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COINAGE OF TRIPOLI (XII\textsuperscript{th}-XIII\textsuperscript{th} CENTURY)

In studying the coinage of Tripoli, one is faced with a number of problems in making attributions. Since eight rulers — four Raymonds and four Bohemonds — struck several types of coins over a span of 150 years, the numismatist is faced with a puzzle that seems to defy solution.

De Saulcy (1847), Schlumberger (1878), Sabine (1980) and Metcalf (1983) wrote extensively on the coinage, but made attributions with many reservations.

In researching the coinage of Tripoli, the writer tried to bring together evidence available in 16 mixed crusader hoards\(^{(1)}\), historical sequences\(^{(2)}\) and numismatic data\(^{(3)}\).

It was felt that if all three supported one theory or attribution, then this theory can be considered acceptable until new findings — be they hoard, historical or numismatic — advance a different premise.

It is hoped that this paper, although its conclusions may differ with long-held attributions of certain coins, will at least stimulate interest in an area of numismatics long in a state of dormancy.

Tripoli, unlike other crusader principalities, was a dependency of Toulouse. It is not surprising that its coinage is closely related and patterned after the coinage of that city in the south of France.

Tripoli's last Toulousan ruler, Raymond III, left the principality to the son of Bohemond of Antioch. But before dying, Raymond


\(^{(3)}\) See ref. 1 and catalogue of this article.
stipulated that, should a Toulousan prince come to the East, he would have the right to claim the country (4).

Raymond IV of St. Gilles, Count of Toulouse

Raymond IV was a major figure among the crusading princes. He came to Constantinople in 1101 to spend the winter with Alexius whose confidence he enjoyed. He was a friend of the Pope and was respected as a senior prince.

The whole crusading army, composed of French, German and Byzantine forces, moved across Asia Minor under Raymond’s command. The trials and tribulations this army encountered on its march to Antioch are well documented (5).

Raymond was the most powerful and wealthy of all the leaders. A pious ruler, he was determined to fulfill his vow of liberating Jerusalem. On his way to the Holy City, he captured Tortosa and decided to remain there instead of marching on to Jerusalem. His main objective was to capture Tripoli.

Tripoli was very well garrisoned. When Raymond attacked it with the assistance of the Genoese in 1103, his army was beaten back. He did, however, secure control of the surrounding countryside. Late in 1104, he attacked again and, in the course of battle, a burning roof fell on him. He died February 28, 1105, perhaps as a result of his injuries.

It should be stated that Raymond IV of Toulouse is also known as Raymond I of Tripoli.

Coinage of Raymond I

As Count of Toulouse, Raymond had a number of coins struck in France (6). He did not have a mint in the East where he lived for only a short time. No coins exist from an eastern mint bearing his name.

(5) See n. 2 and John & Laurita HILL, Raymond IV, Count of Toulouse, Syracuse, 1962.
When Raymond IV of Toulouse left Europe for the crusade, he had no natural son. He left the government in the hands of his bastard son, Bertrand.

Raymond's wife, Elvira, accompanied him to the East. Just before Raymond's death, she gave birth to a son, Alfonso-Jordan. Raymond's cousin, William-Jordan, Count of Cerdagne, who had recently arrived in the East, was appointed regent of the newborn baby.

In the meantime, the barons of Toulouse, not knowing of the birth of the child, had accepted Bertrand as their ruler. When they finally learned of the birth of Alfonso-Jordan, they sent word to the young heir, asking him to come home and rule his ancestral lands. Elvira, preferring life in France, sailed with the child and arrived in Toulouse in 1108. The child's regent, William-Jordan, did not accompany them, but stayed behind to rule the region of Tripoli.

It appears that the change in Toulousan rulers was made in an amicable manner. Bertrand was given lands in the East and sailed for them in the summer of 1108. He had ruled Toulouse for a decade and was a mature and wise man. He realized that, to establish a principality in the East, he must capture Tripoli and also neutralize William-Jordan, whose position was growing insecure.

Bertrand arrived with an army of 4,000 cavalry and infantry and a flotilla of 40 galleys. His son, Pons, accompanied him.

Bertrand astutely bought the services of the Genoese by promising them a favored commercial position once the city of Tripoli was captured. It is interesting that William-Jordan also recognized the necessity of securing the assistance of naval forces of the Genoese, but tried too late to enlist their alliance.

William-Jordan formed an alliance with Tancred, a hero of the first crusade and prepared to prevent Bertrand from claiming his inheritance. The armies of William-Jordan and Tancred readied themselves to fight those of Bertrand and the Genoese. But just as the battle was in the offing, an appeal was made to the king of Jerusalem. The king sent Baldwin of Edessa to intervene and a court of justice was held.

An agreement was reached. William-Jordan was to keep Tortosa and Arga. Bertrand was given Jebail and Tripoli. But he had to capture Tripoli first.
In June of 1109, all the princes of the Frankish East combined their forces outside Tripoli. The king had 500 knights and as many infantry. Tancred brought 700 knights. They were joined by the forces of Bertrand and Baldwin of Edessa.

Seeing the power of these assembled forces, the Arab governor of Tripoli offered to surrender and the Franks entered Tripoli July 12, 1109.

Upon entering the city, Bertrand assumed the title of Count of Tripoli. Ignoring his obligations to Alexius of Constantinople, he affirmed his vassaldom to the king of Jerusalem.

Shortly thereafter, William-Jordan was killed under suspicious circumstances and Bertrand took over his lands.

**Coinage of Bertrand**

While in France, Bertrand, as ruler of Toulouse, had struck a number of deniers (7). It is surprising and curious that there are a few exceedingly rare deniers of Bertrand with the legend BERTRANDUS COMES/CIVITAS TRIPOLIS. Four of these deniers are mentioned in a recent publication of Sabine (8).

Since all are struck from different dies, it must be concluded that some quantities of these coins were issued.

Explaining the raison d'être of these deniers poses some difficulties. It is highly unlikely, if not impossible that these rare deniers were struck in the East.

It must be remembered that the first deniers of Antioch were struck during the reign of Raymond of Poitiers (1136-1149) some 25 years after Bertrand's death, and in Jerusalem during the rule of Baldwin III (1143-1163), over 30 years later. Tripoli apparently did not have a mint and one would not expect that Bertrand, in a period of two or three years, could have organized a mint. The answer to the problem must be sought elsewhere. We must also consider that there are no copper coins of Bertrand, whereas the succeeding rulers struck coppers in large numbers.

As mentioned above, Bertrand ruled Toulouse for 10 years and was wisely cooperative when the young heir, Alfonso-Jordan, retur-

---

(7) Ibid., p. 346, Pl. LXXX, n° 14, 15, 16.
ned home to assume control. Bertrand, while ruling Toulouse, struck coins in his own name.

Upon acquiring Tripoli, Bertrand struck deniers, very much of the same type and style as his deniers of Toulouse, but bearing the name of Tripoli. This consolidated his legal rights.

It may be that these coins were struck in Toulouse and brought to the East. Certainly there were no facilities to strike such coins in Tripoli.

Since the deniers of Bertrand bear the legend CIVITAS TRIPOLIS, one may conclude they were struck after the capture of the city. Thus, Bertrand had less than three years before his death to strike coins in Toulouse and import them to Tripoli. Not an impossible task. It should be recalled that money in circulation in the crusader principalities was mostly of European origin.

It is interesting that one of the four existing specimens of Bertrand is part of a hoard which consists largely of Tripoli pieces (9).

**Pons (1112-1137)**

Pons continued his father's policy of allegiance to the king of Jerusalem and in many instances fought alongside the king as his vassal.

Throughout the history of the crusader principalities, although the princes of the East recognized the sovereignty of the king, that recognition went only as far as it was enforceable. Whenever the princes felt strong enough, they rejected their obligations to the king.

In 1122, Pons tried to renounce his allegiance to King Baldwin of Jerusalem, but was forced to submit. In 1131, he refused to allow King Fulk to pass through his lands, but was punished by the king and again forced into submission.

With the passage of time, however, the king's power diminished and the princes followed policies independent of him.

**Coinage of Pons**

Since Pons ruled for 25 years, there would have been many surviving specimens of his coins, had he ever struck coins. The evidence is that he did not have a mint in Tripoli and did not issue any coins.

(9) Paul Z. Bedoukian, o.c.
Numismatists have considered the possibility that a single specimen with the legend TRI : PO : LIS/TRIPOVIS CIVITAS may have been struck by Pons. This piece is in the style of Toulouse deniers, and is probably a variation of Bertrand's issues, rather than of Pons. The idea that the middle two letters, PO in TRIPOLIS stand for the word PONS is unconvincing (10).

It seems evident that Tripoli had not as yet begun striking coins during the reign of Pons.

Raymond II (1137-1157)

When Pons died, his son, Raymond, was 22. He was not a particularly wise or brave man and had a checkered career. For reasons unknown, he marched on the Moslem leader, Zengi, who was laying siege to the city of Homs. When Zengi advanced on the Franks, Raymond retreated and called for the assistance of King Fulk of Jerusalem.

The ensuing battle was a disaster for the Christians. Raymond was taken prisoner. Baldwin barely escaped and took shelter in the fortress of Montferrant. Raymond was subsequently released under terms whereby Zengi gained control over Montferrant.

In 1148, Alfonso-Jordan, the count of Toulouse, came to the East with the second crusade. It was thought that he might try to claim Tripoli, thereby placing Raymond II in a difficult position.

But Alfonso met a different fate. On his way to Jerusalem, he died in agony and Raymond was accused of having poisoned him.

The young Bertrand of Toulouse, bastard son of Alfonso-Jordan, had come along on the journey and witnessed his father's horrible death. Bertrand could not endure the idea of the rich inheritance of Tripoli remaining in the hands of the man accused of murdering his father.

Young Bertrand managed to capture the castle of Araima and defied Raymond to dislodge him. Raymond approached several crusader leaders, pleading for military assistance, but none would help him. He then called upon the Moslem leader, Nur-ed-Din, of Damascus. Nur-ed-Din came with a large army. The fortress was captured, looted and leveled to the ground.

Bertrand and his sister were taken to Aleppo where they spent 12 years in captivity.

In 1152, at the gates of Tripoli, Raymond was struck down by assassins. He was the first Frankish leader to die at the hands of assassins.

Coinage of Raymond II

Raymond's fears of Alfonso indicate clearly the political position of Tripoli and Toulouse. Whether responsible for Alfonso's mysterious death or not, Raymond's actions against young Bertrand show clearly that, legally, Raymond was a liege of Toulouse, and not an independent ruler.

Nevertheless, political or economic necessity encouraged Raymond to establish a mint and strike coins. Raymond must have begun striking copper coins during the early years of his rule, before Alfonso-Jordan came east in 1146. As a dependency of Toulouse, he chose the design of the agneau pascal, or the horse and cross design, patterned after the copper of Alfonso-Jordan (1112-1148) (11).

The coins of Raymond II are scarce, but not rare. They are usually in poor condition, but the composite legend reads + RAIMUNDUS COMS/CIVITAS TRIPOLIS.

Both the styling and the striking of the coins indicate the workmanship of a newly established mint. Unlike other crusader coins, very often the legend begins at a position other than 12 O'clock. The letters are often not uniform and are sometimes incomplete. And the cross usually found at the beginning of a legend is occasionally missing.

Hoard evidence is strongly in favor of attributing the horse-and-cross types to Raymond II. There are only 18 horse-and-cross coppers distributed among eight hoards, a much smaller number than other types of coppers. Most of the specimens are quite worn, pointing to long usage.

Thus, historical, hoard and numismatic evidence is clearly in favor of attributing the horse-and-cross coppers to Raymond II.

(11) POEY D'AVANT, o.c., p. 247, Pl. LXXXI, n° 13, 16.
Raymond III (1152-1187)

During his long reign, Raymond III was a leading figure in the crusader principalities. He never publicly recognized the sovereignty of the king of Jerusalem. He had married a woman who had feudal obligations in Galilee. He realized that this made him, in the eyes of those ruling Galilee, a vassal of the king. Raymond III was deeply involved in politics, but retained his attitude of independence.

In 1164, Nur-ed-Din of Aleppo attacked the northern crusader principalities. Prince Bohemond of Antioch called for the assistance of Raymond as well as Toros of Armenia. In spite of Toros' warnings, the combined crusader forces were ambushed and all the crusader leaders were captured.

Toros and Bohemond were released, since they were considered to be vassals of the Emperor of Byzantium and Nur-ed-Din did not want to antagonize the emperor.

Raymond, however, was imprisoned for nine years (1164-1173). He eventually was released upon payment of 80,000 dinars, a sum raised largely by King Amalric of Jerusalem and the Hospitalers (12).

On July 11, 1174, King Amalric died, leaving the 13-year-old leper, Baldwin, as his successor. Baldwin was crowned by the patriarch and Raymond, as the closest kin, was chosen as regent for the young king. Five years later, Baldwin came of age and Raymond gave up his regency.

In the same year, Saladin began his campaigns against the crusaders. Raymond repeatedly assisted King Baldwin in his wars against Saladin. The leper king appointed Raymond as regent of his young child. Raymond did not want the regency because the child was in ill health, and he didn't wish to hear any suspicions should the child suddenly die. But he was finally coaxed into accepting the regency with the understanding that Joscelyn of Courtney would be guardian of the child. Special arrangements were made for succession in case of the death of the child.

King Baldwin died at the age of 24. His child died the following year. Sibylle, the daughter of King Amalric of Jerusalem, was made queen, with Guy Lusignan as prince consort. Not having been

(12) Runciman, o.c., II, p. 395.
consulted in this arrangement, Raymond refused to attend a conference of barons called by Guy.

In 1186, through the rash actions of Reynalds of Chatillon, the truce with Saladin was broken. Guy summoned the leaders to prepare for war, but both Bohemond of Antioch and Raymond of Tripoli refused to obey the king and made a separate truce with Saladin. Fortunately, thanks to the efforts of Balian of Ibeli, civil war among Christians was averted. But it was obvious that the king had lost much of his power among the crusader leaders.

Raymond did, however, fight beside Guy in the Battle of Horns of Hattin in 1187. In this decisive battle, the most powerful Christian army was pitted against the most powerful Moslem army. The Christian forces suffered a disastrous defeat from which the crusader principalities never recovered. After the Moslem victory, Saladin was free to capture many Christian forts in rapid succession.

Raymond died soon after the battle.

**Coinage of Raymond III**

It is apparent from the political situation discussed above that Raymond III enjoyed a strong position and more than once acted independently of the king, even though accepting the latter's overlordship. It is therefore not surprising that, unlike his father, he undertook to strike deniers and copper coins bearing his name. It is also interesting that the 16 hoards contain 83 coppers of Raymond III as compared to 18 struck by Raymond II.

Additional evidence supporting the attribution of the star-and-crescent coins to Raymond III is the fact that this style coinage was issued in Toulouse by Raymond V (1148-1194). This opinion is expressed by de Saulcy (13) and Schlumberger (14) both of whom observe that Raymond IV had no blood relations to the house of Toulouse, and being a prince of Antioch, had no reason to adopt the design of Toulouse. Hence the star and crescent belongs to Raymond III.


(14) SCHLUMBERGER, *o.c.*, p. 102, Pl. IV, no. 4, 5, 6, 7.
Lhotka, in his study of Medieval French coinage (15), attributes what he calls «sun-and-crescent» types to Raymond V and VI of Toulouse. Sabine agrees with the above attributions (16). It is noteworthy that Poey d'Avant prefers to give the star-and-crescent types to Raymond VI (1194-1222) and Raymond VII (1222-1249) of Toulouse. The Tripoli issues certainly point out, if not prove, that this type must have been issued by Raymond V (1148-1194) of Toulouse, since politically and numismatically, Tripoli followed the lead of Toulouse.

Hoard evidence also supports the attribution of star-and-crescent issues to Raymond III. A total of 12 billons in five hoards and 80 coppers in 15 hoards clearly shows that these were issues struck after the horse- and cross-coppers.

The condition of the coins also indicates they were not the earliest issues.

It is thus seen that historical, hoard and numismatic evidence strongly favors the attribution of the star-and-crescent coins to Raymond III.

*The Castle-Type Coppers*

The most abundant of all the issues of Tripoli are the coppers having a castle or castle gate on one side and a cross on the other. The cross has a circle at its center and annulets at the end of each arm. These coins do not bear a ruler's name and there has been some speculation about their proper attribution and the date of earliest issue.

Since such a large number of coins were found in 16 hoards (225 pieces), it can be assumed that, once issued, the coins were struck again and again during the reigns of succeeding rulers as «types immobilisés».

De Saulcy mentions that the Tripoli castle coins may have been struck during the captivity of Raymond III (1164-1173) (17). This is highly improbable because the design of the castle gate is patterned after the coins of Bohemond III of Jerusalem who died in 1163.


(16) SABINE, o.e., p. 79.

(17) DE SAULCY, o.e., p. 51.
Schlumberger is in favor of assigning them to Raymond III (18). Sabine places the beginning of the castle types sometime after Raymond’s release from captivity (19).

Historical evidence supports the theory that the castle types of Tripoli were first struck shortly after the assassination of Raymond III’s father in 1152. At the time, Raymond was only 12 years old and King Baldwin III of Jerusalem was in Tripoli. Baldwin persuaded the barons of Tripoli to pay homage to the Countess Dowager Hodierna in the name of her son (20) and Baldwin himself became regent of young Raymond III (21).

Under the circumstances, it is not unthinkable that Tripoli would adopt a style of coinage patterned after that of King Baldwin III of Jerusalem. Baldwin, as regent of the young Raymond, was essentially in power during the years that Raymond remained a minor. It was politically expedient to strike coins bearing just the name of Tripoli. Plus, ties with Toulouse were no longer very strong nor desirable.

Since there are so many examples found in the 16 hoards, it may be assumed that the coins were struck over a long period of time.

The Moneta Coppers

The rulers of Tripoli struck another type of copper which has the inscription RAYMUNDI COMITIS/MONETA TRIPOLIS.

This inscription bears the name of Raymond, but it is difficult to decide to which of the four Raymonds the copper belongs.

Both de Saulcy (22) and Schlumberger (23) believe that since the copper is unlike any of the other coins bearing the legend CIVITAS TRIPOLIS, the coin must be an earlier issue, probably belonging to Raymond II.

Sabine (24) assigns the coins to an even earlier issue (circa 1102-1109), and assumes MONETA TRIPOLIS implies that Tripoli was not in the hands of the crusaders when these coins were struck.

(18) SCHLUMBERGER, o.c., p. 103.
(19) SABINE, o.c., p. 109.
(21) SETTON, o.c., I, p. 536.
(22) DE SAULCY, o.c., p. 50.
(23) SCHLUMBERGER, o.c., p. 102 and Pl. IV, n° 9-15.
(24) SABINE, o.c., pp. 74, 105.
It is difficult to accept any of the above arguments. If these coins were struck as early as 1102, then it would have to be assumed a mint existed at this early date, and that the coins were struck before the city was captured. A highly unlikely possibility.

It is true the legend differs from the other coins of Tripoli, but this does not necessarily indicate that the coins were struck before all the other issues.

The sixteen hoards contain 18 coppers of horse and cross type, 43 of Moneta type and 80 of Raymond III coppers. The hoard evidence thus indicates that the Moneta coppers could not have been an early issue and were most likely struck after the horse and cross types.

History tells us that Raymond III was held captive from 1164 to 1173. During this time, Tripoli was under the protection of King Amalric of Jerusalem. Indeed, Raymond designated Amalric as regent and, during Raymond's detention, Amalric held the baillage of Tripoli. Under these circumstances, it is reasonable to consider that the Moneta coppers were struck during Raymond's captivity.

The design on the coins, four annulets at the four arms of the cross, may have been patterned after the 10th- and 11th-century coins of the counts of Angoulême.

Raymond IV of Tripoli (1187–1189?)

One of the most intriguing and difficult problems facing the numismatist is the existence of deniers of the type struck during the reign of Bohemond IV and bearing the name of Raymond. To make matters worse, the historical evidence is confusing.

There are two important contemporary sources dealing with the events in the Latin Orient during the life of Raymond III. By far the most reliable source is William of Tyre, but his history ends in 1184, three years before the death of Raymond III.

The second source, dealing with the last years of Raymond's life, is titled, «The Continuation of William of Tyre». It is written in old French and the author is unknown, but is thought to be Ernoul, the

(25) Setton, o.c., I, p. 551.
(26) Poev d'Avant o.c., p. 51, Pl. LVII n° 1, 2, 3.
squire of Balian of Ibelin. The work is written in the style of an eyewitness account. The earliest manuscripts date from the beginning of the 13th century (27). Modern historians have accepted the version given by Eracles (28).

According to Eracles, when Bohemond III of Tripoli realized he was near death and had no heir to defend his country, he asked his friend and relative, Bohemond III of Antioch, to send his eldest son, Raymond, to Tripoli to rule the city. Raymond was the godson of Bohemond of Tripoli, had earlier fought beside Bohemond of Tripoli at Hattin and had accompanied Bohemond to Tripoli.

Eracles also states that Bohemond of Antioch declined to send Raymond, whom he needed to defend Antioch, and instead, sent a younger son, Bohemond, to Tripoli. The dying count was forced to accept Bohemond's decision. He turned over all rights to young Bohemond and ordered that homage be paid him.

This passage from Eracles has led modern numismatists to accept categorically that Bohemond, the younger son of Bohemond III of Antioch, succeeded Raymond III and that there was no such ruler as a Raymond IV of Tripoli and hence no coinage can be attributed to him (29).

In contrast, both de Saulcy and Schlumberger (30) accept the rule of Raymond IV and assign to him the star deniers bearing the name of Raymond.

It is also interesting that the editors of RHC (31) agree that a Raymond IV did rule Tripoli, but this opinion is based on the writings of du Cange (32) written in 1678.

The Armenian historian, Hetoum (33), writing in 1296, states that the son of Bohemond (meaning Raymond), count of Tripoli, died in the year of the Armenian era 650, or between 1202 and 1203.

(28) Cfr n. 4, p. 72.
(29) D. M. METCALF, Coinage of the Crusades and the Latin East, London, 1983. See also SABINE, o.c.
(30) DE SAULCY o.c., p. 53, SCHLUMBERGER o.c., p. 102.
(31) See ref. n. 4, p. 72 footnote.
Other modern historians (34) merely quote the passage appearing in Eracles, without passing judgement on the succession of Raymond IV as count of Tripoli.

Baldwin (35) summarizes the existing evidence and points out that there is no document bearing the name of Raymond IV. Also he states that the earliest document issued by Bohemond IV as count of Tripoli bears the date 1189.

**Coinage of Raymond IV**

While historical evidence is not entirely convincing, one cannot overlook the possibility that there may have been someone named Raymond IV and that this person may have ruled Tripoli for a short period.

Certainly the deniers clearly reading RAIMUNDUS must belong to him rather than Raymond III, whose coinage has an entirely different design. The fact that the Raymond deniers are rare merely indicates they were issued over a short time, possibly two years.

The hoard evidence is also in favor of the existence of a Raymond IV. In the 16 hoards, three billons definitely read: RAIMUNDUS. Four others have the same legend, but are written with an « R » that looks like an open « B ».

The attribution of these Raymond IV deniers to Raymond III (36) is unacceptable to this writer. It should be remembered that Raymond III was a prisoner for nine years, from 1164 to 1173, and that he died in 1187. If these issues were struck during the last 14 years of his life, then surely there would have been many more surviving specimens. Also, there was no reason for Raymond III to issue a new design of coin after his release from captivity. He was not a rich man. Others had to raise money for his release. Under these conditions, it is difficult to accept that he was able to design and issue a new type of denier.

Numismatic evidence supports the historical and hoard data. Raymond IV deniers are usually well-struck and in better condition

---

(34) Runciman, o.c., II, p. 470; Setton, o.c., II, p. 526; Grousset, o.c., II, p. 824.
(35) Baldwin, o.c., p. 138.
(36) Sabine, o.c., p. 103; Metcalf, o.c., pp. 44-49, Pl. 15.
than those bearing the name Bohemond. It should be remembered that kings of Armenia often began their coinage with fine issues, but, as time went on, the quality of the workmanship declined so that the later issues were generally poor in style and fabric.

This argument may be used in the case of crusader coins. The coins of Raymond, struck over a short time, were very well struck. Raymond's younger brother, Bohemond IV, ruled Tripoli for a much longer time. As time went on, less and less attention was paid to the coinage quality. Thus, many of the later Bohemond deniers are poorly struck.

The origin of the design of the eight-pointed star is also of interest. Schlumberger claims the star is merely a degeneration of the star-and-crescent motif (37).

Bohemond IV, Count of Tripoli (1189-1233), Prince of Antioch (1213-1233)

There is some question about the actual date Bohemond IV assumed the title of Count of Tripoli, but he did rule that city until his death in March of 1233. His father, Bohemond III of Antioch, died in 1201. When Bohemond IV's brother, Raymond of Antioch, died in 1213, Bohemond became ruler of Antioch as well as Tripoli. Taking over rule in Antioch was not easy for Bohemond, but eventually, he gained control of the city (38).

Bohemond was a capable man and even his enemies admired his refined ways and learning as a lawyer. He was an adept diplomat and managed to profit from the crusade of Frederick and consolidate his position. Although the 10-year peace treaty signed by Emperor Frederick did not apply to Bohemond's holdings, this treaty brought a breathing spell to the Christian principalities of the East.

Coinage of Bohemond IV

Bohemond was in charge of Tripoli for over 40 years and he struck deniers in his name. The lack of coppers of similar design would

(37) SCHLUMBERGER, O.C., p. 104.
lead us to believe the castle-type coppers, of which many survive, continued to be circulating as "types immobilisés".

Neither de Saulcy nor Schlumberger expresses a definite opinion on the coinage of the late Bohemonds.

Sabine (39) gives the star deniers with the legend RAMUNDUS COMS/CIVITAS TRIPOLIS to Raymond III, and BAMUNDUS COMS/CIVITAS TRIPOLIS to Bohemond IV (1187-1233).

There is a similarity in type, styling and legend, indicating one coin follows the other. However, the very small number of surviving specimens in the 16 hoards shows that the Bamundus deniers were only initial issues, struck for a short time.

The large number of deniers with the legend BAMUND COMS/CIVITAS TRIPOL must be given to Bohemond IV who ruled for a long period of time. His coinage is represented by the badly struck deniers which have three dots in the first quarter of the cross.

Bohemond V (1233-1252)

Bohemond V succeeded his father. He was not a strong man and was disliked by the Commune of Antioch. He inherited Antioch, a city impoverished by wars and open to constant incursions by the Moslems. Commerce had declined greatly and Antioch was separated from Tripoli by a territory Lattakieh and Jebata occupied by the Moslems (40).

In contrast, his county of Tripoli was in close contact with the kingdom of Jerusalem, had a prosperous port and was flourishing. In addition, Tripoli had excellent defences.

Coinage of Bohemond V.

It is difficult to speculate on the coinage of the last three Bohemonds. There is an abundance of deniers with three dots in the first quarter of the cross, and these may have been struck by Bohemond V, since the legend is changed from BAMUNDUS COMS/CIVITAS TRIPOLIS to BAMUND COMS/CIVITAS TRIPOL. If the latter legend is assigned to Bohemond V, then we must agree that few deniers were struck during the 43-year reign of Bohemond IV.

(39) Sabine, o.c., p. 103.
(40) Runciman, o.c., II, p. 207.
A compromise can be made by assuming the latter coins were issued by Bohemond IV and continued to be struck during the reign of succeeding Bohemonds, just as the castle-type coppers continued to be issued until the extinction of the county.

More definite attributions can be made only with the discovery of hoards and other evidence.

**Bohemond VI (1252-1275)**

Bohemond VI was 15 when his father died. He began his rule under his Italian mother's regency. King Louis IX of France was in the East and assisted Bohemond in gaining full control of his principality.

Louis saw the weak position of the crusader holdings and understood the necessity of strengthening existing forces.

Cilician Armenia was the major force in the region and, in 1254, Louis arranged the marriage of Bohemond to Sibylla, daughter of Hetoum of Armenia. The Armenian king agreed to take the responsibility of defending Antioch, so that, in effect, Bohemond became the vassal of Hetoum.

Political necessity required the cooperation of Armenia and Antioch. Hetoum's predecessor had attempted and failed to bring Antioch into the orbit of Armenia, but Louis' actions brought about a successful alliance.

Subsequent events show that Bohemond repeatedly was at his father-in-law's side in the alliances in the Latin East.

Hetoum had established a close alliance with the Mongols. When the Mongol leader, Hulagu, captured Aleppo, Hetoum received some of the lands captured by the Seljuks and Lattakieh was returned to Bohemond with some adjacent territories.

In 1260, when Hulagu and his Mongol warriors entered Damascus, the forces of Hetoum and Bohemond were with him. When Hetoum visited Hulago in 1264, Bohemond accompanied him.

The tide was soon to turn.

Under the able leadership of Baibars, the Mamluks fought back. Armenian and Mongol forces held off the Mamluk resistance, but, in 1265, after much fighting, the towns of Haifa and Arsuf fell to Baibars.

The Mongol Khan Hulagu died in 1265 and Abagha succeeded him. Baibars vigorously continued his attacks and managed to capture several Christian holdings.
In 1266, the Mamluks entered Cilician Armenia. Anticipating the coming danger, Hetoum hurried to the court of Abagha to ask for assistance.

On August 24, 1266, the Mamluk forces decisively defeated the outnumbered Armenians and devastated the towns of Cilician Armenia. Hetoum returned with a small Mongol force to find his country in ruins, one of his sons killed in battle, and his heir taken to Egypt in captivity.

It was a blow from which Cilician Armenia never recovered.

In 1267, Baibars tried unsuccessfully to capture Acre. But the following year, he appeared in front of the walls of Antioch. He ordered a second army to the Syrian gates to prevent any help from Armenia.

Bohemond was in Tripoli. The undermanned garrison of Antioch was unable to withstand the full assault. The city fell May 18, 1268, and was nearly destroyed.

The rich were able to ransom themselves, but many notables were put to the sword. The loss of Antioch was a severe blow and heralded the end of the Crusader East.

Bohemond, realizing the weakness of his position, sued for peace. Baibars felt secure insofar as the Frankish states were concerned, but he feared a new Mongol assault. He granted a 10-year truce to Bohemond. By then, no inland fortresses remained in Christian hands.

A new crusading force arrived at Acre on May 9, 1271, under the leadership of Edward, son of Henry III of England. He at once sought the assistance of the Mongols, but was able to receive only a force of 10,000 horsemen.

At the same time, there was talk that the powerful Charles of Anjou was planning a crusade. Baibars attempted to have Edward assassinated. The plan failed, but Edward was seriously wounded.

A truce for 10 years and 10 months was signed May 22, 1272. Edward returned to England to find himself king.

Thus the Christian principalities obtained a breathing spell.

Bohemond VI died May 11, 1275.

Coinage of Bohemond VI

It remains uncertain whether Bohemond struck any deniers during his reign. One might surmise that the striking of old deniers continued along with the issue of castle-type coppers.
The existence of the handsome silver gros and half-gros must belong to the reign of Bohemond and his successor. These silver pieces are similar to the gros tournois which appeared during the reign of Louis IX in 1266. It thus appears that the Bohemond gros were struck after that date.

The gros tournois appears in finds from the East (41). It is likely that when King Louis arrived from Egypt, the coins were placed in circulation and became popular. Bohemond VI and VII struck similar coins in their name for circulation. Since the ones bearing the inscription BOEMUNDUS COMES SEPTIMUS must be given to Bohemond VII, the others bearing no « SEPTIMUS » can reasonably be attributed to Bohemond VI.

**Bohemond VII (1274-1287)**

When his father died, Bohemond was 14. King Hugh, as the next adult heir, claimed regency.

Bohemond’s mother, Princess Dowager Sibylla of Armenia, however, assumed office at once. When Hugh arrived in Tripoli to take over the regency of Bohemond, he found the boy had been sent to the court of his uncle, Levon III of Armenia.

Over the years, the Templars of Jerusalem opposed Sibylla. When Bohemond VII, no longer a minor, arrived in Tripoli to assume control of the government, he faced the opposition of the order. Eventually he was forced to wage a terrible fight with the Templars.

In 1281, the Mongol armies, assisted by Georgian forces and the troops of Levon III of Armenia, advanced into Syria, laying waste to many towns along the way. In the battle of Homs, the Mongol leader, Timur, was wounded and retreated. Levon had to fight his way out of battle.

Bitter rivalries and animosities in Christendom made united efforts impossible. Aside from the Franks, the Venetians, Pisans and Genoese were always at each other’s throats for commercial gains.

Europe itself could not manage to unite with the Mongols to oppose the Mamluks. The cause of the Outremer was lost because of negligence and pettiness of rulers of the West.

(41) See ref. n. 1.
Coinage of Bohemond VII

Again it is uncertain whether any denier were struck during the reign of this ruler. Possibly the castle-type coppers were issued as petty coinage and perhaps the six-pointed denier was issued by this last count of Tripoli.

Certainly the beautiful gros and demi-gros bearing the legend BOEMUNDUS COMES SEPTIMUS belong to him.

A few of these silvers have been found in the hoards proving they circulated alongside common deniers and coppers in the Latin East.

TRIPOLI COINS
In Sixteen Crusader Hoards (42)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoard</th>
<th>Raymond II</th>
<th>Raymond III (1152-187)</th>
<th>Raymond IV</th>
<th>Bohemond IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>Ruler</td>
<td>Captivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1137-1152</td>
<td>1152-58</td>
<td>1158-64</td>
<td>1164-73</td>
<td>1187-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1173-87</td>
<td></td>
<td>1189-1232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schl. IV-8</td>
<td>Schl. IV</td>
<td>Schl. IV-3</td>
<td>Schl. IV-16</td>
<td>Schl. IV-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-15</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>Bil.</td>
<td>Cu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(42) The numbers refer to plates and numbers of Schlumberger.