan had not given up on the prospect of gaining western support against the Mamlûks, his actual military activity proved otherwise. On one hand, Öljeytü corresponded with Pope Clement V, Philip IV of France, and Edward I of England for the prospect of alliance. At the same time, however, he also engaged in complex diplomatic tactics by communicating with the sultan towards peace.

With only one military campaign planned against Mamlûk Syria, the military alliance between the Ilkhanate and Cilician Armenia also withered. Bayarsaikhan Dashdondog even suggests that Öljeytü “did not care much about his partnership with Cilicia. It can be said that he saw no use for this alliance anymore.” The partnership may not have been advantageous because the Armenian kingdom had itself become a weak military ally that was burdened with severe internal instability. Cilician Armenia,

---

251 Northrup, 155.
252 Broadbridge, Kingship and Ideology, 96.
253 The Ilkhanate’s wars with the Golden Horde and Chaghatay Khanates drained Ilkhanid resources, particularly causing devastation in the Transcaucasus. While Öz-Beg Khan of the Golden Horde’s campaign against the Ilkhanate in 1319 proved unsuccessful, he and his successors continued to launch offensive strikes aimed at regaining the Transcaucasus from Ilkhanid control. Success would only come under the leadership of his son Jānī Beg (d. 1357), who proved victorious in Tabriz in 1356. The Chaghatayids of Central Asia equally served as a formidable threat, with the Muslim Tarmashirin (r. 1331-34) setting his eyes on Khurasan. As part of a defensive strategy, the Ilkhanate’s attempted to negotiate for an alliance with the Delhi Sultate of India against the Chaghatayids, who were shared enemies to both states. These diplomatic exchanges, however, produced little fruition. Rene Grousset, L’Empire des Steppes (4th edition, Paris: Payot, 1965), 488-91.; Peter Jackson, “Abū Saʿīd Bahādor Khan,” EI, http://www.iranchronicle.org/articles/abu-said-bahador-khan. (accessed 31 January 2014).
254 The Latin West showed very little interest in the Ilkhan’s proposal. Dashdondog, The Mongols and the Armenians, 206.
255 Ibid, 207.
however, still held onto its position as a political intermediary, carrying on diplomatic communication with the Latin West in support of a crusade and Mongol alliance. This role as an intermediary was articulated by Hayton in his mission to the papal court, as he was guided by the hope that Öljeyitü would gain Latin support and continue in the legacy of his brother Ghazan.

Despite Hayton’s optimism regarding the prospect of a Latin-Mongol-Armenian alliance, Anne F. Broadbridge concludes that the years 1295-1316 marked the “age of Ilkhanid conversion” to Islam.\textsuperscript{256} The process of conversion was a complex phenomenon among both Ilhans and Mongol nobles, having developed as a result of their contacts with their Muslim subjects in the Near East.\textsuperscript{257} Islamisation among the Mongols became intricately tied to the political aspirations of the later Ilkhans.\textsuperscript{258}

Scholarship has been divided on the subject of Islamisation among the Ilkhans, with some understanding the process as being the major factor in the deterioration of Mongol-Armenian ties. Others like Angus Donal Stewart have paid closer attention to the weakening position of the Ilkhanate during the fourteenth century based on its internal problems and what this meant for its ties to the Armenian kingdom and political rivalry with the Mamlûk Sultanate. A closer look at the evidence in various primary sources reveals that both factors seem to have contributed to the weakening ties between the Armenian vassals and Mongol overlords.

\textsuperscript{256} Ibid, 64.
\textsuperscript{257} In looking at the process of Islamization in the Ilkhanate, Judith Pfeiffer has suggested that Islamization may have occurred first in Ilkhanid Anatolia rather than in Iran. Judith Pfeiffer, “Reflections on a ‘Double Rapprochement:’ Conversion to Islam among the Mongol Elite during the Early Ilkhanate,” in Beyond the Legacy of Genghis Khan, ed. Linda Komaroff (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 375.
\textsuperscript{258} Broadbridge, Kingship and Ideology, 64-98.
The most symbolic example of the declining relations between the Ilkhanate and Cilician kingdom is evident in the assassinations of the royals, Hetʿum II and Lewon IV, in 1307 by Bularghu (also called Pilarghu, Bilargu), a Mongol commander stationed in Anatolia.259 Scholars have been divided in their interpretations of the assassinations, with some studies placing the blame on the Muslim commander’s clashes with the Christian party, while others point to the context of the fragmenting state of Ilkhanid power.260 Varying motivations are also presented in Armenian, Cypriot and Muslim sources, which range from pointing to the commander’s greed for Cilician territory to his zealous Muslim faith which clashed with the Christian Armenian entourage who came to see him.261 While the reasons behind the assassinations remain unclear, the case reveals the ebbing nature of Ilkhanid-Cilician ties during the fourteenth century, which may have been exacerbated by the growing Islamization among the Mongol elite.

Fourteenth century Armenian sources exhibit a growing sense of apprehension toward the process of Islamization, including Hayton who treats the matter in a very...

259 The varying names of the Mongol commander in Stewart, “The Assassination of King Hetʿum II,” 50, ft. 22.
261 Samuel d'Ani, “Extrait de la Chronographie,” 466; “Samouel d'Ani: Tables chronologiques” 477; The Gestes de Chiprois goes into great detail about the royal assassinations, especially regarding the futile escape of young Lewon. For details, 867; The Anonymous author of the Vita of Georges of Skevra notes that the Mongol chieftain, described as a “prince of the family of the Khan,” had come to Cilician Armenia to hunt, but ended up spontaneously killing the royal Armenian entourage “without any reason.” See Trois Biographies de Georges Skéva, trans. Father Vincent Mistrhi, Studia Orientalia Christiana, 14 (1970): 99-100; Colophons, XIV century, 66 no.73; Al-Maqrizi’s focus on religious difference has nonetheless been accepted by several scholars. According to the Egyptian historian, Hetʿum immediately notified Öljeitü of Bularghu’s objective of constructing a mosque in Sis, which in turn, caused the commander’s unauthorised actions to be reprimanded. Al-Maqrizi’s account contains additional errors, including the description of Lewon’s escape from the massacre and subsequent refuge at the Ilkhanid court to notify the Ilkhan of Bularghu’s massacre; no other sources speak of such escape. Al-Maqrizi, IV, 279. Robert W. Edwards, “The Fortifications of Cilician Armenia,” DOS 23 (1987): 65-72.
delicate manner for his western audience.  

Scribes were particularly vociferous about the development during Öljeitü’s reign, lamenting that “a symbol of opprobrium” was enforced on Christian dress and how many were compelled to proselytize (“convert to their false hope”). Others complained of religious persecutions coupled with heavy taxations under the rule of the “donkey’s servant,” signaling the two major burdens voiced by Armenian scribes in both Cilician Armenia and the Christian Caucasus. Similar complaints were expressed during the careers of the later fourteenth century puppet khans when the Caucasus region particularly suffered due to the Ilkhanid wars with the Golden Horde and the general decline of Ilkhanid power.

The end of the Ilkhanid-Mamlūk wars also proved detrimental for Cilician Armenia. Peace emerged during the career of Öljeitü’s successor, Abu Sāʿīd (r.1316-1335) who forged a treaty with Mamlūk Sultan al-Nāsir (third reign, 1309-1341) in 1322, marking the end of the Ilkhanid-Mamlūk wars. The peace forged between the Ilkhans and Mamlūks reflected the political dominance of the Sultanate and the Ilkhanid realization that it was no longer in a position to launch campaigns against its age-old enemy. In contrast, the treaty allowed the Sultanate to be the undisputed political force in the Middle East. In comparing the period right before and after the peace treaty of 1322, Linda Northrup concludes that “in contrast, the fourteenth century, as a consequence of the Mamlūk-Mongol peace treaty of 1322 and the dissolution of the Īlkhānid regime soon
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262 Boyle, “The Dynastic and Political History of the Ilkhans,” 401-02. This fear is pronounced in a colophon from 1315. See, Colophons, XIV century, 114 no.151.
263 Sanjian, Colophons, 52 no.1; Khachikyan, 46 no.61.
264 Colophons, XIV century, 92 no.125. The scribe, clearly frustrated, wrote the colophon in 1313.
265 Dashdondog, The Mongols and Armenians, 214; 218.
266 Ibid, 209.
after, brought relative peace and prosperity to the land. Mamlūk resources could now be
directed to other matters than military ends.”267

While the period after Ilkhan Abu Sāʿīd’s death largely remains outside the
parameters of this study, it should be noted that the Ilkhanate itself would soon be
extinguished due to the intense political upheaval upon the Ilkhan’s failure to produce a
male heir to continue the Hülegüid line. This imperial vacancy roused the competing
ambitions of various Mongol factions, each of which followed its own pursuit of
power.268 The growing independence of the Mongol emirs also meant that they could
more easily carry out their own plans throughout the Ilkhanid domains, creating an
environment of anarchy and “rapaciousness.”269 It would be Timūr, founder of the
Timūrid dynasty, who would eventually conquer the lands of the Ilkhanate as part of his
vast scope of conquests throughout Asia.

Cilician Armenia’s political isolation meant that Turcomen confederations
consolidated power with ease, especially in former Ilkhanid domains and after the decline
and break-up of Seljuk power in Anatolia. This was the case with the expanding power of
the Karamanid dynasty, which as previously discussed, had long represented a

268 Charles Melville, The Fall of Amir Chupan and the Decline of the Ilkhanate, 1327-1337: A Decade of
Discord in Mongol Iran (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999).
These factions included the Chobanids, named after their eponym Amir Choban, who had forged a
formidable career during Abu Sāʿīd’s reign; the joint ambitions of Abu Sāʿīd’s vizier, Ghiyāth al-Din
Muḥammad and Arpā (r.1335-36), a descendant of Āriq Böke, brother of Hülegū; The Oyrat tribe under the
leadership of Āriq ‘Alī Pādshāh; in addition to the powerful position of the Jalayerids, whose dynasty,
based out of Baghdad, was forged under Shaykh Ḥasan Jalayir, amir-e-olus (chief amir) for Abu Sāʿīd and
his short-lived successor Arpā. Other major political forces in the region included the Sarbadārs, with their
capital Sabzvar in Khurasan, in addition to Muzaffārīds and İnjūids, who warred against one another over
31 January 2013).
formidable threat to Cilician Armenia throughout the thirteenth century, in addition to its
staunch opposition to the Mongols. However, the Karamanids were not the only
political force in the region. Other Turkic groups equally took advantage of the power
vacuum in the former lands of the Ilkhanate.

More specifically, the Ramazans gained power in Cilicia having established their
base in Adana. This Turkic confederation, also known as the Ramadan Oghullari,
eventually ruled Cilicia from 1378-1608. Having served as Mamlūk allies in the
campaigns against Cilician Armenia, the Ramazan dynasty eventually took over the cities
of Cilician Armenia including Ayas, the major port city of the kingdom, and Sis, which
had served as the capital and home of the Armenian catholicos after the fall of
Hρomkla.

The Mamlūks relied upon these Turcomen confederations to guard the Anatolian
frontier, which they themselves did not settle after the devastation caused by Black
Death. These Turkic groups simultaneously served as allies and potential threats due to
their ongoing alliances with “mamlūk would-be rulers.” While the Armenian kingdom
was defeated under the Mamlūk banner, its former lands became the core of the Ramazan
principality until the later Ottoman conquests.

Elsewhere in former Ilkhanate domains, the Dulkadırīds rose in Marash and
Elbistan (known to the Byzantines as Ablastha). The Aq-Qoyunlu consolidated power in

270 Holt, The Age of Crusades, 176.
271 Shai Har-El, The Struggle for Domination in the Middle East: the Ottoman-Mamluk War, 1485-91
272 Bosworth, The New Islamic Dynasties, 237.
274 Har-El, Struggle for Domination in the Middle East, 34-35.
western Iran and eastern Anatolia, while the confederation of the Qara-Qoyunlu, former vassals of the Mongol Jalayarid dynasty, eventually took over Baghdad.  

While the Turcoman penetration into Asia Minor was not a new development, it was one that gained momentum in the fourteenth century, as a result of the disintegration of the Ilkhanate and its exposed frontiers.

Dissolving Ilkhanid-Armenian ties, the loss of the crusader presence in the Levant, increased Turcomen invasions, and the dominance of the Mamlûk Sultanate, were thus all important factors in isolating Cilician Armenia during the fourteenth century. The kingdom’s vulnerable political position, which resulted in its complete exposure to Mamlûk and Turcomen penetrations, encouraged its urgent diplomatic overtures to the Latin West and the desperate hope for a future crusade. This was precisely the nature of Hayton’s diplomacy for a Latin-Mongol-Armenian alliance. A careful reading of his activities will later show his awareness and fears of the fading dream of Ilkhanid assistance and of the difficulties in procuring western aid on a large scale. It was this dimming reality of Ilkhanid protection and the realization of Mamlûk military dominance that encouraged Hayton’s cautious rendering of the past in La Flor des estoires.

2.7 Cypriot Connections

While Ilkhanid-Armenian ties were dissolving during the fourteenth century, Cypriot-Cilician links strengthened due to their positions as the defending Christian polities of the Eastern Mediterranean in the aftermath of the loss of the crusader states in
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the late thirteenth century. While Cypriot-Cilician interests became intertwined based on their shared military vision in fighting the Mamlûks and the high level of intermarriages among the nobility, they also fluctuated based on changing political currents in the Eastern Mediterranean. Hayton’s worldview can nonetheless be described as being Cypriot-Cilician, as his interests were tied to the political, religious, and social affairs of both kingdoms.

Hayton’s Cypriot-Cilician worldview can be understood as an extension of the process of Latinisation among the nobility, which meant that the Armenians expressed an openness to receiving Frankish customs. The impact of Latinisation upon the rest of the Cilician population is difficult to gauge as a result of a lack of evidence. According to Robert Thomson, Latinisation played out in “Armenian social life, religious practice, legal codes, linguistic idiom, and artistic achievement.” The process of Latinisation among the nobility reflects the distinctive geopolitical position of the Armenian kingdom as it became attached to the interests of the crusaders while simultaneously maintaining ties to the Ilkhanate and Armenians of the Caucasus. Thus Latinisation was not the only social process at work within the kingdom, but one which developed alongside the kingdom’s exchanges with the Mongols and Armenians of the Caucasus.

---


Latin rule of Cyprus had developed from the Third Crusade when Richard I of England conquered Cyprus from Greek control, having overthrown Isaac Ducas Comnenos (r.1184-91), who ruled in rebellion against Byzantine Emperor Isaac Angelus (r. 1185-95; 1203-04).\(^{282}\) Isaac Ducas had expressed hostility towards the crusaders, particularly enraging Richard I by his seizure of the king’s sister, Queen Joan of Sicily, and his betrothed, Berengaria, daughter of the King of Navarre, who arrived on the island in the course of a shipwreck. The island was then briefly sold to the Templars and then to Guy of Lusignan (r.1186-92) in 1192, who had been in exile after Saladin’s conquest over Jerusalem in 1187.

The fates of Cyprus and Cilician Armenia became intertwined when Cyprus was recognized as a kingdom in 1196, just two years prior to Lewon I’s own artful negotiations in 1198. Lewon I’s marriage to Sybilla, daughter of Aimery of Cyprus and Isabella of Jerusalem, represented the shared interests of the two kingdoms in strengthening diplomatic relations. The Lusignan dynasty in Cyprus would indeed take a leading role in the affairs of the Eastern Mediterranean upon inheriting the crown of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem as a result of Hugh III of Cyprus’ (r.1267-84) claim.\(^{283}\)

As intermarriages had taken place among the Armenians and crusaders over several generations, a tightly-knit ruling class developed in Cyprus and Cilician Armenia. The number of unions continued to increase during the course of the thirteenth and


fourteenth centuries. This tightly-knit class inevitably shared the goal of defending the Eastern Mediterranean.284

Hayton’s advocacy of Amaury’s rule in Cyprus and his sojourn on the island would be inexplicable without looking at the context of the shared political, social, and cultural affairs of the two kingdoms, which transcended their borders based on the high level of interactions. Marital unions were by no means limited to the royalty but also extended to the nobility as in the case of the Ibelin family, who dominated the position of seneschal in Cyprus and married into the Cilician Armenian circle.285 Close relations also meant that relationship between the two kingdoms became periodically strained due to conflicting interests, as will be discussed in the following chapter.

Nicholas Coureas has noted that the rate of intermarriages increased from the thirteenth century onwards, due to the worsening political situation in the Latin East and the limited number of available spouses.286 With the fall of Antioch, Tripoli and Acre, Cyprus and Cilician Armenia represented the two last Christian kingdoms in the Eastern Mediterranean amidst the growing dominance of the Mamlūk Sultanate. More importantly, Hayton’s interests in Cyprus and Cilician Armenia suggest that the ruling class saw themselves as part of a type of Christian coalition, with both parties having a mutual agenda in securing themselves against the threat of Mamlūk aggression. According to Coureas, the papacy equally perceived intermarriages as a means to strengthen the Christian front of the Eastern Mediterranean, especially in the context of

284 For example, Queen Melisende of Jerusalem (1105-1161) was the daughter of Baldwin II, King of Jerusalem from 1118-1131 and his Armenian wife, Morphia, daughter of the ruler of Melitene.
286 Ibid, 36-37. In turn, the papacy supported these intermarriages through its allocation of dispensations, given to those unions which fell within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity.
the worsening political situation in Cilician Armenia and the ongoing Mamlûk threat to the Cypriot kingdom. 287

Military co-operation was a natural extension of the close dynastic links and desire for security in the Eastern Mediterranean. Cyprus was particularly important in the defense of the Eastern Mediterranean as it became the headquarters of the Military Orders after the loss of Frankish Syria. The Cypriot kingdom also showed a willingness to cooperate with the Ilkhans, despite having no formal ties as tributaries of the Mongol Ilkhans like Cilician Armenia. This was the case when King Henry II’s brother, Amaury of Lusignan, along with the Templars and Hospitallers, went on a campaign to the Syrian port city of Tortosa (and then to the Isle of Ruad) in response to Ilkhan Ghazan’s second Syrian campaign in 1301. 288 While Cypriot and Mongol troops remained uncoordinated and delays came to stall Mongol plans, the participation of Cyprus reflected its common ground with Cilician Armenian interests. 289

Additionally, Cypriot military assistance continued to be offered to the Armenians during the fourteenth century despite periods of strained Cypriot-Armenian relations, especially after King Henry II’s imprisonment in Cilician Armenia following the coup d’état of 1306. 290 Cypriot efforts were supported by Pope John XXII (r.1316-1344), who
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287 Ibid, 38. The dispensation given to Ōšin, Hayton’s son’s marriage to Margaret, daughter of Balian of Ibelin and Armenian royal Alice of Lambron, was illustrative of the close relations between the leading families of both kingdoms.
288 For the earlier aid planned by Henry II and John of Ibelin, Count of Jaffa, see Edbury, The Kingdom of Cyprus and the Crusades, 104-05.
289 At the end, the Mamlûks captured the Templars at the island of Ruad. The Mongol raids, under the direction of commander Qutlugh-Shah, were short-lived and accomplished very little.
290 Papal documents address the tense nature of Cypriot-Cilician relations in the aftermath of Henry II’s release. Jean XXII, Lettres communes, tome III, 189, no.12389; tome IV, 342, no.18098-18101. Edbury, The Kingdom of Cyprus, 135-36; Marie-Anna Chevalier, “Le Rôle de la papauté dans la politique arménienne,” 233-34; Sir George Hill, History of Cyprus, vol.2, 276-78. Ōšin’s unwillingness to release Henry after Amaury’s assassination in 1310 reveals the complex ways in which Cilician Armenia was brought into the Cypriot political crisis. Other powers were also involved including the diplomatic
urged the defense of both kingdoms and encouraged the Lusignan dynasty to assist Cilician Armenia amid its growing destabilization. The Cypriot rulers showed concern for the welfare of the Armenian kingdom as illustrated by Henry II’s organization of aid in the aftermath of the Mamlūk attack on the Cilician port city of Ayas in 1322, as described in the *Chronique d’Amadi*.

Cypriot concern for the protection of Cilician Armenia should not be understood solely as a product of the closely knit ruling class. Linda Northrup has underscored the importance of Cypriot economic interests in influencing their defense of Asia Minor in the context of the Mamlūk Sultanate’s growing dominance over the strategic region noted for its outlets by the sea and abundant resources. Quite interestingly, both the Mamlūks and Cypriots looked to Cilician Armenia to protect their economic interests. This was mainly because the kingdom’s main port city, Ayas, played a role in long-distance trade between East-West trade and in short-distance trade between the two kingdoms. As Italian merchants played an active role in the flourishing trading network between Famagusta and Ayas, the loss of coastal Asia Minor to the Mamlūks would have been detrimental for Cypriot commercial interests.
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While the late fourteenth century remains outside the parameters of this study, it should be briefly noted that the Cypriot rulers continued in their plans to reverse Turkish aggression into Asia Minor and thus maintained an interest in defending Cilicia. The Cilician kingdom had officially fallen to the Lusignan dynasty after the throne went to Guy de Lusignan (r.1342-44), third son of Amaury de Lusignan and his Armenian wife, Isabella. Peter I (r. 1358-69) oversaw campaigns into Korykos (the former lordship belonging to Hayton) and Antalya (Adalia), both of which were strategic ports. Later Cypriot interest in crusading was thus undoubtedly tied to the economic interests of the kingdom, rather than solely being based on a religious conflict between the Christian Lusignans and Muslim Turks.

Despite Lusignan attempts at assisting Cilician Armenia and impeding Turkish gains, the Cypriot kingdom was unable to reverse the Muslim advances into Asia Minor. This was partly because Cyprus was increasingly pre-occupied with the Genoese during the second half of the fourteenth century. Genoa, a fourteenth century mercantile power, came to resent Cypriot-Venetian relations and Lusignan plans to restrict Genoese trading activities in the Eastern Mediterranean. As a result, the Genoese-Cypriot wars in 1373-74 ended in the Lusignan loss of the important harbor, Famagusta. With little opposition, the Mamlûks successfully took Lewon V (r.1374-75) captive in 1375.
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296 Guy de Lusignan became known as Constantine IV upon taking the throne in Cilician Armenia.
297 Edbury, The Kingdom of Cyprus,163. For Genoese interests in later period, Kate Fleet, European and Islamic Trade in the Early Ottoman State. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
299 Genoese-Cypriot relations had been tense for a long time and worsened upon the kingdom’s favour towards the Venetians, principal rivals of the Genoese. Edbury, The Kingdom of Cyprus, 163.
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Despite the loss of Cilician Armenia to the Mamluks, Armenian refugees flooded into Cyprus, just as the earlier crusaders had done having been driven out of the Levant. This period would represent a new stage of relations between the Cypriots and Armenians as the proximity of the island allowed many to escape the debilitating conditions of the mainland. Fourteenth century Augustinian monk and pilgrim, James de Verona, sums up the large influx of Armenian refugees into Cyprus:

“…several large vessels and galleys and gripparia came from Armenia, from the city of Logaze, crowded with old men, children, women, orphans and wards more than fifteen hundred in number, who were flying from Armenia because the Soldan had sent hosts, many and mighty, to destroy it, and they burnt all that plain and carried off captive more than twelve thousand persons, over and above those whom they had slain with the sword…”301

2.8 The Hospitaller Presence

In addition to the Cypriot kingdom, Cilician Armenia depended upon its ties to the Military Orders. A look at the presence of the Hospitallers is necessary to understand the context of the crusade plans of Clement V and the ways in which Hayton’s recovery treatise was in dialogue with the reports submitted by the Order. While Hayton was an experienced military tactician, the Hospitallers served as the principal defenders of the Eastern Mediterranean during the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, gradually replacing Templar and Teutonic assistance. Papal-Armenian exchanges for a crusade came to depend upon Hospitaller support. Western rulers were gradually pre-occupied with domestic affairs, thereby making the Order highly relevant for the defense of the East. While all three Orders, founded during the twelfth century, were located in Cyprus following the fall of Acre in 1291, the Hospitallers were able to sustain their presence in

the Eastern Mediterranean upon their conquest of Rhodes and played a significant role in the naval leagues against Turkish ascendance. Cilician-Hospitaller contacts also continued throughout the fourteenth century.

Before discussing the Hospitaller presence in the East, it is worthwhile to highlight why the two other orders, the Templars and Teutonic Order, lost their positions in Cilician Armenia. Templar-Armenian relations had long been tumultuous as the order had occupied key castles located along the Antiochene-Cilician frontier, directly challenging the ambitions of the Cilician rulers to expand into Antioch. Such was the case with the Templar hold of Baghras (also known as Gaston); the fortress was significant as it defended the strategic Belen Pass, also known as the Amanus Pass or Syrian Gates, which allowed access from Cilician Armenia to Syria. The strategic importance of the Amanus frontier thus embittered relations between the two parties, especially as the Order exercised a great degree of autonomy in the region.

Mamlūk incursions eventually reduced the Templar presence in the Amanus frontier when Baghras fell to Baybars upon his conquest of Antioch in 1268. According to Kristian Molin’s study of the crusader castles, the Templars were unable to halt
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Mamlûk aggression, and as such, relinquished their remaining fortresses.  

Cilician Armenian ties to the Hospitallers became even more significant in the aftermath of the dissolution of the Templar Order in 1307, which was staged by Philip IV (r.1285-1314) of France and supported by the papacy.  

The Teutonic Order also experienced a similar fate in Cilician Armenia in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. Earlier on, the order had developed a solid presence in the Eastern Mediterranean and specifically in Cilician Armenia following Lewon’s coronation in 1198, which had gained the support of the Holy Roman Emperor. In return for imperial backing of the coronation, the Armenian king became a German vassal. Cilician Armenian rulers continued to cooperate with the Teutonic knights well into the thirteenth century, illustrated by Het’um I’s involvement as a Teutonic confrater (“fellow” or “brother”) in the Armenian kingdom. Despite the Teutonic-Armenian alliance, the military ascendancy of the Mamlûk Sultanate proved detrimental to the Order’s survival in the Levant.  

The fall of Acre also impacted the Teutonic presence in Cilician Armenia, as some knights gradually turned their attention to Cyprus and eventually to northeastern Europe. Despite some level of continued interest in the Eastern Mediterranean, the Teutonic Grand Master first transferred to Venice and then to Malbork (Marienburg) in
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310 Molin, *Unknown Crusader Castles*, 187; Houben, “Teutonic Knights in Palestine, Armenia and Cyprus,” 144. The important Teutonic castle of Montfort, situated north of Acre, was lost to the Mamlûks by 1271.
Prussia in 1309. This move would also mark their increased gravitation towards European affairs, and therefore, their pulling away from the defense of the Eastern Mediterranean.

It was in this context that the Hospitaller role became particularly important for Cilician Armenia and for the crusading plans of the papacy, which continued to uphold the defense of the Eastern Mediterranean as a priority. During Hayton’s diplomatic negotiations with Clement V, the papacy relied upon the Hospitallers, who had long served as papal representatives in mediating Cypriot-Cilician relations in periods of conflict. No other European power was capable of taking part in his envisioned crusade, which had originally been allotted to Philip IV of France and Charles II (“the Lame”) (d. 1309) of Angevin Naples. The papal exchanges with these rulers never materialized despite their initial promises to support the enterprise. Similar overtures to Edward I of England (r.1272-1307), Albert I of Germany (r.1298-1308), and James II of Aragon (1267-1327) had equally proven futile due to the pressing nature of their own political issues, including the Aragonese Crusade against Granada. Additionally,

314 Hospitaller diplomatic involvement would be particularly significant during King Henry II’s imprisonment in the Cilician kingdom, which took place upon his brother Amaury de Lusignan’s uprising. Henry II’s captivity in Cilicia marked a significant turn of events in Cypriot-Armenian relations during the early fourteenth century, which will be addressed in detail shortly after. John XXII relied upon the Hospitallers as his mediators in the affairs of the Latin East, in addition to other papal representatives including the patriarch of Jerusalem. Maurice de Pagnac is addressed in a letter written in 1319, which notes the truce reached between Henry II and Ošin. *Lettres communes*, II, 428, no. 9953; Chevalier, “Le Rôle de la Papauté dans la politique arménienne,” 234; Anthony Luttrell, *The Hospitallers of Rhodes and their Mediterranean World*, Variorum Collected Series CS360 (London: Ashgate Variorum, 1992), 163; Hill, *A History of Cyprus*, II, 281.
European rulers were showing increasing skepticism toward Hospitaller aspirations, perceiving the crusade as an excuse for the Order’s territorial ambitions in the East.  

Despite hesitations from the lay rulers, the papacy continued relying on the Hospitallers for the defense of Cilician Armenia throughout the fourteenth century. No other political force was capable of devoting the time or resources for the cause. This was evident in the aftermath of the Mamlûk attack on Ayas in 1321, which fuelled the crusading enthusiasm of Charles IV (r. 1322-8), son of Philip IV, who proposed a preliminary expedition, part of a three-staged plan to aid the Armenian kingdom. His crusade plans ultimately failed to be realized due to difficulties in procuring adequate funding, coupled with Charles IV’s tension with Edward II of England (r.1307-27) (who held the title of Duke of Aquitaine). A smaller Hospitaller force, under the organization of Fr Maurice of Pagnac, seems to have been all that was available to defend the kingdom in 1324.  

While the Hospitallers maintained an interest in defending the Armenian kingdom and held a preceptor there during the first half of the fourteenth century, they gradually shifted their attention to the Aegean front. The Hospitallers took part in naval leagues, which represented new phase of military action, organized in response to the burgeoning

---


318 Ibid, 128.

320 According to Jonathan Riley-Smith, the leagues represented “…alliances of those front-line powers which felt themselves most threatened or whose rulers were most enthusiastic…”

321 The Turkish military ascendance in the Aegean thus captivated the attention of the Hospitallers and European rulers, rather than the Mamlūks in the Middle East. Most notably, the Emirate of Aydın succeeded in taking Smyrna, located along the Aegean Coast of Anatolia, from the Genoese in 1329, while the Emirate of Menteshe equally oversaw substantial raiding activity in the region. By the mid fourteenth century, the Ottomans emerged as a substantial threat to the Byzantines, having first captured Bursa in 1326, located in northwestern Anatolia. Despite consistent efforts of the papacy to send help to the Armenians, little assistance was actually sent because of the aforementioned Turkish threats. As such, Anthony Luttrell concludes that “nothing was done to prevent Leon VI, the last king of Armenia, being captured by the Mamlūks at Sis in April 1375.”

2.9 Relations with Byzantium

While Cilician Armenian diplomatic negotiations with the Latin West served as the dominant focus of the kingdom’s foreign policy throughout the fourteenth century, Byzantine-Cilician exchange also took place in light of the changing political currents in


the East.\textsuperscript{325} A tumultuous history marked the relationship between the two parties, going back to the Council of Chalcedon in 451 and fluctuated based on the expansionist plans of both powers. There also continued a lingering Byzantine assumption that Cilician Armenia was rightfully the Empire’s territory. Nonetheless, like Cilician Armenia, Byzantine strategy focused on cultivating diplomatic relations with neighboring political powers to their advantage.

Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologus (r.1259-82) engaged in complex negotiations with Mamlūk Sultans Baybars and Qalawun, seeking to secure the slave trade which relied upon recruits from the Black Sea.\textsuperscript{326} Alongside negotiations with the Mamlūks, marriage alliances reflected the broader Byzantine strategy in engaging in multi-lateral diplomacy. Michael VIII arranged the marriages of his daughters to the leaders of the Ilkhanate and Golden Horde (Maria married Ilkhan Abaqa, while Euphrosyne married Nogai of the Golden Horde). Andronikos II (r.1272-1328) maintained contacts with Ilkhan Ghazan similarly aimed at securing aid against the Turkish threat, but produced little result.\textsuperscript{327} These multilateral negotiations with regional political powers took place in the context of Angevin ambitions to retake Constantinople, an enterprise which was backed by the papacy.\textsuperscript{328} The marriage of Cilician royal Rita-Maria (who adopted the Byzantine name Xene upon her marriage) to co-emperor Michael IX Palaeologus (r.1294-1320) in 1296 equally highlights the complex nature of the multilateral

\textsuperscript{325} While the aggressive expansions of the Komnenos dynasty, under the leadership of Emperor John II Komnenos (r.1118-43) and Manuel I Komnenos (r. 1143-1180), had left bitter memories for the Armenians, the kingdom maintained diplomatic and ecumenical relations through the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries when Byzantium experienced political fragmentation. A.A Vasiliev, History of the Byzantine Empire, vol.2, (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1952), 447.

\textsuperscript{326} Northrup, “The Bahri Mamluk Sultanate, 1250-1390,” 278-79.

\textsuperscript{327} Boyle, “The Dynastic and Political History of the Ilkhans,” 392.

\textsuperscript{328} Jonathan Harris, Byzantium and the Crusades (London: Hambledon and London Books, 2003), 178.
negotiations.329 This was a period in which Michael IX’s father, Andronikos II refused to accept papal supremacy due to the high anti-Union climate in Byzantium at the time.330 While this strengthened the alliance between the two Christian states, it was clear that the Byzantines first attempted to negotiate with other Latin rulers based on the context of the Angevin threat upon the reconquest of Constantinople.331

In addition, Sandra Origone highlights that the Byzantine-Cilician Armenian diplomacy stood in line with Byzantium’s growing connections to the Genoese merchants who rose as a dominant power abroad in the Mediterranean and Black Sea in places including Pera (now known as Galata), Caffa, Cyprus, and the port city of Ayas in Cilician Armenia.332 The Italian republic played a complex role in shaping Byzantium’s diplomatic exchanges and functioned as brokers for the marriages between the Greeks and Latins.333

The close allies to Byzantium were heavily involved in trading in Cilician Armenia, in direct competition with the Venetians. The Armenian kingdom had been considered especially important to the Italian mercantile republics after the fall of Acre of 1291.334 Right before the union, in 1294, the Genoese admiral Nicolò Spignola had

---


331 The subsequent marriage of Andronikos III (r.1328-1341) to Irene of Brunswick and later to Anne of Savoy points to Byzantium’s complex negotiations; attention was also placed on the Balkans and Turks.


334 Coureas, “Genoese Merchants and the Export of Grain from Cyprus to Cilician Armenia, 1300-1310,” 1.
defeated the Venetians in Ayas.\textsuperscript{335} The royal marriage seems to have gained the support of the Genoese after they became embittered by the Cypriots during Henry II’s reign.\textsuperscript{336}

While Het’um II’s journey to Constantinople in 1295 reflects the importance of maintaining Byzantine-Armenian relations, both powers seem to have prioritized their exchanges with other powers based on the weakened state of both parties during the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Donald M. Nicol has aptly referred to Byzantium as a “second-rate power” during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. Cilician Armenia fared no better, being continuously exposed to raids and being gradually abandoned by the Ilkhans. Moreover, the Armenian kingdom would have hardly benefited from the Byzantine navy that had been dismantled based on a lack of resources available. While Cilician Armenia faced political instability due to its internal fratricidal struggles, Byzantium was exposed to two civil wars during the first half of the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{337}

The vulnerable position of the Byzantines meant that the Empire was no match for the Turks who had begun building their own ships during the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{338} Indeed, most of Asia Minor would fall to the Turks by the end of Andronikos II’s career.\textsuperscript{339} The Byzantine reliance on mercenaries also meant that the foreign fighters tended to prioritize their own interests first as in the case of Roger de Flor’s Catalan Company. Byzantium was thus facing tremendous obstacles during the period in which Cilician Armenia sought aid for its own problems.


\textsuperscript{336} Edbury, \textit{The Kingdom of Cyprus}, 110-111.

\textsuperscript{337} The two civil wars took place from 1321-28 and 1341-54.

\textsuperscript{338} Nicol, \textit{The Last Centuries of Byzantium}, 107-08.

\textsuperscript{339} Harris, \textit{Byzantium and the Crusades}, 183.
Moreover, the Greeks preferred to engage in complex multilateral exchanges with the “superpowers,” the Mamlûks and Mongols of the Ilkhanate and Golden Horde, largely to secure their economic dominance over trade and fight the threat of the Turks. Cilician Armenia was not in a position to negotiate with the Mamlûks in the same manner as a result of its close involvement with the Ilkhanate, principal enemy of the Sultanate. These limitations exacerbated the isolation of the Armenian kingdom. The declining state of the Ilkhanate and growing Islamization among the Mongols also meant that the main source of hope for the Armenians would rest in the hands of the Latins. This reality formed the basis for Hayton’s La Flor des estoires.

2.10 Conclusion

Hayton’s world was thus shaped by complex forces based on its position as a crossroad in Eurasian politics. While scholars largely focus on the kingdom’s interactions with the crusaders and emphasize the result of Latinisation, Cilician Armenia also developed a distinctive relationship to the Ilkhanate, Mamlûk Sultanate, and maintained links to the Armenians outside its borders. Different forces were at work in the kingdom based on a combination of factors. The kingdom’s increasing reliance on gaining western aid and aligning itself to Rome did not imply that it had stopped looking to the Ilkhans as allies. Rather, the Cilician kingdom pursued cooperation with both powers, as evidenced in Hayton’s career. Moreover, Cilician Armenian requests for western aid

---

340 Andronikos II corresponded with the Ilkhan Ghazan and Öljeitü for men. Nicol, The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 140.
341 Sergio La Porta, “The Armenian Episcopacy in Mamluk Jerusalem in the Aftermath of the Council of Sis (1307),” JRAS 17 (2007): 99-115. La Porta has underscored how the acts of the Council of Sis did not signify a departure from Ghazan’s and Öljeitü’s diplomacy with the Latins. In 1308, Pope Clement V encouraged the latter Ilkhan’s war efforts, which indicates that both the Ilkhans and the Armenians rulers pursued similar diplomatic objectives in working with the West.

Just as the Armenians propagated their identity as Latin Christians, the Mongols encouraged their pro-Christian position and willingness to recover the Holy Land. This was evident in the Ilkhanid diplomatic missions sent to the Latins, including that of Ilkhan Arghun (r.1284-91), under the Nestorian monk, Rabban Bar Sawma, who projected the pro-Christian image of the Ilkhan at the courts of Pope Honorius IV (r.1285-87) and European rulers. During the beginning of the fourteenth century, Ilkhans Ghazan and Öljeitü also continued this policy despite their brief conversions to Islam.\footnote{John Andrew Boyle, “The Il-Khans of Persia and the Princes of Europe,” \textit{CAJ} 20 (1976): 36-39.}

The papacy responded by stressing that baptism was the central requirement for the Ilkhans to be considered potential allies, signifying their conversion to Christianity.\footnote{Adam Knobler, “Pseudo-Conversions and Patchwork Pedigrees: the Christianization of Muslim Princes and the Diplomacy of Holy War.” \textit{JWH} 7 (1996):181-197.}

Hayton’s advocacy of the Ilkhans as pro-Christian allies is thus firmly situated within this stage of diplomatic history where Christian ambassadors, eastern Christian or expatriate Latins, strove to promote Ilkhanid interests to the west. As a result of these exchanges, missionary activity flourished in the East in places like Sultanieh and Tabriz.\footnote{De Rachewiltz, \textit{Papal Envoys to the Khans}, 176-77.}

Cilician Armenian diplomacy thus stood in line with Ilkhanid political interests and Latin-Mongol diplomatic dialogue. Nonetheless self-preservation seems to have been the underlying motive behind the Armenian’s leadership’s bold pro-Latin policy. When the Ilkhanate itself disintegrated in the 1330s, the papacy maintained an interest in defending and promoting missions in the East. It became increasingly clear to the
Armenians that military assistance would only come from the Latin West, and mainly from the Hospitallers. ³⁴⁶ The early fourteenth century indeed represented a transitional political moment in which the alliance with the Mongols evolved and Armenian-Latin negotiations intensified. Hayton’s career was firmly situated in this context, as will be demonstrated in the following chapter.

³⁴⁶ For this view, Bundy, “The Trajectory of Roman Catholic Influence” 85. He underscores that the Islamization of the Mongols played an important factor in changing relations.
Chapter 3

A Biographical Portrait

An examination of Hayton’s biography reveals a multifaceted career of a Cilician Armenian royal prince of the Hetʿumid dynasty. Known as the “Lord of Korykos,” Hayton was also a military tactician, crusade theorist, diplomat, patron of various Armenian commissions, historian and translator, convert to Catholicism with links to the Cypriot Premonstratensians, and a key actor in Cypriot-Cilician politics. The breadth of his career can be understood in the context of the high level of inter-cultural contacts forged among the Latins, Mongols, and Armenians in the Near East. A closer look at his biography and literary accomplishments aims to illuminate the ways in which Hayton bridged East-West relations by serving as an elite intermediary who crossed cultural, religious and political boundaries.

As a result of his vast range of activities, Hayton has been treated as somewhat of an enigmatic figure in past scholarship, having been mistaken as both a Cilician Armenian king and as the author of an apocalyptic text, among an array of erroneous attributions.347 While Hayton is perhaps best known for his composition of the widely circulated, La Flor des estoires, his far-reaching interests were deeply connected to early fourteenth century socio-cultural and political developments of the Eastern Mediterranean world. A biographical overview reveals the centrality of this region as a zone of high inter-cultural exchange.

---

347 A nineteenth century geographical work designates Hayton as a king, likely mistaking him for his kinsmen Hetʿum I or Hetʿum II. Conrad Malte-Brun, Précis de la géographie universelle ou descriptions de toutes les parties du monde sur un plan nouveau d’après les grandes divisions naturelles, vol. V (Paris: A. André, 1833); Hayton is also described as the author of apocalyptic commentary in André Léon Goovaerts, Écrivains, artistes, et savants de l’ordre de Prémontré: Dictionnaire (Brussels: Société belge de librarie, 1899), 360.
This chapter will examine multiple aspects of Hayton’s activities and roles, highlighting the complex ways in which he was able to extend influence across different cultural and political groupings as a result of his royal background and the Armenian kingdom’s interactions with various political powers. The latter portion of the chapter will focus on the layers of Hayton’s complex religious identity—as a Premonstratensian convert, his chronicle as a work of religious translation, and his engagement in the religious debate between pro-Union advocates and Orthodox defenders. This biographical study will ultimately underscore that Hayton’s career followed the path of several of his Armenian noble peers based on the unique geo-political positioning of Cilician Armenia as a medieval crossroads in the Eastern Mediterranean.

3.1 Hayton, Hetʿumid Prince: Immersion in Politics, War and Diplomacy

Hayton’s social membership in the royal family of Cilician Armenia undoubtedly played a critical role in shaping the breadth of his activities and political career. Born into the Hetʿumid dynasty around 1240, Hayton was one of the three sons of Ōshin, lord of Korykos, son of Kostantin of the strongholds, Baberon (Babaron) and Lambron (Namrun), who was a nephew of King Lewon I and his second wife, Alice of Lambron, and who served as constable and regent of the kingdom.348 The Hetʿumid dynasty rose as one of the most influential political powers in the Eastern Mediterranean world, through its forging of close relations with the Latins, Mongols, and Eastern Christians of the Transcaucasus.

---
The Hethumids were not new to the political scene in the late thirteenth century, but had previously served as loyal vassals to the Byzantine Empire. The noble family gradually rose in prominence when Kostantin succeeded in elevating his son Hethum as the Cilician Armenian king while taking the title of ‘Grand Baron’ and exercising a considerable level of political influence behind the official reign of his son. Through a game of shrewd politics, Kostantin skillfully arranged the marriage of Hethum to Zabel, daughter of Lewon I, thereby uniting the two most prominent noble families, the Hethumids and Rubenids, in Cilician Armenia. This union was the second marriage for Zabel, who was widowed after the murder of her husband Philip of Antioch in 1225/26.349

As a result of the marriage alliance between Hethum and Zabel, members of the Hethumian dynasty quickly succeeded in securing prominent political careers, largely as a result of Kostantin’s shrewd political tactics and his efforts to eliminate all threats to his family’s consolidation of power. Most notably, Hayton’s father, Ōšin, and his paternal uncle, Constable Smbat, became immersed in the diplomatic and political life of the Armenian kingdom during the thirteenth century.350 Hayton was part of the following generation of this new powerful dynasty, which had to deal with the major political fluctuations in the Eastern Mediterranean including the Mongol presence, fall of the crusader states and dominance of the Mamlûk Sultanate.

350 Their other children were: Basil, who served as Archbishop of Sis, Lewon, and three daughters, Kalamaria, Stephanie, and Hripsimē. Two of his daughters forged important marriage alliances. Kalamaria married John of Ibelin and Stephanie to Henry I of Cyprus.
Kostantin’s political maneuverings resulted in the Hetʿumid dynasty’s receiving valuable territorial rewards. Hayton eventually inherited the title of Lord of Korykos, which was also known in the variations of Gorigos, Ghorigos, Corycos, Curci, and Curchi.351 Located at the mouth of the Göksu River, Korykos was formerly known as Calycadnus in Cilician Trachaea. It was annexed to the Hetʿumid dynasty in the thirteenth century through military conquest after having previously functioned as an important coastal city under Roman, Byzantine, and Crusader Antiochene rule. The Hetʿumid possession of the lordship only took place during the thirteenth century, when Kostantin succeeded in conquering it from a supporter of Raymond-Rouben, Prince of Antioch. 352

Raymond-Rouben rose as one of the main political rivals of the Hetʿumian dynasty based on his claims to the kingdom after the death of his maternal uncle, Lewon I in 1219.353 In supporting the claim of Lewon’s daughter, Zabel, Kostantin aggressively opposed and defeated Raymond-Rouben’s ambitions in Cilician Armenia. A rather idealized treatment of Kostantin’s success is relayed in the Chronicle of Constable Smbat, where praise is lavished on his grandfather’s skills as a military tactician and his

351 Ōšin held the lordship of Korykos until his death (c.1265), upon which it passed to his sons. The jurist John of Ibelin, Count of Jaffa and Ascalon, and husband to Kostandin’s daughter Maria verified the validity of Ōšin’s lordship over Korykos after Constable Smbat attempted to take it for himself as the eldest son. For background, RHC : doc. arm. t. vol.1, 605, footnote 1 ; Le Comte Beugnot, Assises de Jérusalem; ou, Recueil des ouvrages de jurisprudence. Assises de la haute cour, vol.1 (Paris, 1841), 220. The Assises provides a colorful description of the conflict between Ōšin’s and Smbat over the lordship: "Et ce qu’il me manda que je lor enqueysece por le Corc que il diseit qui il avait conquis et que il voleit doner à baron Oissin son fiz, et que baron Sembat, le conestable d’Ermenie, son ainz né fiz, contredisait cel don, e diseit que il ne le poeit faire." Claude Mutafian provides additional context for the importance of Korykos, Mutafian, "Héthoum de Korykos,” 159-162.
353 The Military Orders also became involved in the conflict. The Hospitallers supported Raymond-Rouben’s claims over Cilician Armenia, as they strove to strengthen their own power base in the region. Helen J. Nicholson, The Knights Hospitaller, 30. Jean Richard, The Crusades c.1071-1291, 238. John of Brienne (c.1170-1237) was another claimant to the throne based on his marriage to Stephanie, daughter of King Lewon; he declared his claim to the Cilician throne after his wife and infant died in 1220.
victory over Raymond-Rouben’s supporters, who had sought refuge in the city of Tarsus. It was a military success that allegedly took place with ease as a result of the crucial aid provided by a key informant named Vasil.354

Evidence for Hayton’s possession of Korykos emerges at the end of the thirteenth century, indicating that he likely gained possession of the lordship upon the death of his older brother, Grigor, bailiff of the kingdom, in 1277.355 Hayton received the lordship of Korykos along with neighboring provinces.356 A colophon from 1287 addresses Hayton as the Lord of Korykos, in addition to lavishing upon him a string of praises including “prince of princes.”357

Hayton’s title as Lord of Korykos was thus a product of Kostantin’s masterful seizure of several key areas, many of which were under Latin control, such as his takeover of the fortress Silifke (Seleucia) from Hospitaller hands, which Lewon I had granted to the Order in 1210 as part of his wider aims to secure the frontier between the Seljuks and the Armenian kingdom (it was also where Kostantin had discovered Zabel, his soon-to-be daughter-in-law hiding from his clutches).358 The second half of the thirteenth century thus proved a critical time for the Hetʿumid dynasty’s assertions of political legitimacy and territorial advancement, which paved the way for Hayton and his

354 The Chronicle of Constable Smbat, 224 (see year 1220).
357 Matevosyan, Colophons, XIII Century, 610 no. 496. The manuscript is housed in the Vatican collections. For additional information, Eugene Tisserant, Codices armeni Bybliothecae Vaticanae, (Rome: Typis polyglottis vaticanis, 1927), 221.
family members to participate in the highest levels of Cilician Armenian politics, diplomacy, military leadership and exertion of cultural influence.

Hayton’s membership in the royal family consequently allowed for his immersion in the diplomatic and political affairs of his kingdom. It is thus not surprising that his career as political mediator paralleled that of his father Ōšin, who served in the diplomatic exchanges between the Armenians and the Latins, while also working as bailiff of the Cilician kingdom. More specifically, Ōšin of Korykos had traveled to Acre in 1262, where he visited papal legate, Thomas Agni de Lentini, whom the papacy had assigned to the Latin East and made Bishop of Bethlemen. Lentini was in the East to investigate the conflict of the War of St. Sabas, the long-lasting war between the Genoese and Venetians over control of the lucrative trading port of Acre from 1256-1270.

Relations between Cilician Armenia and the papacy had become rather tense as the legate had learned of the recent Armenian and Antiochene submission to the Mongols. Memories of the past attacks on Eastern Europe, coupled with the Latin West’s relative lack of knowledge of the foreign people, likely triggered the legate’s frustration as he placed a ban of excommunication on Prince Bohemond VI for his Mongol support. It was during this period of strained relations in which Lentini was charged with investigating the religious position of the Cilician kingdom towards the Roman Church.

---

360 Additionally, the War of St. Sabas involved various political powers including: Philip of Monfort; John of Ibelin, the Count of Jaffa; the Hospitallers; the Templars; the Byzantines; and the Mamluk Sultan Baybars. The principal source for the encounter between the legate and the Armenian party is found in the thirteenth century account of the Cilician Armenian priest, Mxiṭʻar Dašir who was a key participant at Acre, charged with representing the interests of the Armenian catholicos and defending Armenian Orthodoxy to Lentini. According to Dašir, Ōšin journeyed to Acre to clarify the legate’s purpose for the engagement and provide a report to his brother the king. Bernard Hamilton has noted that the meeting was not only directed at discussing union with Rome, but also at gaining information about the nature of the Armenian-Mongol alliance. Hamilton, “The Armenian Church and the Papacy at the Time of the Crusades,” 82; Mekhitar Dashir, “Relation de la Conférence,” in *RHC doc. arm. I*, 692.
The meeting at Acre temporarily strained Latin-Armenian relations as the Hetʿumid representatives asserted their Orthodoxy.

As former Byzantine vassals, the Hetʿumid clan had traditionally upheld a pro-Byzantine position, but it gradually oriented itself towards the Latin West based on the military dominance of the Mamlūk Sultanate and the fragmenting of Ilkhanid-Armenian ties during the course of the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Scholars have also highlighted that the Hetʿumid dynasty’s early reservations towards the papacy seem to have been rooted in its perceived security in the early stages of Ilkhanid support. Bayarsaikhan Dashdondog has referred to this period as marking an early stage of Mongol-Cilician Armenian cooperation.

Nonetheless, the Hetʿumid dynasty became more flexible in their negotiations with the West as the need for an imminent crusade intensified from the latter half of the thirteenth century onwards. Hayton’s diplomatic career reflected the later period of the Hetʿumid dynasty’s bolder articulations to the papacy, based on its awareness of the increasing state of political insecurity facing the Armenian kingdom.

Other key members of Hayton’s family also participated at the highest levels of Cilician Armenian politics. Constable Smbat served as commander-in-chief of the

---

362 These early reservations did not mean a complete lack of communication between the Cilician leaders and the papacy. Catholicos Kostantin I (1221-67) pursued careful diplomatic bargaining with the Roman Church, evidenced by his acceptance of the filioque issue at the Synod of Sis in 1251. As a concession to the papacy, it highlighted the Cilician kingdom’s objective in maintaining positive relations with Rome. The correspondence with the Latins also severely angered the clergy in Greater Armenia, who threatened schism. The conflict between those who supported stronger relations with Rome and those who upheld orthodoxy would grow more acute as the kingdom faced increasing political instability. S. Peter Cowe, “The Armenians in the era of the Crusades (1050–1350),” in Eastern Christianity, vol. 5 of The Cambridge History of Christianity, ed. Michael Angold (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 651.

363 Dashdondog, The Mongols and the Armenians, 121-35. Bernard Hamilton argues that the Cilician position and “their subsequent failure to renew the ties with Rome can only be explained by religious antagonism, which the presence of alternative military protectors made it unnecessary to disguise.” Hamilton, “The Armenian Church and the Papacy at the Time of the Crusades,” 83.
Cilician army and diplomat when he traveled to Kayseri (Caesarea) in 1243 to negotiate with the Mongol chief Baiju and farther east to the Mongol court at Karakorum in 1246, in hopes of negotiating the kingdom’s surrender upon the Mongol conquest of the Seljuk Sultanate in Anatolia. For his successful diplomatic exchanges with the Mongols, Smbat was given a Mongol bride, with whom he conceived a son, Vasil Tartar, who was eventually killed at the Battle of Mari between the Mamlûks and Armenians in 1266.  

Smbat’s career parallels that of Hayton’s in many ways as the constable also served as an intermediary who straddled political, religious and cultural boundaries.

Smbat’s letter to his brothers-in-law Henry I of Cyprus and the Count of Jaffa records first-hand observations on the Mongols, as written from Samarqand in 1248, where he sought to solidify Armenian submission. The letter’s attention to the presence of Christianity and churches in the Empire was clearly intended to promote the Mongols as friendly allies to his skeptical Latin audience. By doing so, the constable was equally striving to justify Cilician Armenia’s recent submission to foreign, pagan conquerors. As a result of Smbat’s position in the highest level of Cilician Armenian politics, his testimony of the East gained the attention of King Louis IX of France during his time in Cyprus in the context of the Seventh Crusade, where he had also received a Mongol delegation from the noyan (title of authority) Eljigidei; the embassy similarly promoted the Mongol favor towards Christianity. 

---

364 Dashdondog, _The Mongols and the Armenians_, 94. Dashdondog dates the battle to 1269, other scholars including Angus Donal Stewart date it to 1266. See Stewart, _The Armenian Kingdom and the Mamluks_, 189.


366 Peter Jackson, tr. _The Seventh Crusade, 1244-1254: Sources and Documents_ (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009), 67; Jackson, _The Mongols and the West_, 98-99.
In addition to serving as a significant diplomatic agent in Near Eastern politics, Constable Smbat also showed interest in the cultural affairs of his kingdom, evidenced in his translation of the French legal code, Assises d’Antioche, an adaptation of an earlier medieval Armenian law code, and his work as a chronicler.  

His wide-ranging cultural pursuits reveal his access to a variety of sources and interests in Frankish culture. Hayton’s La Flor des estoires and translation of the Cronicon can be understood as later examples of the Cilician family’s close ties to Frankish society and culture, which had developed as a result of the crusades and the establishment of the Latin East. Hayton’s activities as cultural mediator, therefore, cannot be separated from the context of the royal family’s wider contributions to the cultural sphere.

3.1.1 Cultural Influence of the Hetʿumid Dynasty

The Hetʿumid dynasty’s cultural contributions were made possible because of the peak in literary activity in Cilician Armenia during the latter half of the thirteenth century, which was evidenced in the production of “quite new literary genres, such as rhymed history, elegy and lyrical poetry,” as noted by J.J.S. Weitenberg.  Cultural innovations were certainly not limited to literature, but also extended into the arts, as evidenced by the prolific achievements of Cilician manuscript illuminator, T’oros Roslin, who worked in the scriptorium at Hṙomkla. Seta Dadayan emphasizes that the flourishing of culture and ideas in Cilician Armenia developed as a result of the kingdom’s positioning between East and West and its involvement in a high level of

intercultural exchanges.\textsuperscript{370} The kingdom’s vitality in trading in the Eastern Mediterranean likely served as a critical factor in encouraging cultural productivity based on an increase of its wealth and resources.\textsuperscript{371}

Members of the Hetʿumid dynasty thus not only participated in the highest levels of politics, but also took on an active role in cultural production. Cilician royalty became involved in such pursuits as the writing of historiography and poetry. Constable Smbat’s production of his \textit{Chronicle}, which provides an important overview of events from 951-1272, indicates his royal interests in composing a historical record of the kingdom’s affairs. While the royal chronicler relied upon the historiography of the Armenian abbot, Matthew of Edessa, and his continuator, Gregory the Priest, for its earlier section, he produced a significant historiographical work based on his intimate knowledge of the affairs of the Latin East and access to a wide range of sources.\textsuperscript{372} Ioanna Rapti has underscored that Smbat’s chronicle was particularly innovative as it was based on the Hetʿumid royal’s first-hand experience in battle and his prominent position in court.\textsuperscript{373}

Hayton’s contemporary, King Hetʿum II, also demonstrated the royal family’s extension of cultural influence. Hetʿum II produced a poem during the latter half of the thirteenth century, describing the political affairs of the kingdom by giving close attention to the Mamlûk assaults upon Cilician Armenia and the Latin East during this turbulent period.\textsuperscript{374} In addition to the poem, Hetʿum II may have authored a chronicle on the main events of the Latin East. While his authorship of the chronicle remains

\textsuperscript{370} Ibid, 197.
\textsuperscript{371} For importance of trading city Ayas, see Mutafian, \textit{La Cilicie au Carrefour des empires}, I, 446.
\textsuperscript{372} Dashdondog, \textit{The Mongols and the Armenians}, 20.
\textsuperscript{374} “Poème de Héthoum II,” in \textit{RHC doc. arm}. I, 550-5.
contested, what is evident is that the Cilician royalty became invested in extending their cultural influence. Hayton’s epithet as “historian” was, therefore, reflective of the wider socio-cultural milieu in which he lived and particularly indicative of the interests of the elite, rather than being representative of the majority of the populace.

3.1.2 Hayton, Cilician Patron

In addition to Hayton’s historiographical interests, his royal patronage was also situated within a period in which aristocratic sponsorship increased in Cilician Armenia. Earlier patronage had been largely conducted by the Armenian catholicoi and other leading clergy who traditionally served as the principal sponsors of manuscripts. In looking at the context of lay sponsorship of paintings in the thirteenth century, Sirarpie Der Nersessian has noted that the increase in patronage reflected the growing political authority among the royals. Lay patronage served as an important platform through which the Hetʿumid dynasty succeeded in articulating power, affluence and piety. Constable Smbat’s interest in philosophical treatises and Hayton’s father, Marshal Ōšin’s commissioning of a manuscript of the Gospels, illustrate this trend among the Cilician royalty. Hayton’s activities as patron were thus firmly situated within this period of increased royal sponsorship, which in turn, played an important role in promoting the artistic and intellectual exchanges of the period.


It was within this prosperous cultural milieu that a well-known medical tract or *bžkaran*, known as the “Gagik-Hetʿumian,” appears to have been commissioned by Hayton in 1294. The medical book’s title is a product of modern scholarship and not attributed to the name of the thirteenth century patron. The medical tract was an anonymous work, which seems to have been first composed during the rule of King Gagik at the end of tenth or early eleventh century; scholars have largely relied on the king’s name to identify the work. The insertion of “Hetʿumian” has been suggested as referring to a Hetʿum Sebastios, brother of Nersēs of Lambron, Archbishop of Tarsus. Sebastios seems to have edited the medical treatise in the late twelfth or the start of the thirteenth century. The tract became a highly copied manuscript throughout the Middle Ages and served as a didactic guide for Armenian physicians. In assessing the value of the medieval source, Stella Vardanyan has compared it as the Armenian equivalent of Ibn Sina’s *The Canon of Medicine,* the standard medical text used in the Latin West.

Stella Vardanyan has also noted that the manuscript of Hetʿum Sebastios seems to have been made available to Hayton, who then commissioned it to be copied by a scribe named Vart in 1294. The commission represents an abridged version of the one
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377 While earlier scholarship only knew of two extant manuscripts, four copies of the medical treatise are currently extant: Jerusalem MS 370, MS 1281 in Venise, MS 9837 in the Mashtots Matenadaran, and MS 245 in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France. For further information on the manuscript copies, see Vardanyan “The Medical Heritage of Cilician Armenia,” in *Armenian Cilicia*, eds. Richard G. Hovannisian and Simon Payaslian (Costa Mesa, CA: Mazda Publishers, 2008), 278-79; Stella Vardanyan, “The Gagik-Hetoumian Medical Book and Its Editorial Versions,” *P-B H* 2 (1985): 145-160 Stella Vardanyan has been the leading scholar on the manuscript tradition and has challenged earlier scholarly views that claimed that Grigor Magistros was the author of the work. In contrast, she asserts that an Armenian doctor with a background in the medical tradition of Ani likely served as the author of the first part of the tract, which later included the work of the Armenian physician, Mxitʿar Heracʿi and an anonymous pathological and clinical treatise.
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produced by Sebastios. Hayton’s activities of patronage are tied to the interests of the royal family in exercising influence over different aspects of Cilician society. Hayton’s interests as a patron mirror Constable Smbat’s interest in Aristotle’s *Categories.* The rise of medical schools in Cilician Armenia during the thirteenth century should not be overlooked in shaping the interests of patrons like Hayton.

In addition to Hayton’s patronage of the medical tract of 1294, the Lord of Korykos sponsored other significant commissions, which were also reflective of his position as royal prince. A colophon from the year 1287 refers to his patronage of a calendar, which is now housed in the Vatican collections. Its scribe, Stepʿanos, celebrates Hayton’s affluence by noting his royal pedigree and status as a patron.

Additionally, two colophons from 1293 describe Hayton’s commissioning of a gospel manuscript and a renovation project in his lordship of Korykos. The two colophons contain the same historical overview of the Mamlūk conquests in the Latin East, lamenting the loss of Tripoli in 1289 and Hṙomkla in 1292. The colophons reveal

---
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385 Tisserant, *Codices armeni Bybliothecae Vaticanae,* 221 ; Matevosyan, 610 no.496.
386 Matevosyan, *Colophons, XIII Century,* 610 no. 496.
387 Shahe Ajamian, “The Colophon of the Gospel of Hethum “Bayl,” in *Text and Context: Studies in the Armenian New Testament,* eds. Shahe Ajamian and Michael E. Stone (University of Pennsylvania, Armenian Texts and Studies, 1994). The two colophons are nearly identical to one another, with the exception of some key differences. The first colophon appears in a manuscript of the Gospels copied in 1293, which was recently translated into English and analyzed by the late Archbishop Shahe Ajamian, the purchaser of the copy for his private collection. The colophon notes that “I, Hethum, son of Oshin, brother of Hethum king of Armenia, by the grace of God, lord of Corycos, Manion, Punar, Amanur, Kupa and other fortresses as far as Savrio and citadels of provinces, paid for this Gospel that I desired with all my heart and commissioned Basil, the scribe of my decrees to write it.” Ajamian, “The Colophon,” 11. The second colophon is located in a miscellaneous manuscript housed in Yerevan, MS 5613, copied in 1608. Matevosyan, *Colophons, XIII century,* 718-720. The seventeenth century copy identifies Hayton as the scribe. Another major distinction between the two extant manuscript copies is that the earlier one includes a theological interpretation on the Evangelists and their Gospels, whereas the later copy contains exclusive historical information. Notwithstanding these significant differences, the shared historical content of both colophons still communicates Hayton’s role as a royal patron.
that the manuscript was to be placed in a church dedicated to the Holy Mother of God in Korykos. 388 This construction project was intended “to secure a refuge for our Christians from the sword of the lawless ones,” highlighting Hayton’s efforts to serve as a defender of the kingdom. 389 Hayton thus likely commissioned the manuscript and renovation of the site in Korykos in the aftermath of Sultan al-Ashraf’s (r. 1290-93) Cilician campaign of 1292. 390

Michael E. Stone has underscored that the act of copying and commissioning a manuscript fulfilled various functions, including serving as a vehicle for the expression of piety. 391 As such, “to copy or commission a manuscript, to ransom it from the captivity in the hands of the Moslems or to rebind it, or even just to look at it, were acts of pious virtue.” 392 Hayton’s patronage of the manuscript can be understood along similar lines, as it intended to showcase his religious identity and piety as a Hetʿumid lord.

Hayton’s patronage of a renovation project in Korykos also paralleled the actions of his Hetʿumid predecessors, who used royal funds to defend the southern coast. The port of Korykos had particularly served as an important harbor since antiquity. Robert W. Edwards has noted inscriptive evidence on the island fortification in Korykos, which

389 Ajamian, “The Colophon,” 6. Archbishop Ajamian also observes that Hayton “erected a fortress on the island facing the port,” which is known today as Kizkalezi.
390 Korikos/Korykos was significant for commerce as it was a coastal city along the Mediterranean Sea. It had been important for all its past rulers. The Byzantines had refortified it in the twelfth century, during the time in which the port city was part of the Empire, David Winfield, “Crusader Art: Sir Steven was Right,” in Byzantine Style, Religion and Civilization: in Honour of Sir Steven Runciman, ed. Elizabeth M. Jeffreys (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 160.
describes Lewon I’s and Het’um I’s strengthening of the former Byzantine fortress. Hayton’s father, Ōšin, also seems to have overseen a project in his lordship according to the account of Franciscan friar William of Rubruck, who notes his visit to “Curchus, a port belonging to the king of Armenia,” and his subsequent meeting in Sis with the Het’umid royal family with the exception of one “named Baron Usin, who was seeing to the construction of some fortresses.” It is worth noting that the harbor of Korykos would later hold strategic and economic significance for Cypriot King Peter I (1328-69), who fought Turkish dominance of the southern Anatolian coastline. As a strategic harbor along the southern coast of Asia Minor, Korykos would continue to hold Latin interest until its fall to the Turks in the 1448.

Hayton’s patronage served as a means through which to express his piety, power, and erudition—all facets of his royal identity. His interests paralleled the activities of the Cilician royal family. Like Constable Smbat and King Het’um II, Hayton also wrote from the perspective of an experienced military tactician, well-versed diplomat, and enjoyed access to a range of records due to his social standing in the kingdom. Hayton’s own career thus progressed very much in the same vein as those of his contemporaries. As remarkable as his accomplishments may initially seem, they were formed in the context of medieval Cilician Armenian society and highlight the ambitions of the royal class.

While Hayton’s activities were not necessarily unique, they indicate the exceptional
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393 Robert W. Edwards, “Ecclesiastical Architecture in the Fortifications of Cilician Armenia,” DOP 36 (1982): 173. Edwards notes how a dyke joined the mainland and island fortifications as part of a complex. The mainland fortification had three chapels, while the one offshore had only one.
nature of Cilician culture which developed as a result of the high level of cross-cultural encounters during the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The situation of Hayton’s interests in the context of Cilician society is particularly important for understanding the background of his worldview and composition of *La Flor des estoires*.

### 3.2 Political Outcast

Hayton’s royal background and intermarriage with the Franks placed him at the center of the political affairs in both Cilician Armenia and Cyprus. Domestic conflicts plagued both kingdoms during the early fourteenth century, drawing in Hayton’s involvement based on his position of influence and social standing. A closer examination into his involvement in the political affairs of both kingdoms offers a window through which to view the political, religious and social connections between the two states. Hayton’s interests in the affairs of both kingdoms can be understood in the context of a Cypriot-Cilician worldview, based on the intertwined ties between both powers during the early fourteenth century, especially in the aftermath of the fall of Acre in 1291, which marked the loss of the crusader presence in the Latin East.397

#### 3.2.1 The Cypriot Case

Hayton became entangled in the dynastic disturbances in Cyprus during the early fourteenth century based on the close socio-cultural relations between the two kingdoms, which had resulted from the crusades. A coup d’état was launched against King Henry II in 1306 under the leadership of his brother, Amaury, Lord of Tyre and Constable of
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Jerusalem. The opposition to Henry II’s rule gained substantial backing in Cyprus, being widely supported by the majority of Cypriot nobility, including Balian of Ibelin (the prince of Galilee), John IV of Ibelin (Lord of Arsuf), Philip of Ibelin (Count of Jaffa), and Hugh of Ibelin. These lords had recently become vassals of Cypriot kings, who claimed the title of king of Jerusalem at the end of the twelfth century.

A declaration with the signatures of the opposing nobility was delivered to the king, which forced him to accept Amaury de Lusignan as ‘gubernator et rector’ (governor and rector) in exchange for a lump sum payment. His opponents addressed the king’s ill-health as contributing to the weak rule over the kingdom. Disenchantment towards Henry II’s sovereignty seems to have become widespread based on additional factors including his military incompetence against the Mamlûk Sultanate, growing problems with Genoese merchants, and exclusive reliance on the counsel of the seneschal of Cyprus, Philip of Ibelin (the brother of Henry’s mother, Queen Isabel), which isolated the rest of the nobility.

Amaury de Lusignan’s political coup involved several actors including Cilician Armenia and the Military Orders. The Knights Templar had experienced a long-standing conflict with the Cypriot king after the Order’s numbers had strengthened in the island upon their expulsion from Palestine. Tense relations had polarized Master Jacques de Molay and Henry II since the latter’s accession in 1285. Their antagonism was partly

based on the wider context of Templar-Angevin ties, which conflicted with the Cypriot
king’s opposition to Angevin claims to the throne of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{401} While de Molay was
not one of the signatories of the declaration listing the grievances against the king’s rule,
the \textit{Chronique d’Amadi} notes that the Order provided financial assistance to Amaury in
the sum of 50 000 bezants. \textsuperscript{402}

The Armenians also became involved in the political conflict based on the social
relations forged between the two kingdoms during the early fourteenth century. Amaury
de Lusignan had married Zabel, daughter of Lewon II and Kyr Anna, and therefore, sister
of Het’um II (r.1289-93; 1295-97; 1299-1305; regent 1305-07) and Ōšin I (r.1308-20).
The marriage alliance between Amaury de Lusignan and Zabel encouraged Cilician
Armenian support of the political aspirant. The Armenian kingdom would play an
important role in the uprising as evidenced in Hayton’s service as Amaury’s delegate to
the court of Clement V in 1307 and Ōšin’s I’s imprisonment of Henry II in Cilician
Armenia upon the request of his brother-in-law.

Hayton’s own marriage alliance had brought him into close proximity with the
leading family in Cyprus—the Ibelins—who served as key participants in the plot against
Henry II.\textsuperscript{403} Hayton seems to have been pulled into the Ibelin factional struggle, which
supported Amaury’s claims against Henry II. Hayton’s marriage to Isabella, daughter of
Guy of Ibelin and Maria, daughter of King Het’um I, seems to have played a role in
shaping his support of the political plot.\textsuperscript{404} It was through this marital union that Hayton

\textsuperscript{401} Charles of Anjou claimed the title of Jerusalem in opposition of Henry’s position as King of Jerusalem. In addition, the Templars had trading networks in Angevin lands. Malcolm Barber, \textit{The Trial of the Templars}, 252.
\textsuperscript{402} Ibid, 252-53.
\textsuperscript{403} Edbury, \textit{The Kingdom of Cyprus}, 113.
\textsuperscript{404} RHC Lois, II, 449.
became allied with the most powerful family in Cyprus; the Ibelins had dominated the positions of seneschal and constable during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Guy’s father, Baldwin of Ibelin, had been appointed seneschal of Cyprus in 1246.  

Prominent members of the Ibelin family played a significant role in the Cypriot revolt, which may have served as a factor in guiding Hayton’s opposition towards Henry II. More specifically, Hughes of Ibelin and his nephew, Philip of Ibelin, rose as key opponents until they were defeated by Henry II, who returned to power in 1310. Hayton’s social ties to the Ibelin family are likely to have shaped his alignment with Amaury’s interests rather than backing the king, who had proven unpopular with the majority of the nobility. It has also been suggested that Hayton remained in Cyprus as a political fugitive after having plotted against Hetʿum II, as will be discussed in the following section of this chapter. Hayton’s alignment with the Ibelin faction may have thus developed from the sanctuary and support he received on the island.

In addition to the role of intermarriages in shaping Armenian involvement in the Cypriot affair, Hayton’s support of Amaury can also be understood as an expression of the wider military and political aspirations and affiliations of the Eastern Mediterranean. As previously mentioned, Henry II had been widely criticized for being an ineffective, passive ruler against the Mamlûks and Genoese. More specifically, Hayton would have likely been aware of Henry II’s failure to promptly respond to Ilkhan Ghazan’s requests for an alliance for his first Syrian campaign in 1299, which had resulted in the short-lived
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405 His grandson, also named Baldwin, switched sides in 1308, aligning himself with Henry II. His actions seem to have reflected the wider disenchantment among the nobility towards Amaury’s rule. See Edbury, The Kingdom of Cyprus, 130-31.
406 Chronique d’Amadi, 385-86; 398. They were sent into the prisons of the Kyrenian Mountains, situated along the northern coast of Cyprus, where the prisoners starved to death as a result of Henry’s return to power.
Mongol occupation of Damascus. According to the *Gestes des Chiprois*, Ghazan had “wanted the king and all the Franks to come west during that winter, and that he wanted the king and all the Franks to come meet him in Armenia.” Ilkhanid-Cypriot plans failed to accomplish anything substantial at this point based on a lack of coordination and the haphazard plans of Henry II, which included a raid near Rosetta, the port city east of Alexandria.

As a direct participant in Ghazan’s military campaigns, Hayton was certainly aware of the earlier futile Cypriot response to Ilkhanid requests. On the other hand, Amaury de Lusignan, along with the Military Orders, exhibited a more pro-active role in Ghazan’s second Syrian campaign in 1300-01 and in efforts to regain a Latin presence in the East after Acre fell in 1291. Amaury and Jacques de Molay unsuccessfully attempted to recapture Tortosa, which had previously served the Templars. The Cypriots seem to have had more time to organize a response in Ghazan’s second campaign in comparison to the earlier Ilkhanid-Lusignan exchange.

Notwithstanding Latin efforts, the Ilkhanid troops were delayed and only arrived in Syria in early 1301, by which time Amaury’s men had already abandoned the expedition and returned home. Only a small Templar force remained on the island Ruad, situated off the coast of Tortosa. A Mamlûk strike proved detrimental for the Templar force stationed there and resulted in the captivity of the knights and recapture of the
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411 Edbury, *The Kingdom of Cyprus*, 104-05.
island. Despite the failure of Amaury’s expedition, his active involvement revealed a
desire to cooperate with the Ilkhans and defend the Eastern Mediterranean frontier
against the Egyptian threat.\footnote{Hill, A History of Cyprus, II, 26.} While Ilkhan Ghazan’s successors showed little interest in
invading Syria, this was a reality not yet apparent to crusade enthusiasts like Hayton,
whose strategic plans for war relied upon military co-operation among the Latins,
Mongols and Armenians.

Based on his close alignment with the Cypriot nobility, Hayton was chosen as
Amaury’s delegate to the court of Clement V. His mission aimed at gaining papal
approval for Amaury’s consolidation of power against Henry’s resistance. Amaury
provided 10,000 gold florins to support Hayton’s mission to the papacy, which served as
the first of three missions to the Latin West (the other two were not led by Armenians).\footnote{Chronique d’Amadi, 254, 278-80; Les Gestes des Chiprois, 879. Edbury, The Kingdom of Cyprus, 115,
119; Boase, The Cilician Kingdom of Armenia, 28-29.}

Aware of the threat of Henry II’s return to power, Amaury used the embassies to promote
himself as a crusade enthusiast, which according to Peter W. Edbury, may have also
served as a strategy for gaining papal approval of his usurpation.\footnote{Edbury, The Kingdom of Cyprus, 120.}
The Chronique
d’Amadi relates how the Armenian “ambassador” returned to Cyprus in 1308 without
having accomplished the purpose of his embassy.\footnote{Chronique d’Amadi, 278-80.} Having failed, Hayton carried papal
letters with him, which dealt with the affairs of Cypriot religious houses, and a more
serious matter, the calling for the arrest of the Templars and the confiscation of their
Notwithstanding Hayton’s diplomatic efforts, Pope Clement V refused to accept Amaury’s legitimacy, which subsequently had a negative impact on Amaury’s legitimization in the eyes of the Cypriot nobility, who later shifted their allegiance by backing the restoration of Henry II. Growing increasingly unpopular, Amaury was eventually assassinated in 1310 after the nobility attempted a rebellion against him in 1308. The king, who had first been under ‘house-arrest’ at the royal estate of Strovolos and later under the supervision of Ōšin I in Cilician Armenia, was restored to power, ruling until 1324.

While there is no information about Henry II’s subsequent treatment of Hayton, Cilician-Cypriot relations suffered in the aftermath of his return to power as Ōšin’s backing of Amaury was not easily forgotten. A letter dated on 13 August 1319, years after Henry’s return to power in 1310, highlights Pope John XXIII’s concern for the tense relations between the Cypriots and Armenians. The letter, addressed to the mediators, Petro de Genulhaco, a canon from Nicosia, and the Hospitaller Maurice de Pagnac, indicates the papal encouragement of a truce between the rulers of both kingdoms.

Hayton’s role as Amaury’s first diplomat and his close ties to the Ibelin faction seem to have triggered his negative treatment in Cypriot sources, which depict him as a treacherous fugitive from Armenia. The Chronique d’Amadi, which survives in a
sixteenth century manuscript named for its owner, situates Hayton as a key figure in the political coup, as a “fugitive of the king of Armenia” who advised Amaury to revolt upon his arrival in Cyprus.\textsuperscript{422} The account, highly reliant on earlier Latin Eastern sources like the \textit{Gestes des Chiprois}, reveals support for Henry II’s career, which may have played a factor in shaping its negative treatment of the Armenian prince and ally of Amaury de Lusignan.\textsuperscript{423} In a similar vein, fifteenth century Greek chronicler, Leontios Machairas, a supporter of the Lusignan regime, equates Hayton’s treasonous efforts in Cilicia with his new ambition against Cyprus:

“…he had run away from Armenia because of the great mischief which had had done against his lord Sir Hayton, the heir of Armenia: and he came to King Henry with his wife and his children. And the good King Henry received him and gave him a fitting livelihood. And just as he had made a quarrel between Sir Hayton the King of Armenia and his brother Sir Thoros and had made a dissension in Armenia between the two brothers, just such another dissension he made between these two brothers also…”\textsuperscript{424}

Charles Kohler notes that both \textit{Les Gestes des Chiprois} and Marino Sanudo, who relied on \textit{La Flor des estoire} for his own treatise, make no mention of Hayton’s influence over Amaury.\textsuperscript{425} Indeed, the lack of evidence in other sources suggests that the Cypriot sources appear to be exaggerating the extent of Hayton’s involvement, and

\textsuperscript{422} \textit{Chronique d’Amadi}, “fugitive dal re de Armenia,” 254; Charles Kohler’s introduction in \textit{RHC doc.arm.} II, xxxviii. Edbury, \textit{The Kingdom of Cyprus}, 125 ft. 92.
\textsuperscript{425} Kohler, \textit{RHC doc.arm.} II, xxxiv.
therefore, scapegoat him as the main plotter behind Amaury’s rise. Hayton’s role as an instigator of the plot is quite implausible based on the high level of discontentment towards Henry II’s rule. While overemphasizing Hayton’s involvement, the Cypriot sources reveal that Hayton was indeed a significant, noteworthy figure, active in Cypriot politics. Amaury’s selection of Hayton as his principal delegate substantiates that he was not merely a peripheral, exiled figure, who was pressured into supporting the revolt against Henry II. He was clearly invested in the revolt based on his social relations and military interests in defending the Christian presence in the Eastern Mediterranean.

3.2.2 The Case of Cilician Armenia

In the context of Cilician Armenia, Hayton became one of the key political opponents of his uncle, Hetʿum II, the eldest son of Lewon II (r.1269-89). While Hetʿum II and Hayton shared a similar commitment to promoting Catholicism to the Latin West and alliance with the Ilkhans, the king became embroiled in a power struggle over rulership with his brothers, which seems to have drawn in Hayton’s involvement. Increased Turcomen and Mamlûk strikes undoubtedly contributed to the political destabilization of the kingdom, having a major impact on dynastic stability during the last decade of the thirteenth century. Hayton, as a principal member of the Hetʿumid dynasty,
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426 Hetʿum was the eldest of seven brothers and three sisters. Hayton lists the brothers in the following order: Hetʿum, Tʿoros, Smbat, Kostantin, Nersēs, Ôshin, and Alinax. La Flor des estoires, 326. The Continuator of Samuel of Ani simply notes that there were seven sons and three daughters. See the Continuator of the Chronicle of Samuel of Ani, in RHC doc. arm. I, 463. The anonymous biographer of Georges of Skewra notes that there were seven sons and that Hetʿum was given Lampron, p. Vincent Mistrih, tr. Trois Biographies de Georges de Skevra, 78. Zabel, Rita and Stephani are listed as the sisters in ‘Azgabanakan ašxatutʿwun,’ in Minor Chronicles, II, 105.
was likely pulled into the violent conflict, just as he was drawn into Cypriot politics as a result of his intermarriage and relations with the powerful Cypriot nobility. 427

A short but significant reference is found in The Chronicle attributed to King Het’um II, which incriminates Hayton and his brother, Ōšin, as co-accomplices in a plot against Het’um II in 1293-94, around the time of the latter’s first abdication from power. The Armenian chronicle describes how both Hayton and Ōšin were exiled upon being involved in a failed attempt to remove Het’um from power.428 While Hayton seems to have found refuge in Cyprus, his brother appears to have later been executed in 1309 for his continued involvement in political intrigue.429 More specifically, Ōšin seems to have played a major role in the assassination of T’oros after the young royal’s journey to Constantinople in 1296 for the marriage of their sister to Michael Palaeologus.430

The timeframe of the plot of 1293-94 corresponds to the specific period in which the king seems to have first abdicated and retired into a monastery after having transferred power to his younger brother, T’oros. It is impossible to know whether his abdication was forced upon him by opposing noble factions or if it was a matter of personal choice.

Several Armenian and Latin sources speak of Het’um’s withdrawal from power in the aftermath of the Mamlûk invasion of Cilicia in 1292, including Les Gestes des Chiprois, which relays that Het’um II became known as “frere Johan d’Armenie,” upon

427 David Bundy has shown how Hayton’s depiction has held remarkable influence on modern scholarship. See David Bundy, “Religion and Politics in the Reign of Het’um II,” in Armenian Perspectives, ed. Nicholas Awde (Surrey: Curzon Press, 1997), 83-94.
428 Chronicle attributed to King Het’um II, 86-87.
429 Rüdt-Collenberg, The Rubenides, 66. The reason for his assassination remains unknown.
430 Ibid.
turning towards the mendicant religious order. Venetian theorist, Marino Sanudo, also notes that the king “had never wished to be crowned, but had adopted the habit of the Franciscans, and so from then on was commonly known as ‘Brother John’.” Het’um II was also a recipient of a manuscript of the *Book of Psalms*, in which a colophon of 1293 similarly describes his religious name as Hovannes, the Armenian equivalent of John.

The *Chronicle attributed to King Het’um II* dates his abdication to 1293 as well. Dating the abdication to around the year of 1293 is well supported based on the high number of colophons that refer to Het’um II’s rule prior to this date.

Het’um II’s abdication was connected to his ties to the Franciscans active in Cilician Armenia and aimed at gaining the support of Pope Nicholas IV, the first Franciscan to be elected pope in 1288. Scholars have pointed out that Het’um II’s gravitation towards the Franciscan Order may have also developed from his contacts with Franciscan John of Montecorvino, the papal legate active in Persia and Armenia. It should be noted that Montecorvino seems to have overseen the first Franciscan convent in Cilician Armenia in 1280. The rise in missionary enterprises in the Near East during this time may have indeed played a factor in shaping the course of Het’um II’s religious
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433 *Colophons, XIII century*, 705 no.573.
434 *The Chronicle attributed to King Het’um II*, 86; the text also notes that the king placed the realm in the hands of his brother T’oros in the year 1293.
435 For the year 1290, see for example, 654 no.530; 655 no.531; 658 no.532; 659 no.533; 660 no.535; 661 no.537; 662 no.538; for 1291, 664 no.541; 666 no.542; 666 no.543; for 1292, 682 no.554; 685 no.556; 691 no.560; 696 no.564; 699 no.568; 700 no.569; 701 no.570; 703 no.571; 704 no.572. For one main exception, see 698 no. 567. A thirteenth century chronicler from Sis dates Het’um II’s abdication to 1294, see Hakobyan, *Minor Chronicles*, I, 106.
identity. The timing of Hetʻum’s conversion as a Franciscan also corresponded to the visit of the charismatic Spiritual Franciscan, Angelo Clareno, to Cilician Armenia.437

In addition to the reference in the *Chronicle attributed to Hetʻum II*, extant Cypriot sources including the *Chronique d’Amadi* reference Hayton’s opposition to Hetʻum’s II rule. The *Chronique d’Amadi* suggests that Hayton came to Cyprus to avoid facing repercussions from the king for his involvement in an unsuccessful political coup against him. This information lends support to the reference of the plotting in 1293-94 as found in the *Chronicle attributed to King Hetʻum II*. Further evidence of Hayton’s conflict with the king is found in the same Cypriot chronicle which describes the Lord of Korykos’ elation after learning of Hetʻum II’s assassination at the command of the Mongol official Bularghu in 1307.438

Recent scholarship has supported that Hayton’s visit to Cyprus in 1305 seems to have been made in light of his conflict with Hetʻum II.439 Hayton’s subsequent entry into the Premonstratensian Abbey in Cyprus may have indeed been the move of an outlaw escaping punishment from Hetʻum II, who was back in power at the time of the prince’s time in Cyprus.440 It should, however, be repeated that the reliability of Cypriot sources is somewhat problematic, considering the lack of information about the author of the *Chronique d’Amadi* or the time in which it was composed. What is known, however, is
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438 *Chronique d’Amadi*, 280. Described as having been “molto contento.”
440 *Chronique d’Amadi*, 254. Described as “fugitive dal re di Armenia.”
that it was likely based on some version of *Les Gestes des Chiprois*, which supports the career of Henry II.\textsuperscript{441}

Learning the details of Hayton’s political opposition to Het’um II is quite a difficult undertaking in light of the dearth of extant source materials. Hayton’s own account, *La Flor des estoires*, or more specifically, the material derived from a particular extant version of the work, serves as an important source of information, which lends support of his defiance towards Het’um II.\textsuperscript{442} Hayton’s antagonistic treatment of Het’um II in *La Flor des estoires* suggests that he sided with a competing faction that supported Smbat’s (one of Het’um II’s brothers) claims to power. Factions within the royal family indeed divided brother against brother, resulting in a violent fratricidal struggle. Placed in governance during Het’um’s II diplomatic activities abroad, Smbat refused to surrender power upon Het’um’s return from the Byzantine capital.\textsuperscript{443}

According to *La Flor des estoires*, Smbat journeyed to the court of Ilkhan Ghazan where he received a mandate for the arrest and detention of Het’um II and T’oros.\textsuperscript{444} Hayton underscores Ilkhanid support of Smbat’s claims to power as a means to legitimize his rule. Further evidence of Ilkhanid support is provided when Hayton notes Smbat’s acceptance of a Mongol bride, an “uxorem eciam de projenie Cassanie,” (a wife from the family of Ghazan).\textsuperscript{445} The gift of receiving a Mongol bride represented a significant diplomatic gesture, as the marriage would have reassured the Armenian claimant of the

\textsuperscript{441} Coureas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus*, 271.
\textsuperscript{442} Kohler, *RHC doc. arm.*, II, x.
\textsuperscript{443} Sources note that Het um II had left Smbat in charge for the duration of his trip to the Byzantine court in 1296. See for example, Sarkis P’icak Ssic’um, in *Minor Chronicles*, I, 106; “The Annals of the Anonymous Sebastac’i,” in *Minor Chronicles*, II, 149.
\textsuperscript{444} Hayton, *La Flor des estoires*, (Latin) 328; (French) 209.
\textsuperscript{445} Ibid.
cordial relations between the two parties, just as in the past when Constable Smbat accepted a Mongol bride upon Cilicia’s submission to the Empire.

Hayton’s account of Smbat’s legitimization finds parallels in other sources, which suggest that there was a wider acceptance of the latter’s claims to power. *Les Gestes des Chiprois* corroborates how ‘Sempad got to the Tartars before them (the visit of Het’um II and T’oros), and married a Tartar wife in order to have a better friendship with them.’

While *Les Gestes des Chiprois* notes Ghazan’s support of Smbat’s claims, it suggests that it only happened because he reached the Ilkhanid court first, before the arrival of Het’um II and T’oros who never made it to their destination, being captured en route. The swift nature of Smbat’s tactics is also alluded to by Hayton. Whether or not the Ilkhan initially supported the claims of Smbat, he later worked with the restored Het’um II during his Syrian invasion of 1299.

Hayton’s legitimization of Smbat’s rule is substantiated in Armenian sources as well, suggesting a wider acceptance of the dynastic change. Indeed, several Armenian scribes seem to have accepted Smbat’s rulership in 1297, which despite all his efforts, turned out to be a short-lived experience. The continuator of the *Chronography of Samuel of Ani* goes as far to say that Smbat was consecrated as king upon gaining the support of the catholicos, in addition to having consolidated the backing of the
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447 *Les Gestes des Chiprois,* 833.

448 Hayton, *La Flor des estoires,* (French) 209, (Latin) 328.


450 The *Chronicle attributed to King Het’um II* relays that there was a rebellion against him in 1296 right before his trip to Constantinople. The *Annals* of Anonymous Sebastac’i refers to Smbat as a king, in *Minor Chronicles,* II, 149 (see year 1297).

451 Colophons, *XIII Century,* see 801 no.638; 803 no.640; 804 no.641; 805 no.642; 806 no.645. Several of these colophons were written from the Cilician cities of Skewra and Sis. For 1298, see 817 no.654.
nobility. Moreover, both the continuator and Nersēs Paliencʿ express that the former’s claims to power were made in response to the pressures of “evil princes.”

Whether being pressured to accept rule or not, sources agree that Smbat resorted to violent measures to solidify his position. Having viciously seized his brothers upon their return from Byzantium, he is noted to have first imprisoned them, followed by ordering the execution of the young T’oros and the mutilation of Hetʿum II, who was left temporarily blinded as a result. This turbulent period of dynastic conflict was marked by further fratricidal struggle as it was not long before Smbat himself was ousted from power by his brother Kostantin, who seems to have been driven by his own political opportunism. Upon being released from captivity, Hetʿum II banished Kostantin into exile as a means to eliminate all political threats.

In addition to legitimizing Smbat’s rise to power, Hayton’s blames Hetʿum II for being an obstinate, weak ruler, responsible for adding to the political instability of his kingdom. A closer look at the antagonistic tone found in La Flor des estoires stands out compared to the information presented by other Armenian and non-Armenian sources, which generally provide a more neutral depiction of the royal figure.

452 “Extrait de la Chronographie de Samuel d’Ani,” 464. See Armenian year 746. ‘The Annals of the Anonymous Sebastacʿi’ notes that Smbat attempted to exile Catholicos Grigor for an unknown reason, suggesting that the religious leader failed to support Smbat’s plans in 1297, in Minor Chronicles, II, 150.

453 Nersēs Paliencʿ, “Fragments of Chronicles,” in Minor Chronicles, II, 183; “Extrait de la Chronographie de Samuel d’Ani,” 464; Table chronologique, 477; (1893), 154.

454 “Extrait de la Chronographie de Samuel d’Ani,” 464; Table chronologique, 477; (1893), 154. The continuator notes that both brothers were imprisoned at Barjrberd (Partzapert). For description of Partzapert (High Castle), Boase, The Cilician Kingdom of Armenia, 175-76. Other sources note that the two brothers were imprisoned in separate locations. Sargis Pʿicak Ssicʿun relays that Hetʿum was taken to Molovon while Tʿoros was sent to Barjrberd, Minor Chronicles, I, 106; For Molovon, see Boase, The Cilician Kingdom of Armenia, 174; ‘The Annals of the Anonymous Sebastacʿi’ simply note that Smbat took the captives into Cilicia upon their return from Byzantium, Minor Chronicles, II, 149.

455 “Extrait de la Chronographie de Samuel d’Ani,” 465; Table chronologique, 477; (1893), 154.

Hayton first focuses on the alleged repeated abdications of the king by underscoring that Het’um II never had an interest in ruling or marrying upon receiving the throne in 1289, and spurned the counsel of his nobles by ceding power to his brother, T’oros, and retreating to Mamistra (ancient Mopsuestia/Armenian Msis), where he oversaw the construction of a grand monastery. Hayton then describes Het’um II’s second abdication when he took the “habitum fratrum Minorum” and became a Franciscan under the name John.

For Hayton, it seems that the act of abdication itself was not the crucial problem. Indeed, he was aware of previous examples of royal abdication in the history of Cilician Armenia including Het’um I’s decision to retire at the end of his long career in 1269. Taking on monastic vows in old age was not frowned upon by contemporaries. Het’um I’s abdication followed a career which spanned over forty years, taking place in the aftermath of the disastrous campaign of Sultan Baybars that resulted in the death of Het’um’s son T’oros and captivity of his other son, Lewon. Armenian sources including Hayton speak in celebratory tones of the Het’um I’s long rule and his adoption of the name Makar upon his retreat to the monastery of Dṙazark at the end of his career in old age. There was clearly precedent for retiring in Cilician Armenian political and cultural memory.

More specifically, Hayton is highly critical of Het’um II’s failure to listen to his kinsmen and place the security of his kingdom as a priority. Instead, Het’um II is

457 Hayton, La Flor des estoires, 326. A colophon from 1296 also describes Het’um’s project in Mamistra. Colophons, XIII century, 788-89 no.628.
458 Hayton, La Flor des estoires, 328.
459 “Extrait de la Chronographie de Samuel d’Ani,” 462 (see Armenian year 719); Table chronologique, 475; (1893), 151, 155; Vahram Rabuni, RHC doc.arm.I, 525. The poem of the royal scribe emphasizes Lewon’s reluctance in accepting the crown and his subsequent grief upon learning of his father’s passing. Hayton, Cronicon, 75.
presented as an obstinate leader who refused to accept counsel from others. On several occasions, Hayton juxtaposes Het’um II’s judgment with that of “his brothers and all the prelates, nobles and vassals…,” all of whom are critical of the king and prioritized the security of Cilician Armenia.

Hayton’s treatment is rather unfair and appears to be scapegoating Hetʻum II for the severity of the Mamlûk assaults during the late thirteenth century. This was indeed a catastrophic period for the Armenian kingdom as Mamlûk Sultan al-Ashraf launched aggressive strikes, proving victorious over Hrômkla in 1292. In this period of turmoil, it is unsurprising that several Armenian scribes lament the depth of destruction caused by the Mamlûk forces, which also resulted in the humiliating captivity of Catholicos Step’anos IV (1290-93). In the Latin East, the loss of the coastal city of Acre expunged the crusaders from mainland Syria; shortly after the Genoese and Venetians recommenced war in 1293, which was resolved at the Battle of Curzola in 1298.

Additional political instability emerged with the weak rule of Ilkhan Geikhatu (r.1291-95), who according to the Chronography of Bar Hebraeus, ruled as one who “occupied himself with nothing except riotous living, and amusement and debauchery.” The beginning of Ilkhan Ghazan’s (r.1295-1304) reign in 1295 also proved uncertain for the Christian subjects within the Empire because of his short-lived persecutions of churches and other non-Islamic religious institutions upon his conversion
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460 Hayton, La Flor des estoires, 326.
461 Hayton, La Flor des estoires, 327.
462 T.S.R. Boase dates this first abdication as early as 1292. Boase, The Kingdom of Cilician Armenia, 29.
463 Colophons, XIII century, 691 no. 560; 696 no.564. Major clashes also occurred between the pro-Roman position of the Cilician leaders and the majority of clergy. Het’um II’s own Poem speaks of the obstinacy of his people in accepting the Roman date for Easter, Het’um II, Poem, 553-54.
464 Edbury, The Kingdom of Cyprus, 110.
465 Bar Hebraeus, Chronography, 494.
as a Muslim. Hayton’s blame on Hetʿum II’s vacillations and recalcitrant behaviour is thus significantly divorced from the context of these wider circumstances, which added to the political instability of not only Cilician Armenia, but of the Eastern Mediterranean world. Hayton’s oppositional treatment of Hetʿum II is particularly evident in comparison to other sources which relay that Hetʿum II showed great concern for the security of his kingdom, indicated by his journey to Ghazan’s court in 1295 to stop the destruction of the churches and his diplomatic exchanges with Byzantium.\(^{466}\) In addition to his diplomatic ventures, Hetʿum II clearly participated in Ghazan’s expeditions, indicating that he also served as military leader and was not simply a recluse as Hayton suggests in his portrait of the king.\(^{467}\)

*La Flor des estoires* also contains two additional references which speak of Hayton’s hostility towards the king. Firstly, the author compares the success of his own accomplishments to the failures of Hetʿum II in upholding the royal duty of protecting the kingdom. Hetʿum II’s selfish interests, therefore, stand in direct contrast to Hayton’s praise of his own responsibilities as lord to fight for his kingdom, which took priority over his own desires to enter a monastery. Hayton cites God, Otho de Grandson, the

\(^{466}\) Bar Hebraeus notes how the king traveled to the Ilkhanid court to plead with Ghazan to stop the destruction of the Christian churches, Bar Hebraeus, *Chronography*, 506; “Extrait de la Chronographie de Samuel d’Ani,” 464; *Les Gestes des Chiprois*, 847; Sarkis Pizak Ssecʿou, *Minor Chronicles*, I, 106; An Armenian colophon of 1296 also speaks of Hetʿum II’s visit to Ghazan and the anxiety following the murder of his predecessor, Baidu, who is described as a Christian Ilkhan. *Colophons, XIII Century*, 772-773 no.622; The *Annals* of Anonymous Sebastacʿi notes that the destructive activities were carried out by Sahib diwan, *Minor Chronicles*, II, 149; Fifteenth century chronicler Kirakos dates the visit earlier to 1294, Kirakos Ṙštuncʿu, in *Minor Chronicles*, I, 120.

Masters of the Templars and Hospitallers, their members, and everyone else in Cilician Armenia and Cyprus as witnesses to his accomplishments.  

A final element of opposition towards Het’um II’s rule is found in Hayton’s lavish praise of the future Lewon IV (born 1298), who was crowned in 1305/06. Hayton downplays Het’um II’s control over the kingdom’s affairs as regent, preferring to concentrate on the future of the young ruler. Hayton’s support of Lewon stands in direct contrast to his negative portrait of the oscillating rule of Het’um II, a depiction which has been accepted by a number of modern scholars, who have also underscored his vacillating decisions.  

It is plausible that Hayton concentrates on Lewon as a way to indicate the onset of more stable political conditions within the kingdom. With a state of increased stability, the kingdom could better serve as a suitable base for the crusaders. What is missing from this treatment is that Het’um II continued to play a major role in the governance of the kingdom, despite having relinquished official power to Lewon. Het’um II’s authority was most evident in his overseeing of the Council of Sis in 1307, where he aggressively pushed Catholicism upon the Armenian clergy.  

Despite the optimism placed upon Lewon IV’s career, Cilician Armenia was undergoing a transitional period. Internal discord continued to place immense pressures upon the stability of the kingdom. Moreover, Ilkhanid-Armenian ties became increasingly

468 Hayton, La Flor des estoires, 330; Otho de Grandson, a nobleman, had been involved in the protection of Acre and visited Cilician Armenia. Stewart, “The Armenian Kingdom and the Mongol-Frankish Encounter,” 274-75.
470 See for example, Claude Mutafian, “Brilliant Diplomacy,” 107.
472 Colophon sources refer to Het’um as the ‘Grand Baron’ after the coronation of Levon as king, see Sanjian, Colophons, 50-5.
distanced after Ghazan’s reign. These changes were most evident when young Lewon and Het’um II were assassinated by the Mongol official Bularghu in 1307. Hayton’s opposition to Het’um II was, therefore, reflective of the kingdom’s growing political instability as a result of both internal and external factors.

Political upheaval would indeed continue to plague the kingdom, involving Hayton’s own children who also became involved in later fourteenth century dynastic struggles in Cilician Armenia. It is worth highlighting how deeply the heirs of Korykos became embroiled in the dynastic feuds of the fourteenth century to reveal the extent of the political influence exercised by Hayton and his heirs over the major affairs of the kingdom. A brief look at the career of his son, Ōšin, indicates how the family played a critical role in Cilician politics during the early fourteenth century.

Ōšin rose as a key actor in the political affairs of the kingdom through his skillful marriage alliances.⁴⁷³ First, he married into the upper social echelons of the Cypriot kingdom, through his union to Margaret of Ibelin, the daughter of Seneschal Balian of Ibelin and his wife Alice.⁴⁷⁴ Ōšin of Korykos subsequently had a second marriage to King Ōšin I’s widow, Jeanne of Anjou, daughter of Philip of Sicily, prince of Taranto.⁴⁷⁵ Scholarship has also suggested that the heir of Korykos was responsible for the murder of the king.⁴⁷⁶ Through this marriage, Hayton’s son consequently served as bailiff and regent for the young son, Lewon. An Armenian colophon written in 1325 refers to Ōšin
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⁴⁷⁴ W.H. Rüdt-Collenberg, ““Les Ibelins aux XIIe et XVe siècles”, in Familles de l’Orient latin XIie-XIVe siècles (London: Variorum Reprints, 1983), 182-84; Coureas, “Lusignan Cyprus and Lesser Armenia, 1195-1375,” 37. Balian’s wife was Alice of Lambron, sister of Kyrranna and sister-in-law of King Lewon III.
⁴⁷⁵ Rüdt-Collenberg, The Rupenides, Hethumides and Lusignans: The Structure of the Armeno-Cilician Dynasties, 13, 15; Rüdt-Collenberg notes that Ōšin of Korykos may have been her lover before the death of the royal husband.
⁴⁷⁶ Ibid, 72. Rüdt-Collenberg refers to the lord of Korykos as the “supposed murderer.”
as one of the three “principal and illustrious” guardians for the young Lewon; the other two included Hayton’s other son, Kostantin, and another prince named Hetʿum Nsrecʿi. Hayton’s son Kostantin also extended significant political influence by serving as the kingdom’s constable.  

Nonetheless, in the turbulent politics of the time, Ōšin’s rise to power proved short-lived when Lewon IV (r.1320-41) had both his father-in-law and wife assassinated, as relayed in detail by Jean Dardel, the Franciscan mediator involved in Lewon V’s (d.1393) release from Egyptian captivity. One manuscript continuation of the *Chronicle attributed to King Hetʿum II* adds that Lewon delivered Regent Ōšin’s head, along with that of his treasonous brother, to the Egyptian Sultan Melik Naser.  

Violence and treasonous plots were indeed a symptom of the unstable climate of fourteenth century Cilician Armenia. External political threats, religious debate, fragmenting alliances, all played a role in destabilizing the royal court. As Seta Dadoyan has noted, “it was during the reign of King Lewon IV (1320-1342) that both the kingdom
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477 *Colophons, XIV Century*, 193 no. 240. Sanjian’s English translation reads as the following: “…This commentary was completed during the reign of King Lewon (Leon IV of Cilicia), son of Awšin (King Ōšin), the minor, newly anointed and most pious and devout child. Because of his minority, the throne is administered by the three principal and illustrious princes, (namely) the two brothers, Baron Awšin (Oshin) and Baron Kostandin, who hold the ranks of Grand Baron and Gundustaple respectively, and the third Baron Hetʿum Nłrcʿi.” Sanjian, *Colophons*, 66 no.2. Ōšin arranged the marriage of his daughter, Alice of Korykos, to the young Lewon. Through this marriage, Ōšin exercised substantial political power, ruling behind the young king.  
479 Jean Dardel, *Chronique*, 20. Dardel also highlights the negative character of Regent Ōšin’s daughter, Alice, whose assassination allegedly occurred as the result of her “dishonest life.” Lewon took Constanza of Sicily as his second wife, also the widow of King Henry II of Cyprus following his death. The continuator of the *Chronicle of Constable Smbat* maintains the innocence of King Lewon V in the assassination plot, blaming instead a group of royal officers, who had made an unauthorized occupation of castles in the immediate aftermath of the death of King Ōšin. *RHC doc. arm.*, I, 670-71. The studies of scholars Bayarsaikhan Dashdondog and Mark Chahin have contextualized Regent Ōšin’s antagonism towards Lewon as part of the wider religious conflict between the two parties, characterizing the former as an anti-Catholic power and the latter as a supporter of Union with the Latin Church. Dashdondog, *The Mongols and the Armenians*, 215; Mark Chahin, *The Kingdom of Armenia*, (2nd edition, Surrey: Curzon Press, 2001), 291.  
480 *The Chronicle attributed to King Hetʿum II*, 88. See entry for year 1329.
and the Catholicosate encountered the most serious problems at doctrinal and political levels." 481 Hayton’s and his heirs’ involvement in the political feuds thus reflected the wider discordant nature of the era and their participation in the highest level of Cilician Armenian politics. 482

3.3 Religious Overtures: Ties to the Premonstratensian Order in Cyprus

The Armenian prince’s entry into the Premonstratensian abbey in Bellapaïs, Cyprus, was a combined result of the Cilician-Cypriot ties, the process of Latinization among the Armenian royalty and the kingdom’s diplomatic policy of Union with Rome. A more detailed look at Hayton’s religious career reveals the impact of Latin Western influence on the social lives of the Cilician nobility and royalty. This section will analyze and situate Hayton’s Latinized religious identity in the wider context of the social relations between the Cypriots and Cilicians and the diplomatic dialogue between the Latin West and the Armenian kingdom.

Hayton entered the architectural gem also known as the White Abbey or Episcopia, situated in northern Cyprus in 1305, just before Amaury’s plot against Henry II. As aforementioned, it is a possibility that he entreated the abbey as a fugitive, in hopes of getting away from the political disturbance in Cilician Armenia and facing a reprisal from Hetʿum II. The Cypriot interlude did not stop him from later returning to Cilician Armenia and playing an active role in the kingdom’s defense.

Nonetheless, Hayton did not lead a quiet life in Cyprus. Most likely in the capacity as a lay brother, he became a keen promoter of a crusade and defender of

482 Boase, The Cilician Kingdom of Armenia, 29. Boase also underscores the difficulty in knowing whether Hayton was forced to leave Cyprus or did so willingly.
Amaury’s legitimacy to Clement V in 1307. While the motivation behind Hayton’s choice to enter this specific abbey remains somewhat obscure considering the lack of information pertaining to the abbey, his Latinized religious identity served as a way to promote his political interests. The process of Latinization was evident in his life from an earlier period, based on a reference in the Latin version of La Flor des estoires, which mentions that Hayton had previously visited a Latin monastery called “Vallem Viridem,” which Claude Mutafian has suggested to be situated in France when he traveled “transmarinem.” The Cypriot interlude represents a window into his Latinized identity, which found parallels in the lives of his Cilician peers. A closer look at his ties to the abbey reveals the complex interconnectedness between the Cypriot and Cilician kingdoms.

Before looking at Hayton’s entry into the abbey, it is worthwhile to note the brief history of the abbey in its Cypriot context to provide an understanding of why the Armenian prince chose the Premonstratensians, as opposed to entering other Latin religious houses on the island. The Premonstratensian Order itself had been established in the twelfth century by St. Norbert of Xanten and came to develop several holdings in the Latin East. Having initially adopted Augustinian rule in the twelfth century, it gradually fell under Cistercian influence in Cyprus. Notwithstanding its half-ruined and quiet state today, the Premonstratensian abbey once functioned as a thriving religious house in Cyprus during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

483 Hayton, La Flor des estoires, 252.  
484 Hayton, La Flor des estoires, 330. Claude Mutafian suggests that it could be a reference to an abbey in Paris or Nîmes in southern France, “Héthoum de Korykos,” 164.  
485 Coureas, The Latin Church in Cyprus, 201.
The prominent status of the abbey in the fourteenth century and its ties to the leading Cypriot families seems to have served as a major factor in shaping Hayton’s decision to enter it. Episcopia enjoyed the benefits of royal patronage and developed into a prominent religious house; other Cypriot houses like that of the Cistercian Beaulieu equally enjoyed a high degree of sponsorship. King Hugh III (1267-84) served as significant patron of the Premonstratensian abbey, endowing it with major gifts. The abbey continued to enjoy royal patronage under the rule of Hugh IV (1324-59). Consequently, by the time of Hayton’s entry, the abbey served as one of the most important religious centers in Cyprus, making it well-suited for an influential royal of the Cilician kingdom. Nicholas Coureas has pointed out that the abbey had indeed become well-known to Armenian royals who visited it during the thirteenth century. Based on the abbey’s prominence and ties to both the Cypriot and Cilician royalty, it is hardly surprising that Hayton, with his marital ties to the powerful family of the Ibelins, chose to reside at Episcopia.

Hayton’s entry into the Premonstratensian abbey can also be studied in parallel to a wider social pattern among his Armenian peers. Sources indicate that Cilician Armenian royals established prominent Latin religious identities in Cyprus. This was particularly evident for the women after becoming widows. The pattern was made possible through the large number of intermarriages between the kingdoms. In particular, two Cilician princesses are known to have become Latin nuns upon being widowed. They appear to have entered the Benedictine abbey of Our Lady of Tyre in Nicosia (now
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486 Enlart, *Gothic Art and the Renaissance in Cyprus*, 175-76.
487 Coureas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus*, 204. Coureas suggests that King Het’um I and Het’um II entered the abbey as monks. Coureas also explains that the Armenian ties to the abbey highlight how the renowned site “acquired a reputation that transcended the confines of Cyprus itself.”
located in a Turkish military zone), which functioned as the most important abbey for Latin women in Cyprus, having replaced the abbey of St. Mary the Great in Jerusalem.488 Hetʿum I’s daughter, Euphemia, called Fimi in Armenian sources, entered Our Lady of Tyre as an abbess in 1308-1309, after the death of her husband, Julian of Sidon (d.1275), Count of Jaffa. 489 This was a privileged position as the abbey also received significant patronage from the Cypriot upper class.490 Her sister, Maria, second wife of Guy of Ibelin, appears to have entered the same nunnery following the death of her husband.491 The abbey would later fall under Armenian control. Additionally, intermarriages played a role in shaping the religious identities of the female royals elsewhere. In the context of Armenian-Byzantine ties, Hetʿum II’s sister, Rita, who became Byzantine Empress through her marriage to Michael IX, also became a nun named Maria at the end of her career.492

Aside from the role of intermarriage, increased Latin missionary activity in the East seems to have encouraged the process of religious Latinization among prominent Armenians. Later Armenian diplomats to Avignon including Nersēs Paliencʿ converted to Catholicism as a result of the surge in missionary activity in the East rather than through marriage. 493 The high level of intercultural encounters in the Eastern Mediterranean and later missions to the Caucasus during the fourteenth century played an important role in

488 Edbury, *The Kingdoms of the Crusaders: From Jerusalem to Cyprus*, 104.
490 Edbury, *The Kingdoms of the Crusaders: From Jerusalem to Cyprus*, 104.
492 Ibid, 71.
shaping this religious trend, which in turn, helped foster closer relations between the papacy and the Catholic convert communities. Like Hayton, converts like Nersēs Paliencʿ would use their Latinized religious identities to pursue diplomacy with the papacy.494

Furthermore, Hayton’s choice to enter the Premonstratensian abbey also seems to have been connected to its ties to his wife, Isabella of the Ibelin family. According to the Chronique d’Amadi, Guy of Ibelin, son of the seneschal Balian of Ibelin and Alice of Lambron, was buried in the abbey of Bellapaïs on 8 September 1309.495 Guy’s sister, Margaret, had married Hayton’s son, Ōšin of Korykos, regent for the young Lewon IV.496 Additionally, C.K. Slack has noted that the Ibelin family had served as a benefactor of the Norbertine Order in Palestine, which also received aid from the Latin patriarch and king.497 The family’s connections to the Premonstratensians thus continued in their Cypriot history.

Additionally, the Premonstratensian abbey also appears to have housed many supporters of Amaury. Nicholas Coureas has observed how Chronique d’Amadi speaks of a “fra Bartholomio abbate della Piscopia,” as one participant in a delegation sent to King Henry II, which sought to legitimize Amaury’s claim as governor.498 The Premonstratensian partisanship toward Amaury was contrasted by the Franciscan support for Henry II, who had previously served as a major supporter of the mendicant order’s expansion in the island. Coureas further notes that the Franciscans had a monastery next

494 Nersessian, Treasures from the Ark, 55.
495 Enlart, Gothic Art and the Renaissance in Cyprus, 174; Coureas, The Latin Church in Cyprus, 204; Chronique d’Amadi, 293. “A di 8 settembrio, mori messer Gui de Iblim, fo de messer Balian (de Ibl)hin, synescalco de Cypro. et fut seppulto a al Piscopia de li frati. ch’è appresso Cerines.”
498 Coureas, The Latin Church in Cyprus, 204; Chronique d’Amadi, 302. Edbury, The Kingdom of Cyprus, 118-20. Edbury provides the background of the conflict between Henry II and Amaury, which centred on the former’s refusal to acknowledge his brother’s claims to power.
to the Cypriot king’s palace, which also serves as evidence for his esteem for the Franciscans, who unsurprisingly, remained loyal to the king during Amaury’s revolt. It is also worth noting that the *Chronique d’Amadi* also specifies that Franciscans accompanied Henry II in his exile to Cilician Armenia.

The cases of the Cypriot Franciscans and the Premonstratensians highlight the complex ways in which religious affairs became connected to the Cypriot political struggles of the early fourteenth century, illustrating the intersection between religious and political interests. Hayton’s choice to enter the abbey at Bellapais exemplifies this blending of interests as the Premonstratensians received Ibelin patronage and became involved in Amaury’s coup.

The intertwining of religious and political interests is further evident in another aspect of Hayton’s embassy to Clement V in Poitiers. In addition to representing Amaury in his solicitation of papal recognition of his status in Cyprus, Hayton worked on behalf of the Premonstratensians in pursuit of the religious interests of the abbey at the papal court. He notified the curia that the Greek Orthodox monastery of St. George of Mangana, situated near Nicosia, was acting in disobedience and requested that their lands be transferred to the Latin abbey in Bellapais. Mangana was one of the prominent Orthodox monasteries on the island, which also held holdings in Cilician Armenia and Palestine. While the monastery had property in Armenia, it appears Hayton’s request was in response to the Premonstratensian abbey in Cyprus. His role in promoting the
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interests of the Premonstratensians thus reflects another dimension of his close ties to the Latins of Cyprus and integration in the religious life of the kingdom.

A papal letter dated 8 February 1308 was addressed to Mangana in response to the complaint. While it appears Clement V directed bishops to look into the matter, the Orthodox monastery continued to enjoy a stable existence throughout the fourteenth century. Its longevity into the fourteenth century suggests that Hayton’s complaint did not materialize in any permanent transfer of lands from Greek to Latin hands.

Furthermore, Pope John XXII safeguarded Mangana from later Latin interests. Chris Schabel has highlighted that Mangana became particularly well-protected by the papacy in the fourteenth century.

While Hayton’s Premonstratensian identity reflected his close ties to the world of the Latin East, it can also be understood as part of the diplomatic dialogue between Cilician Armenia and the papacy. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Cilician leadership placed great emphasis on projecting a pro-Latin position to the papacy from the late thirteenth century onwards. This pro-Latin stance was articulated in various ways including the official Councils of Sis in 1307 and Adana in 1314, as well as evidenced by
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502 Acta Clementis V, 41 no.24.
the individual cases like Hetʿum II’s articulation as a Franciscan brother. This policy would continue into the fourteenth century as evidenced by the embassies of Catholic Armenian ambassadors to Avignon, including the visit of the Franciscan Daniel of Tabriz, who presented *Libellus de erroribus Armenorum* to the papacy in 1336.

Hayton understood the diplomatic value of his Latin religious identity by emphasizing to the papacy the sincerity of his decision to become a Premonstratensian canon, specifically noting how the pursuit of a quiet, reclusive life had been his desire for many years, and not just reflective of a decision he took before coming to the Latin West. The articulations of Latin religious identity by individuals like Hayton and Hetʿum II were not just coincidental in timing, but were situated within a period in which the Cilician kingdom desperately negotiated for military aid from the Latin West and attempted to subdue any trace of skepticism that the papacy might have harbored towards the sincerity of their conversions.

### 3.4 Translating Catholicism: The Cronicon and Attributed Genealogical Text

In addition to *La Flor des estoires*, Hayton produced an Armenian chronicle, which was clearly reliant on various western sources and largely appears to be a translation of unidentified Frankish sources. A high number of French words are found in the text, indicating that the author had knowledge of the French vernacular and likely produced an Armenian translation based on his access to French sources. In his critical edition of the *Cronicon*, Vahram Hakobyan notes that this is particularly evident when looking at

---

509 Hakobyan also suggests that the chronicle reflects, at times, a rough translation, as a result of the compiler’s difficulties in translating from a foreign language into Armenian. The text also makes several errors including noting the arrival of “William the Bastard” in England in 666 and his death in 1086. Hayton, *Cronicon*, 56 (year 1068).
the high number of French words (such as noel, homage, etc.) used throughout the text, many of which were known in Cilician Armenia as a result of its contacts with the Latin East. Knowledge of foreign languages was especially evident within the court according to Seta B. Dadoyan who concludes that “most Cilician authors knew at least one foreign language and were more open to other religious and intellectual cultures.” While it is unknown if Hayton worked on the chronicle during his time abroad in Cyprus or in the Latin West, the translation indicates his knowledge of western languages.

Unlike La Flor des estoires, the chronicle is not divided into books which treat a separate subject matter. It serves as an overview of the main historical events from Christ’s Nativity to the year 1294, when Celestine V retired and Pope Boniface VIII rose as his successor. It, therefore, has a longer temporal scope than the Chronicle attributed to King Hetʿum II which only covers the medieval period from 1076-1296. In chronological order, Hayton’s text begins by recording the lives of the Roman emperors and papacy, in addition to including details on the length of rule of each ruler, their proclamation of decrees, construction or renovation of buildings, and place of burial. Interspersed are details of major historical events pertaining the Latin West and later concerning the world of the Eastern Mediterranean.

---

510 Hayton, Cronicon, 34.  
512 The Cronicon’s presentation of imperial history focuses on the West rather than recording the lives of the Byzantine Emperors, who saw themselves as the rightful successors of the Roman Empire. The Cronicon proceeds to cover the various careers of the Julio-Claudian, Flavian, Nerva-Antonine, Severan, Illyrian, Constantinian, and Theodosian families. It then begins to cover the careers of the emperors of the East after the fragmentation of the Western Empire, covering Leonid, Justinian, Heraclian, and the rulers from the period known as the ‘twenty years of anarchy,’ between period of 695-717. The text jumps from one figure to another, skipping certain careers, such as its jump from Pope Urban I (r.222/3-30) to Pope Dionysius (r.259-68). Hayton, Cronicon, 41.
For its first half, the *Cronicon* incorporates significant information on the Latin West, describing, for example, the rise of Charlemagne, who is referred to as Charles I in the text and as Emperor of the Romans. The *Cronicon*, from this point onwards, reveals the *translatio imperii* (transfer of rule) that represented the western rulers as the inheritors as emperors of the Romans in what evolved into the Holy Roman Empire.\(^{513}\) The text’s focus is clearly on the Latin West, covering the rise of the Merovingian dynasty, the Islamic invasions in Europe including the Arab Sack of Rome in 846, the history of the Carolingian Empire, and the notable career of Robert Guiscard, the eleventh century Norman adventurer, and details on the lives of prominent western saints including St. Ambrose of Milan (c.340-397) and St. Martin of Tours (316-397). Thus its early scope largely ignores the history of Byzantium and the Eastern Christian world.

Moreover, in the vein of other medieval chronicles, the Armenian text incorporates legendary information circulated in western literature.\(^{514}\) Constantine the Great’s mother, Helena, is presented as a native of Britain who was responsible for finding the True Cross.\(^{515}\) For the year 733, the *Cronicon* also records a vision of Charles Martel in hell because of his conflicts with the Church—the depiction presented in the western text, *Vita Eucherii*.\(^{516}\) Yet another example is found in the entry for the year 809, where the text describes Roland the Frankish knight and his “Count paladin” who proved victorious against the Muslim troops in Spain until Knight Ganelon’s betrayal, thus paralleling the

---

\(^{513}\) Hayton, *Cronicon*, 51, (year 809). The text speaks of Emperor Michael (year 816) and Leo (817). These careers likely refer to those of Michael I Rangabe (r. 812-13) and Leo V (r.813-820) of Byzantium.\(^{514}\) The chronicler likely viewed these details as part of his records, and therefore, as historical truths. According to Gabrielle M. Spiegel, “Facing the past, the medieval chronicler viewed himself as a faithful conveyor of the written record and his text as a vehicle for transmitting segments of the past texts conjoined.” Spiegel, “Genealogy: Form and Function in Medieval Historical Narrative,” *History and Theory* 22 (1983): 45.\(^{515}\) Hayton, *Cronicon*, 42; Antonina Harbus, *Helena of Britain in Medieval Legend* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2002).\(^{516}\) Joanna Story, *Charlemagne Empire and Society* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), 13.
tradition of the *Chanson de Rolande*, the heroic poem based on the Battle of Roncevaux in 778.

As the *Cronicon* progresses, it transitions into the history of the crusades and the affairs of the Latin East for its coverage from the late eleventh century onwards. The *Cronicon’s* later history largely incorporates the history of the Latin East, while adding interspersed details on the Latin West. Vahram Hakobyan has also pointed out that the history of the Latin East includes information on Cilician Armenian affairs, especially evident from the year 1173 onwards.517

As Hakobyan has noted, the extensive coverage of Latin history suggests that the chronicler’s significantly relied upon western sources, and more specifically, on the popular thirteenth century text, *Chronicon pontificum et imperatorum* of Dominican friar Martinus Oppaviensis (d.1278), who served as chaplain to Pope Nicholas III (r.1277-80) and as Archbishop of Gniezno in Poland.518 The *Cronicon’s* incorporation of imperial and papal history indeed seems to be drawing from a version of the widely circulated text, which also covered the history of the Roman popes and emperors.

While Martinus Oppaviensis, also known as Martinus Polonus, produced a wide corpus of literature, including a collection of sermons, a compilation of decretals, his *Chronicon Pontificum et Imperatorum* was, according to Anna-Dorothea von den Bricken, “by far the most popular papal and imperial chronicle of the Middle Ages.”519

The Dominican’s *Chronicon Pontificum et Imperatirum* gained substantial popularity by

---

517 Hayton, *Cronicon*, 33.
518 Ibid, 34. Hakobyan also indicates that many of these words had become used in Cilician Armenia based on the kingdom’s interactions with the crusaders. Nonetheless, Hakobyan notes a degree poor translation in certain sections, *Cronicon*, 35.
serving as a didactic aid for clerics, as its chronological information was originally organized into two columns, listing the successions of the popes and emperors, beginning from the birth of Jesus and ending with the friar’s death. In its annalistic form, it places papal chronology on the verso pages of the text, while the emperors follow on the recto side. This format, however, was later abandoned after repeated copies were made. Paralleling other medieval chronicles, the Chronicon Pontificum et Imperatorum included anecdotal and legendary narratives in its efforts to transmit records of the past.

It is highly possible that Hayton had access to a version of the chronicle as the “medieval best-seller” circulated widely in the Latin West and was copied in more than four hundred extant manuscripts. Additionally, it was translated into several vernacular languages including Greek and continued by later chroniclers. Copies also seem to have made their way to the Near East, as a direct result of increased cross-cultural activity based on the intensification of missionary and mercantile presence in the region.

In addition to Hayton’s likely reliance upon the chronicle, a version of the Dominican’s text became known to the Armenian prince’s contemporary, Rāshīd ad-Dīn Fadl-allāh Hamadānī (1247-1318), Persian vizier to the Ilkhans, and to Nersēs Palienc’, the Dominican convert who made an Armenian translation in the mid-fourteenth century. Hayton’s Cronicon and the Jamīʿ al-tawarīkh would have been made possible

521 Ibid.
522 Ibid, 327.
523 Ibid, 331-332.
because of the high level of exchanges within the Ilkhanate and Latin East. By the time of Nersēs Paliencʿ, missionary activity had intensified, encouraging Armenian converts to embark on translating Latin works into Armenian. The lands of the Ilkhanate, including places like Tabriz, became zones of high intercultural contacts, where were clerics, scholars, missionaries, merchants, and diplomats, gathered and exchanged ideas.

Scholarship has insightfully shown that Armenian artists travelled to Ilkhanid cities like Tabriz and actively participated in the exchange of ideas.

Aside from the Oppaviensis text, Hayton’s chronicle seems to have built upon additional Old French texts circulated in the Latin East. A closer look at the Cronicon suggests that it may have used a source closely related to the Annales de Terre Sainte, which was composed in Old French in Latin Syria and is now extant in three principal redactions. The latter source covers the main historical events of the crusades and the Latin East. Les Gestes des Chiprois; La Chronique d’Amadi; the Continuations of

525 The Persian vizier’s objectives were to glorify his Ilkhanid patrons. His treatment of the Franks is thus intended to highlight their place among the many cultures in contact with the Mongols, including the Chinese, Jews, Turks, Indians and Franks. For this latter group, Rashid al-Din first includes a geographical overview of Europe, followed by the inclusion of an annalistic account of papal and imperial history, which clearly relies on the Oppaviensis text, beginning with Christ’s Nativity and Passion and ending with the careers of Pope Benedict XI (1303-04) and Emperor Albert I (1298-1308). Karl Jahn, “Histoire Universelle de Rašīd al-Dīn Fadl Allāh Abul-Khair,” (Leiden: Brill, 1951), 5.

526 R.-J. Loenertz, “Les Missions dominicains en Orient au Quatorzième Siècle,” AFP II (1932): 1-83, especially, 40; Christine Gadrat, Une Image de l’Orient au XIVe siècle,” 45; Tabriz, established as the capital of the Ilkhans under the reign of Öljeitü, reaped the fruits of Latin proselytizing efforts. Successful missions occurred in the main urban centers, which contained Armenian inhabitants as well. Tabriz became a bishopric, with Dominican Bartolomeo Abagliati established as its head. In fact, by the early fourteenth century, Catholic bishoprics were established in various Ilkhanid cities, revealing the impact of missions along trade routes. Judith Pfeiffer, ed. Politics, Patronage and Transmission of Knowledge in 13th-15th Century Tabriz (Leiden: Brill, 2014).


William of Tyre (in Old French); and Venetian theorist Marino Sanudo were all acquainted with the text or a version closely related to it.529

Each of these aforementioned works relied upon the Old French chronicle in varying degrees. For the sources produced in the Latin East, the annalistic account makes up the first book of *Les Gestes des Chiprois* and was written between the years 1314-1321.530 According to Peter W. Edbury, the *Chronique d’Amadi* employed the *Annales de Terre Sainte* for its coverage of the affairs of the thirteenth century, while the continuations of William of Tyre incorporated it for the history of the Latin East post-1240s.531

Hayton’s *Cronicon* similarly relies upon a source closely related to the *Annales de Terre Sainte* for its details on the main events of the crusades including the Christian attack on Damietta in 1218 and its subsequent loss in 1221; the building or renovation of key crusader fortresses such as Montreal (described by its Arabic form Shawbak) in 1115; the deaths of the principal figures of the Latin East such as that of John of Ibelin, the Lord of Beirut, in 1235; and the major catastrophes that impacted the Crusader East including the earthquake in Acre in 1202.532

While a close inter-textual study between these texts remains outside the parameters of this study, what is important to highlight is that the *Cronicon*’s author viewed the history of Outremer as the natural continuation of its earlier coverage of western affairs.

531 Edbury, “Famagusta and the Tradition of History Writing in Frankish Cyprus,” 45.
532 While the *Cronicon* places John of Ibelin’s death in 1235, it occurred a year later as noted in the *Annales de Terre Sainte*. 
The compilation of Old French sources makes it possible to progress from the history of the Latin West into the world of the Latin Eastern Mediterranean.

More importantly, the *Cronicon*’s progression from the affairs of the Latin West into the Frankish East includes a place for the kingdom of Cilician Armenia. While Cilician Armenian affairs are treated as part of the general history of the Latin East, they are not presented as the main focus of the historical narrative, which highlights the main events of the Latin East. The wider focus on the affairs of the Latin East situates Cilician Armenia as part of the Frankish political landscape and can be viewed as an extension Hayton’s Latinized identity.

Hayton does not refrain from covering the main events of the Hetʿumian dynasty, including details of Constable Smbat’s trip to the court of Guyuk Khan in 1246; the marriage of King Hetʿum I’s daughter, Rita, to Constantine of Sarvantikar in 1261; the Mamlūk attack against the kingdom in 1266; the coronation of King Lewon II in Tarsus in 1271; the succession of Hetʿum II in 1289; and the Mamlūk campaign against Hṙomkla in 1292. These details serve to further situate the Cilician Armenian kingdom as an integral political power of the Latin East.

The progression from the Latin West to the world of the Eastern Mediterranean can thus be understood as an extension of Hayton’s Latinized identity and his pro-Union position. The *Cronicon* not only reflects Hayton’s interest in Latin historiography, based on his general interest as a *Patmicʿ* (historian), but can also be viewed as part of his wider pro-Union interests. By showing papal and imperial history as the precursor to the world of the Latin East—in which Cilician Armenia also occupies a place—Hayton underscores
the natural link between Catholicism and the kingdom, making it seem a natural progression rather than the forced efforts of the leadership in the name of diplomacy.

Hayton’s efforts directly parallel those of Nersēs of Palienc’, a fourteenth century convert to Catholicism who visited the papal court at Avignon. He would later translate the Oppaviensis chronicle from Latin into Armenian around c.1347. Similar to Hayton’s Latinized identity, Nersēs, as the bishop of Urmia, worked to promote Catholic interests upon the Orthodox Armenians, as evidenced in his *libellus* of 1341, *Fides armenorum*, which addressed the errors of the Armenians and their traditional Orthodoxy. His interests in translating the Oppaviensis chronicle can also be seen in parallel to Hayton’s writing to promote Latin culture in the East. Both their efforts were in direct response to the growing desire of the papacy to exert control over the Christian East.

Indeed, the later movement of the Armenian *Fratres Unitores*, or Armenian converts to Catholicism in Iran and the Caucasus can also be understood as a product of Latin influence over eastern affairs. These later fourteenth century converts to the Dominican Order also engaged in significant translation projects, working several Latin texts into Armenian, as part of their agenda in promoting their Latin faith among the Orthodox clergy. These later translations of the Unitor movement could similarly be understood as textual transmissions of religious identity. Indeed, the works of Dominican friar Thomas Aquinas, for example, became available in Armenian translations.

---

533 Hakoyan, *Minor Chronicles*, II, 174-175. Hakobyan mentions that the Matenadaran houses four extant manuscripts of the Armenian convert’s translation. See also Hayton, *Chronicon*, 35 ft. 2.


Similar to the context of diplomatic exchange between the papacy and Cilician leadership, the interests of the Armenian Catholic brethren became closely attached to the efforts of Pope John XXII, who encouraged the establishment of bishoprics in the East.537 Numerous monasteries were founded in Greater Armenia, which attracted erudite Armenian scholars to produce these works of translation.538 These translations thus emerged during a period of close contacts between the papacy and the Armenian clergy of the Caucasus region, which ran parallel to dialogue fostered between the Latin West and Cilician kingdom.

In addition to the *Cronicon*, the genealogical text attributed to Hayton also aims to present the lineage of Cilician Armenia as part of the crusader world, by placing it first (168v-172v) before moving onto its overview of the kings of Jerusalem and Cyprus (172v-174r), followed by the princes of Antioch (174r-175r).539 Scholarship has recently attributed the authorship to Hayton, who appears to have served as the translator of *Les Lignages d’Outremer* into Armenian.540 The original work was produced with the intent of highlighting the principal families in the Latin East, with its first redaction surfacing in the late thirteenth century.541

Gabrielle Spiegel has noted how medieval genealogies were “written above all to exalt a line and legitimize its power, a medieval genealogy displays a family’s intention

538 Ibid, 29.
539 See Hakobyan’s introduction to the text, *Minor Chronicles*, II, 94.
to affirm and extend its place in political life.” The place of importance given to the Armenian rulers as first among the principal families, can therefore, be understood as a means to glorify the Cilician kingdom, while also underscoring its place in the crusader world.

What is most interesting is that the Armenian version was produced during a turbulent period of Cilician history, just as the earlier version of the Lignages d’Outremer emerged in the context of Mamlûk aggression. In addition to identifying Cilician Armenia in the world of the Latin East, Hayton may have also sought to preserve the detailed pedigrees of Outremer in light of the dismantling of the crusader polities by the Mamlûk Sultanate. This factor should not be overlooked especially as the text seems to have been produced after the fall of Tripoli and Acre and the sacking of Hród kl.

While being different types of sources, both the Cronicon and the genealogical text attributed to Hayton are clearly representative of the Latin influence upon Cilician culture, or at the very least, upon the worldview of the author. Indeed, French was one of the languages used among the nobility in Cilician Armenia, and the language of “administration, culture and communication” in Lusignan Cyprus. The works testify to the appeal of Frankish culture for the Armenian upper class, a gravitation which was undoubtedly facilitated through the high number of intermarriages among the aristocracy. At the same time, however, these works reflect the political and religious interests of the author, revealing the complex ways in which Hayton acted as a translator to suit his Latinized interests. The clash between the pro-Union and Orthodox supporters would indeed polarize the Cilician leaders from the majority of clergy and prominent religious

542 Spiegel, “Genealogy: Form and Function in Medieval Historical Narrative,” 47.
544 Ibid, 221.
thinkers of the period. This period of debate also came to involve the Armenian prince, showing that his exchanges with the papacy were far from being mere lip-service.

3.5 Participant in the Debate over Union with Rome

Evidence of Hayton’s exchanges with the Orthodox clergy highlights his efforts in promoting Union among the Armenian clergy. His communication with Armenian religious leaders relays his vested interests in promoting Catholicism in his kingdom, standing in line with the Cilician leadership’s positon during the early fourteenth century. The main evidence for this is found in a letter addressed to Hayton by Esayi of Niš (born c. 1260), a renowned churchman and rector of the hamalsaran, or University of Glajor, who specialized as a grammarian and rhetorician among other skills until his death in 1338.  

Scholarship has proposed dating the letter to somewhere between the years 1320-1325, based on a reference to Ōšin of Korykos as bailiff, Hayton’s son who also received a copy of the letter. Levon G. Khacheryan has counted this letter as part of a corpus of seven letters written by the erudite rector, which specifically address the Union debate. Esayi’s correspondence was not limited to the Cilician Armenian circle, but was also directed to other promoters of church union, including the Armenian converts in Tabriz.

With respect to Esayi’s letter to Hayton, it seems to have been sent in response to Hayton’s earlier correspondence, which indicated his profession of Latin faith. While

---

548 Cowe, “Latin-Armenian Ecclesiastical Interchange,” 58.67
Hayton’s letter remains presently undiscovered, Esayi’s reply to the Cilician prince is fortunately extant in several manuscript copies housed in the archives of the Matenadaran and Venice. A closer look at the rector’s response highlights the nature of the wider dialogue between the Cilician royals and staunch Apostolic Armenian clergy.549

More specifically, the prominent religious thinker focused on three key issues, which represented the primary points of contention between Armenian and Latin Church traditions: the nature of Christ, the mixing of water and wine in the Eucharistic cup, and the date of the Nativity.550 In the letter, Esayi notes how the nature of Christ had been thoroughly discussed and defended in the Armenian tradition, underscoring the nature of Christ as being both divine and human. The letter also defends the legitimacy of Armenian tradition in contrast to the heresies of Arius and Nestorius.551

With respect to the second point, Esayi defends the Armenian Apostolic tradition of using undiluted wine in the Eucharistic cup by looking to scriptural justifications and the traditions established by the early church under the leadership of St. Gregory the Illuminator.552 While the Armenians had traditionally used unmixed wine, the letter surfaced in a time in which the papacy placed increasing pressures on the Armenian Church to adopt the diluted form of wine for the Eucharistic chalice.553 As papal pressures intensified during the fourteenth century, prominent religious leaders like Esayi

549 Petrosyan, “Letters,” 97; Matenadaran : MS 579 ff. 316v-320v, which is a 15th century manuscript and MS 9622 which was copied in 1858. Venice : MS 253 is the oldest. For details Basile Sarghissian, Grand catalogue des manuscrits arméniens de la bibliothèque des P. P. Mekhitaristes de Saint-Lazare, II (Venice, San Lazarro, 1924) 728-29 ; M.-A. van den Oudenrijn, Linguae haicanae scriptores, Ordinis Praedicatorum Congregationis Fratrum Unitorum et F.F. Armenorum Ord. S. Basilii citra Mare consistentium quotquot huc usque innotuerunt (Berne : A. Francke, 1960), 21-22.
550 MS 253 72r.
551 Petrosyan, “Letters,” 97; MS 573, 320v; MS 253 72r.
552 Petrosyan, “Letters,” 97; MS 573, 317v-317r.
553 Bundy, “The Council of Sis,” 42-56.
would produce various texts in defense of the Apostolic tradition. The subject of the type of wine used in the Eucharistic cup seems to have held particular importance for Esayi, who also defended Armenian tradition elsewhere, as evidenced in his letter, “Against those who err in the matter of the Eucharist,” which was addressed to King Hetʿum II and the catholicos.554

Historical justifications are also cited in the letter to Hayton for the celebration of the Armenian Nativity on the 6th of January, which was held in connection with the Epiphany, instead of the 25th of December, the date honored by the Chalcedonian churches. Hayton’s adoption of the Chalcedonian date stood in parallel to the overtures of Catholicos Grigor VII (1293-1307) who also followed western custom for the Nativity date, just as he moved the date of the Annunciation from April 7 to March 25 (the catholicos had also proclaimed Pope Boniface VIII as Christ’s vicar on earth).555 It is thus unsurprising that Hayton would follow the official lead of the catholicos in this matter, as the Cilician leadership articulated a pro-Latin position from the late thirteenth century onwards. Despite the official position of the Cilician leaders, Esayi maintained the legitimacy of the Armenian date based on the tradition set by St. James of Nisibus.556 Elsewhere, Esayi signed a refutation letter, drawn up by Metropolitan Stepʿanos Orbelian, in which prominent Armenian churchmen also defend the Armenian dates for the Nativity and Annunciation as part of its objectives in maintaining Orthodox tradition.557

556 Petrosyan, “Letters,” 98;
557 Cowe, “Grigor VII Anavarzetsi and Stepanos Orbelian,” 250-251. For the refutation, the early modern publication of Stepʿanos Orbelian, “Refutation of Diophysites” (Constantinople: 1756), 168-87.
Esayi’s letter to Hayton highlights the main issues of debate between the Apostolic clergy and the pro-Union supporters. As the renowned rector of the University of Glajor in the Caucasus region, Esayi was not only aware of the Cilician kingdom’s diplomatic overtures to the Latin West, but faced the increasing penetration and influence of Latin missionaries in the East, which resulted in the creation of the aforementioned Catholic converts, the Fratres Unitores and the rise of Catholic Armenian converts in places like Tabriz and Caffa. The adoption of Catholicism was thus evident in various spheres of Latin-Armenian interchange. Hayton’s debate with the rector of Glajor is particularly reflective of Cilician Armenia’s political overtures to the Latin West as opposed to the prince’s contacts with the missions.

In addition to the letter addressed to the Lord of Korykos, both Hayton’s and Ōšin’s names were also associated with the Council of Adana in 1316, which essentially confirmed the decisions taken at the Council of Sis in 1307. Hayton is referred to as a “dux generalis” in the acts of the Council of Adana, suggesting that he served as constable of Cilician Armenia during the last known stages of his life while promoting the Union cause. This reference serves as further evidence of Hayton’s vested interests in promoting Catholicism among the Armenians, indicating that his assertions of being a Catholic Armenian were not simply made in Poitiers to suit the papacy. The debate on Union clearly involved prominent lay individuals like Hayton and was, therefore, not limited to the ecclesiastical circle.
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558 The surge in missionary activity seems to have played a role in the conversion of Armenian leaders in contact with the mendicants including Bishop Mattēos of Tabriz. Matthews and Sanjian, Armenian Gospel Iconography, 30; Cowe, “Latin-Armenian Ecclesiastical Interchange,” 49.

559 Galanus, Conciliatonis ecclesiae, 504; Kohler, RHC doc. arm. II, xlv.

560 Hovsepian, The Khaghbakians or Proshians, 283. Hovsephian notes that various prominent families became involved in the debate including the leading families of the Orbelians and Proshians.
Both Hayton’s correspondence with Esayi and his involvement in the Council of 1316 show the extent of his pro-Union interests, which were likely fuelled in reaction to growing pressures of the papacy and the increasing political instability of his kingdom during the fourteenth century. Alignment with the papacy was indeed viewed as a political means to secure western aid. In his capacity as regent of Cilician Armenia, Ōšin of Korykos similarly continued the pro-Union policy of Het’um II and Ōšin I. These responses were geared to increasing papal pressures on the Armenians to align themselves with the Church of Rome, as noted by Pope John XXII’s exchanges with the Cilician kingdom.

3.6 Conclusion

Hayton’s multifaceted career as royal prince, diplomat, patron, historian, and Catholic convert reveal the complex ways in which he engaged in the political affairs of the Eastern Mediterranean at the start of the fourteenth century. In the context of acute political destabilization in the region, he became entangled in the domestic disputes of both Cyprus and Cilician Armenia, as well as in the religious debate among the Armenians. His political, religious and literary interests were all illustrative of the increased level of intercultural contacts between the two Eastern Mediterranean kingdoms and the process of Latinization among the Cilician Armenian upper class. A look at the various facets of Hayton’s life thus reveals the complexity of his background. His interconnected interests would largely play a critical role in shaping his historical and geographical discourse.

561 Ibid, 283.
562 Ōšin of Korykos relied upon Pope John XII’s dispensation to marry the widow of King Ōšin, Jeanne of Anjou. Acta Ioannis XXII, 41, 82-83.
Chapter 4

Hayton’s Geography

Hayton’s geographical treatise forms the first book of *La Flor des estoires*, as the introductory window of the East. His treatment of Asia covers fourteen ‘kingdoms,’ beginning with Cathay (China), progressing on to Tars, Turkestan, Khwarazm, Cumania, India, Persia, Medea, Armenia, Georgia, Chaldea, Mesopotamia, Turkey, and ending with Syria—the region most familiar to him. The treatise is a highly interesting text that reflects Hayton’s inter-cultural experiences and Cilician Armenia’s positioning as a medieval crossroads.

A closer look at the geographical treatise reveals that Hayton employed a pragmatic, sober-minded approach in covering the topographical and ethnographical landscape of the East. His representation of Asia was closely connected to his diplomatic objectives, offering a distinctive geographical perspective from other Latin and Armenian geographical texts of the late medieval period. At the same time, his treatise captures and reflects a shared intellectual culture in many vernacular forms, building upon common biblical, classical and contemporaneous tropes. By never losing focus of his wider diplomatic and political goals, Hayton ultimately crafts his geographical treatise in such a way as to underscore his expertise as a Cilician Armenian intermediary, based on his first-hand experience and access to a range of source materials.

This chapter will use a thematic approach in studying Hayton’s geographical portrait of the East. It will first examine the geographical treatise as a product of the intercultural contacts between Cilician Armenia, the Latin West, the Muslim Middle East and Mongol Central Asia, during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. To this
extent, it will be shown that Hayton’s geography communicates the connected intellectual traditions and historical connections across Eurasia. The latter portion of the chapter will examine how Hayton’s ethnographical treatment of Eastern Christians, Muslims, and non-monotheistic groups reveals his political objectives of highlighting the cultural diversity of the Mongol Empire, and especially of the diversity of its Christian community. This will be followed by a close examination of his topographical overview of the East, which similarly focuses on the vast landscape of Mongol-occupied lands. The chapter will finally explore the ways in which Hayton articulated his expertise on speaking of eastern affairs and offered a unique perspective on the Holy City of Jerusalem within his overarching objective to highlight the breadth of the Mongol political landscape.

4.1 Situating Hayton’s Geographical Treatise

Hayton’s geographical treatise on the East was situated during a period which witnessed the rise in the circulation of Western accounts on Asia. *La Flor des estoires* played a particularly important role in disseminating information in the medieval and early modern periods. While not all the accounts of Asia were well-circulated, *La Flor des estoires* fared comparatively well, playing a valuable role in shaping western knowledge of eastern geography and conditions. Western accounts of the East reflected the growing thirst for more detailed, empirical observations of Asia, which had occupied a wide-range of meanings in medieval writings, being home to Alexander the Great’s enclosure of the unclean races of Gog and Magog, the resting place of Noah’s Ark, the location of the Garden of Eden and the dwelling of a plethora of ‘exotic’ creatures—such
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as the Sciapods (one-footed men) and Cynocephaly (dog-headed men).\textsuperscript{564} Influenced by Edward W. Said’s \textit{Orientalism}, Suzanne Conklin Akbari has argued that there was no simplistic East-West binary in western medieval thought, but rather, the geographical position and understanding of Asia varied in the accounts of medieval writers.\textsuperscript{565}

Hayton’s account is distinctive from western medieval traditions in many ways. It contains accurate details on the borders and frontiers of Asia, while also presenting a rather objective depiction of its ethnographic communities. Hayton’s geographical focus pays particular attention to covering Mongol-occupied territories of the East. This approach complements his advocacy of a Mongol alliance in his crusade proposal and his treatment of the Mongols as pro-Christians in his historical treatise. Hayton’s conception of the East, therefore, predominantly treats Mongol territory, suited to the interests of his western audience.

The extent of knowledge of the Mongol Empire and of the needs of his papal audience were directly linked to the increasing level of intercultural contacts in the

\textsuperscript{564} Recent scholarly contributions have produced insightful studies on medieval representations of the East and their focus on elements of \textit{exotica}. Depictions of the exotic and marvelous were closely tied to socio-cultural attitudes and conceptions of identity, which continued to evolve throughout the medieval period. Medieval images of diversity—in terms of ethnographical communities, cultural practices, flora and fauna, and the imaginary—functioned as channels through which medieval writers, travelers, and map-makers were able to grapple with wider social and cultural values. Iain Macleod Higgins closely examines various circulating versions of \textit{The Book of Sir John of Mandeville}, arguing that the work’s representation of the Orient functioned as a means through which to examine the values and attitudes of the Christian West. Its geographical portrait served as a type of lens through which criticism of the ‘domestic’ sphere could be voiced. Iain Macleod Higgins, \textit{Writing East: The ‘Travels’ of Sir John Mandeville}. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997); Sarah Salih, “Idols and Simulacra: Paganity, Hybridity and Representation in Mandeville’s Travels,” in \textit{The Monstruous Middle Ages}, ed. Bettina Bilhauer and Robert Mills (Cardiff: University of Wales, 2004), 113-33.

Eastern Mediterranean and Mongol Asia, as a result of the crusades, increased trading networks and missionary activities. All of these factors played an important role in encouraging the flow of information among different groups of people. As a result of these exchanges, first-hand experience was combined with the ‘inherited’ knowledge of works like the well-circulated *Etymolgiae* of Isidore of Seville) and patristic sources.\(^{566}\) A closer look at Hayton’s text will show that he was not only versed in earlier traditions, but also in contemporaneous reports circulated in Latin (missionary) and eastern (Armenian, Nestorian, Muslim and Syriac) circles.

### 4.2 The Impact of the Crusades and Mongol Conquests

As briefly mentioned, western reports on the East became increasingly valuable for the papacy in the wider context of thirteenth and fourteenth century mendicant expansion into Asia and crusade-planning against the Mamlūk Sultanate and Turkish emirates. Missionary reports and *recuperatione terre sanctae* served as influential texts in circulating topographical and ethnographical information into the West, which was largely ignorant of the conditions of the East. Some texts contained a greater degree of topographical details (dealing with one place/location), while others incorporated a

\(^{566}\) In the Latin West, geographical works were often incorporated within different genres of literature. The modern designation of ‘geography,’ derived from the Greek word *geographia* (describing the earth), significantly differed from the medieval conception of the subject. It did not function as a distinct discipline in the early middle ages, having only come into more regular usage in the early fifteenth century. Geographical material was taught in universities as part of the *quadrivium* (four arts). Considerably shaped by classical Greek and Roman tradition, medieval geographical literature heavily relied on the *Naturalis Historiae* of Pliny the Elder, the first century Roman naturalist, and Solinus, the thirteenth century Latin author of a geographical description of the world (Ptolemy only became popular in the thirteenth century through the translation of Arabic works). This classical geographical heritage soon became incorporated within a Christian framework, evident through the writings of the early Christian writers. Seventh century Archbishop Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologiae* became an instrumental work in developing medieval geographical knowledge; St. Augustine of Hippo also made significant contributions, promoting the study of the physical world and its inhabitants as part of one’s spiritual development, as knowledge (*scientia*) was a means towards a deeper understanding of God (*sapientia*). Natalia Lozovsky, ‘The Earth is Our Book:’ *Geographical Knowledge in the Latin West, ca. 400-1000* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2000), 10-14.
chorographical (regional) approach. In terms of territorial focus, Hayton’s own geographical account of the East parallels the texts of Marco Polo and other mendicant travelers, covering the vast scope of Asia, describing Cathay (China); Southeast India; the Central Asian Steppe; the Caucasus; Asia Minor; and the Middle East.

Hayton’s report was particularly valuable based on his worldview as an ‘easterner’ and status as a Mongol vassal. His background made him a relevant source for the papacy. He was able to relay the conditions of Mongol Asia for Clement V’s crusading interests and consideration of the prospect of Mongol alliance. The Cilician prince’s geographical treatment of Mongol Asia thus came at an opportune time, in the aftermath of Ilkhan Öljeitü’s diplomatic overtures to the Latin West in 1307. An Ilkhanid embassy was in Poitiers during the same time in which Hayton worked on *La Flor des estoires*.

The geographical treatises of the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were groundbreaking, incorporating information received from eastern sources and first-hand experience. Such texts were not produced in earlier times due to sparser contacts between the East and West, particularly as information became gradually limited with the onset of the Islamic conquests during the 8th and 9th centuries. Arab authorities had generally discouraged western merchants and pilgrims from traveling freely in the East. These

---

restrictions changed with the onset of the crusades and the establishment of the crusader states in the Latin East. 

Additionally, the Mongol conquests also functioned as a second major catalyst in augmenting medieval knowledge of Asia. Between c.1250-1350, a profusion in geographical literature circulated in the Latin West. These sources included letters, chronicles, historical works, and travel narratives, as a direct result of the conditions created by the Mongol conquests. The Mongol Empire greatly encouraged western clerics and merchants to travel through their lands, through the establishment of eased communication and commerce, commonly described as the pax mongolica. While inter-khanate feuding created dangerous conditions for travelers, the Mongol Empire nevertheless integrated regions politically in a way that did indeed foster long distance commercial and cultural exchanges.

Medieval travelers thus gained access to the complex trading system linking China, Central Asia, Persia, and the West that was denied to traders under the earlier Islamic Empire of the East. Mongol political control—which took form in either direct

---

571 Joan-Pau Rubiés, Travel and Ethnography in the Renaissance: South India through European Eyes, 1250-1625 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 45. Rubiés also explains that several of the later missionary reports embodied a more hagiographic tone. Nonetheless they were significant in shaping geographical and ethnographical knowledge for the papacy.
573 Muslim and Jewish merchants also benefited from the integrated conditions under the Mongol Empire. Non-Christian merchants played a particularly important role in trade in coastal China. Travelers also had access to the Indian Ocean and could sail to places like Hormuz, a key and prosperous Persian port in the thirteenth century, and farther east to Zaiton (Quanzhou), an important port under the Yuan dynasty. May, The Mongols in World History, 125.
or indirect overlordship—over Russia, China, the Caucasus, Persia, and Asia Minor, created favorable conditions for merchants and missionaries alike to travel through Central Asia via caravan routes.\footnote{Janet Abu-Lughod, \textit{Before European Hegemony: The World System, A.D. 1250-1350} (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 158.} Travelers were commonly endowed with \textit{yarlighs} (grants of privileges) to travel through the Mongol khanates.\footnote{Richard, \textit{Les Papauté et les missions d’Orient au moyen age (XIIIe-XVe siècle)}, 187.} This remarkable cross-cultural development was only made possible through Mongol control over important Muslim cities like Samarkand and Bukhara in Central Asia and the region of Khorasan. Latin merchants not only traveled through Mongol-held lands, but established colonies in major cities like Tabriz in 1264.\footnote{Ibid.}

Marco Polo’s \textit{Le Divisament dou monde}, c. 1298, represents a major example of the impact of late thirteenth century intercultural contacts, facilitated through the \textit{pax mongolica}. According to Joan-Pau Rubiés, Polo’s text represented an “unprecedented type of narrative,” written in Italianate French, which was produced from his diplomatic experience in the Mongol court of Khubilai Khan during 1275-1291.\footnote{Rubiés, \textit{Travel and Ethnography}, 46.} The Italian merchant, a contemporary of Hayton, related his travels to the romance-writer Rustichello di Pisa from a Genoese prison cell around 1298, having been caught in the ongoing Genoese-Venetian war. Soon translated into several vernacular languages as well as Latin, the work enjoyed enormous popularity in Western Europe based on its detailed account of the East.\footnote{Jas Elsner and Joan-Pau Rubiés, \textit{Voyages and Visions: Towards a Cultural History of Travel} (London: Reaktion Books, 1999), 37.}

\footnote{Thomas Allsen, \textit{Culture and Conquest in Mongol Eurasia}, 41-42.}
\footnote{Richard, \textit{Les Papauté et les missions d’Orient au moyen age (XIIIe-XVe siècle)}, 187.}
\footnote{Ibid.}
\footnote{Rubiés, \textit{Travel and Ethnography}, 46.}
\footnote{Jas Elsner and Joan-Pau Rubiés, \textit{Voyages and Visions: Towards a Cultural History of Travel} (London: Reaktion Books, 1999), 37.}
Aside from the rise in mercantile activity, the Franciscans developed missions in China and around the Black Sea region, while the Dominicans largely focused on Persia. Fourteenth century mendicant-travelers, such as the Franciscan friars, John of Montecorvino, John of Marignolli, Odoric of Pordenone, and Dominican Jordanus Catalanus and John of Cori, composed valuable travel reports filled with detailed coverage of the East. Their texts combined their knowledge of classical traditions with fresh information gained through their travels. Odoric of Pordenone’s text (c.1330) was particularly influential on the fourteenth century, The Book of Sir John of Mandeville, which turned out to be immensely successful, surviving in hundreds of medieval manuscripts.

Antonio García Espada has recently argued that several of these fourteenth century texts “for the first time considered the lands beyond Dar-al-Islam —the lands around the Indian Ocean from Persia to China—as a geopolitical unit analogous to those geopolitical units around the Mediterranean and adjacent to Latin Christianity—that is, Islam and Byzantium.” According to Joan-Pau Rubiés, these geographical narratives were additionally influenced by intercultural encounters and were not simply projections

579 James D. Ryan, “Conversion or the Crown of Martyrdom: Conflicting Goals for Fourteenth Century Missionaries in Central Asia?” in Medieval Cultures in Contact, ed. Richard Gyug (New York: Fordham University Press, 2003), 29. The Chagatai khanate in Central Asia received missions at a later point, compared to the other khanates.
581 Antonio García Espada, “Marco Polo, Odorico of Pordenone, the Crusades, and the Role of the Vernacular in the First Descriptions of the Indies,” Viator 40 no.1 (2009), 204; 211. Espada continues to note that many of these narratives were soon bound together with crusade recovery treatises, despite their different purposes and structure. One of the manuscripts, containing Jean le Long’s La Flor des estoires de la terre d’Orient, for instance, also contained le Long’s copies of the texts of Odoric of Pordenone and Marco Polo. The rise of the narratives on the East and recuperatione terrae sanctae during the same period indicates their growing relevance to European audiences. Hayton’s text, copied in several manuscripts, represents one key example which influenced the Book of Sir John of Mandeville and the recuperatione terrae sanctae of Venetian theorist Marino Sanudo.
of the writers’ own perceptions or pre-existing information. Increased contacts thus allowed for a deeper knowledge of Asia and also resulted in a shared repository of tropes circulated in Latin, Muslim and Eastern Christian circles. While Rubiés largely focuses on western geographical narratives, Hayton’s treatment of the East can also be understood as a product of the increased level of intercultural activity within the Mongol Empire.

As further evidence of the impact of cross-cultural encounters in the East, Rubiés has pointed out the ways in which an Eastern proverb became repeated in several sources including Hayton’s geographical treatise. In Hayton’s account of China, he notes that “Cathayans say that they alone see with two eyes, and that the Latins see with one eye, but of the other nations, they say that they are blind. And from this it can be understood that they see the other people as thick-witted.” According to Rubiés, this proverb was widely circulated in the East, making its way into ambassadorial accounts and various fifteenth-century histories. Hayton’s inclusion of the proverb thus reflects the opened channels of communication as a result of the Mongol Empire. His geographical treatise indeed reflects the fluidity of exchanges during the period, which allowed for the consolidation of his intimate knowledge of the Mongol Empire.

4.3 Hayton’s Geography in Relation to Armenian Literature

While Hayton’s geographical work was first composed in French and intended for a western audience, his background as a Cilician Armenian also raises the question of
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582 Rubiés, Travel and Ethnology in the Renaissance: South Asia through European Eyes, 1250-1620, x.
583 Hayton, (French) 121; (Latin) 261.
how his treatise compared to medieval Armenian geographical literature, which was
largely based on classical Greek heritage, paralleling the influence of Hellenistic ideas on
Islamic geographical thought.\footnote{How much the treatise of the Ašxarac’oyc’ compared to
medieval Armenian geographical literature, which was largely based on classical Greek heritage, paralleling the influence of Hellenistic ideas on Islamic geographical thought.\footnote{The works of Ptolemy and others such as Marinus of Tyre were translated into Arabic in the 9th century.} Drawing on classical traditions, the geographical treatise attributed to the seventh century, the Ašxarac’oyc’, was circulated as the most significant work in Armenian geographical literature during the medieval period, aside from the vast geographical data found within historical works.\footnote{The Geography of Ananias Širak: The Long and Short Recensions, Introduction, Translation and Commentary, ed. and trans. Robert H. Hewsen (Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert, 1992). Scholarship has debated the authorship of the Ašxarac’oyc’; some scholars have attributed the work to the historian Movses of Xoren, writer of the History of Armenia, while others to Ananias of Širak, the seventh century polymath, known for his contributions in mathematics, geography and astronomy. Regardless of the complex, heated scholarship on the subject of authorship throughout the years, what is important to note is that the Ašxarac’oyc’ became an influential text in shaping later Armenian geographical knowledge. Its impact was evident through the numerous extant copies of the treatise, particularly in its shorter recension. Like many medieval texts, the Ašxarac’oyc’ went through a complex transmission process, resulting in a shorter family of manuscripts found in more than fifty known copies; the earliest of which was copied in 1178. The shorter version may have served more as a didactic aid, functioning as a textbook for Armenian students throughout the early and later medieval period. This version of the Ašxarac’oyc’ also contains descriptions of the kingdom Cilician Armenia. Such interpolations underscore the continued interest of the work during the medieval period and its adaptation to new political conditions. Robert H. Hewsen, “The Geography of Pappus of Alexandria: A Translation of the Armenian Fragments,” Isis 62 no.2 (Summer 1971): 187. The abridgment has been translated in various earlier editions. For French, M.J. St-Martin, Mémoires historiques et géographiques sur l’Arménie (Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1819), vol. II, 301-405; Armenian edition, A. Abrahamyan, The Works of Ananias of Sirak (Yerevan: Armenian Academy of Science, 1944).} \footnote{The Geography of Ananias Širak: The Long and Short Recensions, Introduction, Translation and Commentary, ed. and trans. Robert H. Hewsen (Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert, 1992). Scholarship has debated the authorship of the Ašxarac’oyc’; some scholars have attributed the work to the historian Movses of Xoren, writer of the History of Armenia, while others to Ananias of Širak, the seventh century polymath, known for his contributions in mathematics, geography and astronomy. Regardless of the complex, heated scholarship on the subject of authorship throughout the years, what is important to note is that the Ašxarac’oyc’ became an influential text in shaping later Armenian geographical knowledge. Its impact was evident through the numerous extant copies of the treatise, particularly in its shorter recension. Like many medieval texts, the Ašxarac’oyc’ went through a complex transmission process, resulting in a shorter family of manuscripts found in more than fifty known copies; the earliest of which was copied in 1178. The shorter version may have served more as a didactic aid, functioning as a textbook for Armenian students throughout the early and later medieval period. This version of the Ašxarac’oyc’ also contains descriptions of the kingdom Cilician Armenia. Such interpolations underscore the continued interest of the work during the medieval period and its adaptation to new political conditions. Robert H. Hewsen, “The Geography of Pappus of Alexandria: A Translation of the Armenian Fragments,” Isis 62 no.2 (Summer 1971): 187. The abridgment has been translated in various earlier editions. For French, M.J. St-Martin, Mémoires historiques et géographiques sur l’Arménie (Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1819), vol. II, 301-405; Armenian edition, A. Abrahamyan, The Works of Ananias of Sirak (Yerevan: Armenian Academy of Science, 1944).} Hayton’s exclusive focus on Asia presents somewhat of a departure from wider Armenian geographical tradition, which was influenced by the Ašxarac’oyc’. The latter source adheres to Greek tradition by dividing the world into a tripartite model: Europe, Libya (Africa) and Asia. For its section on Europe and Africa, it relied heavily on the work of Pappus of Alexandria (c.290-350), whereas its lengthier section on Asia likely incorporated local sources, including Persian archive materials—which unfortunately, remain anonymous.\footnote{The works of Ptolemy and others such as Marinus of Tyre were translated into Arabic in the 9th century.} The lack of references of the non-Greek sources seems to suggest...
the author’s higher esteem towards Greek knowledge. Later Armenian geographical
treatises followed the tripartite model closely, contrasting with Hayton’s exclusive focus
on the East. Hayton’s distinctive focus on Asian history was clearly shaped by the
interests of his western audience in learning more about the Mongol Empire.

Hayton’s geographical treatise also stands in particular contrast to the
Ašxarac’oyc’ attributed to the thirteenth century priest, Vardan Arewel’i. Building
upon the older Ašxarac’oyc’, the latter treatise also follows a similar pattern of describing
three parts of the world in a brief descriptive manner. According to Haig Bérbérian, the
treatise equally provides valuable insights on contemporaneous political developments.

Hayton’s representation of the East closely follows the political landscape of
Mongol-occupied territories. In contrast, the Ašxarac’oyc’ attributed to Ananias “devotes
a disproportionate amount of its coverage to the country in which it was written and to
those nations that bordered upon it,” appearing to draw from extensive Persian and localarchives to describe Armenia, Georgia, and Caucasus Albania. The Ašxarac’oyc’

Hipparchus and Marinus of Tyre, highlighting the paramount influence of classical knowledge in
developing Armenian geographical tradition. While these secondary Greek sources are referenced
throughout the Ašxarac’oyc’, Robert H. Hewsen argues that they appear to have been known largely through the
work of Pappus. Hewsen, The Geography of Ananias of Sirak, 28-31; Hewsen, “The Geography of Pappus of
Alexandria,” 187. Adam J. Silverstein draws a parallel between Ananias’ work and wider Islamic
geographical literature. For insightful discussion in “The Medieval Islamic Worldview: Arabic Geography
in Its Historical Context,” in Geography and Ethnography, and Perceptions of the World in Pre-Modern
Societies, eds. Kurt A. Raaflaub and Richard J.A. Talbert (Chichester, UK: Wiley- Blackwell Publishers,
2009), 274.

589 Jean Saint-Martin produced French version of the text. He also speculated that it was written by a
student of Vardan, based on the manuscripts which note Vardan’s grave in Armenia. More recently, Haig
Bérbérian produced the critical edition, placing Vardan as its author. Haig Bérbérian, ed. Ašxarac’oyc’
Vartanac’ Vardapeti (Paris: Arax, 1960). Berberian’s critical edition is based on twenty-four extant
manuscripts based on two versions of the treatise (a long and short recension). Bérbérian contests Saint-
Martin’s views on the authorship by stressing that the shorter (and according to him, older version) do not
include mention of the grave. Bérbérian’s critical edition also reveals the challenges in studying the
Ašxarac’oyc’ attributed to Vardan, highlighting the varying information found in the later copies of
manuscripts and the large number of scribal errors. See Bérbérian, xxiii, xvi.


591 Bérbérian, Ašxarac’oyc’ Vartanac’ Vardapeti, xv-xvi.

592 Hewsen, Introduction, 16.
attributed to Vardan similarly provides detailed descriptions of Armenia, which make up a significant part of the geographical narrative.\textsuperscript{593} The focus on the Caucasus region thus reflects the main interests of the Armenian texts. In contrast, the Caucasus region is part of Hayton’s portrait of the East. It is given equal treatment in relation to the other regions. Different audience expectations played a role in shaping Hayton’s geographical scope; \textit{La Flor des estoires} was intended to inform the papacy, while the Armenian \textit{Ašxarac’oyc’} tradition likely served as a didactic aid.\textsuperscript{594}

In addition to the popular tradition of the \textit{Ašxarac’oyc’}, specialized geographical sources were also produced. Extant copies of the \textit{mlonač‘ap’k’} highlight awareness among the Armenians of the key routes and cities situated in the East, serving as itineraries for merchants and aiming to highlight distances between areas.\textsuperscript{595} More specifically, the manuscripts depict the various roads of Asia from Dvin, the important commercial center of medieval Armenia.\textsuperscript{596} A late thirteenth \textit{mlonač‘ap’k’} is housed in the Matenadaran collections among several later copies, produced between the 15\textsuperscript{th}-18\textsuperscript{th} centuries. The copies indicate the integration of Armenian mercantile activity in early modern trading networks.\textsuperscript{597}

Additional specialized geographical texts dealing with particular regions or topographical subject matter were also produced. The anonymous \textit{Description of cities, Indian and Persian} is an example of this type of practical geographical information.

\textsuperscript{593} Vardan, \textit{Ašxarac’oyc’} (Short Recension) 24; (Long Recension), 50.
\textsuperscript{594} Jackson, \textit{The Mongols and the West}, 336.
\textsuperscript{597} MS 1746 188v-189v.
which circulated within mercantile circles; the earliest extant manuscript appears to be
dated to the thirteenth century. It appears to have been designed for merchants
journeying to the East as the text cites the key cities, towns and distances between Persia
and the Indian subcontinent.

Unlike the comparatively limited nature of western contacts with Asia prior to the
Mongol conquests, the Armenians, like the Muslim and Jewish merchants of the Near
East, were well-acquainted with the principal trade routes of the East, from the Middle
East to the Indies. Vladimir Braginsky has closely examined the aforementioned
manual’s Armenian toponyms, noting its linguistic similarities to Arabic. The detailed
information and linguistic similarities to Arabic sources reveal the rich layers of cross-
cultural contacts within mercantile circles.

The thirteenth century manuscript, which also contains Hayton’s *Cronicon* and
genealogical work, also has texts covering the major rivers and tributaries of the East,
including those flowing out of the Garden of Eden. The same manuscript also contains
a specialized treatise on the names of cities and their founders. While these texts reveal
a detailed understanding of eastern geography, Hayton’s text stands as a distinctive
perspective, as it was intended to inform the papacy of the wider conditions of Asia,
rather than providing a detailed overview of specialized routes and bodies of water.

598 Vladimir I. Braginsky, “Two Eastern Christian Sources on Medieval Nusantara,” *Bijdragen tot de Taal-,
599 Ibid.
600 Braginsky, “Two Eastern Christian Sources on Medieval Nusantara,” 369-370; see also Brian E.
Colless, “The Traders of Pearl: the Mercantile and Missionary Activities of Persian and Armenian
601 MS 1898 folios 222v-223r.
602 MS 1898 221r-222v.
His geographical treatise can nonetheless be interpreted as a specialized text, based on its detailed attention to covering the lands under Mongol control. Peter Jackson has particularly underscored that Hayton’s objective was to introduce “Western readers properly to the idea that there now existed a number of rival Mongol states…”\textsuperscript{603} The geographical treatise thus indicates a detailed objective, marked by a sense of pragmatism aimed at situating the key frontiers, borders and cultures of the Mongol world. Hayton’s geographical treatise intends to instruct and orient the papacy around the complex landscape of the East.

4.4 Ethnographical Treatment

Hayton’s overarching objective in depicting Mongol-controlled Asia also frames his treatment of the ethnographically defined communities of the East in a distinctive manner. The geographical treatise aims to highlight the diverse communities of the East including the multiple groups of Eastern Christians and Turks, Persians, Arabs, Chinese, and Indians. A closer look at Hayton’s ethnographical portrait of the East also reveals that he relied upon a complex use of classical and contemporaneous knowledge to characterize the diverse communities of the East. The integration of various modes of knowledge can be understood as a product of Cilician Armenia’s high-level of cross-cultural exchanges. The ethnographical treatment ultimately highlights his wider aim of providing the papacy with an informative, pragmatic report of the diverse cultural landscape under the Mongol Empire.

\textsuperscript{603} Jackson, \textit{The Mongols and the West}, 336.
4.4.1 Representations of Eastern Christians

Hayton’s ethnography of the various Eastern Christian communities focuses on providing a brief coverage of their religious rites and their liturgical languages. It would appear straightforward to assume that his background as an ‘Easterner’ would place him in a well-informed position to describe the diverse Eastern Christian communities of Asia, whose churches were found in the Middle East, Asia Minor, India and Far East. A closer look at his portrait of the Christians of India attributed to the evangelical mission of St. Thomas, however, indicates that he was incorporating information that was also acquired by his Latin peers, who composed their own narratives on the East. A closer look at his treatment of this Eastern Christian community reveals the ways in which contemporaneous reports served as a mode of knowledge in shaping the geographical treatise.

Before looking at the Indian community, it should be noted that the concept of India represented a multiplicity of meanings in medieval western literature, far from being defined in precise terms. It was often confused with Ethiopia, commonly called ‘Middle India’ in medieval texts. This was partly because the well-circulated work of Bishop Isidore of Seville depicted multiple Ethiopias, locating one in the East, which was propagated in later sources.604

In addition to the mix-up of India and Ethiopia, other sources exclusively focused on Southern India, (including parts of Southeast Asia, being sometimes called Greater India) or on Northern India, typically referred to as Lesser India. Hayton’s parameters for India includes Southeast Asia and Ceylon (today’s Sri Lanka), situated off the

southern coast of the Indian subcontinent. The northern section of the ‘Indian kingdom’ is described as the desert where Alexander found a great many “beasts and serpents,” while its eastern frontier is noted as Badashkhan (the region of the Badakh Mountains).  

In his account of India, Hayton relays the legend of Apostle St. Thomas and his conversion of the pagan Indian population. The apostolic foundation of the Indian Church was indeed based on an older tradition, dating from at least the third century, which held that the Apostle St. Thomas traveled to the East to fulfill Christ’s universal mission, arrived in India and converted the populace. Historically, the church was in contact with the East Syrian Church, using Syriac as its liturgical language.  

According to La Flor des estoires, this early period of missionary activity was insufficient in establishing a faithful community of Christian believers. Hayton further explains that the principal cause of the weak presence of Christianity was the geographical distance of the Indian Christians from other Christian lands. He notes that only one city maintained a Christian population, whereas other locales reverted back to their idolatrous beliefs. While the Church had forged historical contacts with the East Syrian Churches of Persia and Mesopotamia, Hayton underscores the geographical isolation and religious marginality of the Indian Christians from the rest of the Christian world. Interestingly, Constable Smbat also highlights the religious marginality of the

---

605 Hayton, (French) 125-126; (Latin) 265-66.  
Indian Christians, noting how surrounding Muslim kings continually harassed the sole Christian Indian king living in the frontiers of the Christian world.  

The image of the backsliding or even heretical Indian Christians was also shared by contemporaneous missionary sources, which similarly disdain the ‘weak’ Christian faith of the Indian inhabitants. Exemplifying this representation, Dominican friar Jordanus Catalanus laments in his *Descripta Mirabilia* (c.1329) how the Indian inhabitants identify themselves as Christians, but confuse St. Thomas with Jesus Christ and refuse baptism—which represent clear signs of their poor grasp of Christianity. Thus they are presented as Christians only by name. It is worth noting that Catalanus served as Bishop of Quilon, a port city situated in Kerala, India. This position facilitated his exchanges with the natives and shaped his perceptions of the Indian Christian community. In a similar vein, Franciscan friar Odoric of Pordenone’s well-circulated travel narrative underscores the rampant level of idolatry and the presence of Nestorian heresy among the Indian population. Both perspectives were indeed reflective of their narrower religious worldview and clerical background.

While not writing from a missionary perspective, Hayton’s image of the backsliding Christians of India parallels some of the wider circulating ideas on the community within Latin narratives, suggesting that he was directly drawing from western discourses on Eastern affairs. While it is unclear if he retrieved this information directly from their narratives or from oral transmission, the parallels support his likely contacts with Latin sources.

---

In addition to the state of weak Christianity among the Indian Christian community, Hayton also refers to the skin color of the Indians living in the islands, noting that they “are all black and go completely naked because of the heat, and worship idols.”611 While Hayton’s specific references to skin color, nudity, and the worship of idols appear to be a neutral assessment used in his portrait of the geographical diversity of the East, they are also reflective of western cultural attitudes towards the ‘exotic’—as part of the Latin West’s fascination with geographical distant lands, peoples, and odd creatures.612 Nonetheless, his presentation of black skin and idolatry is comparatively neutral in comparison to the much harsher depictions found in the accounts of his Latin contemporaries, including Friar Jordanus Catalanus and Marco Polo.613 Hayton’s account of black skin rather works to situate the ‘kingdom of India’ as a distant, extremity of Asia. The reference may also serve as an indication of his knowledge of Latin conventions in accounting for his conception of the Orient.

*La Flor des estoires* also portrays the presence of Christianity in Central Asia and alludes to the popular legend of Prester John, the mythical Christian king and Eastern ally against the Muslims. While Hayton does not specifically reference the legend of Prester John, he draws on ideas related to the well-circulated narrative by situating the descendants of the three Magi kings in the kingdom of ‘Tharse.’614 His depiction of Tharse serves to delineate Mongol imperial lands as the home of Christian circles. This
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611 Hayton, (French) 126; (Latin) 265.
614 Hayton, (French), 122; (Latin), 262.
image thus supports his wider objective of treating the Mongols as pro-Christian allies in the East.

While Tharse seems to have designated Tarsus in Asia Minor in earlier literature, it soon became associated with the Far East, namely denoting Tartar lands in the thirteenth century.\footnote{Geraldine Heng, *Empire of Magic: Medieval Romance and the Politics of Cultural Fantasy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), 418; Paul H.D. Kaplan, *The Rise of the Black Magus in Western Art* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1985), 64.} Other medieval sources also used variations of this name. Friar John of Montecorvino, for example, describes the use of “Tarsic” letters, which seem to point to the Uighur alphabet employed by the Turkic communities in Eastern and Central Asia.\footnote{Montecorvino, in Yule, *Cathay*, IV, 53; ‘Epistolae,’ in SF, 333-55.} In Hayton’s text, Tharse also seems to represent Uighur territory, where he notes that the majority of the population adhered to idol-worship. The kin of the three Magi, the kings who traveled to Bethlehem to witness the Nativity of Jesus Christ, are described as a minority in the largely pagan land.\footnote{Jean Richard, ‘L’Extrême-Orient légendaire au Moyen Âge: Roi David et Prêtre Jean,” *Annales d’Ethiopie* 2 (1957): ft. 1, 236; Paul Pelliot, “Chrétiens d’Asie Centrale et d’Extrême-Orient,” *T’oung Pao* 15 (1914): 636.} More importantly, Hayton then explains that many Tartar/Mongol nobles are the direct descendants of the Magi.\footnote{Hayton, (French) 122; (Latin) 262.}

Indeed Christianity had been well-established among the Uighur Turks, whose presence was also noted by thirteenth century travelers Marco Polo and Taoist Chang Chun (the latter had visited Chinggis Khan and subsequently produced an account on the Mongols and their lands).\footnote{Li Tang, “Medieval Sources on Naiman Christians and on their Prince Küchlüg Khan,” in *Hidden Treasures and Intercultural Encounters: Studies on East Syriac Christianity in China and Central Asia*, ed. Dietmar W. Winkler and Li Tang (Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2009), 264.} Other medieval and early modern sources also made the connection between the Magi and Tharse, perhaps drawing inspiration from Hayton’s depiction. Most notably, *The Book of John Mandeville* references “Tarshish” as the
home of the Three Magi, while Camaldolese monk, Fra Mauro’s fifteenth century map also shows that the Magi came from Tharse.620

Latin narratives were not the only sources describing the presence of the descendants of the Magi in Central Asia. A similar account is found in Constable Smbat’s report on the East, dated to 1248 from Samarkand. This marked the first phase of his journey before he reached the court of the Great Khan in Karakorum. The letter had been composed for his Latin relatives, King Henry I of Cyprus and the Lord of Jaffa, both of whom had married his sisters. It was soon accessed by encyclopedist Vincent Beauvais, who incorporated it in his Speculum Historiale.621 More significantly, King Louis IX received a copy of the letter while he was in Cyprus during his crusading activities.

What stands out in the letter is Constable Smbat’s accentuation of the presence of Christianity within the Mongol realm. The text relays how the three Magi came from Tangut (described as “Tanghat” in the letter), denoting the Empire of Western Xia, which eventually fell to the Mongols under the leadership of Chinggis Khan. Drawing from Smbat’s letter, Vincent Beauvais refers to it as “Cagbat.”622 According to Smbat, the Christian legacy of the Three Kings endured into his own lifetime, evidenced in the presence of the Christian community in “Tanghat” and its neighboring area of “Chata.”623

In a similar vein to Hayton’s depiction of the Mongols as pro-Christian, Constable Smbat emphasizes that the Mongol realm was one that honored Christianity based on the presence of the descendants of the Magi and made every effort to protect its community of believers. Smbat particularly notes the presence of churches, Christian art, and even
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622 Ibid, 690.
623 Ibid. This is referred to as “Catha” by Vincent Beauvais. See footnote 35.
goes as far to say that the khan converted to Christianity. The letter was clearly addressing the wide presence of Nestorian Christians within the Mongol Empire and their prominent role in Mongol administration and court life.

According to recent scholarship, Smbat’s letter can be understood within the context of his awareness of Franciscan John of Plano di Carpini’s recent journey to the Mongol court of Great Khan in 1245-6, from which he returned disillusioned by their poor grasp of Christianity and threatening mandate of world domination. As a newly established ally and vassal, Smbat’s pro-Christian portrait of the Mongols is unsurprising, especially when considering his involvement in the initial stages of Armenian-Mongol negotiations, based on his position as an influential member of the Het’umid dynasty. In looking at this broader context of intercultural encounters, Alexandr Osipian has recently concluded that Smbat’s letter served as a refutation of Friar Carpini’s “anti-Mongol arguments.”

Both Hayton’s and Constable Smbat’s accounts of the presence of Christianity within the Mongol Empire parallel the rumors circulated by the Nestorians, who played a major role in the Empire’s administration and courts. The efforts of the Nestorian envoys of Mongol general Eljigidei exemplify the community’s role in spreading the positive, pro-Christian image of their overlords. As the general’s envoys, the Nestorian envoys delivered a letter to Louis IX in 1248 while the king was still in Cyprus. As Eastern Christians themselves, the envoys emphasized the pro-Christian leanings of the Mongol
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624 Ibid, 690-91.
leadership and requested the improved treatment for the Eastern Christians living in the Latin East. Like Constable Smbat’s letter, the Mongol embassy focused on the commander’s positive treatment of his Christian subjects.628

The influence of local oral sources, likely circulated by the Nestorian circle, is also observable in the geographical text attributed to Vardan Areweli. The narrative describes the Far Eastern lands of “Chinumachin” and the city of “Xata” as having a Christian population. 629 According to Robert Bedrosian, the treatise describes these lands as being situated beyond Iran.630 It seems a very likely possibility that these lands refer to the region of the Kara-Khitan Empire and its large Nestorian population, spanning Central Asia.

Similar to the tone found in Constable Smbat’s letter, the geographical treatise notes that these Christian inhabitants have the Gospel of Matthew in their possession, and a kingship and justice in place, being a place where there is no grief. 631 In looking at this passage, Robert Bedrosian has suggested that the account parallels wider circulating rumors of Prester John.632 The similar depictions portrayed by Hayton, Constable Smbat, and the geographical treatise attributed to Vardan Areweli‘i reveal the ways in which circulating rumors and reports within the East served as an important mode of knowledge for the shaping of their accounts of Asia.

628 Ibid.
629 Vardan, Geography, 53.
631 Ibid.
632 The geographical treatise also picks up the popular Armenian tradition of locating the Armenian Mamikonean clan’s heritage in the eastern land of Chenk (China). Bedrosian, “China and the Chinese according to 5-13 Century Classical Armenian Sources,” 17-24.
Mention of Prester John’s surviving lineage was particularly significant in Latin sources, as his descendants represented the continuation of the war against Islam. A Christian ally in the East meant that the Latins and Eastern Christians could rely on distant support to defend the Christians of the East. In turn, medieval writers—especially western travel and missionary narratives—aimed to locate the far eastern ‘home’ of Prester John and of his living descendants.633

Franciscan John of Montecorvino was convinced that he had converted a descendant of Prester John, who was supposedly the Nestorian King George of the Ongut tribe.634 The prophetic text, *Relatio de Davide*, presented to Jacques de Vitry and the crusaders in Damietta (originally in Arabic), also spoke of the military feats of the legendary King David, great grand-son of Prester John. Jean Richard has aptly interpreted this source within the historical context of the Mongol victory over the Khwarazmian Empire.635 In assessing the excitement for locating these Christian allies, Richard C. Trexler observes that “any Christian communities that could be located behind the Islamic lines, so to speak, might help turn a Christian flank against the world of Islam and bring the latter to ruin.”636

For Hayton, it seems the interest in portraying lapsed Christians, mythical Christian leaders like Prester John, and reports of unknown communities of Christians became tied to his wider objective of highlighting a latent and potentially active universal Christian community in the East. This notion seems important from a strategic

perspective for Hayton, as he advocated a pan-Christian alliance and encouraged the image of the Mongol khans as supporters and friends of Christianity.

His treatment of other Eastern Christian communities further signals his wider political objective of showcasing the Mongol Empire as home to the presence of various Christian communities, with whom the Latin West could cultivate an alliance based on common geopolitical interests. This global pan-Christian alliance would be forged through the language of religious identity and common confession as the basis, ignoring sectarian differences, as addressed in the chapter on Hayton’s crusade strategy.

For Hayton, the Mongol Empire is home to a wide variety of Christian communities. In his description of the Armenians, he notes that they follow the manner of the Tartars, “because they have been under their lordship for a long time,” noting their subjugation under the Mongols.637 In Khwarazm, he refers to the Melkite community which he labels the “Soldains.” The Soldains are noted to have “proper letters and language, believe like the Greeks, and are obedient to the Patriarch of Antioch.” Hayton also differentiates the celebration of their Greek rite from their liturgical language, which he specifies “is not Greek.”638

According to the scholarship of Paul Pelliot, Jean Richard and Jean Dauvillier, Hayton’s ethnographical reference points to the Central Asian Sogdians who adhered to the Byzantine Rite.639 In contrast, the earlier scholarship of Charles Kohler erroneously
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Dauvillier further contextualizes the history of the Melkite Christian community of Khwarezm, noting that their presence was the product of earlier Byzantine missions aimed at promoting the translation of the Greek liturgy in the local languages, in this case, Sogdian, a Middle Iranian language, commonly used in Central Asia.

Hayton further underscores the diversity of the Eastern Christian community by also accounting for the Greeks, Armenians, Jacobites, Nestorians, Syrians and Maronites (in addition to the presence of Saracens) in Syria. Less interested in doctrinal or liturgical differences that would have concerned Latin clerics, Hayton’s main objective is to highlight the diversity of the Eastern Christian community of the Levant, noting that the Syrian Christians were obedient to the Latin Church, whereas the Maronites, who reside around Mount Lebanon, adhered to the Jacobite rite and used Arabic.\footnote{Hayton, (French) 134; (Latin) 273.}

It should be noted that the treatise curiously omits mentioning that Maronites stood in communion with the Roman Church. The Maronites, who took their name from Mar Maron, the fourth and early fifth century Syriac monk, resided around Mount Lebanon and the kingdom of Jerusalem. They had united with the Roman Church during the crusades, as noted in the account of William of Tyre.\footnote{Matti Moosa, \textit{The Maronites in History} (New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 1995), 217-232.} While ignoring the Maronite...
full communion with Rome, Hayton simply refers to their liturgy in Syriac, which belonged to the Antiochene-West Syrian rule.\footnote{Robert Taft, “The West Syrian and Maronite Traditions,”*The Liturgy Hours of the East and West*, (Minnesota: The Order of St. Benedict Inc., 1986), 239-248.}

The text also reveals a degree of conflicting information regarding the Nestorian community. In the French version, Hayton describes the Chaldeans as Nestorians, who used Chaldean and Arabic letters and followed the false law of Muhammad.\footnote{Hayton, (French) 130.} The Latin version, however, presents a more nuanced version by accounting for some Chaldean Nestorians, as well as Chaldean Muslims.\footnote{Hayton, (Latin) 269.} The Latin translation likely corrected the error, as it was composed slightly later than the French version.

Despite these minor issues concerning the Maronites and Nestorians, Hayton’s treatment of the Eastern Christians suits his objective in providing pragmatic information to the papacy. By highlighting the diversity of Eastern Christianity in Asia, and especially in Mongol-conquered lands, Hayton is able to advance his military strategy by presenting the Mongols as suitable pro-Christian allies and advocating a pan-Christian alliance, as outlined in the crusade proposal.

Hayton’s ethnographical treatment is quite distinctive when compared to Latin narratives, which were significantly more ambivalent and ignorant toward the Eastern Christians.\footnote{Ibid, 13.} In examining the general Latin hostility towards the Eastern Christians, Andrew Jotishchky notes that “behind the accusation of vacillation and oscillation lay a genuine fear. For native Orthodox people were mobile, with the ability to cross political boundaries from Frankish to Muslim control.”\footnote{Ibid, 13.} The harshest treatment was laid on the
Arabic-speaking Greek Orthodox, despite their acceptance of Roman primacy. The problem for the Latins rested on the group’s shared cultural homogeneity with the Muslims and lack of defined territory, as they resided throughout the Levant.\textsuperscript{650}

The Armenian kingdom was largely an exception based on its political independence and contributions to fighting the Mamlūk Sultanate. While Armenian sources were also harsh in their treatment of certain groups like the Nestorians, they lived in a region noted for its religious and cultural diversity, and established links with Eastern Christian groups including the Syriac Orthodox clergy, who played an important role in Cilician Armenia.\textsuperscript{651} Hayton’s largely non-polemical tone is thus also reflective of his Cilician Armenian worldview with its close ties to the Eastern Christian communities of the Middle East and Caucasus.

\textbf{4.4.2 Representations of Muslims and Others}

A pragmatic ethnographical approach is also used to depict the Muslims and pagans of the East, by largely refraining from polemical discourse, as characterized in wider medieval representations. Hayton’s ethnographical treatment reflects his position as a military tactician, whose account largely refrains from delving into excessive polemical, religious discourse. A close examination of Hayton’s representations of the Muslims and pagan communities reveals the ways in which his ethnographical remarks were suited to Clement V’s wider interests in gaining detailed information pertaining to the East.


\textsuperscript{651} The Chronicle of Smbat notes the participation of a Syriac Orthodox Patriarch in a royal baptism in Sis in 1272, Smbat, (Venice: 1958), 292; Vardan notes the “false doctrine” of the Nestorians in his account of Doquz Khatun’s Christian faith. Vardan, 149.
His background as a diplomat and Mongol vassal may have also meant that he was trying to appease the interests of his overlords in addition to those of the papacy. As the Ilkhans held a syncretistic worldview and forged close ties to their Muslim subjects, Indeed, Hayton may have refrained from presenting contentious representations of the Muslim subjects living in various regions of the Empire. Moreover, the conversions of Ghazan and Öljeytü to Islam reveal the close links between the rulers and their Muslim subjects.652 Hayton’s harsher treatment of the Mamlûk Sultanate in his crusade proposal can be read in light of his exhortation for a crusade against the political enemy of both the Latins and the Mongols. The polemical representations used in the proposal thus do not conflict with the Mongol imperial values in the same way as they would in his geographical treatise, where he treats the Muslims living in Mongol-occupied territories.

Hayton’s account of the Muslims includes a treatment of the Kurds, Arabs, Persians, and Turkic inhabitants of Asia. His principal focus rests on evaluating the military strengths, weaknesses, and customs of the Muslim communities. As such, Hayton makes no distinction between Muslim or Christian fighters, equally weighing their martial abilities. He notes that the kingdom of Medea is known to have skilled infantry bowmen. 653 Alternately, the Persians “do not take arm in battle,” as they are non-warlike, living by trade and agriculture.654 Christian and Muslim inhabitants are presented as the principal inhabitants of Mesopotamia, where the Christians take up arms, while its Muslim population is largely preoccupied with an agricultural lifestyle, with the
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652 Although it should be noted that Hayton denounces Islam at times, such as in his overview of Persia, where he notes that the inhabitants were originally fire-worshippers until the “evil line of Muhammad came into those parts.” Hayton, (French) 126; (Latin) 266. He also references the “false teachings of Muhammad,” in his overview of the Muslim community in Turkestan. Hayton, (French) 123; (Latin) 263.

653 Hayton, (French), 127; (Latin), 267.
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exception of the Kurdish infantry bowmen in Meredin (Mardin). As such, Hayton evaluates the fighting skills of the Muslim forces in a similar tone to his assessment of the Maronite, Armenian and Georgian troops.

Hayton’s lack of polemical descriptions on the pagans and Muslims also parallels the tone found in the writings of other Eastern Christian writers. In particular, the twelfth century Patriarch Michael the Syrian offers a similarly non-polemical description of the Turks, speaking of their customs and organization, as well as highlighting some of their positive attributes. Similarly, Vardan Arewelcʿi also depicts the Turks in rather neutral manner. Vardan even lauds the career of Seljuk Sultan Malik-Shah I (r.1072-1092), referring to him as “a good and peaceful man.” Increased contacts between the Christian and Muslims may have played a role in shaping the neutral tone used in these narratives. Familiarity with the cultural practices of the non-Christian groups of the East may have thus also encouraged Hayton’s neutral ethnographical approach.

In addition to treating the Muslim subjects of the Mongol Empire, Hayton also addresses the presence of other diverse cultural groups in the East. This is the case in his account of the Alans of the North Caucasus. More specifically, he notes how several nations live around the mountain range of Elbrus, which he designates as the country of “Alanie,” in French, and “Alania,” in Latin. This region is described for its multi-
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658 Translation from Thomson, *Historical Compilation*, 192. For information on other Armenian works dealing with the Turks, especially 191, ft.2.
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ethnic composition, as home to “many nations of people,” including the conglomeration of Alan tribes. 661

The Alans, whose descendants are the present-day Ossetians, had settled in the North Caucasus region since the first century. Their dominance in the region was crushed by the Mongols in the late 1230s, causing the survivors to join the Mongol army. 662

While both Christianity and Islam had spread to sections of Alania, its inhabitants also adhered to a pagan religious system, which persisted until the eighteenth century when conversion to Orthodoxy took place. 663 Hayton’s omission of the religious orientation of the Alans may be read as an indication of his wider interests in presenting the diversity of ethnographic communities living under Mongol rule.

4.5 Hayton’s Topographical Approach

A tactical approach continues to frame Hayton’s territorial survey of the East, one which intends on relaying relevant information about the territorial boundaries and regional characteristics of the lands largely under Mongol rule. His topographical overview of the East incorporates classical and biblical geographical knowledge with his understanding of the contemporaneous Eastern political landscape. In this wide territorial scope, he presents a general portrait of the cities situated along the Silk Road, the major trading cities and ports, and sites of biblical and ancient significance.

661 Ibid.
As mentioned, the geographical treatise reveals an objective to delineate the frontiers and borders of each region, aiming to survey the range of Central Asian lands under Mongol rule during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. In the case of the kingdom of Turkestan, he locates the oasis Utrar (Farab; transcribed as Hocetar in Latin/Ocetar in French), the main city in the region otherwise noted for its lack of urban centres. Hayton depicts the city’s growing prominence in the fourteenth century, but carefully makes no mention that Utrar had been previously targeted by Chinggis Khan after a Khwarazmian attack of a Mongol caravan in 1218.

Unlike Hayton’s omission, Marco Polo notes that the Charchan (Kashgar), situated in the province of Turkestan, was “once a fine and fertile region, but the Tartars have ravaged it considerably.” Nevertheless, in looking at Hayton’s treatment of Turkestan, Marina Lushchenko concludes that his geographical overview of the area highlights a better grasp of the political landscape than most western medieval geographical literature, especially when considering that the designation of ‘kingdom of Turkestan’ was largely omitted in Latin texts. Based on his position as a Mongol vassal and experience in Ilkhanid warfare, Hayton’s intimate knowledge of the Mongol Empire seems to have played a role in shaping his awareness of the conditions of Central Asia. His descriptions also found their way into the Mandeville text, thereby providing the Latin West with a clearer understanding of the boundaries of Central Asia.

664 Hayton, for kingdom of Turkestan, (French), 123; (Latin), 263.
665 Allsen, Culture and Conquest in Mongol Eurasia, 17.
668 See the comments of Iain Macleod Higgins in The Book of John Mandeville: with Related Texts, 151, ft.494
Hayton’s depiction of the lands of the Cumans (Comaine in French; Cumania in Latin) also reflects his intimate understanding of the political landscape of Central Asia. It is in this region where the confederacy of the Kipchaks, known as the Cumans to the Latin West, occupied a vast territorial scope. As a loosely connected confederacy, the Cuman tribes had functioned as a major military force in the Eurasian Steppe by regularly entering into alliances with neighboring powers including the Georgians, Byzantines and Russians. By Hayton’s time, the Mongols had subjugated the Cuman confederacy in 1241, integrating the region under the Mongol khanate of the Golden Horde.

In defining the borders of Cuman territory, Hayton delineates its eastern border with Khwarazm and desert land, the “Mer Maior” (Black Sea) and “Taine” (Sea of Azov) to its west, Russia to its north, and the River Etil (Volga) to its south. According to Dimitri Korobeinikov, Hayton’s delineation of the boundaries of the Dasht-i Kipchak, the steppe of the Kipchak/Cumans, stands out as “one of the best descriptions” of the period. It speaks of the Armenian author’s informed knowledge of the Central Asian lands under Mongol occupation.

Korobeinikov also observes that Hayton’s portrait seems to be “influenced by, if not directly borrowed from” William of Rubruck’s Itinerarium, as both Cilician prince and Franciscan friar delineate similar boundaries for Cuman land. It is highly difficult to ascertain whether Hayton relied upon a manuscript copy of Itinerarium (there are five known manuscripts today), which was composed in Latin, or perhaps on an unidentified

670 Hayton, (French) 124; (Latin) 264.
672 Rubruck, Itinerarium, 194-195.
text based on it. Korobeinikov’s point, however, should not be dismissed as the text became known to thirteenth century scholar, Franciscan Roger Bacon, who used it for his *Opus Maius*. As Hayton’s geographical treatise was produced in the Latin West, he may have also accessed a variety of western texts. His detailed understanding of Cuman territory, however, may have been derived from eastern sources as well, based on the high level of intercultural activity within the Mongol Empire.

In addition to accounting for contemporaneous conditions in Central Asia, Hayton also incorporates classical knowledge of the region. This is also evident in his account of Cuman territory, where he notes extreme weather conditions, flat plains with sparse trees, and nomadic lifestyle of the inhabitants. This description is paralleled in Muslim and Christian sources, which relay how the vast and landscape of the Kiphchak Steppe had little vegetation. Victor Spinei notes similar themes used by classical writers who typically referred to the region north of the Black Sea as the “Scythian Desert.”

Hayton’s description of the ‘kingdom of Turkey’ also combines contemporary and classical forms of knowledge. His objective is to underscore the plurality of cultures in Turkey by listing the four main groups living in the realm’s eight principal provinces. These groups include the “Grex, Armins, Jacobins et Turcs, qui sunt Sarazins” (Greeks, Armenians, Jacobites, and Turks, who are Saracens). Ghazi warriors had indeed taken permanent residence in the region, having established emirates such as Menteshe, Aydin, and that of Osman, whose comparatively smaller emirate in Bithynia, later triumphed.
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against the Byzantine Empire. Unlike Hayton’s emphasis on the plurality of cultures, fourteenth century German traveler, William of Boldensele (d.1338/39), depicts a harsher portrait of the Turkic settlement of Asia Minor by noting how they (the Turks) “have driven away all the Christians or killed them or made them slaves.”

Hayton largely relies on classical tradition to label the provinces in the kingdom. This is evident in the designations of “Saure” (Isauria, the rugged region in South Asia Minor) and “Liconie” (Lycaonia, situated in the interior of Asia Minor). Hayton’s designation of the principal cities in these provinces also closely adheres to classical references as in the case of “Elconie,” which became known as the Seljuk capital Konya. Its Latin name, Iconium, was commonly used by medieval writers. Similarly, Hayton refers to the classical name of Germanicopolis in the province of Paphalogonia, which became known as Çankırı in Turkish.

Hayton’s political landscape also includes contemporaneous political changes. According to Marina Lushchenko, Hayton’s references to “Quisitun” and “Geneth” seem to identify “new Turkish provinces,” in addition to the aforementioned classical references. Charles Kohler has suggested that the former denotes Saruhan, the province which was named after its ruler, with its capital later established at Magnesia in
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“Geneth” has been noted as a reference to the Turkish-occupied Djanik, situated along the Black Sea. Political changes in Asia Minor are further evidenced in Hayton’s overview of Turkey. The city of Ephesus, home of the tomb of St. John, is described under Turkish control. The long-held Byzantine city was permanently taken by the Turks in 1304, upon the collaboration of the Aydınoğulları and Sasa Beg of the Menteshe emirate.

Thus Hayton’s account of Turkey takes into account the growing dominance of the Turks in Asia Minor. The first half of the fourteenth century was indeed a period of significant political changes as a result of the Mongol conquest over the Seljuk Empire. While the Byzantine Palaeologus dynasty employed Roger de Flor of the Catalan Company to re-establish Greek control over Asia Minor, these efforts produced transient military victories that were quickly reversed in the early fourteenth century. The establishment of Turkish emirates and their corsair activities would indeed prove a formidable force in the medieval Eastern Mediterranean world.

In addition to relying on contemporary and classical sources, Hayton also uses biblical history as a tool for his construction of the East. His description of the kingdom of Chaldea, situated in Lower Mesopotamia, is particularly reflective of the use of
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biblical history as a source of authority. Hayton presents the ancient city of Nineveh, located near the Tigris River, as “one of the greatest in the world,” where the Prophet Jonah was sent to preach according to Holy Scripture.689 In a similar vein, in his overview of the kingdom of Mesopomania, Hayton situates the ancient city of Harran as home of Abraham and his family prior to their journey into the Promised Land.690 Elsewhere, Tarsus is highlighted as the birthplace of the Apostle Paul; Mount Ararat in the kingdom of Armenia as the site of Noah’s ark; Edessa (Rohais, present day Urfa) is noted as the home of King Agbar, to whom Jesus Christ sent the vernacle, the cloth with which St Veronica used to wipe the face of Christ on his way to Cavalry.691

The dependence on biblical history also causes Hayton to confuse matters, illustrated in his treatment of Baghdad and Babylon, which appears to engage in the common medieval confusion of the two cities. More specifically, Baghdad, founded in the eighth century by the Abbasid Caliph al-Manṣūr, was often confused by Latin medieval writers with the ancient city of Babylon, which to make matters more confusing, was also used by medieval writers as a reference for Cairo. Hayton equates Baghdad with the ancient Babylon, “the greatest city of the kingdom of Chaldea,” where King Nebuchadnezzar exiled the Israelites upon his conquest of Jerusalem.692 Interestingly, Marco Polo omits any mention of the ancient city, instead only commenting on Baghdad.693 Other medieval

689 Hayton, (French), 130; (Latin), 269.
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691 For Mesopotamia, ibid; For kingdom of Armenia, (French), 128; (Latin), 267; For Tarsus in the kingdom of Syria, (French) 134; (Latin), 272.
692 Hayton, (French) 130; (Latin) 269.
693 Marco Polo, Le divisament dou monde, ed. Gabriella Ronchi, 591-93.
writers also described the region, including twelfth century Jewish traveler, Benjamin of Tudela, who in contrast to Marco Polo, refers only to the ancient city.  

Armenian writers seem to have understood the difference between the two cities. Both Vardan Arewelci’s and Kirakos Gandzakeci distinguished Baghdad from Babylon. Kirakos, in his account of the Mongol conquest of the former, specifically notes that it was a five day journey between the two cities. Vardan relays the following:

“In 707 the valiant Hulawu captured Baghdad-517 years after its construction by Jap’r the Ismaelite, in 194 of the Armenian era-on the river Tigris, a seven-days’ journey from old Babylon, as they say.  

Hayton’s confusion over the two cities may suggest that he relied upon Latin conventions for his treatment of Baghdad. This observation seems to complement Dimitri Korobeinikov’s point that Hayton’s treatise shows familiarity with the Latin work of William Rubruck. The reliance on Latin sources is indeed a likely possibility in consideration of the location in which the text was produced.

4.6 Articulation of Expertise: The Case of the Land of Darkness

In addition to employing a wide range of sources in La Flor des estoires, Hayton also articulates his own authority as a source. This is primarily evidenced through his promotion of himself as an eyewitness. By citing first-hand experience, Hayton strives to legitimize his expertise and knowledge on speaking of the East to his papal audience. His
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articulation as an expert on eastern affairs represents a theme running through *La Flor des estoires*. For his papal audience, Hayton makes it explicitly clear that he is experienced in Ilkhanid warfare and has accumulated an intimate knowledge of Mongol society. Additionally, he expresses pride on his background in defending Cilician Armenia against the Mamlūks and his role as an expert military strategist.697

All of these references indicate his awareness of his unique background as a Cilician Armenian prince, which allowed for his immersion in the political and military affairs of the Near East. Moreover, these references serve as tools to emphasize the validity of his ideas and bolster some of his exaggerated claims concerning the Eastern landscape. A look at his description of the kingdom of Georgia, in the tenth book of treatise, especially highlights his self-fashioned role as a “qualified” counselor to the papacy.698

Hayton’s asserted authority is presented in his description of the kingdom of Georgia, where he locates a veil of darkness enshrouding the region of Hamshen, described as part of the Abkhazian side of the realm.699 According to the account, this region is home to a frightening presence of the supernatural—where one can eerily hear “voices of men, the singing of the rooster, the neighing of horses…”700 Hayton shows an awareness that this report may be considered false by the papacy. Thus he stresses the

697 Hayton, (French) 149; (Latin) 285. For example, he notes that he attended two Mongol elections, which gave him an intimate knowledge of how they select a khan.
698 Hayton, (French), 129; (Latin), 268-69.
700 Hayton, (French) 129; (Latin) 269.
legitimacy and truthfulness of his ‘facts’ by asserting that he was a first-hand witness of the supernatural land, specifically noting that “je fu là,” (I was there).”

Hayton’s reference to the peculiar Hamshen region seems to be drawing from a shared repository among Islamic, Latin Christian, Jewish and Eastern Christian traditions pertaining to the ‘Land of Darkness.’ Based on the widely circulated Alexandrian legends, the Land of Darkness was home to monstrous, strange and barbaric peoples. It was usually located in inaccessible and cold mountainous regions, marked by isolation. Islamic literature typically referenced Siberia or other northern regions. In the accounts of al-Idrīsī and Ibn Battuta, for example, the Land of Darkness was associated with the territory of the Bulgars, situated beyond the Volga River. Christian sources pointed to the Eastern Caucasus, which appears to pertain to Hayton’s own location of the land. According to Hovann H. Simonian, the darkness alluded to by Hayton seems to be describing the “quasi-permanent fog that covers Hamshen, as well as the impediment to access caused by its forests, mountains, and ravines…”

It should be briefly mentioned that the Alexandrian legends also feature in other sections of Hayton’s geographical treatise including in his account of the kingdoms of Armenia and India. In the former, Hayton describes the “Porte de fer” (Iron Gates), as the location of the unclean races which were enclosed by Alexander. For India, he directly
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705 Hayton, (French) 128; (Latin) 267-68. He delineates the region’s boundaries from the Caspian Sea to the Caucasian Mountains. The gates enclosing the unclean and apocalyptic tribes of Gog and Magog were typically located in the two locations: the Darial Pass, running through Eastern Georgia or the Derbent Pass, which cut through Caucasian Albania, present day Daghestan. The two were often confused with each
cites Alexandrian sources to account for the plethora of serpents and beasts found in the remote region of the East. Hayton’s references to the Alexandrian sources seem to be used to frame his depictions of the distant frontiers of the East, paralleling the conventions used in wider medieval literature.

Hayton’s depiction of the Land of Darkness can thus be understood in the context of shared Latin, Armenian, and Muslim traditions. His focus on the Caucasus region specifically finds parallels to the Eastern Christian tradition. At the same time, however, Hayton’s account of the Land of Darkness represents a unique depiction, which he sets into a historical setting in Georgia. More specifically, the text relays how the Land of Darkness emerged after an ancient Persian emperor sought to forcibly convert the Christians to idolatry. Those opposed “would be burned with fire.” The historical context provided also seems to be a strategy to highlight the veracity of his treatment of the remote region.

The Latin version of *La Flor des estoires* notes that the histories of Armenia and Georgia reference ‘Savoreus’ as the Persian emperor, which seems to be a Latinized version of the Persian name Shapur of the Sasanian dynasty, which lasted from 224 CE-651 CE. The Persian emperor’s persecutions are noted to have caused some to flee and others to convert to Zoroastrianism. One specific group of “good Christians” living in “Moughan,” or the Steppe of Mughan, located on the banks of the Arras River, planned
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on escaping to “Grece” or Byzantium, until the emperor found them in this remote region of Hamshen and ordered a mass-slaughter. Hayton then relays how the Christians asked for divine intervention. Responding to the prayers of the persecuted, divine forces inflicted a shroud of darkness on the land, which “blinded the emperor and his men.” Hayton then claims that local reports confirm that the Persian forces were condemned to remain in the land for an indefinite period.709

The combination of Hayton’s first-hand witnessing, references to historical context, and reliance upon local reports, indicate his objective in asserting his expertise on the East. The text makes it clear to the papacy that the information on the Land of Darkness is believed by everyone.710 This definitive statement aims at eliminating any doubts that the papacy could form against the veracity of his claims.

Additionally, Hayton’s claims show how he fashioned himself as an expert based on his position as an easterner. The insertion of his first-hand experience reveals that he perceived his background as a Cilician Armenian as an advantage for the accumulation of knowledge, based on his interactions with eastern communities and access to local histories. Hayton’s assertion of his intimate understanding of eastern affairs thus works to bolster the validity of his report. This voice of authority parallels the tone employed throughout La Flor des estoires, underlining his confident self-promotion as a vital cultural and political intermediary for the papacy.711

First-hand observations became increasingly used as structural tools by western medieval writers to account for the truthfulness of their reports on the East. Franciscan
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friar John of Marignolli’s universal chronicle, for example, reflects the importance of his witnessing to *disprove* the marvels of the East. The chronicle was written for Emperor Charles IV of Bohemia, composed years after his travels through Asia in 1339, weaving fragments of his memories in China and India. Marignolli’s account is valuable as he was “the last western witness to the mission in China.” Like Hayton’s text, the friar’s chronicle articulates his authority as a witness, using this voice to refute popular legends of monsters and marvels in the East. Similar to Hayton’s articulation of his expertise, the cleric notes how had “travelled in all the chief countries of the earth, to the places where merchants from all parts of the world do come together, such as the island of Ormes, and yet I never could ascertain as a fact that such races of men really do exist...” Both writers thus rely on their first-hand experience to bolster the legitimacy of their reports.

The parallel between the two sources should not be understood as a mere coincidence. Rubiés has recently argued that the thirteenth and fourteenth century writers placed growing emphasis on the “truthfulness” of their accounts as a means to validate their reports. This convention is also observable in the narrative of Marco Polo which fashions the Italian merchant as “guarantor of either empirical observation or hearsay...” Hayton’s inclusion of first-hand authority and his emphasis on the veracity of his reports seems to also suggest his awareness of these conventions in Latin sources.
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712 John of Marignolli, *Cronica Boemorum*, in *Sinica franciscana*, vol. 1, ed. Wyngaert (Quarracchi-Florence, 1929), 524-560. English translation, Yule, *Cathay and the Way Thither*, 209-69. Interestingly, his chronicle was virtually ignored until the late 18th century and was only edited in the 19th.
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While Marco Polo and Marignolli accumulated knowledge from their travels, Hayton’s expertise was a result of his eastern background, as one who had opportunity to engage in a high level of interactions in the East and access to various types of sources, made possible through his travels and contacts. Thus, while he seems to rely on Latin literary conventions to frame his voice of authority, his message to the papacy represents a distinctive perspective as it highlights the unique geo-political positioning of Cilician Armenia as a medieval crossroads with access to a wide range of sources and intercultural exchanges. It is this position that allows for the accentuation of his intimate knowledge of Asia and his first-hand experience. Clement V’s eagerness to learn about the East and genuine concern for the security of the Armenian kingdom may have encouraged Hayton’s augmented presentation of his background, especially in light of his ambitions to gain military assistance for the Armenians. The wide circulation of *La Flor des estoires* indicates that Hayton’s geographical knowledge was indeed seen as authoritative.

### 4.7 Situating Jerusalem

In addition to Hayton’s portrait of the Land of Darkness, his treatment of Jerusalem is also presented in such a way to suit his political objectives. More specifically, Jerusalem is described as part of the kingdom of Syria, the last kingdom covered in the geographical treatise. Quite interestingly, Hayton refrains from elaborating on its spiritual significance, but simply treats it as an important location in Syria, which is divided into “Sham,” home of “the noble city of Damascus,” “Antiochia,” home to Aleppo and Antioch; and finally Palestine where the Holy City is situated.\(^{717}\) The French
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version simply describes the city as Jerusalem, whereas the Latin contains a slightly elaborate reference, noting it as the “Holy City of Jerusalem.”

The brief representation of Jerusalem within the geographical treatise contrasts to its depiction in his crusade proposal, based on the distinct objectives of each book. In the crusade proposal, Hayton follows western conventions by providing exhortations for a crusade against the Mamlûks. By building upon a western framework, Hayton is able discuss the just cause of the crusaders in organizing an expedition to the East and present Jerusalem as the inheritance of all Christians based on Christ’s sacrifice. The spiritual exhortations further allow Hayton to articulate his alignment with the Roman Papacy, as he repeatedly refers to the pope as the leader “de tout le monde” and articulates his own status as a humble servant of Rome.

In contrast to the tone used in the crusade treatise, Jerusalem is merely listed as one of the main cities in Syria in the geographical treatise, without any special reference to its sacredness for Christians. The de-emphasis of Jerusalem as a cosmological and Christological center may seem peculiar when compared to the Holy City’s representation in the crusade treatise. Yet when examining it within the broader framework of the geographical text, the treatment of the Holy City parallels the empirical, sober methodology of the author. Hayton’s overarching focus on the geographical text rests on informing the papacy of the political landscape of the Mongol Empire, with close attention to its borders and ethnographical composition.

Hayton’s pragmatic and rather passing treatment of Jerusalem also differs from both wider Latin and Armenian geographical traditions, which typically highlight the
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central position of the Holy City as the earthly *omphalos* (naval) of the world, drawing from Jewish tradition. St. Jerome, the influential fifth century church father, and Isidore of Seville, the seventh century encyclopedist of *Etymologiae*, both accentuated the sacred location of Jerusalem. In the Armenian context, the early medieval *Asxaracʿ oykʿ* also presents Jerusalem as the *omphalos*. In a similar vein, Islamic cartographic tradition typically situates Mecca at the center of maps.

As a means to emphasize the centrality of Jerusalem, western maps relied upon a popular model called the T-O (*terra-oceanus*) conception, which had been used by Alexandrian hermit, Cosmas Indicopleustes, in his sixth century *Topographia Kristanike* and subsequently incorporated in the influential writings of Isidore of Seville. These maps presented a circular representation, (the “O”) of the earth with the shape of a “T” transposed on it, which divided the world into three parts and placed Jerusalem at its center. The symbol of “T” also carried spiritual significance, as it represented the shape of the cross. The East, the largest of the three continents, was commonly situated at the top of the map, followed the placement of Europe and Africa on the bottom right and left.

Armenian geographical knowledge also emphasized the centrality of Jerusalem. In addition to the *Asxaracʿ oykʿ*, Armenian geographers also became aware of the T-O
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conception, using the model to depict the world and highlight the central position of Jerusalem. According to Rouben Galichian’s study of an extant Armenian T-O map, which he suggests was composed in Caffa during fourteenth century, Jerusalem is placed at the center of the world.\textsuperscript{726} Galichian points to the wider context of Genoese influence upon Caffa, which seems to have influenced the Armenian cartographer’s interest in producing an Armenian T-O map based on Latin tradition.\textsuperscript{727} Caffa, situated in the Crimea along the Black Sea Coast, functioned as a thriving trading settlement, first under the rule of the Mongol Golden Horde and then under the Genoese in the late thirteenth century. Due to its economic significance in trade, it attracted various cultural groups including the Armenians. The Armenian T-O map can thus be understood as a product of the high level of inter-cultural exchanges which took place as a result of the Mongol Empire’s integration of Eurasian lands.\textsuperscript{728}

In a similar vein, Tamar M. Boyadjian has shown the influence of western geographical tradition in the Armenian Catholicos Grigor Tłay’s “Poem of Lamentation over the Capture of Jerusalem,” composed during the late twelfth century. While not a geographical treatise \textit{per se}, Boyadjian addresses the possibility that the poem may have used the T-O conception as one of its literary tools while also relying on Ptolemaic tradition.\textsuperscript{729} The use of a combination of geographical traditions was indeed made

\textsuperscript{726} Rouben Galichian, \textit{Historic Maps of Armenia: the Cartographic Heritage} (London: I.B. Tauris, 2004), 15. Galichian further notes that the copyist refrains from marking Armenia, as well as Persia and Assyria, which is remarkable compared to the focus on Armenia in the other geographical sources, including later T-O maps. The map represents a modified version (it does not clearly refer to the two rivers Don (Tanais) and the Nile usually found along the horizontal lines of the “T” in the Western maps).
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\textsuperscript{729} Boyadjian, “Bridging East and West,” 115-119.
possible through Cilician Armenia’s high-level of intercultural exchanges as a result of its geo-political situation as a medieval crossroads.

In comparison to the importance placed on Jerusalem in wider medieval literature, Hayton’s brief treatment of the Holy City stands out as a distinctive representation, which can be understood as an extension of his larger objective of covering the breadth and diversity of the East. The minimal focus on Jerusalem parallels his rather neutral characterization of the Muslims living in Mongol lands. Hayton’s reluctance in delving into polemical representations of Islam is matched by his avoidance of theological considerations of the Holy City. Similar to Hayton, Franciscan friar, William of Rubruck also briefly mentions the centrality of Jerusalem in his account of his journey of the East.730 Like Hayton, his objective was to cover as much detail as possible about the Mongols, whom he attempted to convert to Christianity based on Louis IX’s orders from Cyprus in 1253. The texts of both Hayton and William of Rubruck thus provide extensive coverage of the Mongol Empire, albeit for individual purposes. Hayton’s focus was clearly intended to promote a Latin-Mongol alliance, while the Franciscan’s detailed treatment of the Empire was presented as part of his wider missionary goal to convert the khan.

Hayton’s brief treatment of Jerusalem supports David Woodward and Iain Macleod Higgins’ emphasis that there was indeed a diverse range of representations of the Holy City in medieval geographical literature.731 The interests of the author/map-maker thus played a significant role in the creation of geographical representations. One illustrative example is Matthew Paris’ Chronica Majora (c.1270), where he emphasizes

730 This observation has been raised by Iain Macleod Higgins, “Jerusalem in The Book of John Mandeville,” 36.
731 Ibid, 340.
the centrality of the last crusader stronghold, Acre rather than Jerusalem. This shift seems to be based on the altered political conditions of the Latin East during the late thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{732}

The Book of John Mandeville also reveals a unique manner of situating Jerusalem as a cosmological and Christological center, but then moves on to explore the East. Jerusalem receives the most attention in the introductory remarks of book, where the author presents himself as a pilgrim.\textsuperscript{733} Higgins has noted that, “as a survey of the world beyond the Holy Land,” the text departs from the genre of wider pilgrimage literature, and therefore, offers a distinctive perspective.\textsuperscript{734} While scholars have provided different interpretations of the Mandeville-author’s motivations for his account of the diversity of the East, what is important to note here is that a range of interpretation of Jerusalem is apparent, colored by the authors’ individual perspectives.\textsuperscript{735}

4.8 Conclusion

Hayton does not ignore the significance of Jerusalem for the Christians, but carefully treats it within the context of his crusade treatise. While his geographical treatise complements the crusade strategy by emphasizing the political success of the Mongol Empire and its diversity of cultural communities, Jerusalem is given minimal attention as Hayton does not want to subordinate the treatise to theological concerns. A similar, sober-minded approach is used to account for the rest of the political landscape and ethnographical communities of the East. This approach is mainly used to highlight the breadth of the territory under the Mongols, made in response to the need for more

\textsuperscript{732} Woodward, “Medieval Mappamundi,” 341-42.
\textsuperscript{733} Akbari, Idols in the East, 52. The continental and insular versions of the text contain this prologue.
\textsuperscript{734} Higgins, “Defining the Earth’s Center,” 40.
\textsuperscript{735} Ibid, 40-41. Higgins summarizes the different scholarly insights on the text’s treatment of Jerusalem.
accurate knowledge in the Latin West. Clement V’s crusading interests and consideration of a Mongol alliance likely prompted Hayton’s use of a systematic, neutral framework to present the East.

Hayton’s geographical treatise represents a distinctive tone as it also shows familiarity with Latin reports. This is most notable in his description of the Eastern Christian communities of the East and in his delineation of Central Asian territories occupied by the Mongols. The similarities between his text and various Latin sources indicate shared access to information during this period, likely facilitated by the conditions created by the Mongol Empire. His geographical treatise thus represents a complex work, which reflects his intimate knowledge of the eastern landscape, but is presented in a framework to suit the needs of his western audience. A similar approach is employed in his historical and recovery treatises.
Chapter 5

Hayton’s Historical Treatment of the Mongols

Hayton was well-aware of the Latin West’s ambivalence towards a Latin-Mongol alliance. Western hostility and skepticism towards the Mongols was partly based on their pagan religious system. The reports of the mendicants like William of Rubruck and John of Plano Carpini expressed just how foreign and ‘alien’ the Mongol Empire seemed compared to the ‘civilized’ society of the Latins. In contrast, Hayton came from a background which was well-versed in the advantages of forging pragmatic alliances and shifting allegiances, regardless of religious differences.

Cilician leadership had not only submitted to the Mongols, but rose as an enthusiastic ally in the Eastern Mediterranean, eager to participate in Ilkhanid military campaigns and champion the prospect of a Latin-Mongol alliance, as was evidenced in King Hetʿum I’s earlier backing of Antioch’s collaboration with the Mongols. Acutely aware of the religious differences between the Latins and Mongols, Hayton sought to bridge this gap by minimizing the cultural differences between the Latins and Mongols. Aware of the papacy’s interests in converting the Mongols, Hayton’s historical treatment presents the shared religious identity of both parties—an image clearly suited for the purposes of encouraging a political alliance.
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Known as the Patmičʿ (“Historian”), Hayton employs a historical framework to emphasize the religious commonalities between the Christians and non-Christian Mongols. This chapter will also focus on his fashioning of the Mongols as pro-Christian allies, which also serves as a strategy to downplay the growing prevalence of Islamization within the Ilkhanate during the early fourteenth century. Unlike the comparatively parochial worldview of the Latin West, Hayton’s historiographical treatment of his overlords shares commonalities with Armenian sources, which also indicate a positive depiction of the Ilkhans as pro-Christian overlords. The parallels between these sources suggest that a pattern emerged among Eastern Christian writers emphasizing the pro-Christian position of the Mongols. For Hayton, knowledge of such reports functioned as a tool for constructing a history of the Mongols, catered to audience expectations.

5.1 Mongol Religion

One of Hayton’s main strategies in eliminating religious differences between the Mongols and Christians is found in the downplaying of traditional Mongol animism and syncretism. In order to highlight Mongol affinity for Christianity, Hayton underscores the monotheistic worldview of the foreign leaders. The focus on Mongol monotheism serves as a platform from which Hayton can present the foreigners as pro-Christian allies for a future crusade. Hayton’s construct of Mongol monotheism specifically draws from their traditional values of religious syncretism and toleration, as well as their belief in the sky-god Tenggeri.

738 Glenn Burger has noted that Hayton’s account of the vision shows the Mongols as “monotheistic, pseudo-Christian.” Burger, 76-77.
Before looking at Hayton’s portrait, it is important to note that ancestral worship and ties to the spirit world lay at the heart of Mongol religious culture—which is commonly (and erroneously) referred to by modern scholarship as shamanistic. Syncretism was indeed a major feature of the religious culture of the Inner Steppe, where Nestorian Christianity had flourished since at least the eighth century. The number of Nestorian brides in the imperial Chinggisid family was also indicative of the Mongol contacts with the Eastern Christian communities of Asia.

Ignoring the syncretistic and animistic characteristics of Mongol religious culture, Hayton’s conception of Mongol monotheism draws from their reverence to Tenggeri (‘sky’). Before looking at Hayton’s treatment, it is worth highlighting that The Secret History of the Mongols, the only extant Mongolian source, produced during the thirteenth century, does not present Tenggeri in a monotheistic framework, but rather focuses on Mongol animistic tradition. According to Anatoly Khazanov, the concept of Tenggeri may have gradually developed as an all-powerful god, being similar to the divine figurehead in those monotheistic religions in contact with the Mongols. Tenggeri was soon believed to have established a divine mandate which validated the Mongol quest for world domination, the core feature of Mongol political ideology. According to Khazanov,

Scholarship has recently addressed the problematic use of the term “shamanism” by noting its emphasis on the role of the shaman and neglect of the religious practices of the wider population. Shamans were indeed key intermediaries between the spirits and the humans who shared the same living space. These religious figures were instrumental in warding off the malevolence of evil spirits intent on harming the khans, in addition to ensuring their good-health, prosperity and fortune. Jackson, The Mongols and the West, 45; Alessandro Bausani, “Religion under the Mongols,” in The Saljuq and Mongol Periods, vol. 5 of The Cambridge History of Iran, ed. John Andrew Boyle (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 538-549.


the political ideology of divinely sanctioned rule mirrored nomadic Steppe culture broadly, with the exception that the older Turkic khanates applied it to their local subjects, rather than as a mandate on a global scale.745

David O. Morgan has argued that the ideology of world domination was likely employed in the aftermath of Chinggis Khan’s rule, as little evidence seems to indicate that he fashioned himself as the ruler of the world.746 While it is difficult to ascertain the dating of the ideology, Mongol princes soon attributed this mandate to Chinggis Khan, as a means to further legitimize their dynasty and military conquests.747 Within this ideological framework, any resistance to Mongol overlordship was considered an opposition to their divine mandate, as evidenced in the ultimatums directed to various rulers, including the papacy.748 The Mongol articulation of Tengerri’s mandate may have thus encouraged Hayton’s distorted perception of the religious worldview of the khans.

5.2 The Vision of Chinggis Khan and Mongol Monotheism

Temüjin, the future Chinggis Khan and founder of the Mongol Empire, is carefully presented as a monotheistic leader in La Flor des estoires. Hayton’s account of the conqueror sets the stage for his subsequent treatment of the monotheistic or pro-Christian faith of the Mongols. Although Hayton admits that the Mongols had no religious system at first, he focuses on Temüjin’s divine vision of a knight on a white horse, which served
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748 Eljigidei’s letter to King Louis IX in 1248 omits mention of the ultimatum. The Mongol envoys were intent on promoting the Christianity of their rulers, noting that both Eljigidei and Guyuk khan were Christians. Louis became quickly disillusioned after his envoys found out that the Mongols required his submission. Voegelin, “The Mongol Orders of Submission to European Powers,” 390.
to bring the Mongols under the protection and blessings of a monotheistic deity. Hayton employs this vision as a means to later underscore the suitability of the Mongols as pro-Christian allies, highlighting their turn from paganism to monotheism.749

Hayton’s repeated references to the role of the “Immortal God” in converting Chinggis Khan further underscores the Mongol conversion from paganism to monotheism.750 Additionally, the monotheistic leanings of Chinggis Khan are made clear through his attempts (albeit unsuccessful) to spread the ‘good news’ to his fellow Mongols. While Hayton notes the initial skepticism of the Mongols in accepting the claims of their leader, the historical treatise relays that the Immortal God directed the same spiritual vision to the Khan’s kinsmen, who upon hearing the divine message, accepted Chinggis’s claim to political power and acknowledged the power of the monotheistic deity.751 Hayton explicitly notes that Chinggis Khan subsequently commanded his subjects to worship the Immortal God, thereby ending their days of having “no faith or law.”752

Hayton’s account of the vision of Chinggis Khan is clearly building upon a vision story which was interpreted in a variety of ways in the East. His version is clearly aware of a cross-cultural discourse on Chinggis Khan’s divinely mandated mission and its world historical implications. More specifically, Juwaynī, Bar Hebraeus, and Latin sources relay variations of the vision, as each of these cultures struggled to reconcile the rise of the Mongols with their own place in world history.

749 Hayton, (French) 148, (Latin), 284.
750 Ibid.
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According to Juwaynī, God’s message to the shaman was the following: “I have given all the face of the earth to Temujin and his children and named him Chingiz Khan. Bid him administer justice in such and such a fashion.”\textsuperscript{753} Unlike Hayton, however, Juwaynī makes sure to note that Chinggis was “…the adherent of no religion and the follower of no creed.”\textsuperscript{754} In a similar vein, Bar Hebraeus notes the shaman’s role in delivering the divine message to Chinggis Khan, but also underscores the presence of idol-worship among the Mongols, which he attributes to their contacts with Chinese priests.\textsuperscript{755} Bar Hebraeus thus distinguishes Mongol pagan culture from those “who have Scriptures and the Books of the Prophets…”\textsuperscript{756} Peter Jackson has also noted how versions of this divine vision also found their way into western medieval sources including the texts of crusader Jean de Joinville and the Dominican encyclopedist, Thomas de Cantimpré.\textsuperscript{757}

Western writers were equally far from convinced of Mongol monotheism. Franciscan friars John of Plano de Carpini and William of Rubruck also note the Mongol adherence to a form of monotheism, but make sure to clarify that idol-worship was rampant within the Empire.\textsuperscript{758} In comparison to these aforementioned sources, Hayton’s account of Mongol monotheism is the most pronounced. His emphasis on their departure

\textsuperscript{753} Juwaynī, \textit{The History of the World Conqueror}, I, 39; Bar Hebraeus, \textit{Chronography}, x. “And at that time a certain man of the Tatarrs rose up, who in the depth of winter, in all the frost and cold which exist in that country, went about naked, and he walked through the mountains and hills for many days. And he used to come and say, 'I have gone forth from God, and He said unto me, I have given the whole earth to Temurshin (Temurgin) and his sons. And I have called him by the name of "Chingiz Khan", now his original name was Temurkhin, and the Tatars call this man 'Tubuth Tangri'.”

\textsuperscript{754} Juwaynī, \textit{The History of the World Conqueror}, I, 26.

\textsuperscript{755} Bar Hebraeus, \textit{Chronography}, 355. He explains that the Mongols learned of these enchanters through their contact with the Uighur Turks.

\textsuperscript{756} Bar Hebraeus, \textit{Chronography}, 355.

\textsuperscript{757} Cited in Peter Jackson, \textit{The Mongols and the West}, 207-208.

from Mongol paganism can be understood as part of his objective in promoting the prospect of Mongol alliance to the Latins.

An examination of the *HNA* attributed to Grigor of Akner, however, suggests that Hayton may have been drawing his representation from reports circulated in Armenian circles. The *HNA*, most notably, relays that an angel in the form of an eagle delivered the divine mandate to Chinggis Khan.759 The account parallels Hayton’s treatment in noting that the vision caused the Mongols to turn from their heathen ways, described as the following: “They had no kind of religion save idols of felt, needed for sorcery, which they always carried with them, but they paid reverence to the sun, as a manifestation of divine power.”760 Similarly, Hayton states that the Mongol went from having no faith to accepting the commands of the Immortal God.761 Both sources thus indicate the Mongol adoption of a monotheistic religion system.

Enthusiasm for Mongol monotheism and their pro-Christian disposition seems to have developed from their syncretistic worldview, which was especially evidenced in the imperial court setting, where the khans encouraged leaders of various faiths to participate. A variety of ‘holy men’ rose in prominence in the imperial court and developed close relations to the khans. Muslim clerics, mystical Sufis, Christian and Buddhist priests were all able to offer their ‘spiritual services’ (including prayers) to the khans as the Mongols ruled with a syncretistic approach and believed their efforts contributed to the political success of the Empire.762

759 *The HNA*, 288-89.
760 *The HNA*, 289.
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762 Atwood, “Validation by Holiness or Sovereignty,” 238-253.
In return, religious leaders of different faiths—including Christianity, Islam, and Buddhism—were given special exemptions and treated with great esteem, paralleling the privileges given to the shamans within Steppe tradition. Hayton’s enthusiastic treatment of Mongol monotheism can be understood as an extension of the positive reports circulated by the Armenian clerics who enjoyed close relations with the khans. Most notably, the text of Vardan Arewelc’i states that “clerics from every region and of every Christian tongue” enjoyed great privileges in the Ilkhanid court. Of course, this is not to say that the priest did not notice the competitive element among religious leaders vying for the attention of their rulers. Thus the priest also laments the competition at work in the Persian court of Ilkhan Hülegü, complaining of the success of the Buddhist priests who “worked whatever witchcraft they desired upon him.”

5.3 Christian Heroes: Hülegü and Arghun

Hayton’s presentation of Mongol monotheism lays the foundation for his subsequent treatment of the Mongols as pro-Christian allies. There is little mention that many of the Ilkhans, including Hülegü and Arghun (r.1284-91), developed close ties to other religions including Buddhism. Ignoring Mongol syncretism, Hayton portrays Hülegü and Arghun as pro-Christian allies, underscoring their wars against Islam. Hayton’s historical interpretation of the careers of these Ilkhans complements the tone employed in his crusade proposal, where he advances the prospect of a Latin-Armenian-Mongol
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763 Translation from Thomson, Historical Compilation, 217.
766 Ilkhan Abaqa (r.1265-82) is given an interesting treatment in La flor des estoires. Hayton suggests that because he remained an idolator, the Mamlûk Sultanate strengthened as the Ilkhan refrained from engaging in war. Hayton, (French) 176; (Latin) 305. His idolatry is presented as the cause behind the rise and success of Baybars, without noting that the Ilkhan had begun sending letters to the papacy early on. See also, Jackson, The Mongols and the West, 166-67.
alliance. His historical context aims at reducing Latin ambivalence towards the Ilkhans and underscoring their potential as allies. Hayton’s careful historical interpretation is thus aimed at persuading the papacy of the legitimacy of the broader Ilkhanid overtures to align itself with the Latins in the conflict against their shared enemy, the Mamlûk Sultanate.

Hülegû’s transformation of the political and religious landscape of the Middle East undoubtedly fuelled the enthusiasm of Hayton and his Eastern Christian contemporaries who interpreted it as having favorable consequences for the Christians. According to Hayton, Hülegû’s destruction of the Abbasid Caliphate in 1258 epitomized his confrontation with Islam (despite the fact that the caliph only exercised nominal power at this time). In more blatant (and misleading) terms, Hayton underscores that Hülegû served as a champion of the crusader cause based on his intent to recover the Holy Land and restore it to Christian hands.

Hayton’s exaggerated depiction of Hülegû’s alignment with crusader interests was likely drawing from his awareness of the Mongol leader’s correspondence with the Latins. Hülegû had written to Louis IX in 1262 asking for a blockade of Egypt after the Mongols had failed to defeat the Mamlûks in Syria in 1260. Mongol-Latin exchanges would indeed increase in regularity after the Mongol loss at ‘Ayn Jalūt, as the Ilkhanate looked for assistance in fighting the Mamlûk Sultanate for their control over Syria. Similar diplomatic overtures would be overseen by Ilkhans Abaqa (1265-1282) and
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767 Hülegû’s attack of Baghdad is recorded in several Armenian sources. See for example, Mkhitar Ayvanec’i, *Histoire Chronologique*, 107.
768 Hayton, (French) 170, (Latin) 301.
770 Jackson, *The Mongols and the West*, 166; Meyvaert, 259. The letter describes the Egyptians as “canini generis infidels Babilonicos.”
Arghun (1284-91) based on the tense Ilkhanid-Mamlûk wars which occupied Mongol interests in the latter half of the thirteenth century.771

Hayton’s treatment of Hûlegü also finds parallels in other Armenian sources, which similarly underscore the Ilkhan’s pro-Christian disposition. This suggests that Hayton was not deliberately lying about Mongol religion, but was building upon ideas already circulated by the Armenians. The Armenian priest Vardan Arewele´i frames Hûlegü’s subsequent invasion of Aleppo in 1260 as part of his objective to “free all the Christians, clerics and people from death” also noting that Catholicos Kostantin I blessed Hûlegü before the Syrian siege.772 A similar tone is found in the HNA attributed to Grigor of Akner, which highlights the close relations forged between the Ilkhan and his Eastern Christian subjects.773 The text makes repeated mention that “Hulawu Khan was very good, loving Christians, the church, and priests” and “was so friendly and pro-Christian,” 774 and more importantly, “he loved the Christian folk more than the infidels.”775 Similar to Hayton’s portrait of Hûlegü, the HNA underscores the Ilkhan’s ill-treatment of his Arab subjects, relaying how they were forced to care for and consume pork in fear that they would be executed.776

Other Eastern Christian sources provide more objective depictions, suggesting that Hayton and his contemporaries may have been exaggerating Hûlegü’s pro-Christian standing. The Chronography of Bar Hebraeus, for example, refrains from characterizing
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Hülegü as a Christian or even as a pro-Christian leader.\textsuperscript{777} He attributes the intercession of key Eastern Christian forces in securing the interests of the Christian population. Most notably, these individuals included Hülegü’s Nestorian wife, Doquz Khatun, and the Jacobite Catholicos.\textsuperscript{778} The Byzantine historian Georges Pachymeres depicts the depth of destruction inflicted on the Abbasid caliphate, but also refrains from describing “the Tocharioi” (the Mongols) as Christian supporters, treating their conquests as part of the Mongol imperial ambitions.\textsuperscript{779}

The specific motivations and experiences of the authors seem to have influenced the shaping of these varied reports. Hayton was writing from a privileged position, from the perspective of a royal line that had negotiated its submission to the Mongols and was treated as an ally in the Ilkhanid wars over Syria. Hayton’s immersion in the diplomacy of the Near East also made him aware of the dialogue between the papacy and Ilkhans, knowing full well that the Latin West would only consider an alliance upon the Mongol acceptance of Christianity.

Pachymeres, writing from the imperial court in Constantinople, does not seem to have developed close relations to the Mongols, but was more focused on covering the affairs of the Palaiologus dynasty. Bar Hebraeus spent many years in Maragha, the Ilkhanid capital and witnessed the Syrian Orthodox Church flourish under the Empire.\textsuperscript{780} According to George Lane, the Syriac scholar’s “uncommonly objective” treatment of the

\textsuperscript{777} Bar Hebraeus, 444.
\textsuperscript{778} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{779} Georgius Pachymeres, trans. Cassidy, II, 64.
\textsuperscript{780} George Lane, “An Account of,” 225.
Mongols was a reflection of his wider writings, which also communicate a sober-minded approach based on his religious convictions.\textsuperscript{781}

Hayton further highlights Hülegü’s pro-Christian image by describing the presence of prominent Christians around him. His chief wife, Doquz Khatun, is noted as a “descendant of the Magi” who lived as a good Christian.\textsuperscript{782} Attention is also placed on the Ilkhan’s principal general Kitbogha (Kitbuqa), also described as a “descendant of the three kings who had come to adore the Nativity of the Lord.”\textsuperscript{783} Hayton equally underscores Kitbogha’s desire to return the Holy Land to the Christians, thus emphasizing that the Ilkhan and his chief general were both supporters of a crusade.\textsuperscript{784}

While Kitbogha was indeed a Nestorian Christian, Hayton’s account distorts Mongol interest in the Levant. The Armenian author gives a false impression of the conflict between Kitbogha and the Franks of Sidon (located in Lebanon), which resulted in a Mongol attack on the city in 1260. The text ignores how Hülegü had left Kitbogha behind with a smaller Mongol force to raid the Levant. The force may have even made it to Jerusalem based on the evidence found in contemporaneous sources including a Hebrew letter written in 1267.\textsuperscript{785} In contrast, Hayton blames the Franks of Sidon for initiating a conflict with the Mongols in the aftermath of Hülegü’s retreat to Azerbaijan.\textsuperscript{786}

\textsuperscript{781} Ibid, 229.
\textsuperscript{782} Hayton, (French) 169-70, (Latin) 301-02. Hülegü’s wife, Doquz Khatun, was also revered as a pious Christian wife, as she came from the Nestorian Kereyid tribe, to which his mother Sorqaqtani also belonged. Hayton and several eastern Christian sources praise her Christian faith. See for example, Kirakos of Gandzak, 334; \textit{HNA}, 341, 351. In addition to the Armenian sources, Bar Hebraeus similarly praises her Christian piety, \textit{Chronography}, I, 419; 444; Persian vizier Rashid ad-Din also notes her protection of her Christian subjects, trans. W.M. Thackston, \textit{Compendium of Chronicles}, II, 472.
\textsuperscript{783} Hayton, (French) 174, (Latin), 304.
\textsuperscript{784} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{786} Jackson, “Crisis in the Holy Land,” 485; Stewart, “The Armenian Kingdom and the Near East,” 534-35.
The Mongol sack of Sidon is strategically blamed upon a savage group of Christians who raided Biqa’ Valley (in East Lebanon) where they killed local Muslims and Kitbogha’s nephew, who had tried to capture them. Sidon had been divided between the Muslims and Franks since the mid-thirteenth century after the crusader stronghold fell to the former in 1249. In contrast to Hayton’s historical revisionism, Les Gestes des Chiprois, the other principal source on the event, clearly presents it as a Mongol-initiated assault.

Hayton treats the episode as the origin for distrust and hostility that he believes, can and should be overcome between the Latins and Mongols. His crusade proposal similarly expresses his concern for the cultural differences and historical experience of conflict between the two parties, which rendered the possibility of an alliance difficult, despite having a shared enemy in the Mamlūks. He uses this episode as a historical example to show that the Latins caused the shift in relations and initiated mutual hostility, thereby downplaying the nature of the Mongol interest in the Levant during the 1260s.

Peter Jackson has indeed underscored that the Mongols represented a threat to the Latins during this period. Aware of the dangers posed by the Mongol armies, the Franks (with the exception of Antioch) did not regard the Mongols as allies, and on the contrary, looked to them with immense apprehension and with due cause. Hayton’s presentation of the Christian coalition of Hülegü and Kitbogha as supporters of the recovery of the Holy Land is thus misguided. It overtly revises Mongol expansionist
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plans for the Middle East during this time. The downplaying of Mongol aggression and raiding is clearly aimed at protecting Hayton’s crusade strategy of organizing an alliance.

In addition to Hayton’s careful projection of Hülegü as an ally of the Christians, the career of Ilkhan Arghun is also given special treatment, one which further underscores the ways in which the ruler honored his Christian subjects. The Ilkhan is said to have devoted considerable efforts in rebuilding the churches that were destroyed by his predecessor Tegüder Aḥmad (r.1282-84), who had converted to Islam, as will be explored in the following section. Like Hülegü, Arghun is presented as a principal ally of the Christians devoted to recovering the Holy Land.

Hayton’s pro-Christian portrait of Arghun parallels the favorable treatment found in other Eastern Christian sources. Clearly Armenian observers celebrated Arghun’s disposition as divinely ordained relief to the Christians of the East and interpreted his rule through a confessional and identitarian lens. An Armenian colophon from 1287 notes how Arghun was “greatly loved by the Christians.” An additional colophon from a bible, also dating to 1287, commends Arghun’s amiable relations with the Christians of the East. While omitting mention of the Ilkhan’s Christian identity, a colophon from 1289 highlights that his earthly dominion was bestowed upon him by the divine. In addition to seeing his rule through a confessional and identitarian lens, Armenian writers may have also been alluding to the political conflict between Arghun and his uncle Tegüder Ahmad. Unlike the unpopular rule of Tegüder, for reasons which will
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be explored, Arghun’s reign is repeatedly noted to have caused the Christians much joy.  

Thirteenth century Armenian poet Frik’s poem, “On Arghun and Bugha,” also defends the Ilkhan as a legitimate ruler in the context of his conflict with the Mongol commander Buqa. While Buqa had served as a key agent in securing Arghun’s escape from prison during his clash with Tegüder, the two nonetheless became embroiled in a hostile feud, in which the commander aligned himself with Arghun’s enemies. While Frik was highly critical of living under foreign Mongol rule, his treatment of Arghun’s rule mirrors the favorable depictions given by other Armenian writers, who prized the Ilkhan’s good relations with his Christian subjects and justified his rule as divinely ordained.

Hayton’s depiction of Arghun’s pro-Christian disposition was geared towards decreasing Latin ambivalence towards the Mongols. Western inconclusiveness towards the Mongols is most notable in the account of Dominican missionary, Ricoldo of Montecroce (d.1320), who spent time in Ilkhanid territory. The Italian Dominican begrudgingly labels Arghun as a “friend of the Christians,” but does not hesitate to call him “hodus pessimus.” Hayton’s immersion in diplomacy and his contacts with the Latins made him aware of the largely negative views of the Mongols. As a historical

798 Ibid.
799 Peter Jackson, “ʿArgūn Khan,” in EI. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/argun-khan-fourth-il-khan-of-iran-r683-90-1284-91 (accessed 2 January 2014); John Andrew Boyle, “The Il-Khans of Persia and the Princes of Europe,” CAJ 20 (1976): 31-37. Buqa’s political ambitions to place Joscub as ilkhan were thwarted, as the latter switched sides. Buqa was quickly executed along with his brother Aruq, while Joscub would also be executed as a result of looming suspicions regarding his political treason. His opposition to Arghun seems to have been caused by his loss of crown-land revenues.
802 Ibid.
interpreter, Hayton’s depiction of Arghun thus reveals his mediation of knowledge, aimed at influencing his Latin audience. Historical context is more specifically given to persuade Clement V of the validity of the pro-Christian orientation of the Ilkhans. Hayton’s interests as a historian are clearly intended to promote his military vision of an alliance and push for the organization of a crusade.

Hayton’s historical interpretation of Arghun as a pro-Christian ally was also drawn from his knowledge of the political relations between the Ilkhan and the Latin West. Arghun was significantly invested in the Ilkhanid conflict with the Mamluks (the Ilkhan also faced growing threats from the rival Khanate of the Golden Horde and localized rebellions in Iran) and pushed for diplomatic negotiations with the papacy. More specifically, Arghun pursued diplomacy with the Latin West during the period just before the fall of Acre in 1291. Four embassies were directed to the Latin West in 1285, 1287-8, 1289-90 and 1290-1. Christian envoys were sent in order to best promote the Ilkhanid requests for aid and underscore the Mongol affinity towards Christianity. The East Syrian monk Rabban Sawma and the Genoese diplomat Buscarello Ghisolfi were, as examples, chosen in separate embassies to best advocate the prospect of an alliance. As part of his interest in diplomacy with the West, Arghun had Öljeitü, his son by a Kereyt princess named Uruk Khatun, baptized under the name Nicholas—a move which was likely made in homage to Pope Nicholas IV (r.1288-92).
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Hayton and his Armenian contemporaries were aware of these broader negotiations between the Ilkhanate and the papacy. Metropolitan of Siunik Step’annos Orbelian, most notably, places himself as a witness in the consecration ceremony of a tent-church sent by the papacy. The gift was made in the context of the diplomatic exchanges between the two powers. Taking pride in his participation at the ceremony for the church, the Metropolitan relays the gathering of the most eminent clerics of the Syriac and Armenian Churches, interpreting their presence as a sign of the pro-Christian disposition of the Ilkhan.  

The chronicle of Step’annos Espiskopos similarly applauds the consecration of the church as a victory for “all Christians.”

A Syriac account of the ceremony similarly describes Arghun’s intimate relations with the Eastern Christians, noting:

“And for the honour of the Catholicos, and also to support the hearts of all Christians who confessed Christ, and to increase the love for him among then, he set up a church so close to the Door of the Throne, that the ropes of the curtains of the church intermingled with those of his house.”

Both Armenian and Syriac accounts thus interpreted the diplomatic exchanges between the papacy and Ilkhanate through their own identitarian lens. The observations of the tent-church ceremony reflect how the diplomatic negotiations of the papacy and Ilkhans directly shaped Eastern Christian perceptions of the Ilkhanate. Hayton’s background as a Cilician Armenian diplomat would have made him acutely aware of the political negotiations between the two parties and the circulating reports in Eastern Christian circles. This awareness was used to frame his historical interpretation of his overlords.
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While the diplomatic exchanges between Nicholas IV and Arghun were positive, they did not mean that Arghun actually became a Christian. Hayton’s account shows a careful historical interpretation based on the Ilkhan’s diplomatic overtures. In fact, the Ilkhan continued to adhere to traditional Mongol religious syncretism by developing an interest in various religions, especially in Buddhism, which was evidenced by his close relations to the Buddhist toyins.\footnote{Jackson, “Argun Khan,” EI (http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/argun-khan-fourth-il-khan-of-iran-r683-90-1284-91) (accessed 2 January 2014).} Furthermore, the subsequent deaths of Arghun in 1291 and that of Nicholas IV, just a year later, stalled further diplomatic negotiations. The next Ilkhan to promote an alliance would be Ghazan, who ascended to the throne in 1295. Hayton’s omission of Arghun’s religious worldview was thus clearly suited to persuade the Latin West of the advantages of alliance.

5.4 Conversions to Islam: Ilkhans Tegüder Ahmad and Ghazan

While Hayton’s principal objective was to convince the papacy of the advantages of an alliance, he also had to grapple with the reality of the Mongol conversion to Islam, which was evidenced in the careers of Ilkhans Tegüder Aḥmad (r.1282-84) and Ghazan (r.1295-1304).\footnote{Stewart, “The Armenian Kingdom and the Near East,” 538-39.} Conversion to Islam within the Ilkhanate preceded their careers, but seems to have accelerated by the end of the fourteenth century.\footnote{Charles Melville, “The Conversion of Sultan Mahmud Ghazan Khan,” Pembroke Papers 1 (1990): 159-77.} Eastern Christian circles were aware of the growing ‘problem’ of Islamization, which caused increasing anxiety in terms of how converted Ilkhans would interact with their Christian subjects. For Hayton’s diplomatic interests, Islamization among the Mongols was particularly a source of anxiety for the projection of a crusade.
As a historian, he treats the subject matter in such a way as to downplay the extent of Mongol conversion to Islam, choosing to depict it within the context of Mongol political policy or as the result of isolated cases based on the personal convictions of the said rulers. This careful rendering of the complex, gradual religious process serves to subdue the suspicions of his Latin audience. The recovery theorist and mystic Ramon Lull had indeed spoken of the dangers of conversion among the Mongols before Ghazan’s rise to power, suggesting western awareness of the rise of Muslim converts among the Mongols.

In the case of Ilkhan Tegüder, Hayton presents a fanatical ruler who chose to convert based on his relationship to prominent Muslims. Ruling between 1282 and 1284, Tegüder, the son of Ilkhan Hülegü, is described as the “son of the devil” who adopted the name Muḥammad (an erroneous attribution as he took on the name Aḥmad), despite having been baptized as a child. Hayton then underscores the brutal persecutions launched by the Ilkhan against the Christians, which resulted in the destruction of their churches, the inability of Christians to preach their faith, and the banishment of priests and the religious from the realm. All of these harsh measures are said to have been executed in the context of the Ilkhan’s association with his Muslim subjects.

Hayton’s historical interpretation of Tegüder’s conversion to Islam seems exaggerated when compared to the reports of other Eastern Christian sources. This

813 While the conversion process seems to have been gradual among the Mongol elite and amirs, it did not mean the total abandonment of traditional Mongol religious culture. Judith Pfeiffer, “Confessional Ambiguity vs. Confessional Polarization and the Negotiation of Religious Boundaries in the Ilkhanate*,” 162. Pfeiffer underscores that different sects of Islam appealed to the various khans, as evidenced by Öljeytü’s turn towards Twelver Shi’ism and Abu Said’s embrace of a Sunni faith.
814 Ramon Lull, “Tractatus de modo convertendi infidels seu Lo Passatge,” 96; 105-06; See also Schein, Fideles Crucis, 90.
815 Hayton, (French) 185, (Latin), 313-314.
816 Ibid.
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suggests that Hayton was deliberately blaming the Ilkhan’s personal interest in converting to Islam, rather than situating it within the political dynamics of the Ilkhanate’s relations with its Muslim subjects and the context of Ilkhanid-Mamlûk exchanges. Peter Jackson points to the narratives of Bar Hebraeus and the Syriac account on Rabban Sawma, which portray a more complex, nuanced Ilkhanid policy, one which does not simply juxtapose a Muslim ruler against his Christian subjects, as in the case of Hayton’s treatment. The following passage by Bar Hebraeus indicates that the Ilkhan was noted for his expressions of goodwill towards the Christians:

“And he looked upon all peoples with a merciful (or, sympathetic) eye, and especially on the heads of the Christian Faiths, and he wrote for them Patents which freed all the churches, and the religious houses, and the priests (elders), and monks from taxation and imposts in every country and region.”818

In contrast, the biographer of the Nestorian monk, Rabban Sawma, does not provide a flattering description of Tegüder, noting his general lack of refinement and his association with Muslims. Nonetheless, the account also refrains from juxtaposing a “bad” Muslim ruler against his “good” Christian subjects. Rather, the Syriac account highlights an inept ruler, noted for his ill-manners and frivolity. His harsh measures against his Christian subjects are said to have been initiated as a punitive measure against those who politically aligned themselves with Tegüder’s political rival (and successor), his nephew, Arghun.819 This depiction finds a parallel in the account of Egyptian historian, al-Nuwayrî (d.1333), which supports the idea that Tegüder damaged his relationship with senior Mongols based on his crude manner of rule.820

818 Bar Hebraeus, *Chronography*, 467.
819 *Histoire de Mar Jabalaha III*, 45-
820 As cited by Amitai-Preiss, “al-Nuwayrî as Historian of the Mongols,” 34.
Even Metropolitan Step’annos Orbelian, whose account mirrors Hayton’s praise of the Ilkhans in many ways, communicates how Tegüder executed a group of prominent Christians, Muslims and Mongol nobles for their political opposition.\(^{821}\) Tegüder’s persecutions are thus contextualized as part of his efforts to consolidate power, which proved unpopular and resulted in his subsequent execution in 1284.\(^{822}\) Hayton’s historical interpretation of a religiously ‘fanatical’ Tegüder seems distorted from the political context of the Ilkhan’s persecutions.

Styling himself as a legitimate Muslim ruler, Tegüder also used his Muslim identity for political negotiations with the Mamlûk Sultanate—a point also downplayed in Hayton’s historical work. The Ilkhan delegated two embassies to the Mamlûk Sultanate in 1282 and 1284. Evidence of his embassies is found in three letters, with the first being Tegüder’s address to Sultan Qalawun; followed by the Mamlûk Sultan’s response, and the third being Tegüder’s final letter before his death.\(^{823}\) Sultan Qalawun failed to respond to Tegüder’s second embassy, having learned of the Ilkhan’s deposition and execution in 1284.\(^{824}\)

According to Adel Allouche, key expressions in the correspondence between the Sultan and Ilkhan suggest that Tegüder, although a Muslim, does not seem to have abandoned his conflict with the Mamlûk Sultanate, but rather worked towards the peaceful submission of the Egyptians. This interpretation of his conversion has also been

\(^{821}\) Step’annos Orbelian, 425.

\(^{822}\) Dashdondog, *The Mongols and the Armenians*, 178-79. Tegüder was later executed for arranging the murder of his brother Qonqurtay, ruler over Anatolia. Peter Jackson suggests that wider opposition to his rule may have started early on, upon his rise to power. Ahmad Takûdâ,” EI I, 661-662; http://www.irancaonline.org/articles/ahmad-takudar-third-il-khan-of-iran-r (accessed on 19 March 2014).


\(^{824}\) Hayton incorrectly notes that the Ilkhan was cut to pieces, whereas according to Judith Pfeiffer, he was killed by the breaking of his back, as referenced in Persian sources, see ft.70 183.
supported by Anne F. Broadbridge. Through this correspondence, the Ilkhan fashioned himself as a pious Muslim ruler and leader of Islam, an image which must have irritated both Christians and the Mamlûk Sultan, who saw himself as the principal defender of the Islamic world.

Stepʿannos Episkopos particularly took note of the political framework of Tegüder’s conversion, reporting how the Ilkhan styled himself as sultan rather than a khan, adopting a title which clearly rivaled the Mamlûk Sultan’s political and religious legitimacy. In contrast, Hayton’s historical treatment of the Ilkhan’s conversion largely omits consideration of the context of Tegüder’s diplomatic exchanges with the Mamlûks, and prefers to concentrate on his zealous, personal adherence to Islam. By ignoring the context of the aforementioned political factors, Hayton is able to treat the Ilkhan’s conversion as an isolated episode, as a reflection of his personal zealotry rather than the product of the growing influence of Islam upon the Ilkhans and the ways in which religious identity was used to enhance Mongol prestige and political legitimacy in the diplomatic exchanges and correspondence with the khanate’s historic enemy, the Mamlûk Sultanate.

Hayton’s focus on the personal fanaticism of Tegüder is further illustrated by the Ilkhan’s push to have “the law of Muhammad” spread through the realm in his efforts to
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825 Allouche, 437; He argues that this is particularly evident in his first embassy, which was headed by the qadi of Sivas, Qutb al-Din Mahmud al-Shirazi. Tegüder’s first letter especially articulated his authority as a Muslim leader by underscoring his good deeds; reform of religious endowments; and his protection of traveling merchants and pilgrims through his lands. These acts were typical duties of proper and legitimate Muslim sovereigns.

826 The second embassy, headed by his spiritual advisor Shaykh ‘Abd al-Rahman to Damascus, failed to initiate a peace agreement between the two parties. Shaykh ‘Abd al-Rahman’s entry into Syria was considered highly offensive due to his use of a parasol—part of the ceremonial garb of the sultan. Teguder’s spiritual advisor was ill-treated, with his entourage broken up and held captive in the sultan’s citadel, where he died shortly thereafter. See Broadbridge, 43-44.

827 Step’annos Episkopos, 45.
convert the Mongols.\(^{828}\) He is equally presented as a threat to the Armenians, Georgians, and “other Christians of the Orient” for his conversion efforts.\(^{829}\) Al-Nuwayrī, on the other hand, indicates that the Ilkhan forced conversion only upon his senior Mongols.\(^{830}\) While Tegüder seems to have placed pressures on the senior Mongols to align themselves with his rule, Hayton’s historical treatment clearly distorts the extent of his efforts and presents them as a threat to the Christian community of the East.

Additionally, Hayton underscores that Tegüder’s forced conversions contradicted Mongol imperial values, which were rooted in religious toleration. The Ilkhan’s fanatical outlook is cited to have caused Arghun and Tegüder’s brother to journey to the court of the Great Khan Khubilai (r. 1260-94), where they complained of his extreme proselytization efforts.\(^{831}\) Tegüder’s Muslim faith is thus contrasted with imperial Mongol tradition. The Latin version of *La Flor des estoires* explicitly states that Tegüder “had forsaken the way of their forbearers” through his conversion to Islam.\(^{832}\)

In this reference, Hayton seems to be showing his understanding of Mongol political ideology, which was based on the edict of Chinggis Khan discouraging favoritism towards one confessional community.\(^{833}\) A Mamlûk text written in 1300 accounts for this practice among the Ilkhans of Persia, stating that “every religious sect could proclaim its faith openly—whether Christian, Jew, Magian, Sun-worshipper or idolater; and that no
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Moslem should disapprove of any one of the faiths or oppose them in language or in deed.”

Hayton’s subtle reference to the subject of Mongol religious toleration somewhat contradicts his overarching theme of the pro-Christian disposition of the Ilkhans. Throughout *La Flor des estoires*, Hayton repeats the close links between the Ilkhans and Christian subjects, underscoring their shared objective in opposing the Mamlūk Sultanate and recovering the Holy Land. Thus his reference of Mongol toleration of various religious groups reveals an interesting angle to his broader historical interpretation and crusade strategy, which aim to convince the papacy of the suitability of the Mongols as allies of the Christians.

In treating Ghazan’s case, Hayton presents the Ilkhan’s conversion in a completely different light, by contextualizing it as a short-lived act of political opportunism aimed at legitimizing his power base in Persia. Hayton situates Ghazan’s rise to power in the aftermath of a rebellion organized by local Islamicized Mongols against Ilkhan Baidu (r.1295), “a good Christian.” Hayton explains that the faction of Muslim Mongols promised to back Ghazan as ruler upon his conversion to Islam. Ghazan’s early persecutions of the Christian population are thus treated as an extension of political pressures placed upon him, and which abruptly ended when “his authority was established.”
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835 Hayton, (French) 190, (Latin) 316. The Georgians are blamed for rising against Baidu in al-Jazarī’s account. Al-Jazarī, 43.
836 Ibid.
837 Ibid. It should be noted that the Ilkhanid adoption of Islam had repercussions for competing Muslim sects and Jews as well, and therefore, did not merely impact the lives of the Eastern Christian community. See also Judith Pfeiffer, “Confessional Ambiguity vs. Confessional Polarization and the Negotiation of
Hayton’s historical depiction of Ghazan’s conversion betrays his awareness of the growing number of Mongol converts to Islam and the increasingly confessionalized politics of the Ilkhanate in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. Nonetheless, he attempts to show that the factional influence on Ilkhanid politics was minimal, as evidenced in Ghazan’s subsequent efforts to honour the Christians upon his election to power and punish the Muslims who had supported his early career. This is somewhat of a distortion as the number of converts to Islam increased throughout the fourteenth century. Charles Melville has suggested that the process of conversion commenced long before Ghazan’s rise as Ilkhan and continued in the later period of the Ilkhanate. Bayarsaikhan Dashdondog similarly concludes that “the Mongol minority was absorbed slowly but steadily by the indigenous Islamic majority.”

It should be mentioned that Hayton was not alone in downplaying Ghazan’s conversion to Islam, which was deliberately done for his papal audience. Non-Persian Muslim writers also attached little importance to the Ilkhan’s conversion. Hanbali theologian Ibn Tamiyya (d.1328) seems to have been a major skeptic of the Ilkhan’s newfound religious identity. The prominent theologian clearly underscores the pagan ancestry of Ghazan in contrast to the legitimacy of the Mamlûk rulers. His negative treatment of the Ilkhan ultimately indicates his political alignment with the Sultanate. Egyptian historian, al-Nuwayrî (d.1333) does not even address Ghazan’s conversion
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during his early career, but only briefly refers to it in his description of the Ilkhan’s short-lived occupation of Damascus at the start of the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{842}

While Hayton’s historical treatment downplays the extent of Mongol conversion to Islam, his association of Ghazan’s conversion with political opportunism is an accurate interpretation. Ghazan took on the title and name Sultan Maḥmūd as a means of gaining support from the local Iranian population. His chief Persian advisor Nawruz was permitted to oversee the destruction of Christian churches and persecute Buddhists during this early period of his rule.\textsuperscript{843} These persecutions particularly ignited a fury of riots in the Caucasus, revealing the ways in which the increasingly confessionalized politics of the Ilkhanate impacted Christian circles.\textsuperscript{844}

Ghazan may have also been using his Muslim identity as a way of establishing independence from the Great Khan. Reuven Amitai-Preiss has looked at the timing of Ghazan’s conversion in the aftermath of Great Khan Khubilai Khan’s death in China in 1294. Amitai-Preiss observes that there is no mention of the title of the Great Khan on the Arabic legends of the minted coins in the Ilkhanate.\textsuperscript{845} Indeed Ghazan utilized his Muslim identity to articulate new dimensions of his royal power, further evidenced by his implementation of fiscal and administrative reform and the development of a massive architectural complex.\textsuperscript{846} Directly challenging Mamlūk legitimacy, the Ilkhan presented himself as the prime leader of the Islamic world by taking on symbolic gestures like

\textsuperscript{842} Amitai-Preiss, “Al-Nuwayrī as a historian of the Mongols,” 35.
\textsuperscript{843} Jean Aubin, Emirs mongols, 61-68. Nawruz would later be executed for plotting against Ghazan, see Stepanos Orbelian, 1910: 475.
\textsuperscript{844} Dashdondog, The Mongols and Armenians, 197.
\textsuperscript{846} Sheila Blair, “Patterns of Patronage and Production in Ilkhanid Iran: The Case of Rashid al-Din,” in Court, 40-42 and Religious Art, 123-29.
having black banners made in Abbasid tradition.\textsuperscript{847} At the same time, however, Ghazan continued to respect the Mongol \textit{Yasa}, the code of laws attributed to Chinggis Khan, upholding Mongol tradition, whereas his successors seem to have gradually replaced it with the Muslim sharia.\textsuperscript{848}

Hayton’s downplaying of Ghazan’s conversion to Islam is also tied to the latter’s continued conflict with the Mamlûk Sultanate. Hayton’s historical treatment cannot justify the image of a Muslim Mongol fighting the Muslim Mamlûks. Ghazan is still treated as a champion of crusading interests, evidenced through his organization of three Syrian campaigns in 1299-1300; 1300-01; and 1303. Ghazan’s military interests were particularly important for Cilician Armenia compared to the ‘quieter’ careers of Ilkhans Geikhatu (r.1291-95) and Baidu (r.1295) in war. Ghazan’s wars over Syria were unsurprisingly celebrated in Hayton’s historiography, while his conversion to Islam was downplayed.\textsuperscript{849}

Several Armenian colophons, dating from the early fourteenth century, also omit discussion of Ghazan’s conversion, paralleling Hayton’s positive portrayal of the Ilkhan. From the monastery of Akner in Cilician Armenia, a scribe presents Ghazan’s wars with the Mamlûks as part of a divine plan, in which “God wished to punish and avenge the deeds of the Ismaelites (Ismayelacʿocʿn)…”\textsuperscript{850} One colophon dating from 1304 describes Ghazan as a “wise and beneficent king, and who is an uplifter of the downtrodden.”\textsuperscript{851} He is referred to as “the guardian of our Armenian nation” by a scribe writing in Van,
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\textsuperscript{850} Sanjian, no. 6, 47; Khachickyan, no. 231; 186.
\textsuperscript{851} Sanjian, no. 2, 48; Khachikyan, no. 27, 22-23.
located on the eastern shores of Lake Van.\textsuperscript{852} Writing in the same year, another scribe relays:

May his memory be blessed and may he occupy the throne with the holy kings, because during his reign there was peace on earth as in God’s paradise, (and) everywhere all traces were removed. The Lord God gave him, as the Psalmist said, “the justice of a king” [Psalm 72.1], for he was the son of Arghun Khan, the just king, and “the king’s strength loves justice.” [cf. Psalm 99.4].\textsuperscript{853}

The positive depictions of Ghazan likely emerged because of his aggressive efforts against the Mamlūks. Hayton devotes considerable attention to the Ilkhanid victory over the Mamlūks at the Battle of Wādī al-Khazindār in December 1299, which is characterized as a “victory due to God’s aid.”\textsuperscript{854} While Hayton erroneously dates Ghazan’s military feat to 1301, he relays how Ghazan defeated the Mamlük troops under the young Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad and launched an aggressive pursuit of fugitives.\textsuperscript{855} Hayton’s account seems to be an exaggeration, when considering that the pursuit did not likely take place, or occurred in a small manner, as suggested by Reuven Amitai-Preiss.\textsuperscript{856}

While Hayton praises Ghazan’s campaigns, the occupation of Damascus proved to be a short lived victory.\textsuperscript{857} The Sultanate regained control of the city by the spring of 1300.\textsuperscript{858} Nonetheless, the brief Mongol occupation of Damascus ignited rumors in the Latin West of the Ilkhan’s recovery of the Holy Land. Sylvia Schein has pointed to the
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celebratory depictions of Ghazan which emerged in the aftermath of his campaign. 859 Hayton’s historical treatment of Ghazan’s Syrian campaigns is thus framed in such a way as to promote his image as an ally of the crusaders.

This framework does not permit Hayton’s recognition of Ghazan’s political image as a legitimate Muslim ruler. Anne F. Broadbridge has underscored that he never abandoned his image as a just Muslim ruler, as his religious identity was a means through which he could undermine the political legitimacy of the Mamlūk Sultanate. 860 Ghazan’s quest for political supremacy was clearly expressed in his letter to the Mamlūk Sultan al-Nasīr Muḥammad (during his second rule, 1290-1309) during his second campaign in Syria during the winter of 1300-01. 861 Hayton’s account of Ghazan’s wars thus ignores the nuances of the Ilkhan’s political ambitions, which relied on religious identity as a means to convey power and legitimacy to his local subjects and historic enemy, the Mamlūk Sultanate.

Hayton’s omission of Ghazan’s interests in applying his Muslim identity for political purposes was also paralleled by the messages relayed by the Mongol embassies to the Latin West. Ghazan solicited aid from Pope Boniface VIII in 1302 and refrained from any mention of his Islamic identity. 862 Hayton and the Ilkhanid embassies were acutely aware that they had to project Ghazan as an ally of the Christians in order to best promote

859 Schein, Fideles Crucis, 168-175.
860 For summary and analysis of these sources, another letter addressed to Syrian Mamlūk military commanders; two Ilkhanid decrees (firmans) appointing the two Mamlūk commanders, Qipchac and Baktimur, in power; and finally an address to the Syrian population. Broadbridge, 74-79. For English text, Yunini/Guo, Dhayl, I: 139-42; Mulaḍḍal, 476-80.
an alliance with the Latin West. Sylvia Schein concludes that “Ghazan, it seems, did not let his Moslem religious feelings cloud his political judgment.”

Hayton’s emphasis on Ghazan’s continued interest in recovering the Holy Land signals the Ilkhan’s alignment with the Latin West in fighting the Mamlûks. The text further underscores how the Ilkhan maintained an interest in invading Syria after his loss at the Battle of Marj al-Ṣuffâr, south of Damascus in April of 1303, during his third campaign. Hayton is clearly alluding to Ghazan’s plans for a fourth invasion of Syria, which was terminated by Ghazan’s sudden illness and death in May 1304. While Ghazan’s plans for an alliance ultimately failed, Hayton’s depiction of the Ilkhan stands in line with the ruler’s diplomatic policy towards the Latins. As a Mongol vassal and well-versed diplomat, it is, therefore, unsurprising that Hayton’s treatment of Ghazan mirrors broader Ilkhanid diplomatic tactics, clearly intended to win over the papacy. As Ghazan’s conversion seems not to have materially altered his political and military strategy of aggressive enmity toward the Mamlûks, for Hayton, he was effectively a politically pro-Christian ruler despite his nominal conversion to Islam.

5.5 Cilician Armenian Mediation: The Baptism of the Great Khan Möngke

In addition to underscoring the Ilkhanid disposition towards Christianity and downplaying Mongol Islamization, Hayton accentuates the significance of the Armenian kingdom as a religious, cultural and political intermediary between the Latins and
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864 This treatment of the king stands in great contrast to Ghazan’s frustration with his commander Qutlugh Shah. According to the Mamlûk historial al-Maqrizi, upon hearing the news the ilkhan’s “blood ran in abundance from his nostrils; he was at the point of death. Al-Maqrizi also notes how Ghazan was ready to have the defeated commander executed, but subsequently chose to send him into exile to Gilan, based on the intercession of other Mongols. Maqrizi, (Quatremere), II, 204. Hayton, (French) 203; (Latin) 324.
Mongols. As Angus Donal Stewart has observed, *La Flor des estoires* clearly situates the Armenian kingdom as a key middle-power geared to promote Christian interests to the Ilkhans. Hayton’s portrait of the Great Khan Möngke’s (r.1251-59) baptism underscores the vital mediation of Hetʿum I to introduce Christianity and promote the recovery of the Holy Land to the Mongols, and in such a way, the Armenian king is presented as a champion of papal interests. Furthermore, according to Stewart, the kingdom serves as “the bridge between the Mongols and the wider Christian world.”

This defined role of the Cilician Armenian King as a key intermediary between East-West relations is a theme repeated throughout Hayton’s discussion of Ilkhanid-Cilician Armenian contacts.

The baptism of the Great Khan Möngke is described as having taken place during Hetʿum’s visit to the Mongol court in Karakorum in 1252—a journey which marked the second stage of the kingdom’s negotiations for its submission as a vassal state, following Constable Smbat’s earlier embassy in 1246-47. As mentioned earlier, the royal journey was a strategic move after the forced subjugation of the Seljuk Sultanate of Iconium, located at the Cilician kingdom’s northern frontier. Such visits to the Mongol court were obligatory for all subject lords in order to declare their submission, among an array of other political and social motivations.

According to Hayton, when Hetʿum reached the imperial court at Karakorum, he seized the opportunity to make seven requests of the khan, including, the khan’s conversion to Christianity, peace between the Christians and Mongols, the construction of Christian churches and the exemption of taxes, for support in the recovery of the Holy
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869 Visits to the Mongol court were also made to make pleas and attend elections.
Land, for the removal of the Abbasid Caliph and the conquest of Baghdad, for the promise of military assistance to Cilician Armenia, and the return of lands seized by the Turks.870

Interestingly, no other source corroborates Hetʿum’s role in baptizing the khan, which makes Hayton’s portrait appear nothing more than a propagandistic piece. Peter Jackson has thus dubbed Hayton’s version of the royal journey to Karakorum as nothing more than “sheer fantasy.”871 While the baptism episode is not found in other sources, Hayton’s fanciful treatment reveals his awareness of the diplomatic exchanges between the Ilkhans and the Latin West, which focused on the papacy’s request for the Ilkhans to receive baptism before an alliance could be forged. Hetʿum’s role as a religious intermediary was thus positioned within the diplomatic dialogue between the Ilkhanate and papacy. Hayton’s report to Clement V is comparable to the efforts of the Ilkhanid missions, which similarly projected the willingness of the Mongols to convert to Christianity as part of their hopes for an alliance.

While not an official envoy of the Mongols, Constable Smbat’s letter to the Franks in 1248 also exemplifies the ways in which Mongol vassals promoted the pro-Christian disposition of their overlords.872 While Hayton’s depiction finds parallels in the reports circulated in the East, his account is geared towards highlighting the role of the Cilician king as an intermediary. Möngke Khan’s conversion to Christianity thus represents the fruits of Hetʿum’s labors. Through this lens, Hayton succeeds in underscoring the significance of Cilician Armenia as an intermediary in the East. Judith Pfeiffer has recently highlighted how conversion stories have much to say about the

870 Hayton, (French) 164-65; (Latin) 297.
872 Jackson, Mongols and the West, 98.
intended audience and the values and memory of the society. In Hayton’s case, the story works to signal the political significance of the kingdom, which faced an uncertain future at the start of the fourteenth century.

Hayton’s conversion narrative thus goes beyond both the diplomatic dialogue between the Latin West and Ilkhanate and Eastern Christian enthusiasm for the Mongol affinity towards Christianity. The spotlight rests clearly on Hetʿum as the papal advocate in the East. Hayton further accentuates this role by noting that it was Hetʿum’s idea to have the Mongols invade the Abbasid caliphate and plan for the recovery of Jerusalem. Hayton specifically notes that the Mongol Khan consented to the recovery of Jerusalem and its return to Christian hands, and promised to see the plans through “for the reverence of Jesus Christ.” By making these requests known to the Khan, Hetʿum is presented as a champion of the Christian cause.

The mediation of Hetʿum in Möngke’s court finds an analogous example in the account of Armenian Metropolitan Stepʿanos Orbelian. A look at this narrative is valuable as it shows how Hayton may have been drawing from conventions used in Armenian historiography to glorify the careers of the royals. In paralleling Hayton’s depiction of Hetʿum, Stepʿanos Orbelian glorifies the close relations forged between his kinsman Prince Smbat Orbelian and Möngke Khan during the former’s trip to Karakorum.

875 Hayton, 166.
in 1251-52. Their interaction closely parallels Hayton’s treatment of Het’um’s prized position vis-à-vis the Great Khan.

The rise of the Orbelians was overtly fashioned by the Mongols in the thirteenth century. The Orbelian family’s social ascendancy reflected a growing trend in Mongol policy during the thirteenth century, whereby certain families were favored by their Mongol overlords by enjoying promotions such as inju status and territorial concessions. The Mongols established the careers of certain nobles, while extinguishing the prominence of others. This imperial strategy aimed at exploiting the political rivalries among the lords of the Transcaucasus, which in turn, would encourage the subjects to compete for Mongol favor. The Orbelian family represented one such success story whose political career was engineered at the expense of their former overlords, the Zakarians.

Paralleling Hayton’s treatment of Het’um’s role as a religious intermediary, Step’annos underscores how Prince Smbat’s Christian piety played a major role in developing his close relationship to Möngke (an attribute listed among many including the prince’s sharp intellect, valor, and knowledge of different languages.) Step’annos describes how the prince incessantly prayed, upon which a wondrous sign appeared in the sky over his tent (a shining circular sign with a cross above it, beaming with rays of light.)

---
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According to Step'annos, Möngke, in a surprisingly informal manner, descends from his throne and embraces the relic. Möngke is described as a devout Mongol ruler whose realm had a church and a large Christian community. Impressed with Smbat’s piety, Möngke honors the prince with a yarligh, an imperial decree, which accredited him hereditary rights and expanded his territorial domains, typically given to churches and priests. The conversion narrative thus serves to legitimize the rise of the Orbelians, based on the reality that Smbat was rewarded with an inju status, which established his domain as crown land and meant that the prince was solely accountable to the Mongols, thereby breaking the Orbelian family’s ties to the Georgian crown.

Smbat is also noted to have secured additional territories, significantly expanding his base of power. The close relationship between overlord and vassal is presented within a Christian framework, similar to Hayton’s treatment of Het’um’s interactions with the Great Khan. Both writers take the strategic submissions made by their lords to the Mongols and glorify the rewards of the Mongol-Armenian partnership. These rewards are defined according to their individual needs. In Hayton’s case, Het’um succeeds in establishing a “Christian” ally, while Step’annos treats the legitimacy of his family’s rise to power.
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According to George Lane, the political careers of individuals like Smbat served as “pillars of the Mongol administration.” Inscriptive evidence supports the idea that Smbat enjoyed a prestigious career and notes his title as king. Writing at the end of the thirteenth century, Stepʿan nos Orbelian continued to be held in high esteem by his Mongol overlords. The Metropolitan’s celebratory treatment of Smbat’s achievements is, therefore, a reflection of his own enjoyment of Mongol patronage and the position his family secured in the Empire. Other princes who voluntarily submitted to the Mongols also cemented close ties to their new overlords and were largely able to protect their interests in return for supporting Mongol military campaigns.

Composed in a transitional period of Mongol rule, both early fourteenth century narratives interpret the early stages of their families’ fortunes in a nostalgic framework. Both Hayton and Stepʿan nos had grown up in the courts of their respective kin and had witnessed the positive relations of Mongol-Armenian exchanges. Hayton’s account is situated within diplomatic dialogue between the Latin West and Ilkhanate, while the latter’s version is intended for a local audience. Both their accounts were made possible because of Mongol syncretism and the Empire’s reliance upon the skills of its subjects. These two factors allowed for individuals like Prince Smbat and Hetʿum I to serve as
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valuable political subjects and for later writers like Hayton and Stepʿannos to overstate the Armenian influence on the policies of the Mongol khans.

5.6 Defining Cilician Armenia’s Role in a Future Crusade

Hayton’s historical survey of the Mongols also serves as a deliberate propagandistic tool to construct the Cilician king’s indispensable role as a political intermediary in a future crusade. As the overarching theme of *La Flor des estoires* is to plan a crusade and promote an alliance with the Mongols, Hayton, unsurprisingly, devotes considerable efforts in advancing the king’s role as a papal ally in the war against Islam and recovery of the Holy Land. Therefore, in addition to presenting the Ilkhans as pro-Christian allies, the Cilician king is treated as a vital political agent in the military affairs of the Near East and the principal agent in influencing Ilkhanid plans to assist the crusaders.

Hayton underscores how Hetʿum initiated Möngke’s plans to send Hülegü, brother of the Great Khan, to destroy the Abbasid Caliphate. This is a distortion of the complex relations between the Mongols, Abbasid caliph, and the Ismāʿīlīs, a Shīʿī sect of Islam in Iran. While Möngke had previously negotiated with the caliph and the Ismāʿīlīs, tensions arose between them, especially after the Abbasid Caliph refused to submit unlike the other Muslim rulers the Mongols had encountered in Transoxiana and Persia.890 All forms of obstinacy were punishable in the context of the Mongol mission to control the world.891

Furthermore, Hülegü’s campaigns were not merely intended to be punitive in nature, but were part of Möngke Khan’s plans for Mongol expansion, as noted by Rashīd ad-Dīn, whose account also describes the dispatching of the Khan’s other brother, Qubilai, to
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China at the same time. Unlike Hayton’s focus on Het’um’s critical role in planning the attack on the Muslim Middle East, the Mongols were guided by their own political interests, that is, to expand territorially based on their mandate of world domination.

While Hayton’s version is enthusiastic in its treatment of the Mongol invasion of the Middle East, it is drawing from the positive military cooperation between the two parties and the enthusiasm of Cilician Armenia’s participation in the Mongol campaigns. Furthermore, just because Het’um did not instigate plans for the assault on Iran and Baghdad, it did not mean that he did not play a critical role in the military campaigns. Claude Cahen has pointed out that Het’um likely served as a strategic informant for the Mongols, based on his background as a Cilician Armenian and knowledge of the political affairs of the Near East.

Indeed, the Mongol reliance upon informants to support their war machine was a major strategy employed by the khans. While Het’um may not have initiated plans for the Mongol conquest of the Middle East, he would have likely supplied critical information to assist in the planning of Möngke’s military objectives. The Armenians and Georgians particularly served as valuable informants and played an active role in the Mongol military expeditions. The Mongol Empire’s success in mobilizing troops and using non-Mongol auxiliaries allowed for such positive reports to circulate.

Kirakos of Gandzak, for example, describes the strategic role played by Prince Hasan Jalal Dawla of the Caucasus region, who worked very closely with Mongol messengers in
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addition to performing obligatory military service. The same Armenian cleric portrays the esteemed standing of Prince Proš from Greater Armenia—who participated in the fall of Baghdad and served as a direct eyewitness source for the Armenian priest. Proš served as Hülegü’s chosen delegate to the court of the caliph to demand his submission and payment of taxes (despite his efforts, the Armenian prince received a hostile reaction from the caliph, who called the Chinggisid prince a dog). Equal praise is given by Kirakos to Prince Sadun, another noble from Greater Armenia, whom the cleric celebrates as a valiant fighter of the Ilkhans, “appointed among foremost champions.” In a similar vein, the HNA lauds the martial skills of Sadun and his close relationship to Hülegü. While their participation was considered obligatory military service, the Armenian and Georgian lords clearly served as vital military forces in fighting in the Middle East and in the Ilkhanid wars against the Golden Horde.

However, Hayton’s account is not interested in simply highlighting the privileges enjoyed by the Cilician king. On the contrary, he depicts the position of Hetʿum as a political equal to the Mongols, evidenced in the king’s journey alongside Hülegü to the Middle East against the Ismaīlīs in 1256. The image of a Mongol and an Armenian riding alongside each other portrays equal political standing, one which blurs the distinction between conqueror and subject. This image also downplays or even refrains from noting Cilician Armenia’s position as vassal state.
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While the Armenian kingdom proved a loyal ally in the Ilkhanid invasions, it was not considered an equal political power. Thus Hayton’s portrait is misguided in nature. With the election of each new Ilkhan, there was always the threat of Mongol-Armenian relations changing for the worse. This was partly why Armenian rulers made efforts to visit the Ilkhanid Persian court, where they would re-iterate the positive alliance between the two parties. Bar Hebraeus particularly notes that uncertainty arose for the vassal lords with each new succession of Ilkhan. In his account of Het’um II’s journey to visit the newly elected Ilkhan Baidu (r.1295), he relays that: “He desired greatly to come to his service, and to meet him in person, and to put on a sure footing many matters between Baidû and himself.”

It should also be mentioned that Arabic sources also speak of the leading role of the Armenian forces in the Ilkhanid campaigns, suggesting that the Mamlûks also viewed them as Mongol allies rather than as mere vassals. Ibn Shaddâd al-Ḥalabî, for example, relays the savage manner in which the “king of Sis” assaulted the Great Mosque (also known as the Umayyad Mosque) in Aleppo during the Mongol campaign of 1260, where he also “killed a great number of men.” This type of polemical imagery would continue to resurface in Arab sources to account for the leading support provided by the Armenians in the Ilkhanid invasions of Syria.

Hayton also uses the siege of Aleppo in 1260 to underscore Het’um’s strategic planning of the assault. According to La Flor des estoires, the destruction of the Sultan of
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Aleppo would bring Syria under Mongol control, and hence, pave the way for the recovery of the Holy Land.\textsuperscript{905} Hetʿum’s masterminding of the Aleppan assault also appears to be an exaggeration of the Armenian’s involvement in the campaign. The *Chronicle* of Constable Smbat makes no mention of Hetʿum’s planning of the assault, but notes that Hülegü only asked for Hetʿum’s participation when he had already surrounded the city and was prepared to launch a siege.\textsuperscript{906} As supreme commander of the Armenian forces, it is noteworthy that Smbat underscores Mongol initiative in the attack, and therefore, does not attribute it to Cilician Armenian mediation.

Smbat’s treatment seems to be better indicative of Hülegü’s invasion of Syria, as it covers the Mongol goal of establishing control over the region, which was undergoing a period of political instability at the time. Syria had become politically vulnerable under the rule of various Ayyūbid princes. These Ayyūbid princes in Syria—including al-Nāṣir Yusuf ibn al-Muḥammad, Sultan of Aleppo and Damascus—exercised relatively weak control in the region due to internal Ayyūbid rivalries and factional dynastic politics.\textsuperscript{907} Al-Ashraf Mūsā, former prince of Homs, had written to Hülegü promoting his invasion of Syria as part of his plans to regain his political position. The former prince of Homs had been stripped of power by Sultan al-Nāṣir Yusuf, who had succeeded in having him deposed.\textsuperscript{908} This context of bitter competition among the Muslim lords allowed for Hülegü to target Sultan al-Nāṣir for his uncooperative diplomatic gestures.\textsuperscript{909} Damascus would soon follow the fall of Aleppo under the Mongol commander Kitbogha. Thus, while Hayton’s treatment focuses on the contributions of his Christian king in the wars
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against Syria, the reality was that the Mongols equally relied upon the assistance of local Muslim princes to suit their political objectives.

Hayton’s account of Cilician Armenian mediation is not completely unfounded, as Het’um did succeed in recruiting Antiochene aid for the Mongol campaigns. Having gained the support of Prince Bohemond VI, his son-in-law, both Cilician Armenia and Antioch experienced initial success for their military assistance to the Mongols (their involvement also caused later Mamlûk retaliation against them). In treating Hülegû’s campaign of Syria, Hayton does not shy away from highlighting the rewards of this military cooperation.\(^\text{910}\) Het’um received fortresses in western Cilicia from the Mongols, while Bohemond retook Latakiah in exchange for his aid.\(^\text{911}\) Vardan Arewel’i praises how Het’um, “freed from death the Christians, ecclesiastics and laymen, in every place.”\(^\text{912}\)

Christian rulers were not the only beneficiaries for their support of the Mongols; the Ayyûbid Prince al-Ashraf Mûsâ was given Homs, along with gaining titular rule over Syria.\(^\text{913}\) The rewards for Cilician Armenian and Antiochene support were nevertheless short-lived. While Cilician Armenia was spared Antioch’s fate in 1266, it was exposed to Mamlûk retaliation for its status as an Ilkhanid ally from the mid-thirteenth century onwards.\(^\text{914}\)

Lewon III (r. 1269-89) is also described by Hayton as a critical political intermediary to Ilkhan Abaqa (r. 1265-82) in his role as an advocate for the recovery of the Holy

\(^{910}\) See specifically chapter twenty-nine.


\(^{912}\) Translation from Thomson, *Historical Compilation*, 218.


\(^{914}\) While the Mamlûks targeted the kingdom, its main port city, Ayas, flourished as a result of trading. The fall of Antioch seems to have helped Cilician Armenia in economic terms, as trade went through Ayas as opposed to Antioch. See Amitai-Preiss, *Mongols and Mamluks*, 133; Ashtor, *A Social and Economic History of the Near East in the Middle Ages*, 245-65; Ashtor, *Levant Trade*, 52-54.
Land.\textsuperscript{915} The text particularly notes that Mongols greatly honored the king who made repeated requests for Abaqa to recover the Holy Land.\textsuperscript{916} Lewon’s role in promoting a crusade stands in line with Hayton’s broader articulation of Cilician Armenia as a key middle-power between the Latins and the Mongols due to its relations to both powers. Hayton is clearly drawing from the Cilician leadership’s regular communications with the Latins, which focused on the urgency of military aid and the prospect of alliance with the Mongols. Lewon, most notably, had directed envoys to Edward I in 1278, hoping to promote military cooperation with the Mongols.\textsuperscript{917} It may very well be that he also advocated the crusade to his Mongol overlords.

Abaqa showed interest in negotiating with the Latins upon his election as Ilkhan. In late 1266/early 1267, the Ilkhan dispatched a mission to Pope Clement IV and King James I of Aragon, which only resulted in a papal reply in 1268.\textsuperscript{918} Abaqa’s foreign policy needed western support based on his wars against the Mamlūks and Chaghataid-Ögodeids khanate.\textsuperscript{919} As Ilkhanid military resources were drained, news of the crusading interests of Pope Clement IV, Louis IX of France, Prince Edward of England (future Edward I), and James I of Aragon, ignited Ilkhanid enthusiasm for an alliance.\textsuperscript{920}

Abaqa continued to promote the Ilkhanid interest for a joint crusade. He sent David Ashby and his Latin secretary Ricardus to the Second Council of Lyons in 1274. The

\textsuperscript{915} For Arghun, see ch.38.

\textsuperscript{916} Hayton, 179.

\textsuperscript{917} Lloyd, \textit{English Society and the Crusades}, 254.

\textsuperscript{918} Dashdondog, \textit{The Mongols and the Armenians}, 171.

\textsuperscript{919} Unfortunately Abaqa’s letter remains unfound. Clement’s reply gives evidence to what the original correspondence may have contained. Clement IV congratulated the ilkhan on his conversion to Christianity and alerted him that a crusade was to be organized in the near future. Clement IV also complained that the original letter was sent in Mongolian. D’Ohsson, \textit{Histoire} 3: 540-42; Boyle, “Princes of Europe,” 29.

\textsuperscript{920} This was notably the case with the famous Sunqur al-Ashqar, who revolted against Mamlūk rule in Damascus. Amitai-Preiss, \textit{Mongols and Mamluks}, 181-183; Rohricht, 637.
Vassali brothers were similarly sent in 1276-7 and also tried to enlist the collaboration of Philip III of France and Edward I of England. Abaqa also tried to enlist the assistance of the Latin Christians in the East, while continuing to appeal to Edward I for the Ilkhanid attack on Syria in 1288/81.921

The Ilkhanate also engaged in diplomatic negotiations with the Byzantines. The shifting political currents of the Near Eastern world necessitated such multi-lateral diplomatic tactics. Byzantine-Ilkhanid diplomatic ties were strengthened through the marriage of the Greek emperor’s illegitimate daughter, Maria, to the Ilkhan in 1265. Having regained control of Constantinople in 1261, Michael IX also sought to improve his relations with the papacy as part of his multilateral diplomatic strategy in dealing with various political powers.

While Hayton emphasizes Lewon’s critical role in promoting Ilkhanid interests to the Latins, Abaqa’s diplomatic overtures, however consistent, proved largely unsuccessful.922 Louis IX’s crusade ended in disaster at Tunis in 1270 while Edward’s participation in 1271 was but a brief window of military collaboration. Each party maintained separate courses, with the Mongols carrying out a small raid through Syria and Edward launching an attack on Qaqun in Palestine.923

---

923 Jackson, *The Mongols and the West*, 167. Sultan Qalawun prevented the Franks from joining the Mongol armies led under the command of Abaqa’s brother Mongke Temur. The Hospitallers of Marqab also launched a raid against the Mamluks during the Mongol campaign. While Ahaqa did not succeed in recruiting significant support from the Franks, the possibility of collaboration posed a threat to Sultan Qalawun. Reuven Amitai-Preiss has pointed out that the Mamluk sultan likely established truces with the Franks to avoid an augmented force against him. In contrast, Acre declined to provide the requested men and provisions. These particular truces (*hudnat*) were especially used in the earlier years of Qalawun’s reign in dealing with the threat posed by the Franks in the East. Abaqa’s death in 1282 halted his consistent efforts for military collaboration. Amitai-Preiss, *Mongols and the Mamluks*, 186; cited in R. Rohricht, “Les
5.7 Cilician Armenian Mediation in Near Eastern Politics

Hayton’s historiographical treatment also presents Cilician Armenia as a political intermediary in the politics of the Near East, aside from the kingdom’s role as an advocate of the recovery of the Holy Land. The text places emphasis on the kingdom’s strategic geo-political positioning for protecting Ilkhanid interests in Anatolia, especially in the context of Sultan Baybars’ invasion of the Mongol-occupied Seljuk Sultanate in 1277, which resulted in the Egyptian victory at the Battle of Abuluystan (Elbistan) against the Mongol forces which included Armenian, Georgian and Seljuk contingents.

The Mamlūk invasion of the Seljuk Sultanate took place after the Egyptian raid on Cilician Armenia in 1274/75. Sara Nur Yildiz has looked at how Mongol-controlled trade routes, including the one from Anatolian Sivas, presented a logistical dilemma for Baybars, whose army depended upon slave recruits originating from the Kipchak Steppe. Thus the Mamlūk Sultanate’s attention to the Mongol-occupied territories of the Seljuks seems to have been partly aimed at destabilizing Mongol power in the region as a way to protect Mamlūk military interests. Additionally, the Mamlūk army had received a high number of discontented Turkish vassals (wafidiyya).

The attack of 1277 seems to have been based on the duplicitous efforts of the Pervāne (vizier), Mu’in al-Din Sulayman b. Muhadhdhab al-Din Ali al-Daylami (who is commonly referred to in scholarship by his held title). The Pervāne held considerable

---


924 For discussion of the attack on Cilician Armenia, see Stewart, 50-51.


926 Ibid, 374.

927 Boyle, *Cambridge History of Iran*, V, 361. Kilij Arslan was one of the two Sultans placed in power. The other, exiled Kay-Khusru II was in the Crimea. Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, 284; Amitai-Preiss, *Mongols*
political power in Mongol-controlled Anatolia, where the Ilkhans appear to have placed
Seljuk officials alongside Mongol princes as a way of limiting the independence of the
Turks. The period in which Baybars’ attention turned towards the Anatolian frontier
witnessed increasing Turkish disenchantment with Mongol rule, including the Pervâne’s clash
with Abaqa’s brother, Ajai, who had been stationed there. It is also telling that
the inhabitants of Kayseri greeted Baybars with enthusiasm upon his victory in April
1277. According to La Flor des estoires, the Pervâne deliberately encouraged a Mongol
loss by “trying to ruin the Tartars or cause them to desert.” In reality, the Pervâne left
the battlefield upon realizing the imminent loss, but did not purposely encourage a defeat,
as Hayton would have us believe. While the vizier secretly negotiated with Baybars, he
would not risk inciting the wrath of his overlord Abaqa. Nonetheless, Hayton’s account
of the vizier’s duplicity finds parallels in the Chronography of Bar Hebraeus, where the

*and Mamluks*, 159-160. Earlier on, the Pervâne had succeeded in having Sultan Rūkn al-Dīn Kılıç Arslan
murdered, based on charges of his pro-Mamlûk position (a commonly used accusation against enemies in
Mongol occupied lands). Through this political maneuvering, the Pervâne came to the political sphere,
ruling behind Rūkn al-Dīn’s young son and successor Ghiyath al-Dīn Kaykhusraw III, who was sultan only
in name.

Yildiz, 351. Yildiz emphasizes the lack of information concerning Mongol Anatolia in Rashīd al-
Dīn and the important source of Ibn Bibi, which makes it difficult to provide details in regards to the ways in
which the Ilkhans exercised control over the sultanate.

Yildiz, 376. The blame on the Pervâne’s treasounous plotting is not ungrounded, but is rooted in the
Seljuk vizier’s complex, double-handed gestures to both Baybars and Abaqa. The astute political actor had
initially written to Baybars in support of a Mamlûk invasion of Rum, while also maintaining his formal
allegiance to Abaqa, who had overseen his rise to power at the Seljuk court at Rum. The Pervâne’s
duplicitous efforts in keeping open relations with both Abaqa and Baybars may have served as a means to
protect his interests, in case of a future aggressive Mongol retaliation. According to Carole Hillenbrand, the
Pervâne’s actions may have also been tied to his personal ambitions in carving out his own semi-
independent state. Carole Hillenbrand, Parwana, 270; 273.Amitai-Preiss, 160-161, 175; Cahen, *Pre-

Yildiz, 383.

Hayton, (French) 180-81; (Latin) 309-10.

Amitai-Preiss, *Mongols and Mamluks*, 173. See also account of the Coptic Mufaḍḍal who speaks of the
Pervâne’s escape, 426.
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Pervāne is described to have encouraged the Mongol commanders to drink heavily before the battle for a guaranteed defeat.\textsuperscript{933}

Hayton attaches little importance to the Mamlūk victory by choosing to concentrate on Abaqa’s subsequent retaliation and Lewon’s strategic input in the aftermath of the Ilkhanid response. Baybars’ invasion of 1277 did not result in Mamlūk consolidation of power in Anatolia despite his victory. In anticipation of a major Mongol retaliation, the Egyptian forces retreated after their subsequent conquest of Kayseri.\textsuperscript{934} Their withdrawal allowed the Karamanid Turks to expand their base of power by taking over Konya in 1277.\textsuperscript{935} Thus while Hayton softens the blows of the Mamlūk victory, the political consequences of the Egyptian invasion did not impact the Mongol occupation of the Seljuk Sultanate.

Hayton uses the Egyptian invasion of 1277 to highlight Lewon’s role as a political intermediary in its aftermath, indicating that Abaqa relied upon Cilician Armenia’s counsel to plan the best course of political action for the Seljuk Sultanate’s future. Hayton first notes how Abaqa attacked and seized two thousand Saracen cavalry and an additional five thousand Kurdish families living in the area following the Mongol defeat. His treatment contrasts with the accounts of Bar Hebraeus and Rashīd al-Dīn, as well as other Arabic sources, who note the significant number of Mongol troops killed in earlier battle.\textsuperscript{936}

\textsuperscript{933} *Chronography*, see chapter eleven.
\textsuperscript{934} Yıldız, 383.
\textsuperscript{935} Pfeiffer, “Ahmād Tegüder’s Second Letter to Qalā‘ūn (682/1283),” 181, ft. 63
Hayton’s account of Abaqa’s severe retaliation is based on the Ilkhan’s slaughter of the Muslim population of Eastern Anatolia upon hearing of the loss at Abuluystan. The Arabic account of the Coptic Mufaḍḍal depicts the wrathful Abaqa’s subsequent slaughter of the Muslim population, including the notables. Hayton underscores how the news of Abaqa’s arrival terrorized Baybars, who upon hearing it, “wanted to flee the land of the Turks.” Rumors of Abaqa’s reprisal indeed reached Baybars who subsequently retreated from Anatolia into Syria, where he fell ill and died in 1277. Marius Canard suggests that if Baybars had remained alive, he would have likely conquered Cilician Armenia to fully secure his hold of Anatolia. The Armenian kingdom was clearly seen as an important frontier between Ilkhanid and Mamlûk held territory.

Hayton’s text suggests that the Ilkhan became so pleased with the Cilician loyalty that he offered Lewon the Turkish realm, which he allegedly refused based on his inability to effectively govern two polities. Abaqa’s proposal illustrates Hayton’s historical objective to portray Cilician Armenia as a loyal Ilkhanid ally and key political power in the Near East. This portrait of the political exchanges in the Anatolian context is highly exaggerated, as the Ilkhan is unlikely to have offered the entire sultanate to Cilician Armenia, despite the king’s committed involvement in Ilkhanid military ventures. The

---

937 Ibid, 176.
938 Mufaḍḍal, 436-437.
939 Ibid.
941 Additionally, Hayton highlights Abaqa’s punitive execution of the Pervâne, noting how his flesh was consumed in a cannibalistic ritual by the Ilkhan and his nobles. Unsurprisingly, Hayton’s does not discuss Abaqa’s initial reluctance to execute the high-profiled Pervâne, and only did so, after hearing the grievances listed against him by the Mongol nobility. Hillenbrand suggests that Abaqa’s reluctance may have been a sign of his close relationship to the Pervane, 270.
942 Hayton, (French) 181; (Latin) 309.
Ilkhan’s letter to Baybars after the Mamlük victory at Elbistan particularly indicates the Mongol mandate of world domination, revealing that the Ilkhans were by no means willing to give up their territories to other powers.\textsuperscript{943}

*La Flor des estoires* then underscores how Lewon acted as the principal counselor in guiding Abaqa’s plans for Anatolia. More specifically, Lewon is noted to have advised Abaqa to minimize the possibility of a revolt in Anatolia so that it would never be subject to Muslim rule. With this reference, Hayton shows his awareness of the growing anti-Mongol sentiments in the region.\textsuperscript{944} While Lewon likely served as a counselor to Abaqa, his expertise was not as exclusive as Hayton would present. Abaqa significantly relied upon the intervention of key Muslim officials to strengthen Ilkhanid control over Rum in the aftermath of the Mamlük invasion. Moreover, Abaqa’s plan was to shift power from the Seljuks into the hands of Mongol governors as a means to eliminate the possibility of a future revolt and further duplicitous actions by the Seljuk officials.\textsuperscript{945} Fakhr al-Dīn Ṭalī was subsequently appointed as the new vizier, while Ghiyas al-Dīn Kaykhusraw III (d.1284) served as Seljuk Sultan.\textsuperscript{946}

Hayton’s focus on King Lewon’s strategic contribution is situated in the transformed political landscape of Anatolia following the Mamlük invasion and the death of the Pervāne, who exercised immense political power. While the Seljuk Sultans continued to rule until 1308, effective power was transferred to the Mongol military and

\textsuperscript{943} Amitai-Preiss, “Mongol Imperial Ideology and the Ilkhanid War;” 65.
\textsuperscript{944} Hayton, (French)181, (Latin) 309.
\textsuperscript{945} Boyle, *The Cambridge History of Iran*, V, 250.
\textsuperscript{946} Yildiz, 386.
administrative elite. These changes exacerbated Seljuk discontentment towards the Mongols and resulted in the rise of anarchic conditions and onerous taxation.  

La Flor des estoires’ portrait of the political events in Seljuk Anatolia underscores the importance of Cilician Armenia as an Ilkhanid vassal in the politics of the Near East, While Hayton’s depiction of the Anatolian context revises political history, it also reveals that Cilician Armenia served as a frontier or buffer zone between the Ilkhans and Mamlûks, playing an important role in the conflict between the two superpowers. The Armenian king was thus not only viewed as an intermediary for Ilkhanid-Latin exchanges, but as a loyal vassal of the Mongols in the political events of the Eastern Mediterranean, serving to defend Mongol interests against Mamlûk and Turkish opposition. This position later proved disadvantageous to the kingdom, as the Ilkhans were unable to offer protection to the kingdom, thereby allowing Cilician exposure to Egyptian assaults and increasing Turkic advances. By Hayton’s time, Cilician Armenia suffered due to its position as a buffer state between two hostile forces, as it was neither independent nor neutralist in its position. Its siding with the Ilkhanate greatly limited its diplomatic possibilities and essentially increased the vulnerability of the Armenian satellite state.

5.8 Conclusion

Hayton’s historical interpretation of the Mongols is thus a complex portrait of the political forces at work in the Near East. His careful rendition of the Mongol religious worldview is to underscore their monotheistic and pro-Christian disposition. This

---

treatment was firmly situated in the dialogue between the Latins and Ilkhans as both parties negotiated the terms for an alliance against the Mamlûks. It was also situated within the reports of his Armenian contemporaries, suggesting his awareness of the information circulated in the East. While some of his ideas including Möngke’s baptism seem misguided, Hayton was building upon a repository of tropes available to him.

His historical treatise also reveals his understanding of the gradual conversion to Islam among the Ilkhans. This reality was especially threatening to Cilician Armenia, as a Christian vassal, and to his negotiations for a Latin-Mongol alliance. He, therefore, relied upon a careful historical interpretation to downplay the process and emphasize the Ilkhanid esteem for the recovery of the Holy Land, thereby maintaining the Mongols as allies of the Christian cause. Despite his efforts, the Latin West expressed hesitations to work with the Mongols.

Additionally, Hayton’s historical framework does not neglect to address the political significance of Cilician Armenia as an intermediary. The kingdom is presented both as a religious agent advocating papal interests to the Ilkhans and a political intermediary in defending Ilkhanid interests in the Near East. His focus on Cilician Armenian intermediation was firmly situated in his plans to advocate the Armenian kingdom as a crusader base, as will be explored in the following chapter.
Chapter 6

Hayton’s Crusade Strategy

*La Flor des estoires* stands out as a distinctive recovery treatise of the fourteenth century, as part of a group of approximately fifteen proposals written after the fall of Acre in 1291 during the pontificate of Clement V. While written counsel certainly preceded and followed the career of Clement V, the proposals during his pontificate represented a peak in the production of the ‘genre,’ with their rise—either solicited or unsolicited—being largely attributed to direct papal requests and in line with the wider discussion of crusade planning.\(^{948}\) An examination of Hayton’s *recuperatione* treatise reveals the complex interests of a Cilician Armenian prince, which focused on the advantages of a Mongol alliance, the use of Armenia as a base for the crusaders, and defined the Armenian kingdom as a critical political intermediary in Near Eastern politics.

This chapter will first survey the scholarly treatment of Hayton’s proposal. It will then situate Hayton’s crusade proposal in the context of Clement V’s crusading ambitions, followed by a close assessment of the treatise’s key features: spiritual motivations, assessment of the Mamlûk enemy, logistics of the course of the expedition, and the promotion of a ‘triple’ alliance among the Mongols, crusaders, and Armenians—all of which reflect his careful positioning of Cilician Armenia as a key intermediary power between East and West. A study of his ideas will ultimately indicate how his

\(^{948}\) Not all the treatises were addressed to the papacy. The treatise, *Liber de Fine* of Majorcan mystic Ramon Lull, was delivered to King James II of Aragon in 1305, promoting a crusade from Spain to North Africa.
proposal fits into the wider crusading genre and the ways in which it stands out as a unique text, based on his worldview as a Cilician Armenian prince. This worldview is also defined by Hayton in the crusade proposal as a strategy to delineate his role as an authoritative expert on eastern affairs and promote his interests to the Latin audience, which focused on the security of Cilician Armenia and Ilkhanid alliance. The final section of the chapter will focus on the overall impact of Hayton’s crusade proposal, as it had a significant role in shaping the knowledge of future theorists, being circulated outside the papal circle in the Latin West.

6.1 Recovery Treatises and Scholarly Treatment

Over the past century, the scholarly treatment of the genre of recovery treatises has produced insightful studies of the proposals, evolving from a more descriptive overview of the texts as a collective, towards an analytical approach with greater focus on individual treatises. Modern scholarship has looked at the interplay of social, political and economic factors which shaped the production of treatises and the particular motivations of the individual authors. While major studies have shed light upon the collective body of treatises and on important individual works, Hayton’s crusade proposal has not received adequate individual study, having largely been analyzed together with other crusade treatises.

As mentioned in the historiographical section of this study, Charles Kohler produced several focused studies on the crusade proposals, paving the way for future scholarship. His publication of the recovery memoirs of Hayton, Dominican friar William Adam and the anonymous author of the Directorium ad faciendum formed the second volume of Recueil des historiens des croisades, documents arméniens\(^{950}\). Elsewhere, Kohler published the anonymous crusade treatise, the Via ad Terram (the French version) and the Memoria (its Latin counterpart), as well as the treatise of the Genoese physician, Galvanto of Levanto. Kohler’s publications of several crusade memoirs became seminal works by increasing their accessibility for further study.\(^{951}\)

In the late nineteenth century, Joseph Delaville le Roulx published a significant study of the crusade proposals from the fourteenth century, examining the works as a collective body and their impact on actual crusade expeditions. His book, La France en Orient au XIV siècle, while representing a major study, offers a rather descriptive overview of the proposals including Hayton’s, without presenting an analytical framework from which to examine their motivations and context.\(^{952}\) His work nonetheless serves as a valuable piece of scholarship which treats several of the recovery treatises as a collective.

Notwithstanding le Roulx’s emphasis on the descriptive data of the texts, his conclusions reverberated with later scholars, and therefore, created long-held

\(^{950}\) For William Adam, ‘De modo sarracenos extirpandi,’ RHC doc. arm. II, 521-55; for the lengthy treatise, ‘Directorium ad passagium faciendum,’ RHC doc. arm. II, 367-517.


observations which have only been recently challenged. More specifically, le Roulx
classified the crusade proposals of the early fourteenth century as futile endeavors, which
ultimately failed to accomplish the objective of recovering the Holy Land. He argued that
a huge discrepancy surfaced between the idea of crusades and their actual realization,
thereby labeling the fourteenth century “la periode des projets steriles.”

Similar to *La France en Orient*, Aziz S. Atiya’s *opus magnum*, *The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, stands as an important contribution to the subject of recovery
treatises. Atiya, influenced by le Roulx, judged the first half of the fourteenth
century—the period in which the bulk of the crusade treatises were composed—largely as
a time of inactivity in terms of actual military organization. In contrast, the latter half of
the fourteenth century was characterized as a time when more opportunities for crusading
existed, such as the crusade against Smyrna (1344) and Peter I of Cyprus’ crusade against
Alexandria (1365).

Accordingly, the fourteenth century represented a clear divide: the first half being
an inactive period for crusade activity, with the latter producing actual military endeavors
to the East. In the first half, Atiya characterizes the crusade theorists as “propagandists,”
who advocated their interests within the wider social context of minimal enthusiasm for a
crusade. This understanding of the ‘crusades in the later middle ages’ was also
accepted by other key scholars including Sir Steven Runciman and Joshua Prawer.

---

955 Atiya, *The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, 345; for more detailed overview, see Leopold, 3-4.
956 Ibid, 17.
957 Steven Runciman, *History of the Crusades*, 427-68; Joshua Prawer, *World of the Crusaders* (London:
Little Hampton Book Services Ltd, 1973), 147-52; Louis Bréhier’s *L’Eglise et l’Orient au moyen age: les
croisades* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1907) also adheres to Atiya’s understanding.
More recently, Norman Housley and Christopher Tyerman have argued there was sustained interest in crusading throughout the ‘later middle ages,’ challenging Atiya’s rather systematic treatment of the fourteenth century and the designation of the treatises as mere propagandistic works. Their works have thus challenged the idea that crusading had become an antiquated, unpopular idea during the fourteenth century. Housley has stressed the longevity of crusading interest based on the enterprises that took place outside the Levant, and therefore, took form alongside the objective of recovering the Holy Land from Muslim occupation. The consideration of these other arenas of warfare is now looked at as part of the pluralist viewpoint of the crusades.

Furthermore, Sylvia Schein has also countered the conclusions of Le Roulx and Atiya in her major study of the recovery treatises produced between the Council of Lyons in 1274 to the Council of Vienne in 1311. Her scope, standing in line with Housley, challenges the older historiographical tradition which typically characterizes the fall of Acre in 1291 as the end of the ‘classical’ period of crusading or as the ‘start’ of the later crusades. Arguing against this rather clean-cut division, Schein focuses on the continuity of crusading ideas, by specifically looking into the ways in which the ideas discussed post-Acre had earlier antecedents at the Second Council of Lyons and continued to be defined well into the early fourteenth century.

---


961 Leopold also provides a more detailed overview of the newer historiographical trends, 4.
Her major study, *Fideles Crucis* contrasts with Atiya’s assumptions by emphasizing the context in which the treatises were produced, advocating that the first half of the fourteenth century as characterized by an atmosphere of enthusiasm for a crusade rather than the realization of the actual goal. Her detailed study of a wide range of primary sources concludes that the loss of Acre in 1291 was noted by thirteenth century contemporaries to be a mere “temporary setback.” Thus the theorists were not merely propagandists advocating their own interests, but worked within a wider movement for embarking upon, and encouraging enthusiasm, for a crusade. 962

Furthermore, the genre of crusading memoirs reflected the growing need for detailed strategy based on the reality that a direct attack on the Holy Land was not a readily attainable goal, thereby prompting the theorists to strategize ‘outside the box.’ Strategic measures such as implementing a blockade of Egypt, allying with the Mongols, utilizing Mediterranean bases, and addressing the question of unifying the Military Orders, were all popular topics in their works. Schein concludes that the emphasis on more minutely-planned expeditions also helped promote the professionalization of the armies, as noted in Hospitaller-led *passagium* of 1309. 963

In addition to the significant scholarly contribution of Schein, Antony Leopold has recently produced a major study of crusade proposals. 964 While Schein analyzed the recovery treatises as part of her examination of the wider perceptions of crusading, Leopold considers the proposals composed between 1290 and 1336 as a genre, thereby also looking at the later proposals including that of Dominican friar William Adam,

---

962 Ibid, see introductory remarks, 1-13.
which fell outside Schein’s chronological framework up to the aftermath of the Council of Vienne and the death of Clement V in 1314.

In looking at a broader range of treatises, Leopold focuses on the backgrounds of the authors and the circumstances in which their memoirs were produced. Moreover, he compares and contrasts the manner in which the theorists present the subject of crusade preparation and strategy; their outline of the passagium particulare and passagium generale; their theoretical justifications for a crusade; their evaluation of potential allies and their enemies; as well as the potential government of the New Kingdom of Jerusalem upon the recovery of the Holy Land. Such an in-depth analysis of the recovery treatises as a collective genre also reveals that the authors came from diverse backgrounds, writing with various objectives in mind, including the promotion of their ‘national interests’ such as Hayton’s treatment of Cilician Armenia. 965

Another important aspect of Leopold’s study is his look into the ‘timing’ of the production of recovery treatises, “which were clustered in certain periods,” remarking that most of the recovery treatises — though not all — were responses to papal initiative. 966 While largely made in response after the fall of Acre, the theorists appear to have largely recycled ideas on strategy already in circulation, and these ultimately had minimal impact on actual crusade plans. 967 Despite their marginal influence on actual crusade organization, the advocacy of a multi-staged strategy slowly earned favor amongst European leaders. 968

965 Ibid, see introduction, 1-7.
966 Ibid, 5.
967 Ibid, 206.
968 Ibid., 207.
By examining the impact of the proposals on actual crusade plans, Leopold does not analyze the ways in which the treatises were in dialogue with diplomatic and social issues. The examination of Hayton’s ideas seem largely disconnected from the context of Cilician Armenia’s political circumstances and its wider exchanges with the papacy and Mongols during the early fourteenth century. The lack of emphasis on the context of broader political issues limits the understanding of Hayton’s contributions to crusade planning.

Specialized topics pertaining to the crusade proposals have gained greater recognition in recent years. Alain Forey has treated the subject of the Military Orders in the proposals, while military historian J.F. Verbruggen has analyzed the strategic advice found in recovery treatises within his broader study on medieval warfare.969 Antonio Garcia Espada and Emmanuelle Vagnon have recently examined geographical components of the crusade proposals as an extension of Latin interests towards the East.970

In light of this general overview of the historiographical literature, a study of Hayton’s crusade proposal is a worthwhile undertaking, as his work has been predominantly examined among other proposals without much contextualization of its unique features. Hayton has thus been treated as a mere crusade propagandist, whose ideas seem detached from those of his contemporaries. A study of his treatise suggests that his impressions were deeply situated within the broader context of East-West

relations and were particularly rooted in his Cilician Armenian worldview. Moreover, his counsel engaged with the concerns of other recovery theorists. His crusade proposal thus moves beyond simply offering pragmatic details for warfare and indicates his understanding of the key diplomatic and political issues of his time. More specifically, his military counsel reflects broader Cilician diplomacy in requesting aid from the papacy and Ilkhanid-Latin exchanges.

6.2 Clement V and Hayton’s Submission

The fall of Acre in 1291 ignited substantial interest in the launching of a crusade. The crusade proposal of Hayton and his contemporaries were situated in the altered political landscape of the Latin East following the fall of the de facto capital of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. Papal efforts were also geared to aid the kingdoms of Cyprus and Cilician Armenia as both were threatened by the potential of a Mamlûk assault. The careers of those popes who exhibited greater dedication towards the recovery of the Holy Land witnessed a natural increase in recovery treatises. This was evident in the case of Pope Nicholas IV (r.1288-92) who expressed interest in launching a crusade, gaining funding and the participation of England, requesting the building of fleets by the Military Orders, and banning trade with Muslims. In contrast, his predecessors, Nicholas III (1277-80) and Martin IV (1281-85) had been more pre-occupied with domestic Italian
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971 Nicholas IV issued two bulls, the Dirum amaratudinis calicem (13 August 1291) and Dura nimis (18 August 1291), in which he pressed for military action. The later encyclical requested small councils to be held to discuss tangible plans for recovery. Schein, Fideles Crucis, 74-75; Nicholas IV, Registres de Nicholas IV, ed. E. Langlois (Paris, 1886-91) nos. 6791-5.

972 The careers of Boniface VIII (1294-1303) and Benedict XI (1303-04) indicate the link between minimal papal initiative and few strategic reports. Their pontificates showed more interest in dealing with domestic Italian affairs instead of planning a crusade to the Holy Land. Schein, Fideles Crucis, 157-78; T.S.R. Boase, Boniface VIII (London: Constable and Co., 1933); Laiou, Constantinople and the Latins, 202-3. The pontificate of Celestine V (August-December 1294) was short-lived to initiate any tangible results.
affairs and had framed the necessity of defending their political interests in Italy before the possibility of engaging in a crusade to the East.  

While the conditions post-1291 encouraged an intensification of crusade planning, it is worthwhile to point out that the antecedents of the recovery treatises had been made earlier on. Even as early as 1199, Innocent III (r.1198-1216) showed an avid interest in collecting information on the conditions of the East by writing to the Patriarch of Jerusalem, the bishop of Lydda, and the Military Orders, as part of his plans for a crusade. Perhaps most important were the efforts of Pope Gregory X (r.1271-76) who became attached to the idea of a crusade and encouraged the outpouring of advice following Prince Edward’s crusading expedition in 1271. Consequently, several key written reports were produced at the Second Council of Lyons in 1272-74, including the well-known works of Dominicans William of Tripoli and Humbert of Romans. Unlike the later recuperatione treatises, these early works exhibited minimal focus on military strategy, but extensively covered the issues of interest to the papacy in the context of council discussions; William of Tripoli concentrated on the rise of Islam and the career of

974 P.A. Throop, Criticism of the Crusade: a Study of Public Opinion and Crusade Propaganda (Amsterdam, 1940), 8-9; Regesta Regni Hierosolimitani, ed. Reinhold Rochricht (Innsbruck: Wagner, 1893-1904), nos. 760 and 762.  
Muhammad, whereas Humbert of Romans focused on the promotion of the crusade and preaching.977

Gregory X also commissioned the report of Franciscan Fidenzio of Padua, who eventually composed what is generally accepted as the first so-called recovery treatise, the Liber recuperationis Terrae Sanctae, believed to have been completed sometime before the fall of Acre in 1291.978 Fidenzio was familiar with the conditions of the East, having served as a Franciscan vicar of the Holy Land and as witness to the fall of Tripoli in 1289.979 The Liber recuperationis Terrae Sanctae was groundbreaking in its focus on military strategy, coupled with its overview of the history of the Holy Land, the rise of Islam, and the life of Muhammad. Thus the work combined military strategy with relevant information pertaining to the East and the status of the enemy—a trend which continued in the works of the later recuperatione terrae sanctae, including the treatise of Hayton and the crusade memoir of Charles II of Anjou (d.1309), a seasoned crusader with a personal claim to the throne of Jerusalem after his father had purchased its rights from Maria of Antioch in 1277.980 Hayton and his contemporaries therefore did not contribute to a novel genre, but built upon earlier traditions, adapting them to the increasingly refined interests of the Latin leadership.

Clement V’s pontificate marked a dramatic surplus of the production of fifteen recovery treatises. The papacy’s enthusiasm for a crusade was matched by that of the French monarch, Philip IV (r.1285-1314). Originally, Clement V and Philip IV discussed

978 Fidenzio of Padua, ‘Liber recuperationis Terrae Sanctae,’ (Golubovich, II), 9-60; Leopold, 16.
979 Moreover, Fidenzio had traveled with Baybars’ army after the fall of Antioch in 1268 in order to aid the Christian captives.
the potential of a crusade in 1305-6, which aimed at planning an offensive against Constantinople under the leadership of the king’s brother, Charles of Valois (1270-1325), based on the latter’s claim to the Byzantine Empire through his marriage to Catherine of Courtenay.\footnote{Regestum Clementis Papae V, no.2269; Leopold, 27.} Philip IV perceived the crusade as an effective means to expand French political power, but added that he would not journey to the East in the event that the crusade conflicted with the domestic security of his kingdom.\footnote{Menache, Clement V, 104.} While Clement supported French royal plans, he did not lose sight of the urgent necessity of recovering the Holy Land, as evidenced through his correspondence with other European leaders.\footnote{Laiou, Constantinople and the Latins, 203; Sylvia Schein, “Philip IV the Fair and the Crusade: A Reconsideration,” in Crusade and Settlement, 121-6.} Edward I of England (r.1272-1307), Albert I of Germany (r. 1298-1308) and James II of Aragon (r.1291-1327) were contacted to discuss leading the crusade to the Holy Land—all of whom were unable and/or reluctant to take up Clement’s offer.\footnote{While Edward I showed interest in crusading, he died in 1307; Albert I was more interested in receiving the imperial crown; James II’s interest in the passagium were highly complex as he engaged in diplomacy with the papacy, Mongols and Egyptians, while also focusing on the crusade in Grenada.} In light of the lack of leadership, a *passagium generale* proved an unfeasible endeavor at the time. The papacy consequently aimed at planning a smaller expedition, a *passagium particulare*, to assist the last two Christian kingdoms in the East, Cyprus and Cilician Armenia.

The crusade theorists almost exclusively supported the use of a limited expedition, the *passagium particulare*, which they advanced as a useful precursor to the general crusade. Large-scale crusading, in the form of a *passagium generale*, came to be viewed as a draining enterprise in the early fourteenth century. This type of passage was burdened with several problems including the difficulty in finding a committed leader to oversee the large expedition, the burdens of domestic conflicts in the Latin West, such as
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981 Regestum Clementis Papae V, no.2269; Leopold, 27.
982 Menache, Clement V, 104.
983 Laiou, Constantinople and the Latins, 203; Sylvia Schein, “Philip IV the Fair and the Crusade: A Reconsideration,” in Crusade and Settlement, 121-6.
984 While Edward I showed interest in crusading, he died in 1307; Albert I was more interested in receiving the imperial crown; James II’s interest in the *passagium* were highly complex as he engaged in diplomacy with the papacy, Mongols and Egyptians, while also focusing on the crusade in Grenada.
the wars between France and England (1294-1303) and the Sicilian Vespers (1282-1302), and the complications in arranging the financing of a general crusade.

In turn, the majority of recovery theorists, with the exception of the Master of the Templars, Jacques de Molay, supported the idea of a *passagium particulare*, which had gained favor among earlier theorists at Lyons. It was argued that an initial force could execute offensive strikes against the Levantine coastline, ensure a maritime blockade of Egypt to stop illicit Christian-Muslim trade, and establish bridgeheads on the Syrian mainland. A larger *passagium generale*, or the traditional crusade, would ideally follow to recover the Holy Land. While their ideas were not innovative, the theorists’ emphasis on producing tangible plans reflected the evolution of crusade planning.

Clement V was further encouraged to plan a crusade upon being informed of the recent affairs in Cilician Armenia through a joint Cypriot-Armenian embassy in the spring of 1306, which underscored the urgency for a crusade. The Cilician king, Lewon IV (1305-7) had requested three hundred knights and five hundred foot-soldiers for the immediate aid of the kingdom. Clement V responded by looking to the Genoese and Arthur II, Duke of Brittany (r.1305-1312) for assistance, both of whom failed to accept the request. According to Sylvia Schein, Clement V may not have appealed to the Military Orders at this point “so that they could be used mainly for the Holy Land,” rather than being directed to the Armenian kingdom.
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987 Schein, *Fideles Crucis*, 197.
Clement’s request for Hayton’s military counsel was in direct response to learning of the recent affairs of both Cyprus and Cilician Armenia. Both Hayton and the Armenian delegation sent to the papal court in the 1306 were aware of the unfeasibility of a general crusade in the near future and thus promoted the advantages of an initial smaller expedition. While Hayton’s visit to the papal court in Poitiers was officially intended to gain papal recognition of Amaury’s rule in Cyprus, the Armenian diplomat was asked to provide his counsel based on his intimate knowledge of eastern political affairs. The period in which Hayton offered his expertise reveals that it was highly relevant and sought after.

Moreover, Hayton’s advice was particularly welcome as the Latin West had received news from Ilkhan Ölijeitü in 1305. The Ilkhan had addressed a letter to Philip IV of France, Clement V and Edward I, which Latin Christian envoys delivered.988 The letter reported the newly forged peace between the Mongol khanates.989 In more overt terms for military cooperation, Mongol envoys subsequently visited Clement V’s court in Poitiers in 1307, the same year and month in which Hayton presented La Flor des estoires.990 Clement V’s response to Ölijeitü indicates that the Ilkhan maintained an interest in uniting with the Latins. He proposed that his men and supplies would wait for the crusaders in Cilician Armenia. Ölijeitü’s military strategy both indicates his interest in working with the Latin West in the tradition of Ilkhanid policy and his recognition of Cilician Armenia as a joint base for the crusader and Mongol armies. Hayton’s own promotion of Cilician Armenia as a vital middle power between the Latins and Mongols and its viability as a

988 Jackson, The Mongols and the West, 183. Jackson notes that the Latin envoys worked strategically to downplay the Mongol mandate.
989 Ibid, 182-83; Dashdondog, The Mongols and the Armenians, 204; Mostaert and Cleaves, “Les lettres de 1289 et 1305 des ilkhan Aryun et Ölijeitü à Philippe le Bel,” 86.
990 Schein, Fideles Crucis, 214.
crusader base thus paralleled the official Ilkhanid position, as reconstructed from the references in the papal response of 1308. Hayton’s counsel thus came at a highly relevant moment of crusade planning and stood in line with Ilkhanid policy.

Hayton’s military advice was also solicited around the same time as that of the treatises of the Masters of the Templars and Hospitallers, who were summoned in 1306 to provide their strategic counsel on the recovery of Holy Land and to address the question of how best to direct military aid to the kingdoms of Cyprus and Cilician Armenia. These recovery treatises marked the first phase of works requested by Clement V, who later procured additional works after the Council of Vienne. Hayton’s ideas were thus also in dialogue with the advice of the Orders, as both Masters were seasoned in eastern warfare and were well-versed in the political conditions of Cilician Armenia. Fulk de Villaret and Jacques de Molay submitted two valuable recovery treatises before their arrival in Poitiers in 1307. Fulk of Villaret was the newly appointed master of the Hospitallers, being the nephew of the previous Master William of Villaret, who had

993 In 1306 French lawyer Pierre Dubois composed De recuperatione Terre Sancte, a treatise written in two parts. The first section was addressed to Edward I and the second to Philip IV. The work promotes Dubois’ political interests to advance French political power in the East. The treatise of Dubois reflects one example of how the interest in providing recovery counsel expanded outside the papal circle. A second phase of recovery treatises were produced during Clement V’s pontificate at the Council of Vienne held in 1311. The council confronted three major subjects: the dissolution of the Templars; the organization of a crusade; and church reforms. With regards to crusade planning, several memoirs were submitted, drawing on the expertise of both ‘eastern’ and ‘western’ perspectives. A key ‘eastern’ response came from the restored King Henry II of Cyprus, who delivered his treatise via envoys. Similar to the background and experience of Hayton, Henry II was very familiar with the political situation of the East. The king encouraged the implementation of a naval blockade, which would precede the passagium organized to sail directly to Egypt. Henry II of Cyprus, “Consilium,” ed. M.L. de Mas-Latrie in Histoire de l’île de Chypre, vol. II, 118-25. Henry also sent a later treatise to the papacy in 1323, advocating a similar viewpoint of his first work; Lettres secrètes et curiales du Pape Jean XXII (1316-34) relatives à France, ed. A. Coulon (Paris: 1906-72), no. 1690.
994 Schein, Fideles Crucis, 197; Hillgarth, Ramon Lull, 72-3.
overseen two major expeditions to Cilician Armenia.\textsuperscript{995} As a more experienced veteran, Jacques de Molay had served as Master of the Templars since 1293, having recently participated in the failed expedition of Cypriots, Templars, and Mongols, which resulted in the heavy Templar loss at Ruad in 1300.\textsuperscript{996}

The two Masters had vastly different ideas on military strategy, colored by their personal experiences in the East. Fulk of Villaret’s memoranda focused on a maritime blockade of the Mamlūk Sultanate, along with the logistics of financing and recruitment for the crusade.\textsuperscript{997} He was also interested in pursuing the conquest of Rhodes as part of the Hospitaller plans to secure naval bases in the Eastern Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{998} Molay, on the other hand, had more experience in the East, having lived there for nearly four decades. He had experience working with the Armenians and Mongols, and having tasted the bitterness of the failed expedition 1300, intended to gain a bridgehead at Ruad, he firmly rejected the use of a passagium particulare, supporting instead, the traditional passage.\textsuperscript{999}

\textsuperscript{995} The treatise of Fulk appears to have been composed prior to Clement’s request; Leopold, \textit{How to Recover the Holy Land}, 27; Fulk de Villaret, ‘Hec est informatio et instruction nostri magistri Hospitalis super faciendo generali passagio pro recuperatione Terre Sancte,’ ed. J. Petit as ‘Memoire de Foulques de Villaret sur la croisade,’ \textit{Bibliotheque de l’Ecole des Chartres} 9 (1899): 603-10. See also Helen Nicholson, \textit{The Knights Hospitallers}, (Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2001), 44-47.

\textsuperscript{996} Molay vehemently opposed the union of the Orders; Villaret’s reply has not survived. James of Molay, ‘Concilium super negotio Terre Sancte,’ 150-4; Malcolm Barber, “James of Molay, the Last Grand Master of the Temple,” \textit{Studia Monastica} 14 (1972), 105-6.

\textsuperscript{997} The Hospitallers also produced another significant crusading treatise for Clement V, which appears to have been directed under Fulk de Villaret. While the Master’s name is not explicitly mentioned, the treatise attributes the authorship to the “Master and Convent of the Hospitallers and by other upright men who have lived overseas for a long time,” reflecting his involvement in the production of the treatise. “Tractatus dudum habitus ultra mare per magistrum et conventum Hospitalis et per alios probos viros qui diu steterunt ultra mare: qualiter Terra Sancta possit per Christianos recuperari,” ed. Benjamin Z. Kedar and Sylvia Schein as “Un projet de passage particulier propose par l’ordre de l’Hopital 1306-07,” \textit{BEC} 137 (1979): 221. Recent scholarship has noted that the work was probably written by Villaret right before his visit to Avignon in 1307.


\textsuperscript{999} Barber, \textit{The New Knighthood}, 286.
The treatises of Hayton and the Military Orders may have been especially welcome as not all submissions came from those with experienced military backgrounds and an informed understanding of the political situation of the Eastern Mediterranean. For example, French lawyer and member of Philip IV’s counsel, William of Nogaret, composed a crusade memoir, extant in two versions, which largely promoted Capetian interests, as did the treatise of Bishop of Angers, William le Maire.¹⁰⁰⁰ Both Nogaret and le Maire directed their attention to the necessary preparations for a crusade and had a weaker grasp of the political situation in the East. In any case, both French theorists did not expect a crusade to be launched in the immediate future, as a result of inter-European conflict.¹⁰⁰¹

In contrast, the reports of Hayton, the Military Orders and the later treatise of Henry II of Cyprus—all advocated the launch of an immediate crusade. Their knowledge of the turbulent political conditions of the East undoubtedly encouraged their advocacy of an imminent expedition, despite their varied opinions on the best course of action needed. Hayton’s report was particularly distinctive based on its political analysis of the East, its vision for a Mongol alliance, and its promotion of Cilician Armenia as a vital intermediary.

6.3 Hayton’s Spiritual Justifications

In the introduction of his crusade proposal, Hayton employs a passionate and polemical tone as a strategy to encourage the organization of a crusade. His exhortations

echo other *recuperatione terrae sanctae*, which similarly incorporated spiritual motivations to promote their pragmatic outlines of recovery. Hayton’s introductory remarks in the fourth book of *La Flor des estoires* draw upon similar discourses on the spiritual motivations and exhortatory conventions of the genre of crusading treatises and underscore his identity as a Latinized Cilician Armenian and alignment with papal interests.

Antony Leopold’s study of the spiritual components of the crusade treatises shows how a “lists of motives” was typically provided to encourage the launching of the crusade, which often stood apart from the main body of strategic advice. Largely written for the papacy and European rulers, these exhortatory passages were often intended to incite an emotional reaction and were generally (though not exclusively) situated in the introductory sections of the recovery treatises, where they set the tone for the rest of the text. Building on Leopold’s insights, Hayton’s spiritual outline can be read as an extension of his projected identity and politics.

Like many of his contemporaries, Hayton rationalizes the need for a crusade by highlighting the concept of a ‘just war.’ This concept was commonly employed by Latins to legitimize crusading warfare. Interestingly, the Byzantines also employed the idea of a *bellum iustum* to justify their attacks against political enemies, reflecting its appeal to both Western and Eastern Christians. The idea of a *bellum iustum* was not novel to the theorists, but one which predated the crusades, having been applied early on
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1003 Leopold, 86.
by the papacy to justify acts of violence directed against non-Christians, and which later became linked to the recovery of Jerusalem following the success of the First Crusade.  

Many argued that the Holy Sepulcher—which had been constructed by the Emperor Constantine at the site of Christ’s crucifixion—had once belonged to the Christian Roman Empire and thus represented a Christian possession. The Holy Land was also argued to have been inherited by St. Peter from Christ, further justifying Christian claims to the land. Aligned with this rationalization, Hayton justifies a crusade against the Muslims based on their unlawful occupation of the Holy Land, and more specifically, of the Holy Sepulcher, “the origin of Christian faith,” which as he highlights, rightfully belongs to the Christians as their heritage from God.

Other recovery theorists similarly lamented the unlawful occupation of the Holy Land by further distinguishing between the earthly and heavenly Jerusalem. Sylvia Schein has noted that this was because the Holy Sepulcher came to be understood as the site of Christ’s resurrection in addition to signifying the site of the crucifixion in the crusader period. The focus on the resurrection encouraged the distinction between the earthly and heavenly Jerusalem, the latter of which looked forward to the future of Christ’s Second Coming to Jerusalem, as it was referred to in the Book of Revelations. This theme was developed by some of the recovery theorists, including the anonymous
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1006 Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City*, 36.
Hospitaller treatise which describes the Day of Judgment, when Christ would return to
“judge the living and the dead in the said Holy Land.”

In addition to his motivation of a ‘just cause,’ Hayton underscores the crusaders’
obligation and duty to recover the Holy Land based on the sacrifice of Christ. He argues
that Jerusalem was the site where the blood of Christ was spilled. Doing nothing would
therefore mean that Christ’s sacrifice had been in vain. Moreover, he also compares
the spilled blood of Christ to the suffering of the Christian population at the hands of the
Saracen enemy. This parallel image of the blood of Christ and the Christians serves to
further accentuate the unjust occupation of the Holy Land by the Muslims, further
necessitating the urgency of a crusade. Hayton adheres to the crusading ideology of
presenting the armies as *milites Christi* (soldiers of Christ), performing their obligation in
fighting for Christianity to reverse this unjust occupation of the land. These exhortations
not only reflect his Latinized worldview, but reveal the complex ways in which he
framed his rationale for a crusade in terms that his Latin audience could understand.

Other recovery treatises also drew on the sacrifice of Christ and his followers,
including the Latin *Memoria* and the proposal of Jacques de Molay. In a similar vein
to Hayton’s treatise, the *Memoria*’s introductory remarks speak of how Christ redeemed
the Holy Land with his blood and how the “blood of the Christians was scattered by the
hands of the enemies of the Christian faith in the destruction of the said land.”
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1009 ‘Un projet particuier,’ 221. Similarly, the author of *Via ad Terram* also differentiates between the
heavenly and earthly Jerusalem, 425.
1011 Ibid, (French) 220; (Latin) 340.
1012 *Memoria*, 435; Jacques de Molay, 147.
1013 Ibid; Leopold, 90-91.
French version, *Via ad terram*, similarly suggests that it would be disgraceful for a crusade not to be launched after Christ’s sacrifice.\(^{1014}\)

The depiction of the sacrifices of Christ’s followers also promotes the idea of retribution against the Muslims. Hayton’s focus on Saracen violence against the Christians reflects the wider discourse on vilifying the Muslims as violators of Christ’s followers. Penny J. Cole has argued the crusades promoted the polemical image of the Muslims as “polluters of Christ’s sacred things and violators of His people.”\(^{1015}\) Accordingly, Hayton’s reference to the enemies’ violations against Christians further underscores the justification of a reprisal against the enemy, paralleling the themes found in wider crusading literature.

Other recovery theorists similarly denigrated the Muslims as ‘polluters’ of the Holy Land as part of their exigent warnings for a crusade in their introductory remarks.\(^{1016}\) The author of the *Via ad Terram*, as one example, bemoans how the enemies performed “such abominations in the holy places,” which could only be atoned for by means of a crusade.\(^{1017}\) Another sharp tone is found in the account of Dominican friar William Adam, where the magnitude of Saracen cruelty towards the Eastern Christians is highlighted.\(^{1018}\) Based on these accounts, it appears the crusade was presented by contemporaries as a means to seek revenge on the Muslim attacks against the Christian community and their sacred sites.

\(^{1014}\) *Via ad Terram*, 425.

\(^{1015}\) Penny J. Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land: 1095-1270* (Cambridge, Mass., 1991), 111. In her study of 12th century sources, Cole argues that because of this image, the crusade came to be seen “as a cleansing operation and a divinely mandated war of reprisal” and also served to justify Christian violence against those intent on destroying Christianity.

\(^{1016}\) Leopold, *How to Recover the Holy Land*, 89.

\(^{1017}\) *Via ad Terram*, 425. English translation is from Leopold, 89.

\(^{1018}\) William Adam, 543-4.
Hayton applies a harsh tone to characterize the Saracen enemy in his introductory exhortations, describing them as “the sons of Ismael,” “the Hagarenes,” the “perfidious enemies of the Christian faith,” “the slaves of Muhammad,” “the perfidious dogs” and the “enemies blaspheming the name of Christ.”\textsuperscript{1019} While such derogatory references had been employed by Armenians, they can be seen as further exhortations to organize a crusade and contrast with the more neutral depictions found in the geographical treatise, where he treats them as part of his ethnographical portrait of the East.\textsuperscript{1020} The major difference between the images of the Muslims can be understood as a result of Hayton’s distinctive objectives for each book. In the case of the proposal, Hayton’s main goal is to exhort the reader to support a crusade. His geographical treatise, on the other hand, focuses on providing the papacy with up-to-date information on the East.

6.3.1 The Inheritance of all Christians and Pan-Christian Alliance

While Hayton relies on western conventions to frame the spiritual motivations for a crusade, his treatise also exhibits a distinctive voice, which can be understood as a reflection of his identity as a Cilician Armenian. This is apparent in the way that his crusade proposal rationalizes the Holy Land as being the inheritance of all Christians, drawing on an older concept in the Latin West which understood the crusade as a legitimate means to reclaim the inheritance of Christ (\textit{Christi hereditas}) from unlawful Muslim occupation.\textsuperscript{1021} Hayton’s emphasis on all Christians reflects his Cilician

\textsuperscript{1019} Hayton, \textit{La Flor des estoires}, (French) 220 and 235 (Latin) 340 and 350.  
\textsuperscript{1021} Ibid, (French) 220, (Latin) 340. The success of the First Crusade strengthened Christian claims to the Holy Land, based on the concept that the land had been given to Christ, and therefore, to the children of Christ. According to Jonathan Riley-Smith, “no passage of scripture was to be more often quoted in connection with crusading than the opening words of Psalm 78:79: “O God, the heathens are come into thy inheritance.” This concept was widely employed in crusading preaching, as in the case of French monk, Alain of Lille, whose sermon was addressed to the crusaders of the Third Crusade. Jonathan Riley-Smith,
Armenian worldview, as one who is quite conscious of other Eastern Christian communities in the Near East.\textsuperscript{1022}

Hayton’s focus on the Holy Land as the inheritance of all Christians can equally be understood as an extension of his overarching military strategy of promoting a pan-Christian crusade. The treatise proposes that a pan-Christian crusade could ideally consist of an alliance of both Latin and Eastern Christians. He describes the Christians living around the Mountains of Lebanon as exceptional fighters, while emphasizing that the Nubians could invade Egypt based on their intimate understanding of the Egyptian desert. The Christians residing around Antioch are noted to be skilled in fighting and ready to aid the crusading army.\textsuperscript{1023} Further east, the Georgians are presented as enthusiastic Christian allies with tremendous martial skill.\textsuperscript{1024}

Hayton’s reference to the Holy Land as the inheritance of all Christians thus complements his military strategy aimed at enlisting eastern assistance, as all crusading participants had a vested interest in protecting Christ’s patrimony. The joint alliance among Latins, Armenians, Eastern Christians, and pro-Christian Mongols, represents his vision for the alliance. His background as a Cilician Armenian seems to have played a role in shaping his vision, as he was experienced in Ilkhanid campaigns, which relied

\textsuperscript{1022} Other recovery theorists similarly incorporated the concept of the ‘inheritance of Christ’ within their treatises. The \textit{Via ad Terram}, for example, refers to the Holy Land as the ‘heritage’ of God, in addition to its aforementioned distinction between the heavenly and earthly Jerusalem. In accordance with Hayton’s portrayal, the author of the \textit{Directorium} depicts the Holy Land as the inheritance of all Christians. Comparably, the \textit{Memoria} highlights how “God promised (the Holy Land) to the sons of Israel,” drawing on a biblical reference which equated the Holy Land as the Promised Land for God’s Chosen People—in this case being the followers of Christ. \textit{Via ad terram}, 425; \textit{Directorium} ad passagium faciendum, 389; \textit{Memoria}, 435.

\textsuperscript{1023} Hayton, (French), 249, (Latin) 358.

\textsuperscript{1024} Hayton, (French) 245-247; (Latin) 357-58.
upon the support of its Eastern Christian vassals. This proposal also complements his geographical treatise, which highlights the martial skills of various Eastern Christian groups living under the Mongol Empire. Hayton underscores the Christian orientation of these allies, leaving no doubt about their religious identity. More specifically, the Georgians are the “most devoted Christians,” who have sanctuaries in the Holy Land, while the Nubians are Christian converts through the work of the Apostle Thomas in the land of Ethiopia.\textsuperscript{1025}

It should also be noted that other theorists also mention the strengths of the Eastern Christian warriors. According to Dominican William Adam, the Georgians are ranked in strength “above all other Easterners.”\textsuperscript{1026} William Adam also attributes the Mongol victories against the Sultanate as a result of the fighting skills of the Georgians, who had earned a reputation for their bravery in the Ilkhanid campaigns.\textsuperscript{1027} Venetian theorist, Marino Sanudo, also encourages the alliance with the Nubians, who according to Antony Leopold, may have referred to the people of Ethiopia (as described in Hayton’s text) or to those people living in the lands of modern-day Sudan.\textsuperscript{1028} Likewise, Fidenzio of Padua similarly notes the ability of the Christians living around Tripoli to come to the aid of the crusaders.\textsuperscript{1029} While these theorists focused on selective Eastern Christian groups, Hayton’s vision for a pan-Christian alliance was a unique strategy, one which reflected his worldview as an easterner.

Hayton’s perspective of the role of Eastern Christians for the Latin audience challenges the conventional and stereotypical views on the Christian communities of the

\textsuperscript{1025} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1026} William Adam, 534. See also Leopold, \textit{How to Recover the Holy Land}, 117-118.
\textsuperscript{1027} William of Adam, 534-35.
\textsuperscript{1028} Leopold, \textit{How to Recover the Holy Land}, 118.
\textsuperscript{1029} Fidenzio of Padua, 55.
Near East, which were viewed as schismatic and presented in an ambivalent light, especially those groups who crossed political boundaries from Frankish to Muslim control. Western hostility was particularly geared towards those Eastern Christian groups which shared similar cultural customs with the Jews and Muslims. Apart from the Cilician Armenians, who developed close contacts with the Latins, had their own state, and fought the Mamlūk Sultanate, other groups like the Jacobites and Nestorians resided throughout the Levant in non-Christian lands, making them more ambivalent and threatening to the Latins. Hayton seems to have been aware of the Latin perceptions of the Eastern Christians. Hayton’s emphasis on their Christian identity and shared interests with the crusaders is therefore aimed at alleviating Latin concerns about the reliability and suitability of the Eastern Christians as allies in his vision of a pan-Christian partnership.

6.3.2 Alignment with Clement V

Hayton’s overview of spiritual motivations for a crusade was also used to underscore his alignment with the papacy. More specifically, the spiritual exhortations addressed illustrate Hayton’s identity as a Latinized Armenian, bridging the religious gap between the Latin West and Cilician Armenian kingdom. Aside from the spiritual exhortations, Hayton makes repeated articulations of the papacy’s role as spiritual leader, further indicating his awareness of Clement’s expectations. Hayton’s strategy can be understood in parallel to the diplomatic policy of the Cilician kingdom during the early fourteenth century.

1032 The last chapter of the crusade proposal expresses this clearly; (French) 252 (Latin) 362.
Hayton also explicitly highlights his alignment with the “most holy and Christian pastor and father”\(^{1033}\) —leaving little doubt that he holds the papacy as the leader of the crusade.\(^{1034}\) Thus the Armenian prince’s Latinized identity is made explicit, reflecting an extension of Cilician-papal dialogue during the early fourteenth century. Hayton’s obedience to the Holy See likely aimed at minimizing wider Latin skepticism towards the loyalty of the Armenian kingdom to Rome in light of past diplomatic negotiations on Union throughout the thirteenth century. Lewon’s acceptance of Union in 1198 had indicated that the kingdom’s overtures to Rome were largely nominal in nature. The political conditions of the Armenian kingdom in the early fourteenth century necessitated clearer articulations of the Cilician religious positioning vis-à-vis Rome.

While Hayton’s account of the spiritual motivations for a crusade finds parallels in other *recuperatione* treatises, the Holy Land also held a particular reverence for the Armenians based on their historic ties to it.\(^{1035}\) More specifically, the Cathedral of St. James on Mount Zion had been obtained by the Armenians from the Georgian community in the twelfth century. It came to function as an important sacred site drawing in Armenian pilgrims and monks alike.\(^{1036}\) According to Joshua Prawer, the site’s popularity intensified during the pilgrimage of the Armenian Catholicos Gregory III (1113-1166) in the twelfth century, during which the complex underwent significant expansion.\(^{1037}\) Tamar M. Boyadjian has also drawn attention to the Armenian ties to the

\(^{1033}\) Hayton, *La Flor des estoires*, (Latin) 350.

\(^{1034}\) Ibid, 362.


\(^{1036}\) Prior to the church, the site functioned as a martyrium for St. Minas and then the Georgians had constructed a church on the site dedicated St. James the Major

Holy Land during the medieval period and the ways in which the intercultural contacts between the Latins and Armenians shaped the latter’s perceptions of Jerusalem. Her insights have particularly emphasized how Jerusalem became viewed as a locus for Armenian and Latin alliance.\textsuperscript{1038}

Hayton’s exhortations to recover the Holy Land also reflected his vision for an alliance. His articulation of his identity as “frater Haytono, ordinis Beati Augustini,” is clearly intended to emphasize the shared interests of the papacy and Armenian kingdom. By articulating Cilician Armenian identity as a Latinized one, Hayton elevates the kingdom’s significance to the Latin West. His treatment underscores how Cilician Armenia was not merely a distant eastern community, but one which was actively involved in crusading and fully in line with the papal mission to unite the Eastern Christians of the East.

\textbf{6.4 Assessment of the Egyptian Enemy}

Aside from the spiritual exhortations incorporated within the crusade treatise, Hayton provides a thorough, pragmatic military strategy by weighing the strengths and weaknesses of the Mamlûk enemy. A look into his treatment of the Mamlûk Sultanate illustrates his role as a political expert on Egypt and Syria, paralleling the tone of authority employed in the geographical and historical sections of \textit{La Flor des estoires}. His assessment of the Egyptian enemy also reflects his dialogue with the ideas circulated by contemporary theorists as the Latins viewed Egypt as the principal obstacle in

\textsuperscript{1038} Boyadjian, “Bridging East and West,” 127-131.
preventing the crusaders from recovering the Holy Land, especially after the fall of Acre in 1291.1039

A strategy against Egypt, with a focus on economic warfare to destroy its dominance, represented a core subject in the *recuperatione* treatises. The crusade theorists largely favored the implementation of an economic blockade of Egypt, which aimed at weakening the position of Sultanate as it had forged trading networks with Christian merchants from around the Mediterranean, whether from the Italian cities of Venice, Genoa or from the Crown of Aragon.1040 Preventing lucrative trading activities was argued to serve as an effective means of weakening the sultanate, particularly as the political structure of the Sultanate relied on slave recruits along with the importation of war materials and resources.1041

The Mamlûk political and military system required the influx of slaves and imported war materials, as free Muslims by Islamic law could not be enslaved by other Muslims. Young pagan males, largely of Turkic background from the Kipchak Steppe, were purchased, converted to Islam, and trained as *mamlûks*. The Genoese, working with Byzantium, came to monopolize this trade by transferring enslaved captives from the Mongol Golden Horde to Egypt.1042 Upon completing training, the slaves were integrated into a military and political system through which they might be promoted to leadership

and command positions.\textsuperscript{1043} Additionally, crucial war materials such as timber, pitch, iron and arms were also imported into Egypt, serving to construct vital war materials including weaponry, galleys and siege engines. These goods were particularly indispensable for Egypt’s military and economy, as the country had become exposed to deforestation by the twelfth century and was deficient in iron and pitch.\textsuperscript{1044} The Mamlûk Sultanate thus heavily relied on key commodity imports to sustain its military infrastructure.

The papacy and crusade theorists, including Hayton, were confronted by the reality of Christian merchants, namely the Italian mercantile republics, using the Eastern Mediterranean to conduct their trading activities. Both Famagusta in Cyprus and Ayas in Cilician Armenia, also known as Lajazzo to Italian merchants, were important for the carrying of Mamlûk-Christian trade, especially after the fall of Acre and Antioch.\textsuperscript{1045} Moreover, certain goods were found in abundant quantity in Cilician Armenia; ore, timber, and iron were plentiful in the Armenian kingdom and exported by Latin merchants to Egypt.\textsuperscript{1046} The extant agreements made between the Venetians and Cilician Armenians indicate the extent of the kingdom’s involvement in Mediterranean trade.\textsuperscript{1047} The Mamlûks also established several treaties ensuring their free trade in the Armenian kingdom, following their military campaigns.\textsuperscript{1048}

\textsuperscript{1043}David Ayalon, \textit{The Mamlûk Military Society} (London: Variorum Reprints, 1979).
\textsuperscript{1046}Ibid, 122.
\textsuperscript{1048}Holt, \textit{Early Mamluk Diplomacy}, 1260-1290, 40, 46, 99.
also emerged, much to the initial reluctance of the local Latin Church, which gradually became more lenient in its position towards the merchants.1049

Christians involved in the lucrative Muslim-Christian trade during thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were cited by Hayton and his contemporaries as ‘false Christian’ merchants, who served as scapegoats for the Mamlūk military victories. Acutely aware of the situation, the papacy repeatedly issued several prohibitions in a futile effort to stop illicit trading activities. Both the Third Lateran Council (1179) and the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) clearly prohibited the trading of war materials including weapons, galleys, iron and wood.1050 Furthermore, Pope Innocent IV not only banned the trade of war materials to Egypt, but also outlawed any form of Christian involvement in directing ships or aiding in the construction of war-related technology for the Sultanate.1051

On 23 August 1291, in the aftermath of the heavy loss of Acre, Pope Nicholas IV declared an embargo prohibiting trade with Egypt, in addition to having threatened excommunication and perpetual infamy to those found guilty.1052 Likewise, his successor, Pope Boniface VIII (1294-1303), placed an embargo in 1295, which also added the penalty of the confiscation of goods from those caught in trading.1053 Despite the harsh tone with which the papacy confronted the unlawful Christian-Muslim trading

1050 For the Third Lateran Council (1179), see Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta, 24, 223 and for the Fourth Lateran Council (1215), Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta, 71, 270.
1051 Jacoby, “The Supply of War Materials to Egypt,” 114.
1053 Las Matrie, Histoire de l’île de Chypre, II, 92-93.
activities, Christian merchants continued to value lucrative trading regardless of explicit threats of excommunication.

In evaluating the role of imports in sustaining the Mamlūk army, Hayton highlights the detrimental impact of those Christians engaged in trade with the Mamlūks to satisfy their greed.\(^{1054}\) Much in line with the ideas found in the other *recuperatione*, Hayton underscores the vulnerability of the Sultanate if it were to be without imported goods and traffic in enslaved captives, echoing wider perceptions of his time. According to Hayton, without the commodities furnished by Latin Christian merchants, the natural environment of Egypt would eventually cause problems for the Sultanate, especially by the Nile River’s occasional failure to irrigate Egyptian lands. A crusade would then be successful as a result of the subsequent drought and famine, which would cause widespread devastation upon the populace. Accordingly, the Egyptians would have no choice but to sell their horses and reduce their forces, thus making it highly difficult for the Mamlūk army to defend its control over Syria.\(^{1055}\) Hayton seems to be exaggerating the sultanate’s vulnerability in terms of food supply to maintain the army.

Furthermore, Hayton underscores that the Sultanate would not endure without the importation of iron and steel, which were vital goods in maintaining the Mamlūk army in light of the scarcity of these materials in Egypt. In a similar vein, earlier theorist Fidenzio of Padua highlights the significance of these commodities to support the Mamlūk military and navy.\(^{1056}\) While Hayton’s emphasis on the role of trade is an important component of his proposal, it is not as elaborately discussed in comparison to the other crusade

\(^{1054}\) Hayton, (French) 241; (Latin), 354.

\(^{1055}\) Ibid. Leopold provides extensive coverage of the theorists’ treatment of Mamluk trade, 119-126.

\(^{1056}\) Fidenzio of Padua, 47.
proposals, which specifically investigate how to further cut off Egyptian trade as a means to weaken the Sultanate.\textsuperscript{1057}

Fidenzio of Padua, most notably, provides attention to economic warfare, encouraging the use of a fleet which could stop trade and perform raids to increase the vulnerability of the coastline.\textsuperscript{1058} His ideas resonated in the works of later crusade memoirs as well. Marino Sanudo’s \textit{Liber secretorum fidelum crucis} supports the use of a naval blockade as the initial stage of the crusade, which would be followed by an offensive attack on Egypt’s coastal areas.\textsuperscript{1059} In a similar vein, William Adam’s early fourteenth century treatise, \textit{De Modo Sarracenos extirpandi}, encourages a blockade in the Indian Ocean as a measure to stop Egypt’s trading activities.\textsuperscript{1060}

Hayton’s more detailed evaluation of the enemy is directed towards the political and military conditions in Egypt, demonstrating his interest in asserting his role as a political expert on the subject of the East, just as he did so in his geographical and historical sections. More specifically, in his assessment of the Mamlûk army, Hayton estimates 20,000 soldiers in Egypt and 5,000 in Syria.\textsuperscript{1061} His estimation stands as one of many estimates of the Egyptian army in the crusade treatises, which fluctuated based on the theorist’s level of experience and access to reliable information.\textsuperscript{1062} What is significant to note is that Hayton’s figures closely adhere to the data found in the Hospitaller \textit{Devise des chemins de babiloine}—a late thirteenth century report on the Mamlûk army which utilized information found in enemy sources—where an estimate of
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24,900 is given, with 15,000 in Egypt and 9,900 in Syria.\textsuperscript{1063} The similarity between the estimates of Hayton and the Hospitaller report suggests a shared access to sources and reflects the expertise of their military backgrounds, as both the Cilician royals and Military Orders sought to collect information on the enemy.\textsuperscript{1064} It is also worth highlighting that the Hospitaller report was more reliable than some of the other treatises, as it based its figures on eastern sources.

In addition to the size of the army, Hayton evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of the Mamlūk Sultanate in an objective manner, without generally engaging in polemical characterizations. For instance, he notes how the Mamlūks have relatively weaker foot soldiers in contrast to riders and how they are highly ingenious at capturing cities and castles.\textsuperscript{1065} Additionally, Hayton does not shy away from stating the fighting skills of the Mamlūk sultans, as evidenced by his description of the Sultan Baybars as “wise, strong and brave in arms.”\textsuperscript{1066} The treatise’s goal is clearly to assess the state of affairs in the East.

Other theorists such as Fidenzio of Padua similarly highlight the strengths of the Mamlūk army, namely by noting their formidable fighting ability—an observation which was based on his first-hand experience in their camps.\textsuperscript{1067} Such pragmatic, detailed evaluations of the enemy typically came from those well-versed in warfare in the Levant. Both Fidenzio of Padua and Hayton indeed came from an experienced military background. In contrast, the theorists who wrote from the Latin West adhered to more...
polemical descriptions of the enemy, perhaps a reflection of their poorer understanding of Near Eastern affairs. This was the case for French lawyer, Pierre Dubois, who was more concerned with western affairs. 1068

As part of his political expertise, Hayton’s crusade proposal devotes considerable attention to the perceived weaknesses of the Mamlūk political regime, emphasizing the vulnerabilities of the state. He exposes the recruitment system through which the sultan raises troops as a failure, focusing on how the emirs, having been provided with income by the sultan, typically purchased cheap and poorly-skilled slaves in order to make a profit. Cheap labor consequently worked to the detriment of the quality of troops. 1069 Hayton’s intimate knowledge of the Mamlūk system was likely drawn from his close contacts with the Ilkhans and Military Orders.

Additionally, Hayton places great weight on the Sultanate’s internal political instability by describing the violent downfall of several sultans at the hands of their own mamlūks. By relying on historical interpretation, Hayton underscores the violent pattern inherent in the Mamlūk political system, exposing the vulnerability of the Sultanate. 1070 Hayton highlights how the sultans remain in a perpetual state of worry from the threat of a revolt from the slave army and their knowledge of the number of previous sultans that were slain. 1071 For Hayton, the high number of slave revolts indicates the instability of the kingdom and an indication of their impending doom. 1072

1068 Dubois, Recuperatione Terre Sancte, 70-74. See also Leopold, How to Recover the Holy Land, 106-111.
1069 Hayton, (French) 222, (Latin), 342.
1070 Ibid, (French) 231, (Latin), 347.
1071 Ibid, (French) 222, (Latin), 341.
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Indeed, Hayton’s portrait of the Sultanate’s internal turbulence was mirrored in the works of other crusade theorists, reflecting the rumours circulated of the weak state of Mamlûk political affairs. In a similar vein, King Henry II also focuses on the political destabilization of the sultanate, by noting that a violent response commonly followed each election. The negative perception of the Mamlûk Sultanate was rooted in the political reality of severe factionalism during Hayton’s composition.

Hayton’s account of the career of Sultan al- Nāṣir Muhammad (r. 1293-94; 1299-1309; 1310-1341) reflects the turbulent political history of the Mamlûk Sultanate. Interestingly, La Flor des estoires focuses on the volatility of Egyptian politics, while ignoring the similar state of affairs in Cilician Armenia during this period. Both Sultan al-Nāṣir and King Hetʿum II both abdicated at the same time in 1293-94. Sultan al-Nāṣir Muhammad first took power in 1293 as an eight-year old child, only to be deposed shortly afterwards in 1294 by the Mongol Kitbogha, who ruled as Sultan al-Malik al-ʿĀdil. The young sultan was reinstated to power in 1299, but later resigned in 1309. His third long-lasting period of rule took place between the years 1310-1341. Hetʿum’s abdications were similarly situated within a volatile political climate, in which the members of the Hetʿumid dynasty engaged in fratricidal struggle. While severe factionalism plagued the Mamlûk Sultanate, political turbulence and instability emerged in several polities in the Eastern Mediterranean including Cilician Armenia.

---

1073 Henry II, 351.
1074 Ibid, 354.
1075 Our understanding of Mamlûk political factionalism is largely indebted to the scholarship of the late David Ayalon, whose work showed how the relationships and loyalties found in the Mamlûk army system produced both major strengths and weaknesses. These advantages and disadvantages both encouraged the state’s longevity and its moments of political chaos. The sultanate relied on the uslûd, and khushdâshiyâ, which focused on the loyalty of the group of mamlûks toward their master, during servitude and after manumission, and the solidarity between the mamlûks. In light of these loyalties, the elected sultan, once in power, was expected to promote his own mamlûks in the highest positions, replacing the elite of his
As part of Hayton’s focus on the inherent weaknesses of the Mamlûk Sultanate, the proposal covers the rise and fall of the careers of the sultans, highlighting in a largely accurate manner, the manner in which they ascended the throne, and often times, their fateful end. The emphasis on the violent deaths of the sultans consequently underscores the fragile state of Egyptian affairs.1076 His detailed descriptions reflect his broader interest in historiography, which is used to frame his military counsel in the treatise. Hayton’s historical interpretation also highlights his awareness of the circulating reports in the East.

This is evident in his account of the death of Baybars in the summer of 1277. More specifically, Hayton notes that Baybars, “having been poisoned, died in Damascus” during his Syrian campaign in 1277.1077 In contrast to Hayton’s claim of the cause of death, scholars speculate that the sultan likely died from hepatic dysentery after drinking kumis, fermented mare milk. The cause of his death remains somewhat mysterious, as news of his passing had been kept secret until his body was returned safely to Egypt. This secrecy most likely helped secure the safe election of his son. Rumors soon circulated that Baybars had been poisoned by sipping from the cup intended for an Ayyûbid prince he wanted dead.1078 The poisoning rumor was also picked up in Les Gestes des Chiprois,


1076 Chronological omissions are made, such as the jump from Sultan al-Said Barakah (1277-79) to Qalawun, jumping over the career of another one of Baybars’ sons: al malik al-Adil Badr al-Din Solamish, who ruled from 1279 under the regency of Qalawun, who later displaced him in 1280.

1077 Ibid, (French) 228, (Latin) 345.

which notes that ‘they say that he had been poisoned.”\cite{crawford76} Hayton’s treatment of Baybars’ poisoning highlights the complex nature of his historical interpretation, reflecting his awareness of circulating reports on the Mamlûks in the Eastern Mediterranean.

In a similar manner, Hayton incorporates the rumor that Sultan Qalawun was also poisoned in 1290.\cite{hayton353} According to Linda Northrup, the cause of Qalawun’s death remains mysterious, as he was buried nearly two months after his offensive preparations against Acre in 1290. According to Muslim sources, the death of the sultan was attributed to natural illness or to assassination at the hands of his own son, the future Sultan al-Ashraf Khalîl.\cite{northrupsection} In his treatment of the death of Sultan Lâjin al-Manṣûr in 1299, Hayton relays how the sultan feared to leave his castle in Cairo, where he remained for a period of over three years. He then notes how Sultan Lâjin was subsequently murdered during a chess match by one of his esteemed servants. Upon his death, the young Melek Nâṣîr, was released and restored as sultan.\cite{hayton230, (latin) 347}

Hayton’s anecdote of Sultan Lâjin’s death was also noted by Muslim sources, which relay a similar account, indicating the Armenian prince’s knowledge of reports circulated about the Sultanate. Mamlûk Syrian historian, Mûsá ibn Muḥammad Yûnînî, comparably echoes that the sultan was “being cautious and seldom riding out, he was afraid of the amirs’ (plots against him),” but was ultimately betrayed by the head of the
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Burji regiment, Kurjī. Likewise, fourteenth century historian, Abul-Fidā relays that Sultan Lājīn was murdered at a chess match, where his servant Kurjī was the first to strike him, followed by the violent blows of the sultan’s young mamlūks.

Hayton’s enthusiastic treatment of the fragility of the Mamlūk Sultanate is used as a tactic to encourage an immediate crusade. His historical interpretation follows the information documented in Muslim sources and suggests that he had access to a range of sources. His strategic use of historiography in the crusade proposal thus parallels the approach used in the geographical and historical treatises. The incorporation of historical detail with pragmatic military advice, in turn, reveals how the recuperatione terrae sanctae intersected other genres of literature.

6.5 Logistics: passagium particulare

Aside from Hayton’s incorporation of historical detail, his crusade proposal devotes considerable attention to outlining pragmatic military counsel, which can be understood as a promotion of the interests of his Cilician Armenian worldview, which was connected to Cypriot and Ilkhanid interests. Like the majority of recuperatione terrae sanctae, Hayton supports implementing a passagium particulare to secure a bridgehead in the East, which would be directed under the leadership of a “vigorous and faithful captain” and legate. Sea travel, often occurring in the face of perilous conditions, was still argued to be the best form of offensive strategy compared to the overland route. Crusade

---

1083 Al-Yunini, Early Mamluk Syrian Historiography: Al-Yunini’s Dhayl Mi’rat Al Zaman, edited and translated by Li Guo (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 113. He dates it to 15 January, 1299. After evening prayer, the sultan was playing chess with Ibn al-Assal, Quran recite. Kurji betrayed the sultan by hiding the Bahri regiment in the corridors of the palace and then grabbing the royal sword and first striking him in the shoulder and then leg, amputating it. Hayton describes how Lachin was playing chess with his servant when he suddenly grabbed his sword and struck him fatally in the head. Hayton, 347.

1084 Abul-Fida, Mémoires of a Syrian Prince, 32. Abul-Fida dates the assassination a day later than Al-Yunini, to 16th January 1299.
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theorists were acutely aware of the relatively weaker Mamlūk naval power, as the Sultanate’s primary strength was centered in its army. Thus the key to destroying the enemy was to rely on the superiority of Latin naval forces.

Underscoring the strength of the Mamlūk armies, Hayton describes the superior fighting skills of the Mamlūks on land and their ability to quickly mobilize their troops stationed in Cairo. As such, he promotes a double preliminary attack with the crusader focus on naval warfare and a Mongol-led offensive on the mainland. The proposed crusader force would consist of one thousand knights, ten galleys, and three thousand foot-soldiers under the command of a captain and legate.¹⁰⁸⁶ His double expedition was distinctive compared to the bulk of other recuperatione which focused on the use of a fleet alone. **Hayton thus developed and advocated a more extensive and detailed strategy, which would involve an alliance with the Mongol Ilkhanate and the participation of an Eastern Christian coalition.¹⁰⁸⁷**

Hayton’s plans for a crusade also reflected his interests toward Lusignan Cyprus. The island is described as a safe place to land and rest after facing the labors of sailing. Hayton also speaks of the short distance from Cyprus to Syria in the case of the first expedition’s success in securing the mainland.¹⁰⁸⁸ Cyprus as a base had been supported by the earlier efforts of Richard I and Louis IX and was not an innovative idea on Hayton’s part. Nonetheless, Hayton relies on this plan to advance the usefulness of the Armenian kingdom as a political intermediary, as he suggests that the crusaders work to have the Armenians organize a Latin-Armenian-Ilkhanid alliance.

¹⁰⁸⁷ As the Hospitallers became the leaders of naval warfare, their recovery treatises advocated naval measures against the Mamluks. Fulk deVillaret, 606-7.
¹⁰⁸⁸ Hayton, (French) 242, (Latin) 355.
Furthermore, he argues that a naval offensive would weaken the Mamlūk Sultanate, drawing their forces out of Egypt to defend their Syrian coastline. The crusaders would then be in a position to take-over Ruad, situated along the coast, which would serve as an advantageous port for the harboring of their ships. Hayton, like many theorists, promoted the use of a naval blockade. Among these was the Master of the Hospitallers, Fulk de Villaret, who proposed the use of twenty-five galleys which would enforce the embargo and an additional fifty to sixty which would carry out raiding activities.

Hayton’s preliminary plan of action along the coastline would be coupled with a Mongol offensive into northern Syria, in “Melitene, from Babylon up to the city of Aleppo,” which would aim at destroying Mamlūk trading activities. Additionally, the proposal highlights the importance of Eastern Christian assistance in the preliminary stage by noting the presence of 40,000 Maronite archers. The joint operations of the Mongols, crusaders and the participation of Eastern Christians would allow for the capture and subsequent fortification of Tripoli, which could serve as the landing base for the second phase involving a future general passage (passagium generale). Hayton’s plans of a passagium particulare thus advocate a complex plan of warfare, by heavily relying on the assistance of the Mongols and Eastern Christians to gradually weaken the Mamlūk Sultanate, rather than planning a direct attack on Egypt. Its focus on Cilician Armenia as a vital political intermediary in the early stage of the passagium is particularly noteworthy.
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6.5.1 Logistics: passagium generale

Hayton also suggests using the sea route for the subsequent crusade, as opposed to following the other two possible routes: the overland journey and the path of the First Crusade, or the passage along the North African Coast from Spain. The overland route, with the exception of the First Crusade, had proven highly problematic and difficult for the crusaders, as evidenced by Frederick Barbarossa’s failed expedition and death by drowning in Asia Minor during the Third Crusade.1093

Acutely aware of the challenges associated with this route, Hayton highlights the difficulties in traveling overland, speaking of the adversities of passing through Constantinople due to its proximity to the Turks, who in his viewpoint, would threaten the security of the crusaders.1094 Hayton further argues that the route between Anatolia and Cilician Armenia remains insecure, except in the event that the Mongols manage to safeguard the area. By doing so, they could then yield provisions to the crusaders.1095 Concerning the route along the North African Coast, Hayton defers to the expertise of other theorists, admitting his lack of knowledge of the region.1096

In tune with his counsel for a preliminary passage, Hayton moves on to discuss the course of preparation for a general passage, which also focuses on a complex plan of warfare, advocating the use of Cilician Armenia and Cyprus as possible landing bases for the crusaders.1097 In the event where the initial passage failed to secure itself in Syria, Hayton suggests sailing from Cyprus to Cilician Armenia after the feast of St. Michael in
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order to avoid the hot climate in Armenia. Hayton provides a detailed itinerary, first suggesting the use of the city of Tarsus for its “abundance of fish and fodder.”

Part of his objective is for the crusaders to reconquer places like Antioch, following the course of the first crusade. He notes that Antioch would easily fall to the crusaders with the aid of the Mongols and local Eastern Christians, and could be followed by a journey along the Syrian coast, which would be advantageous to crusader ships. He offers an alternative route in case the enemies occupy the castle of Margat (between Tripoli and Latakiah) by suggesting a journey from Antioch towards Shaizar in northern Syria, located on the Orontes River. In contrast to the course of the First Crusade, however, Hayton proposes that the armies attempt to capture Damascus, which he underscores would fall easily into crusader control if the enemy forces are weakened. His awareness of past military strategy is thus used to support his more detailed outline for a passagium.

Hayton also uses his skills as a historian to frame his advice for the general passage. He cites the Ilkhanid victories of Hülegü and Ghazan as precedent cases showing how easily Damascus could fall to the crusaders, just as it did to the Mongol armies who overtook the Syrian city “without any labour.” By looking to past Ilkhanid victories, Hayton communicates his view of the Ilkhans as crusader allies, stressing their shared opposition towards the Mamlūk Sultanate.

The crusade treatise is thus using the previous successes of the Mongol Empire to frame the strategy for a general passage. Hülegü’s Syrian campaigns had particularly
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represented a series of swift victories during the early months of 1260. The Mongol armies appeared unstoppable until the decisive Ilkhanid defeat at the battle of ’Ayn Jālūt, which halted their ability to advance into Syria. Al-Nāṣir Yūsuf, the Ayyūbid prince who had gained control of Damascus in 1250, had chosen to flee his city in light of the Ilkhanid Syrian offensive, rather than oppose the Mongol troops after learning of their conquest of Aleppo.\footnote{1103} Hayton’s references to the earlier Ilkhanid campaigns reveal his intimate knowledge of Mongol military activity in Syria.

Hayton’s reference to Ilkhan Ghazan’s Syrian campaigns points to the short-lived Ilkhanid occupation of Damascus in January 1300. Ghazan’s success was transient, as the Ilkhan returned to Persia soon afterward, likely due to a shortage of fodder for his horses.\footnote{1104} Hayton fails to mention how the Mongols (without Ghazan present) unsuccessfully re-attempted to seize Damascus in 1303 during a third campaign, only to be sorely defeated at Marj al-Ṣuffar, situated to the south of Damascus.

Antony Leopold compares Hayton’s proposed course of action with the similar routes advanced by other theorists, including Fidenzio of Padua and the author of Via ad Terram. All three proposals advocate the course of the First Crusade, with the major exception of promoting the conquest of Damascus before Jerusalem. Evaluating their outlines, Leopold concludes that their plans “were impractical, involving an enormous undertaking far from naval assistance and requiring several sieges.”\footnote{1105} Although an ambitious plan, Hayton’s military strategy seems to reflect his certainty of Mongol

\footnote{1103} Scholars note that al-Nasir Yusuf had initially made some form of submission to the Mongols, but by 1260, he made the decision to oppose the Ilkhanid troops. Amitai-Preiss, Mongols and Mamluks, 20-24.
\footnote{1104} Ghazan, who had recently converted to Islam, justified his offensive into Syria as part of his self-fashioning as a Muslim ruler and defender of the faith, which did not conflict with his Mongol ideological views. Amitai-Preiss, The Mongol empire and its Legacy, 66; Irwin, The Middle East in the Middle Ages, 99-101.
\footnote{1105} Leopold, How to Recover the Holy Land, 158. See Fidenzio of Padua, 55, 58, Via ad Terram, 429-31.
backing that would ease the burdens of the crusading forces. His support of an Ilkhanid
attack was based on his personal participation in Ghazan’s offensive in Syria.1106

Hayton’s recommendations to use Cilician Armenia as a base for the general
crusade largely contrasted with the views of the other recuperatione terrae sanctae, with
the exception of the Via ad terram, which also supported landing in the Armenian
kingdom before journeying to the Holy Land.1107 Theorists pointed to various negative
factors for using Cilician Armenia as a base, including its inhospitable climate and the
hostility of its inhabitants in supporting the crusaders.1108 Others like Venetian theorist
Marino Sanudo showed concern for the security of the kingdom and advised the papacy
to send aid to both Cyprus and Cilician Armenia, but refrained from supporting the use of
the Armenian kingdom as a landing base due to its extreme climate.1109 The author of the
Via ad terram similarly notes the kingdom’s harsh climate, but still justifies using
Cilician Armenia as a base due to its natural resources and its proximity to Cyprus,
particularly in the case where further provisions would be required.1110 The treatise seems
to have been composed just after 1293, which may have explained the author’s relatively
positive image of the safety in using Cilician Armenia as a base.1111 The later crusade
theorists would have been aware of the kingdom’s weaker position in the early fourteenth
century.

Opposition towards using the Armenian kingdom is found in the treatises of King
Henry II of Cyprus and the Master of the Templars James of Molay. Their reluctance

1106 Hayton, (French) 249, (Latin), 360.
1107 Via ad Terram, 428-9. Leopold suggest that the author may have been of Armenian background.
1108 For a discussion of the authors’ treatment of Cyprus, Leopold, How to Recover the Holy Land, 153.
1109 Marino Sanudo, 5-9; 37.
1110 Via ad terram, 228-29.
1111 Leopold, How to Recover the Holy Land, 18.
towards incorporating Cilician Armenia in their crusade plans is significant as both had an intimate knowledge of the Eastern Mediterranean and of the political situation of the Armenian kingdom. In the vein of the other *recuperatione* treatises, Henry first highlights Cilician Armenia’s unstable political conditions and excessive climate, which would prove detrimental for the security of the army. In terms of his general outline of the crusade, Henry II rejects using the land route from Syria to Egypt, thereby opposing the route through the Armenian kingdom. He lists the impracticalities associated with the land route, including the loss of valuable time by engaging in siege warfare and the onerous travel conditions through difficult terrains. Instead, he proposes a direct assault from Cyprus to Egypt.\(^{1112}\) Henry II’s outline reflects his own political interests as it encourages the crusaders to come directly to Cyprus and not be concerned with Cilician Armenia.

The opposing arguments of King Henry II of Cyprus and Hayton were heavily conditioned by their personal experiences. Henry II’s fresh recollection as a prisoner in Cilician Armenia after having been dethroned and ostracized by his brother Amaury may have played a major role in negatively shaping his perception of the Armenians, especially since King Ōšin (and Hayton) backed the usurper. In light of this negative experience, Henry unsurprisingly characterizes the Armenians as untrustworthy, by not being reliable in battle nor ready to offer crusaders shelter.\(^{1113}\) On the contrary, Hayton had forged close relations with Amaury of Lusignan, the newly elected ruler of Cyprus. Hayton was also Amaury’s representative to the court of Clement V, which likely contributed to his outlining of Cyprus and Cilician Armenia as viable crusader bases.

\(^{1112}\) King Henry II, 122-123.
\(^{1113}\) Ibid, 122
Like Henry II, the Master of the Templar, Jacques de Molay also vehemently opposed landing in Cilician Armenia. He advocated the organization of a general passagium with 12,000 to 15,000 horsemen and 40,000 to 50,000 bowmen. Unlike the majority of the crusade theorists, the idea of a small passage was not appealing to Molay. His hesitation seems to have been based on the recent Templar defeat on the island of Ruad (Arwad) in 1302. The island held strategic importance for the Order, as it was situated off the coast of Tortosa, their old regional headquarters. In terms of using Cilician Armenia, Molay firmly rejects landing in the Armenian kingdom due to its tumultuous political state, its excessive heat (remarking that out of four thousand horses, only five hundred would survive there), and finally, as a result of his negative perceptions of the Armenians, who are presented as untrustworthy allies.

More specifically, Molay concludes that the Armenians would not support the crusaders, indicating a certain level of hostility between the Order and the kingdom. His negative perceptions of the Armenians may have been rooted in the older Armenian-Templar conflict over the Syrian Gates. Additionally, the Templar Master may have been aware of the kingdom’s religious oscillations vis-à-vis Rome. A similar vein of mistrust is found in the Directorium, the treatise composed by an anonymous Dominican for Philip VI in 1332. Based on first-hand experience working in Armenia to promote

1114 Adrian J. Boas, Archaeology of the Military Orders (New York: Routledge, 2006), 40.
1115 Molay, 146; see discussion of Leopold, 155.
1116 Barber, The New Knighthood, 286. While the Templars had previously held the castle of Baghras (called Gaston by the Templars) in 1142, which was vital to protect or attack both Antioch and Cilicia, Saladin succeeded in capturing the castle in 1188. A major conflict arose between the Order and the Armenians over possession of the castle, persisting until 1213, when it was finally returned to the Templars, who prided themselves on being the guardians of the pass. The Order later lost the castle along with the other strategic castles including Darbsak (Trapesak), located along the northern approach of the pass in the aftermath of Baybars’ campaign in 1268.
1117 Directorium ad Passagium faciendum, 365-517. For C. Kohler’s discussion on the authorship of the work, which he attributes to Dominican missionary and archbishop of Sultanieh, William of Adam, see
union with Rome, the author firmly proposes that the crusaders avoid the Armenians, as they are untrustworthy because of their superficial acceptance of the Catholic faith. In quite blatant terms, the author labels them the “worst heretics.” These intolerant remarks are rooted in the cleric’s uncompromising religious worldview which focused on uniting the eastern schismatics to Rome.

The different perceptions towards the Cilician Armenians reflect the complex factors in influencing strategic counsel. Both Molay and King Henry II of Cyprus were likely embittered by their experiences with the Armenian kingdom, which may have colored their rejection of it as a crusader base. In contrast, Hayton’s pronounced advocacy of Cilician Armenia as well as Cyprus under the governance of Amaury de Lusignan reflects his wider political agenda in promoting the interests of both kingdoms to his papal audience, while simultaneously advancing Ilkhanid hopes for an alliance against the Mamlūks. Hayton’s omission of any mention of the debilitating state of the Armenian kingdom was also reflective of his hope of attracting the crusaders there to protect it from further Mamlūk incursions.

6.6 Alliance with the Ilkhans

The subject of a Mongol alliance forms a primary issue in Hayton’s crusade proposal, drawing on an old debate which had repeatedly surfaced in light of the diplomatic contacts between the European rulers and Ilkhanid ambassadors. Ilkhan Ghazan’s military offensive campaigns in Syria equally fuelled rumors of the Mongol
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conquest of the Holy Land. Similarly, Ilkhan Öljeltü’s embassy to the court of Clement V, which took place just prior to Hayton’s arrival, articulated the Mongol hope for a joint alliance towards the recovery of the Holy Land. For Hayton, the career of Öljeltü, called Carbanda in the text, represented an opportune window to recover the Holy Land and to crush the Mamlûk enemy.

For Hayton, the interest in a joint campaign peaked in the aftermath of Ghazan’s military campaigns in Syria. Recollections of past Ilkhanid successes and personal involvement in the Mongol military campaigns would likely have fuelled Hayton’s enthusiasm for an alliance. As mentioned, he took pride in his first-hand experience in Ghazan’s campaigns. His advocacy for an allied campaign was further heightened after Öljeltü’s overtures to the Latin West. From the perspective of a Cilician Armenian military tactician, a joint crusade between the Latins and Mongols signified hope for a kingdom plagued by political uncertainty. It also represented a sense of optimism in strengthening Mongol-Armenian relations, which were beginning to dissolve at this time. Hayton’s vision was to rely on the support of 10,000 Mongol troops to carry out espionage and lead attacks on Mamlûk resources.

While Hayton expresses enthusiasm for a Mongol partnership, his proposal also indicates a tone of anxiety, suggesting an awareness of the difficulties in arranging military cooperation. A certain degree of ambivalence is found in his account of the cultural differences between the Latins and the Mongols, which could prove detrimental during a crusade if not negotiated correctly. By hinting at the difficulties in arranging an alliance, Hayton contradicts his broader treatment of the Mongols as pro-Christian allies.

1119 Schein, Fideles Crucis, 170-75.
1120 Hayton, (French) 237, (Latin) 351.
1121 Ibid, (French) 203, (Latin) 324.
More specifically, Hayton suggests the advantage of having two separate courses of action for the two armies in the event that the Ilkhan planned to head south: the Mongols via Damascus and the crusaders via Jerusalem. The strategy in following two separate routes for the armies is proposed to help avoid an inevitable clash between the crusaders and the Mongols. Hayton explicates that problems would likely arise because of the Mongol tendency to become “austere,” (austeri), “puffed up with pride,” (tumuli),” and “arrogant,” (superbi)—behavioral traits which were especially acute after their military victories.

In other words, a mutual toleration would be virtually impossible if the Latins and Mongols were to unite as one army. Military success could, therefore, only be achieved if the troops stayed separated, following their own paths. Hayton further alerts the papacy that there was a likelihood that the Mongols would refuse to follow the orders of the Christians if united, further emphasizing the need to keep the armies apart. Moreover, he underscores that such obstacles would arise regardless of the khan in power. Hayton’s anxieties seem to reflect his intimate understanding of the conflicting values of both political parties. As a Mongol vassal, he was aware of the Mongol mandate of world domination and its position of authority in conducting military expeditions involving vassal forces including Armenians, Georgians, and Seljuk Turks. As a Latinized Armenian, he was equally aware of the crusader reluctance in allying with the non-Christians Mongols, who had previously posed as a major threat to the Latin East. He knew full well that no Mongol leader would receive a command from a crusader. His
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understanding of the distinct worldviews of each political power encouraged his tactful proposal of maintaining two separate courses of action.

Aside from highlighting the advantages of pursuing separate military paths, Hayton continues to underscore past Ilkhanid successes against the Mamlûk Sultanate and their skills in warfare, as a means to highlight the value in working with the Ilkhanate.\footnote{Hayton notes the exception of the sultan of Meredin. Hayton, (French)237, (Latin), 351.} Hayton proposes an alliance of approximately ten thousand Mongols to assist in a joint expedition. The Mongol allies would be able to instill fear in the Bedouins and Turcomen who worked with the Mamlûks; to carry out espionage activities based on their agility in traveling quickly and their intimate knowledge of travel routes; and to carry out successful siege warfare on enemy cities, castles and fortifications due to their skilled expertise in this field.\footnote{Ibid, (French) 251, (Latin), 361.} Hayton underscores his expertise in discussing Mongol military strengths based on his first-hand experience in their wars against the Mamlûks. He also makes sure to note that the Mongols would voluntarily surrender any lands conquered in Syria to the crusaders, because of their interests in forming an alliance.\footnote{Hayton, (French) 237, (Latin), 357.}

As a Mongol vassal, Hayton is unsurprisingly the most enthusiastic theorist on the subject of an Ilkhanid alliance. Other crusade proposals also echoed Hayton’s support of a Mongol alliance in varying degrees, especially noting their potential impact in an assault on Syria. Fidenzio of Padua affirms the willingness of the Ilkhans to send an offensive into Syria.\footnote{Fidenzio of Padua, 51, 57.} Marino Sanudo similarly notes how the Mongols could play a

\footnote{1127 Hayton notes the exception of the sultan of Meredin. Hayton, (French)237, (Latin), 351.} \footnote{1128 Ibid, (French) 251, (Latin), 361.} \footnote{1129 Hayton, (French) 237, (Latin), 357.} \footnote{1130 Fidenzio of Padua, 51, 57.}
role in weakening the Mamlûk power there. The *Via ad Terram* highlights how a Mongol offensive in Syria, maintained separately from the route of the crusaders, would effectively draw out Mamlûk troops from Egypt, thereby leaving the Sultanate more exposed for a Christian offensive. The *Via ad Terram* is perhaps closest in strategy to Hayton’s counsel.

Most theorists, however, were less than enthusiastic about the prospect of an alliance with the Ilkhans. The author of the Latin *Memoria*, for example, echoes Hayton’s awareness of Mongol pride, noting that this cultural characteristic rendered them impossible allies for the purpose of the crusade. Additionally, King Henry II and the Masters of the Orders, also highly knowledgeable of the Ilkhans, refrain from promoting the Mongol issue, perhaps in consequence of their recent frustrations in working with Ilkhan Ghazan in 1300-01.

Hayton’s optimism for a successful Mongol alliance was clearly based on his Cilician worldview, which was closely tied to the Ilkhanid wars with the Mamlûks. Unlike Cilician Armenia, the Latins did not share a similar experience and largely defined the Mongols as a political threat and heathens. Peter Jackson pinpoints several factors behind the general lack of enthusiasm among the Latins for a Mongol alliance including “the legacy of the ultimatums and of the devastation perpetrated in 1241-2,” and the lack of confidence in the sincerity of Mongol intentions. In contrast, Hayton, as an Ilkhanid vassal, expressed no skepticism towards Mongol support for forging an alliance, especially as Cilician Armenian troops had decades of experience in the
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Ilkhanid-Mamlûk wars. Hayton’s voice is thus distinctive in advocating for a partnership with the Mongols and calibrated to his assertion of his unique knowledge and authority of the cultural differences between the Latins and Mongols that he alone as a Latinized Cilician Armenian could mediate successfully.

Hayton’s proposal for an alliance was also situated within a transitional period of Ilkhanid-Armenian relations. A sense of urgency is palpable in Hayton’s discussion of an alliance, extending from the evolving fourteenth century relations between Cilician Armenia and its overlords. While Hayton is clear that Öljeitü, “a friend of the Christians,” is a keen supporter of an alliance between the Latins and Mongols, he exhorts that another khan in his place may or may not be as supportive towards the crusader cause. This reality functions as a firm warning to the papacy to not waste time in launching a crusade. Moreover, Hayton alerts his Latin audience of the possibility that the khan’s successor could become hostile to the crusade, and could instead, raising the disastrous specter of religious conversion and its presumed geo-political implications, come to belong to the “sect of Muhammad.”

Hayton’s apprehensive tone was not isolated, but was reported by early fourteenth century Armenian scribes who noted the growing Ilkhanid ties to Islam. One scribe laments how the “azgn netolae” (race of Archers) now “followed the evil sect of the forerunner Antichrist [Karapet Neṙn] Mahmet [the Prophet Muhammad].” One disenchanted scribe describes the Ilkhan as one “who rightly was called the slave of the
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donkey…” (a play on his birth name Kharbanda (mule driver)). Writing from Akhtamar in 1307, another frustrated scribe indicates that the colophon was written in:

“bitter and tartarean [tartaros] times, when the Ismaelites [azgn Ismayēli] became so powerful that they succeeded in converting to their vain hope the entire nation of archers [azgn netolac], so that none among them remained who did not confess their fallacious and false faith, which will lead them directly into perdition…”

Judging from the colophon sources, Armenians began viewing Öljeytü as an enemy, not as a “friend of the Christians,” the very image projected in Hayton’s account. The negative perceptions of the Ilkhan seem to have resulted from the weakening ties between the Ilkhanate and Armenian vassals. While the Armenians continued to participate in the Ilkhanid campaigns of 1312-1313, no further military campaigns were launched. Additionally, Öljeytü was criticized for imposing heavy levies upon his Christian subjects. The Ilkhan also failed to provide military aid to the Armenian kingdom. All of these factors seem to have contributed to the growing disillusionment with Öljeytü’s rule, contrasting with the earlier accounts which mirrored Hayton’s hopeful projection for the Ilkhan’s career.

Bayarsaikhan Dashdondog has indeed highlighted that the Ilkhan’s career represented a transitional period in which Ilkhanid-Armenian ties were disintegrating. The end of the Ilkhan’s career indicated that he held minimal interest in pursuing a Syrian campaign. While Hayton’s optimism was rooted in Öljeytü’s earlier overtures to the Latin
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1138 This colophon was written in 1313. Sandjian, 57; Khachikyan, no. 125, 92. The name Kharbanda was indeed dropped upon his ascension to the throne, upon which he received the name Khudā-Banda (slave of God). This scribe seems to have combined the two elements from the khan’s names, calling him a “slave of a donkey.”
1139 Sanjian, 52; Khachikyan, no. 62, 47.
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1141 Dashdondog, The Mongols and the Armenians, 207.
West, he was aware of the changing political currents of the Near East and the growing process of Islamization among the Mongols. The Armenian prince’s warnings to the papacy ultimately reveal his understanding of the evolving state of the Ilkhanate.

The Ilkhanid-Mamlūk conflict was indeed fading; The Ilkhan would only attack the Mamlūk Sultanate once in 1312, as he seems to have been more concerned with other stages of war including the Mongol conquest of Gīlān in Iran. The diminishing level of Ilkhanid-Mamlūk hostilities also resulted in the tapering of the Mongol diplomatic dialogue with the papacy for the recovery of the Holy Land. As a result, Cilician Armenia became increasingly exposed and isolated to Mamlūk invasions. While Hayton could not predict the future course of events, he was writing in a specific moment in which old allegiances were dissolving. The Cilician Armenian kingdom’s hopes of continued Mongol attacks against the Mamlūks were gradually fading, and would end with the peace forged between the Ilkhans and the Mamlūks in 1322, putting an end to the decades of hostilities that had defined their relationship.

Quite interestingly, Hayton applies similar pressure on the papacy, arguing that the present moment represents the opportune time for a crusade in the context of peace within Europe. While the relationship between peace and crusade was a prominent feature in the recovery treatises, most of the other theorists argued that political strife in the Latin West thwarted any chance of success for a crusade. Both Fidenzio of Padua and Pierre Dubois, for instance, vehemently chastised the Latin West (including the papacy) for engaging in conflicts which ultimately took away from the success of a crusade to the

1142 Ibid, 204-05.
1144 Hayton, (French) 236; (Latin) 350.
East. In contrast, Hayton’s attention to the urgency required in planning a crusade reflects his anxieties about the evolving political currents in the Eurasian context and the transitions experienced in the Ilkhanate.

6.7 Cilician Armenia as an Intermediary in Crusade Plans

Substantial weight is also placed on the Cilician king as a vital mediator between the inter-cultural negotiations necessary for an alliance between the papacy, Eastern Christians and Ilkhans. While other recuperatione terrae sanctae, like that of Fidenzio of Padua, promoted alliance with the Eastern Christian powers of the East, Hayton’s treatment of the subject is particularly distinctive in the ways he uses the prospect of alliance to highlight Cilician Armenia’s role as a political intermediary.

With respect to the correspondence to the Nubian and Georgian rulers, Hayton recognizes the Cilician Armenian king’s ability to send and translate letters on behalf of the papacy. Hayton’s treatment of the king’s role in the crusade thus stands in parallel to the ideas expressed throughout La Flor des estoires, which similarly underscore the Cilician king’s vital position as a political intermediary. Hayton further addresses the Armenian king’s role as an intermediary upon the arrival of the papal legate and crusading captain to the East. More specifically, Hayton highlights that the king’s input would be necessary before the crusader army could send messages to Öljeitü with respect to the course of action to be taken.
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1146 Fidenzio of Padua, 534. Nicholas IV had also addressed the Georgians in his appeal in 1291. Writing in 1291, Fidenzio of Padua notes the value of using Eastern Christian allies, counselling the papacy to encourage Georgian involvement in the crusade.
1147 Hayton, (French) 247, (Latin), 358.
1149 Ibid.
The proposal’s recommendation of the Armenian king’s involvement may also be read as further indication of Hayton’s reluctance in allowing the crusaders to negotiate with the Ilkhans themselves based on the cultural differences between the two parties. To bridge these differences, Hayton advocates Cilician Armenia as an intermediary, as a power capable of mediating between the Latins and Mongols, based on its close relations with both parties. His representation of Cilician Armenia as a key mediator runs parallel to his own articulation as an authority on Mongol society.

Quite interestingly, Hayton’s treatment of the Cilician king was not unique to the Armenian writer, but was also a concept developed in the anonymous *Via ad Terram*. The similarity of ideas running through the anonymous reports and Hayton’s crusade proposal confused earlier historians into mistakenly attributing both proposals to the Armenian prince.\footnote{Memoria, 416. The main differences are that the anonymous work rejects using Cyprus and proposes a different land route in contrast to Hayton.} The treatise speaks of the value of relying on the Cilician king for the diplomatic exchanges between the Latins and the Mongols, primarily because of the close partnership between the Ilkhanate and Armenian kingdom.\footnote{‘Via ad Terram’, “Le roi d’Ermenie porroit quassi moult aidier en ce fait, car il se tient pour lur home et il les conut et eus lui et il a eu a faire a eaus souvent.’ 430.} The Latin translation of the proposal similarly echoes the ties between the two powers.\footnote{Memoria, 453. Latin “et videtur nobis quod mittere Tataris nuncios expediret multum ad nostrum intentum. Et hoc melius per regem Armenie quam per alium fieri posset, quia est eis notus et ipsi sibi et infra illud.”}

Hayton’s emphasis on Cilician Armenian intermediation reveals the intersected interests of his work. As an Ilkhanid vassal, it is unsurprising that he advocated an alliance with the Mongols based on his direct experience in the Ilkhanid-Mamlûk wars. His background as an Armenian also played a role in framing his treatment of the kingdom and in his emphasis on its role as a vital political power in crusade planning.
At the same time, however, Hayton’s crusade proposal speaks of the ephemeral conditions in the East. His warnings of the urgent need for a crusade and alliance highlight the changing relations between the Ilkhanid Mongols, papacy and Cilician Armenian kingdom in the early fourteenth century. All of these issues reflect the complex nature of Eurasian politics in the medieval period.

6.8 Impact of Hayton’s Crusade Proposal

The group of recuperatione terrae sanctae produced for Clement V helped inform the papacy of the conditions of the East. Despite the value of Hayton’s proposal for papal plans, Clement encountered varying forms of resistance to his crusade ambitions, which made the realization of his project difficult to accomplish. In August 1308, Clement V published the papal bull Exsurgat Deus, proclaiming the spring of 1310 as the launch date for the preliminary crusading expedition, which would have been the first to sail to the East since the fall of Acre (the reality of a larger expedition was unfeasible due to various financial strains and mixed responses by Philip IV of France). The small expedition was thus placed under the command of Fulk de Villaret, along with the involvement of a papal legate.1153

Aware of the dangers facing the kingdoms of Cyprus and Cilician Armenia, Clement V had no alternative but to rely on a Hospitaller expedition (the Templars faced persecution from the French crown, being accused of the fall of Acre in 1291 and singled out as heretics). While Clement V had originally envisioned the involvement of both Orders in the defense of the Eastern Mediterranean, the French monarchy’s vicious

1153 Philip IV was expected to serve as the leader of the general crusade following the preliminary passage, but this became increasingly unfeasible due to a lack of resources and finances—two factors which continued to weigh heavily on fourteenth century crusade plans. Housley, “Pope Clement V and the Hospitaller Crusade,” Riley-Smith, The Knights Hospitaller in the Levant, c. 1070-1309, 226.
claims against the Templars made their participation impossible (Philip IV also attempted to interfere in the Hospitaller crusade plans as a result of the Order’s leadership over the preliminary passage).\textsuperscript{1154} In light of these developments, Clement organized 1,000 knights and 4,000 infantrymen to the East, whose aim would be to protect Cyprus and Cilician Armenia for the duration of five years.\textsuperscript{1155}

Additionally, the expedition would aim at damaging Christian-Saracen trading activities. Being a costly enterprise, Clement organized the financing of the expedition through combined funds generated from the papacy, the French crown, and from the revenue collected from the sale of indulgences. This initial course of action closely adhered to the Hospitaller suggestion, which interestingly, was similar to Hayton’s proposal of 1,000 soldiers, 10 galleys and 3,000 foot-soldiers.\textsuperscript{1156}

Despite Clement’s plans to send aid to the last two Christian kingdoms in the Eastern Mediterranean littoral, Fulk de Villaret encouraged the papacy to accept the expedition’s pursuit of the conquest of Rhodes in the Mediterranean—which had begun in 1306—from the Byzantine Emperor, Andronicus II (r.1282-1328), son of Michael Palaiologus (who had already been excommunicated by Clement V in 1307 for carrying out strikes against the Hospitallers). While the conquest of Rhodes was not part of the initial papal plans, Fulk de Villaret convinced the papacy of the indispensability of conquering the island (in addition to Kos and other islands) from the schismatic Greeks.

\textsuperscript{1154} Vitae paparum Avenionensium, 3, 89-90. For example, Philip IV challenged Fulk de Villaret’s leadership by suggesting the English as better leaders of the crusade.
\textsuperscript{1155} Cartulaire général de l’ordre des Hospitaliers de St. Jean de Jérusalem 1100-1310, ed. J. Delaville le Rouix (Paris; 1894-1906), no.4807:
and the Turkish infidels. The Order’s possession of the island would last until 1522, serving as the headquarters from which the Hospitallers could launch naval strikes against the Muslim emirates, see that an embargo on trade was carried out against the sultanate, and plan to attack Byzantium.

Moreover, the pursuit of Rhodes also marked the gradual shifting of the Hospitaller orientation toward the defense of the Latin states in Aegean, which included the principality of Morea and the duchy of Athens. Efforts to assist Cilician Armenia thus gradually disappeared. Clement V’s efforts in organizing a passagium particulare under the Hospitallers ignited negative reactions among the European leaders, reflecting the dividing set of ‘national’ interests that inevitably complicated crusade plans of the fourteenth century. According to Sophie Menache’s study on the career of Clement V, “the growing financial needs of the national monarchies and the high cost of the crusade” played a significant role in shaping papal crusade plans. Furthermore, the competing interests of western political powers directly challenged Clement V’s projections for a crusade, indicating the limitations of his authority in motivating key European leaders. Thus there was a huge divide between made plans and actual commitment derived from the leading political powers of this period.

1157 Andronicus attacked Rhodes in April of 1307, but suffered a major defeat and organized another campaign in 1308. Cartulaire, no.4751; Luttrell, “Hospitallers in Rhodes,” 284-7; Nicholson, The Knights Hospitaller, 47.
1159 For example, the Hospitallers assisted King Peter I of Cyprus in capturing Satalia/Antalya along the Cilician coast in 1361.
1160 Menache, Clement V, 118.
1161 In addition to the obstacles created by James II and Philip IV, the Italian mercantile republics also created considerable problems for the papacy’s crusade. The Genoese, Venetians, Pisans, and the Catalans were blatantlty unwilling to desist from trading with the Muslims. The Genoese particularly became embroiled in a bitter conflict with Hospitallers in the East in 1311. The Genoese worked to weaken Hospitaller power in the Eastern Mediterranean through negotiations with the Muslims and the papacy’s clear push for a commercial blockade, as published in the bull Exsurgat Deus. Clement V’s crusade plans
Preoccupied with his own crusade in the Iberian Peninsula and Western Mediterranean, James II of Aragon vehemently opposed the Hospitaller expedition, instead requesting papal support and revenue for his offensive against the Moors of Granada. Allied with Castille and Morocco, he not only placed heavy pressures on the curia to send aid for his cause, but more importantly, refused to send the Hospitallers of Aragon on the organized *passagium particulare* to the East, despite having previously committed to fight on the Eastern Mediterranean front. Further challenging Clement’s plans, he also prohibited Aragonese mercenaries from joining the eastern expedition and transferring war supplies in order to conserve his resources and manpower for his local conquest plan.\(^{1163}\)

In addition to conflicting priorities, the Aragonese crown was highly skeptical of Hospitaller military aspirations in the Eastern Mediterranean, sharing the opinion that the Order’s true interest was centered on the conquest of Rhodes. This was based on a report commissioned in January 1309, which asserted that the recovery of the Holy Land merely served as a pretext for these other conquests of territory.\(^{1164}\) In turn, the Aragonese crown’s resistance to the *passagium* was grounded in its prioritizing of the crusade in the Western Mediterranean.\(^{1165}\)

---

\(^{1162}\) Housley, “Pope Clement V,” 29-43.
\(^{1163}\) Housley, 33; Delaville, *Cartulaire generale de l’Ordre des Hospitaliers de S. Jean de Jerusalem*, 4, no.4860.
\(^{1164}\) Housley, “Pope Clement V,” 32-33.
\(^{1165}\) Ibid, 33-34.
Similarly, Clement V’s plans also provoked a negative reaction from the French crown. In addition to the opposition voiced by James II of Aragon, Philip IV of France hesitated to support the Hospitaller-led expedition, largely due to his exclusion from the planning and leadership of the crusade. More specifically, Philip IV defined his royal image as crusade leader, asserting and promoting a self-fashioned status as the pre-eminent king of Christendom. As such, the Capetian monarchs regarded themselves as the rightful and exclusive leaders of the crusade. Clement V and Fulk de Villaret’s plans were thus perceived to be repudiating the French crown’s role, with some justice since the Hospitaller Master acted as the pope’s main partner. While Philip IV had originally promised manpower and the large sum of 100,000 gold florins, he loudly voiced his opposition to the Hospitaller leadership in the crusade.1166

Despite Philip IV’s conflicts over the subject of leadership of the expedition, the French monarch continued to express an interest in the idea of crusading based on his self-defined role as the leader of the crusade. While he took the cross at the Council of Vienne, his death soon afterward naturally brought an end to his aspirations. Despite the problems between Clement’s crusade plans and Capetian interests, Philip IV’s son, Philip V, became an active enthusiast for a crusade, reflecting the sustained interest of the French crown in portraying itself as Christendom’s leader.

Notwithstanding the failure of Clement V in sending a crusade to the East, crusading continued to hold interest for the Latin West. *La Flor des estoires* continued to appeal to later crusade enthusiasts based on its detailed account of the East and seems to have served as a source of authority for later theorists. The end of Clement V’s career in

1166 *Cartulaire*, nos. 4831, 4841.
1314 signaled a transition towards the French court’s dominance over crusade planning in the first half of the fourteenth century, which was often marked by intense debates over how to best finance the costly passagium. The careers of Philip V (1316-22), Charles IV (1322-28) and Philip VI (1328-50) demonstrated their enthusiasm in embarking on a crusade; Philip V first took the cross upon his ascension to the throne and later attempted to organize a crusade between 1319 and 1321.1167

Assistance to the Eastern Mediterranean, with a particular focus on sending aid to Cilician Armenia, continued to be of interest to the French crown and the papacy; Philip V of France proposed dispatching a small passage to the Armenian kingdom, under the leadership of Louis of Clermont.1168 Furthermore, Charles IV initially planned a three-staged crusade also aiming to send aid to the Armenian kingdom, but which nonetheless, disintegrated in light of the domestic conflicts in Europe between France and England and Pope John XXII’s problems in Italy.1169 The first Valois king, Philip VI (1328-50) equally supported the idea of dispatching a three-staged crusade in 1333, having taken the cross twice in 1313 and 1326.1170 The interest of the French crown in protecting the kingdom was matched by the efforts of the papacy. In December 1322, Pope John XXII granted indulgences to crusaders who went to Armenia and the Holy Land, as a reaction to the attack on Ayas in June 1322.1171

In light of the continued interest in crusading, proposals were produced and circulated following Clement’s death, despite the diminishing level of papal requests for

---

1167 Riley-Smith, The Crusades, 266.
1169 Housley, ‘The Franco-papal crusade negotiations,’ 180-82. Interestingly, the Cilician king was skeptical about the success of a small passagium, Lettres Secretes du Pape Jean XXII, nos. 1690-91.
written advice during this period. Most notably, the Venetian Marino Sanudo’s *Liber secretorum fidelium crucis* was presented to Pope John XII and Charles IV. The treatise represented a meticulous study of the conditions of the East from the perspective of a well-informed theorist, written at different stages beginning in 1306. In 1309, he produced *Conditiones Terre Sancte*, which later became the first book of the *Liber secretorum* dealing with the idea of a naval blockade of the Sultanate. Soon thereafter, his second book was completed, in which he addressed the recovery of the Holy Land. The third, and final book of the treatise, was completed in 1321. It provided a history of the Holy Land, coupled with a geographical overview of the East and included the insertion of maps.\(^{1172}\)

Sanudo’s treatise reflects a clear dependence on Hayton’s text, as highlighted by recent scholars.\(^{1173}\) The Venetian theorist seems to have relied upon Hayton’s work in his third book of the *Liber secretorum*.\(^{1174}\) Paralleling Hayton’s account, Sanudo provides a detailed overview of a report of Het’um I’s mission to the court of Möngke Khan.\(^{1175}\) In his *Istoria del Regno*, Sanudo also notes being acquainted with the Master of the Hospitallers, Fulk de Villaret.\(^{1176}\) It is clear that Sanudo saw both Hayton and the Hospitaller Master as experts in eastern affairs. As an authoritative voice on the East, *La Flor des estoires* would continue in its appeal to later medieval writers and crusade enthusiasts.

---


\(^{1174}\) Hayton’s work was utilized in the second redaction of the book. Lock, *Marino Sanudo Torsello*, 6-7.

\(^{1175}\) Sanudo *Liber secretorum*, 235-8; Leopold, 195.

Other medieval authors also seem to have utilized *La Flor des estoires* as a reference, including the anonymous work, *Descriptio Europae Orientalis*, composed c.1308. While the work itself was not technically a recovery treatise, it was a geographical overview of Eastern Europe with an anti-Byzantine campaign intended to encourage an offensive against the Empire. Highly critical of the Byzantines, the author decries the quality of the Greek army and stresses the vulnerable position of the eastern Byzantine lands—both of which promote the empire’s conquest. With respect to *La Flor des estoires*, the anonymous author notes that ‘the lord of Gorigos has discussed Asia Minor sufficiently,’ signaling that he was familiar with Hayton’s geographical overview and saw the Armenian writer as an authority on the Near East. Hayton’s ties to Cypriot nobility and first-hand experience of combat alongside Mongol forces against the Mamlûk indeed shaped his detailed knowledge of the Eastern world.

The reference in the *Descriptio Europae Orientalis* also demonstrates that Hayton’s text had already begun to circulate outside the papal court soon after his visit to Avignon. The influence of Hayton’s work was generated through its wide circulation, being found in over fifty extant manuscript copies. The number of surviving copies largely stands out in contrast to the works of the recovery treatises which survive in only unique manuscript copies, most notably including the works of the Masters of the Orders, *Via ad Terram*, and Fidenzio of Padua—all written from authors experienced in the political affairs of the Eastern Mediterranean. While additional copies may have
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1180 Schein, *Fideles Crucis*, 215. Sylvia Schein has asserted that both the *Via* and the *Memoria* were influenced by Hayton, in light of their promotion of Cilician Armenia as a base.
1181 Other unique recovery treatises include those of Charles II, Pierre Dubois, and William of Nogaret.
indeed circulated, the comparatively high number of copies of *La Flor des estoires* speaks of its influence outside the papal circle.

Hayton’s work also appears to have served as an important source of information for the crusading interest of the Burgundian court in the early fourteenth century, based on its interests in opposing Turkish incursions in the Eastern Mediterranean. Antony Leopold has described how the French kings began collecting groups of recovery treatises as references for their crusading plans, and these treatises were “regarded as potentially useful at the French court, whose plans were made with access to their ideas.” Hayton’s work seems to have been collected by the French court with the *Anonymi Descriptio Europae Orientalis* and the *Memoria*, between 1310 and 1330. Most notably, Philip the Bold (1363-1404), who played a major role in the crusade against the Turks in 1396, also shared an interest in Hayton’s text. In light of the Burgundian interest in crusading against the Turks in the Eastern Mediterranean, he purchased three copies of *La Flor des estoires* from a French bookseller at the start of the fourteenth century.

6.9 Conclusion

Hayton’s *La Flor des estoires* highlights the knowledge of a well-experienced authority on Eastern affairs, which may partly explain the work’s popularity beyond the papal circle well into the fourteenth century. Likewise the intermediate position of his Cilician Armenian identity, located along the networks of Eurasia, subordinated to
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1183 Ibid, 46; Leopold suggests that this collection was made by the royal court in light of an extant letter which was “written to a relative of the French king with the copies of the crusade proposal.” See also, Gorka, intro to *Anonymi Descriptio Europae Orientalis*, xxxix.
Mongols but allied with Latins in the Eastern Mediterranean, undoubtedly gave Hayton a distinctive geopolitical perspective which was appealing to the papacy and later enthusiasts. Hayton articulated this unique identity for the Armenian kingdom by claiming that it could mediate the cultural differences between Latins and Mongols and serve as a force to organize a pan-Christian crusade. His background as a Cilician Armenian indeed allowed him to form a distinctive perspective on the Christian East, challenging the wider Latin worldview which largely excluded those unaligned with the papacy. His crusade proposal thus reveals a complex intersection of interests, which reflected his background as a Cilician Armenian.
Conclusion

The study of Hayton’s career as a cultural and political intermediary serves as a window into the global politics of the early fourteenth century. The Armenian prince’s influence in the courts of Armenia, Cyprus, Persia, and the Latin West reveal the career of a highly-skilled diplomat and political intermediary who was able to bridge cultural and religious differences. The analysis of Hayton and his main work *La Flor des estoires* is thus particularly valuable in highlighting the network and range of intercultural exchanges in the medieval Eurasian world.

While most scholars have studied Hayton’s contributions as a crusade theorist, this dissertation has placed emphasis on his worldview as a Cilician Armenian and as a member of the Het’umid dynasty. The focus on his social background reveals how his career mirrored those of his contemporaries like Constable Smbat, who similarly engaged in cultural and political negotiations in the Eurasian context. Hayton’s interest in historiography and serving in diplomacy were also reflective of the interests of the Armenian dynasty that rose in prominence with the Mongol conquests of the Middle East. The detailed knowledge shaping *La Flor des estoires* could not be adequately explained without pointing to the significance of his Cilician Armenian identity and its position as a medieval crossroads. Its geopolitical significance allowed for Hayton and his contemporaries to access a wide of sources, written and oral, as also evidenced in his production of the Armenian *Cronicon*. Their ability to use a range of sources resulted from their multi-lingual fluency based on their immersion in the culture and society of the
Latin East and contacts with neighboring political powers including the Ilkhanate Persian court.

The focus on this worldview is also insightful for understanding his position as a counselor to Clement V for the papal crusade plans and his ability to provide a detailed report, infused with historical, geographical, ethnographical and strategic interpretations, built on contemporaneous reports and shaped according to the interests of the Latin West. Hayton’s background as a Cilician Armenian prince formed his awareness of Latin expectations as the kingdom had developed close ties to the Latins and engaged in diplomatic dialogue with the papacy over the subject of Union with Rome.

Hayton’s worldview as a Cilician Armenian can thus be understood to have been developed by a complex interplay of factors. By looking at his interests in an imperial context, this study has examined the manner in which Hayton served as a loyal Mongol vassal, who was intimately attached to the Ilkhanid campaigns in Syria and to the Ilkhanid-Mamlûk conflict which occupied Cilician interests until the fall of the Ilkhanate in 1335. His position as an influential vassal shaped his knowledge of Mongol cultural values, military tactics and diplomatic strategies for promoting an alliance with the Latin West.

His efforts also closely paralleled those of the Ilkhanid envoys like the Eastern Christian monk, Rabban Sawma. While Hayton was not an official Ilkhanid envoy, his awareness of Ilkhanid diplomatic tactics permitted Hayton to frame his counsel in such a way as to both complement Ilkhanid interests and suit the expectations of his audience in Poitiers. His intimate knowledge of Mongol affairs also made his interpretations highly
relevant for the papacy and played an important role in the circulation of *La Flor des estoires* outside Avignon in the late medieval and early modern periods.

Hayton was thus working in a trans-imperial context as he was also invested in working with the papacy in organizing a crusade for the security of Cilician Armenia. His expertise was particularly relevant for Clement V, who expressed enthusiasm in sending aid to the Eastern Mediterranean. Hayton’s historical, geographical and strategic interpretations were all presented in such a way as to promote the defense of the Armenian kingdom. This study paid close attention to three principal strategies used: emphasizing his expertise as a Cilician Armenian ‘easterner,’ articulating his loyalty to Rome, and incorporating Latin conventions to make his counsel understandable to the West. These tools were particularly necessary as Clement’s other key counselors, the Masters of the Orders, showed minimal interest in allying with the Mongols and in using Cilician Armenia as a crusader base. *La Flor des estoires* was thus competing with other *recuperatione terre sancta*. It was trying to appease western hesitations in working with the non-Christian Ilkhans, using Cilician Armenia as a crusader base due to its turbulent political status in the early fourteenth century and concerns about the reliability of its inhabitants for assisting the crusaders.

In addition to asserting his role as an expert on the Ilkhans, Hayton articulated his alignment with the Latin Church as a way to appease western skepticism towards working with the Armenians and towards the Eastern Christians in general. The emphasis on his obedience to Rome was also employed as a strategy by the Armenian kingdom to downplay ambivalent western views of the Eastern Christians as schismatics and unreliable partners in war. Hayton’s conversion as a Premonstratensian canon paralleled
the decisions taken at the Councils of Sis (1307) and Adana (1314), as well as King Hetʿum II’s distinctive identity as a Franciscan. The pro-Latin movement also worked to divide the Armenian community, polarizing the Cilician leadership from the majority of the clergy who upheld Orthodox tradition. These divisions took place within the kingdom and in Cilician Armenian exchanges with the prominent clergy residing outside its borders. The precedents for this conflict emerged during the context of the Third Crusade and continued to divide Cilician society into the fourteenth century.

While Hayton’s pro-Latin position stood in line with the broader foreign policy of Cilician Armenia, it also had a distinctive voice. Aware of the western hesitations in sending a crusade to Cilician Armenia, he proposed a vision for a pan-Christian alliance, which would include the diverse communities of the East including the Armenians and Georgians of the Caucasus. Hayton’s purpose for this alliance was to inform the papacy of Eastern Christian interests in assisting a western crusade and to underscore the thriving Christian community living under the Mongol Empire. This unique strategy can be understood to have been aimed at reducing the western reluctance in working with the ‘Oriental’ Christians and to define Cilician Armenia’s role as the critical political intermediary in organizing a global alliance of Christian partners.

Cilician Armenia was thus presented as a key power in promoting a crusade to the Ilkhans, organizing a pan-Christian alliance, and as a strategic base for the crusaders. All of these methods of persuasion were employed by the Cilician statesman to underscore the political significance of the kingdom during a transitional period in which its political future remained insecure as a result of increasing Mamlûk aggression and Turkish settlement, as well as the declining power of the Ilkhanate as a protector of the kingdom.
Not only did the Ilkhans fail to launch invasions of Syria, but they also broke their partnership with Cilician Armenia.

Growing Ilkhanid conversion to Islam and the weakening Ilkhanid-Mamlūk conflict were indeed sources of anxiety for Hayton. This dissertation has focused on the tone of urgency found in La Flor des estoires, suggesting how the Lord of Korykos was operating within a transitional period. Öljeitü’s reign (1304-1316) was of particular concern, as his effort to engage in war against the Mamlūks waned in relation to that of his predecessor Ghazan. Hayton’s concerns were mirrored by his Armenian contemporaries.

This study has suggested that Hayton used historical interpretation to downplay the political transitions at work in the Near East. His ethnographical and historical approaches conformed to the expectations of his audience, reading them alongside his plans for war. More specifically, Hayton emphasized earlier Mongol successes and looked towards Ilkhan Ghazan’s recent Syrian campaigns as examples of the rewards of a Mongol alliance. La Flor des estoires, however, also reveals his subtle awareness of the political uncertainties of the time in which he composed his treatise for the papacy.

The broader implications of this study reveal the complex diplomatic negotiations of the early fourteenth century Eurasian world, which involved a range of political actors including the Latins, Armenians, Mamlūks, Mongols and Eastern Christians. Diplomatic exchanges within this period contribute to a better understanding of the cultural perceptions of one group towards another. They also reveal the ways in which diplomatic exchanges attempted to bridge cultural and religious differences in efforts of promoting shared political goals.
The dissertation also underscores the fluidity of identities and cultural and religious pluralities in the Eurasian context, which were largely developed by the onset of the crusades and Mongol conquests. Hayton’s career as a political intermediary particularly reflects the diversity of identities in the Eastern Mediterranean, a region which developed connections to the Mongol world. Additionally, the range of inter-cultural experiences in this region was not only marked by exchanges of ideas and political cooperation, but also by competing interests and conflicts. Cilician-Mongol ties were particularly reflective of the ways in which the kingdom became isolated and exposed to Mamlûk assault due to its reliance and exchanges with the Ilkhanate.

While Hayton ultimately failed to achieve his goals of organizing a crusade and forging a global alliance, his representation of the East continued to hold interest in the Latin West. *La Flor des estoires* was copied into numerous manuscripts and early modern printings, as the Europeans increasingly desired information about the East. As mentioned in this study, his work became known to the author of *Mandeville’s Travels*, which was copied into hundreds of manuscripts and enjoyed substantial popularity within Europe. Thus while Hayton may have failed as a political intermediary, his contributions as a cultural intermediary thrived.

This study’s concentration on Hayton’s contributions during the early fourteenth century can thus be expanded to cover the later medieval and early modern periods in order to explore the ways in which his ideas held resonance for later audiences. An insightful avenue of research would be to look at later texts and examine the ways in which they were adapted to suit contemporaneous concerns. This focus would expand our
understanding of Hayton’s contributions as a cultural mediator and specifically point to
which of his ideas held particular significance in the later period.

This study also suggests further analyzing his contributions in an eastern context. An
emphasis on the ways in which his Cronicon compared to later Armenian translations of
Latin works and to the historiography of Rashid ad-Din, which also relied on a similar
chronicle, would strengthen our knowledge of the cultural milieu of the Mongol Empire.
An inter-textual approach would reveal new insights on Hayton’s role as a cultural
intermediary in the East in light of comparison to other sources. These possible avenues
of research ultimately underscore how his career was more than that of a simple political
propagandist. The study on Hayton reveals intertwined identities and overlapping forms
of intermediation, which were produced by the diverse range of intercultural contacts in
the early fourteenth century.
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