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ABSTRACT

Cooperation and Conflict: Christian and Muslim Group Identity and Accommodation between the Second and Third Crusades, 1145-1192

Leah Ensing

This study examines interaction and accommodation between Western Christians and Muslims in the Levant between the Second and Third Crusades, 1145 to 1192, examining three groups: short term crusaders, members of military orders, and permanent settlers. While members of these groups possessed several personal and group identities, most shared a prescriptive religious identity that encouraged a common goal: holy war for the protection of the Holy Land from Muslims, whom they identified as a distinct, enemy ‘other.’ Despite these prescriptive beliefs, when Christians came into contact with Muslims, particularly following longer and more varied contact, most engaged in some convergent accommodation, such as diplomatic accommodation, development of shared languages and gestures, or admiration for chivalric qualities. Those settled in the Levant accepted the existing economic and social structures, assuming the roles of previous elites, adopting certain local customs, sharing sacred spaces, medical knowledge, or even developing personal ties with Muslims.
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INTRODUCTION

The period between the Second Crusade (1145-49) and the Third Crusade (1187-92) provides rich evidence of contact between elite Latin European Christians and Muslims. For some individuals, as in the case of those who embarked upon a crusade and then quickly returned home, the contact was brief and limited in nature. For others residing in the Holy Land for a prolonged time, though, as in the case of members of the military orders and the settlers in the crusader states, interactions with Muslims could be extensive and complex. The present study examines the impact that different kinds of interactions with Muslims had on the religious ideology, behaviours and attitudes of elite Latin Christians towards Muslims between 1145 and 1192, and the degree to which accommodation with Muslims took place as a result of interaction and other factors.¹

While papal calls to crusade and clerical preaching usually encouraged attitudes of hostility towards Muslims—attitudes that were already entrenched in European society by the mid-twelfth century—closer contacts with Muslims often increased Christians’ respect for Muslims and decreased the religious hostility dictated by prescriptive religious ideology, at least in secular interactions, allowing for convergent accommodation. This was at times encouraged by individual situations and personalities as well as the needs and values associated with other group identities making up the mental world of individual Latin Christians, although an increased respect for Muslims could bring a loss

¹ In this study accommodation is defined as the ways in which a group’s or individual’s attitudes, beliefs and behaviours towards another group are affected or changed through contact with them. This can be either divergent, where the group seeks to affirm the differences between the groups by acting in ways that separate them from another group, highlighting their own uniqueness, or convergent, where attitudes, beliefs or behaviours become more similar to those of the opposite group. See below for further discussion.
of respect from fellow Christians, who believed their fellow believers had appeased those who were enemies of the faith.

Theoretical Framework

This study examines how the group identities of elites as members of a crusading mission, military order, or Christian state were challenged, and to some degree transformed, through interactions with Muslims, and how this at times led to accommodation with Muslims. In understanding questions of group identity and the process of its transformation, sociological ideas regarding group belief and group identity, as well as theories of cultural accommodation have been particularly important. In particular the work of Daniel Bar-Tal, Group Beliefs, on group identity, and Giles, Coupland, and Coupland, “Accommodation Theory,” on convergent and divergent accommodation in individual and group interactions have provided a framework for the discussion in this study. In addition, Gallois and Callan, “Interethnic Accommodation,” have also provided some useful insights into accommodation between cultures.2

According to Daniel Bar-Tal, in his work Group Beliefs, every individual belongs to many groups that collectively make up his or her identity. Each of these groups possesses group beliefs that are used by the group to help define what makes them a group, what defines the boundaries of the group, and who lies outside of the group.3 Bar-Tal defines group beliefs as “convictions that group members (a) are aware that they share and (b)

---


3 Bar-Tal, Group Beliefs, 1-2.
consider as defining their ‘groupness.’ … [T]he contents of group beliefs usually pertain to group identity, myths, goals, values, ideology, norms, tradition, or history.” He suggests that the groups that make up an individual’s identity vary in importance and that an individual’s behaviour is regulated by the beliefs of the groups to which the individual belongs. An individual’s behaviour in relation to any specific group is based on the importance of each group. It will be argued that the Latin Christians who went to the Holy Land on crusade, or who remained there, had many identities, related to language, ethnicity, nationality, political affiliation, and professional and social status, among other factors. However, there was one identity that brought these groups together in a single overall purpose, and that was their identity as members of Christendom. As will be argued in Chapter One, this shared Latin Christian identity provided crusaders with certain ideas about the Muslim ‘other,’ holy war, and also about the meaning of Jerusalem and the Holy Land in Christian history, which encouraged them to undertake the crusades. However, as will be argued in subsequent chapters, once Christians reached the Eastern Mediterranean and came into contact with Muslims, such overarching group identities and beliefs often broke down. While the prescriptive beliefs of Christianity were universal in nature – all those who did not belong within the Christian faith were identified firmly as an ‘other’ and belonging outside the bounds of Christianity – other identities and needs were also powerful and challenged the universal nature of Christian

---

4 Bar-Tal, Group Beliefs, 36.
5 Bar-Tal, Group Beliefs, 41-2.
6 The crusaders considered all Christians, both Latin Christians in the West, and Eastern Christians in Syria and Palestine, to be members of Christendom. It was this identification of Eastern Christians as members of Christendom that encouraged Latin Christians to go to the Holy Land to free their brothers and sisters in Christ from what they considered to be oppression by Muslim infidels.
group identity. Even the identities provided by the military orders, or as permanent settlers, changed the response of Latin Christians to Muslims in the Holy Land.

When the crusaders arrived in the Levant and came into contact with Muslims, in many cases their respect for their professed enemy appears to have increased, with a corresponding decrease in the hostility their religious beliefs decreed, at least in secular interactions. Increased contact between Latin Christians and Muslims appears in many cases to have led to increased accommodation between the groups. In understanding this process, the theories and definitions of accommodation by Howard Giles, Nikolas Coupland, and Justine Coupland, have been important, as has the more specific work on interethnic accommodation by Cynthia Gallois and Victor J. Callan.

Accommodation, as used within this study, refers to the way in which an individual or group is changed by contact with another individual or group. Accommodation can result in changes to a person’s, “underlying beliefs, attitudes, and sociostructural conditions.” Accommodation can be considered either convergent or divergent. Convergent accommodation occurs when contact causes increased agreement between two groups in their behaviours or thought patterns within an interaction, whereas divergent accommodation occurs when contact causes a group to emphasize the differences between the two groups, with their behaviours or thought patterns enforcing their own group’s unique characteristics, outside of the interaction.

---

interaction, and can also happen with only one or both parties converging or diverging. Convergence and divergence are not mutually exclusive concepts and can happen simultaneously within an interaction. The ideology of the crusades presented in papal bulls and clerical preaching suggested that no convergent accommodation with Muslims should take place, for the goal was to rid the Holy Land of all those who did not follow Christ. There was no room in the prescriptive ideology for a decrease or lack of hostilities. Rather, holy war presented a divergent form of accommodation, where the group beliefs of the crusaders were reinforced and heightened through active warfare against Muslims. However, as Christians came in closer contact with Muslims it appears that there was often a reduction in hostilities in favour of less aggressive kinds of contact as well as convergent accommodation. The Christians who interacted with Muslims experienced different levels of convergence. Some were simply spatial, where there was mutual tolerance to share a location. Some was inegalitarian, experienced particularly in the sharing of sacred locations where one group led worship, while others joined. Other forms of convergence were developed more equally between parties, such as the convergence between diplomats where a shared system of gestures was developed that were shared and understood by both sides. What remained limited was intellectual convergence, though this was found to a limited extent through the practice of medicine. This analysis explores the factors, including other group identities and beliefs and other situational elements that challenged the primacy of religious hostilities and led to increased respect for and accommodation with Muslims.

---

While the analysis of group beliefs is a fundamental element of this work, it must be recognized that neither Christians nor Muslims ever formed completely homogenous groups, and that disagreements and animosity within faith groups could lead to suspicion and negative interactions, just as they did between faith groups. Divisions among Muslims and divisions among Christians could at times be so serious as to encourage inter-faith alliances against co-religionists and other forms of accommodation. The divisions between Latin and Eastern Christians in particular could be extreme in terms of ethnicity, creed, and political affiliations, although their interactions are not, for reasons of space, a focus of this thesis. Despite the diversity that existed even among Latin Christians in the East, some general subgroups are apparent and show overall patterns of action and accommodation that can lead to fruitful discussion of the nature of contact between Latin Christians and Muslims during the Second and Third Crusade. The unique experience of individual elites will also be discussed, as some convergent accommodation was the direct result of individual experience and personality.

This study focuses on the experiences of elite members of three groups of Latin Christians: short term crusaders (Chapter Two), military orders (Chapter Three), and settlers (Chapter Four). The focus is primarily on elites because their activities are better documented, and they were more likely to come into close and personal contact with the religious ‘other.’\footnote{Jonathan Riley-Smith, “The Crusading Movement and Historians,” in \textit{The Oxford Illustrated History of the Crusades}, ed. Jonathan Riley-Smith (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 8.} While much of the contact between the Christians and Muslims was divergent, with each side acting in ways that asserted their own group identities, elites in all three groups experienced convergent accommodation, where their attitudes and
behaviours shifted towards those of the other group they were in contact with, as a result of interactions between the two.\textsuperscript{12} However, the types of accommodation and degree to which this happened varied. For short-term crusaders, contact with Muslims was mostly limited to events surrounding military engagements, or diplomatic negotiations to make treaties or truces.\textsuperscript{13} Much of this contact remained divergent, rooted in hostility, and served to highlight the differences between the faiths. Still, such contacts sometimes led to greater respect for the ‘other’ and even some shared customs, particularly among leaders. Members of the military orders also experienced a significant amount of divergent accommodation, being highly committed to the protection of the crusader states against Muslim enemies, but also some convergent accommodation through diplomatic encounters. As members of permanent organizations in the Levant, the brothers of the military orders recognized the necessity of some convergent accommodation, as their limited numbers made constant warfare impossible, and they also experienced personal contact off the battlefield with the Muslim nobility in social settings. In addition, they were property owners who were landlords to Muslim peasants, and owners of Muslim slaves who worked their estates.\textsuperscript{14} These relationships were mediated through Muslims who worked as translators and managers of estates for military order overlords. Permanent settlers and rulers experienced the most extensive and intimate convergent contact with Muslims. Living among the indigenous populations forced the settlers into the realization that continuous warfare was neither practical nor desirable, and this encouraged a willingness to negotiate for peace to allow settlement, trade, and travel to

\textsuperscript{12} Giles, Coupland, and Coupland, “Accommodation Theory,” 7-9.
occur unimpeded.\(^{15}\) Such relationships were also furthered by the fostering of other identities, for example, as members of a chivalric community, as merchants, or medical professionals, that encouraged convergent accommodation beyond what was dictated by their prescriptive religious beliefs. While limited intellectual exchange took place, both military orders and settlers shared sacred spaces with Muslims, adopted some of the customs of their Muslim subjects, and integrated some Muslim practices and ideas into their lives. Individual Christians often displayed respect for individual Muslims based on their personal interactions, although there were always limits to such relationships. Overall, greater time and familiarity resulted in greater respect for the Muslim ‘other’ and willingness to engage in convergent accommodation, though this was always done within limits, as the religious identity of Latin Christians and Muslims remained an important aspect of their identities, and limited the amount of accommodation that was possible.

**Historical Context**

Many of the changes that led to convergent accommodation happened over an extended period of time, as the establishment of the crusader states and the military orders created new group identities with different values and priorities than Christians back in Western Europe. The period between the Second Crusade (1145-49) and the Third Crusade (1187-92) is a rich one for the study of interactions and accommodations between Latin Christians and Muslims in the context of a variety of forms of contact. In the decades

between the First Crusade (1095-99) and the Second Crusade, crusaders continued to arrive and fight for the protection and expansion of the newly established crusader states, as crusading ideology, hostile to Muslims, was widely disseminated in Europe.\(^\text{16}\) However, during this period, Christian groups, including settlers in the crusader states and the military orders established themselves in the Holy Land, developing trade and commerce, and other social and economic activities, forging more extensive and complex relationships with local Muslims. At the same time, Muslims began to recognize the threat the crusaders in the Levant posed to surrounding Muslim powers, and solidified their ideological and physical opposition towards them. Thus, Christians and Muslims on the eve of the Second Crusade already had a well-established set of ideological positions regarding each other, but also a complex web of real-life relationships and interactions that did not always reflect religious ideology. The calling of the Second and Third Crusades in response to Muslim reconquests of territory would create even more opportunities for contact, and deepen and complicate relationships between Muslims and Christians.

In 1144 the Muslim atabeg Zengi (‘Imad al-Din Zengi, d. 1146) conquered the crusader city of Edessa, and subsequently the county. This marked the start of a concerted effort on the part of Muslims to reconquer territory lost in the First Crusade (1095-99).\(^\text{17}\) This loss forced the Latin Christians of the East to seek aid from Europeans in the West, and at


the end of 1145 and again in early 1146 Pope Eugenius III (1145-53) issued the bull *Quantum praedecessores* that would lead to the Second Crusade, the first large campaign since Jerusalem’s capture in 1099. The crusade saw the first European monarchs participating directly in crusades, including King Louis VII of France (1137-80) and King Conrad III of Germany (1138-52). To lead a crusade provided great prestige to rulers, at least theoretically, but they could not be away from their home territories for great lengths of time. This led to them having different goals from the rulers and inhabitants of the crusader states who resided there permanently, leading to conflicts within the Christian armies. The army’s siege upon Damascus was ultimately unsuccessful, in large part because of the disputes between the Christian rulers, and supposed treason on the part of the nobility and rulers of the crusader states. Conrad and Louis eventually returned home having spent much and achieved nothing, and with the stigma of having failed on God’s mission, something that implied both military incompetence and a lack of God’s favour. The failure of the crusade caused many Christians in the West to question the validity of the crusading movement and the accusations of treason dissuaded many potential crusaders from coming to the Levant. It was not until the Third Crusade that another large wave of crusaders came to the East, though smaller contingents of crusaders continued to arrive during the intervening period.

---

After the loss of Edessa in 1144 and the failure of the Second Crusade, three crusader states of the original four remained: Tripoli, Antioch, and Jerusalem. All three states were politically independent, had their own unique character and at times were at loggerheads with one another. However, there were many political connections between them, and it was in the best interest of the states to work together against surrounding Muslim territories. The crusader states never had large numbers of knights on whom they could call. Historians estimate that the total number of knights who owed service to Frankish rulers was not above 2,000. When the Franks sought aid from the West in times of greater conflict with neighbouring Muslim powers, they did so as a combined entity. In addition to soldiers from within the crusader states, in part because of the short term nature and unreliability of crusaders, by the 1140s military orders such as the Templars (Knights of the Temple of Solomon of Jerusalem) and Hospitallers (Hospital of St John of Jerusalem) had evolved to serve as permanent organizations committed to the defence of the Holy Land.

The death of King Amalric of Jerusalem (1163-74) in 1174 began a slow decline of power in the crusader states as Amalric was succeeded by a string of weak and incapable

---

22 Housley, Fighting for the Cross, 7; Josiah C. Russell, “Demographic Factors of the Crusades,” in The Meeting of Two Worlds, ed. Vladimir P. Goss (Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, 1986), 56; John France, The Crusades and the Expansion of Catholic Christendom 1000-1714 (New York: Routledge, 2005), 140. Russell suggests that at the peak of the crusader states there were about 2500 knights with 1500 of them being crusaders. John France suggests a core number of knights between 1200 and 1500. For an example of a letter from the rulers seeking aid see “Princes and Ecclesiastics Beyond the Sea to Emperor Frederick Barbarossa (July 1187),” in Letters from the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12th-13th centuries, ed. Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2010), 75-7.
rulers. This opened the door to further Muslim conquest of Christian territory.\textsuperscript{23} The sultan Salah al-Din (Salah al-Din Yussuf Ayyub, Saladin to western writers, 1137/8-1193) forced the Christians into one of their greatest defeats, at Hattin, 4 July 1187. This was swiftly followed by the devastating loss of Jerusalem on 2 October 1187. This defeat ended Western indifference to the plight of the Franks and caused Pope Gregory VIII (1187) to issue the bull \textit{Audita tremendi}, which launched the Third Crusade to try and bring Jerusalem back under Christian control.\textsuperscript{24} Even more than the Second Crusade, the Third Crusade was a crusade led by kings and undertaken by skilled warriors. Three European monarchs responded to this call to crusade: King Richard I of England (1189-99); King Philip II of France (1180-1223); and King Frederick I Barbarossa of Germany (1152-90), although Frederick drowned on his way to the Holy Land, and the majority of his troops returned home. Far more than previous crusades, the Third Crusade was clearly recognized as a military encounter; crusaders identified themselves not as pilgrims or travellers, as in past crusades, but as \textit{crucesignatus} (one signed by the cross), soldiers who had taken vows to fight the infidel in the Holy Land.\textsuperscript{25} While the Third Crusade did


\textsuperscript{25} Asbridge, \textit{The Crusades}, 372; Jonathan Riley-Smith, \textit{What Were the Crusades?} (London: Macmillan, 1977), 12; Giles Constable, “The Historiography of the Crusades,” in \textit{Crusaders and Crusading in the Twelfth Century} by Giles Constable (Farnham: Ashgate, 2008), 18; Tyerman, \textit{God’s War}, 389-90. Phillip’s personal contingent of soldiers was made up of 2,000 knights. Richard managed to contribute 6,000 knights through his own funding, and to provide transport for another 9,000, including some he directly contributed to their financial support.
have some successes, such as the siege of Acre, efforts were hampered by infighting among the various leaders, as had been the case in the Second Crusade. By 1192, the end of the Third Crusade, the crusader territories had been reduced to a small strip of land along the coast from Jaffa to Tyre. Participants in the Third Crusade returned home in 1192 without having attempted to win back Jerusalem, following negotiations with Salah al-Din to end hostilities. This forms a logical stopping point in the research. After the Third Crusade both the Christian and Muslim powers were weakened and facing political instability. After Salah al-Din’s death in 1193, his three sons and brother al-ʿAdil entered into a dynastic struggle, drawing attention away from Christian territories. The Franks made a temporary truce with al-ʿAdil and re-established a more stable rule in what was left of the crusader states.

**Historiography**

The modern study of the crusades began in the eighteenth century and has covered many varied aspects of the crusades, but only recently have scholars begun to look at issues of identity and accommodation. Some of the earliest considerations of issues of identity arose from questions of motivations, specifically the beliefs or values that brought Europeans to the East. Before the 1950s historians variously suggested crusaders were

---

motivated by blind religious fanaticism, the pursuit of wealth, enjoyment of violence, the search for land and adventure by younger sons, or simple ignorance and superstition. While some of these factors, or combinations of them, are still accepted by some historians, more recent considerations of this question have become more complex and broad-ranging, with scholars looking to other fields such as sociology, psychology, and economics to provide explanations for the motivations of crusaders.

Consideration of other fields has encouraged a recent trend among some historians to view the crusaders’ motivations, actions, and identity in terms of their own “self-definitions and self-perceptions” as presented through contemporary sources of the twelfth century. Many of these scholars, following Jonathan Riley-Smith, suggest that crusaders’ dominant identity was a religious one, and that crusaders were often drawn to the Holy Land for sincere religious motivations. They wished to aid fellow Christians they viewed as being oppressed by Muslims, to reclaim the Holy Land for Christianity, and do penance for their sins and thus receive forgiveness for them, for to go on crusade was an act of penance in and of itself. This view acknowledges that the crusaders came

from many different backgrounds, and had varying individual motives, that potentially included a desire for earthly benefits as well as the promotion of familial or kinship ties. However, these scholars argue that most crusaders shared an overarching religious ideology that gave them a collective identity. While these scholars do not reject financial, or other, motives entirely, they tend to consider them less important than religious motives. As Riley-Smith has pointed out, the crusades in general were highly expensive and unpleasant experiences. There is almost no proof in later crusades of financial gain, yet crusaders, who must have been aware of this, continued to travel far from their families and estates for extended periods of time, and faced great danger and possible death.

While these arguments are compelling and the existence of a powerful shared Christian identity among crusaders at least at the onset of their journey to the East, is largely accepted in this work, it must be noted that acceptance of such theories has not been universal among scholars examining the self-perception of crusaders. Christopher Tyerman and John France have suggested that the desire to fight a holy war and to receive material gain were not in conflict. Rather, the crusaders viewed material gain as

---


God’s blessing and favour for their work. Simon Lloyd places greater emphasis on lordship and kinship ties as motivating factors, as well as local and regional associations. Geoffrey Barraclough sees the crusades not as defensive holy war against perceived enemies of Christianity, but rather as aggressive ventures, which created “radically unstable centers of colonial exploitation.” The present study accepts that other, sometimes competing, motivations contributed to the individual identity of crusaders, and that sometimes such motivations superseded religious motivations when Latin Christians were faced by conditions in the East and interacted with Muslims.

The increasing historiographical debate about the role of sincere religious intentions in bringing crusaders to the Holy Land has tended to bring the actions of crusaders that seem contrary to religious motivations into the spotlight. Ideologically, the crusaders should not have had accommodative or peaceful contact with Muslims, as they were perceived to be enemies of God against whom the crusaders were sworn to fight in a holy war. However, as a number of scholars have pointed out, the crusaders’ response towards

38 Constable, “The Historiography of the Crusades,” 5-6. Some other historians such as Prawer, The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, ix, 380; Joshua Prawer, Crusader Institutions (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), 23, and Small, Crusading Warfare, 62-3 have termed the settlement of the Franks in the Latin East as colonialism. I have chosen not to do so. Along with Phillips “The Latin East,” 112-13, I would suggest that the term colonialism now has come to be associated with more modern events such as Britain’s establishment of colonies in North America or the Spanish conquest of the New World, and does not accurately express the situation in the Levant. In addition, the crusades were undertaken, at least in part, for neither political nor economic gain of a homeland, but for the protection of the Holy Sepulchre and the city of Jerusalem. Phillips suggests a term of ‘religious colonization’ may be appropriate. For more views on colonization and the crusades see Kenneth M. Setton, gen. ed., A History of the Crusades, vol. 5 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 193; Murray, “Ethnic Identity,”59-60; Constable, “The Historiography of the Crusades,” 15; Susan Reynolds, “Empires: A Problem of Comparative History,” Historical Research 79, no. 204 (2006): 151-65.
Muslims was not exclusively hostile.\textsuperscript{39} In addition to fighting in battles, the crusaders made treaties and truces with Muslims, entered into diplomatic contact and at times even formed alliances with them against other Muslims or even fellow Christians. Among elites, chivalric behaviour on the part of a brave warrior was respected regardless of their faith. For members of the military orders and settlers who choose to remain in the crusader states permanently, their interaction with Muslims was even more varied, and not always violent.

The study of personal and group identity and group beliefs seems to be one of the most promising approaches to this problem. The first major scholar to address group identities of crusaders was Jonathan Riley-Smith, who differentiated between the identity of the crusaders and the established settlers, who became collectively known as the Franks.\textsuperscript{40} Riley-Smith, in his seminal article “Peace Never Established” made a clear distinction between the relationships that existed between the crusaders and the Muslims and between the settlers and Muslims, but his focus remained largely on the ideological views of the crusaders and settlers that made permanent peace with Muslims an impossibility.\textsuperscript{41}

Several other recent historians, particularly Thomas Asbridge, Jonathan Phillips, and


\textsuperscript{41} Riley-Smith, “Peace Never Established,” 87-102.
Alan Murray, have followed Riley-Smith in using identity as a key category of analysis, and have been influential in forming this study’s approach. Asbridge and Phillips in their recent surveys of crusade history both recognize the many varied relationships that existed between Christian groups and Muslims. They emphasize the importance of not considering all Christians or all Muslims as a single group, but addressing the varied identities that existed within each, which influenced the amount of contact and ultimately the amount and nature of accommodation between groups. Murray’s concern lies largely with the ways in which prolonged time in the Levant made the identity of the Franks diverge from that of the crusaders. While he acknowledges that this made their reactions towards Muslims different from that of the crusaders, the comparison of changes in identity between the two groups of Christians dominates his discussion.

While the work of these scholars has had an important influence on this project, for many their primary focus is not on the period surrounding the Second and Third crusades, and they have looked mainly at the factors that shaped the varied identities of crusaders, rather than how that identity in turn influenced the nature of contact with Muslims and any resulting accommodation. This study intends to address these gaps.

Some other medieval historians who have addressed the ideas of group identities and beliefs have done so in terms of national identities, as defined by Benedict Anderson and his work on “imagined communities,” debating whether such communities can be found in the Middle Ages. Anderson suggests that a nation is “an imagined political community

---

– and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign.\textsuperscript{44} While Anderson does not see such communities existing before the eighteenth century, historians such as Linda Colley, Sarah Buchanan and Lesley Johnson have all suggested that many of the characteristics he discusses can be found in medieval religious or political entities and that nascent national communities can be seen before the modern age.\textsuperscript{45} While the insights of such scholars are valuable in understanding medieval identity, this study will use the broader sociological frameworks of group identity and accommodation theory, rather than Anderson’s more limited ideas on nationhood, as they allow for a more nuanced understanding of group and personal identity.

Sources

The crusades have not only been studied by modern historians, but those who participated in the crusades themselves recorded their experiences. From the earliest days of the crusade movement Christian clergy, chroniclers, travellers and troubadours found inspiration and motivation for writing in the events of the Latin East. Muslim writers also found the crusades to be worthy of recording. Thus a considerable number of sources relating to Christian and Muslim interaction and accommodation from both Christian and Muslim perspectives have survived for the period between 1145 and 1192, although the uneven production and survival of sources, inherent biases, difficulties in interpretation,

\textsuperscript{44} Benedict Anderson, \textit{Imagined Communities} (New York: Verso, 1991), 4-6.
and other issues present challenges to scholars exploring this field. While few sources are entirely satisfactory in and of themselves, this study attempts to overcome this difficulty by using a variety of sources from different genres. Still, significant gaps remain, for example in the limited number of sources that record the experience of non-elites and women. This has limited the scope of this project, although significant insights into the experience of elite men can still be achieved.

Latin and Muslim chronicles and histories are foundational for this project, as they are the most substantial sources that record the actions and interactions of Christians and Muslims in the Holy Land. Some, like those of Ambroise, the Itinerarium Peregrinorum, Odo of Deuil, Baha’ al-Din and Ibn al-Athir, among others, were written by eyewitnesses, who lived in or journeyed to the Holy Land. William of Tyre was unusual among Latin Christian chroniclers in having been born in the Holy Land, and writing from a specifically Frankish perspective. Other chronicles, such as those by Richard of Devizes or Roger of Wendover, were written by clergy back in Europe, who collected

---


and recorded the accounts of the crusaders. All must be used with caution, as all focus primarily on the military and political exploits of elites, particularly rulers, and all were written to promote specific ideas and messages. For example, Latin chroniclers served not only to record the history of the crusades, but also as propaganda to promote further missions and the ideology underlying them. Overwhelmingly, Christian chronicles were written by clergy. Secular perspectives are rare, although parts of the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum* may have been written by a crusader, and an author of significant proportions of the Old French continuation of William of Tyre, the work of multiple authors, was likely a retainer of the nobleman Balian of Ibelin. Despite the occasional exception like these, most Christian chronicles espouse a distinctly clerical view on the crusades which makes non-religious perspectives difficult to come by.

Muslim histories were often connected to political rulers of Muslim dynasties, for example Ibn al-Athir’s family was employed by the Zengids, while Baha’ al-Din was employed by Salah al-Din, and, like Christian sources, seek to promote specific agendas. The Syrian warrior and gentleman, Usamah, wrote *The Book of Contemplation* likely for Salah al-Din. His work is even more challenging, for it belongs to the *adab* tradition of literature, written for the elite to be used for meditation and entertainment.

While it is presented as an autobiography, its intention is to provide moral and social lessons, presenting the virtues and faults of subjects. His overall purpose is to show that God is in control of the fate of all men. This work provides ideas about Usamah’s perceptions of life among the Franks, though the stories do not necessarily present “truth” as it would be interpreted today; rather it presents stereotypes and general perceptions of the Franks.  

These religious and political affiliations lead often in the works to obvious biases and selective inclusions, although their biases tell us much about the ideology circulating in Christian and Muslim society, and they remain our best source for the events of the crusades. The study of both Christian and Muslims sources helps in overcoming some of the biases of the writers, and helps to elucidate the relationships between the two faiths. Still, the nature and availability of chronicle evidence has shaped this projected in significant ways. Far more Christian and Muslim sources survive for the Third Crusade than the Second.  

Likewise, the lack of evidence on ordinary crusaders has resulted in a focus on the actions and accommodation of elite members of crusader and Muslim societies.

Because of some of the inherent biases and weaknesses of chronicles and histories as sources, this study has also looked to other sources to fill in some of these gaps. Clerical


writings, such as papal bulls, have been examined to provide a clearer picture of official
Church teachings that helped develop the group beliefs of Latin Christians coming to the
East and the motivations that brought them there. These letters sent to and from the Levant, as
well as travel literature written by both Christians and Muslims, have provided a more
personal and immediate view of the political, social and cultural life that was found in the
crusader states. These provide only a snapshot of an individual’s impressions of events
at a specific time and so are limited in what they can tell us about overall life in the East,
but they can provide an impression of life within certain limits. Administrative and law
texts, both from the military orders and the crusader states, provide a window into the day
to day running and laws of these institutions and their codified, if not always practical,
attitudes towards the indigenous peoples within their lands. Finally, chivalric literature,
such as chansons de geste, epic poems about heroic Christian warriors and their
encounters with Muslim enemies, provide a window into the impressions and attitudes of
the laity towards Muslims. The chansons were meant for a public audience and would be

55 Phillips, Holy Warriors, 79; Colin Morris, “Propaganda for War the Dissemination of the Crusading
56 Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate, Letters from the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12th-13th
centuries, ed. Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2010), 44-91;
Theoderich, “Theoderich’s Description of the Holy Places (Circa 1172 A.D.),” in Palestine Pilgrims’ Text
Stewart (1896; repr., New York: AMS Press, 1971); Benjamin of Tudela, The Itinerary of Benjamin of
Tudela: Travels in the Middle Ages, trans. Masa’ot shel Rabi Binyamin, intro. Michael A. Signer, Marcus
Nathan Adler, and A. Asher (Malibu, California: Joseph Simon, 1987); Ibn Jubayr, The Travels of Ibn
Jubayr: Being the Chronicle of a Mediaeval Spanish Moor Concerning his Journey to the Egypt of Saladin,
the Holy Cities of Arabia, Baghdad the City of the Caliphs, the Latin Kingdom, ed. and trans. R. J. C.
Broadhurst (London: Camelot Press Ltd., 1952); Nasir-i-Khusrau, “Diary of a Journey Through Syria and
58 Colonel E. J. King, ed., The Rule Statutes and Customs of the Hospitalllers 1099-1310 (New York: AMS
of the Knights Templar (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1992); Malcom Barber, and Keith Bate, ed. and
trans., The Templars: Selected Sources Translated and Annotated (New York: Manchester University
Press, 2002); M. Le Comte Beugnot, ed., Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Lois I and II (1841-43;
told in courts and after tournaments, encouraging skilled fighters to go on crusade.  
Courtly literature formed a propaganda that worked outside the official papal message of the crusades. It served to encourage lay audiences to take up the cross. When taken together these sources provide an extensive textual view of the military, social, political and religious interactions between the elite members of crusader and Muslim society.

Chapter Overview

Through the use of the many varied primary sources available, this study explores the nature of the group identities, in particular the prescriptive religious identity, of elite Europeans who came to the Levant between 1145 and 1192, and how direct contact with Muslims challenged that prescriptive religious identity. It explores the degree and type of accommodation Latin Christians engaged in with Muslim enemies. This study will first examine the ideological worlds of Christians and Muslims, the preconceptions and assumptions that helped shape their initial responses to the ‘other,’ and then the group identities that experienced different levels of accommodation with Muslims, including short-term crusaders, members of military orders, and permanent settlers.

Chapter One will examine the ideological context of the Second and Third Crusades and argue that the prescriptive religious ideology of Christianity shaped and informed the initial contact of Latin Christians with Muslims and that of Muslims with Christians. The Christians who came to the East had specific preconceptions and stereotypes about Muslims, often shaped by teachings of the clergy. The clergy also had a significant role in
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shaping the Christian view on holy war against Muslims, and the spiritual significance of Jerusalem, the prize for which the crusaders fought. These areas made up some of the significant ideological beliefs that influenced initial interactions with Muslims, and were some of the ideas and beliefs that would be challenged by actual contact.\(^{60}\)

Chapter Two will examine the short-term elite crusaders who came to the East to fight in holy wars against the Muslims who threatened Jerusalem and the Christians of the Holy Land. This study accepts the position of scholars such as Sarah Buchanan, Lesley Johnson, Alan Murray and Jonathan Riley-Smith who have argued that the crusaders formed a group based on their religious convictions that transcended their national, regional, linguistic, and political identities.\(^{61}\) The elite crusaders who came for only a short period had the least amount of time in which to have their prescriptive beliefs challenged by direct contact with Muslims. The majority of their contact came through military encounters or diplomatic negotiations, which could often be characterized by divergent accommodation. However, such contacts still sometimes had an impact on individual and group beliefs and resulted in convergent accommodation, such as through the creation of shared gestures of diplomacy. As Jubb has argued, one significant group identity that did provide a serious, and sometimes overriding, challenge to the religious beliefs of the crusaders came through their participation and identification with the


The elite members of the military orders, in particular the Templars (Knights of the Temple of Solomon of Jerusalem) and Hospitallers (Hospital of St John of Jerusalem), are the subject of the third chapter. The military orders were permanent organizations in the Holy Land, which combined a monastic life with knighthood. They saw their work as a way to live a religious life, combining warfare and charity, a fact that could lead to contradictions in the response of the members to the Muslims with whom they interacted.\footnote{Tom Licence, “The Military Orders as Monastic Orders,” Crusades 5 (2006): 53; Sophia Menache, “The Military Orders in the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem,” in Knights of the Holy Land, ed. Silvia Rozenberg (Jerusalem: The Israel Museum, 1999), 137; Innocent II, “Innocent II to the Templars (Omne datum optimum), 29 March 1139,” in The Crusades: Idea and Reality, 1095-1274, ed. and trans. Jonathan and Louise Riley-Smith (London: Edward Arnold, 1981), 93.} Both orders became military orders, though the Hospital started as a charitable organization, committed to the defence and protection of pilgrims and the crusader states. As members of religious orders, the prescriptive ideological beliefs of Christianity were very important to the elite members of the orders, and they led to much divergent accommodation, with the orders becoming some of the fiercest opponents the Muslims faced.\footnote{Jonathan Riley-Smith, The Knights of St. John in Jerusalem and Cyprus, c. 1050-1310 (London: Macmillan, 1967), 75; Helen Nicholson, The Knights Hospitaller (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2001), 23; Ibn al-Athir, The Chronicle, vol. 2, 324.} However, the longer terms of service the brothers served led to greater
contact with Muslims, and in many cases led to more instances of convergent accommodation. Their longer terms of service meant the orders were more aware of the political and military intricacies of the crusader states and this led them to engage more readily in diplomatic negotiations, and develop convergent diplomatic relationships with surrounding Muslims. This allowed them, with their limited numbers, to continue to protect the crusader states, without risking undue harm. As longer term residents of the Levant, the members of the order also came into more frequent contact with peasants and slaves who worked on their estates, not just with other elites. The orders engaged in peaceful spatial convergence with these workers. At times the orders made personal contacts with individual Muslims, developing relatively friendly relations, as well as sharing certain meaningful religious sites with Muslims who equally recognized their sacred nature. For the Hospitallers, additional convergent accommodation occurred in their Hospital where they worked with Muslim patients and doctors, even adopting some Muslim medical practices. While members of the order did not generally experience intellectual convergence with other Muslims, this did occur in a limited nature through their medical practice. Despite their often fierce military response to Muslims, the military orders did engage in more convergent accommodation with Muslims than did the
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crusaders. However, their religious convictions, and the fact that members did not remain permanently in the East, meant that convergence did remain more limited than that of the settlers, with the pursuit of holy war remaining an important part of their identity.

The final category to be examined is the elite members of the Latin settlers in the crusader states. Alan Murray has suggested that the settlers who settled in the East abandoned their previous identity as members of European countries and came to identify themselves collectively as Franks. Of all the Christians who came to the East, it was the Franks who developed the most complex relationships with Muslims, and who engaged in the most convergent accommodation. The Franks did still experience divergent accommodation, fighting holy wars against Muslim enemies when the crusader states were threatened, but they also developed more extensive forms of diplomacy through learning Arabic, and more extensive shared gestures than the other groups. The Franks chose not to live directly among Muslims, instead settling in areas inhabited by native Christians, their religious identity providing direction to their settlement habits. They did, however, adopt some of the physical trappings of Muslim culture, such as food and clothing. This was an asymmetrical convergence though, for they actively tried to prevent Muslims from adopting Frankish styles of dress. There was also a greater degree of intermarriage between Franks and indigenous Christians than between Franks and Muslims, for intermarriage generally only occurred when one party had converted to the faith of the other, another way in which convergence remained limited, and where the religious identities of the Franks and Muslim played a limiting part. However, the Franks did develop more identities that offered paths to convergent accommodation, becoming
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engaged in the economic, social, and political life of the Levant.\textsuperscript{69} Italian merchants, though at times committed to the crusading ideal, established significant trade connections with Muslims, and traded with Muslims during times of war, even sometimes trading war materials with Muslims, an action that worked to the detriment of the crusader states.\textsuperscript{70} Where the greatest intellectual convergence happened was through the practice of medicine, as happened with the military orders.\textsuperscript{71} Religious identity, though, as in the case of the other groups in question, remained an important identity for the settlers. While the more extensive contact experienced by settlers did lead to more convergent accommodation than that experienced by other groups, their identity as Christians required the continued restriction and exclusion of Muslims in the new power structure of the crusader states, and the control of the political rights of their Muslim subjects. Conversion remained the only way truly to enter the group, and this remained a limited occurrence throughout the crusades.\textsuperscript{72}


Ultimately, this study concludes that regardless of how open to accommodation any individual person or group was, the dominant prescriptive ideology of Christian faith meant that straying too far from these beliefs would ultimately lead to delegitimization of Christians within any of the three groups. This held true for Muslims as well. This meant that while longer and deeper contact did lead to greater amounts of convergent accommodation, as well as legitimate relationships between Latin Christians and Muslims, ultimately a barrier remained between the two faiths, and it was only through the acceptance of another faith, and often not even then, that one could become part of the other group, regardless of the many other identities one could hold in common with an ‘other.’
CHAPTER ONE: THE IDEOLOGICAL CONTEXT OF THE SECOND AND THIRD CRUSADE

The initial interactions of Christian crusaders with Muslims in the Holy Land were shaped to a great extent by the crusaders’ collective identity as members of Latin Christendom and their Muslim opponents’ collective identity as members of Islam, and their respective acceptance of some of the group beliefs that accompanied those identities.¹ This study does not argue that either Latin Christians or Muslims were ever homogenous groups with uniform beliefs and goals. Many subgroups existed within each religion, and individuals also possessed many other group identities that had distinct priorities and beliefs that affected their actions. Nevertheless, both religions provided an overarching prescriptive ideology that defined members of the other religion as a distinct and to some degree unpalatable ‘other.’ Those prescriptive beliefs were important in forming the Christians’ initial impressions of, and reactions towards, Muslims in the Holy Land, as well as Muslims’ reactions towards the Latin Christians. Both Latin Christianity and Islam held many prescriptive beliefs that separated Christians and Muslims, but this chapter will focus on three aspects that were particularly important in the initial encounters of Christians and Muslims: negative stereotypes and preconceptions about the other propagated by each religion, the sacredness of Jerusalem to both groups and the desire to possess it exclusively, and the concepts of holy war against those outside the faith developed by both groups. These prescriptive beliefs should have left no room for compromise, and often did lead to divergent and hostile responses towards one another, such as frequent holy war against each other, that accentuated these differences. All

¹ Bar-Tal, Group Beliefs, 3, 41, 58.
groups are, however, dynamic in nature, and subject to change with exposure to external forces. With increased contact between Christians and Muslims, the attitudes and actions of the crusaders towards Muslims did change, often leading to a greater respect and willingness to engage in limited convergent accommodation, particularly on an individual level among the elites.\textsuperscript{2} This chapter explores the prescriptive beliefs that brought the crusaders to the East and coloured their initial impressions, attitudes and actions towards the Muslims. Further chapters will examine the ways in which these beliefs were challenged through interaction with Muslims or by the primacy of other group identities and their attendant beliefs and needs, leading to some limited forms of convergent accommodation.

Every group centres itself on the belief that it is a group, but also on a collection of other beliefs that define its nature, purpose and boundaries. These help the group to define who belongs within a group and who is an ‘other.’\textsuperscript{3} For Christians in Western Europe, Muslims stood outside of their religious group beliefs. Most crusaders internalized stereotypes and preconceptions about Muslims before arriving in the Holy Land. These helped to identify Muslims as belonging outside the Christian fold, and reinforced the group identity of Christianity in the attitudes of crusaders. These ideas are evident in the writings of clerics and other crusaders. These perceptions often had little basis in reality, since few people in Western Europe outside Iberia and Southern Italy had ever had direct contact with Muslims.\textsuperscript{4} Most of these preconceptions were negative and denigratory of

\textsuperscript{3} Bar-Tal, \textit{Group Beliefs}, 2, 37.
\textsuperscript{4} Daniel, \textit{Heroes and Saracens}, 2.
Muslims. Norman Housley explains that Muslims “were depicted as brutal, sadistic, greedy and lascivious people who captured, enslaved and tortured Christians. The atrocity stories featured in crusade sermons and the like drew liberally on such terms.” Muslims were often described in chronicles and other literature as polytheistic pagans who worshiped their own ‘trinity’ of Muhammad, Tervagant and Apollo. The Cistercian Abbot of Clairvaux, and mentor of Pope Eugenius, Bernard (1090-1153), referred to the Muslims of the Levant as “dogs,” “swine,” and “pagans.” Other chronicles, serving both to record historical events and as propaganda to encourage others to go on crusade, referred to Muslims variously as a “vile and filthy race,” “curs,” a “despised and base race,” “adversaries of the Cross,” “swine,” “dogs,” “Philistines,” a “fiendish race,”
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5 Housley, *Fighting for the Cross*, 210; Penny J. Cole, “‘O God, the heathen have come into your inheritance’ (Ps. 78.1) The Theme of Religious Pollution in Crusade Documents, 1095-1188,” in *Crusaders and Muslims in Twelfth-Century Syria*, ed. Maya Shatzmiller (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993), 100-1.


8 Translated in Ambroise, *Estoire de la Guerre Sainte*, vol. 2 63-4. “Genz vils e ordes, la gent culvert.”


“crafty,” and the Antichrist. These stereotypes often painted Muslims as inferior humans, or less than human, and possessing a religion that stood in direct opposition to Christianity. Through such writings, Christian authors enhanced their own group beliefs in the superiority of their faith and created boundaries between themselves and Muslims who did not belong within their group.

In a similar fashion to Christians who portrayed Muslims in a derogatory manner, Muslim writers shored up the Islamic group identity by identifying the Christians from Europe as a distinct and inferior ‘other’ in ways that were often derogatory. Ibn al-Athir (1160-1233) was a chronicler whose family was connected to the Zengid dynasty (Zengi and Nur al-Din) and, though he did not work directly for them as did his father and brother, his close connections to the dynasty caused him to present favourably the deeds of those leaders, including their exploits against the crusaders. In his writings Ibn al-Athir called the crusaders “monstrous devils,” “devilish,” “infidels.” The chroniclers Baha al-Din Ibn Shaddad and `Imad al-Din were both employed by Salah al-Din and were therefore predisposed, much like Ibn al-Athir, to be critical of the crusaders, presenting the sultan as a great leader of jihad. `Imad al-Din spoke of the crusaders as “adorers of the false God,” “shadowy abominations,” “idolaters,” and the “dregs of

---

The insults used by the chroniclers that most separated their beliefs from the crusaders, creating clear group boundaries, were those that dealt with the core of the Christian faith, the belief in the Trinity (God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit – a belief all Muslims firmly rejected). Thus they referred to Christians as “people of the Trinity,” “polytheists,” “Hypostatics,” and “Trinitarians.” Rulers such as Salah al-Din used such rhetoric to help unite potentially disparate groups of Muslims into fighting against Christians.

Through stereotypes and propaganda, Christians and Muslims provided an image of the ‘other’ that emphasized the many differences they perceived to exist between them. However, there were some similar beliefs and ideas between the faiths that also led to conflict. These similarities rested around the overarching nature of their faiths, viewing unbelievers as decidedly inferior, though conversion was never a priority for either faith. Both religions also attached great importance to Jerusalem as one of the sacred spaces of their faith. Christians and Muslims between 1145 and 1192 sought to hold Jerusalem in their exclusive control, asserting their faith’s claim to the city. Jerusalem would remain a
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22 Translated in Ibn al-Qalanisi, Damascus Chronicle, 278, 288.
23 Translated in Imad al-Din, “The Sultan Saladin and His Army Enter Frankish Territory,” 128.
24 Translated in Imad al-Din, “The Fall of Tiberias,” 136.
point of contention throughout the crusades as both faiths sought to possess and control it exclusively.

The crusaders were united in their belief in the spiritual and historical significance of the city of Jerusalem, and the importance of keeping it in Christian possession. Its significance was rooted in its religious history. Christians believed that Jesus had been the fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures, their Old Testament, and it was in Jerusalem that many of the Old Testament fathers had fulfilled their faith. Christians believed the city held the locations of Jacob’s dream, the threshing floor of King David, the Temple of Solomon (*Templum Domini*), and the rock upon which Abraham was called by God to sacrifice his son Isaac.

Of even greater importance to the Christians’ religious identity and its ties to Jerusalem was its connection to Jesus Christ. Jerusalem, as well as the surrounding Holy Land, was where Jesus had performed his many miracles in life. The city was also where Christians believed he had been crucified and resurrected, bringing salvation to all believers. As Riley-Smith explains, Jerusalem provided Christians with a tangible and physical manifestation of their faith. It was “the place where God had redeemed mankind and in
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which his presence still lingered in the objects he had touched, the streets he had walked, the ground that had soaked up his blood, the sepulchre in which he had been buried.”

The Dome of the Rock, the same rock upon which Abraham’s faith had been tested, was also believed to be where Jesus had preached. Around the tomb where the crusaders believed Christ’s body had been laid before he was resurrected, the crusaders constructed the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

Christians venerated Jerusalem’s sacred character not just for what had happened in the past, but also for the role it would play in their future salvation. Reflecting a theme running throughout the Old and New Testaments, Christians believed Jerusalem would serve as the location where Jesus would eventually return, heralding the final resurrection and the end of days. It was in Jerusalem that the anti-Christ would first appear and where tombs would split open and the bodies of those who had died would be resurrected.

The spiritual significance of Jerusalem made it a destination for pilgrims from early on. During the reign of the Roman emperor Constantine I (c. 280-337), his mother Helena was said to have discovered a relic of the Holy Cross upon which Christ was crucified. Since then pilgrimage to Jerusalem greatly increased and continued even after conquest
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by Muslims in 638 CE. Those who came on pilgrimage, including eventually the
 crusaders, saw Jerusalem and the Holy Land not as just a place containing sacred relics,
such as the True Cross on which Christ was crucified, but viewed the Holy Land as a
 relic in itself to be worshipped. Pilgrims continued to come to Jerusalem right through
to the First Crusade (1095-99).

The sacred character of Jerusalem was also recognized by Muslims and over time became
important to their religious identity as well. Muslims did not consider Islam to be a new
religion, but rather they believed Muhammad had been granted revelations that brought
about the fulfillment of Judaism and Christianity. Because of this, Muslim group beliefs
also acknowledged the sacred character of many early prophets, and of Jesus, who was
recognized by Muslims as a prophet, although not as the son of God as Christians
believed. Because of their respect for these Judaic and Christian figures, Muslims also
venerated Jerusalem for its historical significance to early spiritual figures. Independently
of the Judaic and Christian faiths, Jerusalem held sacred significance for its connections
to the prophet Muhammad. Jerusalem was considered the third most important city within
Islam, after Mecca, where Muhammad first began to preach after receiving God’s
revelation, and Medina, where Muhammad moved his followers in 622 and where much

Muqaddasi (c. 945-c. 1000) praises Jerusalem for its connection to Abraham, Job, David, Solomon, Isaac and Jesus.
of the Qur’an was revealed to him. Jerusalem was the city Muslims were first directed to pray towards (the qibla) though it was eventually switched to Mecca. It was also the location of the Night Journey, where Muhammad was taken by the angel Gabriel from Mecca to Jerusalem and up to heaven in one night. Muslims believed it was from this rock on the haram (the hill on which many of Jerusalem’s holy sites were found) that the final judgement would take place, as well as the resurrection of believers in the last days. When the caliph Umar b. al-Khattabb (r. 634-44) took control of Jerusalem in 638 he built the al-Aqsa mosque on the site of the previous Jewish Temple, while the caliph ’Abd al-Malik ibn Marwant erected the Dome of the Rock over the rock Muslims believed to be the site of the Night Journey. Islam’s group identity was historically rooted, and, like Christianity’s, centred on the historical locations of their faith, as well as the continued spiritual nature of them.

35 Karen Armstrong, Islam: A Short History (New York: Modern Library, 2002), xiii; Al-Muqaddasi, The Best Divisions for Knowledge, 152. Al-Muqaddasi acknowledges that while Mecca and Medina are more holy because of their close connection to the life of the prophet Muhammad, the end of days will occur in Jerusalem and at that time Jerusalem will overshadow both Mecca and Medina.
In 1099 the First Crusade (1095-99) reconquered Jerusalem from Muslims and the Latin Christians established the city as the capital of the new kingdom of Jerusalem. They reclaimed many of the Muslim holy sites, re-identifying the Dome of the Rock as the location of the Lord’s Temple of the New Testament and converting it into an Augustinian church called the *Templum Domini*. The al-Aqsa mosque was identified as the Temple of King Solomon, the *Templum Solomonis*, which served first as King Baldwin I’s (1100-18) residence, and later the headquarters of the Templars. The crusaders believed these structures remained holy, despite the taint of previous Muslim inhabitation, and needed not to be destroyed, but rather restored to their holy state.

While the crusaders re-appropriated Jerusalem’s sacred spaces for their own worship, they did not permanently close the city to Muslims. After an initial slaughter of Muslims during the conquest, Muslims were prevented from living within the city walls, but they were not prevented from coming as pilgrims to worship. The al-Aqsa mosque and the Dome of the Rock continued to have sections remain open for Muslim worship, as did sections of other churches in cities around the Levant. This tolerance did not amount to acceptance of Muslims into the Christianity identity. The Muslims remained second-class citizens, subject to Frankish rule.
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The prescriptive religious beliefs of the crusaders and Muslims were widely accepted, and ultimately caused each faith to view the ‘other’ as possessing an inferior religion. These beliefs also encouraged both faiths to press their claims upon the city of Jerusalem and the surrounding Holy Land in an exclusionary and sometimes violent fashion. This was framed in the rhetoric of holy war and jihad and served as a form of divergent accommodation. Holy war and jihad encouraged members of each faith to come together in unified action against those whom they perceived as being beyond the boundaries of their faith and a threat. For Christians the concept of religious warfare was developed over time and by 1145 had become a significant factor in bringing the crusaders to the Levant. The ideology of jihad began through revelations in the Qur’an received by Muhammad and was developed by religious scholars (ulama) and legal experts (muftis). By the time of the crusades, jihad was used by rulers and theologians to frame Muslim actions towards the crusaders. As both sides refined their view of holy war and jihad, these ideas both justified and constrained their interactions with one another.

While Jerusalem had long played a part in Christian group identity and pilgrims had traveled to the Holy Land for hundreds of years to connect with a physical manifestation of that identity, the crusades added a new facet to that journey – armed warfare to protect Christianity’s sacred spaces. Christians had a long history of finding justification for war within the structure of their faith. Over the course of the eleventh and twelfth centuries the concept of just war merged with ideas of holy war, reaching a culmination in the crusades. Holy war served as warfare that was not only legal (just war), but actively
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encouraged by God for a holy purpose. The concept of holy war provided justification and motivation for Western Europeans to turn away from war within Europe and to fight God’s enemies, the Muslim infidels, as well as other pagans and heretics who threatened the core beliefs and religious domains of Christendom.

The Bible, the sacred text of Christianity and the root of many of its group beliefs, is itself ambiguous about the use of violence and against whom it can legitimately be directed. This ambiguity led to a shifting and changing of group beliefs over time in the way the Church and society dealt with violence and its relation to sin. In the Old Testament, God, in many instances, appears to approve and even encourage the Israelites to fight in wars for their own survival. The New Testament is more ambiguous, but does not forbid the use of violence outright. While Jesus often speaks about not using violence, as in Matt. 5:9 and Matt. 26:52, he also speaks at the Temple of coming to bring division, not peace. He also does not condemn the centurion he meets for his profession, but declares that the centurion has more faith than the inhabitants of Israel. Warfare, even in the New Testament, could have spiritual merit in specific circumstances. These

48 “Do not suppose that I have come to bring peace to the earth. I did not come to bring peace, but a sword.” Luke 12:49, 51. “I have come to bring fire on the earth, and how I wish it were already kindled!...Do you think I came to bring peace on earth? No, I tell you, but division.” Matt. 10:34 (NIV). “Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.” Matt. 5:9 (NIV). “Put your sword back in its place...for all who draw the sword will die by the sword.” Matt. 26:52. Nicholson, The Knights Hospitaller, 14; Frederick H. Russell, The Just War in the Middle Ages (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 10; Asbridge, The Crusades, 15.
ambiguities led Western European Christians to interpret the use of violence and warfare in a variety of ways.

Early Christian theologians such as Origen (145/6-352/4 CE) generally rejected the idea of public warfare, but when the Romans made Christianity the official state religion in 381, Rome’s brutal warfare had to be justified in Christian terms. Eusebius of Caesarea (c. 260-c. 339) therefore distinguished between the clergy, who were not to participate in warfare, and the laity, who could. Augustine of Hippo (354-430) took the concept of just war even further, and it was he who would make the greatest contributions to the concept of just war that would influence the crusaders. He asserted that war itself was not inherently evil, but, rather, it was a love of violence that was evil. Peace was to be the goal of all war, and war should be fought to restore a state of peace. He likewise supported Eusebius’ distinction allowing soldiers to wage war, while preventing clergy and private citizens from doing so. Augustine developed conditions to decide if a war could be considered ‘just’ and therefore legitimate to participate in. For a war to be just the cause must be just (causa justa), which meant righting a wrong committed in the past or present. It had to be defensive in character, and be called by a legitimate, sanctioned authority (auctoritas principis). Finally, those fighting had to possess a right intention (intention recta); their motives have to be pure, with warfare being the only possible means to achieve a justified outcome. Through these conditions warfare, which could so
easily be sinful, could be sanctioned and justified.\textsuperscript{54} Augustine believed that war could be not only a consequence of sin, but now also a remedy to sin.\textsuperscript{55} Just war was a way to prevent sinners from perpetrating further wrongs.\textsuperscript{56}

With the collapse of the western half of the Roman Empire, from the sixth century onwards, the complexities of Augustine’s arguments were lost and the group beliefs of just war were adapted towards the localized political and social situations clerics found themselves in.\textsuperscript{57} For example, Isidore of Seville (d. 636) in Visigothic Spain favoured an approach in which a formal declaration of war was made to recover lost goods or to punish or fend off enemies.\textsuperscript{58}

This dispersion of beliefs did not last, and by the tenth century the Church’s teachings on just war began to coalesce again. Concern began to return about the idea that though war could be just, killing was still sinful and needed to be followed by penance.\textsuperscript{59} This concern brought the issue of just war back to a more central place in the beliefs of Christians in Europe. The Peace and Truce of God movements developed out of these concerns. The Peace of God movement that started late in the tenth century sought to prohibit clergy, who were usually also members of the aristocracy, from participating in

\textsuperscript{54} Riley-Smith, \textit{What Were the Crusades?}, 16; Tyerman, \textit{God’s War}, 34; Riley-Smith, \textit{The Crusades: A Short History}, xxviii; Asbridge, \textit{The Crusades}, 15.
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warfare as they had often done during the early Middle Ages. It also sought to protect monks, clergy, the weak, and poor from war, by having soldiers swear to protect the non-military classes. The Truce of God movement started at the beginning of the eleventh century and restricted soldiers from fighting at specific times, including holiday days, Sundays, etc. These movements sought to limit the effects of warfare, and, by extension, the impact of sin.

Pope Gregory VII (1073-85) and Bishop Anselm II of Lucca (1073-86) both believed that warfare could be just, but that killing was still inherently sinful, and they sought ways to mediate that sin. They suggested that the sinfulness of soldiers could be tempered by acting through love. In a letter to Italian bishops regard their soldiers Gregory wrote,

...as the duty of your office requires, you should most diligently warn them to perform proper penance, and to keep good faith towards their leaders as befits Christians. In all their deeds they should have before their eyes the fear and love of God, and they should persevere in good works. And thus, strengthened by the authority of ourself, or rather by the power of blessed Peter, absolve them from their sins.

---
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With this concept of love as mediating the effects of the sinfulness of war, Gregory began the path towards the merging of just war with the concept of holy war that was so significant to the crusades. Through love of God, and the proper intentions of that love, warfare could become not only less sinful, but meritorious.

Up to the tenth century only just war was part of the consciousness of Christians in their consideration of sin and its effect on their lives. Just war – a war fought within the legal, secular sphere, called by a legitimate ruler, and fought to accomplish a limited objective – was considered lawful, but still sinful. In the tenth century a doctrine of holy war developed, and encompassed war that was actively supported by God, not just tolerated. Holy war worked within the religious, transcendent sphere, as opposed to just war’s legal, secular sphere. Historian H. E. J. Cowdrey explains holy war “is warfare undertaken according to the purposes of God and with his self-effecting blessing; in an answer to urgent prayer to him, God, by a judgement that is sure if unsearchable in wisdom and unequivocal in its decisiveness, settles which side in a conflict is just and righteous.”

The test to decide whether a war was a holy war was to ensure it conformed to God’s will. The doctrine of holy war suggested that as long as Christians were following God’s calling under the leadership of a legitimate authority, their actions would not be considered sinful, but praiseworthy.

---
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Augustine had not specifically addressed a concept of holy war in his framework and this allowed for other theologians and scholars to develop their own interpretations in the late eleventh and into the twelfth century. In holy war God was declared to rest his intentions and will with a single party, with only their aims being declared legitimate, unlike just war where both sides could be equal in God’s eyes. Yet, war still had to be authorized by a legitimate authority in holy war, and by the 1070s the papacy was considered such an authority. Soldiers were also recognized to hold a legitimate place in society under the leadership of a legitimate authority.

Both Pope Gregory and Pope Urban II (1088-99) asserted the idea of the pope as a legitimate authority to declare God’s will to fight a holy war. In 1074 Gregory tried to call soldiers to aid fellow Christians against the Turks in the East, focusing specifically on Jerusalem, but the campaign never transpired. Pope Urban was more successful in his call to war. Robert the Monk’s (d. 1122) record of Urban’s speech at Clermont in 1095 records Urban calling soldiers to turn away from sinfully fighting fellow Christians in Europe, and instead to put their efforts into a holy war against the Muslim infidel, “an accursed race, a race utterly alienated from God.”
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many forms, in each incarnation there would be common elements: each was a holy war that was fought for God; it was penitential in that going on crusade serving an act of penance in and of itself; and it was authorized by the pope, a legitimate authority as God’s representative on earth.73

In 1140, the Italian monk Gratian (d. c. 1159) wrote an influential book on canon law, the Decretum, which systematically brought together centuries of thought from Augustine to his own time.74 Like Augustine, Gratian concluded that violence and warfare were to be used to prevent damage and to punish wrongdoing.75 Gratian asserted that not all warfare was sinful – one’s internal disposition, or intention, was the most important factor in deciding whether an action was sinful, not the outward action itself. Those who acted on the command of a legitimate authority to punish a sinner and to prevent them from committing further harm acted out of love and benevolence. It was this right intention that legitimised their efforts.76

The doctrines of just war and holy war were very much present and central to crusaders’ group beliefs in the calls for the Second Crusade.77 After Zengi’s capture of the city and principality of Edessa in 1144, Pope Eugenius III (1145-53) issued a call to crusade in

73 Riley-Smith, The Crusades, Christianity and Islam, 9; Riley-Smith and Riley-Smith, introduction to The Crusades: Idea and Reality, 1; Riley-Smith, What Were the Crusades?, 15.
74 Russell, The Just War, 55; Cowdrey, “Christianity and the Morality,” 186.
75 Russell, The Just War, 57; Cowdrey, “Christianity and the Morality,” 187.
76 Russell, The Just War, 58, 64; Riley-Smith, “Crusading as an Act of Love,” 189. For example see Phillips, The Second Crusade, 43.
which he portrayed the disaster as the outcome of the sin of Christendom. It was therefore the duty of all Christians, for the remission of that sin, to take up arms against the infidel in an act of penance against God’s legitimate enemies and defend the Church in the East. The Cistercian Abbot Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153) brought the developing ideas of holy and just war to fruition in preaching for the Second Crusade. He effectively synthesized Gregorian teachings on warfare with the crusading ideal. Bernard ascribed control and direction of material warfare to the pope. Secular authorities were merely to be the physical manifestation of that power and to carry out its wishes. Bernard saw the crusaders carrying out a new kind of warfare. Crusaders were militia, soldiers fighting for God, whereas secular knights were malitia, driven by earthly desires. For Bernard, like Gratian, intention was the most important factor in undertaking war. A just cause undertaken with the right intention would lead to a successful outcome. When soldiers killed unrighteous men for God’s cause, they did not commit homicide, but rather ‘malicide,’ killing the sin and unbelief they were fighting against.

In the period between 1145 and 1192, the idea that crusaders were fighting God’s enemies was well-developed and this became a group belief and an important motivating factor for both the short term crusaders and the military orders. It became a means of
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divergent accommodation, bringing together the Christians in delineating the boundaries between fellow Christians and enemies of other faiths.\(^{82}\) The preaching of clerics greatly affected the crusaders’ approach towards their Muslim enemies and the way they saw the intricate connection between their religious faith and warfare. They saw themselves as fighting God’s enemies, and doing so with God’s approval in a holy war. The crusaders were highly motivated for not only were they fighting God’s enemies (those who had fallen away from the true faith and were flouting the laws of Christ) to protect God’s land, but in the process they were achieving their own personal salvation as well. Success in the Levant was deeply connected to both their own individual spiritual motivations and well-being and their group identity as Christians.\(^{83}\)

In a similar fashion to the crusaders, Muslims, by the time of the Second Crusade, were brought together and motivated in their fight against the crusaders by a concept of holy war – jihad. Jihad in the decades before the Second Crusade grew in its centrality as a group belief among Muslims and served as a means of divergent accommodation among Muslims, identifying them as a group that was unique and separate from other faiths around them, providing a concept around which to unify and putting religious concerns ahead of secular ones.\(^{84}\) Jihad for Muslims meant to struggle or strive to live in accordance with the will of God.\(^{85}\) This was comprised of two components, a greater
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jihad (al-jihad al-akbar) and a lesser jihad (al-jihad al-asghar). Greater jihad was the struggle within oneself to follow the will of God and to struggle against one’s selfishness and ego. Lesser jihad was a physical war against non-believers. The greater jihad was considered the more noble pursuit.\(^6\) Jihad as a doctrine developed over time through the interpretation of the Qur’an and hadith by many different people within their own historical contexts, creating nuances in the concept over time.\(^7\) In the period from 1145-92 Muslim rulers such as Zengi, Nur al-Din and Salah al-Din interpreted jihad in response to the threat posed by the crusaders, uniting their followers together to direct military attentions against the Christian infidel, thus reducing conflict among Muslims groups. The reclamation of Jerusalem and its importance as a sacred place became one of the motivators to fight jihad.\(^8\)

The roots of jihad are found in the seventh century. In seventh-century Arabia, warfare and violence were the normal way of life, with many tribes gaining the necessities of life through raiding. The prophet Muhammad received revelations from God, suggesting a different way to live, to unite people from many tribes to live in a community devoted to
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a life following God.\textsuperscript{89} This was a radical change to the way of life followed by most people and after coming into conflict with the people of Mecca, Muhammad moved his followers to Medina (the hijra) in 622. Because they were leaving the safety that was provided by tribal associations, they were forced into a position where they had to defend themselves physically. Because of this, jihad as a means of protection was addressed in early Qur’anic verses. Surah 22:39-40 states, “Permission (to fight) has been granted to those against whom war has been waged, because they have been treated unjustly, and Allah is certainly able to help them. These are the people who have been expelled unjustly from their homes only for the reason that they said, ‘Our Lord is Allah.’”\textsuperscript{90} More variants would be added to the original revelations and teachings over time.

Shortly after Muhammad’s death there was a split in the religious community. His followers disagreed over who should lead the community, his father-in-law Abu Bakr, believed by some to be the most religious man, or the head of the family, Muhammad’s son-in-law Ali. The majority followed Abu Bakr, and became known as Sunnis, while those who followed Ali became the Shi’ites.\textsuperscript{91} These two groups generally retained similar beliefs about jihad. They both saw jihad as a communal and sometimes individual struggle to follow God and to defend the Muslim community. They differed, however, in who they believed could legitimately call a jihad. Sunnis believed the caliph, the political leader of the Muslims, had the right to call jihad, while the Shi’ites believed that power


\textsuperscript{90} Qur’an, Surah 22:39; Esposito, \textit{Unholy War}, 31-2; Armstrong, \textit{Muhammad}, 168; Peters, “Jihad,” 89.

rested with the true successor to Muhammad, the imam. However, they believed the Imam had been hidden from the world and therefore only defensive jihad could be undertaken.92

In the first century of Islam, the community expanded dramatically, and it was believed that Islam would eventually extend its faith over the entire world.93 The community sought to replace unbelief with a religious society that brought justice and God’s will.94 As the community expanded, legal scholars developed Sharia law and teachings on jihad, based on the Qur’an, hadith (sayings of the prophet), and legal texts. The Shafi’i tradition of law stated that jihad was a communal and perpetual duty and, in times of danger to the community, it could become the duty of individuals to take up arms.95 In the eighth century expansion slowed after Muslims led many unsuccessful attempts to overtake the Byzantine city of Constantinople. These failures caused Muslims to realize that continued expansion was not going to happen, and the community turned to stabilization rather than conquest.96

With this stabilization Sharia law developed a distinction between the House of Islam (dar al-Islam), the community within which all Muslims lived, and the House of War

(dar al-Harb), containing all people who were not part of the House of Islam. Theoretically, there was to be perpetual conflict between these houses until all people had either become Muslim or submitted to its authority, although for much of their history conversion was not a focus for Muslims. Because of this distinction, a permanent peace treaty between Muslims and anyone else was impossible under the law. All there could be was a temporary truce that was to be no longer than 10 years, the time of the truce between Muhammad and the Meccans. However, in the tenth century the `Abbasid caliphate fragmented into a number of smaller dynasties and lost its political power. In response to a lack of united power, it appears that peace with neighbouring powers became more common than war. In addition to the House of Islam and the House of War, jihad doctrine had added to it a House of Peace (dar al-sulh). Neighbouring non-Muslim states could keep their autonomy and be exempt from attacks from Muslims as long as they acknowledged Muslim overlordship. They received this in exchange for paying a tribute, or poll tax (jizya). It was also possible for non-Muslims to travel into Muslim territories under a safe conduct. These changes were made to allow for trade and diplomacy to take place. Jihad during this period appears not to have been a priority of the caliphs, but along some frontiers Muslim soldiers did take on jihad as personal duty. For Shi’ites in this period, a minority of the Muslim population, the true imam was believed to be hidden from the world, and, therefore, as imams were the only true

---
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authority who could call jihad, the obligation for offensive jihad was lapsed, though
defensive jihad could still be undertaken.\textsuperscript{101}

Though no period ever completely lacked a spirit of jihad, there were times when peace
was more common and there was less concern for continued lesser jihad. By the end of
the tenth century in Syria and Palestine, according to Muslim writers, there was a lack of
jihad spirit. The famous Arab writer al-Muqaddasi wrote of Syria, “The inhabitants have
no enthusiasm for jihad and no energy in the struggle against the enemy.”\textsuperscript{102} The eleventh
century saw many political disputes among Muslims, with rulers often paying less
attention to the necessity of jihad against enemies outside the faith, and more attention to
internal Muslim disputes. Both Sunni and Shi’ite political rulers were concerned with
spreading their own versions of Islam, and less concern was focused on other groups.\textsuperscript{103}

Carole Hillenbrand suggests, along with others, that it was the appearance of the
crusaders that rekindled jihad among political and military leaders. “When the Crusaders
approached the Holy Land in 1099, the disunited and strife-ridden Muslim world had, it
seems, buried the idea of jihad deep into the recesses of its mind. Indeed it was the
Crusaders who possessed the ideological edge over the Muslims.”\textsuperscript{104}

While political rulers appeared less concerned about jihad, religious writers continued to
declare its importance in the early crusading period. One of the earliest Muslim jurists to
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respond to the threat of the crusaders was `Ali b. Tahir al-Sulami (d. 1106), a Damascene jurisprudent. In the Kitab al-jihad (Book of the Holy War) in 1105 al-Sulami suggested that it was Muslim indifference to the arrival of the Franks and a failure of Muslims to carry out jihad that had resulted in the conquest of Jerusalem by the Christians. He called for rulers once again to fight jihad and come back to the true path of God.\footnote{Hillenbrand, The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives, 107; Christie and Gerish, “Parallel Preachings,” 145; \'Ali ibn Tahir Al-Sulami, “A Translation of Extracts from the Kitab al-Jihad, of `Ali ibn Tahir Al-Sulami (d. 1106),” trans. Niall Christie, accessed September 17, 2011, http://falcon.arts.cornell.edu/prh3/447/texts/Sulami.html.}

A few military encounters can be seen to have been undertaken in the name of jihad between 1099 and 1144, but it was not until Zengi (`Imad al-Din Zengi ibn Aqsunqur, r. 1127-46) captured the city and county of Edessa that jihad spirit became immersed in military rhetoric again.\footnote{Hillenbrand, The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives, 108-11; Frenkel, “Muslim Responses to the Frankish Dominion,” 38-9.}


By the Second Crusade the Muslims of Syria and Palestine had regained strong political leaders who recognized the strong religious ideology of the crusaders. In response to these changed realities, Muslim leaders began to shape the doctrine of jihad to the political realities they faced and launch their own
counter-crusade. The doctrine of jihad has always changed in response to the historical and political situation of the day. During the second half of the twelfth century political policies combined true piety with political expediency, and jihad grew in its centrality to Muslim beliefs. Sunni rulers took the rhetoric of jihad and used it to bring together the Muslim world and directed their militaristic energies towards the emerging threat of the crusaders. In particular, three major Muslim rulers emerged from 1145 to 1192 who skillfully used the rhetoric of jihad to further their own political and religious goals: Zengi; Nur al-Din (al-`Adil Nur al-Din Mahmud ibn Zanki, 1118-15 May 1174); and Salah al-Din (Salah al-Din Yussuf Ayyub, 1137/8-1193).

Muslim rulers acted out of a wide variety of motivations, including political, personal and family, but through the use of jihad rhetoric, they came to be remembered in sources as upholders of jihad who acted out of pure religious motivations to protect Islam and to defend its people. Zengi was the first to use such rhetoric to his advantage. While a brutal and ruthless warrior who enforced a strict moral code and discipline, he was remembered as a great leader of jihad against the infidel. His official titles reflect this, as he was given
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the title shahid, or martyr, normally reserved for those who died performing jihad.\textsuperscript{112} Nur al-Din’s chroniclers likewise refer to him as a great religious leader of jihad, with his Arabic titles emphasizing his dedication to jihad and to Sunni orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{113} Nur al-Din’s most important titles became al-mujahid (fighter in the Holy War), perhaps gained after saving Damascus from the crusaders after the Second Crusade, and al-`adil (the just).\textsuperscript{114} Salah al-Din’s historian Baha’ al-Din Ibn Shaddad (Baha al-Din Abu’l-Mahasin Yusuf ibn Ragi’ ibn Tamim, 1145-1234) glowingly spoke of Salah al-Din’s commitment to the five pillars of Islam, and above all of his dedication to jihad, suggesting the sultan had spent all his money and time, shunning all the normal pleasures of life, in its pursuit.\textsuperscript{115} Jihad provided legitimacy to the power held by rulers, though such power had not always been gained legitimately, and provided a way to encourage the religious group identity of their Muslim followers through divergent accommodation.\textsuperscript{116} For Nur al-Din, it was a way to continue to establish the legitimacy and control of the Zangid Empire of his father Zengi.\textsuperscript{117} Many Muslims during this period considered jihad to be warfare that was carried out for purposes of territorial expansion of the Islamic state, and directed against
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the unjust. Sunni jurists considered jihad a political tool that had been granted divine approval as a means to continue the expansion of the House of Islam (\textit{dar al-Islam}) and its interests and to contain the House of War (\textit{dar al-Harb}). It was within this context that writers described Nur al-Din directing jihad against the Franks. It was Nur al-Din’s perceived commitment to jihad and his pursuit of orthodox Muslim causes, such as his establishment of hospitals and educational institutions, or sending troops to protect the city of Medina, that solidified his legitimacy as an Islamic ruler. Salah al-Din wrested control of Nur al-Din’s followers after the early death of Nur al-Din’s rightful heir, his son al-Malik al-Salih Isma’il (d. 1181). Salah al-Din had no legitimate claim to power, so instead he presented himself as carrying on Nur al-Din’s ideological policies, claiming to be his rightful successor through adherence to his policies, and to Muslim orthodoxy.

The renewed pursuit of jihad developed around the recognition of the sacred character of Jerusalem to Muslim religious identity and the necessity of its recovery, for by 1145 it
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had become clear that the crusaders were both staying in the Levant and keeping their
hold on the city of Jerusalem. Jihad united warring groups of Muslims together under a
single faith and a united goal, encouraging them to practice convergent accommodation
with each other and diverge from their shared Christian enemies.

Nur al-Din’s state policy declared that Jerusalem’s sacred nature was being corrupted and
tainted by the religious associations it shared with Jews and Christians, and needed to be
reclaimed. Salah al-Din similarly encouraged the many varied ethnicities that made up
his army to take up jihad against the Franks, and in particular to reclaim Jerusalem, rather
than to direct their military efforts towards fighting the many different groups of Muslims
contained within his lands. Jihad focused Muslims on expelling the Franks from the
Holy Land under the guidance of their Muslim rulers. The doctrine of jihad endowed
rulers with a legitimacy they would have otherwise been lacking, and focused Muslims in
a way that other motivations could not.

For the crusaders, the beliefs around which they shaped their group identity and that
couraged them to go to the East were in large part shaped by the official message of the
papacy and the ecclesiastics who spread that message. These messages revolved around
the need to protect fellow Christians and the Holy Land, in particular Jerusalem, through
a reinterpretation of warfare into a religious duty and right of Christians – holy war – and
also a form of penance that could assist Christians in their quest for salvation. In response
to the threat posed by the crusaders to surrounding Muslim groups, Muslim military
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leaders launched a counter-crusade, based on the resurgence of the centrality of the doctrine of jihad to Muslim group identity. During the counter-crusade Muslim political and military leaders continued to develop and define jihad rhetoric, legitimizing their political rule through the presentation of their power as their spiritual right and a spiritual necessity to fight Christians in jihad and bring Jerusalem back under Muslim control.

Both faiths presented their calling in a universalist fashion that should have maintained tension and aggression between the religions when they met in the East, and often did, encouraging the followers of each faith to resist accommodation with ‘the other’ and pursue divergent practices. The crusades were primarily military efforts and violence against Muslims was the priority of many Latin Christians. However, as will be discussed in subsequent chapters, the crusades put Latin Christians and Muslims in close proximity to one another. Through closer contact a greater respect for Muslims was often fostered in Latin Christians, and led to greater convergent accommodation between the faiths. In addition, as the crusaders spent increased time in the East, they assumed more group identities that challenged the primacy of their prescriptive religious ideologies and challenged the continued engagement in jihad and holy war. However, prescriptive ideology remained important to both groups, and placed limits on the degree of accommodation that could take place. Ultimately, excessive accommodation with an ‘other’ carried the risk of delegitimization of one’s identity as a member within the group and therefore total acceptance into a faith group required conversion.
CHAPTER TWO: THE CRUSADERS

Throughout the crusades, including the specific period in question (1145-92), a steady stream of pilgrims and crusaders arrived from the West to worship at holy sites in and around Jerusalem, and, in the case of the crusaders, to fight in holy wars against Muslims. These numbers increased whenever a disaster occurred in the crusader states, and permanent settlers called to the West for aid. In response to these crises, the papacy issued calls to crusade that were circulated widely by the clergy. Most of the crusaders who came in response to these calls remained in the East for only a short period, a few years at most, and, once they had fulfilled their crusading vows, returned to Europe. Crusaders arrived in the East holding many stereotypes and preconceptions about Muslims and about their role in the Holy Land. Upon arrival in the East, through contact with actual Muslims, many of these preconceptions were challenged. The contact of short term crusaders with Muslims was limited in comparison to that of the military orders or settlers, but still they gained some familiarity with Muslims through warfare, particularly sieges, and also through diplomatic negotiations, the taking of prisoners by both sides, ransoming, and other encounters. Given their military mandate, crusaders did often pursue divergent paths, acting in ways that reinforced their group identity, such as through the pursuit of holy war, but sometimes as a result of other competing needs and identities, they engaged in convergent accommodation with those they had originally considered only enemies. Convergent accommodation can be seen in a willingness to negotiate rather than fight, the acquisition of shared languages and gestures, the recognition of shared chivalric qualities and values, adjustments in response to pragmatic
considerations of the realities of life in the East, and occasionally through conversion and
the acceptance into the group identity of the crusaders. While crusaders did retain their
religious identity, contact with Muslims sometimes led to convergent accommodation and
challenged the centrality and importance of the religious identity of the crusaders.

It was suggested in the previous chapter that crusaders shared a prescriptive ideology and
sense of Christian history as a result of their shared identity as Latin Christians, although
they individually possessed a variety of other group identities and associated beliefs and
values. Historians have identified some elements that appear consistently in all crusading
movements that were rooted in the religious ideology of the crusaders. Each crusade was
identified as a holy war; given legitimacy through papal authorization; and focused, at
least to some degree, on returning to the control of Christendom lands believed to belong
to God or Christian peoples. In exchange for taking crusader vows, crusaders received
spiritual and temporal privileges, including indulgences that they believed would help
them achieve salvation.\(^1\) This has led many recent historians to assert that religious faith
provided a strong motivating factor to go on crusade, although it is clear that crusaders
had a variety of other motives.\(^2\) Jonathan Riley-Smith argues that the crusaders knew that
the crusades “would disrupt their lives, possibly impoverish and even kill or maim them,
and inconvenience their families, the support of which they would anyway need if they
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were to fulfill their promises.”3 It was, at least in part, the strength of their religious ideologies, and the belief in the spiritual benefits of such a journey, that convinced them to undertake such an arduous endeavour and provided a strong group belief for crusaders who came from many different areas, spoke different languages and belonged to different ethnicities.4 Certainly, as has been demonstrated, such religious ideologies circulated widely in Latin Christian Europe.

These shared group religious beliefs that the short-term crusaders arrived with in the Levant prescribed uncompromising holy war against the Muslims. The papal calls to crusade that brought two great waves of crusaders during the second half of the twelfth century emphasized the need for holy war against the enemies of Christians, and protection of the holy places. In the bull Quantum praedecessores (1 March 1146) Pope Eugenius III (1145-53) called for the Second Crusade. In response to the capture of Edessa in 1144, Eugenius spoke of how his listeners’ fathers in the First Crusade had wrested the holy places of Christ from the hands of the infidels. Now that Edessa had been captured, it was once again up to faithful believers to fight the enemies of Christ and free the Holy Land and their brothers and sisters in Christ from continued oppression.5 The message had changed little by the final months of 1187 when Pope Gregory VIII (1187) issued the bull Audita tremendi. In response to the Muslim capture of Jerusalem, Gregory called on believers to go to the East to prevent the continued profanation of holy

---

4 Asbridge, The Crusades, 11; Bar-Tal, Group Beliefs, 2.
places by the “savage barbarians.”⁶ In these bulls, Muslims were clearly defined as the enemy ‘other,’ and such messages allowed little room for the possibility of convergent accommodation.

Nevertheless, religious beliefs were not the only consideration that informed the actions of the crusaders once in the East. While the participants of the Second and Third Crusade found themselves in the Levant generally for less than two years, even their relatively short exposure to Muslims in the Levant changed the beliefs and attitudes they arrived with.⁷ Crusaders individually possessed multiple group identities and beliefs, which sometimes took precedence over religious ideology, something encouraged by contact with Muslims. Thus we sometimes find Latin Christians, including crusaders, members of the military orders, and settlers, allying themselves with Muslims against other Christians.⁸ Warfare, while intensifying differences in some ways, also bred respect for the prowess of the enemy. Christian elites found kinship with Muslim elites in sharing similar codes of codes of honour, both on and off the battlefield. The realities of warfare and daily existence in the Levant also shifted and challenged the crusaders’ priorities and behaviours, encouraging diplomatic negotiation, rather than fighting, which could lead to convergent accommodation, such as truces, shared gestural language, and respect and

⁷ In the Second Crusade the French and Germans arrived in the Levant in the spring of 1148 and Conrad’s army departed in September 1148 while Louis’ forces returned in the spring of 1149. For the Third Crusade, Philip arrived in April of 1191 and Richard in June of the same year. Philip decided to leave shortly after the conclusion of the siege of Acre in early August of 1191, while about half of his army remained. Richard returned to England October of 1192.
even friendship for their opponents.\textsuperscript{9} Capture or exchanges of hostages could create situations where Muslims and Latin Christians became more familiar with each other. On rare occasions, members of each faith converted to the faith of the ‘other,’ though this was generally more due to circumstance, rather than through true conviction. The prescriptive beliefs with which the crusaders arrived in the East did not always remain central to their identity, and with the lessening of these beliefs, and the formation of other group identities, convergent accommodation became possible.

The most common forms of contact between crusaders and Muslims described in the sources are military interactions, such as sieges, raids, and, more rarely, battles. As this suggests, the group identity provided by religious convictions remained strong within the crusader community, and tended to lead to a strengthening of divergent accommodation, the unique identity of the crusaders apart from the Muslims, in a continued commitment to, and pursuit of, holy war.\textsuperscript{10}

The realities of war and life in the Levant, however, as well as competing pressures from other identities and their attendant beliefs, particularly that of chivalry, sometimes meant that groups of crusaders chose not to go to war with Muslims, or found ways to mitigate the effects of war. These practices often gave the armies the ability to avoid bloodshed and negotiate with Muslims over contested ground.\textsuperscript{11} The prescriptive beliefs of both


Christianity and Islam did not ultimately allow for a permanent cessation of hostilities, but some temporary or limited concessions from both side allowed the armies to avoid risking large losses of life and to survive to be able to fight later on.  

War between crusaders and Muslims presented itself in different forms, some of which provided little contact beyond the strictly violent, whereas others allowed for a certain amount of non-violent contact, and challenged the primacy of the group commitment to holy war. Three major forms of combat were present in the crusades: direct pitched battles, raids and sieges. Pitched battles and raids were inherently violent, and lacked broader contact with Muslims. Pitched battles were relatively uncommon, as they were risky and could lead to great loss for an army, as can be seen in the slaughter of the Christian army at Hattin in 1187. Because of this risk, pitched battles were avoided if other options were available. Raids were far more common. These were quick forays into enemy territory, with limited objectives. These objectives could include seizing caravans, capturing castles, or stealing supplies from an enemy camp. These could be part of a larger venture, or could be retaliation for a previous action by the enemy. Out of these raids the aggressors would hopefully gain captives or booty. These forms of military engagement did not generally last any great length of time or include extensive

---

contact between enemies, except through the taking of prisoners, which will be discussed below, although they could lead to greater respect for the military prowess of the enemy.

Sieges, on the other hand, a very common form of military engagement, led to far greater contact between enemies, for they could become prolonged encounters, often with extensive negotiations conducted by diplomats or envoys between the defenders and besiegers throughout. Such negotiations could result in the reduction or even rejection of holy war to further other objectives such as the protection of the combatants or a leader’s return to Europe. Sieges could last for as little as a few days or, as in the case of the siege of Acre during the Third Crusade, almost two years.\footnote{For examples see Ibn al-Athir, \textit{The Chronicle}, vol. 2, 339, 346, 348, 354-5; Baha’ al-Din, \textit{The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin}, 91, 161-2; Nicholson, \textit{The Chronicle of the Third Crusade}, 45, 67, 218-22; Edbury, \textit{The Conquest of Jerusalem}, 50; William of Tyre, \textit{A History of Deeds Done}, vol. 2, 184-92; 217-23. The siege of Acre lasted from 28 August 1189 to 12 July 1191.} During these encounters sometimes the crusaders’ responses to Muslim enemies were dictated more by on-the-ground military concerns, than prescriptive religious beliefs. If the army was unable to outlast a siege because of a lack of manpower or resources, which would lead to eventual starvation, and if no external aid was coming, instead of fighting to the death in a holy war as the papacy called on them to do, they would attempt to negotiate a surrender with the enemy. While they were committed to the defence of the Holy Land, if the crusaders were the besieged, they often chose to protect the bulk of the army and save the lives of the non-military inhabitants of cities, rather than to die in the name of Christ. If they were the besiegers they also appear to have been willing to negotiate the lives and sometimes
the possessions of the Muslim inhabitants of cities to gain control of more land and strongholds.\textsuperscript{16} Holy war was not fought to the exclusion of all other considerations.

The response of the crusaders to Muslims, fighting in holy war, was, by definition, divergent accommodation, and in many cases the response of the crusaders to Muslims was solely divergent. However, even in warfare crusaders did sometimes engage in convergent accommodation. One way sieges and other forms of conflict did lead to a convergent change in attitude between Latin Christians and Muslims was through the observation of elite warriors as they fought in close proximity. Through this contact on the battlefield there developed an admiration for the skills of elite enemies. This contact challenged some of the stereotypes the crusaders arrived with in the East and led to individually convergent attitudes.\textsuperscript{17} In these cases, the faith of the enemy came second to their skill in battle. The author of the \textit{Itinerarium Peregrinorum} had great admiration for some of the warriors of the Turkish force holding Acre during the Third Crusade. In part, facing a skilled enemy, a worthy adversary, helped explain the suffering the crusaders faced. The author of the \textit{Itinerarium Peregrinorum} speaks of a Turkish knight killed in battle, “He was a very daring and extremely doughty man of renowned name. He was said to have been of such great strength that no one would ever be strong enough to throw


him off his horse, in fact they would not even dare to attack him.” Ambroise likewise records respect for an emir who led his men against the Christians during the siege of Acre, “Among them came an emir, a great man of high degree, by the name of Bellegemin; he was valiant, bold and of great renown.” While these writers acknowledged the enemy status of their opponents, their skills and prowess rendered them worthy of respect, and challenged the primacy of the writers’ Christian group identity and their distaste for those who did not possess the same faith.

An important underlying reason behind the respect for the military skills of elite enemies was their participation in and acceptance of similar codes of honour and military prowess, known to European Christians as chivalry. While the crusaders’ religious beliefs dictated a view of Muslims as enemies, chivalric group values fostered an admiration of other elite warriors for their skills and virtues of character, regardless of their faith. In the twelfth century knighthood was associated with elite social status and a code of behaviour and manners that was shared by knights and nobles. This created a group identity separate from other warriors. This system of chivalry developed into a group identity based on a chivalric lifestyle, incorporating not only skill on the battlefield, but a whole moral and behavioural code to underpin it. As Margaret Jubb explains, chivalric group identity

“went beyond military prowess and valour to include loyalty, courtesy, and generosity.”

The elite crusaders came to value and respect the ‘civilised’ aristocratic nature of a knight, regardless of his faith, and this included a worthy opponent. For elite crusaders, this identity of chivalry meant knights could, and did, develop a respect for their Muslim opponents, despite their religion.

The group beliefs of chivalric knighthood were greatly influenced and supported by literature, in particular *chansons de geste* and romances. These forms of literature were written for the laity, and in the case of literature about the crusades, could serve as propaganda to encourage warriors to take up the cross and go on crusade. These works presented an ideal of knighthood, praising knights for their chivalric qualities, such as bravery, courage, largesse, etc. These works encouraged respect and admiration for knights, including Muslims, who upheld the chivalric ideal, regardless of their faith.

While Muslims in general were presented as possessing a hideous appearance, providing a visual signifier of their exclusion from the Christian fold, knights who were presented as members of the chivalric group were described as possessing an attractive appearance, similar to Christian knights. For example, Ambroise’s *Estoire* presents al-´Adil (al-´Adil Sayf al-Din Abu Bakr ibn Ayyub, 1145-1218), Salah al-Din’s brother (Saphadin in

---

western literature), as bold, noble, generous, courteous and like a brother to Richard.  

_The Song of Roland_, the written version of which is dated sometime around or shortly after the First Crusade, speaks of an emir as possessing a noble form with eyes that are “bold and clear. When on his horse he’s mounted in career/He bears him bravely armed in his battle gear,/And for his courage he’s famous far and near.” In chivalric literature, Muslim elites were presented as belonging to the same group as Christian knights, though they fought on opposing sides. When a western knight and a Muslim met in single combat, it was not their religious persuasion, but rather their noble lineage and chivalric values that made them worthy competitors.

As elite Muslims came into contact with elite Christian warriors, they too developed a respect for worthy opponents that challenged their religious beliefs, as they possessed moral and behavioural codes in some respects similar to that of Christian chivalry, and this led to convergent accommodation. While Muslims often considered Christians inferior to them in general, they found some exceptions in Frankish knights. The warrior Usamah ibn Munqidh (4 July 1095-15 November 1188) had little respect for the Frankish people in general, but he held Christian knights in great esteem. He writes, “The Franks (may God confound them) have none of the human virtues except courage. They

---


29 Daniel, _Heroes and Saracens_, 35, 37.

have neither precedence nor high rank except that of the knights, and they have no men 
worthy of the name except knights – it is they who are the masters of legal reasoning, 
judgment and sentencing.”31 There are some limits to how far this respect stretches for 
Usamah, for he refuses to send his son with a Christian friend, a knight of King Fulk, 
who wants to teach the boy chivalry in Europe.32 In Muslim sources, the most glowing 
praise of an enemy warrior was given to King Richard. Salah al-Din’s chronicler, Baha’ 
al-Din wrote of Richard being a powerful warrior, who fought his battles with great 
bravery and fearlessness, and possessed extensive experience.33 Ibn al-Athir similarly 
praised the English king. He saw the Muslims facing a disaster in Richard for he was an 
unusually skilled knight full of courage and bravery, as well as being able to endure 
throughout a battle.34 While the overall opinion of Muslims about crusaders remained that 
they were inferior to Muslims and were enemies who needed to be fought, individual 
knights who possessed the skill and the character traits of knights were to be respected.

While chivalry provided a competing identity that encouraged convergent 
accommodation, there were limits to such accommodation. While Christian knights could 
hold great respect for the military skill and personal qualities of Muslim elites, those 
qualities did not overcome a supposed inferiority based on a lack of shared religious 
beliefs.35 The group identity provided by religion was ultimately prioritized over chivalry 
in most cases, and ultimately limited the accommodation that was possible between the

31 Translated in Usama Ibn Munqidh, The Book of Contemplation, 76.
32 Usama Ibn Munqidh, The Book of Contemplation, 144.
33 Baha’ al-Din, The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin, 146.
“Knowing the Enemy,” 381.
groups. Contemporary writers, of both chronicles and chivalric literature, suggested that while Muslim knights possessed many noble qualities, they could never truly belong to the Christian knighthood until they shared the same faith. In a typical passage in the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, in discussing the Turkish troops who were guarding the city of Acre during the siege, the author laments, “They certainly ought to be admired for their valour in war and their integrity. If only they held the right faith, there would be none better – according to human reasoning that is.” The *Chanson d’Antioche* similarly both lauded the Turkish commander’s son Sansadoine and regretted his lack of Christian faith, saying, “Sansadoine swung proudly into the saddle. He was an exceptional specimen: had he been a Christian he could have inflicted serious damage on ten Turks by his charge on the battlefield.” While their chivalric qualities made them respected, they could never be embraced into the Christian knighthood.

While Salah al-Din and Richard never met in person, Salah al-Din’s brother al-`Adil and Richard forged a close bond, though one that retained limits. Al-`Adil often served as an envoy between the two leaders, and through that contact experienced a convergence of shared military and moral attitudes and behaviour towards Richard, forging a close bond

---

39 Asbridge, “Talking to the Enemy,” 279; Baha’ al-Din, *The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin*, 193. Though Richard requested meetings, Saladin refused, for he felt it would be disgraceful to continue to be at war with someone with whom he had shared a meal. He promised Richard a meeting once they had come to a settlement, but this never came to pass.
with him, and eventually even calling him ‘brother.’ Richard of Devizes (fl. 1191) speaks of al-`Adil as, “A man of long military experience, very polished and wise, whom the king’s magnanimity and munificence had won over to his friendship and to favouring his side.” This mutual esteem could be seen not just in diplomatic encounters, but also on the battlefield. The *Itinerarium Peregrinorum* recounts that during fierce fighting at the battle of Jaffa Richard’s horse fell. When al-`Adil became aware of this, he sent a retainer with two horses to Richard in the midst of battle, “in recognition of his noted prowess.” In the relationship between these warriors, the tension between the group identities provided by religious beliefs and chivalry can be seen. These warriors held one another in high esteem, and, despite religious differences, Richard and al-`Adil formed a close bond based on mutual admiration of one another’s military and moral attributes. However, their religious group identities generally remained more central to their overall decisions and place within the Levant and prescribed that they ultimately remain enemies, despite their bond.

Some of the greatest degree of contact, as well as convergent accommodation, between crusaders and Muslims occurred through diplomatic exchanges, participated in by crusade leaders or through the diplomats and envoys that travelled between them to negotiate treaties and truces. The crusaders were separated from the Muslims they fought

---

by language, religion, and social, political and intellectual culture. Behavioural and linguistic accommodation was used to overcome these many differences, with the development of a shared system of gestures and practices to communicate effectively.\textsuperscript{44} For short-term crusaders, overcoming this communication barrier meant employing indigenous inhabitants or longer term residents who were bilingual to communicate with Muslims, as well as developing certain shared gestures, such as the giving of gifts during negotiations, to create productive diplomatic conduct.\textsuperscript{45}

A basic barrier to any productive communication and accommodation that needed to be overcome was the issue of language. As many of the crusader nobility in the kingdom of Jerusalem were French, French was the dominant language among the elites, with Latin being used for legal and ecclesiastical matters. In the county of Tripoli, Provençal was used, while in the principality of Antioch, a Norman dialect was favoured. Other vernaculars were also used by common soldiers.\textsuperscript{46} Arabic was the common language used by Muslims, including non-Arabic Muslims such as Kurds, Seljuks or Turks, who spoke Arabic in addition to their own languages.\textsuperscript{47} To address the communication and accommodation barrier the lack of a shared language posed to crusaders and Muslims, the short term crusaders looked to those who would have a greater knowledge and understanding of their enemies. This might include Frankish settlers who had learned

\textsuperscript{44} Friedman, “Gestures of Conciliation,” 31-2; Giles, Coupland, and Coupland, “Accommodation Theory,” 2, 18.


native languages and customs or native Christians, Armenian and Muslim converts. In addition, as will be seen later, captives and hostages might also serve as translators. These groups were able not only to speak a number of languages, but also to comprehend the subtleties of the religious beliefs and cultural practices of both parties.\(^{48}\) At this time it was acceptable for diplomatic engagements to be carried out through the use of a trusted interpreter (dragoman), or an elite who was capable of interpretation.\(^{49}\) During the Third Crusade, as the crusader army was marching towards Ascalon, al-`Adil, the sultan’s brother, was sent to King Richard to negotiate for potential peace. The Frankish nobleman Humfrey of Toron served as a trusted interpreter between the two.\(^{50}\) At the end of the Third Crusade King Richard wanted to return home to Europe, as the political situation there had become volatile. Richard faced competing demands from his identity as a political ruler in Europe and as a leader of the crusades in the Holy Land. His obligation to his European polity proved greater than his need to continue crusading, and he chose to return to Europe. To do so he needed to ensure that the crusader states would be protected when he left. He turned to Salah al-Din to negotiate a peace agreement so he could go home. Humfrey served as the interpreter in these negotiations as well.\(^{51}\) Such interpreters became crucial to a shared diplomatic communication between crusade leaders and Muslims, valued for their ability to speak Arabic fluently and their abilities to


\(^{50}\) Baha’ al-Din, *The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin*, 173.

\(^{51}\) Baha’ al-Din, *The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin*, 193-5. For other examples on the use of interpreters between crusaders and Muslims see Nicholson, *The Chronicle of the Third Crusade*, 219; Baha’ al-Din, *The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin*, 37, 145, 148.
work within the political, religious and social culture of those with whom they were negotiating.\textsuperscript{52}

The giving of gifts was another accommodative gesture that had to be adapted during the crusades.\textsuperscript{53} While both Christians and Muslims attached great significance to the giving of gifts, the implied meaning differed greatly, and both sides had to accommodate and come to an agreed understanding as to what it would mean in the context of the crusades, creating new norms. For Muslim rulers, to send a gift to an enemy was a way to request the opening of diplomatic negotiations. For European rulers, the giving of a gift was used to signify the conclusion of a treaty with a vassal.\textsuperscript{54} One similar factor for both was that gifts were given in relation to hierarchy with the superior, more powerful party sending gifts to the lesser.\textsuperscript{55} The giving of gifts for elites of both sides highlighted their generosity, a key chivalric quality.

King Richard was the ruler during the Third Crusade who proved most adept at convergent accommodation and negotiating gift giving with enemy rulers, a trait that would bring him criticism from his army, who did not all understand the cultural meanings underlying such exchanges as Richard did. The Christian army believed


\textsuperscript{53} Friedman, “Gestures of Conciliation,” 35-6, 39-46; Giles, Coupland, and Coupland, “Accommodation Theory,” 7, 12. More examples of accommodative gestures used in diplomacy will be discussed in Chapter Four.


Richard was being tricked by Salah al-Din and his brother al-`Adil when they sent gifts to him to initiate negotiations that would allow Richard to return to England at the end of the Third Crusade. However, Yvonne Friedman rightly argues that in fact Richard was showing a sense of acculturation in accommodating to the Muslim convention of gift giving to open negotiations, and was aware of the offence his rejection of gifts would cause. He knew that accepting gifts was the way into further negotiations. Generosity was a prized value within the chivalric system and this would have added to Richard’s appreciation of such a gesture. By the Third Crusade, western leaders were coming to realize the importance of accommodating to the system of gestures and customs that had been adapted over the previous century by the crusaders and Franks in the East and their Muslim neighbours.

While sieges offered a chance for greater contact between Latin Christians and Muslims, they did not always generate greater trust or understanding between parties, and chivalric principles were certainly not always followed. After an almost two year siege against the Muslim inhabitants of the city of Acre (28 August 1189 to 12 July 1191), terms were eventually reached by which the Franks would receive the city’s equipment, ships, 200,000 dinars as well as 1,500 common prisoners, 100 specified prisoners of higher ranks and the return of the Holy Cross. In exchange it was agreed the Muslim inhabitants

56 “For Saphadin [as Salah al-Din’s brother al-`Adil was known to Western writers] so deceived the king that he accepted his gifts. Messengers came and went, bringing these gifts to the king, for which he was much blamed and much criticised. However, Saphadin gave him to understand that he truly wanted peace.” Ambroise, Estoire de la Guerre Sainte, vol. 2, 132. “Mais Saffadins lui fist entendre,/Qu[ë] il voleit a la pais tender/E lis reis tost la pais preïst/Qui honoree lui feïst/Por eschaucier nostre creance,/E por ço que li reis de France/S[en] iert alé don’t il to dote, Qu’il saveit qu’il ne l’ameit gute.” Ambroise, Estoire de la Guerre Sainte, vol. 1, 120.

would be allowed to leave in safety, taking with them their wives, children, and wealth.\textsuperscript{58} When Salah al-Din delayed in fulfilling his end of the terms, Richard, who was leading the siege, executed 2,700 Muslim captives he was holding hostage until the terms of the surrender were completed.\textsuperscript{59} Though Richard often was more willing to engage in negotiations with Muslims than some of his other crusader comrades, he was only willing to extend his trust so far. He never forgot that Salah al-Din, despite his chivalric virtues, remained an enemy to be feared.\textsuperscript{60}

One of the ways the crusaders dealt with sieges, and other military engagements, with the enemy was through truces. Truces could be entered into for a number of reasons, including facilitating surrenders, to unite groups of different faiths against a common threat, or because it was the best option open.\textsuperscript{61} While the crusaders were willing to negotiate in the case of sieges, in general they were far more reluctant to negotiate larger periods of peace than were settlers in the crusaders states. As will be discussed in Chapter Four, the settlers appear to have been more willing to enter into treaties with enemies, or even on occasion, ally with Muslim groups if the political necessity arose.\textsuperscript{62} The crusaders of the Second Crusade believed they had been betrayed by the Franks when the Franks entered into a treaty with the Atabeg of Damascus, Unur, to assist in driving Zengi


\textsuperscript{60} Asbridge, \textit{The Crusades}, 450-55; Phillips, \textit{Holy Warriors}, 153. Richard was criticized for this slaughter by Christian chroniclers, as he had failed to live up to the treaty agreement.

\textsuperscript{61} Omran, “Truces between Moslems and Crusaders,” 426-34.

\textsuperscript{62} Riley-Smith, “Peace Never Established,” 99.
back from his attack on the city.\(^{63}\) When the siege failed the crusaders blamed the Franks whom they believed had acted treacherously by fraternising with the enemy.\(^{64}\) In such cases, short term crusaders showed much more commitment to the prescriptive ideology associated with the crusades, than did the settlers whose identities were as permanent residents, and who possessed a greater familiarity with the enemy, making them more willing to reach accommodations.

While it was mostly the crusader states that negotiated longer peaces, some examples of short term crusaders negotiating peace can be found. One of the most significant, and for them successful, truces the crusaders took part in during the Third Crusade was the above-mentioned siege of Acre. The crusaders also sought a truce with Salah al-Din when he attacked the city of Jaffa, then held by the crusaders. When the sultan put the city under siege, the patriarch in the city sought a safe conduct to negotiate a surrender. The sultan and the crusaders arranged that they would be given a day’s reprieve to await any coming aid and, if that failed, they would pay a ransom (the same that had been offered at Jerusalem in 1187) to free themselves.\(^{65}\) The crusaders sought to protect their army so they could make an assault on Jerusalem, the ultimate goal of the crusade. While both sides used their faith to frame their arguments, what they were willing to agree to was often necessitated by military, as well as sometimes religious, concerns.


\(^{64}\) Roger of Wendover, *Flowers of History*, vol. 1, 502.

For Muslims, while jihad had become an important, and often driving, force in military practices by the second half of the twelfth century, Islam allowed for a temporary cessation of hostilities through a treaty with enemies, called a hudna. Hudnas served as legal temporary truces which many jurists contended could be held for a maximum of ten years, the amount of time Muhammad held a truce with the Meccans. In all known cases of truces between Muslims and crusaders or Franks, according to Riley-Smith, truces lasted for less than ten years, with only a single known exception, that of King Amalric’s 1167 treaty with the Fatimids of Egypt that was to last indefinitely. These agreements were entered into for a number of purposes, including having the truce-holders fight one another’s enemies, allowing for captives to be returned in safety, as well as letting merchants travel through territories in safety. These arrangements lessened the centrality of the importance of jihad, while still maintaining the overall religious group identity of Islam.

Surrenders were often used to conclude a siege and protect the lives of the inhabitants. Such surrenders offered crusaders and Muslims opportunities to avoid unnecessary bloodshed that would damage the abilities of their armies to continue to defend their territories. Such contact did not generally lead to a deeper understanding of the ‘other,’ but it at least acknowledged that while the crusaders were declared to be in the Levant to participate in holy war, and while Muslims were reviving calls to jihad within military circles, it was not always prudent to fight or prolong sieges and risk losing large numbers.

---

67 Riley-Smith, “Peace Never Established,” 100.
of lives in the process. Both sides often found it preferable to save the lives of the faithful than to die for principles of the faith.\textsuperscript{69}

Through successful sieges, and raids of settlements or caravans, or through the intentional exchange of hostages, both civilians and soldiers could be taken captive, and this opened a whole new realm of contact, one that sometimes saw captives engaging in asymmetrical convergence to their captors by accommodating to the behaviours and beliefs of those who held them hostage.\textsuperscript{70} Once these varied people ended up in captivity, their survival was usually subject to mercenary considerations, with prisoners being kept alive only if there was a good economic or political reason for doing so.\textsuperscript{71} Prisoners who were not automatically killed were sold into slavery, used as labour, put in prison, or held to be ransomed.\textsuperscript{72} The most significant factors that decided the fate of a captive were linked: the social rank of the captives and whether they could be held for a significant ransom. Yaacov Lev suggests that one of three things was likely to happen to high ranking military captives: they might be seen as an economic boon and held for as large a ransom as captors believed could be provided, exchanged for prisoners of the side holding them captive, or treated savagely to make an example of them if they could not raise a ransom.

\textsuperscript{69} Nicholson, \textit{The Knights Templar}, 62; Friedman, “Gestures of Conciliation,” 32; Francesco Gabrieli, introduction to \textit{Arab Historians of the Crusades} (New York: Dorset Press, 1969), xvi.


\textsuperscript{71} Friedman, “Women in Captivity,” 80; Lev, “Prisoners of War,” 14, 16.

Rich merchants also were also held for a significant ransom.\footnote{Lev, “Prisoners of War,” 16.} It was the poor soldiers, who would raise very little money if held for ransom, who commonly faced enslavement or death upon being taken captive.\footnote{Lev, “Prisoners of War,” 16; Yvonne Friedman, “The Ransom of Captives in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem,” in Autour de la Premiere Croisade: Actes du Colloque de la Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East, ed. Michel Balard (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1996), 186.} Because of this, only a minimal level of trust and cooperation was accorded in negotiations between captors and those who wished to ransom prisoners. Even at the most elite levels, therefore, where respect for a fellow knight and nobleman was the most powerful challenge to the religious group identity, a lack of trust persisted between captor and captive.\footnote{Jubb, “Enemies in the Holy War,” 257-8. According to Jubb, in fictional literature of the time, treatment of captives could be more favourable. In the Itinerarium Regis Ricardi Salah al-Din is held captive by Humphrey of Toron and is knighted by his captor. In the thirteenth-century Ordène de Chevalrie, Humphrey is the captive, but his captor Salah al-Din still seeks knowledge about the Christian knighthood, its virtues, and ceremonies, but Humphrey is reluctant to supply this, because of Salah al-Din’s inferior faith. This later version was likely meant to be preached in churches, and is more clerical in its outlook.} Some captives were not taken by force, but were put in the hands of enemies as hostages. By holding hostages, captors could help guarantee that the terms of a surrender, a treaty, or a truce were carried out. Hostages could also be held for ransoms.\footnote{Dajani-Shakeel, “Some Aspects,” 197; Kedar, “The Patriarch Eraclius,” 201; Omran, “Truces between Moslems and Crusaders,” 433-4; Helen Nicholson, “The Third Crusade: A Campaign of Europe’s Elite,” in Crusades: The Illustrated History, ed. Thomas F. Madden (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2004), 97; Friedman, “Women in Captivity,” 77; Dajani-Shakeel, “Diplomatic Relations,” 213. See for example Kedar, “The Subjected Muslims,” 141; Ibn al-Athir, The Chronicle, vol. 2, 345-6.} Hostages were often nobles, and while in captivity it was expected that they would be cared for and returned to their own people unharmed once the terms of the treaty had been fulfilled. For some this was the case, but the treatment of prisoners in captivity varied greatly and did not always conform to the chivalric virtues extended to other warriors, sometimes leading
Sometimes hostages also faced outright mistreatment and cruelty. Usamah ibn Munqidh recounts a tale where a Frank named Robert FitzFulk was taken captive in a battle by Il-Ghazi and Tughdakin. Robert set his own ransom at ten thousand dinars, but Il-Ghazi sought more. He sent him to Tughdakin to scare him into paying more, but Tughdakin, who had been drinking, cut his head off with a sword before he could pay the ransom. When Joscelin II of Edessa (1131-50) was taken captive in 1150 by Turcomans, he was going to be released for a ransom. However, Nur al-Din took Joscelin from them, and blinded him and kept him captive for nine years at Aleppo until Joscelin’s death. Many elites possessed a sense of chivalric honour that mandated that captives be treated well, according to their status, particularly as fellow warriors, but enmity towards members of another faith, or personal enmity, could prevent hostages being cared for.

Some nobles were cared for, and during their captivity, which could be lengthy, sometimes years, they engaged in asymmetrical convergent accommodation towards their captors, learning to speak their language, Arabic. Through the process of learning their captors’ language, some captives came to be acquainted, in addition to Arabic, with many
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of the cultural and religious practices, beliefs, and mores of their Muslim captors. These captives subsequently sometimes even became involved in conducting diplomatic negotiations due to this learned knowledge. For example, the Muslim general Shirkuh brought Hugh of Caesarea, one of his captives, to act as an envoy in negotiations with King Amalric of Jerusalem in 1169. Such an arrangement benefitted both sides as Hugh had extensive knowledge of both parties and was able to interpret what each side wanted and was willing to give.

The ransoming of captives and hostages to release them from captivity became a value that was held by both Muslims and Christians religiously and chivalrously. The combination of these two values allowed for the development of ties of respect and understanding in the ransom of captives, and therefore, convergent accommodation. For those who shared religious ties with captives, ransoming them was believed to bring personal spiritual rewards. For Muslims, the Qur’an called for a portion of alms to be set aside for the purpose of ransoming slaves. Muslims already had a long history of ransoming with their Byzantine neighbours, and they adapted these practices to their interactions with the crusaders. Usamah ibn Munqidh spent much of his life interacting with the Franks and during periods of truce he would travel to Jerusalem where he would ransom Muslim captives from King Baldwin II (1118-31). Usamah’s family ruled the city of Shayzar and paid tribute to Baldwin. When the king was taken captive, Usamah
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84 “Zakat collections are only for the needy and the indigent, and for those who are employed to collect them and for those whose hearts are to be won over and for the ransoming of slaves and for helping the debtors and for the Way of Allah and for the hospitality of the way-farers. This is an obligatory duty from Allah: and Allah is All-Knowing, All-Wise.” Qur’an 9:60. Lev, “Prisoners of War,” 20.
used his political connections to help ransom him, keeping the king at Shayzar and later holding captive for his release while his ransom was raised. By the Second and Third Crusades, the crusaders had adopted this tradition of ransoming and saw it as both a valued spiritual exercise as well as a practical means to negotiate peace. The crusaders saw ransoming as similar to other acts of charity like giving food or clothing to the poor, and as such it was a way for them to identify themselves with Jesus Christ (see Matt. 25:36). Yet the practice of ransoming was also a way to evade holy war and attain peace. Thus, while it supported prescriptive ideology to some degree, ransoming can also be seen as a form of convergent accommodation.

Ransoming could also be seen in light of chivalric virtues. Elite captors who allowed for the ransom of captives were admired by fellow elites of the other faith, and this could lead to respective convergence in the freeing of captives. Salah al-Din’s generosity, an important chivalric quality, was well-noted, not only in Muslim sources, but also in Christian sources. When he captured Jerusalem in 1187, he reduced the ransoms he had originally demanded and allowed many of the poor to go free or pay a far smaller ransom than he had demanded, proving his virtue and generosity, and increasing his esteem among both Muslims and Christians. The Old French Continuation of William of Tyre also speaks of a group of women whose husbands had either been killed or taken captive

89 “I needed clothes and you clothed me, I was sick and you looked after me, I was in prison and you came to visit me.” Matt. 25:36 (NIV); Friedman, “Women in Captivity,” 76; Friedman, “The Ransom of Captives,” 179.
90 Hamilton, “Knowing the Enemy,” 385. For examples of Salah al-Din’s chivalric qualities in Muslim sources see Baha’ al-Din, *The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin*, 19, 36.
at Jerusalem going to Salah al-Din and begging for mercy. He took pity on them and agreed to release any of the husbands of those women who remained alive. Salah al-Din was greatly admired for his chivalric qualities, his generosity in particular, even towards certain Christians. The ransom of captives at times fostered a respect between members of both faiths, and within the chivalric community.

Another convergent form of accommodation towards captors was the conversion of captives to the faith of their captor. Women in particular were among those who converted to the faith of their captors, attested to by the Arab-Syrian gentleman Usamah ibn Munqidh. These conversions do appear at times to have been conversions based on circumstance rather than on a true change of belief, as they did not always last. Men who remained prisoners for an extended period also at times chose to convert, sometimes even for reasons of faith rather than convenience. Ibn Jubayr (Abu’l-Husayn Muhammad ibn Ahmad ibn Jubayr, 1145-1217), the secretary to the Moorish governor of Granada, went on pilgrimage to Mecca, and on his return in 1184 travelled through the crusader states, recording in a diary his impressions of the lands he journeyed through. In his writings Ibn Jubayr recalled an encounter with a Muslim who converted to Christianity after being released from a Frankish prison. Ibn Jubayr lamented how this man was seduced to turn away from the faith of Islam and become baptized, thereby making

---

92 Edbury, The Conquest of Jerusalem, 64.
himself unclean, suggesting this was not a conversion of convenience but one of true conviction.\textsuperscript{94}

The crusaders in the twelfth century generally expressed very little interest in converting the general Muslim population, and it was never the express goal of any papal summons to crusade. Nor did converts ever play a significant role in the politics or administration of the kingdom of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{95} The crusaders’ response to those belonging to the Muslim warrior elite, however, was different. The desire to bring conversion to chivalric knights was strongly evident in both chronicles and literature. A tension always existed in knights between prescriptive Christian beliefs that saw Muslims as an ‘other,’ and the respect that was engendered through chivalric identity. Through conversion Muslims would be brought into the Christian group identity and this act would legitimize the respect the crusaders held for them.\textsuperscript{96} Sometimes this desire was realized and Muslim knights did convert. The Old French Continuation of William of Tyre records during the 1187 siege of Tyre by Salah al-Din the son of one of his emirs becoming angry with his father. He came to Conrad of Monteferrat, converting to Christianity, and helped Conrad capture five of the Muslim army’s ships.\textsuperscript{97} While there were some legitimate conversions, conversions through a change in belief remained rare. Apostasy from Islam was a capital offence, so converting was a serious decision, taken most often when the alternatives

\textsuperscript{95} Kedar, \textit{Crusade and Mission}, 60, 75.
\textsuperscript{97} Edbury, \textit{The Conquest of Jerusalem}, 68; Kedar, \textit{Crusade and Mission}, 76.
were equally dire, for example to avoid death or starvation. Most converts reverted to their own faith again when it was possible. For example, at the conclusion of the siege of Acre, when crusaders took the city, they promised all Muslims who converted to Christianity would be freed. Those who were afraid they would be killed converted, but as soon as they were freed, they returned to Salah al-Din.98 Because of this, deep levels of trust did not exist between converts and those who shared their newfound faith. This fact did not decrease the desire of knights to see Muslim elites join the Christian group identity and therefore belong to two complementary groups, where they could be admired for their chivalric qualities and their religious convictions.

Salah al-Din was one of the Muslims greatly admired by the crusaders, and whom they desired to convert, but, unsurprisingly, he showed no desire to convert. In fact, many of the warriors the crusaders most admired showed no inclination to convert.99 To legitimize the respect westerners had for him, particularly in literature after his death when he no longer posed a threat, his ferocity and enmity towards the Christian world were downplayed, with focus shifting to his chivalric virtues such as his prowess in battle or his generosity.100 He was appropriated into the Western chivalric tradition and claimed as a Western hero. This involved presenting Salah al-Din as having a French bloodline.

through his mother, or having been knighted or baptized, bringing him into the Christian faith and identity. After his death, when Salah al-Din was no longer threatening the existence of the crusader states, audiences in the West became more interested in hearing of a noble knight rather than an enemy. Salah al-Din became an adoptive hero of chivalric literature. In doing so these works downplayed his ‘otherness’ and began to claim him as a Christian, as well as a chivalric warrior, merging two disparate group identities.

When the crusaders arrived in the Holy Land, one of their main driving forces was a universalist Christian identity that sought to have the crusaders fight a holy war against Muslim infidels as an act of penance, to protect fellow Christians and the Holy Land. Most crusaders had never met any Muslims before their arrival in the Levant, and their preconceptions were based on stereotypes and religiously charged ideas preached by ecclesiastics. However, when the crusaders, in particular the elite crusaders, came into contact with actual Muslims, some of their group beliefs and behaviours towards Muslims were challenged. This direct contact caused certain group beliefs of the crusaders, in particular the need to engage in constant holy war, to be reduced in importance, and allowed for limited convergent accommodation through diplomatic exchanges. Other group identities, in particular, that of chivalry among elite warriors, also encouraged a change in attitude towards Muslim fellow elite warriors, breeding a respect for military and moral values possessed by Muslims that was otherwise

impossible. However, while other group identities, in particular chivalry, challenged the primacy of religious belief for crusaders, their identity as Catholic Christians ultimately remained one of the most important group identities, and played a significant role in shaping their actions. Only through conversion, a limited occurrence, could a Muslim truly become part of the crusader community. Because of the universalist nature of the crusaders’ religious identity, their relationship with the Muslims of the Levant remained one of limited contact and accommodation.
CHAPTER THREE: MEMBERS OF THE MILITARY ORDERS

For most crusaders, the trip to the Holy Land on crusade was a relatively short term one. Crusaders came to participate in a military endeavour, and, ideally, worship at many of the holy places within the Levant. Once this was accomplished and their vows were fulfilled they returned home. Some warriors, particularly dedicated to the crusading ideal and a religious life, however, joined military orders, religious orders that committed themselves to the care and defence of fellow Christians in the East. The two orders that will be the focus of this chapter are the Hospitallers (Hospital of St John of Jerusalem) and the Templars (Knights of the Temple of Solomon of Jerusalem). Members of these orders usually served much longer tours of duty in the East than did ordinary crusaders, although they also spent periods of time at posts in Europe as well. For the military orders, the defence of the Latin East against Muslim enemies became long term occupations.\(^1\) Members of the military orders shared a group identity with the crusaders as members of Christendom who embraced the value of crusading, but their identity as members of military-religious orders and their longer experience in the East made their attitudes and behaviours towards the Muslims of the Levant somewhat different from those of the crusaders, and resulted in a greater degree of both divergent and convergent accommodation.\(^2\)

---


The military orders combined monasticism and knighthood with both warfare and charitable acts expressing members’ devotion to a religious life. These two distinct aspects could lead to contradictions in the lives of the brethren, particularly in the case of the Hospitallers, and led to a continual balancing of priorities, which also led to a variety of both convergent and divergent accommodation with Muslims. Fundamental to the identity of both groups by the 1140s was military opposition to the Muslims, although the Hospitallers initially were not a military order. As this suggests, the military identity of the orders intensified over time, reflecting divergent accommodation. Between the 1150s and 1190s, the orders were integral to many significant campaigns against the Muslims, and gained the reputation among Muslims of being their most dangerous opponents. Nevertheless, the long service of members in the East and their extensive knowledge of the intricacies of political and military matters meant that their leaders were frequently chosen to serve as intermediaries in diplomatic situations between Christians and Muslims, encouraging a high degree of contact. This knowledge and the fact that the orders’ primary residences were in the Levant made them more inclined to accept the advantages of certain forms of convergent accommodation, such as negotiations and peace treaties. An important factor in the identity of the members of the orders was their residence in the Levant, which meant they routinely had contact with Muslims, not only elites, but also the peasants and slaves who worked on their estates. This familiarity led to various forms of convergent accommodation, such as friendly relations with individual
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Muslims, and the sharing of religious sites that had meaning to both faiths. Additionally, the Hospitallers regularly came into contact with Muslim patients and doctors in medical facilities, something that led to the adoption of some Muslim practices and ideas. Despite these varied levels and types of contact, brothers did not generally engage in a deeper intellectual exchange with Muslims, except, to a limited extent, through the medical profession. The members of the military orders, despite their often fierce response to Muslim armies, did engage in more convergent accommodation than the crusaders. However, their religious convictions, and the fact that only certain members remained permanently in the East, meant that fighting holy wars against Muslims remained relatively central to their identity, and they were less inclined towards convergent accommodation than the permanent settlers.

Modern scholarly interest in the military orders began in the 1950s with Jonathan Riley-Smith’s volume on the Hospitallers in Jerusalem and with the work of Jean Richard and Joshua Prawer on the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem. These works highlighted the role of the military orders in the protection of the Levant and the role they played in the daily life of the crusader states. In the last thirty years, interest in the military orders has flourished among historians. This has been fuelled by the growth of the study of crusading, with the

---

identity of the members of the military orders. Similarly, the role of the Hospitallers as medical practitioners and the type of care they provided in the East also has recently attracted scholarly interest, making it clear how regular interaction with Muslims was in this context.\(^{13}\)

While such studies provide an important foundation for this chapter, the precise nature of the relationship forged between members of the military orders and their Muslim enemies and subjects in the Levant has been accorded only limited attention in modern research. Nevertheless, several historians have examined the forms of contact between the members and Muslims, including their military and diplomatic encounters, their medical interactions, their contact through religious sites and ceremonies, and their settlement of the Levant and connections to Muslim peasants and slaves on their estates.\(^{14}\) While these studies provide important insights into contacts between the military orders and Muslims, and will be discussed in the relevant sections of this chapter, the current study deepens the analysis by discussing such contacts in the broader context of the identity of Latin Christians in the East and the way in which that identity affected the types of contact and the amount of accommodation with Muslims. As this chapter will suggest, their group


identity as members of religious-military orders provided warriors with an ideology that made them some of the fiercest military opponents of the Muslims. The permanent status of their organizations in the East, and more extensive non-military contacts with Muslims, however, led to more instances of convergent accommodation than between Muslims and crusaders.  

The focus of this chapter is often on the collective actions of the military orders as a group, rather than on individuals, although individual elite members are discussed when possible. This is a consequence of the institutional nature of many of the available sources. Chronicles recorded the military and diplomatic activities of the military orders, but most often focused on the action of the orders as a whole along with the Christian army, rather than on specific individuals, though the role of the master is often highlighted. The statutes and rules that governed the running and administration of the orders reveal prescriptive expectations, but not individual realities. Some letters written by leaders of the orders, often masters, to the West have survived, providing some information about individual elite members, but overall little personal writing by
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members survives.\textsuperscript{18} This, in part, is because the orders emphasized the community, and it was against the nature of the orders to single out individual members’ actions.\textsuperscript{19} The surviving records of the orders also tend to be focused on institutional, rather than individual matters.\textsuperscript{20} Because of these restrictions, therefore, this chapter will focus on the role of members as a whole within the order, as well as the function of specific positions within the orders, and the way these positions influenced the interactions between members of the military orders and surrounding Muslim enemies.

A fundamental role for both the Templars and Hospitallers in the period between the 1150s and 1190s was military protection of the Holy Land against Muslims. They played an active and often leading role in most military conflicts during this period and were among the Muslims’ most feared opponents. This was not the original function of either group, and their evolution in this direction, particularly in the case of the Hospitallers, should be seen as a significant example of divergent accommodation.\textsuperscript{21} As will be discussed in the next chapter, the permanent Frankish population of the crusader states was always relatively small and the number of short-term crusaders usually inadequate to deal with the continual threat posed by surrounding Muslim states.\textsuperscript{22} The transformation

\textsuperscript{18} For numerous examples of letters written by military order members see Barber and Bate, \textit{Letters from the East,} 47-87.

\textsuperscript{19} Nicholson, \textit{The Knights Templar,} 512.


\textsuperscript{22} The settlers were always a minority. At their height, their numbers were approximately equal to a third of the indigenous inhabitants of the crusader states. In the 1180s it is estimated the Frankish population measured around 100,000-140,000 while the subject population numbered somewhere in the range of 300,000-360,000. Kedar, “The Subjected Muslims,” 148; Ronnie Ellenblum, \textit{Frankish Rural Settlement in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem} (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 31; Riley-Smith, \textit{The Crusades: A Short History,} 51.
of these orders into organizations dedicated to protecting the crusader states from Muslims reflects this pressing problem, as well as the orders’ adherence to the prescriptive ideology associated with their identity as members of Christendom.

Military opposition to the Muslims formed part of the collective identity of the Templars from the start. Around 1119 Hugh of Payns formed the order specifically to protect Christian pilgrims travelling to and from Jerusalem against Muslim attacks and raids.23 The Church expanded this mandate to the protection of all Christians in the Holy Land when Pope Innocent II (1130-43) issued the bull *Omne datum optimum*, in which he called on the Templar brothers to commit themselves to the protection and defence of the Church itself from all who came against it.24 In 1149 the brothers of the order took on official protection of the kingdom of Jerusalem and were given control of the castle at Gaza to keep watch on the Muslim-controlled city of Ascalon, a city which served as a gateway to Egypt and was a weak point in the protection of the crusader states.25 The group identity of the original brethren of the Temple was based on a coming together of monastic, religious life, and knighthood, based on a belief in the necessity and virtuousness of living an active spiritual life, by providing fellow Christians in the Holy

---


Land with protection from the Muslim infidel. In his work *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, the preacher Bernard of Clairvaux saw the Templars as *militia*, fighting for God, whereas secular knights were *malitia*, driven by earthly desires. They viewed their role in the East as a defensive one. Whereas most religious orders demanded that members abandon their military activities, the order provided a way for laymen to use their military skills in legitimized warfare against the Muslims, while continuing to embrace many of the other aspects of monastic life, such as prayer, obedience, chastity, and personal poverty. Therefore, both fighting the Muslims and the elements of a monastic life, such as prayer, and following monastic hours, were integral to their identity and sources suggest that members took the vows of the order seriously and followed the Rule and statutes of their order closely in the twelfth century at least.

The original identity of the Hospitallers was, like that of the Templars, rooted in Christian faith and monastic values, but, in contrast to the Templars, they initially had no association with violence and military activity, though they gradually took on a military role in the Holy Land. As a result, their relationship with Muslims was always more ambiguous than that of the Templars. The original Hospitallers were Amalfitan merchants who started a hospice in 1071 with the permission of the Fatimid caliphate at
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29 Nicholson, *The Knights Templar*, 138, 140; Forey, “the Military Orders, 1120-1312,” 213-16. The orders were not always regarded as following a spiritual and monastic life. In 1307 the Templars in France were arrested by Philip IV, who claimed the Templars had violated their calling. Pope Clement V extended the call to all Western rulers to arrest the Templars and take possession of all their estates. During their trial it was claimed that recruits were forced upon initiation to deny Christ, that the brothers worshipped idols, and that homosexuality was encouraged. For summarized list of charges against the Templars see Nicholson, *The Templars*, 206.
the church of St Mary of the Latins in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{31} In addition to providing a place for fellow merchants to stay, the Amalfitans took in destitute pilgrims and fed and cared for them.\textsuperscript{32} After the First Crusade and Latin Christian take-over of Jerusalem, the hospice came under the rule of the canons of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the Hospitallers were established. The first master Raymond du Puy (1129-60) instituted a Rule, based on the Augustinian Rule, which laid out the running of the monastic order.\textsuperscript{33} Instituted in the first Rule, and reaffirmed in the statutes of Roger des Moulins (1177-87), the brothers were to care for all poor with “zeal and devotion” as if they were lords.\textsuperscript{34} This commandment extended to all religions, including Muslims and Jews, for, as Acts 10:34 said, “God is not a respecter of persons” and wishes “no one to perish.”\textsuperscript{35} The brothers of the Hospital also hired Muslim physicians, along with Christian ones, respecting their medical skills.\textsuperscript{36} It was only after the foundation of the Templars that brothers of the Hospital gradually extended their order’s involvement in the East to include military opposition to Muslims.\textsuperscript{37} By the Second Crusade, like the brothers of the Temple, the members of the Hospital committed themselves to the hiring of men to escort and protect pilgrims from Muslim raids, and by the 1140s they were involved in
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protecting the Holy Land from surrounding Muslim powers, working both with the rulers of the crusader states, and independently.\(^{38}\) The Hospitallers, in their gradual transformation into an order dedicated to the military defence of the Holy Land against Muslims, provide a striking example of divergent accommodation. Yet, their original identity as carers for the needy, regardless of religion, persisted, resulting ultimately, as will be argued later in this chapter, in a considerable degree of convergent accommodation.\(^{39}\)

The military orders were international organizations that recruited from across Western Christendom, with many recruits originating in France, mostly from the lesser nobility, merchant classes, craftsmen, agriculturalists, and free peasants, rather than from the high nobility.\(^{40}\) Because those who joined the orders came from across Europe, and from a variety of professions, they possessed many different individual and group identities. However, upon joining the orders, they received a new, overarching group identity, that of a member of a religious-military order, dedicated to fighting for the protection of the Holy Land from Muslim enemies. All professed brethren, like most other religious orders, took religious vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. But, unlike most other

---


religious orders, their identity was tied to combat, rather than contemplation.\footnote{Licence, “The Military Orders as Monastic Orders,” 46; Barber, “The Social Context of the Templars,” 41; Upton-Ward, \textit{The Primitive Rule of the Templars}, 22, 34-5; Forey, “The Emergence of the Military Order,” 179.} Brothers who were engaged in combat were either knights, skilled soldiers who fought on horseback, or sergeants, soldiers who had less skill and heavy armour, and who had not been knighted. In addition to professed brothers, the orders also accepted temporary members who supported the goals and needs of the orders, including crusaders would join the orders’ field armies, as well as associates who did not take full membership.\footnote{Nicholson, \textit{The Knights Templar}, 124; Forey, \textit{The Military Orders}, 55; Riley-Smith, \textit{The Knights of St. John in Jerusalem}, 230, 243-4.} Others served with the orders as penance. For example, the two men who murdered Thomas Becket were sent to serve with the Templars for 14 years.\footnote{Forey, \textit{The Military Orders}, 56.} While members joined the orders for a number of reasons, and from wide geographical areas, the common goals and religious structure provided a shared group identity that separated them from other Christians in the East and would come to influence their interactions with Muslims and the level of accommodation they engaged in.

The length of time members of the military orders spent in the East could vary greatly, but members of the order in general, and their leaders in particular, usually served longer periods in the East than the short-term crusaders, and thus were more aware of the political and social conditions of the East. This heightened knowledge often led them to more extensive contact with Muslims, and encouraged them to engage in more convergent accommodation as well. Members of the military orders were generally sent
to the East almost immediately after recruitment if they were militarily skilled. For most brethren their service in the Levant was not permanent, and many brothers later in their careers returned to Europe to work in the commanderies that produced the goods and finances needed to supply the orders in the Holy Land. According to the depositions of Templars when the order was put on trial starting in 1307, the average length of service was 14.6 years, with times of service ranging from less than a month, to over 45 years. Many senior members of the central convent of the Hospital before 1291 had spent their careers going between posts in the East and the West, but had been members of the order for over 20 years. The orders were usually led at the highest level by those most familiar with the realities of the life the East, although lesser officials like bailiffs (administrators) might serve shorter terms, at the beginning of their careers. The master of each order was elected for life.

The long-term service of the masters and other leaders was important in providing an understanding to the orders of the political and military situation in the East, and making them more open to accommodation with Muslims than short-term crusaders. Both orders were overseen by a master who was in charge of the administration of the order, as well
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47 Nicholson, “Myths and Reality,” 96; Riley-Smith, Templars and Hospitallers as Professed Religious, 54.

as its military exploits. The master served many functions within the order. He was the military leader of the orders, leading the brothers in battle, as well as overseeing the daily running of the convents, along with the bailiffs. He was also the orders’ spiritual leader. In addition, the master was the person who served as the representative of the order to the outside world. This last function was particularly important to the relationship of the order with both the Christian rulers of the Latin states as well as surrounding Muslim powers. The masters of the military orders often worked with the kings of Jerusalem, advising them on their military policies with Muslims. At least three of the masters of the Temple are known to have served as royal ministers before joining the order. The masters also played a crucial role in diplomacy between the orders or other Christians, and the Muslims of the East. It was often the masters who were responsible for negotiating with Muslims, either on behalf of the order, or for the rulers of the Latin states. The masters, along with certain other officials, provided continuity to the orders, as they served for long periods of time, and came to be acutely aware of the nature of politics and social life within the Levant among the various peoples who lived there. This continuity led to deeper relationships with Muslims, and at times to deeper convergent accommodation than that found among the short-term crusaders, though military protection of the crusader states remained important to the orders throughout.

51 Nicholson, *The Templars*, 69. These masters were Philip de Milly, Odo de St. Amand and Gerard de Ridefort.
By the 1140s, the identity of the Templars and to some degree the Hospitallers centred on a belief in the sacredness of the Holy Land and the necessity of its protection from Muslim forces, and they were widely recognized by Christians, and would come to be recognized by Muslims, as the Holy Land’s most committed and effective defenders. Their considerable experience, familiarity with the enemy, and ideology made them especially effective and dedicated fighters. When the brothers fought alongside the crusader armies, they routinely took on some of the most dangerous roles within the military operations. During the Third Crusade, when the army was on the march, they worked as guards, protecting the Latin Christian armies, and serving as the vanguard and rearguard, where the enemy’s harassment was most intense. An anonymous pilgrim wrote of the brothers of the Temple, “The Templars are most excellent soldiers…They go in silence. Their first attack is the most terrible. In going they are the first, in returning the last. They await the orders of their master.” The brothers were committed to the protection of the people who shared their faith, and the land they considered sacred, willing to put themselves in harm’s way to defend the Holy Land and its inhabitants. In this way their commitment to the service of God in the protection the Holy Land and fellow Christians led to divergent accommodation with the Muslims, making them fierce opponents, reluctant to back down from a fight.

The commitment and discipline of the brethren in battle over time came to be recognized by their Muslim opponents, encouraging divergent accommodation on their part as well in the form of harsher treatment. In their initial interactions with members of military orders, Muslims rarely identified them as separate from the crusaders, and up to the 1180s treated them much like other Christians, holding them hostage or ransoming them when members were taken captive in battle.\(^{56}\) For example, on 18 June 1157 at Safed the Templar Grand Master, Bertrand of Blancfort, along with 87 other knights, was captured by Nur al-Din. They were held in captivity until May 1159 when they were ransomed by Emperor Manuel of Byzantium.\(^{57}\) This treatment appears to be similar to that of any other hostages. As the Muslims’ knowledge and experience of the orders grew, however, they came to see that members of the orders were intransigent in their faith and presented a greater threat than other soldiers.\(^{58}\) The courtier, military theorist and propagandist for Salah al-Din, al-Harawi (Abu al-Hasan Ali bin Abi Bakr al-Harawi, c. 1145-1215), wrote of the orders in his book Al-Harawi’s Discussion on the Stratagems of War (written sometime after 1192), “[The Sultan] should beware of [the Hospitaller and Templar] monks…for he can not achieve his goals through them; for they have great fervor in religion, paying no attention to the [things of this] world; he can not prevent them from interfering in [political] affairs. I have investigated them extensively, and have found nothing which contradicts this.”\(^{59}\) By the 1180s, due to their military skills and refusal in


\(^{58}\) Riley-Smith, The Knights of St John in Jerusalem, 76.

\(^{59}\) Translated in Hamblin, “Muslim Perspectives,” 104.
many cases to make peace, Muslim leaders, including Salah al-Din were treating the military orders more harshly than other Christian opponents.\footnote{Hamblin, “Muslim Perspectives,” 103.} This can be seen most starkly in the treatment of brothers of the Templars and Hospitallers after the battle of Hattin, 4 July 1187.\footnote{For primary accounts of this famous battle see Edbury, \textit{The Conquest of Jerusalem}, 36-48; Nicholson, \textit{The Chronicle of the Third Crusade}, 31-35; Baha’ al-Din, \textit{The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin}, 72-75; Ibn al-Athir, \textit{The Chronicle}, vol. 2, 230-24.} While some of the prisoners were sent off to captivity, Salah al-Din chose to kill all the brethren he captured.\footnote{Riley-Smith, \textit{The Knights Hospitaller}, 75; ‘Imad al-Din, “Saladin’s Treatment of the Templars and Hospitallers, Beheading Them and Causing General Rejoicing at Their Extermination,” in \textit{Arab Historians of the Crusades}, ed. Francesco Gabrieli (New York: Dorset Press, 1969), 138; Roger de Hoveden, \textit{The Annals}, vol. 2, 65-6; Terricus, Grand Precepto of the Temple, “Terricus, “Grand Preceptor of the Temple, to all preceptors and brethren of the Temple in the West (between 10 July and 6 August, 1187),” in \textit{Letters from the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12th-13th centuries}, ed. Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2010), 78.} The Christian \textit{Itinerarium Peregrinorum} stated that this was done because Salah al-Din “knew that they surpassed all others in battle.”\footnote{Translated in Nicholson, \textit{The Chronicle of the Third Crusade}, 34. “\textit{In bello cæteris noverat prævalere.”}}\footnote{Stubbs, \textit{Itinerarium Peregrinorum}, 16.} The Muslim chronicler Ibn al-Athir stated that Salah al-Din “singled these out for execution because they were the fiercest fighters of all the Franks.”\footnote{Translated in Ibn al-Athir, \textit{The Chronicle}, vol. 2, 324.} The brothers’ ferocity led Salah al-Din to further separate himself from these Christians, in a form of divergent accommodation, treating them with more animosity and violence than he did regular Christian soldiers.

The consequences of military encounters between the military orders and Muslims were not always divergent in nature. The military identity of the orders, particularly the Templars, led them to oppose Muslims ferociously. However, the fact that the orders they served were permanent institutions in the Holy Land, with a few members, such as the masters, also being permanently situated in the East, and their extensive knowledge of
political and military conditions at times encouraged a willingness to engage in diplomacy and negotiation with Muslims, and meant that their leaders were often the ones chosen to act as negotiators for crusading armies.\textsuperscript{65} The crusader leader Richard I of England depended on the brothers of the military orders throughout the Third Crusade, relying on them to negotiate treaties with various Muslims. During the siege of Acre the commander of the Hospitallers conducted peace talks with Salah al-Din. Salah al-Din also looked to the Templars to aid in negotiations.\textsuperscript{66} While they were members of religious orders, deeply committed to their faith, the brothers also recognized the precarious nature of the Latin states meant they could not live in perpetual combat.\textsuperscript{67} While this often brought them criticism from less informed sources in the West, the members of the orders realized that commitment to their vows to protect the crusader states needed to include elements of diplomacy.\textsuperscript{68} This unwillingness to make rash military decisions brought the members of the order into frequent extensive diplomatic contact with Muslim rulers and diplomats, and extended the convergent accommodation between the two.

The military force of the orders appears to have always been quite small, a factor that greatly influenced the attitudes the brethren held towards surrounding Muslims and the way they interacted with them. Estimates as to the size of the orders vary, but there seem to have been around 300 knights in each of the Templars and Hospitallers in the kingdom.

\textsuperscript{65} For example see Roger de Hoveden, \textit{The Annals of Roger de Hoveden}, vol. 2, part 1, 214, 269; Roger of Wendover, \textit{Flowers of History}, vol. 2, 122.


of Jerusalem, with perhaps the same amount again in Antioch and Tripoli combined. In addition, sergeants, Turcopoles and mercenaries may have created an army three times larger.\textsuperscript{69} Still, this was a relatively small force. At the peak of the Hospitallers’ militarization under the mastership of Gilbert d’Assaillly (1162-70), the order was able to send 500 knights and 500 sergeants with the crusader army to invade Egypt.\textsuperscript{70} At the peak of the Templars before the battle of Hattin, Malcolm Barber suggests numbers as high as 600 knights with 2,000 sergeants and 50 priests.\textsuperscript{71} With such small numbers, despite the members’ commitment to the protection of Christian land and peoples, the members were quick to realize that continuous warfare was impractical, and often counterproductive. In addition, as will be discussed in Chapter Four, the settlers and soldiers of the crusader states themselves were always a minority compared to the non-Latin Christian inhabitants. Once crusaders returned back to Europe the brothers did not always have the manpower necessary to protect and maintain any conquests the short term crusaders had made, and the masters and commanders often decided that some degree of accommodation that led to peace was in the best interests of the crusader states, rather than unceasing warfare, which could threaten the size and strength of the armies.\textsuperscript{72}

Diplomacy became a form of limited convergent accommodation for the members of the military orders and Muslims in the East. Both orders developed relationships with many

\textsuperscript{69} Menache, “The Military Orders in the Crusader Kingdom,” 139; Dajani-Shakeel, “Natives and Franks,” 174; Barber and Bate, introduction to The Templars: Selected Sources, 12; Nicholson, The Knights Hospitaller, 13; Nicholson, The Knights Templar, 54; Nicholson, Templars, Hospitallers and Teutonic Knights, 4.

\textsuperscript{70} King, introduction to The Rule Statutes and Customs, 4; Riley-Smith, The Knights of St. John in Jerusalem, 61; Barber, “The Charitable and Medical Activities,” 158; Nicholson, The Knights Templar, 54.

\textsuperscript{71} Barber, “Supplying the Crusader States,” 318.

\textsuperscript{72} Nicholson, Templars, Hospitallers and Teutonic Knights, 131; Riley-Smith, Templars and Hospitallers as Professed Religious, 5.
of the surrounding Muslim powers and they used their influence with these rulers to help
rulers of the Latin states and crusader leaders to negotiate with their enemies.\textsuperscript{73} While
Christian leaders on the whole did not extensively cultivate these relationships, they
relied on the connections between the military orders and Muslims to aid in the protection
of the crusader states. In 1142/4 Raymond II of Tripoli agreed to make no truces with the
Muslims “without the advice and approval of the brothers of the house [Hospitallers],”\textsuperscript{74}
while Bohemond III of Antioch (1163-1201) made a similar agreement with the
Hospitallers, who were given freedom either to fight Muslims or make treaties with them
with his support. He also agreed not to make truces with Muslims without the advice and
consent of the order.\textsuperscript{75} The masters and other leaders of the orders viewed part of their
role in protecting the crusader states as cultivating diplomatic ties with Muslims.

The leaders of the orders often helped other Christians in their negotiations with
Muslims, but they also negotiated when most other Christians wanted to fight,
particularly when they felt military actions could threaten the Latin states. They showed
more awareness of the realities of the East and displayed more willingness to admit that
there were costs that could not be overcome. This can be seen in 1192 at Jerusalem when
the crusaders were keen to try to wrest Jerusalem back from Salah al-Din’s control, for
they had taken vows to do so. When the military orders and nobles from the Levant
opposed the idea, a council of five Templars, five Hospitallers, five native Syrians and
five French chiefs were appointed. The council advised Richard not to undertake a siege

\textsuperscript{73} Nicholson, \textit{The Knights Templar}, 79; Forey, “Literacy and Learning,” 200; Giles, Coupland, and
\textsuperscript{74} “\textit{Absque consilio et assensu fratrum ejusdem domus.”} Forey, “The Militarisation of the Hospital,” 77, 81;
\textsuperscript{75} Riley-Smith, \textit{The Knights of St. John in Jerusalem}, 66; Forey, \textit{The Military Orders}, 51-2.
for, though Jerusalem was sacred, it could not be held even if it was taken.\textsuperscript{76} The Templars also refused to join King Amalric in his invasions of Egypt in the 1160s because it would violate treaty agreements they had with the Egyptians.\textsuperscript{77} While the orders were dedicated to the protection of the Holy Land and the possession of Jerusalem, there were limits to their abilities and they were not opposed to backing away from a fight when necessary, something the crusaders, who did not have to deal with the long term consequences of such actions, were far less keen to do.

As in the case of crusaders, extended diplomatic negotiations could lead to personal ties between Muslims and members of the military orders, and special personal accommodations.\textsuperscript{78} Usamah ibn Munqidh relates that when he was praying in a chapel reserved for Muslims in the al-Aqsa mosque (the Temple of Solomon), where the Templars had their residence, a crusader who had recently arrived from the West and had never seen a Muslim praying towards Mecca, tried to reposition him to point towards the east. The Templars, who knew Usamah well through diplomatic interactions, removed the crusader, allowing Usamah to complete his prayers.\textsuperscript{79} In this case, the Templars actively defended Usamah against a Christian, showing that relationships developed between members of the military orders and nobles like Usamah that at times transcended their religious beliefs. However, this accommodation was limited and did not necessarily run deep. On another occasion, Templars attempted to kill Usamah when he was

\textsuperscript{78} Forey, “The Military Orders and the Conversion,” 11-12; Gallois and Callan, “Interethnic Accommodation,” 250.
travelling with Rukn al-Din `Abbas and his son Nasr al-Din in 1154.\textsuperscript{80} The members of the orders were most likely to accommodate those Muslims with whom they had developed personal ties when it did not interfere with their larger objectives.

Another of the ways brethren in the orders used their diplomatic connections with Muslims, adapting to the conventions of the Levant, was through the practice of ransoming. This brought them into both divergent and convergent accommodation with the Muslims of the Levant. Within the orders themselves, the response to ransoming was generally divergent, and large payments to affect the ransom of their own brethren were not encouraged; rather they attempted to negotiate their release and safe conduct without payment.\textsuperscript{81} While the brothers did not want their members to remain in captivity, the finances needed to secure their release were more critical to the running of their mission than the brothers themselves.\textsuperscript{82} In 1179 the Templar master Odo of St. Amand was captured by Salah al-Din. Robert of Torigny reports that Odo refused an offer by Salah al-Din to be released for it was the practice of the Templars to ransom themselves only in exchange for their sword-belt and knife. Because of this he died in captivity.\textsuperscript{83} Other sources suggest that Odo died in battle rather than in captivity, and so it is unknown how accurate the rest of Robert’s account is, but there are other sources that also suggest it was not the orders’ policy to ransom their brethren for large sums of money. In the few cases where the specific details of a payment for ransom are known, most do not involve

\textsuperscript{80} Usama ibn Munqidh, \textit{The Book of Contemplation}, 36-7; Nicholson, \textit{The Knights Templar}, 79.
\textsuperscript{81} Forey, “The Military Orders and the Ransoming of Captives,” 260.
\textsuperscript{82} Forey, “The Military Orders and the Ransoming of Captives,” 265.
large sums. The orders were hesitant to accept the ransoming traditions that had been developed in the Levant for the protection of their own members.

The members of the orders generally refused to pay large sums to ransom themselves, but they were willing to accommodate with Muslims and use their diplomatic connections to assist royalty and nobility, who did not share such relationships with Muslims, to secure their own ransoms or those of family members. In 1174 Raymond III of Tripoli was in captivity and it was the Hospitallers who negotiated with Muslims to free him. William of Tyre writes that Raymond declared that the Hospitallers, “used all their efforts and faithful endeavours to secure my freedom with the aid of divine mercy,” freeing him after eight years in confinement. The commander of the Hospital also assisted in the negotiations between Salah al-Din and the Christian army in Jerusalem in 1187 when the sultan captured the city. The commander helped to negotiate the rate of ransom, and also put forward some money for the release of captives, though many suggested the order did not contribute enough. The leaders of the orders committed themselves to the survival of the crusaders states and their inhabitants, allowing a certain amount of convergence with Muslims to do so. They were willing to use their contacts and knowledge of the Levant to bring fellow Christians from the chains of captivity.

85 Nicholson, The Knights Templar, 72.
An important factor in convergent accommodation between Muslims and the military orders was the regular contact between Muslims and members of the military orders through their daily interactions. While regular monastic orders, ideally at least, generally followed a policy of enclosure, living their religious lives away from the world, members of the military orders viewed their membership in orders as a way to live a religious life that did not completely separate them from the secular world. Tom Licence suggests that the orders viewed their role as following principles of asceticism and charity, rather than asceticism and withdrawal from the world. The members of the orders, particularly the leaders, interacted with those outside the order for business, to deal with property, to assist rulers and other authorities, all of which activities brought them into frequent contact with Muslims. At times this led to fierce hostility, while at others this led to limited convergent accommodation.

The economic realities of life in the East encouraged contact and some forms of convergent accommodation. One of the ways the orders came into limited contact with Muslims was through the estates the orders owned, which were worked largely by Syrians, either Muslim prisoners of war who were slaves, or by local peasants, some of whom were Muslim. These lands were necessary for the support and running of the orders, providing food and other necessities. Thus both groups experienced spatial convergence. The orders also accommodated with local customs to a considerable degree, acting as landlords, while leaving the day to day running of the lands to a dragoman or

91 Nicholson, The Knights Hospitaller, 98.
ra’is, local headmen. In return the orders were given a portion of the crops and produce.

While the members of the order experienced generally peaceful spatial convergence with agricultural workers on their estates, they rarely experienced religious convergence, being willing, and often preferring, to allow the faith of their workers to remain unchanged. In the case of slaves, religious convergence was actively discouraged, in large part because their work was so necessary to the economic survival of the orders. Slaves were taken through raids or captured as prisoners of war, and served the brethren in a variety of capacities, such as household servants, agricultural labourers, shoemakers, carpenters, smiths, or other craftsmen. Such tasks sometimes placed slaves in close physical proximity to members of the orders. Slaves who served for a long time within the orders could rise to positions with considerable responsibility, though the potential threat they posed during a siege was never forgotten, and there was never complete trust or acceptance into the group of the orders. Religious convention dictated that if a slave converted to Christianity they were to be set free, essentially joining the group identity of those who had previously been positioned over them. Thus conversions meant that the orders would lose the manpower and skills provided by slaves and the resultant labour

92 Riley-Smith, The Knights of St. John in Jerusalem, 426. For more information on dragomans and ra’is, see Chapter Four.
93 Riley-Smith, The Knights of St. John in Jerusalem, 426.
and monetary gain. In light of the fact that the military orders in the Levant were always short on manpower, they were eager to hold onto their slaves and were reluctant to promote conversion. In fact, members of the military orders often actively discouraged conversion, preferring to remain in a position of power, identified through their separate religious convictions. The loss of manpower to the orders outweighed any perceived benefits of creating new Christians (even if the slaves did experience a legitimate conversion). Similarly, the orders also showed a distinct reluctance to exchange Muslim slaves to ransom Christian captives, an activity that was otherwise considered to be spiritually meritorious. Such cases illustrate the conflict that occurred between the identity of the brethren as members of the military orders and their identity as members of Christendom.

The reluctance of the orders to encourage conversion among Muslims in favour of economic concerns was not limited strictly to their slaves. It could also affect decisions regarding noble hostages as well. In 1154 a group of Templars captured Nasr, the son of Abbas, Egypt’s vizier. William of Tyre narrates that the Templars kept him captive for a lengthy period, and during that time Nasr expressed an interest in learning of Christianity and being baptized. The brothers appear to have complied with his request until they were offered 60,000 gold pieces by the Egyptians for his ransom. While they do not seem to

---

98 “I needed clothes and you clothed me, I was sick and you looked after me, I was in prison and you came to visit me.” Matt. 25:36 (NIV). Friedman, “Women in Captivity,” 76; Forey, “The Military Orders and the Ransoming of Captives,” 275.
have opposed his conversion, winning a convert for Christ was ultimately less important than their own financial gain.99

The lack of interest of the orders in converting Muslims, while closing one form of accommodation, potentially opened a path to the sharing of sacred spaces, a significant form of convergent accommodation that resulted to some degree from the orders’ familiarity with the ‘other’ through frequent contact. The orders with their extensive knowledge of Muslims and Muslim customs, recognized that their own sacred spaces sometimes overlapped with those of Muslims and sometimes were willing to share them with Muslims. This spatial convergence, which, as noted by Benjamin Kedar, rarely involved a convergence of religious ideas, can be seen in the Templars allowing Muslim nobility to worship in what the Christians considered to be some of Jerusalem’s most holy sites, and even, on occasion, their defence of the rights of Muslims to worship as they chose, as in the case of Usamah ibn Munqidh told above. Usamah commented that whenever he would come to Jerusalem he would pay a visit to the holy sites, including the al-Aqsa mosque (the Temple of Solomon) where the Templars had their residence. The Templars provided a small chapel where Muslims could come to pray.100 Such toleration was possible because conversion was so seldom a goal of crusading efforts. Such spatial accommodation was not limited to Christians. The brothers of the Temple liked to worship at the shrine of Our Lady of Saydnaya, a Greek convent 25 km northeast of Damascus during periods of truce with Muslims, celebrating festivals and bringing

back oil for pilgrims. At the convent, there was an icon of the Virgin Mary from which a curative oil flowed that was believed to heal peoples’ ailments. There Christians and Muslims gathered in mid-August and in September to celebrate the Feast of the Virgin, as both faiths shared a belief in the spiritual character of Mary. This spatial convergence allowed for members of both faiths to come and gather together in places they both held to be sacred.

While the military mandate of the orders tended to encourage divergence from the Muslims, the Hospitallers never abandoned their original identity as carers for the poor and sick in Jerusalem, regardless of the patient’s religion, ethnicity, gender, or any other factor. This meant that Muslims were cared for in the Hospital. Moreover, the brothers of the Hospital also hired Muslim physicians, along with Christian ones. This provided another forum for contact with Muslims, and one that proved fruitful for the sharing of ideas and practices. Muslims possessed more extensive knowledge of medicine and treatment, and from them the Hospitallers came to adopt some of these practices. This intellectual convergence was a factor that was often missing from other spheres of contact between groups in the Levant.

101 The shrine was brought to the attention of the Frankish world by the Templar Walter of Marengiers, who visited the shrine on his way home after being released from Muslim captivity upon the truce between Salah al-Din and Raymond of Tripoli in 1185. Roger of Wendover, the chronicler of St. Albans, records, “the brethren of the Temple take [the oil of Saidnaya] back to their houses [in the Latin East] when they have truces with the infidel, so that they may give [phials] to pilgrims who come to pray there, who may take them back reverently into different parts of the world in honour of the Mother of God.” Quoted in Bernard Hamilton, “Our Lady of Saidnaiya: An Orthodox Shrine Revered by Muslims and Knights Templar at the Time of the Crusades,” in The Holy Land, Holy Lands, and Christian History, ed. R.N. Swanson (Woodbridge, Suffolk; The Boydell Press, 2000), 211. Kedar, “Convergences,” 92, 94-5.
103 Kedar, “Convergences,” 94-5.
104 Riley-Smith, Templars and Hospitallers as Professed Religious, 19; Edgington, “Medical Care in the Hospital of St John,” 27-8. In the statutes of Roger des Moulins, an alternative oath was provided for doctors who were not Christians Doctors either had to swear by the saints or vow to do everything they could for a patient without expectation of payment.
The transfer of intellectual knowledge was in part possible because both Muslims and Christians at their root shared the same basic conception of illness, though the Muslims possessed a greater knowledge of treatments and cures. This shared understanding allowed for a certain amount of transfer of knowledge. The Franks and Muslims both found the roots of their medical traditions in Greek learning. This shared classical view of the human body and health stated that the body was comprised of four different humours (blood, yellow bile, black bile and phlegm). When a person became ill it was because these humours had become out of balance and balance needed to be restored to bring the person back to health. This balance was achieved through lifestyle changes such as diet or exercise, through treatment with drugs supplied by an apothecary or through surgical means, such as phlebotomy (bloodletting).

Muslim study of Greek medicine was more advanced than that of Western European Christians in the twelfth century. The Muslim caliphate was established within the Hellenistic world during the seventh century and adopted its conception and knowledge of medicine and disease. By the eighth century translation of Greek medical texts into Arabic was well under way and soon Muslims were writing their own advanced texts.


107 Toll, “Arabic Medicine,” 36-7; Edgington, “Oriental and Occidental Medicine,” 191. The caliph al-Ma’mun (813-33) founded an academy in Baghdad where Greek texts were translated into Arabic.
The extensive medical knowledge that flourished in the Muslim world was slower to revive in Catholic Europe. In the eleventh century, and especially the twelfth century, Greek and Arabic medical texts were discovered and translated into Latin, especially in areas such as Spain and Italy where there was extensive contact with Muslims.\footnote{108 Among the significant texts were Ibn Sina’s \textit{Canon} and Hunyan’s \textit{Isagoge}. Woodings, “The Medical Resources and Practice,” 268; Mitchell, \textit{Medicine in the Crusades}, 206-7; Edgington, “Oriental and Occidental Medicine,” 190-1.}

Therefore, intellectuals in the twelfth century would have been well aware of the superiority of Muslims in this field.\footnote{109 Mitchell, \textit{Medicine in the Crusades}, 140; Toll, “Arabic Medicine,” 37; Edgington, “Oriental and Occidental Medicine,” 191.} In the Latin East the crusaders inherited important centres of translation where a wide variety of manuscripts were translated from Arabic into Latin, among them medical texts. Among the most significant of these were Antioch, Tripoli and Acre, important cities in the crusader states.\footnote{110 Mitchell, \textit{Medicine in the Crusades}, 207-8; Edgington, “Oriental and Occidental Medicine,” 197.} These translation centres continued a process of reintroduction of Greek and Arabic medical knowledge, opening the Christians of the East to a willingness to engage in convergent accommodation with Muslim scholars and medical practitioners who could extend their knowledge.

When brothers from the Hospital first arrived in the Levant, their conception of the purpose of medical intervention, and how they undertook medical practice, differed from the Muslims in the East, though they shared the same basic conception of the root causes of illness. Over time the theory and practice of the Hospitallers converged with that of the Muslims, suggesting direct contact with doctors of different faiths and a growth of

\footnote{108 Among the significant works that were translated at these centres were al-Majusi’s \textit{kitab kamil as-sina `a at-tibbiya} (\textit{The Complete Book of the Medical Art}), which included portions of works which had been poorly translated by Constantinus Africanus in the eleventh century; \textit{The Hundred Books on the Medical Art}, by Eastern Christian physician Ab_Sahl al-Mas\_h, who was likely Ibn Sina’s teacher; and medical texts from Dioscorides. Two early translators of significance in the Latin East were the Englishman Adelard of Bath (born c. 1080) who arrived in Antioch around 1114 and Stephen of Pisa who worked in Antioch between 1126 and 1130.}
Hospitaller medical practices, based on classical and Arabic knowledge. When the doctors of the Hospital first arrived in the East, they mostly cared for the sick through good food, a careful diet, and spiritual care, for their primary purpose was not to cure their patients, but to provide physical and spiritual comfort during their illness. The term *hospitale* referred not just to facilities that provided medical treatment, but also to alms houses or residential houses, often run by the secular clergy, which provided food and resting places for the poor and weary.  

This focus on care was brought to the Holy Land by the military orders, and the early work of the brothers of the Hospital focused on caring for, rather than curing, patients. In part this was because many of their patients were poor and weary pilgrims who merely needed nutritious food and sleep to restore them to health. Other sick pilgrims also came to Jerusalem not to be cured, but to die in a holy place.

Arabic medicine at the time of the crusades was more advanced, for it focused on providing medical cures for illness, not simply providing care. Arabic hospitals took a more specialized approach to medicine, separating patients from one another by the disorder from which they suffered, as well as by gender. Specialized wards could include “medicinal, surgical, ophthalmological, psychiatric, orthopaedic, dysentery and fever cases and a ward for convalescents.” When the Jewish merchant traveller Benjamin of Tudela was in Baghdad, he visited a hospital and was greatly impressed by the facility he

---

found there. On the banks of the river there was, “a hospital consisting of blocks of houses and hospices for the sick poor who come to be healed. Here there are about sixty physicians’ stores which are provided from the Caliph’s house with drugs and whatever else may be required. Every sick man who comes is maintained at the Caliph’s expense and is medically treated.” Curing ill patients was the focus of these hospitals. Unlike Christian institutions in the Holy Land, Arabic hospitals were secular institutions. Rulers provided funding to establish hospitals as well as other civic institutions. Nur al-Din established the Nur hospital in Damascus in 1174 while Salah al-Din was responsible for the establishment of the Nasiri hospital in Cairo. Ibn Jubayr also records the sultan providing funds to run a hospital in Alexandria for the care of strangers who were ill. The establishment of such hospitals was often motivated by the spiritual merit that would be accrued by the founder.

Over time the brothers who ran the Hospital in Jerusalem began to expand from providing care for the ill to a more Islamic focus of actually attempting to provide cures for the sick, engaging in convergent intellectual accommodation with Muslim medical professionals. In the first Rule of the Hospitallers (date unknown, but before 1145), instituted by the master Raymond du Puy, the brethren were instructed to give patients the Holy Sacrament (communion) after they had confessed their sins to a priest, a bed in

---

115 Translated in Benjamin of Tudela, The Itinerary, 98.
which to rest and food to restore them. In later years the brethren never lost their focus on the care and support of pilgrims and travellers, as witnessed by the travellers Theoderich and John of Wurzburg, but by the institution of the 1182 statutes of Roger des Mouline the provisions for the ill had taken on a more curative approach, coming closer to the practice of Arabic medicine. These later statutes made provisions for hiring doctors and other medical practitioners to provide medical treatments for patients. The statutes instructed the Hospitallers to hire for those who were sick four doctors, “who are qualified to examine urine, and to diagnose different disease, and are able to administer appropriate medicines.” The Hospital by this period had eleven wards with 143 attendants to assist the doctors, working out to around six or seven patients per attendant. Salah al-Din was greatly impressed by the facility he found in 1187 upon his conquest of Jerusalem, and allowed it to remain open. The instructions in the statutes and the increased number of medical practitioners make it clear the brethren of the Hospital were accommodating towards the medical practices they found among Muslims in the Levant.

The convergence of the intellectual culture of medicine and the adoption of Arabic medical customs was perhaps facilitated by the acceptance of Muslim patients and the

123 John of Wurzburg records the Hospital accommodating 2000 patients, double the number suggested by Theoderich. John would have seen the hospital in a period of emergency.
employment of Muslim doctors within the Hospital, providing direct and intimate contact between the brothers of the Hospital and members of the Muslim faith. The Hospital accepted all patients, except lepers, regardless of their social standing, faith, or gender. An anonymous cleric in the 1180s, said the Hospital accepted all who came, “as this holy house rightly understands that the Lord invites all to salvation, wishing no one to perish, also men of pagan creed find in it mercy, and also Jews, if they flock to it.” Repeatedly in the rules and statutes of the order, including those of both Raymond du Puy and Roger des Moulins, the order is directed to care for any and all who require their aid “as if they were lords” or “for our lords the poor.” The Hospital also hired Muslim and other non-Latin Christian physicians, respecting the skills of those doctors, and willing to incorporate their knowledge and skills into the running of the Hospital. In an Old French version of the statutes of Roger des Moulins, two oaths are given by doctors employed by the Hospital. The first one focuses on the treatment of patients. All doctors, “should earnestly study the qualities of the sick and of their illnesses, inspect their urine and give syrups, electuaries and other things necessary to the sick, forbidding contrary things and giving profitable ones.” In addition to this first oath, a second oath was sworn by doctors caring specifically for the critically ill. This oath, significantly, had two variations. Christian doctors were to swear by the saints, while all doctors of other faiths were to swear to care for their patients to the best of their abilities without expecting any sort of recompense. The brothers of the Hospital demonstrated a trust in the abilities of non-Christian doctors and were willing to allow doctors of other faiths treat their patients.

128 Translated in Edgington, “Medical Care in the Hospital,” 27.
129 Edgington, “Medical Care in the Hospital,” 27-8.
and help them carry out their calling to aid the ill. In doing so, they gained new skills and perspectives on medicine and medical care, and engaged in an intellectual accommodation not seen in many other aspects of life in the crusader states. They also were open to treating the sick and weary of all faiths, opening a new door of contact as well, prioritizing in their religious identity the care of all peoples, rather than the enmity that could be fostered through their military exploits. The brothers of the Hospital were not the only Franks to practice medicine in the Levant, and the contact and accommodation between other medical practitioners and Muslims will be discussed in Chapter Four.

The brethren of the military orders merged concepts of asceticism and charity that manifested themselves for both the Templars and the Hospitallers as military protection of crusaders, pilgrims and settlers in the Holy Land against Muslims, but also, especially for the Hospitallers, physical care for the poor and needy. These two different facets of the identity of the orders were expressed in both divergent and convergent accommodation with Muslims in the Levant. The military orders were committed to living an active religious life, and active warfare against the enemies of Christendom played a significant part in that. This led to divergent accommodation, as the brethren of the orders became some of the fiercest opponents of the Muslims, and in response the Muslims came to fear the orders more than regular crusaders, and treat them more harshly. However, members of the order possessed more extensive knowledge of the political and military situation in the East as members spent longer in the Levant than crusaders. This bred in them a greater awareness of the precarious hold of the Franks on
the crusader states, and the limited manpower they possessed to defend them. This led the orders into convergent accommodation with Muslims through extensive diplomacy, as well as assisting crusaders in negotiations with Muslims. The orders knew this was often preferable to direct combat which could threaten the crusader states. Their diplomatic contacts also brought them into personal contact with Muslims, and sometimes led to personal convergence, such as between Usamah and the Templars. The economic realities of the East also brought the military orders to another form of limited convergent accommodation. As the military orders were permanent organizations in the East they owned estates that served to support the work of the order, and these were often worked by Muslim peasants and slaves. Through these estates the military orders came into spatial convergence with Muslims, but rarely into religious convergence, for they actively discouraged conversion of their subjects, not wanting to lose their labour, as convention dictated that converts be freed. Where the members of the military orders came into the greatest convergence with Muslims was through the adoption of the medical knowledge of the Muslims. The Hospitallers accepted Muslim patients and employed Muslim doctors. Through these contacts they received more advanced medical knowledge that Muslims possessed.
CHAPTER FOUR: THE PERMANENT SETTLERS

The Europeans who settled in the Levant in the wake of the First Crusade shared the same religious, political, military, and cultural beliefs as those crusaders who returned to Europe. However, over time, the settlers who remained in the Levant formed their own distinct Frankish identity.\(^1\) The new settlers were separated from their European homes by great distance, and lived among peoples with whom they did not share languages or cultural practices. While most chose to settle in lands traditionally populated by native Christians, not Muslims, native Christians practiced a different form of Christianity than Catholic Europeans did, so they were separated from their neighbours by religion as well.\(^2\) This society was not simply an amalgamation of the various European cultures of the immigrants, but a new group with a unique group identity that was influenced both by the group identities members brought with them, and also by the life and culture they found in the Levant.\(^3\) Group beliefs do not remain static, but change over time as a result of external conditions and forces, causing a group to adapt to new situations and realities.\(^4\) The Franks did continue to view surrounding Muslim powers as enemies, and thus did engage in divergent activities such as warfare with them, but as the Franks became more established, through a process of convergent accommodation they adopted certain practices and beliefs of the culture they found in the East, at times adopting new group identities to accommodate these practices. This included engaging in extensive diplomatic practices with Muslim powers, trading with Muslims, engaging in social and

1 All Europeans who settled in the Latin states, regardless of their place of origin, came to be collectively known as “Franks,” or *Franci* in Latin. Murray, “National Identity,” 116, 119.
cultural rituals such as bathing and hunting with Muslims, gaining medical knowledge from them, and even, to a limited extent, sharing spatial or inegalitarian convergence, where one group participated in worship with another party leading, in sacred spaces with Muslims, though this remained rare. However, their identity as Christians remained important, and the beliefs associated with this dictated that convergent accommodation remained limited, and often focused in the secular sphere.\(^5\) Much like the crusaders and members of the military orders, straying too far from the religious strictures of Frankish society could lead to the exclusion of any group member from the group, and necessitated that convergent accommodation remained largely in the secular arena. The group boundaries of the Franks often remained tied to their religious beliefs.\(^6\)

During the first two decades of crusader presence in the Holy Land, four states were established: the county of Edessa (1098), the principality of Antioch (1098), the kingdom of Jerusalem (1099), and the county of Tripoli (1109). Each of the states was politically independent, with its own character, but headed by elite crusaders and their descendants who ruled over Latin settlers and multi-ethnic indigenous populations including Muslims, and was supported by a Latin Christian aristocracy. In 1144 Edessa was regained by Muslim powers, triggering the Second Crusade, but the other three states survived for several decades longer. However, after 1174 a succession of relatively weak rulers in Jerusalem and internal disputes brought instability to all the crusader states.\(^7\) At the end of the Third Crusade in 1192 the kingdom of Jerusalem had been reduced to a small strip
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of land between Tyre and Acre, with Antioch and Tripoli also having lost significant
territory.  

While at times the states worked for their own benefit, sometimes to the detriment of the
other states, there were strong political connections between them, and they often worked
together to protect the Christian territories from surrounding Muslim powers.  

Of all the Latin states, the kingdom of Jerusalem was the most politically influential, a role it
gained in large part because it contained the sacred city of Jerusalem.  

The kings of Jerusalem possessed many of the most prestigious lands, as well as the ones which
brought in the most wealth, including the port cities of Tyre and Acre, significant centres
of trade and commerce for both Muslims and Christians. Barons were given lands, where
they were in control of their Christian and Muslim subjects, being able to enforce justice
and dictate their own foreign policies, but they were still vassals of the king, and
therefore owed military service and had their own legal matters dealt with through the
king’s High Court.  

Given the continual threat of surrounding Muslim states, as well as
competing crusader states, a significant part of the king’s power rested on his ability to
lead an army into war.  

The power of rulers in Jerusalem and the other states could never be absolute, for the rulers had to rely on the military assistance of the nobles and lords, members of the military orders, as well as powers from the West, against surrounding
Muslim enemies.  
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8 Nicholson, The Knights Templar, 48; Riley-Smith, The Atlas of the Crusades, 60; Riley-Smith, The
Knights of St. John in Jerusalem, 88.
13 Tyerman, God’s War, 179.
The crusaders ruled an indigenous population that far outnumbered them, comprised of Jews, Muslims (both Sunni and Shi’ite), and various sects of Eastern Christians, including Greek Orthodox, Armenians, Jacobites, Nestorians, and Zoroastrians.\textsuperscript{14} The Franks remained a minority of the total population throughout their control of the Holy Land. At their peak, it is estimated their population was a third of the indigenous inhabitants. Their number of knights available for the protection of the crusader states was also limited, with historians estimating the total number of knights who owed service to Frankish rulers to be no more than 2,000.\textsuperscript{15} Frankish control of the indigenous population, despite a smaller population, was based on a few factors, including control of trade and the economic structure of the states, and, when necessary, particularly right after the establishment of the crusader states, military power.\textsuperscript{16} The Franks’ small numbers and permanent presence in the Holy Land, as well as their tendency to be absentee landlords, encouraged a relative amount of tolerance towards their subjects, as more extensive interaction unavoidably occurred through the necessities of daily life, such as trade, and as they were asserting political power over a substantially larger population.

As in the case of the crusaders and military orders, warfare with Muslims remained a prominent aspect of life for the Franks, resulting in divergence between the Franks and

\textsuperscript{14} Phillips, “The Latin East,” 113; Phillips, \textit{The Crusades}, 41. The ethnic mix of each state was diverse: Antioch was made up of Franks, Greeks, Armenians and some Muslims. Edessa was mostly Armenian. Tripoli was more varied with Greek Orthodox, eastern Christians and diverse Muslim sects. The kingdom of Jerusalem was a mixture of Muslims, including Bedouin tribes and eastern Christians.
\textsuperscript{16} Tyerman, \textit{God’s War}, 185.
surrounding Muslim territories. The Franks relied on the crusaders and the military orders for military aid when the danger posed by surrounding powers outweighed their ability to respond to them. Yet, it can be argued that their group identity as Christians governed the military activities of the Franks far less than it did the crusaders and military orders. The military campaigns and alliances undertaken by the Franks did not always follow religious lines. At times their policies led to convergence with Muslims when there was another threat that proved more dangerous to the Franks than entering into an alliance with Muslims. For example, a few years before the fall of Edessa to Zengi in 1144, the Franks made an alliance with the Muslim governor of Damascus, Unur, when Zengi threatened Unur’s territory. Such an agreement was accepted for both parties faced danger from Zengi.\textsuperscript{17}

The Islamic world was significantly more unified by the second half of the twelfth century than it had been during the First Crusade, but there were still Muslim groups who were at odds with one another, and Muslims also turned to Franks for convergent action against other Muslims when it served their interests. For example, in 1163 King Amalric of Jerusalem was persuaded by the vizier of Fatimid Egypt, Dirgham, to help him in his fight with Nur al-Din and the former vizier of Egypt, Shawar, who were threatening Dirgham’s power. He offered to pay the original tribute his successor had paid the Franks, in addition to handing over hostages.\textsuperscript{18} When Dirgham was killed in battle, Shawar turned on Nur al-Din, and appealed to Amalric for help. The Franks accepted, for Nur al-Din posed more of a threat to the crusader states than Shawar, while the Fatimids

\textsuperscript{17} William of Tyre, \textit{A History of Deeds Done}, vol. 2, 105-6.  
viewed Frankish lands as a potential buffer between Egypt and Nur al-Din. The Franks more frequently engaged in convergent alliances with neighbouring Muslims against other Muslims, than did the crusaders. The Franks did not forget that these alliances could be tenuous and that the neighbouring Muslim powers remained hostile, but they were also willing to form alliances with the religious ‘other’ for the overall benefit they provided.

The necessity of fighting in continued holy war remained important to the identity of the Franks, but their permanent presence in the Latin states highlighted the impracticality, and at times the undesirability, of constant warfare. This made the Franks more open to partaking in truces to bring about temporary cessations of hostilities. These could be brief pauses, such as to allow an army to bury its dead, or a longer duration of years to allow both sides to pursue more pressing military threats. For example, Nur al-Din made an agreement with Antioch that the land near Aleppo would belong to Aleppo, and the land near Antioch would belong to Antioch, allowing both sides to focus their efforts elsewhere. Even Salah al-Din, who consistently established his legitimacy as a ruler on the importance of jihad, made two significant truces with Franks before Hattin. From 1180-82 both armies agreed to a truce so they could address more imminent military threats than one another. Between 1185 and early 1187 Raymond III, count of Tripoli (r.

---

19 Hamblin, “To Wage Jihad,” 31; Christie, “Religious Campaign,” 57-8, 70; Omran, “Truces between Moslems and Crusaders,” 425-6; Ibn al-Qalanisi, Damascus Chronicle, 276. King Fulk (1131-43) made a similar treaty with Unur, the regent of Damascus, to create an alliance between the two against Zengi, as did Joscelin with Kara Arslan.
20 Tyerman, God’s War,” 260; Bar-Tal, Group Beliefs, 16, 42, 58.
1152-87), acting as regent of Jerusalem made a truce with the sultan due to a crippling famine. During this time the Muslims supplied food to the Franks, saving their lives. This truce ended when Reynald of Chatillon, in late 1186, attacked one of Salah al-Din’s caravans arriving from Egypt, giving the sultan the excuse to invade Frankish territory, precipitating the call for the Third Crusade.

At times the Franks converged even further with Muslims, seeking treaties to prevent hostilities from erupting in the first place. These treaties were generally concluded to allow the necessities of daily life to occur, for both sides ultimately benefitted from such accommodation. For example, safe conducts were negotiated to allow merchants and foreigners to travel through enemy territories with their goods. When travelling between Frankish and Muslim lands, Ibn Jubayr remarked on the safety Christian and Muslim travellers experienced, including the merchant caravan he was travelling with. In exchange for safe conduct, merchants paid a tax to neighbouring states. Both sides decided that while their states were often at war, trade and travel were necessities that they wanted to continue, and often, as long as taxes were paid, the travel of merchants happened relatively easily. This desire for trade resulted in sometimes conflicting identities, where the conviction of the necessity of holy war was challenged by a desire for the economic benefits and physical goods brought into the crusader states through

trade.\textsuperscript{27} These treaties could be broken, such as was done by Reynald, and bandits were always feared by all caravans, but treaties allowed trade to continue at least to some extent, even sometimes during times of war.\textsuperscript{28}

Not all convergent accommodation with the enemy was undertaken for the good of Christendom as a whole, or even that of the crusaders states. For some Franks, their personal goals were their priority, rather than the benefit of the larger group or their identity as Catholic Christians.\textsuperscript{29} For example, Conrad, the marquis of Montferrat (and future king of Jerusalem, r. 1192), sought to gain the kingdom for himself, and he was willing to try many things to get it.\textsuperscript{30} One of those attempts saw him offering an agreement with Salah al-Din that he would keep peace with him in exchange for half of Jerusalem, as well as the cities of Beirut and Sidon and half of the countryside on his side of the Jordan. This agreement was never concluded, as before he could finish negotiations with Salah al-Din he was assassinated.\textsuperscript{31} The Franks were not a homogenous group, and, while they shared general characteristics, the choices of individuals towards Muslims could remain unique, and converge or diverge regardless of the greater group identity or group goals.

\textsuperscript{27} Jacoby, “Aspects of Everyday Life,” 84-6; Bar-Tal, \textit{Group Beliefs}, 43.
\textsuperscript{29} Gallois and Callan, “Interethnic Accommodation,” 250.
The Franks were more likely to engage in convergent military accommodation with Muslims than short term crusaders, due to the realities of the necessities of daily life presented by permanence in the Levant, and because they faced many enemies on a more continuous basis. However, many of these truces and treaties remained short lived and tenuous. In part this was the case because the religious identity held by Franks and Muslims prevented permanent arrangements. In particular, for Muslims, this was enshrined in their military practices, as seen in Chapter Two, with the practice of allowing hudnas, short-term truces. Muslims were permitted only to make truces that lasted a maximum of ten years, prescribed by the time of the truce between Muhammad and the Meccans. Though these treaties could be renegotiated, in the eleventh to thirteenth centuries, of all known truces, only one exceeded this. The truce between King Amalric (1163-74) with the Fatimid caliphate in Egypt in 1167 was to be indefinite. Because of the tenuous nature of many of these agreements, treaties did not generally create lasting intellectual understanding or convergence between both faiths.

Aside from raids, sieges, and pitched battles, much of the military diplomatic contact that occurred between the crusaders and Franks and the Muslims of the Near East occurred through the Frankish nobility and rulers, and through the diplomats and envoys they used to travel between them, negotiating treaties and truces. The crusaders and Franks were separated from the Muslims they fought by language, religion, and social, political, and intellectual culture. The Franks went further than the crusaders in creating convergent accommodative practices to help to bridge some of these separations to engage more

32 Christie and Gerish, “Parallel Preachings,” 142; Riley-Smith, “Peace Never Established,” 100-1.
effectively in negotiation and diplomacy. While language was one of the biggest hurdles to cross, gestures and symbols could vary greatly between cultures, and a shared language of gestures had to be developed. While the crusaders developed this to a limited extent (see Chapter Two), the Franks were far more adept at this form of convergent accommodation, and this led to more opportunities for successful diplomacy.

Diplomats and envoys needed to be skilled in understanding the culture and religion of the people with whom they were coming into contact, and in the language and gestures used to express their ideas, and needs in negotiations. This need led to greater convergent accommodation with Muslims by diplomats and rulers than other soldiers. For the emissaries who worked between the Christians and Muslims, some gestures were the same and could be easily transferred across the cultural divide. For instance, bowing, kneeling, and prostration were performed in relation to a person’s rank as a sign of humility. Other gestures did not have the same cultural meaning and new meanings needed to be assigned to them. One such example was the manner in which a ruler was approached. In the East, a ruler was to be elevated above his subjects, and those approaching him were to stand lower, or bow forward. A subject’s hand was to extend towards the ruler, but no physical contact took place. It was considered an insult even to put a letter directly into a king’s hand. In Europe such behaviour was perfectly acceptable. To clasp a right hand in Europe was a crucial gesture to seal a treaty and represented putting one’s strength in another’s hand. In the Levant, a treaty was sealed
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35 Friedman, “Gestures of Conciliation,” 31, 34.
36 Friedman, “Gestures of Conciliation,” 40, 42.
through bowing and kneeling, and through the giving of gifts. An envoy usually served as a proxy to the ruler.\textsuperscript{37} By the time of the Third Crusade, there had been convergence between both groups, and the taking of a right hand had become a mutually accepted gesture to conclude a treaty. In September 1192 Salah al-Din and Richard were engaged in ongoing negotiations to arrange a hudna (peace treaty) so Richard could return to Europe. Upon the conclusion of these negotiations, Richard, who was ill, sent an envoy to Salah al-Din, giving his hand, and Salah al-Din in response, also agreed to give his hand to confirm the treaty.\textsuperscript{38}

These shared gestures extended the ability of the Franks and Muslims to engage in convergent accommodation, but they could also be used in a divergent manner, to assert power, and could lead to situations of diplomatic discomfort. When King Amalric came to assist Shawar in Egypt in 1167, the Frankish envoy, Hugh of Caesarea, was brought to the caliph al-Adid with a treaty proposal. When the proposal was accepted, the caliph offered a gloved hand, but Hugh insisted that he offer a bare hand. William of Tyre records, “Finally, with extreme unwillingness, as if it detracted from his majesty, yet with a slight smile, which greatly aggrieved the Egyptians, he put his uncovered hand into that of Hugh.”\textsuperscript{39} With this simple gesture, Hugh was asserting a position of Christian power. Since this gesture had not yet become one with a shared meaning, Hugh was forcing the


\textsuperscript{38} Baha’ al-Din, The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin, 228-9, 230-1; Asbridge, “Talking to the Enemy,” 294.

caliph in European terms into putting himself into the hands of his enemy, as well as referencing a sign of surrender. On the Muslim side, to have physical contact with the caliph was considered to be a sign of grace.\textsuperscript{40} By forcing physical contact Hugh was expressing both convergent and divergent behaviour, by concluding the treaty, but doing so on terms that expressed a position of Christian strength.

The major barrier to convergent diplomacy, as well as trade, was the lack of a shared language. By the Second Crusade the Franks had realized the importance of learning Arabic, or employing those who had.\textsuperscript{41} Attiya has suggested that more Franks learned Arabic than previous historians recognized, despite the original implications of Urban’s speech that the hostility of the crusaders towards Muslims would not allow them to gain any knowledge of Islamic culture.\textsuperscript{42} By learning to speak Arabic, certain Frankish rulers and nobility expressed a willingness to undertake convergent accommodation and negotiate with Muslim enemies, coming into close physical space, as well as beginning to share a limited cultural space.\textsuperscript{43} The chronicler William of Tyre records during the siege of Damascus that a Frankish envoy was selected to negotiate with the atabeg Unur, “because of his familiarity with the language of the Turks.”\textsuperscript{44} Baha’ al-Din records that Reynald, lord of Sidon and Beaufort (1171-1200) knew Arabic and beyond that, was familiar with some collections of Hadith (the recorded sayings of Muhammad) and

\textsuperscript{40} Friedman, “Gestures of Conciliation,” 38.
\textsuperscript{42} Attiya, “Knowledge of Arabic,” 203-4.
\textsuperscript{43} Dajani-Shakeel, “Some Aspects,” 200; Friedman, “Gestures of Conciliation,” 32.
Muslim histories. By learning Arabic as well as some of the histories and stories of Islam, Franks, to a greater extent than the short-term crusaders, began to converge in a limited manner towards Muslim culture, knowledge that assisted them in their negotiations and interactions.

The degree and type of interaction and convergent or divergent accommodation that occurred outside a military setting between the settled European populations and the native inhabitants of the Levant has been greatly contested by historians over the last century. Before the 1940s historians such as Munro, Cahen and Grousset posited the existence of a highly integrated society where the Franks assimilated themselves into the life of the East, creating a new Franco-Syrian identity. This model, supported by French historians, failed to make a distinction between native inhabitants who were Christian and those who were of other faiths such as Muslims or Jews. This was a significant failure, for religious convictions were fundamental to the identity of medieval societies, and the religious identity of the native inhabitants greatly affected the geographic areas in which the Franks chose to settle.

After the 1940s new historians challenged this model of assimilation. R.C. Smail and Joshua Prawer were some of the first to suggest that settlement by the Franks among the native populations was actually limited, with the Franks mainly remaining an urban
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45 Baha’ al-Din, *The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin*, 90; Attiya, “Knowledge of Arabic,” 206.
population, congregating in cities, with only limited rural settlement. While the Franks took on the food, clothing, and other physical assimilations of the Near East, these elements were only outward trappings, and did not point to a deeper cultural assimilation. Smail suggests that instances that are often used as proof of a deeper connection at best prove a connection that was ‘superficial’ contact and was often only experienced by a small portion of the population, not the whole. According to him, this second school of thought “considers that the basic feature of the organization of the Latin states was the imposition of a numerically small military aristocracy over the mass of the native population. This ruling class exploited the subject peoples economically by means of social arrangements which they found in existence, and which were akin to those they had known in Europe.” But other than this economic imposition, this view suggests the Franks did not greatly affect the lives of the native populations. They kept to themselves within the large and protected cities of the East.

More recently, historians have returned to suggesting a more integrated model of settlement, with the Franks extending their settlements into rural areas, but making distinctions between the ethnic and religious backgrounds of the native inhabitants amongst whom they settled. From 1985-88 and 1989-91 Ronnie Ellenblum conducted archaeological surveys in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, examining over 200 crusader settlements, consisting of rural burgi (villages) and maisons fortes (manor houses). These
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villages were often attached to castles owned by the Franks, and they served as centres from which agricultural work was done. The *maisons fortes* also served as centres for agriculture, usually in more remote locations. Ellenblum’s excavations show that the Franks gathered in certain areas more than others, and it appears that the preferred areas were ones where Eastern Christians were either a strong minority or a majority of the population. Adrian Boas suggests that after an initial period of unrest as the Franks settled themselves, these settlements in rural areas remained largely unfortified until the Franks’ hold on Outremer began to wane in the 1170s, at which time previously unfortified structures began to be fitted with outer defensive walls. It is this view of settlement that this study will accept and build upon.

The amount of convergence or divergence initially experienced between the Franks and Muslims depended largely on the way the Franks conquered the specific territories. When the takeover was violent, such as the conquest of Jerusalem in 1099, the response was largely divergent, with much of the Muslim population either killed or taken in captivity. When the takeover was relatively peaceful and the native population surrendered, more opportunities for convergent accommodation occurred. Peasants were permitted to remain on their land, though elite Muslims generally chose to relocate to other Muslim-controlled territories. After this initial period of violent takeovers or negotiated
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53 Ellenblum, “Settlement and Society,” 35-6. For a map of the locations of the settlements excavated by Ellenblum see p. 37.
surrendered, there was subsequently little resistance from the indigenous inhabitants who were used to living in a divided country where their ruler changed regularly.57

Throughout their tenure in East, the Franks were always a numerical minority, a fact that greatly influenced their approach to their new subjects.58 Because their control of the Levant depended on controlling a population much larger than their own, they offered a certain amount of convergent accommodation to ensure cooperation from their subjects.59 Instead of imposing a new administrative and political structure on their subjects, the Franks converged towards the existing structure, keeping their structures similar to the ones of those who had ruled before them, though they diverged by placing themselves at the top of this structure, followed by Eastern Christians, with Muslims finding themselves now at the bottom, along with the Jews. Yet, daily life and traditions likely changed little for Muslim peasants. The Franks were generally content to allow the Muslims to keep their religion and way of life as long as they remained peaceful. In exchange, the peasants worked for an overlord, overseen by a dragoman or ra’is, Muslim overseers appointed by the Franks, giving a portion of their goods as taxes. In his travels through the crusader states, Ibn Jubayr travelled through agricultural lands near Tyre and observed that the Muslims were living a relatively comfortable life under the Franks. These peasants paid half their crops and an additional tax on the crop from fruit trees, as well as a poll tax. These amounts could be similar to or even less than what they would pay in Muslim territories. Other than these impositions they were left on their own. In fact, Ibn Jubayr

58 At the peak in the 1180s it is estimated the Frankish population measured around 100,000-140,000 while the indigenous population numbered 300,000-360,000.
criticizes them for the comfortable life they live under the Franks, when they could be living in Muslim territories. The imposition of the poll tax highlights the divergent response of the Franks to their subjects. This tax was similar to the Muslim jizya that had previously been imposed on dhimmis, Jewish and Christian subjects, that the Muslims themselves were now being charged. The Franks placed Muslims at the bottom of the social scale. They also restricted certain legal rights. While the placement of Muslim peasants in the social strata changed under the Franks, the Franks converged towards the administrative structure already in place, allowing peasants to maintain their religious beliefs and cultural practices, as long as they acquiesced to Frankish political control and taxation.

While many peasants faced little overall change to their daily life, for some Muslims, their treatment became far worse under the Franks, as their overlords diverged greatly from previous practices, asserting their control over the Muslim peasant population. The Hanbali writer al-Maqdisi (Diya al-Din Abu `Abd Allah Muhammad b. `Abd al-Wahid al-Maqdisi, 1173-1245) from Damascus wrote a hagiographical dictionary about the shaykhs (elders) of the community of Nablus (Karamat Masha’ikh al-Ard al-Muqaddasa/The Wondrous Deeds of the Shaykhs of the Holy Land) which was

conquered by the Franks in 1099. The treatment of Muslims in Nablus appears to have been harsher than that observed by Ibn Jubayr around Tyre. The Hanbalite community appeared to react with fear of violence when the Franks were near. Under the rule of Baldwin of Ibelin (1133-86) they also experienced higher taxes. Yet even in a community that faced harsher treatment from their overlord, they were still granted some freedoms. Al-Maqdisi concedes that the Franks allowed Muslims to pray publically in mosques, visit shrines, and go on pilgrimage to Mecca. ‘Imad al-Din wrote that the Hanbalites had “accommodated themselves to living as subjects of the Franks…who annually collected from them a tax levy and changed not a single law or cult practice of theirs.” While the Franks who ruled Nablus were perceived as creating harsher living conditions for the Muslim peasants, their relationship was, according to Kedar, one of “rare resistance, limited collaboration.”

The Franks primarily chose to settle in areas inhabited predominantly by indigenous Christians, diverging geographically away from their Muslim subjects, and limiting chances for other kinds of convergence. Muslim villages and towns were controlled by Frankish overlords, who were largely absentee landlords, and run on a day to day basis by a ra’is, or headman, to serve as an intermediary between the village and the Frankish
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overlord, a position that was usually filled by one of the heads of the local families. The ra’is oversaw the agricultural production of the village. When Ibn Jubayr arrived at a Muslim farm he was met by the ra’is, a man he recognized as holding the Franks’ approval to oversee the land, and it was from him that Ibn Jubayr and his caravan received hospitality and lodging. The ra’is also served as an arbiter of justice, presiding over the Cour des Syriens, a continuation of earlier courts dating before the arrival of the Franks. The Cour des Syriens was granted jurisdiction over all who did not fall under the jurisdiction of the ‘law of Rome,’ the Latin Christians. In some places that had markets, the Cour des Syriens was eventually replaced by the Cour de la Fonde, a market court, dealing with commercial and civil matters, which was run primarily by Franks, along with a few native Syrians. The Franks allowed the Muslims to deal with their own justice, except in cases, as in markets, where there was contact between the two groups. The Franks exhibited a certain tolerance, if not extensive convergence, towards their inhabitants, encouraging a willingness for a population of much greater size to subject themselves to the rule of the Franks.

Along with the ra’is, two other important positions were used by the Franks to administer Muslim settlements. These were the dragoman and the scribe. The dragomans were often Latins, but sometimes also Muslims who spoke both Arabic and European languages and
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worked as interpreters, serving as intermediaries between Muslim inhabitants and Frankish lords. The amount of power they held varied by their position. In villages they were also responsible for taking in agricultural produce from peasants and that which belonged directly to the master. Scribes were largely Muslims, though there were also some who were Latin or Native Christians, fluent in Frankish languages and Arabic. Scribes were clerks who were responsible for the collection of the revenues of a village. When Ibn Jubayr’s caravan arrived at Acre he was impressed by the Christian clerks he dealt with who were fluent in Arabic. Through these positions the Franks experienced limited convergence with their Muslim subjects, allowing them to retain the social and administrative structures of their previous rulers. However, most Franks had little contact with the general Muslim peasant population, choosing to settle among native Christians, and placing themselves at the top of the social structure, relegating Muslim peasants to the bottom.

When it came to the faith of their subjects, for the secular and religious leaders of the crusader states, a limited convergent accommodation was often their approach towards Muslim subjects. They allowed limited toleration of their subjects’ religious practices, and did not force conversions. In both theology and law, conversions and baptisms were
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not allowed to be forced, and so Muslim subjects were allowed to remain in Frankish territory and keep their own religion. James Muldoon suggests two reasons for this. First, if non-Christian subjects were allowed to remain, there was always a chance they would convert in the future. Second, the Muslims provided labour that was desperately needed by the Frankish population, always in a numerical minority. The economic advantages provided by Muslim labourers were greatly valued, and it was better to have Muslim subjects remain on their land working.\(^{79}\)

When conversions did occur, of either Franks or Muslims, they were often a result of circumstance, rather than genuine belief. When the Franks faced a severe famine, some fled to the Turks and apostatized, saving their bodies (though, according to the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, damning their souls).\(^{80}\) Conversions were also found among Christians and Muslims when they were faced with danger, converting after being captured in battle to avoid being put to death, or enslaved by their captors.\(^ {81}\) However, these conversions were often impermanent. As soon as danger passed, the newly-converted reverted back to their original faith.\(^ {82}\) When the Franks conquered Acre they offered to free all those who converted and those who feared for their lives did so, but once they had been freed they reverted and returned to Salah al-Din.\(^ {83}\) As the faith of each group was one of the key parts of their overall group identity, it often took extreme

\(^{83}\) Roger de Hoveden, *The Annals*, vol. 2, part 1, 215; Usama Ibn Munqidh, *The Book of Contemplation*, 143. Usamah recounts similar stories of Christians who converted to Islam only to turn their back on their faith. This will be discussed at greater length in section on intermarriage.
circumstances for that to change. Members of the group faced delegitimization and expulsion from their group if they converted.

It was only through conversion that people could enter fully into the group identity of ‘other,’ though, for it was their religious identity that served as one of their most significant and central identities, and affected many of their attitudes and behaviours towards others.⁸⁴ It was only through conversion that one was able to join the Frankish community as a full group member. A limited number of records do exist of people choosing to convert of their own volition. While those of the same faith who record them are highly critical of the converts, the conversions do appear to have happened voluntarily.⁸⁵ Ibn Jubayr travelled with a Maghribi man who met with Christians along the way. He converted and, according to Ibn Jubayr, became a monk, “thereby hastening for himself the flames of hell, verifying the threats of torture, and exposing himself to a grievous account and a long-distant return (from hell).”⁸⁶ Al-Maqdisi records a similar episode in his writings about the Hanbalite community at Nablus. He records only one man converting, entering a church and thereafter belonging “to the people of hell.”⁸⁷ Through these conversions these members of other faiths became full group members.

The Franks who came to the East settled there to protect the sacred sites of the Holy Land, and were therefore often very protective of those sites. Muslims too sought control

⁸⁴ Bar-Tal, Group Beliefs, 16, 42, 58; Giles, Coupland, and Coupland, “Accommodation Theory,” 2.
of holy places. Both the crusades and counter-crusade were focused on bringing Jerusalem and other sacred sites into the sole possession of their faith, and this often led to tension or outright violence.\textsuperscript{88} In July 1188 Salah al-Din attacked the city of Antartus, tearing down the city wall, and burning down the city, in particular a church that was a significant site of pilgrimage for Christians, as well as a church at Lydda in 1191.\textsuperscript{89} In 1182/3 the Franks attacked Daryya and planned to demolish its mosque. This was averted when the Muslims threatened to destroy multiple churches in retaliation.\textsuperscript{90} The Temple Mount and Mount of Olives were also places Muslims and Christians fought for exclusive control.\textsuperscript{91} The fight for these sites led to religious divergence and hostility.

Interestingly, though, control of sacred spaces did not always lead to divergence. Some sacred sites for Muslims and Christians inspired peaceful spatial convergence rather than violence, though not generally greater intellectual understanding or other convergence.\textsuperscript{92} One of the ways this happened was through the Franks allowing certain mosques to remain in use, or keeping a portion of sites for Muslim worship, despite their being now Christian sites. Ibn Jubayr records that at Tyre he was able to worship at a mosque that

\textsuperscript{88} Riley-Smith, “Government and the Indigenous,” 123. Yet even Jerusalem found instances of peaceful worship. While Muslims were not allowed to live within Jerusalem’s walls, they were allowed to come and worship and would come to pray at the Dome of the Rock as well as the al-Aqsa Mosque. See Chapter One for Jerusalem’s significance to Christians and Muslims.

\textsuperscript{89} Baha` al-Din, \textit{The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin}, 83; Hillenbrand, \textit{The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives}, 380.


had remained in Muslim hands.\textsuperscript{93} He also recounts that a small portion of a mosque containing the tomb of the prophet Salih in Acre remained a mosque while the rest was converted to the Christian Church of the Holy Cross.\textsuperscript{94} Like the military orders, the Franks allowed a limited spatial convergence to occur within certain sacred sites.

In other cases, sacred spaces, including shrines or tombs, were shared, though often one faith served as a gatekeeper. Some provided simple spatial convergence, whereas others saw inegalitarian convergence where a service was shared, with one side leading and the other participating.\textsuperscript{95} Christians could attend the Frankish cathedral of Sebaste, and its tomb of John the Baptist for free, while Muslims gained entry with a “gift.”\textsuperscript{96} Free entry was granted to Muslims at the Church of the Holy Nativity in Bethlehem, and at the Templum Domini in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{97} At Hebron, Muslims were custodians of tombs believed to belong to Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebekah, and Jacob and Leah. Muslims provided information to pilgrims who paid a fee.\textsuperscript{98} Muslims were also known to gather at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem to witness the miracle of the lighting of the Easter fire.\textsuperscript{99} This spatial and inegalitarian convergence saw Christians and Muslims prioritizing peaceful convergence and access to these sites rather than continued struggle and exclusive control.

\textsuperscript{95} Kedar, “Convergences,” 91-3; Limor, “Sharing Sacred Space,” 220. Benjamin Kedar provides useful distinctions between spatial, in-egalitarian and egalitarian convergences at sacred sites as well as examples.
\textsuperscript{96} Kedar, “Convergences,” 91; Hillenbrand, \textit{The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives}, 372.
At a popular level, Franks and Muslims joined together in egalitarian convergence in seasonal celebrations, where Muslim and Christian celebrations coincided with one another. When the Franks celebrated Easter the Muslims celebrated their new year (Nawrūz); at Whitsuntide the Muslims celebrated al-Anšarah (heat); Christmas fell in the cold season; and the rainy season coincided with the Feast of St. Barbara (4 December). Even when the crusaders were at war with Muslims, these celebrations continued among common people.\footnote{Dajani-Shakeel, “Natives and Franks,” 162; Al-Muqaddasi, The Best Divisions for Knowledge, 166.}

The Franks also adopted many aspects of the physical culture of the society they found in the East, a decision that was largely of a practical nature in response to the new climate and physical geography of the Levant. This accommodation was a change in the outward behaviour of the Franks, but did not necessarily result in a more convergent attitude overall towards their Muslims subjects.\footnote{Ciggaar, “Adaptation to Oriental Life,” 261; Giles, Coupland, and Coupland, “Accommodation Theory,” 11-12.} The Franks still found ways to identify themselves as separate, and superior, to their subjects. When the settlers first arrived, they moved into the houses they conquered, and ate many of the available local foods, including beans, lentils and peas.\footnote{Marwan Nader, “Urban Muslims, Latin Laws, and Legal Institutions in the Kingdom of Jerusalem,” Medieval Encounters 13, no. 2 (2007): 245-6; Krijnie N. Ciggaar, “Adaptation to Oriental Life by Rulers in and Around Antioch Examples and Exempla,” in East and West in the Medieval Eastern Mediterranean, ed. Krijnie Nelly Ciggar and David Michael Metcalf (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters en Departement Oosterse Studies, 2006), 261.} Usamah tells a story of a Frankish man who invited a Muslim man to dinner. When the Muslim hesitated to accept, the Frank assured him he employed an Egyptian cook who followed Muslim customs, so the man could eat without
fear of eating foods forbidden by his faith. Muslim women, both those who had converted and those who had not, served as domestic servants to the nobility. They were also responsible for introducing the Franks to Levantine food, as well as teaching the children in their care Arabic.

The clothing of the Levant also highlighted ways in which Franks converged to some of the physical accoutrements of the East, while maintaining divergent identities overall, identities that were based at least in part on their religious group identity. Many of the Frankish settlers chose to wear the loose clothing of the East, more practical garments in the heat of their new environment. The fashions favoured by Muslim women also transferred over to Frankish women. Yet, while the Franks adopted Muslim styles of dress, they actively discouraged any reversal, and in this way diverged from their subjects, as the new political and social elite. A law was instituted at the 1120 council of Nablus that prohibited Muslims from wearing Western clothing. The council was held in response to the crushing defeat of Prince Roger of Antioch’s (1113-19) army by the Artuqid emir of Aleppo, Ilghazi (r. 1107-22) at the Field of Blood in 1119. Many of the canons laid out at Nablus sought to reaffirm the “moral purity” of the crusader states, and their separate religious identity and discourage close mixing between the Franks and Muslims. In addition to restrictions of Muslims from wearing European-style clothing,
it also prohibited sexual relations between Christians and Muslims.\textsuperscript{109} The prohibition on shared clothing was likely meant to serve a similar purpose as the prohibition on sexual relations, to prevent “inadvertent” intimacy, or convergence, between faiths (see below).\textsuperscript{110} By the time of the 1240 \textit{Livre des Assises des Bourgeois} these laws were no longer operative. They were a response to the calamities that had befallen the crusader states before 1120 (particularly at the Field of Blood) and were an attempt to restore what was perceived as a sinful Christian population back to faith and consequently back into God’s favour through a distancing of themselves from Muslims.\textsuperscript{111}

Just as the Franks asserted their dominance by mandating the clothing that could be worn by their subjects, they also maintained some outward physical divergence themselves, so that, even though they adopted the clothing of the East, they remained visibly distinct from their subjects. The men of the Levant wore beards while Western European crusaders, as well as settlers, tended to go clean shaven. An anonymous pilgrim in the Holy Land sometime before 1187 recorded of the Franks, “They are warlike men, practised in arms, are bareheaded and are the only one of all these races who shave the beard.”\textsuperscript{112} Exceptions to this rule included pilgrims who would let their beards grow as they travelled, which led to some being killed by friendly fire when the crusaders conquered Antioch. Templars, as part of their order’s regulations, also kept their beards. This made them highly visible in battle as members of a military order, making them

\textsuperscript{109} Kedar, “On the Origins of the Earliest Laws,” 313-14; Asbridge, \textit{The Crusades}, 177-8, 183; Talmont-Heller, “Muslims and Eastern Christians,” 45. Men who violated the law were castrated and women were subjected to their noses being cut off (rhinotomy). It is unclear however if the punishments set forth were ever carried out.


\textsuperscript{111} Asbridge, \textit{The Crusades}, 178.

\textsuperscript{112} Translated in Stewart, “Anonymous Pilgrims,” 27; Ciggaar, “Adaptation to Oriental Life,” 268-70; Baha’ al-Din, \textit{The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin}, 173.
more vulnerable upon capture, but also making them potential targets of friendly fire in battle, when mistaken for a Muslim. Jacques de Vitry provides an *exemplum* of a pilgrim being captured by the enemy. His beard suggested he was a Templar but he denied it. Eventually he decided he was willing to be martyred and confessed to being a Templar and was duly killed.\textsuperscript{113} The Franks converged towards certain elements of life in the East, often out of necessity, but the importance of their Frankish identity, both politically and religiously, caused them to institute policies and traditions that kept them separate from their Muslim subjects.

Though adopting some of the physical trappings of the culture of the East, the Franks retained a separate identity from their Muslim subjects. As seen with both the crusaders and members of the military orders, what provided one of the most significant group identities for both the Franks and the Muslims was their religious identity. There were some Muslims who were accepted into this identity, and this came through conversion to Christianity. One of the ways this acceptance was expressed was through intermarriage between Latin Christians and Muslim converts. Through intermarriage, Muslims also brought with them some of the physical trappings of Eastern life, as mentioned above. Intermarriage accounted for some of the differences noted by contemporary writers between settlers whose families had spent a few generations in Syria and new immigrants who were less familiar with the customs and lifestyles of the Muslims of the Levant.\textsuperscript{114}

\textsuperscript{113} Ciggaar, “Adaptation to Oriental Life,” 271, 278, original Latin text provided on 282. 
Intermarriage between Franks and native Christians (Greeks, Armenians) was relatively common.\textsuperscript{115} Sources are less clear on the rate of intermarriage between Franks and Muslims, though some did occur, particularly between Frankish men and Muslim women who had converted to Christianity.\textsuperscript{116} The religious identity of both parties remained important, and sources suggest conversion was an important factor in intermarriage, for it brought the spouse into one of the most significant group identities of their partner.

Interramarriage appears to have been more common in early sources, but by the thirteenth century it was more restricted.\textsuperscript{117} The French chaplain of Baldwin I, Fulcher of Chartres (1059-1127), in encouraging Westerners to come settle, wrote of settlers who were already in the Levant, “For we who were Occidentals have now become Orientals…Some have taken wives not only of their own people but Syrians or Armenians or even Saracens who have obtained the grace of baptism.”\textsuperscript{118} While Fulcher suggests early settlers were accepting of such pairings, the council of Nablus in 1120, as mentioned above, was more condemnatory of the possibility of intermarriage. After the Frankish defeat at the Field of Blood in 1119, the council prohibited many kinds of fraternisation with Muslims, including sexual contact between Franks and Muslims.\textsuperscript{119} With both of these sources, it is difficult to know how much is a reflection of actual experience, or how much they are

\textsuperscript{115} Asbridge, \textit{The Crusades}, 177-8; Setton, \textit{A History of the Crusades}, vol. 5, 46-7.


\textsuperscript{117} Brundage, “Marriage Law,” 263.


\textsuperscript{119} Jonathan Phillips, \textit{The Crusades 1095-1197} (London: Pearson Education, 2002), 33; Asbridge, \textit{The Crusades}, 178; Talmon-Heller, “Muslims and Eastern Christians,” 45. For the relevant Latin text of the council of Nablus see Kedar, “On the Origins of the Earliest Laws,” 331-334. Male transgressors were to be castrated, while females who consented were to have their noses cut off.
trying to encourage or discourage a practice that may or may not have been already happening in significant numbers.

The theologian Gratian (d. c. 1159), in his work the _Decretum_, acknowledged the theological possibility at least of a marriage between a Christian and a Muslim. He asserted that if one party converted and the other did not, the marriage remained valid, as long as the spouse lived “peaceably” with the newly converted spouse.\textsuperscript{120} It is possible that the children of such a union were still considered legitimate, though the Church and law disapproved of such unions.\textsuperscript{121} In the first decades of crusading, this theological standpoint reflected the possibility of convergence and inclusion into the group identity of a spouse between the Franks and Muslims through intermarriage, as Fulcher of Chartres recorded.\textsuperscript{122} By the mid-thirteenth century, though, this attitude appears to have waned, with the Franks putting a more divergent emphasis on their relations with Muslims, asserting their superior position in the crusader states.\textsuperscript{123}

Muslim sources also provide few examples of marriage between Muslims and Christians.\textsuperscript{124} However, Usamah provides a few stories of intermarriage. In his accounts, these marriages fail for the Christians refuse to converge completely, clinging to their

\textsuperscript{120} Muldoon, “Tolerance and Intolerance,” 120.
\textsuperscript{121} Brundage, “Marriage Law,” 263; Beugnot, _RHC Lois II_, 107.
\textsuperscript{122} Brundage, “Marriage Law,” 263.
\textsuperscript{123} Brundage, “Marriage Law,” 262-3; Prawer, _Crusader Institutions_, 208; Beugnot, _RHC Lois II_, 107. In the _Livre des Assises des bourgeois_, a law book from c. 1240, a previously obsolete Constantinian law was reintroduced into the kingdom of Jerusalem, prohibiting the marriage of a free person with an unfree or freed person. In the laws of the kingdom, Latin Christians could not be enslaved, so persons who were in the second category were almost exclusively Muslims, Jews or Oriental Christians, not Latin Christians. James Brundage suggests this law was brought back into existence to prevent the marriages of Franks to members of the indigenous populations. The _Assises_ implied, much like Gratian, that such marriages between Christians and heretics were valid but not licit. It is possible that the children of such a union were still to be considered legitimate, though the Church and the law were disapproving of such unions.
\textsuperscript{124} Hillenbrand, _The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives_, 350-1.
Frankish Christian identity. In one story a pretty captive Frankish serving girl married an emir. She had a son who, upon the emir’s death, was made lord. Despite her status and wealth, the woman returned to the Franks to marry a shoemaker, preferring a lowly Christian to an important Muslim. Another captive woman had a son who converted and was granted a position as a stonecutter and a marriage to a devout Muslim woman. The man had two sons with the woman. He took them with him, returning to his own people, and converting back to Christianity. While it appears intermarriage happened, the success of such marriages appears often to have been dependent on the genuine conversion of one member to the faith of the other, not something that could be relied upon. When conversions did happen, it appears there was often distrust as to the genuineness of the conversion, and whether the conversion would last.

The Turcopoles were a distinct group that developed in part at least out of intermarriage between Franks and indigenous populations. The name was derived from Greek and means “Sons of Turks.” They appear to have been archers and light horsemen who used the techniques of Turkish fighters. While some were Muslims who had converted to Christianity, many were the children of interracial marriages, usually a Christian father and a native mother. Usamah identifies the Turcopoles simply as archers for the

129 King, *Rule Statutes and Customs*, 48n.
Franks, while the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum* describes them as native auxiliaries. Both the Hospitallers and the Templars employed Turcopoles, who made up a significant portion of the orders’ forces but were not officially brothers of the order. They were commanded by a *Turcopolier*. For the Templars this position started as a subordinate one under the marshal. For the Hospitallers, by the records of the chapter general in 1330, the position of Turcopolier was one of the high officials. For the Turcopoles and those who worked with them, their ethnic identity played a lesser role to their religious one. Upon conversion, they were brought into the community of Christendom, and their primary allegiance became to those with whom they shared a faith.

In rural areas of the Levant, Muslim peasants had more limited contact with Franks, and therefore more limited opportunities for convergence as well. However, similarly to crusading nobility, the elite Franks engaged in more direct and extensive contact with the Muslim nobility and merchant classes within the cities. The group identity provided by nobility, and chivalric virtues, again caused a horizontal split in society, where nobility offered a point of convergence, regardless of religious or ethnic identity.

One of the places where elite Franks came into contact with Muslim neighbours was in the bathhouse. The bathhouse provided a place to cleanse in a hot climate, but, more than that, it provided a place for entertainment and relaxation. For Muslims, bathing was part

---

of their daily religious practices, as well as the bathhouse being a place to socialize and entertain guests.\textsuperscript{134} When the Franks first arrived in the Levant, there was a stereotype among the native Muslim populations that the Franks lacked basic hygiene.\textsuperscript{135} The Frankish nobility challenged this stereotype, adapting to the climate and cultural traditions and availing themselves of bathhouses frequented by locals.\textsuperscript{136} It appears, though, that they may have brought some changes to the bathhouse culture, such as challenging the strict segregation of sexes, which would have been a shock to Muslims.\textsuperscript{137} Usamah related stories of experiences between Franks and Muslims in bathhouses in passages typical of \textit{adab} literature. They provided instruction and entertainment to the reader, while not being bound strictly to what today would be considered truth, presenting dichotomies meant to instruct the reader. He suggested that some Franks confirmed all bad stereotypes of the Franks and did not abide by the customs of the bathhouses. He tells of a Frankish man who admired the Muslim men’s shaved pubic hair, and insisted a Muslim man do the same for himself and his wife. This man breached conventions and in a very inappropriate way. Usamah asserted that the Franks lacked a sense of honour and propriety.\textsuperscript{138} In another tale, Usamah provides a counterpoint, in which another Frankish man breaks convention, but does so for honourable reasons. He tells of a Frankish man who brought his daughter to the bathhouse to wash her hair, for her mother had died and there was no one to help her. While the man was doing something that would normally be considered improper, Usamah’s assessment of the man was that he was honourable, and

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{134} Ciggaar, “Adaptation to Oriental Life,” 264-5, 267.  \\
\textsuperscript{135} Ciggaar, “Adaptation to Oriental Life,” 264-5; Hillenbrand, \textit{The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives}, 272.  \\
\textsuperscript{136} Ciggaar, “Adaptation to Oriental Life,” 264-5; Al-Muqaddasi, \textit{The Best Divisions for Knowledge}, 152; Buckley, \textit{The Book of the Islamic Market Inspector}, 104-7. Bathhouses were governed by a Muhtasib, or inspector governed by hisba manual (best practice) to ensure cleanliness and modesty were maintained.  \\
\textsuperscript{137} Ciggaar, “Adaptation to Oriental Life,” 262.  \\
\end{flushleft}
would receive a heavenly reward for his actions.\textsuperscript{139} The bathhouse became a point of contact between Franks and Muslims, where there was social convergence, as well as spatial, though it was not without some adjustment for the Muslims as Franks challenged many of the conventions of the space.

The Franks were engaged in war with the Muslims often, and the Franks did consider surrounding Muslim forces to be enemies, but the chivalric identity and attitude of the Frankish and Muslim nobility caused them to prioritize horizontal relationships with fellow elites over solidarity with those of their own faith at times. One of the ways they socialized was through hunting together.\textsuperscript{140} Usamah includes an entire section of his book recounting episodes of hunting, including with the Frankish nobility. In one instance King Fulk of Jerusalem (1131-43) invited the emir Mu`in al-Din and Usamah to hunt in Acre. While there the emir met a Genoese man who had with him a hunting goshawk and dog. The emir fancied the animals and asked the king to give them to him – a request which was duly granted.\textsuperscript{141} While the Franks did not abandon the need for holy war, or the necessity of the protection of the Latin states, when they were not directly involved in war they prioritized their chivalric identity and personal relationships with Muslims in a horizontal structure over the prescriptive beliefs of their faith that discouraged such friendly interactions.\textsuperscript{142}

\textsuperscript{139} Usama Ibn Munqidh, \textit{The Book of Contemplation}, 149-50; Ciggaar, “Adaptation to Oriental Life,” 262.
\textsuperscript{140} Talmor-Heller, “Muslims and Eastern Christians,” 45; Friedman, “Gestures of Conciliation,” 45.
Another group in the Levant who possessed an identity that challenged the primacy of religious identity were the merchants who came to trade in the Levant, establishing flourishing centres of commerce. Merchants from Italian city states responded to the call to crusade, much like other Christians, and offered ships and fought in campaigns as well. But, their identity as merchants challenged this religious military assistance, particularly since merchants from city states such as Naples, Amalfi, and Venice had already established trade routes with Muslims in the Middle East and North Africa before the First Crusade.¹⁴³ With the crusades these routes expanded and became even more lucrative. Merchants developed trade relations with Muslims, trading with them in times of war, even trading military goods to them. Merchants developed a professional identity based on trade, and this identity led them to convergent accommodation with Muslims, which sometimes threatened crusading endeavours, despite their religious faith and their support of crusading ventures.

Italian merchants did respond with concern for the welfare of the Latin states and the crusading movement, involving themselves in crusades out of religious devotion, though some historians have suggested they acted solely out of economic motives.¹⁴⁴ While many rulers granted them trading privileges due to their role in the crusades, it was not their sole motivating factor.¹⁴⁵ The Italians committed resources and ships to a movement

whose outcome was unknown, and potentially disastrous, without being guaranteed an economically beneficial outcome. They were willing to risk great financial loss for the sake of the crusades and their fellow Christians.\footnote{Abulafia, “Trade and Crusade,” 1; Abulafia, The Great Sea, 290; Tyerman God’s War, 265-6; Phillips, The Second Crusade, 9-10.} During the Second and Third Crusades, Italians assisted crusaders transporting armies and goods to the Levant. Once there they joined the crusading armies against the Muslims. In preparation for the Third Crusade King Philip of France used the Genoese to bring his army by ship to the East.\footnote{Ambroise, The Crusade of Richard the Lion-Heart, 46.} In the initial siege of Acre Venetians and Genoese made up some of the first combatants, along with the barons of King Guy of Jerusalem.\footnote{Roger of Wendover, Flowers of History, vol. 2, 69.} The Pisans were also actively involved in the siege, protecting the shores, and blockading the city, a position they were assigned for their skills at sea.\footnote{Nicholson, The Chronicle of the Third Crusade, 69-70.} In exchange for their assistance, the Pisans received a promise from King Guy for many trading privileges and properties on the island of Cyprus.\footnote{Edbury, The Conquest of Jerusalem, 120.} The Italian merchants identified with the religious goals and beliefs of the crusading movement, but their identity as professional merchants did see potential advantages to be had as well.

Italian merchants had a longstanding trade relationship and identity with Muslims, extending to before the crusades. Amalfitan, Pisan and Genoese merchants had all traded

\textit{Done,} vol. 1, 552-6; Benjamin of Tudela, \textit{The Itinerary,} 49, 38, 62. Historians are not the only ones to be critical. The contemporary Jewish merchant Benjamin of Tudela on his trip through the Near East between 1159/60 to 1173 criticized Italian merchants of Venice, Genoa and Pisa for being too focused on their own economic gain to prevent the Muslims from harming Outremer. He was also critical of the competition between the republics when they attacked locations for their spoils, as well as one another. “Venetian Treaty,” in \textit{The Crusades: A Reader,} ed. S. J. Allen and Emilie Amt (Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press), 2003, 91-3. In 1124 the Venetians were granted extensive property, trading rights and their own courts in exchange for previously rendered assistance to the kingdom. William of Tyre lays out the privileges they received.

\footnote{Abulafia, “Trade and Crusade,” 1; Abulafia, The Great Sea, 290; Tyerman God’s War, 265-6; Phillips, The Second Crusade, 9-10.}
extensively with the Fatimids of North Africa, and after 969 with Egypt. By 1060 the Amalfitans had also gained rights to work within Jerusalem. These relationships carried on into the crusades. Italian merchants engaged in extensive trade with neighbouring Muslim states, even during periods of war. At times their merchant identity conflicted with their identity as potential crusaders, and took precedence over it. In some instances, they can be seen to be working directly against the best interests of the crusader states. This included trading war materials to neighbouring Muslim states. In 1154 the Pisans confirmed a treaty with the Egypt, providing the Fatimids at Alexandria with timber, iron and pitch. In return they received alum to trade in the West. In 1156 King Baldwin III of Jerusalem (1143-63) tried to win over the Pisans by offering privileges in exchange for them quitting trading goods and arms to Egypt. The Pisans refused because Alexandria was a large trading hub, providing access to extensive trade routes. By the 1170s, the Venetians and Genoese had also begun extensive trade with Egypt, including goods used in war materials and arms. In these cases the merchants appear to have identified more strongly with their professional identity, and converged

152 Jacoby, “The Supply of War Materials,” 106; Abulafia, “Trade and Crusade,” 14, 16. The extent of the contacts provided through Alexandria can be seen in the list compiled by Benjamin of Tudela of the merchants he encountered in the port from around the world. “Alexandria is a commercial market for all nations. Merchants come thither from all the Christian kingdoms. On the one side, from the land of Venetia and Lombardy, Tuscany, Apulia, Amalfi, Sicilia, Calabria, Romagna, Khazaria, Patzinakia, Hungaria, Bulgaria, Rakuvia (Ragusa?), Croatia, Slavonia, Russia, Alamannia (Germany), Saxony, Danemark, Kurland? Ireland? Norway (Norge?), Frisia, Scotia, Angleterre, Wales, Flanders, Hainault? Normandy, France, Poitiers, Anjou, Burgundy, Maurienne, Provence, Genoa, Pisa, Gascony, Aragon, and Navarra. And towards the west, under the sway of the Mohammedans: Andalusia, Algarve, Africa, and the land of the Arabs. And on the other side India, Zawilah, Abyssinia, Lybia, El-Yemen, Shinar, Esh-Sham (Syria); also Javan, whose people are called the Greeks, and the Turks. And merchants of India bring thither all kinds of spices, and the merchants of Edom buy of them.” Benjamin of Tudela, The Itinerary, 134.
with Muslim traders, which at times potentially undermined the political success of the crusader states by aiding the war effort of the Fatimids and later of the Sunnis under Salah al-Din by providing war materials.\textsuperscript{154}

The Franks possessed political control of the crusader states, but their population always remained a minority compared to that of the indigenous inhabitants, with historians suggesting their numbers equalling approximately a third of the indigenous inhabitants. In the 1180s the subject population is estimated to have numbered between 300,000-360,000 while the Franks likely numbered around 100,000-140,000.\textsuperscript{155} This affected their outlook towards the viability of holy war, the way they lived their daily lives and where they worshipped. It also affected their practices concerning trade. The Franks did not radically change the economic structure that was already established in the Levant, but rather converged towards the existing economic structure, preserving it and working within it, maintaining the rural workforce and trade structures.\textsuperscript{156} This structure allowed merchants to foster a professional identity that often seems to have taken precedence over their religious identity. The crusader states possessed centres of trade where there were merchants of many different religions and ethnicities, including Franks, indigenous Christian and Muslim populations from within the crusader states, and to a more limited

extent, Muslims from inland Muslim centres of trade such as Damascus.\textsuperscript{157} Significant port cities, including Tyre, Antioch, Tripoli, and Acre, provided a multi-ethnic, and multi-faith, environment, where merchants from around the world came to trade their goods.\textsuperscript{158}

In Acre, the largest port city of the Franks, merchants of many faiths, immigrants, crusaders, and pilgrims all intermingled. In the port cities, such as Acre, merchants of many identities were gathered together, with the Franks expressing a relative tolerance for the presence of other faiths. Oriental Christians continued to live in Acre after its conquest by the Franks in 1104. No permanent Muslim community existed, but a few Muslim merchants were granted an aman (safe conduct) to establish a residence in the city.\textsuperscript{159} Italian merchants, including Pisans, Genoese, and Venetians, had their own quarters in the city, having received privileges from the Franks.\textsuperscript{160} When Ibn Jubayr came through Acre he observed of the city, “It is the focus of ships and caravans, and the meeting-place of Muslim and Christian merchants from all regions. Its roads and streets are choked by the press of men, so that it is hard to put foot to ground.”\textsuperscript{161} The Franks, especially merchants, exhibited spatial and economic convergence, working within close quarters with Muslims for the economic benefit of the Frankish states, allowing their

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{159} “Meanwhile, sailors were proceeding on their usual courses to Acre. Some carried merchandise and others pilgrims, people from all over the Christian world.” Nicholson, The Chronicle of the Third Crusade, 35. Jacoby, “Aspects of Everyday Life,” 73, 84-6; Dajani-Shakeel, “Some Aspects,” 198.
\textsuperscript{160} Abulafia, The Great Sea, 325.
\textsuperscript{161} Translated in Ibn Jubayr, The Travels of Ibn Jubayr, 318.
\end{flushright}
merchants to sell their wares, and to bring in necessities and luxuries for the crusader states.

The Franks allowed merchants from many different faiths to trade in the crusader states, converging to the system that had been previously established. The identity provided by the merchant profession, encouraged a mingling for the greatest economic benefit. They diverged in their accommodations when it came to the power structure, however, for there was still separation of merchants of different faiths within the system. This system placed Latin Christians in the most privileged positions, with other faiths below. When goods arrived at the city by land they were taxed by the funda/fonde (market) based on the type of product, as well as the ethnic and religious origin of the merchants. When Christian merchants entered Muslim territories they faced a similar taxation process. When Ibn Jubayr, the Arabic traveller, travelled with a group of merchants to the Frankish city of Acre, he seemed to accept this system without hostility. Upon his arrival, the bags of the caravan he was travelling in were inspected and the appropriate taxes applied, “with civility and respect, and without harshness and unfairness.” The Frankish merchants used their professional identity to work in close quarters with Muslims, and in a generally peaceful fashion. However, the religious identity of the Franks in the crusader states set up a structure in which, while working closely, merchants were still separated by their religious beliefs, and treated accordingly.


With so many religious and ethnic groups gathered into one place, courts were established to deal with the inevitable disputes that arose. In these courts, as in the wider social strata of society, religious identity provided the criteria by which stratification took place. Latin Christians were placed at the top of the hierarchy, the Syrian Christians slightly below, with Jews and Muslims falling at the bottom of the social rungs. Once again, the Franks placed non-Latin Christians outside of their group identity. Merchants dealt with the Cour de la Fonde, or the Market Court. The Market Court was granted jurisdiction over all commercial matters as well as over all civil and criminal matters concerning non-Franks within the city, with the exception of matters that fell under the jurisdiction of the High Court. Muslims and Jews were placed in a legally inferior position as they lacked any representation on the jury. The court was presided over by six jurors: four native Syrians and two Franks, with a bailli (a knight or a burgess) presiding over them. Though sources are limited, it seems in Acre, and perhaps in other places, this court eventually replaced the Cour des Syriens (see above for more detail) which ruled Muslim populations and was headed by a Muslim ra’is.

164 Richard, The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, 127-8, 131; Setton, A History of the Crusades, vol. 5, 258; Riley-Smith, “Government and the Indigenous,” 130. The Cour de la Fonde was the court system that dealt most extensively with inter-religious conflict. Two other major courts existed in the Frankish states that dealt more exclusively with Frankish inhabitants. Burgess Courts (Cour des Bourgeois) dealt with commercial and criminal matters between Frankish burgesses and between Franks and Italians, Muslims or Syrian Christians where the latter were the plaintiffs. These courts were comprised of 12 jurors who were selected by the king or the local lord. Within this court members of different faiths swore on their own holy book (i.e. Jews swore on the Torah, Muslims on the Qur’an and native Christians, including Syrians, Armenians, Greeks or Nestorians, swore on the Gospels). The High Court (Haute Cour) dealt with cases in the royal domain dealing with cases between knights or between knights and burgesses.


167 Riley-Smith, “Some Lesser Officials,” 7; Prawer, Crusader Institutions, 366; Richard, The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, 139; Beugnot, RHC, Lois II, 171-81. By the time the Livre des Assises des
In general, the Franks appear to have resisted engaging in much intellectual convergent accommodation with Muslims. Historians have suggested a few reasons for this lack of intellectual interaction. First, there were few intellectuals who arrived with the crusaders, while most Muslim intellectuals left the crusader states when they were conquered. Of those who remained, many were separated by a language barrier. The religious identity possessed by both sides also led to each often dismissing the other as being less culturally or religiously advanced than themselves. One area where the Franks found some intellectual common ground with Muslims counterparts, however, was in the profession of medicine. As mentioned in the last chapter, at this time Arabic medical knowledge, through Arabic and Greek medical literature, was starting to make its way to Europe through Spain and Sicily, centres of learning and translation, as well as through translation centres in the Latin East. While sources are unclear as to the extent to which physicians were in contact with one another, it is clear that not only Hospitaller physicians, but also other Frankish physicians adopted common practices, customs, and in some cases common treatment to their fellow Muslim doctors, suggesting some intellectual contact and accommodation occurred. The group identity provided by medical practice gave a direct challenge to religious identity, lessening its centrality, and allowing in this case a more extensive exchange of intellectual knowledge.

---

* Bourgeois* was written between 1240-33, non-Latin Christians, Jews and Muslims were all dealt with by the Cour de la Fonde.


As was seen in the previous chapter, from the eleventh century onwards, Greek and Arabic texts began to make their way into the consciousness of Western Europeans, leading to more of an interest in curing patients, rather than simply caring for them.\(^\text{172}\)

The Franks also inherited translation centres in Tripoli and Antioch, and through these centres, Arabic medical knowledge became increasingly accessible to Frankish doctors.\(^\text{173}\) Many European scholars came specifically to use these facilities. For example, Stephen of Pisa was one such scholar who came to Antioch between 1126 and 1130 and translated al-Majusi’s *kitab al-malaki* (Complete Book of the Medical Art), into Latin as *Regalis Dispositio* (The Royal Arrangement).\(^\text{174}\) Through these texts, medical knowledge that had been lost to the European world was reintroduced, and allowed Frankish doctors to build upon their base knowledge of classical medicine.

The depth and extent of knowledge possessed by Muslim medical professionals is evident from the testing they were required to undertake to practice medicine. Since the eleventh century, most Muslim hospitals required doctors to be licensed. Medicine was treated as a trade and doctors were regulated by a *muhtasib*, an official who was appointed to oversee the practical and moral management of Muslim markets.\(^\text{175}\) The regulations for the *muhtasib* were laid out in *hisba* manuals, which laid out best practice and the knowledge that was expected of medical practitioners. Regulations were included for a variety of medical professionals, including apothecaries, those who made syrups; phlebotomists and

---

\(^{172}\) Edgington, “Medical Care in the Hospital of St John,” 33; Mitchell, *Medicine in the Crusades*, 210-11.


cuppers; as well as physicians, eye doctors, bone setters and surgeons. The manual required that all physicians be tested on Hunyan b. Ishaq’s *The Trial of the Physician*, and Galen’s *The Trial of the Physician*. Eye doctors were to be tested on Hunyan b. Ishaq’s *The Ten Treatises of the Eye*. Bone setters were to know Paul’s sixth book of the *Kunnash* and surgeons were to have knowledge of Galen’s *Qatajanus* and the book al-Zahrawi wrote on wounds. Only those who could prove sufficiently to the *muhtasib* that they had knowledge of these books as well as a practical knowledge of their chosen specialty were to be allowed to practice.

Before the crusades Europeans had no such licensing practices, but by the 1140s Frankish doctors were starting to be licensed, and by the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries it had become common practice. This was a practice likely adopted from Muslims, who, by 949, required all physicians to be licensed. In the 1240-44 *Livre des Assises de la Cour des Bourgeois*, the Frankish licensing practice was similar to that of Muslim physicians. All doctors, of any religion, from outside the kingdom were to be tested by local doctors and the bishop to ensure they had the necessary theoretical and practical knowledge to practice medicine safely. Once the doctors were licensed, they were to be overseen by an official called a *mathessep*. This post appears to have been an adoption of

---

179 Susan B. Edgington, “Medicine and Surgery in the *Livre des Assises de la Cour des Bourgeois de Jerusalem,*” *Al-Masāq* 18 (2005): 87; Woodings, “The Medical Resources and Practice,” 269; Edgington, “Oriental and Occidental Medicine,” 204. The *Assises* were written by a burgess of Acre. They were originally believed to represent the laws of the kingdom from its inception in 1099 to 1187. It is unclear if these laws do reflect this earlier period, or if they reflect the laws as they stood at the time of the document’s writing in 1240-44.
the role of the Muslim *muhtasib*.¹⁸¹ In the practice of licensing, it can be suggested the Franks were assimilating Muslim practices into their own medical profession.

Medical professionals of different religions usually worked separately, but sources do make reference to physicians of one faith engaging in convergent accommodation and treating patients of another.¹⁸² Some Franks were willing to be treated by non-Latin physicians.¹⁸³ While Franks could have consulted Latin doctors, they appear at times to have preferred Jewish, indigenous Christian and Muslim physicians, in addition to Latin ones. Some Latins prioritized the skills of Muslim, and other non-Christian doctors, over their commitment to their Christian identity.¹⁸⁴ William of Tyre disapproved of this, being critical of the skills of non-Latin doctors, and believing Franks were putting themselves in danger by using them. When Baldwin III received a physic from the Syrian physician Barac, he developed fever and dysentery, leading to his death. William blamed Barac for Baldwin’s death, “for our Eastern princes, through the influence of their women, scorn the medicines and practice of our Latin physicians and believe only in the Jews, Samaritans, Syrians and Saracens. Most recklessly they put themselves under the care of such practitioners and trust their lives to people who are ignorant of the science of medicine.”¹⁸⁵ But not all Franks felt this way, and they seem not to have been restricted

to using Latin physicians. Rather, doctors could work fluidly among faith groups.\textsuperscript{186} When King Amalric got dysentery and a fever, he first looked to Greeks, Syrians and other physicians for treatment. They refused, possibly because of the harsh fines that existed for the failure to treat a free man successfully, particularly the king.\textsuperscript{187} Only after their refusal did he look to a Latin physician, agreeing to take responsibility for any failed treatment.\textsuperscript{188} The Franks appear to have sought out physicians of other faiths and creeds, suggesting a trust in the skills and knowledge of these practitioners.

Muslims possibly had more extensive medical knowledge, but they do not appear to have believed all Latin Christian doctors to be without skill. Usamah provides stories of Frankish doctors who do lack skill, but also a doctor who provides care beyond Usamah’s knowledge. Usamah records how his uncle sent Thabit, a Syrian Christian physician, to a friend whose companions needed a doctor. He was assigned two patients, a knight with an abscess in his leg for whom he made a poultice, and a woman who was experiencing dry humours for which he changed her diet, to increase her wetness. While he was treating them a Frankish physician came and insisted on changing the treatment. The Frank had the knight’s leg amputated, and insisted the woman was suffering from a demon in her head and so shaved it and returned her to her regular diet. This caused her humours to become dry again and she became worse. In response he cut the shape of a cross into her skull and rubbed the exposed area with salt. In both cases the patient

\textsuperscript{186} Mitchell, \textit{Medicine in the Crusades}, 33; Edgington, “Medical Care in the Hospital of St John,” 28.
\textsuperscript{187} William of Tyre, \textit{A History of Deeds Done}, vol. 2, 395; Woodings, “The Medical Resources and Practices,” 270. For the list of fines to be found in the \textit{Assises} see Beugnot, \textit{RHC Lois II}, 164-69. For an English translation see Edgington, “Medicine and Surgery,” 92-96.
\textsuperscript{188} William of Tyre, \textit{A History of Deeds Done}, vol. 2, 395.
died.\textsuperscript{189} This view seems to support Usamah’s general opinion that the Franks possessed less skill than physicians from Syria and Palestine.\textsuperscript{190} While these were drastically unsuccessful treatments, Usamah also acknowledged observing Frankish physicians who saved their patients. A Frankish knight, Bernard, was kicked in the leg and the wound festered, continuing to open in different places. A Frankish physician took away the ointments being used to cover it, and instead washed the leg in vinegar and the leg closed and healed. In another successful case an artisan from Shayzar, Abu al-Fath, had a son suffering from scrofula on his neck that saw sores form repeatedly. While in Antioch, a Frankish man offered Abu al-Fath a cure for his son’s illness, if he promised to share it with others and not demand payment. Abu al-Fath agreed and the man gave him the remedy, which worked on his son, as well as for Usamah in treating others.\textsuperscript{191}

Muslim and Christian physicians engaged in the intellectual convergent accommodation that was so often missing from other forms of contact between both faiths in the Levant. Frankish physicians learned much from Muslim doctors, using Arabic and Greek medical texts that had been lost to the Western world, and adopting the practice of licensing, based on the Muslim model. Muslims also appear to have had some trust in the skills of Latin doctors, for they too were not unwilling to be treated by them.

When the Franks came to settle in the Levant they brought with them the same beliefs, attitudes and behaviours as those crusaders who only stayed temporarily. Over time, however, the settlers developed a new identity that separated them from their crusading

\textsuperscript{189} Usama Ibn Munqidh, \textit{The Book of Contemplation}, 145.
\textsuperscript{190} Ciggaar, “Adaptation to Oriental Life,” 264-5.
\textsuperscript{191} Usama Ibn Munqidh, \textit{The Book of Contemplation}, 146.
counterparts, and their European identities, forming a distinct ‘Frankish’ identity. This identity was separate from the crusaders, but it was also unique from the Eastern cultures and peoples they lived amongst. The surrounding Muslim powers were still viewed as enemies, and the Franks were not averse to fighting in holy wars when necessary. To a greater extent than the crusaders, however, the Franks found continual holy war to be untenable and unwanted. They were more willing to engage in treaties and truces to bring an end to disputes, or to prevent them from breaking out in the first place. In large part, this was because the Franks were always a minority population, and rarely had the manpower to fight extensively. They relied on truces for their survival, and turned to the West for aid when situations were truly beyond their capabilities. In regards to their own subjects, the Franks adopted a policy of relative tolerance and convergence, keeping many of the political and administrative structures the Muslims had established, but placing themselves at the top of this new hierarchy. What differentiated the social strata of the Levant was the religious identity of each group. They also adopted many of the physical elements of Eastern culture, including food, clothing, and housing. What generally eluded the Franks was a deeper intellectual convergence with their subjects, as their religious identity mostly prevented this. Where greater convergence can be found is within competing group identities. Elite nobles developed a social relationship with other Muslim nobles, and merchants traded extensively with Muslims both within and around the crusader states. The greatest intellectual accommodation occurred through the practice of medicine.
CONCLUSION

This study has argued that the crusaders who came from Europe to the Holy Land between 1145 and 1192 possessed a wide variety of identities, influenced by their ethnicity, language, political affiliations, and personal loyalties. They came to the Levant for a wide variety of reasons as well: to engage in holy war against the infidel as penance, to come on pilgrimage to worship at Jerusalem, for adventure, or to start a new life. However, most crusaders did share a religious identity that encouraged a common goal: to protect the Holy Land, the land where they believed Jesus had lived, performed his miracles, and brought salvation to all believers through his death and resurrection, from the Muslim infidel. This meant maintaining the land that had already been conquered, and fighting to reclaim what had been lost, in particular, during the Third Crusade, the city of Jerusalem. The Latin Christians possessed strong prescriptive religious beliefs that identified the Muslims as a distinct and enemy ‘other’ who threatened their protection and possession of the Holy Land. This otherness placed the Muslims firmly outside of the Christian identity, and identified them as a legitimate target for holy war. However, this study argues that when the Christians arrived in the East, and they came into contact with actual Muslims, the religious identity that prescribed holy war was challenged by other identities that prized contact and convergent accommodation over divergent warfare, and by a lessening in the centrality of the commitment to holy war in their religious identity, due to other concerns based on the actual situations encountered in the East and the realization that continued warfare was not always practical or desirable. Despite the convergent accommodation that occurred, the religious identity of the crusaders, military
orders and Franks remained one of the primary factors in their attitudes and behaviours to Muslims. This meant that complete inclusion into any of these communities ultimately required conversion, something that was not a priority, and so remained limited.

The majority of crusaders served in the Levant for only a few years at most, fulfilling their vows and returning to Europe. Because of this, their encounters with Muslims in the East were far more restricted than those who remained for more extended periods of time or settled permanently, and therefore their views of Muslims as religious enemies were less open to challenge through direct contact. The brevity of their stay also limited the forms of contact with Muslims the crusaders experienced. Most of their encounters with the Muslim ‘other’ were through military encounters – including raids, direct warfare or sieges – all primarily divergent forms of accommodation, forms of accommodation that accentuated the differences between groups, and reinforced their own group identity. Limited contact in a hostile fashion was particularly true of common soldiers. However, the elite of both Muslims and Latin Christians did come into direct contact more frequently, and through this contact created instances of convergent accommodation, accommodation where actions and attitudes encouraged similarities within the interaction between groups. Envoys and diplomats negotiated treaties and truces between armies, and, at times, these negotiations were even carried out by rulers themselves. Through these diplomatic meetings a convergent language of gestures and symbols was developed. The development of this shared system opened the door to successful diplomacy and times of peace. For elites an additional point of contact was created through the development of the system of chivalry, which was an important secondary identity for
many elite crusaders. By the twelfth century chivalry was not only a way to identify trained knights, but had developed into a way of living that valued the skill and bravery of a knight on the battlefield, and character virtues such as generosity off the battlefield. Admiration of a fellow knight crossed religious boundaries, and crusader elites felt great respect for a courageous warrior, regardless of their religion.

Contact between the military orders and Muslims was more complex than between short term crusaders and Muslims. The military orders combined monastic life with knighthood into a profession dedicated to the protection of the crusader states, which led to inherent tensions in their own organizations and in the way they responded to contact with Muslims. For the Templars the military element was always their focus, whereas the Hospitallers started as a charitable organization. Members of the Templars and Hospitallers also served longer terms of service than crusaders, and belonged to organizations that had a permanent presence in the crusader states. This increased the amount and type of contact they had with Muslims, increasing opportunities for both divergent and convergent accommodation. As members of religious orders, they took their role as defenders of the Holy Land seriously, and became some of the fiercest enemies the Muslims faced. By the last quarter of the twelfth century they were often treated with far more violence by Muslims than other Christians, frequently being slaughtered upon capture instead of held for ransom along with other captives. This contact was largely divergent and hostile. Yet, as permanent organizations in the East, the military orders were more aware of the necessity of convergent accommodation with Muslim foes than their short term crusader counterparts, a fact that brought them much
criticism from the West. While crusaders came to the East to assist the crusader states for short periods of time, the majority of the time there was a shortage of manpower for adequate protection. In such circumstances the orders saw the benefit of converging and negotiating with Muslims and forming truces, allowing them to protect the land already in Christian possession. In some cases, they even developed friendships with elite Muslims, challenging their religious identity, and reflecting a chivalric respect for fellow elites, such as that between the Templars and the Arab Syrian Usamah Ibn Munqidh. Their contact with Muslims was also not limited to the Muslim military and elite. Both the Templars and Hospitallers owned estates worked by Muslim peasants and slaves. The orders experienced a good deal of peaceful spatial convergence. These workers were given a relative degree of tolerance by the orders, being allowed to retain their own faith. Though committed to the protection and defence of the Holy Land, the orders were pragmatic in their overall contact with Muslims, allowing for accommodation and contact when the overall safety and security of the Latin states were preserved by doing so. The roots of the Hospitallers as a charitable order dedicated to the care of pilgrims and the poor also challenged the militant nature of the order. The Hospitallers dedicated themselves to the care of all who needed it, as their Christian duty, and this included the care of Muslims. In addition, the Hospitallers engaged in limited intellectual convergence with Muslim medical colleagues, adopting much of their extensive medical knowledge and practices.

The settlers who chose to stay permanently in the Levant and start a new life there developed a new identity, collectively identifying themselves as Franks, regardless of
where they had originated from in Europe. The Franks retained a strong Christian identity and desired to control the holy places of the East, leading to divergent accommodation, in the form of holy war and the military protection of the crusader states, often working in tandem with crusaders, but the way they dealt with Muslims was one of the ways this new society differentiated itself from their original European identity. Latin Christians who chose to settle permanently in the Levant experienced the most extensive, as well as the most varied, contact and convergent accommodation with Muslims. In the contact between settlers and Muslims, trends of convergence that began with the crusaders were intensified. For the settlers, constant warfare was not only impractical, it was undesirable. Though most settlers chose not to live in Muslim-populated areas, but in or near areas of traditional Eastern Christian habitation, this did not prevent them from coming into contact with their Muslim subjects regularly. The settlers moved into the rural, agricultural lands of the Levant, lands that bordered traditional Muslim settlements, not just remaining in urban centres, as some historians have argued. Many of the elites also served as overlords to Muslim peasants, working with intermediaries like a ra’is or dragoman to run their estates. The permanent residents of the crusader states did not interfere greatly in the lives of their subjects though. They converged with the resident population by maintaining many of the administrative structures that had previously existed, allowing the Muslims to continue working the land as well as maintaining their Muslim faith, only demanding from them taxes, including produce from their lands, as past Muslim overlords had done with their subjects. Convergent spatial accommodation was also experienced between Christians and Muslims at certain sacred sites. Many sacred spaces were considered to be spiritually significant for both Christians and
Muslims. While at times this created great tension and divergence, sometimes including violence, as was the case periodically over the possession of Jerusalem, at many other sites both faiths were permitted to come and worship together. Another way convergence was experienced between Christians and Muslims was through the creation of identities that competed with the prescriptive religious identity of both faiths. Merchants from the Italian city states and the crusader states engaged in extensive trade with neighbouring Muslim states, even at points during times of war. While they valued the goals of the crusaders, often risking their ships and lives in the crusader causes, they also benefitted greatly from the trading privileges they received from the crusader states, and used these to their full advantage. This included providing Muslims with raw materials to make weapons and ships with Muslim states, even during times of war between Christian and Muslim states. One of the identities that provided the greatest intellectual convergent accommodation between Muslims and Latin Christians was through the practice of medicine. Frankish doctors gained much medical knowledge from Muslims, and adopted their practice of licensing physicians to ensure those who practiced in the crusader states had the requisite knowledge. There were even some physicians who treated patients of other faiths, a seemingly accepted practice, though some questioned the wisdom of this. While the Franks engaged in more extensive convergent accommodation than any of the other groups studied, there remained limits to this accommodation. The religious identity of the Franks remained one of the most important identities, and ultimately restricted the amount of accommodation that could be undertaken.
Despite being bound together by a common Christian identity, this study recognizes that the many Europeans who came to the East all belonged to many different groups, as well as having their own distinct individual identities. They identified themselves not just as followers of the same faith, but also by the rulers they followed, the languages they spoke, and the geographic regions from which they came. At times these loyalties superseded religious or crusading goals. The Muslim world was likewise possessed of more than one competing identity. Dynasties such as the Abbasids and Fatimids, or branches of Islam, including Sunnis and Shi´ites, as well as various offshoots such as the Assassins or Bedouins, defied groups coming together as a single Muslim identity. These competing loyalties at times drove different groups to act in ways that were seemingly counterproductive to their faith, including encouraging members of Christianity and Islam to work together in opposition to members of their own faith to achieve their own goals, goals that were not necessarily those of all Christians or Muslims. Yet, despite the varied motivations that drove people, this study asserts that there were some group identities that can be found to act in a relatively unified way, and that can provide insights into the identity of those in the East and their actions in relation to the ‘other.’

This study has followed the conclusions of recent historians such as Hillenbrand in arguing that to understand the actions and beliefs of crusaders we must rely on Muslim as well as Christian sources and perspectives. Until recently, the focus of the study of crusader and Muslim contact was placed on the crusaders and other Christians, with Muslims being analyzed only for the impacts the crusades had upon them. More recently historians have been acknowledging that the Muslims were active members in encounters
with Europeans and have been considering the nature and forms of divergent and convergent accommodation from Muslim perspectives and sources in addition to Christian ones. This study has relied on a wide range of sources from both Christian and Muslims perspectives, including chronicles, travel literature, letters and sermons to help reduce the potential distortion that exists due to the propagandist nature of many of the chronicles and other sources that survive from the crusades. In this study the examination of both Christian and Muslim texts has been particularly useful in the study of the relationship between elite members of crusader and Muslim society, and in the discussion of the contact between settlers and Muslims.

While this work builds on studies of the military orders and crusader states which have flourished since the 1950s, it fills an important gap in focusing extensively on the interactions of the orders and settlers with Muslims. The focus of researchers has often been directed towards the governance and running of the orders and the Latin states, with less detailed consideration of how they interacted with the Muslims within or surrounding the crusader states. Those studies that have looked at such interactions have tended to be relatively limited in scope. This study has taken a more comprehensive approach to the question of the nature of accommodation between Muslims and Latin Christians in the Levant, dealing exclusively with the issue and addressing the wide range of Latin Christian groups that had contact with Muslims and the variations in the way they chose to engage in those interactions. This study aims to build on the understanding of the ways in which the military orders and settlers developed outside of Europe, studying how they interacted with the surrounding Muslim cultures and those they came to rule over.
politically. This is important not only to show the ways that the military orders and settlers adapted and changed their way of life in comparison to their fellow Christians who came as only short term crusaders, but also how their contact with the Muslims peoples in the Levant changed the way they viewed Muslims and interacted with them – how their contact led them at times to accommodate with, rather than fight, those who had originally been their sworn enemies.

The many groups of Latin Christians who arrived in the Levant all found their religious identity as members of Christendom, challenged upon their arrival in the Levant. In the face of a radically different geographic, political and social landscape from that of Europe, those that remained for a longer time accepted the need for convergent accommodation with Muslims, and acknowledged the benefits to be had from such accommodations. Overall though it appears that the only way truly to enter the community of Christendom or Islam was through a genuine conversion. Such conversions did happen, but they appear to have been relatively rare, with most cases of conversion being a matter of necessity and convenience, to avoid captivity or death in warfare, rather than true conviction. The religious identity of the Christians and Muslims appears to have offered one of the strongest identifiers when it came to interacting with members of another faith. In all three Latin Christian groups, divergent behaviours and attitudes never totally disappeared from responses to Muslims, but relative convergent accommodation and tolerance developed over time. True understanding and acceptance of the other, though, was rarely achieved.
Overall this study advances the discussion of the different group identities that made up the Latin Christians who came to the East in connection with the crusading movement, and the way contact between Latin Christians and Muslims between the Second and Third Crusades shaped the attitudes and behaviours of Christians towards Muslims, leading to both divergent and convergent accommodation. It has suggested that all individuals hold many different, and sometimes competing, identities, and that it was the tension between these identities that helped shape the way Christians responded to those perceived to be an ‘other’ and outside of their communities. Contact with Muslims and the realities of life in the Levant challenged the prescriptive religious beliefs and hostility that crusaders arrived with. Through more intensive contact more forms of convergent accommodation were achieved, though deeper intellectual understanding and acceptance remained limited as long as religious identities were adhered to, with conversion ultimately being the only path to true acceptance.
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