

Jerusalem During The Crusades (1099 - 1187 A.D.)

Joseph Nessim Youssef*

* Ph.D. Medieval History, Faculty of Arts, Alexandria University, Alexandria, Egypt, 1954.
Professor of Medieval History, Faculty of Arts, University of Alexandria,
Alexandria, Egypt.



Abstract

The article deals with the political, economic and social conditions of the city of Jerusalem since the Crusaders captured it the year A.D). 1099 and until the time Saladin recovered it in the year A.D. 1187. It tackles diverse important cases concerning which opinions differed. In some of them, modern historians have not reached a decisive view. Among these cases are the definitions of ancient and modern historians of the Crusades, the different points of view round the motives for their rise, and their being a link in the series of cultural and political struggle extending between the two halves of the world since the ancient times and up till now. I am going to point out how far all the above-mentioned cases have had an effect on the subject of study.

Among the most important points dealt with in the research work, too, are the elements of population in Jerusalem and its vassal states, the characteristics of the Latin rule and its vassal states, the balance of power in the struggle between the Arabs and the Crusaders and all the concepts related to it. Among these cases are: the situation of Jerusalem under the Latin rule, the "poulains" and the newcomers from the West, the policy of Latin settlement in Jerusalem and its satellites and its consequences, the competition between Nur al-Din Muhammed and Amalric I the Latin king of Jerusalem to occupy Egypt. No less important is the Arab awakening and unity and the moderation of the balance of power for the interest of the Arabs, the fruits of which were the Battle of Hattin and the restoration of Jerusalem (October A.D. 1187) from the hands of the Crusaders.

To get to know the history of Jerusalem under the Latin rule between the years A. D. 1099 and A. D. 1187, we had better deal with some important thoughts because they will shed a light on many of the issues around which discussion arose among historians, and which still need more clarification.

On the 15th of August A.D. 1095 the Roman Pope Urban II (A.D. 1088-1099) of the city of Le Puy sent an invitation to the clergymen of the West to attend an ecclesiastical council on the 18th of November in the same year in the city of Clermont south of France. The invitation implied the problems of the Latin church and its relations with the kings and rulers of the West. There was no reference in the invitation to the project of the Crusades although it was the main topic in it. The Pope may have aimed at keeping his Crusade plan a secret to guarantee its success. The council lasted from 16th to 28th of November, and on the day before the last, the Pope went out of the church in which the council was held and he delivered an inflammatory speech among the crowd which thronged outside it¹. He called on them to bear the cross and go to the Islamic Near East and lay their hands on its treasures, and lands which were overflowing with milk and honey.² The scream of the listeners was a sentence of a small number of words but dangerous in its denotation, namely 'Deus le volt'. It was the best expression of the reality of this movement although it made religion a camouflage at a time when the church dominated the people's destinies.

The old Western historians defined these wars as «passagium generale» waged by the Latin West against the Arab world especially in the area of the near East, with the purpose of liberating Jerusalem and saving the Holy Sepulchre. Nothing can prove this more than what has been said by the Latin historian Robert the monk, who witnessed the beginning of the Crusades, and who describes the Crusades as an art of God and not of man³. This definition continued in the western historian works until the first decades of the twentieth century where we find a historian such as Paul Riant⁴ saying that the Crusades are purely religious, its motives and its trends are purely religious and its first and last aim was regaining the holy places.

But the latest historical neutral impartial researches proved that the Crusades are wars which the Westerners waged against the Arab world under the veil of religion in response to the call of the papacy with a view to the occupation of Jerusalem, and the establishment of a "kingdom" for them in it, then working to consolidate this "kingdom", widening its boundary and preserving it so that it may be a fulcrum for them from which they can gain ground at the expense of the neighbouring Arab countries. Beginning from the middle of the twentieth century, this neutral attitude began to appear in the works of a number of modern western historians. Among those was R. Grousset⁵ who said, "The earlier Crusades had led to the first colonial expansion of the Christian West at the expense of Islam." L. Halphen⁶ said that the Crusades are a natural extension of the feudal wars which the West witnessed in the centuries preceding this movement. The English historian G.I. Trevelyan⁷ holds this view. B. Lewis⁸ brings everything to light when he says «The Crusades were essentially an early experiment in expansionist

imperialism motivated by material considerations with religion as a psychological catalyst.»

This movement which left its marks for many centuries to come was not the offspring of a day and it was not the product of a certain factor excluding others. It was the product of several centuries that preceded it and numerous factors which led to it. There is hardly a book dealing with the Crusades or its chapters which is void of referring to this as a whole or in full details. There are many schools which differ in the way they tackle the problem. There was a group which dealt with its motives from different angles whether these motives are political, economic, social, mental, religious, military or others; whereas another group had a comprehensive objective look in addition to connecting the different circumstances and incidents with each other to attain the truth. A third group divided the causes of its rise into essential ones, which date back to hundreds of years before its breakout, and secondary ones which led to the breakout of its first spark, which was extinguished only after three centuries. This group took care to analyse each factor by itself and connect all the factors eventually in one unit, and the writer of these lines belongs to the last school.

Among the essential factors without which we cannot understand this movement which ended in the occupation of Jerusalem and the establishment of a Latin 'Kingdom' in it during the First Crusade, were the prevalent conditions in both the European and the Arab worlds since the appearance of Islam till the rise of the Crusades at the end of the eleventh century. The study of the struggle which broke out between the Arabs and the Europeans and which lasted five centuries before the beginning of the Crusades, and the various powers which had a share in it, throw a light on the circumstances which paved the way for this movement. The idea of the struggle between the two powers is old and normal and is a prelude to the Crusades. Among the main factors, too, is the attitude of the West towards the East since early times, as it is considered the place where inspiration and religions fell upon Prophets, the cradle of learning and knowledge, the center of civilization and cultural radiation, so that the East appealed to the Westerners who were eager to see it. Undoubtedly, this psychological factor had its indirect effect in preparing the atmosphere for the rise of the Crusades. In the mean time, there were the development of the idea of pilgrimage from the West to Jerusalem, and the holy West Christian wars against Moslems west of the Mediterranean in the period preceding the rise of the Crusades. If we ignore these two factors, there is no way to explain the rudiments of this movement. In addition, there was the presence of individuals every one of whom had his part in preparing the minds for its acceptance. At the head of those people was Pope Urban II. We should not forget the part of legends, dreams and fables which aroused religious enthusiasm in the Latins while calling for the Crusades.⁹ In the light of these facts, the picture is completed to prepare the atmosphere for the rise of the Crusades and the loss of Jerusalem during the first campaign.

Accordingly, if we look into this movement, we shall find that it represents an important link in the struggle between the two worlds: The European world and the Arab world in the middle ages, that struggle which extended from the seventh century until the sixteenth century A.D. Meanwhile, it represents a basic stage in the struggle extending between the two halves of the world since early times and up to the present day¹⁰. On these grounds, we must understand the Crusades and the story of Jerusalem under the Latin rule.

However, since Urban II delivered his speech in Clermont in November A.D. 1095, preparations had been made for the breakout of the First Crusade (A.D. 1096-1099) which was divided into two parts: The popular campaigns, but they do not interest us, and the regular campaigns headed by the great feudalists of the West. They moved at the end of A.D. 1046 in four regiments towards the East: The first regiment consisted of the inhabitants of Lorraine headed by Godfrey, Duke of Lower Lorraine and his brother Baldwin, and the second consisted of French people headed by Stephen, Count of Blois, and Chartres. The third regiment consisted of Provençals headed by Raymond of Saint-Gilles, Count of Toulouse, whereas the fourth consisted of the Normans headed by Bohemond and his nephew Tancred. All those people amounted to a number ranging from sixty thousand to one hundred thousand warriors when they came down to the lands of the Byzantine state.¹¹ The story of their relation to the Byzantine Emperor, Alexius I, Comnenus (A.D. 1081-1118) and the agreement of Constantinople which was held between the two parties in May A.D. 1097 and the clashes between the Crusaders and the Seidjuks in Asia Minor is a story that needs a long explanation and the books on the Crusades have referred to it in detail. What is important is that Baldwin Godfrey's brother was able at the beginning of A.D. 1098 to form the Principality of Edessa as the first colony formed by the Franks.¹² In June A.D. 1098, Bohemond occupied Antioch, which became the second colony in the Holy Land.¹³

In April A.D. 1099, the Crusaders headed by Raymond of Saint-Gilles decided to continue the march towards Jerusalem, which they reached on June 7th, and the city at that time was in the hands of the Fatimids and its ruler was called Prince Fakhr-el-Dawla.¹⁴ At once the Franks besieged it from June 7th till July 15th A.D. 1099. The sources tell us that the Crusaders suffered much because of lack of ammunition, shortage of water and the hot weather at this time of the year as well as the brave resistance which the Arab garrison inside the city showed to keep the Latins away from it. The Franks fought intensively until they found an outlet on one side which the Arabs did not care to fortify and they went into it with their armies and horses and ran after the safe people and surrounded them from all sides. So, the people resorted to the Dome of the Rock and the Aqsa Mosque to find protection in them. But the Franks did not care for the sanctity of the houses of God and they drew their swords mercilessly into them giving no consideration for age or race until blood flowed in the form of rivers. Two of the Latin historians witnessed this massacre and wrote about it. These historians were Raymond of Aguilers and Albert of Aix.¹⁵

The invaders were not satisfied with this, but they revealed their fanaticism in their attitude towards the houses of worship when they turned the Dome of the Rock into a Latin Catholic church which they called "Templum Domini". They also used the Aqsa Mosque for their own interests and called it "Templum Solomonis" and they divided it into three parts. They made the first part of it a Latin church and the second part an abode for the Knights Templum and the third a store for their ammunitions. They made the tunnel which was under the mosque a stable for their animals. During the reign of one of their kings, namely, Baldwin II, the royal palace occupied a side of the mosque (A.D. 1118). This reveals one of the motives of the Crusades, that is, working to make the Arab Islamic world a Latin land which believes in Roman Catholicism and in getting rid of Islam and its culture from the region and getting rid of Eastern Christianity and its Orthodox creed.¹⁶

This is a pattern of what the Crusaders did immediately on their breaking into Jerusalem. It denotes brutalities and fanaticism about which the ancient Latin authors, who were contemporaries of the events of this period of time, wrote. Most of them were eye-witnesses such as Raymond of Aguilers, Fulcher of Chartres and William of Tyre. The modern Western historians, cited from them. Among them were Ren Grousset, Steven Runciman, Ernest Barker and others. In their eyes, the Arabs - whether Moslems, or East Christians - were heretics because they do not abide by their dogma. E. Barker confirms this trend when he said that the Latin church was trying to spread Catholicism throughout the Arab world known at that time, even if this led to armed fighting.¹⁷ The clear proof for this is that the Franks converted the mosques and the Eastern churches of the cities they occupied into Latin churches exactly as they did when they converted the great mosque at Ascaion as soon as they occupied it in the year A.D. 1153 into a cathedral bearing the name of St. Peter.¹⁸

Thus the matter ended with the fall of Jerusalem in the hands of the Latins in the middle of July A.D. 1099. In this way, they founded their 'kingdom' in it after it had remained in the hands of the Arabs since A.D. 637 and up to that date, that is more than four centuries and a half. They made one of their leaders, Godfrey, its head. He divided it into feudal emirates which he distributed among his mates after they found in the weakness and division of the Arabs a golden chance to realize their dreams. M. Baldwin writes about that saying, "The Crusaders" states in the Levant may, therefore, best be understood as experiments in colonisation, the first chapter in the long history of Europe overseas.¹⁹

This has something to do with two important ideas. The first is related to the causes of that defeat which befell the Arabs and the results that followed that defeat. The second idea has its connection with the balance of power in the struggle between the Arabs and the Crusaders then. As to the first, there is no doubt that the principal cause of the success of the Latins in occupying Jerusalem is not due to special qualities that distinguish them from others such as daring and bravery, but is due first and foremost to the Islamic Near East being divided among itself politically and dogmatically. In Egypt the Shiite Fatimid Caliphate was not in accord with the Sunnite Abbassid- Caliphate in Baghdad. Weakness and deterioration befell them. While both parties were suffering from downfall, the Turcomans among which were the Seldjuks, were plundering as many as they could of the territories of the Fatimids and the Abbassids. The Seldjuk Sultanate was divided too into small states each of them ruled by a prince as was the case in Aleppo, Antioch and Damascus.²⁰ Ch. Oman made that clear when he said that if the Moslem rulers had agreed with each other then, they would have defeated the Franks. But instead of being united to face the common enemy, they did not make any effort to stop its advance in the Islamic East.²¹

It is not hard to realise that the Latins were fully aware that the Arabs could, if they unified their efforts, drive the Crusade danger away from the Holy city. Also, the Arabs, themselves, were aware that the rapid success which the Franks achieved was only due to their weakness and their disunity. This has something to do with the idea of the balance of power in the struggle between the Arabs and the Crusaders at this early stage of the Crusades and the concepts related to it. The scale of the balance tended towards the European West which got up from its sleep after many centuries of confusion and darkness. Meanwhile, the Arab Near East was divided among itself as we

have mentioned before. For this reason the West adopted the initiative policy and took the offensive which provided it with a chance to score instant victories during the First Crusade which ended in the occupation of Jerusalem. The Arabs remained on the defensive. This position went on until the end of the first campaign. What proves this is that the Fatimids tried in vain to restore the city. They sent a military force headed by the vizier al-Afdal to rescue it. It went to Ascalon pending the arrival of the Egyptian navy at sea. The Franks seized the chance while they were in the ecstasy of victory attacked the Egyptian rescue and defeated it. This took place on August 12th A.D. 1099.²² After that, the Fatimids made repeated attempts to restore Jerusalem in vain, as exactly what happened in May A.D. 1123.²³ This means that with the swing of the Western scalepan at the beginning of the Crusades, it was not easy for the Arabs to direct an effective stroke or even regain what had been lost.

Thus, the Arabs did not forget that the losses they suffered and the gains those foreigners scored at the beginning of their movement were due, first and foremost, to their disruption and weakness. They were well aware that whenever they united, their unity was a good omen of their conscious awakening followed by counter-campaigns on the invaders. In their unity, there is strength and in their strength an end to the Franks and a liberation of Jerusalem, whereas there is weakness in their disunity and in their weakness there is disappointment and a strengthening of the influence of their enemies in the region. As years passed, the Arabs felt that the existence of the Latin 'Kingdom' in the heart of Palestine is a great danger which they should soon stamp out before it infiltrates into the other parts of the Arab world. They were aware that if a day passes without their frontier being united, it will be a certain loss and a delay of the process of al-Jihad. With the increase of the Crusade danger, there dawned in the horizon the initiative of an Arab awakening starting from the beginning of the twelfth century A.D. The Arabs worked for unity to resist the intruders. This was done in the form of local Arab leaps which had not ripened yet in one movement. Thus, it was not within their power to achieve final victory over the Franks in Jerusalem and their other strongholds at that time.²⁴ But this created a state of balance between the two struggling parties: the Arabs, the owners of the place and the intruding Franks, so that it was impossible for either of them in this second part of the struggle to score decisive victory over his opponent. This is the part which was tackled with analysis and in detail by R. Grousset and S. Runciman in their works on the Crusades.²⁵

The Arabs did not have in this stage of balance but two ways in front of them which had no third: either to block in the face of the Latin rulers of Jerusalem the coastal way East of the Mediterranean Sea. This was not possible then because of the castles and ports in which the Franks found protection all along the coast. Also, scoring a final victory in this way was not certain as a result of the gaps that may result inside the Arab frontier itself before unity is completed, and which the enemy could exploit. The second solution was that the Arabs in Egypt and Bilad Al-Sham should start to form a strong united front from the far North to the far South so that it can press on the Latin 'Kingdom' in Jerusalem. Thus, it will be easy to restore the city and liberate the Holy Land.

If we go back to Jerusalem during the Latin occupation while events were taking place quickly on the Arab front in the Near East, we shall find that its rulers were doing their utmost to encourage the westerners to come and settle in it so that their numbers might increase and their society be strengthened. Enthusiasm filled those people at the

beginning of their movement. But no sooner had they settled in the Holy Land and enjoyed its warm sun and fertile soil, than their enthusiasm began to weaken gradually until it vanished in the end. The new life which they began to lead, appealed to them and they disappeared gradually among the original natives. The Latin sources and the ancient Arab travellers wrote about that development which fell upon the Crusaders in a single night. They mingled with the Easterners, shared them their temperament and their habits, married many of them and brought forth children and prepared themselves for permanent settlement in Jerusalem and its satellites and no longer thought of returning home.²⁶

The Latin historian Fulcher of Chartres became aware of that when he wrote round about the year A.D. 1125 saying "Now we, who were Westerners, have become Easterners. He, who was Italian or French, has in this land become a Galilean or a Palestinian.....We have already forgotten our birthplaces. Most of us do not know them or even hear of them. One already owns home and household as if by paternal and hereditary right, another has taken as wife not a compatriot, but a Syrian, Armenian..... He, who was an alien, has become a native, he, who was immigrant, is now a resident. Every day our relations and friends follow us, willingly abandoning whatever they possessed in the West. For those who were poor there has God made rich here. Those who have had a few pence there have numberless gold pieces here, he who had not a village there possesses with God as giver, a whole town here. Why then return to the West, when the East suits us as well?"²⁷

This confession which was made by one of the Latin writers was a call for the immigration of the Westerners to Jerusalem and its satellites and their settling in it permanently without thinking of returning to their homes. Thus, those Franks who became easternized and for whom the Holy Land became their first home were acclimatized after they had forgotten their original homes. They began to renounce the idea of a holy war and they began to have interests which force them to live in peace and calmness. This has also been noticed by the Moslem traveller Usama Ibn Munqidh (A.D. 1095-1113) when he talked about the big gulf between the softness of the ancient Crusader and the strictness of the modern one coming straight from the West and who longed also to possess lands and fiefs.²⁸ The easternized Franks no longer looked at the newcomers with satisfaction and ease. The difference between the two sides was so intense that the new Franks named the old ones 'pullani' or 'Easternized Franks' as a form of scorn and ridicule. This word has its meaning for it used to mean the child who was born a hybrid as a result of the marriage between a Frank and an Easterner,²⁹ and other words were given to the children who are born through these marriages which were unequal in race.³⁰ This reveals the distinct difference between the poulains and the new Franks and how the Latins have prepared themselves for permanent settlement in the Holy land.³¹

For more explanation we can say that the Crusade experiment was summarized in the advent of Western campaigns to realise its aims of expansion disguised in religion. After the end of every campaign, the majority of the Crusaders go back home whereas a minority of them remain in the East. Even this minority either disappears spontaneously among the Arab majority or returns back to the West. This goes back to many political, economic and social reasons inside Europe itself, which attracts those adventurers towards it, besides the confusion of the political, social and economic conditions inside

the occupied Arab territory, as well as the increasing bitter Arab struggle which caused those strangers serious anxiety and finally the awareness of the Franks that the Arabs surrounded them from all sides and that if they united in defence for their being and their sanctities, the Arabs would encircle them and get rid of them. The period of balance in the struggle between both sides has imposed itself on the scene of events. For these reasons, the calls for emigration such as the call of Fulcher of Chartres did not meet with sufficient response in the West. In addition to what has been previously mentioned, the Crusaders used to settle in the coastal towns and leave the Arab citizens in the villages ploughing and tilling the land. The result was that the Arabs were always the majority in their homes whereas the Franks were the minority and there was no tie to bind them to the land they occupy. This was also one of the factors which contributed to undermining the Latin 'state' in Jerusalem.³²

The talk about the scarcity of the Latin existence in Jerusalem and its vassal states leads us to the talk about two important points: First, defining what we mean by the vassal states of Jerusalem and secondly the elements of population in the city and its vassal states.

The Latin king of Jerusalem considered himself not only a master of the holy city, but he also considered this mastery as extending so as to include the various principalities of the Franks in Palestine. It should be learnt that the geographical distance between the principalities of Edessa and Antioch, for example, did not permit the king to exercise any active authority in them especially as each prince was not pleased with this. This royal authority does not appear except when the king of Jerusalem was strong enough to allow this. This position was not usually available. Therefore, the royal domain was actually limited to four cities: Jerusalem, Acre, Nablus and Daron, and all the lands surrounding them, in addition to four main fiefs which follow the 'kingdom': The county of Jaffa, the principality of Galilee, the seigneurie of Sidon and the seigneurie of Oultrejoudain. After that come twelve secondary fiefs at the head of which was the fief of Caesarea.³³ These possessions were narrowing and widening according to the prevalent circumstances at some time with both the Moslems and the Crusaders.

As for the elements of population, we can start saying that the sources and documents of the age - whether Arabic or Latin - did not provide us with statistics or minute numerical bits of information about them. All the material available is scattered here and there from which we can get some indefinite and approximate bits of information. It is clear that the number of Franks who settled in the 'kingdom' during the Latin rule was very small. The number of barons and knights and their families at any time was not more than two thousands, whereas the Frankish children's number was decreasing because of the death of many of them. And if we add to these, the knights who belong to the military religious orders such as the knights Hospitallers and the Knights Templars and the remaining religious men who belong to the Latin church in Jerusalem, we find that their number range from two to three thousands excluding the orientalist Franks.³⁴ To sum up, the Franks who were of pure Latin blood, were a minority in Jerusalem and its vassal states. What assures this what was mentioned by a Latin historian named Humbert of Romans. He said in a book of his in Latin entitled the Call for a new Crusade: «.....and when we conquer their land, we have not obtained permanenet power over those who cultivate and live on it, since our men do not wish to remain in those parts.»³⁵

But the majority of the population of the city and its vassal states at the time were Arab Christian citizens who belong to the various Christian sects such as the Syriacs, the Greeks, the Armenians and the Jacobites.³⁶ In Jerusalem itself there were large numbers of them and some of them were hybrids and they spoke the Arabic language and belonged to the Orthodox church. The Armenians formed a large sect. The same applied to the Jacobites, who were the Copts of Egypt, the Abyssinians and the Syrian Jacobites. This is in addition to a few groups of Westerners who settled in Jerusalem before the Crusades.

As regards the Moslem Arabs, it is known that great numbers of them left Jerusalem when the Latin 'kingdom' was established in it. However, there were villages with their Moslem inhabitants round Nablus. Many of the regions which were occupied by the Franks later remained also Islamic in tinge, nature and inhabitants. Also, the farmers of North Galilee and along the route from Banyas to Acre were Moslems and there were Arab beduins along the Southern frontiers of the 'kingdom' and beyond Jordan river. But the Jews decreased in number sensibly during this period of time for fear of murder and because of the massacres which they were exposed to at the hands of the Latins during the Crusades. They did not forget what had happened to them before the First Crusade left the West on its way to the Islamic Near East.³⁷ What certifies this are the words mentioned by the traveller Benjamin of Tudela when he visited the Holy Land roundabout the year A.D. 1170. He said that he did not find except a small sect of Jews all over the lands subjected to the Franks. About two hundreds of these Jews lived in Jerusalem.³⁸

After all, Jerusalem was ruled by nine people during the period extending from A.D. 1099 to A.D. 1187. The first of these rulers was Godfrey and he refused to bear the title of king and was satisfied with the title of 'Advocatus Sancti Sepulchri' for he thought it was disagreeable to wear a crown of gold when Christ wore a crown of thorns. The period of his reign extended from A.D. 1099 to A.D. 1100. His brother Baldwin I succeeded him (A.D. 1100-1118) after being prince over the principality of Edessa. He used the title 'king of Jerusalem' for the first time in the year A.D. 1104 when he got rid of his rival the Latin Patriarch Diambert. Baldwin II, Baldwin the First's cousin, then reigned (A.D. 1118-1130). He was succeeded by Fulk of Anjou, the husband of Melisende, Baldwin II's own eldest daughter. Then his son, Baldwin III, followed from A.D. 1143 to A.D. 1162. His mother shared the rule with him until the year A.D. 1152. After him, Jerusalem was ruled by his brother Amalric I (A.D. 1162-1174) who was succeeded by his son, Balwin IV, the leprous, from A.D. 1174 to A.D. 1185. Then came Baldwin V the child, who ruled from A.D. 1185 to A.D. 1186. Finally Sibylla and Guy of Lusignan reigned (A.D. 1186-1192).

The story of those rulers is completely known in the references on the Crusades and it does not need any repetition. Thus, I shall not cite their history according to the succession of time but I shall be satisfied with displaying the important phenomena of the history of their rule, which are considered the most distinguished traits of this period. These phenomena are eight and here they are:

The First Phenomenon: Lack of Manpower

The Latin king was badly in need of a supply of manpower from the West because

the number of warriors in the 'kingdom' was not great at any time,³⁹ and it did not exceed under the best of circumstances a few hundred knights and a few thousand infantry. For example, after the occupation of Jerusalem in the year A.D. 1099 the great Latin nobles left the city and returned to the West and no one remained in it except Godfrey and a limited number of forces⁴⁰ which were not sufficient to launch a military action or even to defend Jerusalem in case a great attack is made on it on the part of the Moslems, although the scale of the Crusade balance weighs heavier at that time. This was also the problem of Baldwin I and the rulers who succeeded him.

As a result of this, many s.o.s. signals and letters were sent from the Latin authorities in Jerusalem to the Westerners and to the papacy. Diambert, the pope's legate in the First Crusade who was appointed a Latin patriarch in Jerusalem after its occupation, sent a letter in the year A.D. 1100 to the Westerners in which he talks about the difficulty of getting a sufficient number of men to defend Jerusalem against any Moslem attack. It happened that in August A.D. 1105 the Fatimid ruler of Egypt directed a campaign against Baldwin I towards Ramleh, and the force which the Latin king prepared did not exceed a few hundreds of knights and infantry.⁴¹

In fact, there arrived now and then small numbers of armed groups of pilgrims who came to visit the Holy Sepulchre and spend a few weeks or months in fighting the Moslems, but in most of the time they hurried back to their homes after making a pilgrimage. Most of them did not find his desired aim in the Holy Land, at a time when the Westerners began gradually to distract their thoughts from the Latin Orient. Thus, the kings of Jerusalem tried to persuade the West-comers to stay and join their army through a new kind of feudalism called «money-fiefs». The knight had to render his services to the king all the year round through granting him a number of horses and a sum of money and given amounts of beans, maize and barley. The first who took this step was king Baldwin II. However, this permanent army was small and the number of the king's men did not exceed seven hundred knights and five thousand infantry. The offspring of the hybrid marriages formed later a part of this army.⁴² We can imagine what these can do especially after the moderation of the balance of power in the struggle existing between the two parties in favour of the Arabs.

The Second Phenomenon: Lack of Financial Sources

The lack of manpower was not the only problem which confronted Jerusalem during the Latin rule. The second problem which was not less dangerous was the permanent need of Latin rulers for money,⁴³ from which to spend on the warriors whom they persuaded to stay and to manage the affairs of their 'state'. The need for money was a pseudo-permanent problem. We could see Baldwin I, for example, perform military operations against the Moslems nearly with the object of getting the booties or possessing the captives and selling them as slaves. The kings of Jerusalem, sometimes, gave freedom to their captives in return for very high ransom.⁴⁴ Political marriages were, sometimes, held with a view to getting over the financial trouble.⁴⁵

The 'kingdom' had limited and unstable sources of income. These sources included the taxes imposed on the Frank bourgeois class in Jerusalem and its vassal states and also the taxes imposed on exports and imports and on the processes of sale and purchase, on pilgrims and on the use of balances and measurements, in addition to the

duties imposed on the ships anchoring in the ports that belong to the Franks, and the taxes imposed on the people who do not take part in the campaigns launched by the Franks against the Moslems⁴⁶. These financial resources, however, were not sufficient to cover all the needs of the 'kingdom'. Also, these were not concentrated in the hands of the king and this matter caused him many troubles particularly when he found himself forced to face the Moslems.

The Third Phenomenon: The Struggle between the Clergy and the Laymen

Among the most dangerous matters that the 'kingdom' confronted were those struggles between the laymen and the clergy whose side should have the upper hand in the city. This problem had appeared clearly before the Latins occupied Jerusalem. There arose the matter of choosing a head for the 'state' which they intend to found when they would occupy Jerusalem. This led to the uprise of striking differences between the two sides who took part in the First Crusade. Two councils were held for this purpose, the first of which was held before the occupation of the city and the second after its occupation. The papal legate for the campaign died at that time (August A.D. 1089) and the pope appointed a new legate for him, namely Diambert the archbishop of Piza who arrived in the Holy Land in December A.D. 1099 and the matter ended in the choice of Godfrey who was given the title of 'Defender of the Holy Sepulchre'. The struggle between the two took a new form when Diambert was appointed patriarch of the city and he forced Godfrey to swear loyalty to him in the year A.D. 1100. This means in the feudal term that Godfrey will become subject to him.

The problem arises again after the death of Godfrey in July A.D. 1100. He declared on his death-bed his brother Baldwin, the prince of Edessa, king of Jerusalem. This was in the presence of patriarch Diambert but the patriarch tried to impose his authority all over Jerusalem and its vassal states, he even tried to prevent Baldwin from ascending the throne. When Baldwin reached Jerusalem in November A.D. 1100, he did not get the city except after plots and struggles with Diambert until he was crowned king in December the same year. The struggle continued secretly between the two while the Latin king tried to put an end to the patriarch's authority. This struggle stopped for a time when Diambert was dismissed from his position in A.D. 1102 and forced to leave Jerusalem.⁴⁷ The struggle continued between King Baldwin II and the new Latin Patriarch.⁴⁸

It has been noticed that after the failure of the Second Crusade the direct followers of the king became less submissive whereas the patriarch seized the chance to increase his authority at the expense of the weakness of the royal power.

Thus, the struggle between the two teams continued in various and several forms throwing more light on the motives of the Crusade movement. It was, beside the other previous factors, the worm that was eating into the Latin 'state' in Jerusalem.

The Fourth Phenomenon: Intermarriage

The Latin rule over Jerusalem was a strange mixture of problems and contradictions among which there was what can be called intermarriage or in other words, marriage for

interest either with the object of overcoming a problem which confronted the king, or becoming the ally of other Christian powers whether Armenian, Byzantine, or to overcome a financial trouble.

For example, king Daldwin I in A.D. 1112 in order to get money, sought intermarriage which was of use to him. He married Adelaide the widow of Roger, the ruler of Sicily and it was the third marriage on his part. It is said that she came to him with a huge fleet and hundreds of warriors as well as treasures and weapons, which benefited him in solving the problems which he confronted at the time, among which were payments of the soldiers' salaries and spending money over military fortifications. Private interest dominated these political marriages. When Balwin felt that his death was near he got rid of his wife Adelaide and returned to his second wife, Arda the Armenian. Also king Baldwin II married an Armenian girl called Morphia, whereas his eldest daughter Melisende was married to a Frenchman called Fulk of Anjou⁴⁹. Both Baldwin III and Amalric I married a Greek Princess.⁵⁰

What is important is that the kings of Jerusalem had to hold these intermarriages or the commercial transactions to realise private interests, get rid of specific problems or hunt for money. These intermarriages ended in many cases in failure. They indicate the collapse of the Latin existence inside the 'kingdom' of Jerusalem.

The Fifth Phenomenon: Resident Oriental Franks and Eager Newcomers

We have mentioned that the first Crusaders who remained in the East and enjoyed living there came to have interests which bound them to it. They began to lead a calm and settled life. For this reason, they were not ready to accept new adventurers from the West who may spoil their lives. The bad relations and the contradictory interests between the two teams began to manifest themselves starting from the Second Crusade (A.D. 1145-1148) and up to the restoration of the Holy City by Saladin. The Franks who settled in the East considered the Holy Land and not the West their original home. They looked at the recent newcomers as competitive and intrusive elements that caused them troubles. They, also, suspected their intentions to the extent that one of the leaders of the Second Crusade, Conrad III, accused the Orientalized Franks of treason, and even after the failure of the campaign, its remaining people returned to the West to return the responsibility of its failure to the poulains.⁵¹

There was a feeling of enmity and hatred for those newcomers, which increased the troubles of the Latin king in Jerusalem and added a difficult problem to the other existing and accumulated problems.

The Sixth Phenomenon: Military Religious Orders and Italian Merchant Communities

Besides the problems which caused troubles to the rulers of Jerusalem, there were the military religious orders particularly the knights Hospitallers and the Knights Templars, add to these the Italian merchant communities particularly the Venetians, the Genoese and the Pisans.

During the early period of the history of the 'kingdom' of Jerusalem, the Hospitallers and the Templars were a source of power to it, to the duties which have been entrusted

to them and the fortresses which they were protecting in important strategic regions. They represented the main military force in the 'kingdom'. But in course of time, they indulged in worldly matters. They sought profit and wealth through trade and taxes which they imposed on the caravans passing by their strongholds. The wealth of these Orders was so plentiful that in the year A.D. 1187, they became one of the large land-owners in the Near East because of the grants and gifts of lands which were granted to them by the kings of Jerusalem. The continuous discord among them and the competitions as regards profits and booties became an ordinary matter. This decreased the military power of Jerusalem to face the Arab powers in the area, those powers which began to unite their front to avoid the Crusade danger. Also, the fact that these Orders were not subjected directly to the Latin king in Jerusalem led to the absence of an ecclesiastical unity, which made matters worse and more complicated.⁵²

Though the Italian merchant communities helped with their fleets to transport soldiers and ammunitions from the West to the Near East, their increasing problems were reflected on the Latin 'kingdom'. These communities had commerce as their trade and it brought forth profits whether this was at the cost of the Moslems or at the cost of their Latin natives. It is enough to know that the motto of the Venetians was: "Siamo Veneziani, poi Christiani". But the Genoese had the motto: "We are Genoese first and last". Therefore, the abuses resulting from their existence in the Holy Land were more than the uses. The Latin 'kingdom' depended on the Italian naval cities in view of the fact that Jerusalem and its vassal states had no particular naval power of its own because of the shortage of good ports and its great need for the wood necessary for the manufacture of ships. It relied on the Italian ports to help it to occupy the coastal cities of the Levant, or to transport pilgrims or soldiers or to keep the sea-ways open to the West.⁵³

For these reasons the kings of Jerusalem held agreements with the commercial Italian cities to help them capture the ports of Bilad al-Sham or the inner cities in return for definite gains such as having in these cities a private church or a private market or part of the booties or a private quarter under the control of their consuls, in addition to legal privileges and exemptions from paying taxes and freedom of trade. Also they had farmlands which supplied them with the provisions.⁵⁴ Their colonies in the cities, which were subjected to the 'kingdom' of Jerusalem were communes enjoying self-government, and their individuals spoke Italian and they did not mix socially with the remaining Frank neighbours.⁵⁵

To carry out these agreements the Venetians contributed in the occupation of Jerusalem in A.D. 1099. Also, the rulers of Jerusalem occupied most of the coastal cities with the help of the fleets of the Italian maritime cities. This is what happened when they occupied Haifa in August A.D. 1100, Arsuf in April A.D. 1101 and Caesarea in May during the same year; and this occurred with the help of the Genoese. Also, King Baldwin I captured Jebail in A.D. 1104, Tripoli in A.D. 1110 and Beirut and Sidon in A.D. 1110 with the aid of the Italians. King Baldwin II occupied Tyre in July A.D. 1124 with the help of a Venetian fleet, and so on.⁵⁶

With a piercing look we can say that the interests of those Italians contradicted the interests of the other Latin authorities in the 'kingdom'. We must not forget that these privileges which they enjoyed led, in turn, to the breaking up and disruption of its financial

resources and manpower, at a time when it was badly in need of a fixed source of money and a regular established army. Even the rivalry between the Italian merchant communities inside Jerusalem and its vassal states, for the sake of getting a large amount of booties, led to the rise of violent struggles between them inside the 'kingdom', and this made the matters worse.⁵⁷

The Seventh Phenomenon: The Problems of the Latin Principalities in Bilad al-Sham

In spite of the geographical distance of the Latin principalities which were formed in the late years of the eleventh century, such as the principality of Edessa in the upper parts of the Euphrates and the principality of Antioch in the upper parts of Bilad al-Sham and those principalities which were formed at the beginning of the twelfth century such as the principality of Tripoli on the Syrian coast, these principalities added to the old cumulative problems of the 'kingdom' of Jerusalem many new ones.

The rulers of these principalities were busy fighting against each other or against their Moslem and Byzantine neighbours. Many times have they asked the aid of Moslem allies in their struggles. For instance, when Fulk of Anjou ascended the throne in A.D. 1132 the differences among the nobles in the Holy Land were enormous. The Latin king found himself involved in them when there arose a dispute between him and the prince of Tripoli and when he had to face the plots which his sister-in-law had made against him while she was ruling Antioch.⁵⁸ There are many other examples showing how the problems of those principalities were reflected on the Latin 'kingdom' in Jerusalem. It increased its burdens and weakened its power.

The Eighth Phenomenon: A General View on the Civilization of Jerusalem in the Crusade Period

It may be useful to begin with the collection of the 'Assizes de Jerusalem' which was a reference to go back to if there was a legal problem in Palestine. The views of historians differed concerning this collection and its originals. There was a group that believed that there was no complete legal collection in the full sense of the word. At the top of those was William of Tyre who says, that whenever a legal problem arose during the reign of Baldwin III and Amalric I, the subjects used to appeal to the king himself because of his mastery of law. There is another group that says that the collection has been legislated in the period of Godfrey and it derived its origins from the laws of the different countries from which the Crusaders came, and they have borne the seal of both Godfrey and the Latin patriarch of Jerusalem and kept in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. There is a third group that does not admit the truth of this story and says that this legal collection is attributed to John of Ibelin who came more than a century after Godfrey. In order to give awe and respect to his collection he attributed it to the first ruler of Jerusalem. It is more likely that this legal collection was not put down during the reign of Godfrey but was put down in the thirteenth century, and it included many laws some of which went back to the time of Godfrey and others were issued during the period extending up to A.D. 1181.⁵⁹

Whatever the matter was, the king in Jerusalem was the head of the 'state' in spite of the continuous struggles between the two authorities: the religious and the worldly,

considering who is going to have the upper hand in the city as we have mentioned before. He was in charge of the High Court. He was the supreme commander of the forces of the 'kingdom' and the person responsible for the central administration in it and for the appointment of its employees. His authority extended to Jerusalem and its vassal states in which there were feudal nobles who owed him loyalty although sometimes they caused him trouble while trying to get out of his control. His court was made according to the pattern which was found in the West at that time.

The High court was made up of the great feudatory vassals who owed the king direct loyalty. It was usually held in Jerusalem and its main duty was to try any member who committed any crime. Besides, there were other courts-of-law which were secondary to the High Court in importance such as the Bourgeois Courts in the big cities, and the Native Courts which looked into the cases of the natives. But the City Courts were in the main cities of the 'kingdom'. These law-courts were established at the time of Amalric I. The Italian communities had Consular Courts to attend their internal affairs.⁶⁰

The city of Jerusalem was the centre of government, and the Crusaders represented a minority of its population, whereas in the remaining parts of the city there lived the natives who were occupied in trade and industry. Owing to the constant need of the Latin king for money, he adopted in most cases the policy of leniency and peacefulness with the people under his rule and with the neighbouring Islamic cities. To put this policy into practice, King Baldwin I was kindly to the Christian natives. He restored them their rights in Jerusalem and allowed them to follow their habits and traditions and take legal actions in their law-courts and speak their own languages. The Latin church was not allowed to interfere in the exercise of their religious rites.

He was also in need of active farmers to till the lands which became void of farmers in the city of Judaea as a result of the departure of Moslems. He, also, encouraged intermarriage between the Franks and the natives. He himself set a good example of this. Although the number of great Latin barons who attached themselves to wives from the East was small, this matter became familiar among the common Frank and the poulain soldiers. The offspring of these intermingled marriages amounted to hundreds of children who provided the 'kingdom' with a considerable part of its military forces.

Adopting this policy, he made approaches to the Moslems and the Jews subject to him. He allowed them to build a number of mosques and temples. Also, in law-courts he permitted the Moslems to take an oath with hand on the Koran and the Jews to take an oath with hand on the Torah and allowed Franks and Moslems to become brothers-in-law, although it was objected to by the papacy but he paid no attention to it. When he sought to make approaches to the Arab people, he granted free trade in Jerusalem to the people of all classes and allowed the Moslem traders to come with their goods to the Holy City and the coastal cities and ordered people to treat them well. In the year A.D. 1116, the Moslem caravans began to enter the city and its vassal states for trade. He, also, held agreements with the rulers of the neighbouring Islamic cities. The successors of Baldwin I adopted the same policy.⁶¹ The traveller Ibn Jubayr referred to that during his visit to Bilad-al-Sham.⁶²

Thus, the Latin rulers of Jerusalem had to adopt diplomacy and leniency towards the Arabs, who were subjected to them, whether these Arabs were Moslems or Christians, towards the Jews also and towards the Moslem traders partly to guarantee a market for

their products, partly to create a state of welfare and prosperity in the 'kingdom' to help them to survive and increase their resources and incomes and partly so as not to remain a minority isolated from the Arab majority.⁶³

But as regards agriculture and farming, the latin rulers conveyed the feudal system which they were familiar with, and which had reached then its perfection in the West. George William Coopland says that although the model feudal system has no existence in the West where this system differs in its minute details with the change of time and place, we find this model system of feudalism during the Crusades when the Latins carried it to the Holy Land and imposed it there without a basis or deep roots.⁶⁴

It is known that the Latin kings of Jerusalem did not arouse the feelings of the native farmers, but left the land to its owner on condition that he proved its possession. But because of the Latin invasion the Moslems emigrated from Palestine leaving large areas of the farmlands which the rulers gave to their vassals as fiefs. The farmer who worked on this land used to offer a part of its product to the master lord, who and whose family lived on it. The master, too, exploited the estates in which fruits, grapes and sugar-cane were grown, whereas the farmer who worked in them lived in a satisfactory way. The work on the lord's farm was done in accordance with the corvée system, this is for nothing. Sometimes, the Arab captives were employed in the fiefs of the king and the great nobles.

Although no change had fallen upon the life of the farmer, the Latin rulers of Jerusalem applied the system of farm fiefs which they were familiar with in their countries in the West. There was the royal domain which consisted of four cities: Jerusalem, Acre, Nablus and Daron and the lands surrounding them, in addition to four other chief fiefs and twelve secondary fiefs. As regards the fiefs of the Latin church and the Military Religious Orders, these were continually growing through the gifts and grants or for strategic reasons. The village was the basic unit which embraced a number of fiefs and the villages varied in areas.⁶⁵

As to industry in Jerusalem and its vassal states, we know a little about it although Benjamin of Tudela, had said in his journey that the Jews who had settled in the 'kingdom' took up the manufacture of glass and dyeing particularly in Lydda, Bethlehem and Jaffa, and he mentioned that there was in Jerusalem a dyeing laboratory which the Jews rented from the king annually and that that profession was confined to them.⁶⁶

If we move on to architecture of Jerusalem in the Crusade age we can classify it into three kinds: religious establishments, military establishments and civil establishments. As for the religious architecture, it is known that the Latin churches were built according to the Eastern style and Greek and Moslem expert artists performed their decorations. Among the most important religious establishments are the Dome of the Rock and Al-Aqsa Mosque and the Franks changed them into two Catholic churches and also the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.⁶⁷ Among the most important military establishments are the Tower of David which lies near the Hebron Gate, the Gate of Tancred in addition to the gates of the city namely: the Gate of Ibrahim, the Gate of David, the Sion Gate, the Gate of Jehosaphat, the Gate of Paradise, the Golden Gate of St. Stephens the Jaffa Gate, the Gate of the Column, the Gate of Flowers and the Gate of Grief.⁶⁸ In addition to these, there were a number of forts and castles which the Franks established to defend the city and its suburbs against any Moslem attack. The royal domain beyond the river

Jordan was made up of several castles established along the tribal road between Damascus on one side and both Egypt and Mecca on the other side. The Krak des Chevaliers was the strongest of these castles and also Montreal castle, which Baldwin I built in A.D. 1115. These two castles protected the front borders of the Latin 'kingdom'. Moreover, castle of Scandelion between Tyre and Acre was built to protect the coastal road.⁶⁹

But the civil establishments were headed by the Royal Palace which occupied part of al-Aqsa Mosque, the Latin Patriarch's Palace, St. John's Hospital which was built in Jerusalem by a group of Italian merchants in the First Crusade.⁷⁰ The houses of the Franks, however, were built according to the Eastern pattern. It is worthwhile to say that the Franks depended mainly on the Eastern natives in the building up of these establishments because of their skill in architecture, fine arts and buildings. For this reason, too, they cared for winning the people by their side.

Thus, the kings of Jerusalem depended almost entirely on the natives in agriculture, industry and trade as well as in building, establishment and decoration. No wonder, the Arabs at that time surpassed the Latin West in civilisation. Latin West began to learn from the springs of their sciences and the fountains of their knowledge. This is evident, also, in various fields. For instance, in the field of medicine, they asked the Moslems several times to send them physicians because they appreciated their skill and superiority over their Latin physicians. To prove this, Amalric I sent asking for the help of skillful Moslem physicians when he found his son Baldwin the Leprous suffering from a disease which the Latin physicians had failed to get over.⁷¹ In the book of Usama ibn Munqidh (A.D. 1188) there are several examples which show the extent of the progress of medicine in the Islamic Near East and its regress in the West at that time.⁷²

The Islamic Arab civilisation embraced all fields and extended to embrace also the humane side in dealing with the enemy and this seemed evident in the way Saladin treated his Latin captives after the battle of Hattin in the year A.D. 1187 and after the liberation of Jerusalem in the same year.⁷³ This was met on the other side with the cruelty of the Franks and their brutality in the treatment of their opponents. We felt that when they occupied Jerusalem in A.D. 1099. Their policy during the Crusades went along the same line.⁷⁴ In spite of the counterfeit policy of peacefulness with the natives and their Moslem neighbours to realise their interests, their conduct was exposed when they came in contact with the Moslems. For instance, when king Baldwin I attacked the coastal cities of Bilad al-Sham, the attack was accompanied with brutal acts. He killed the natives after he had promised them security. The Franks, sometimes, burnt the Moslems to obtain gold which they thought they had swallowed in their attempt to hide it as it happened when Baldwin I occupied Caesarea in May A.D. 1101 when a massacre took place inside the great mosque of the city.⁷⁵

From what has been mentioned, we can see clearly that the problems have been after the Latin 'kingdom' of Jerusalem since the first day. They were complicated and interrelated and they accumulated and worsened in course of time so that it was not easy to surmount, overcome or find decisive solutions for them. Jerusalem and its vassal states were then a curious scene of infinite plots, adventures, manoeuvre and confusion. In addition, there were ward children in rule under the guardianship of people who were ambitious to rule, or the presence of sick rulers who were unable to exercise the duties of

the rule.

This was a matter to be expected. The feudal society that they set up in the Near East began as a collapsible and falling one void of the fundamentals of legal states and governments in the comprehensible sense. This society was born weak and lean. The traits of nations and governments were not found in it. For example, there were no arts, no tradition, no custom, no national army, no public wealth and no developing capitals. It embraced scraps of people of different races and languages, and belonging to different groups, castes and classes coming from the West to a land which was not their own. Therefore, it remained exposed to the ups-and-downs, the violent crises and calamities which had befallen it now and then. These factors of weakness were working inside it like worms until they eventually undermined it.

During that same time at which the Latin Orient was in a state of paralysis, and immobility, the European West was distracted from it owing to its indulgence in its local and private problems at the top of which was the Investiture Conflict between the papacy and the empire on worldly matters. In addition to this, there were the defects that spread through the ecclesiastical system and made the thinkers call for its reform. This is why the s.o.s. requests that were forwarded by the kings of Jerusalem and the Franks of Bilad-al-Sham did not meet with enough response. Even the number of Latin pilgrims who used to visit Jerusalem went down considerably and the religious enthusiasm for the Crusades weakened intensively and instead of the people's rushing in a religious war against the Arabs, they began to doubt its use after a great many thousands of the best young men in the West became either captived, killed or wounded. The Latin writers who were contemporary to the Crusades tackled them critically and ironically and revealed in their books the existence of a Western public opinion against the Crusade idea in the West and from the beginning.⁷⁶

This gradual deterioration in the Latin existence in Jerusalem and its vassal states took place while the West was busy with its problems which distracted it from backing the Latin Orient. At the same time, the feeling of the Arab peoples in the Near East, that this existence had endangered them and that they ought to start to get rid of it before it flowed into the remaining parts of the Arab world, increased. The result was the Arab awakening which ripened and was completed in the periods of Imad al-Din Zenki, Nur al-Din Mahmud and Salah al-Din the Ayyubid in the middle of the twelfth century A.D. This meant the beginning of the heavier weight of the Arab scale in the struggle against the Crusaders.⁷⁷

The cycle of history in its movement, as we all know, never goes back. Neither does the position as regards the political and military strife existing in the Holy Land. The Latin 'state' in Jerusalem was weakening and dividing upon itself more and more, whereas the Arabs were uniting themselves into one whole to drive away the Crusade danger. Imad al-Din Zenki (A.D. 1126-1146) occupied Aleppo (A.D. 1128), Hama (A.D. 1129) and Edessa (A.D. 1144).⁷⁸ It was the first city the Franks occupied and the first city the Moslems restored. This was accomplished during the reign of the Latin King Fulk of Anjou. Then Imad al-Din was succeeded by his son Nur al-Din Mahmud (A.D. 1146-1174) who occupied Damascus (A.D. 1154), and he succeeded in building up a strong united state which had connected borders facing the 'state' of the Franks in Jerusalem and their remaining possessions in Bilad al-Sham. This matter disturbed the Franks and

threatened their existence in the Holy Land.⁷⁹ This happened in the period of the Latin King Amalric I.

While both Nur al-Din and Amalric were in a state of readiness towards one another, the field of struggle and rivalry between them changed to become Egypt. An important development took place in the Crusade movement at the time. It manifested itself in the attempt of each of them to occupy Egypt and include it among his possessions. They were encouraged to do so by the weakness and corruption which were characteristic of the late Fatimid State in Egypt in the middle of the twelfth century A.D.⁸⁰ Both Nur al-Din and Amalric knew well that the triumph over his opponent depends on his success in occupying Egypt.⁸¹ The result was that their campaigns against Egypt were launched one after the other between the years A.D. 1163 and A.D. 1168, those campaigns which ended in the defeat of the Franks and the triumph of Nur al-Din's army headed by Asad al-Din Shirkuh, who entered Cairo victoriously in January A.D. 1169.⁸² The Latin king decided to begin a decisive act to invade Egypt and frustrate the plans of Nur al-Din before it was too late.⁸³ He was helped by the circumstances when internal attempts were made in Egypt aiming at the revival of the Fatimid Caliphate and the getting rid of the new minister Saladin who succeeded Shirkuh in the ministry in March A.D. 1169. But these attempts were all met with failure and all the Latin invasions were repelled. Thus, the Latin king failed for the second time in his attempt to include Egypt among his lands in Bilad al-Sham.⁸⁴

Since that time the Latin 'state' of Jerusalem and the remaining principalities and strongholds were surrounded from North to South by Moslem forces and the Crusade colonies were exposed to loss and waste. There was nothing in front of the Franks except the sea. Even in this respect their position became endangered because the strong Arab fleet in the Mediterranean was standing menacing them. One of their writers, namely, William of Tyre who was a contemporary of this era and who watched its incidents, said that essential change which had fallen upon the Arab powers had a thundering effect on the heads of the Westerners and was considered a great blow to their colonies in Palestine.⁸⁵

This meant that the scale of the balance weighed heavier in favour of the Arabs. This was at the time when Jerusalem and its vassal states and the remaining Latin principalities in the Holy Land weakened more and more day in day out and the European West was totally busy with other things because of the changes that had befallen the theatre there. Saladin had declared the end of the Fatimid Caliphate in Egypt and the beginning of the Ayyubid State, which rose on the ground of al-Jihad against the Crusaders.

Thus, everything became ready for directing a finishing stroke to the Crusaders and their 'kingdom' in Jerusalem after the Arab awakening had put an end to every hope they had to gain grounds, and even to survive. This was accomplished during the days of Saladin. After he had felt at ease regarding the safety of the Arab front, he started his famous struggle against the Crusaders. This struggle passed through three stages: The first stage (A.D. 1171-1179) was a period of preparation and manoeuvres and had begun since the first day on which he came to rule Egypt when he besieged the castle of al-Shawbek in A.D. 1171 situated on the way of tribes between Bilad al-Sham and Egypt. But he did not succeed in occupying it. In October A.D. 1177 he met in front of

Ramleh one of the Latin leaders namely Reynald of Châtillon but he was defeated in front of the castle of Beth Gibrin. In the autumn of the year A.D. 1179, the armies of Saladin were victorious in their fight against the Crusaders in the battle of Marj Ayun, although it did not drive them out of their central place in Jerusalem or other Latin places in Bilad al-Sham.

The end of the first stage was At Marj Ayun. This was followed by the second stage of Saladin's struggle, which began right afterwards. This second stage began in the year A.D. 1182 and ended in the year A.D. 1187. He felt roused by Reynald's attempts to undermine Mecca and Medina and the Moslems felt infuriated against the Franks. He launched regular campaigns against them and he attacked them in their dens such as Ayn Jalut and Krak between the years A.D. 1183 and A.D. 1186 so that he did not leave them a means of comfort. This second stage ends in an unsuccessful attempt by Saladin to occupy Krak at the beginning of A.D. 1187.

Next comes the third and last stage of his struggle, namely the offensive war. On July 2nd 1187 Saladin occupied Tiberias. Then, he met the armies of the Franks gathered together at Hattin two days afterwards. There, the greatest battle in the history of the Crusades took place and in it the Franks were met with utter defeat. This was followed by a series of victories scored by Saladin in which the dens of the Latins fell one after the other until his armies came before Jerusalem the garrison of which yielded and Saladin went into it triumphantly on October 2nd 1187. It is worthwhile to say that Saladin did not avenge on its Frank inhabitants but treated them humanely and generously as is recorded in the works of the Latin writers and historians.⁸⁶

The native Christian Easterners remained in the city welcoming its restoration by Saladin, who encouraged them to settle in it. He, also, returned the sacred Christian places in Jerusalem to the Orthodox church and its followers. They did not forget during the Latin occupation of Jerusalem the ill-treatment of the Latin church and the deprivation of the Orthodox clergymen of their posts in the church of the Holy Sepulchre and even trying to force the Orthodox people to pay the tithe. All this made the Orthodox Christians unwilling, to endure the rule of the Latins and they were ready to accept the conquests of Saladin because of the chronic and dominating traditional hostility between the Catholic Latins and the Eastern Christians, the roots of which go back to the dawn of Christianity. They preferred Islamic rule to the Crusade occupation. Also, al-Aqsa Mosque has been completely purged from all the traces of the Latins. Al-Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock were prepared for the Islamic services in them anew.⁸⁸ Saladin did not live long enough to continue his struggle and conquests against the Crusaders as he died on February the 21st A.D. 1193 aged then 55 years.

The restoration of Jerusalem was considered a great occasion in the history of the Crusades in general, and Islamic history in particular. The Islamic historians have talked copiously about it, for instance: Ibn Shaddad, Imad al-Din al-Asfahani, Ibn al-Athir and al-Maqrisi. Also, the Latin historians talked bitterly about it. Ever since then, the Latin principalities have shrunk into a narrow area on the Syrian coast which enabled the successors of Saladin and those who came after them among the sultans of the First Mamluk State, to send the Crusaders out at the end of the thirteenth century A.D.

Steven Runciman wonders at the Crusades saying: Are the conquests of Saladin against the Crusaders attributed to the inevitable reaction of the Moslems to defy the

Franks? Or are they attributed to a farsighted policy which was characteristic of the great Moslem leaders who preceded Saladin? Or are they attributed to what befell the Franks themselves which were subject to dispute and silly acts? Or are they attributed to the strong personality of Saladin and his will which never weakens?⁸⁹

The answer is simply that the victories of Saladin which were crowned by his restoration of Jerusalem, are due, first and foremost to the unity of the Islamic Near East from Egypt in the South to Bilad al-Sham and Iraq in the extreme North to face the Crusade danger. This has disturbed the balance of power between the two conflicting sides. After the Crusaders had the upper hand at the beginning of the Crusades at the end of the eleventh century, it was followed by the levelling of the balance between both sides in the middle of the twelfth century, then the comprehensive Arab unity at the latest part of this century. Here the atmosphere was paved for Saladin to direct this effective stroke at Hattin and liberate the Holy City. However, there is no doubt the factors which Runciman referred to contributed, in some form or other, to speed up the Islamic victory.

One of ancient Westerners wrote after the defeat of the Crusaders at the hands of Saladin saying that "the Crusaders were clearly against the Divine Will", referring to the cry 'God wills it' with which began the Crusades.⁹⁰ These words need no comment.

DEDUCTIONS

From what has been said we can extract several facts and ideas. Here they are:

- 1- The details of this chapter reveal a fact which has its denotation, namely, that Jerusalem, with its Arab origins and roots which go deep in history, had remained a city with an Arab tinge and an Arab nature since the Arab conquest and until its liberation in the days of Saladin. Even during the Latin occupation, the Arab elements formed the majority in it.
- 2- Another idea is that ages of power and unity, and others of weakness and divisions succeeded each other in the Arab Near East. It also highlights the factors and causes that led to the waxing and waning of power and unity, and the result of such changes.
- 3- The struggle between the Arabs and the Latins during the Crusades, concerning the cause of Jerusalem, was a link in the long chain of struggle between the Arab World and the European World, which lasted from the beginning of Islam in the early 7th century A.D. until the end of the middle ages. It has been, also, a stage in the long conflict between East and West from the oldest times and still continues now.
- 4- The strife between the Arabs and the Crusaders from A.D. 1099 to A.D. 1087 may be best signified as a political and cultural strife between two great powers and two different civilizations, each trying to subdue the other. When the two powers are equal, the balance of power is level, so that neither side can gain a decisive victory on the other. When one side feels it is the stronger, it, at once, takes the offensive, while the other side remains on the defensive. The balance of power between both parties keeps changing from one side to the other due to the changes in political, economic, social and religious conditions prevailing at any time in both worlds.
- 5- Another fact is the lesson the Arabs learnt from their struggle with the Franks in the

Holy Land. They found that the amassment of Arab powers into a united front was essential for any kind of effective defence against the Franks. This means that the Arabs, in order to obtain final and decisive victory over their enemies and redeem Jerusalem from their hands, had first to make a united front.

- 6- Another fact is that Arab unity must precede armed struggle. Sometimes, the two went together, but in some cases the holy war preceded Arab unity, when the Arabs were suddenly confronted by a situation in which they found themselves compelled to fight against their enemies.⁹¹
- 7- The violence, cruelty and fanaticism of the Crusaders in their campaigns against the city of Jerusalem and its vassal states, were important factors that excited the nationalist spirit among the Arabs in the Near East.⁹²
- 8- It is worthwhile to say that the Crusaders did not have the chance at all to occupy the internal Islamic cities such as Damascus, Aleppo, Hama, Cairo and Bagdad, even when the balance of power was on their side in the struggle against the Arabs, and in spite of their frequent attempts to achieve that. They preferred to stay in the coastal cities or the cities near the coast and not to risk their lives by going into the innermost parts because they knew well that they would find themselves in the middle of an atmosphere of hatred and millions of people who were ready to pounce upon them and make their life disagreeable.
- 9- From the beginning, the revelation of the real aims of the Crusades - expansion and colonization - was a spur to the rise of the Arab power, culminating in the comprehensive Arab awakening and unity leading to the recovery of Jerusalem and the Holy Land from the hands of the Crusaders.

ABBREVIATIONS

A.O.L. Les Archives de l'Orient Latin.

R.H.C.-Doc. Arm. Recueil des Historiens des Croisades - Documents Armeniens.

R.H.C.-H. Occ. Recueil des Historiens des Croisades - Historiens Occidentaux.

R.H.C. - H. Or. Recueil des Historiens des Croisades - Historiens Orientaux.

R.H.G.F. Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France.

NOTES

- (1) Compare the text of the speech of Urban II in the following sources which are contemporary with the council of Clermont and the first Crusade: Foucher de Chartres, *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem Peregrinantium*, ed. R.H.C.-H. Occ., iii (Paris, 1866), 323-4; Robert le Moine, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, ed. R.H.C.-H. Occ., iii, 727-30; Baudri de Bourgueil, *Historia Jerosolimitana*, ed. R.H.C.-H. Occ., iv (Paris, 1879), 12-5; Guibert de Nogent, *Historia quae dicitur Gesta Dei per Francos*, ed. R.H.C.-H. Occ., IV, 137-40.
- (2) English translation of the text of Fulcher of Chartres in: Downs, N. (ed.), *Basic Documents in Medieval History* (New York, 1959), 74-5.
- (3) ".....Hoc enim non fuit humanum opus, sed divinum." Cf. Robert le Moine, op. cit., ed. R.H.C.-H. Occ., iii, 723.

- (4) Riant, P., "Inventaire critique des lettres historiques des Croisades," cf. **A.O.L.**, i (Paris, 1881), 2.
- (5) Grousset, R., **The Sum of History**, trans. by A. & H. Temple Patterson (Oxford, 1951), 181, 182.
- (6) Halphen, L., **L'Essor de l'Europe** (XIe - XIIIe siècles) (Paris, 1941), 4ff., 46ff., 63ff.
- (7) Trevelyan G. M., **A Shortened History of England** (Aylesbury, 1960), 141.
- (8) Lewis, B., **The Arabs in History** (London, 1958), 150.
- (9) Youssef, J.N., "The Personal Impulse in the Rise of the Crusades," **Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Alexandria University**, no. 16 (Alexandria, 1963), 183-211 (Arabic); idem, Islam and Christianity: **The Balance of Power in the Middle Ages** (Alexandria, 1986), 151-90. (Arabic). Cf. also Barker, E., **The Crusades** (London, 1925), 6-14.
- (10) Cf. Atiya, A.S., **Crusade, Commerce and Culture** (Bloomington, 1962), 23-8; Grousset, op. cit., 7-12; Arnold, T. & Guillaume, A. (eds.), **The Legacy of Islam** (London, 1952), 40-1. A. Toynbee dealt with this point in his "Study of History" and the "Abridgement".
- (11) Runciman, S., **A History of the Crusades**, i (Cambridge, 1954), 169 & Appendix ii, 33641; cf. Heer, F., **The Medieval World: Europe from 1100 to 1350**, trans. from the German by J. Sondheimer (London, 1962), 103-4.
- (12) Matthieu d'Edesse, **Extraits de la chronique de Matthieu d'Edesse**, ed. R.H.C.-Doc.Arm., i (Paris, 1869), 37-8; Michel le Syrien, **Extraits de la chronique de Michel le Syrien**, ed. R.H.C.-H.Doc.Arm., i, 328; Foucher de Chartres, op. cit., R.H.C.-H.Occ., iii, 4-96-7.
- (13) Hagenmeyer, H. (ed.), **Anonymi Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum** (Heidelberg, 1890), 353ff.; Matthieu d'Edesse, op. cit., R.H.C.-Doc. Arm., i, 39-43; Raimond d'Agiles, **Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Jerusalem**, ed. R.H.C.-H.Occ., iii, 253-7.
- (14) Ibn al-Qalanisi (d. A.D. 1160), **Dhayl Tarikh Dimashq** (Beirut, 1908), 135; Ibn al-Wardi (d. A.D. 1349), **Tatimmat al-Mukhtasar fi Akhbar al-Bashar**, ii (Cairo, 1868), 11.
- (15) Raimond d'Agiles, op. cit., R.H.C.-H.Occ., iii, 291ff.; Albert d'Aix, **Historia Hierosolimitana**, ed. R.H.C.-H. Occ., iv, 470ff. Cf. also Ibn al-Qalansi, op. cit., 136ff.
- (16) Runciman, **A History of the Crusades**, ii, 316. Cf. Aref Pacha Al-Aref, **History of Jerusalem** (Cairo, 1951), 71-2, 74-. (Arabic).
- (17) Barker, op. cit., 5.
- (18) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 340.
- (19) Baldwin, M. W. **The Mediaeval Church** (New York, 1960), 103.
- (20) Setton, K.M. (ed.), **A History of the Crusades**, i: **The First Hundred Years** by M.A. Baldwin (Philadelphia, 1958), 96-7; Mahmud, S.F., **The Story of Islam** (Karachi, 1959), 83, 133, 134. Cf. also al-Maqrizi (d. A.D. 1442), **Itti'az al-Honafa bi-Akhbar al-Aimma al-Fatemeiin al-Kholafa**, i (Cairo, 1948), 287-91.
- (21) Oman, C. W. C., **A History of the Art of War in the Middle Ages**, i, (London, 1924), 233.
- (22) Ibn al-Qalanisi, op. cit., 137; Ibn Taghri Bardi (d. A.D. 1469), **al-Nu jum al-Zahira fi Muluk Misr wal-Qahira**, v (Cairo, 1935), 149.
- (23) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 166.
- (24) Albert d'Aix, op. cit., R.H.C.-H.Occ., iv, 670; Matthieu d'Edesse, op. cit., R.H.C.-Doc.Arm., i, 19-24, 96-7; cf. Ibn al-Athir (d. A.D. 1234), **Tarikh al-Dawla al-Atabikiya Meluk al-Mausil**, ed. R.H.C.-H.Or., ii, 2e partie (Paris, 1876), 33.
- (25) Grousset, R., **Histoire des Croisades et du Royaume de Jerusalem**, ii (Paris, 1935), 24ff., 310ff., 609ff. ; Runciman, op. cit., ii, 291ff.
- (26) Lewis, **The Arabs in History**, 150; Runciman, op. cit., ii, 291.
- (27) English translation of the text of Fulcher in: Lewis, op. cit., 150-2; Grousset, **Sum of History**,

- 177; Heer, op. cit., 111.
- (28) Ibn Munqidh (d. A.D. 1188), **Kitab al-I'tibar** (Leiden, 1884), 99.
- (29) "Paullani dicuntur, qui de parte Siano et matre Francigena generatur." Cf. Joinville, J. de, **Memoirs of Louis IX, King of France**, trans. by Johnes of Hafod (London, 1848), 466 n. 1.
- (30) Ambroise, **The Crusade of Richard Lion-Heart**, trans. from the old French by M.J. Hubert (New York, 1941), 16; cf. Rey, E., **Les Colonies franques de Syrie au XII^e et XIII^e siècles** (Paris, 1383), 60-1.
- (31) Grousset, op. cit., 179.
- (32) Youssef, J.N., "The Crusades and the Public Opinion in the West," **Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Alexandria University** (Alexandria, 1968), 47-8. (Arabic).
- (33) Runciman, **History of the Crusades**, ii, 297.
- (34) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 291-2.
- (35) Throop, P., **Criticism of the Crusades: A Study of Public Opinion and Crusade Propaganda** (Amsterdam, 1940), 169; cf. Youssef, op. cit., 47.
- (36) Benjamin of Tudela, X., **Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela** (1165-1173), trans. into Arabic from the Hebrew original by Ezra H. Haddad, 1st. ed. (Baghdad, 1945), 99.
- (37) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 294-5; cf. Margolis, M.L. & Marx, A., **A History of the Jewish People** (Philadelphia, 1962), 359-64; Brooke, Z.N. **A History of Europe from 911 to 1198** (London, 1938), 238.
- (38) Benjamin of Tudela, op. cit., 87, 89, 90, 93, 94, 95, 96, 104, 106, 108, 110. Benjamin stresses that the Jewish communities in the Islamic cities at that time, such as Damascus and Aleppo, were large in number, compared with the small numbers which lived in the Latin East. We understand from his account that they preferred to live in the Islamic cities rather than in the lands controlled by the Crusaders. Cf. Benjamin, 117, 122.
- (39) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 324.
- (40) Baldwin, op. cit., 103.
- (41) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 89-90.
- (42) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 100, 298.
- (43) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 324, 4-03.
- (44) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 72, 81-2.
- (45) This point is discussed in detail when dealing with political marriages which were characteristic of the 'Latin Kingdom' in the Holy Land.
- (46) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 298-99.
- (47) Grousset, R., **Histoire des Croisades et du Royaume Franc de Jérusalem**, i, (Paris, 1934), 201-7; Runciman, op. cit., i, 315ff., ii, 72, 82-3.
- (48) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 177.
- (49) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 36, 102-5, 177f., 292.
- (50) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 309, 349-50.
- (51) Cf. Conrad's Letter, ed. R.H.G.F., xv, 534-5.
- (52) Lacroix, P., **Vie militaire et religieuse au moyen âge et à l'époque de la renaissance** (Paris, 1873), 198-9; idem, **La chevalerie et les croisades: Féodalité, Blason, Ordres Militaires** (Paris, 1887), 226; Grousset, op. cit., ii, 510; Runciman, op. cit., ii, 156-8, 312-4.
- (53) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 314.
- (54) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 73, 167-8, 314-5; Heyd, W., **Histoire du commerce du Levant au moyen âge**, i (Leipzig, 1885), 343-4; Pirenne, H., **Economic and Social History of Medieval Europe**, trans. from the French by I.E. Clegg (London, 1961), 30-3; cf. also Youssef, J.N. **The Arabs, Byzantines and Latins during the First Crusade**, 4th. ed. (Alexandria, 1983), 87-90.

- (Arabic).
- (55) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 294.
- (56) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 73, 88, 168-71.
- (57) Runciman, op. c. it., ii, 315.
- (58) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 187-90.
- (59) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 299, 303.
- (60) Cf. Runciman, op. cit., ii, 300-3.
- (61) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 100-1, 156, 318.
- (62) Ibn Jubayr (d. A.D. 1217), **The Travel of Ibn Jubayr**, ed. Hussein Nassar (Cairo, 1955), 276-7, 288, 290-3. Cf. also Zaki Mohammed Hassan, **Moslem Travellers in the Middle Ages** (Cairo, 1945) 82-3, 93. (Arabic); Grousset, **Sum of History**, 178; Coulton, G.G., **Medieval Panorama** (New York, 1955), 322.
- (63) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 101, 445.
- (64) Coopland, G.W. & Vinogradoff, P., **Serfdom and Western Medieval Europe**, trans. into Arabic by M. Ziada, 3rd. ed. (Cairo, 1958), 24; Youssef, J.N., **Studies on the History of the Middle Ages**, 1st. ed. (Alexandria, 1958), 55-7.
- (65) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 100, 296-7.
- (66) Benjamin of Tudela, op. cit., 87, 95, 99, 104, 108.
- (67) Benjamin of Tudela, op. c. it., 100.
- (68) Benjamin of Tudela, op. cit., 99, 100-1; Runciman, op. cit., ii, 293 & map 4.
- (69) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 98-9, cf. also 229.
- (70) Benjamin of Tudela, op. cit., 99.
- (71) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 318 & n. 1.
- (72) Ibn Munqidh, Usamah's Memoirs entitled 'Kitab al-I'tibar'. Arabic text ed. by P.K. Hitti (Princeton, 1930), 132-4, 137-8.
- (73) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 459-60, 466.
- (74) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 323.
- (75) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 73. **Concerning the cruelty of the Franks during the Crusades**, see the following sources: Ibn al-Qalanisi, op. cit., 136; Abulfida (d. A.D. 1331), **al-Mukhtasar fi Akhbar al-Bashar**, iii (Istanbul, 1286 li.H.), 128-9; Ibn al-Wardi, **Tatimat al-Mukhtasar fi Akhbar al-Bashar**, ii (Cairo, 1285 A.H.), 137; Ibn Kathir (d. A.D. 1373), **al Bidaya wa Al-Nihaya fi al Tarikh**, xiii (Cairo, 1358 A.H.), 83-4.
- (76) Youssef, J. N., **The Crusade and the Public Opinion in the West**. 31-52 (Arabic); Toroop, op. cit., 2ff.
- (77) These facts have been dealt with, in detail, in my book: **The Unity and Awakening Movements of the Arabs during the Crusades**, 2nd. ed. (Beirut, 1981), 27-31. (Arabic).
- (78) Ibn al-Qalanisi, op. cit., 279-80; Ibn al-Athir, **Tarikh al-Dawla, al-Atabikiya Meluk al-Mausil**, ed. R.H.C.-H. Or., ii, 2e partie, 118-25; Grégoire le Prêtre, **Chronique**, ed. R.H.C.-Doc. Arm., i (Paris, 1869), 157.
- (79) Ibn al-Qalanisi, op. cit., 333, 339-42; cf. Guillaume de Tyr, **Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum**, ed. R.H.C.-H. Occ., i, 2e partie (Paris, 1844), 895-7.
- (80) Ibn al-Athir, **Kitab al-Kamil fi al-Tarikh**, ed. R.H.C.-H. Or., i (Paris, 1872), 550; Abulfida, op. cit., iii, 40-2; Ibn Taghri Bardi, op. cit., v (Cairo, 1935), 338-9, 345-6, 363; cf. also Guillaum de Tyr, op. cit., ed. R.H.C.-H. Occ., i, 2e partie, 833.
- (81) Ibn Shaddad (d. A.J. 1233), **al-Nawadir al-Sultaniya Wa al-Mahasin al-Yussifiya** (The Biography of Saladin) (Misr, 1317 A.H.), 29-30; Ibn al-Athir, **al-Kamil fi al-Tarikh**, ed. R.H.C.-H. Or., i, 535, 547; cf. Stevenson, W.B., **The Crusaders in the East** (Cambridge, 1907), 187.

- (82) As regards the campaigns of Amalric I and Nur al-Din against Egypt, see: Ibn Shaddad, op. cit., 28-35; Ibn al-Athir, **Tarikh al-Dawla al-Atabikiya**, ed. R.H.C.-H. Or., ii, 2e. partie, 213-9, 236-41, 246-53; idem, **al-Kamil fi al-Tarikh**, R.H.C.-H. Or., i, 532-41, 546-51, 553-8; Michel le Syrien, op. cit., R.H.C.-Doc.Arm., i, 353-9; Guillaume de Tyr, op. cit., R.H.C.-H. Occ., i, 890-1, 934, 945-6; cf. also Schlumberger, G., **Campagnes du Roi Amaury Ier. de Jérusalem en Egypte**, au XIIe. si cle (Paris, 1906), 46-8, 63-98, 172-229.
- (83) Ibn Shaddad, op. cit., 33-4; Ibn al-Athir, **Tarikh al-Dawla al- Atabikiya**, R.H.C.-H. Or., ii, 2e. partie, 250-1.
- (84) Ibn Shaddad, op. cit., 33-4, 38; Ibn al-Athir, **al-Kamil fi al-Tarikh**, R.H.C.-H.Or., i, 566-7, 599, 601, 611-4; cf. also Casanova, P., "Les Derniers Fatimides," ed. **Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique Française du Caire**, vi, 3e. fasc. (Paris, 1893), 422-32; Schlumberger, op. cit., 262-91.
- (85) Guillaume de Tyr, op. cit., R.H.C.-H. Occ., i, 2e. partie, 895-7.
- (86) Ibn Shaddad, op. cit., 60-73, 143-65, 220-7, 235-7; al-Asfahani (d. A.D. 1201), **al-Fath al-Qussî fi al-Fath al-Qudsi** (Cairo, 1321 A.H.), 17-25, 36-45, 140-260, 314-7; Ibn al-Athir, **al-Kamil fi al-Tarikh**, R.H.C.-H. Or., i, 614-744; Vartan le Grand, **Extrait de l'histoire universelle**, ed. X.H.C.-Doc.Arm., i (Paris, 1869), 439.
- (87) Ibn Shaddad, op. cit., 158-9; cf. Runciman, op. cit., ii, 466.
- (88) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 467-8. For further details about the nature of the relations between the Latin West and the Eastern Christians, and the causes of enmity between them see: Youssef, J. N., **The Arabs, Byzantines and Latins**, 111-8. (Arabic); Idem, **The Crusade of Louis IX to Egypt A.D. (1248-50)**, 3rd. ed. (Alexandria, 1984), 116-21. (Arabic).
- (89) Runciman, op. cit., ii, 473.
- (90) Cf. Youssef, **The Crusades and the Public Opinion in the West**, 37. (Arabic); cf. also Toroop, op. cit., 174.
- (91) Stevenson, op. cit., 723-4.
- (92) Youssef, J.N., "Arab Awakening during the Crusades", **Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, University of Alexandria**, vol. xxiii, (Alexandria 1971), 21-2.
- (93) Cf. Cahen, C., **La Syrie du Nord a l'époque des croisades** (Paris, 1940), 374-7.

* * *