

Alliances and Treaties between Frankish and  
Muslim Rulers in the Middle East

# The Muslim World in the Age of the Crusades

Studies and Texts

*Edited by*

Suleiman A. Mourad (Smith College)  
Paul M. Cobb (University of Pennsylvania)  
Konrad Hirschler (SOAS University of London)

VOLUME 1

*The titles published in this series are listed at [brill.com/mwac](http://brill.com/mwac)*

# Alliances and Treaties between Frankish and Muslim Rulers in the Middle East

Cross-Cultural Diplomacy in the Period of the Crusades

*By*

Michael A. Köhler

*Translated by*

Peter M. Holt

*Revised, edited and introduced by*

Konrad Hirschler



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON  
2013

*Cover illustration:* One of the few surviving artifacts linked to Muslim-Frankish relations in the Eastern Mediterranean. This basin with Arabic and French inscription was presumably produced in Egypt (or Syria) for Hugh IV of Lusignan (d. 1359), King of Cyprus and Jerusalem. The Arabic inscription states that it was produced by the order of Hugh and the French inscription was probably subsequently added in Cyprus. Musée du Louvre, MAO101, Dist. RMN-Grand Palais / Hughes Dubois.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Kohler, Michael.

Alliances and treaties between Frankish and Muslim rulers in the Middle East : cross-cultural diplomacy in the period of the Crusades / by Michael Kohler; translated by Peter M. Holt; revised, edited and introduced by Konrad Hirschler.

p. cm. — (The Muslim world in the age of the Crusades; v. 1)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-24857-1 (hardback : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-90-04-24890-8 (e-book)

1. Latin Orient—Foreign relations—Islamic Empire. 2. Islamic Empire—Foreign relations—Latin Orient. 3. Crusades—First, 1096–1099. 4. Jerusalem—History—Latin Kingdom, 1099–1244. 5. Islamic Empire—Foreign relations—750–1258. I. Holt, P. M. (Peter Malcolm) II. Hirschler, Konrad. III. Title.

D183.K64 2013

909.07—dc23

2012051263

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual “Brill” typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see [www.brill.com/brill-typeface](http://www.brill.com/brill-typeface).

ISSN 2213-1043

ISBN 978-90-04-24857-1 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-24890-8 (e-book)

Copyright 2013 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.

Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

## CONTENTS

Author's Preface to the English Translation .....	vii
Foreword .....	xi
Introduction .....	1
I The Development of the Syrian System of Autonomous Lordships (c. 1070–1099) .....	7
The System of Autonomous Lordships before the First Crusade (c. 1070–1099) .....	8
Frankish-Muslim Alliances and Treaties during the First Crusade (1097–99) .....	20
II Relations Between the Frankish, Turkish and Arab States in the Period of the Syrian Autonomous Rulers (1098–1158) .....	59
The Territorial Expansion of the Frankish Lordships and Their Integration (1098–1112/13) .....	62
The Paradigm of the 'Counter-Crusade': The Syrian Lordships and the Advance of Turkish Allied Armies from the East (1098–1128) .....	90
Syrian Alliance Politics from the Expansion of the Zengid Dominions to the Frankish-Byzantine Rapprochement (1128–58) .....	127
III Frankish-Muslim Relations in the Period of Nur al-Din and Saladin (1158–92) .....	175
The Expansion of the 'No Place' Doctrine and Frankish Policy Towards Egypt and Byzantium (1158–74) .....	179
Franks, Zengids and Nizaris: The Syrian Lordships Confronting the Expansion of the Ayyubid Dominions (1174–83) .....	213
Between Treaty Policy and Confrontation, Subordination and <i>Jihad</i> : Frankish-Ayyubid Relations from the Peak of the Party Disputes in Jerusalem to the End of Saladin's Life (1184–93) .....	246
A Glance at Frankish-Muslim Relations in the Thirteenth Century .....	267

IV Instruments and Implications of Frankish-Muslim Legal Relations in the Middle East during the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries .....	277
Technicalities and Validity of Frankish-Muslim Treaties in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries .....	291
The Formation and Function of Muslim-Frankish Condominia ( <i>munāṣafāt</i> ) in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries .....	312
Conclusions .....	321
Bibliography .....	325
Index .....	345
Maps .....	363

## AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION

Some thirty years ago, in 1982, Ludwig Buisson who held the chair in Medieval History at Hamburg University, Germany, drew my attention to the campaigns of Saint Louis, the French Crusader king. It was then when I first came across those striking references in Western sources of the late thirteenth century, most of them in Old French, describing the negotiating procedures and agreements between Crusader/Frankish and Muslim rulers in the years 1249 and 1254, which as a young historian and orientalist immediately caught my attention and fascinated me. I began to consult the early Mamluk historiography in order to improve my understanding of both negotiating techniques and the political strategies that provided the basis for agreements between Franks and Muslims. Under the guidance of Ludwig Buisson and Albrecht Noth, the inspiring head of the Hamburg School of Oriental Studies and great expert of Muslim historiography, this led me to finally conduct a full research into Frankish-Muslim alliances and treaties in the Middle East from the appearance of the first Crusaders in the region to Mamluk rule in Egypt and Syria: I choose to base my work on a comprehensive assessment of both Western and Muslim sources in parallel, and the idea to formulate questions and answers only from the simultaneous analysis of both groups of sources. Hamburg University accepted my study as a PhD thesis in 1987, and De Gruyter published it in German four years later, in 1991, in the series *Studies on the Language, History and Culture of the Islamic Orient* (vol. 12).<sup>1</sup>

In the following years, my academic and other professional career interests developed in other directions, focusing more on contemporary Muslim history and the day-to-day challenges of political and technical cooperation between Europe and the Muslim world, with which today I am dealing both as a professor for Europe and the Mediterranean in Bruges, Belgium, and as an official of the European Commission. It was all the more a surprise, and a delightful and flattering one, when in 2002 Peter M. Holt of the School of Oriental and African Studies in London

---

<sup>1</sup> Michael A. Köhler, *Allianzen und Verträge zwischen fränkischen und islamischen Herrschern im Vorderen Orient. Eine Studie über das zwischenstaatliche Zusammenleben vom 12. bis ins 13. Jahrhundert*, Berlin – New York 1991 (Studien zur Sprache, Geschichte, und Kultur des Islamischen Orients. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift *Der Islam*, ed. Albrecht Noth, Neue Folge Band 12).

contacted me with the information that he had started to translate my study on Frankish-Muslim alliances and treaties into English in order to enable his non-German speaking students to access the results of my work. Professor Holt soon asked me to authorise the publication of the English translation of the book, which I was only too happy to give. However, it proved unfortunately impossible to finalise the translation and find a suitable publisher before Professor Holt's death in 2006. This seemed to put the project to a sudden halt.

But the story should continue, with a very pleasant *déjà-vu*: In 2010 Konrad Hirschler asked me if my book had ever been translated into English, as like Peter M. Holt before him he regretted that the language barrier made it increasingly difficult to make full use of the study in his teaching at the School of Oriental and African Studies. I informed Dr Hirschler of Peter M. Holt's earlier request and translation work, and Konrad Hirschler was soon able to find and access the still unfinished English manuscript in Harris Manchester College Library, Oxford. He immediately decided to continue where Peter Holt had stopped, to complete the translation and finally submit it to Koninklijke Brill in Leiden for publication.

I am greatly indebted to both the late Peter M. Holt and to Konrad Hirschler and his team at SOAS for their generous work on the English version of this book and their enormous efforts to bring the results of my work to the attention of English language readers. Speakers of both languages will notice that while throughout faithful to the German original, the English version is somewhat shorter and sometimes summarizes the German text; it is also more economic with respect to references and quotes from Latin, Arabic and Old French sources. This makes the text more fluent. Readers who wish to have access to the full text including all references and bibliography may wish to go back to the German version.

Dr Hirschler's contribution has not been limited to editing and putting the finishing touches on Peter M. Holt's translation. In his preface he very usefully places the findings of my study in the context of the results of specialist research published in the last two decades, which has shed further light on individual aspects of motivation of alliances and of diplomatic practice. Indeed, there is ample room for further research in this field, and in particular the study of Syrian history under the Bahri Mamluks based on an examination of the many still unedited Arabic sources of the later thirteenth and fourteenth centuries would promise to provide deeper insights.

While I hope I can still add further contributions to this subject of research, I am delighted that today, some 25 years after the conclusion

of work on the original German text, my study on alliances and treaties is still deemed relevant enough to warrant an English translation which will make it available to a wider readership. Political relations between the Muslim world and the West if anything have become ever more complex in the last quarter of a century since this book was written, and confrontation in the region between countries, within societies, and with the involvement of outside players ever more frequent and bitter. Therefore, not only the findings but also the purpose of this book may still have their justification today. As I stated in my concluding remarks: "For better or worse, history is also used or misused for the purpose of legitimization and historical events as well as tendencies are even occasionally understood as direct instructions for dealing with the present. In view of this practical relevance of history, whether intentional or unintentional, it is all the more urgent that what we comprehend as history should be confronted with changed methodologies. Applied to the Frankish-Muslim encounters of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in the Middle East, called the 'Crusades' for the lack of a better term, it might happen that both Western and Arabic scholars would no longer read the sources merely as confrontational, but would obtain the formulation of new questions from the Arabic sources in particular. If by this means a small step could be taken towards the separation of ideology from the debate about the encounter of Europe and the Islamic world in the past and a scrap of the historical burden lifted from the dialogue between Europe and the Arabs, much would already have been achieved."

I would like to take this occasion to thank all those who contributed in one way or another to making this book possible: Ludwig Buisson and Albrecht Noth who guided and advised me, constantly encouraged me and supervised my PhD thesis; Peter M. Holt and Konrad Hirschler for their initiative, all their hard work and enthusiastic support which has made this English translation possible, and Brill Publishers who accepted to make it available to the public; My mother Margret and my father Volkmarr Köhler for all their help in every situation and in particular during my student's years—I would have wished that my father was still with us to see the publication of this book!; And my wife Ina who since we met at university studying Medieval Islam has become my trusted companion for three decades, helped me finish my PhD, went with me to live and work in Northern Africa, and gave birth to our much-loved children.

Michael A. Köhler  
Brussels, October 2012



## FOREWORD

Books of this kind are seldom translated into English. That is a pity, for this work deserves to be widely known not merely among specialists in the history of the crusades, but to all who are interested in East-West relations.<sup>1</sup> Thus the late James Powell concluded his review of the present work, one that deals with the coexistence of Frankish, that is Latin European, and Muslim states in the Middle East during the period of the Crusades. Although more than two decades have elapsed since the publication of the German version (and Powell's review) the book's originality still warrants a translation. Many historical studies have remained bound to the idea that 'the virtually permanent confrontation [between Muslim and Frankish states] was inevitable', as a study on the principality of Damascus put it.<sup>2</sup> This book's argument questions such a historicization and re-examines the available source material, mainly in Latin, Arabic and Greek. It argues that after their foundation, the Frankish states were swiftly absorbed into the political landscape of Syrian autonomous lordships, wherein a characteristic pattern of alliances and treaties evolved, preventing the intrusion of external powers and the rise of any one particular lordship to a position of dominance. The integration of the Frankish states was facilitated by the development of specific legal instruments, such as the condominium (*munasafa*) and the suspension clause, which were employed in treaties.

Beyond doubt, research has revised or at least refined some arguments to which the book refers. For example, the motives for individuals to support or join the Crusades, an issue that features prominently in this book's first chapter, is to a large extent explained here by materialistic factors, be they of an economic, political or social nature. This issue has since been considered in more subtle ways and, in contrast to the explanation offered here, recent work has put more emphasis on spiritual motives—if one wants to adopt such a binary perspective.<sup>3</sup> A second example where scholarship has evolved, to take an issue from the field of Arabic/Islamic

---

<sup>1</sup> Powell, J.: Review of M.A. Köhler, *Allianzen und Verträge*, in: *The American Historical Review* 98/3 (1993), 850.

<sup>2</sup> Mouton, J.-M.: *Damas et sa principauté: sous les Saljoukides et les Bourides 468–549/1076–1154*, Cairo 1994, 49 (despite citing this book).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the overview in Housley, N.: *Contesting the Crusades*, Oxford 2006, 75–98.

studies, is the source value of *jihad* treatises and poetry. Writings such as those by Ali ibn Tahir al-Sulami (d. 500/1106), especially his early *jihad* treatise against the Crusaders, have been studied in more detail and in particular Christie has underlined his significance for later writers.<sup>4</sup> The present book's point on the employment of *jihad*-propaganda is still a crucial contribution to this debate, but needs to be set against more favourable readings of the oeuvre of poets such as Ibn Munir (d. 548/1153) and Ibn al-Qaysarani (d. 548/1154) over the past years.<sup>5</sup>

However, in other regards research over the last two decades has confirmed the book's main thrust or has advanced arguments that neatly fit into its main thesis. The conquest of Jerusalem in 1099 and the treatment of the local populations by the Crusaders, for instance, have been subject to revisionist studies such as those by Kedar. These studies have argued that the number of victims during the early conquest was lower than previously thought. That the Crusaders did not, even at such an early point, necessarily engage in full-scale massacres of local populations confirms an important argument of this book. In the same vein more studies are now available on a field closely related to the relations between Frankish and Muslim rulers, namely day-to-day relationships between Franks and local populations. The work by Ellenblum on patterns of settlement, for instance, confirms to some extent the close political integration presented in the present book. Just as the Franks did not remain political outsiders to the Syrian political landscape, they also settled well beyond the walls of their fortified cities in the vicinity of (mostly Christian) locales in rural areas.<sup>6</sup>

With this translation the book's main argument will be accessible to a wider audience and will also be more widely taken up in scholarship. Over the last two decades several studies on diplomatic contacts between Frankish and Muslim states have been published. However, these have

---

<sup>4</sup> Christie, N.: Motivating Listeners in the *Kitab al-Jihad* of 'Ali ibn Tahir al-Sulami (d. 1106), in: *Crusades* 6 (2007), 1–14. Christie, N.: Jerusalem in the *Kitab Al-Jihad* of 'Ali ibn Tahir Al-Sulami, in: *Medieval Encounters: Jewish, Christian and Muslim Culture in Confluence and Dialogue* 13 (2007), 209–221; Christie, N.: *The Book of the Jihad of 'Ali ibn Tahir al-Sulami (d. 1106): Text, Translation and Commentary*, London: Ashgate Press, forthcoming.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Hillenbrand, C.: *The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives*, Edinburgh 1999. Latiff, O.: *The Place of Faḍā'il al-Quds (Merits of Jerusalem) Literature and Religious Poetry in the Muslim Effort to Recapture Jerusalem during the Crusades*, PhD Thesis (Royal Holloway University of London) 2011.

<sup>6</sup> Kedar, B.Z.: The Jerusalem Massacre of July 1099 in the Western Historiography of the Crusades, in: *Crusades* 3 (2004), 15–75; Ellenblum, R.: *Frankish Rural Settlement in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, Cambridge 1998.

generally been short articles that could neither match the depth and breadth of this book nor offer a comparable conceptualization.<sup>7</sup> Other studies have brought up new issues, but remained typically focused on one set of sources, either Latin or Arabic.<sup>8</sup> Recent textbooks on the Crusades such as those by Tyerman and Phillips certainly pay much more attention to the interaction between Frankish and Muslim states as to the interaction between Franks and indigenous populations, be they Muslim, Christian or Jewish.<sup>9</sup> Yet their main focus is on the internal workings of these states and the history of crusading campaigns so the rich history of the interaction of these states within the Middle East remains rather marginal. It might be expected that a text-book on the Middle East for the period of the Crusades would adopt a different perspective and allow the Frankish states to be seen more as a part of this region's history rather than first and foremost as part of European medieval history. Yet, such a text-book is still a desideratum and the text-book by Holt is not only outdated, but its title was anyway a misnomer for a book that is basically a (very fine) history of the Mamluk Empire.<sup>10</sup>

If we move away from the academic field towards books specifically authored for non-academic audiences, the framework of presenting the interaction between Frankish and Muslim states is deeply influenced by the approaches of the mid-twentieth century. Such books still reflect the idea of the Crusades as colonial endeavours and the Frankish states as colonial entities that remained fundamentally alien to their Middle Eastern environment throughout their existence, as was argued by Prawer for

---

<sup>7</sup> For instance: Dajani-Shakeel, H.: Diplomatic Relations Between Muslim and Frankish Rulers, 1097–1153 AD, in: M. Shatzmiller (ed.): *Crusaders and Muslims in Twelfth-Century Syria*, Leiden 1993, 190–215; Frenkel, Y.: Muslim Responses to the Frankish Dominion in the Near East (1098–1291), in: C. Kostick, (ed.): *The Crusades and the Near East. Cultural Histories*, London 2010, 27–54; Friedman, Y.: Peacemaking: Perceptions and Practices in the Medieval Latin East, in: *ibid.*, 229–257.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Friedman, Y.: Gestures of Conciliation: Peacemaking Endeavors in the Latin East, in: I. Shagrir et al. (eds.): *In laudem Hierosolymitani. Studies in Crusades and Medieval Culture in Honour of Benjamin Z. Kedar*, Aldershot 2007, 31–48.

<sup>9</sup> Tyerman, C.: *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, London 2006, ch. 6. Phillips, J.: *The Crusades, 1095–1197*, Harlow 2002.

<sup>10</sup> Holt, P.M.: *The Age of the Crusades. The Near East from the Eleventh Century to 1517*, London/New York 1986. Holt, P.M.: *The Crusader States and Their Neighbours, 1098–1291*, Harlow 2004 offers little additional insights and is a summary version of *The Age of the Crusades*. Cobb, P.: *Enemies of God. An Islamic History of the Crusades*, Oxford forthcoming will finally fill this gap.

instance.<sup>11</sup> This is even true for the otherwise excellent and well-informed book by Waterson that is underpinned by a teleological narrative of a 'Muslim resistance' that crystallises after somewhat hesitant beginnings under the holy trinity of *jihad*-studies, that is Imad al-Din Zengi, his son Nur al-Din and Saladin, from the 1140s onwards. After a temporary relapse under the Ayyubid dynasty in the early thirteenth century, according to this narrative history finds its predestined course in the second half of this century under the Mamluks and their aggressive policies towards the remaining Frankish polities.<sup>12</sup>

Against such a background of historiographical development, this book still makes an important contribution to the field and invites us to rethink modern perceptions and scholarship of these events. Professor Peter Holt of SOAS translated most of the book between 1999 and 2001, but he was not able to revise and publish it before his death in 2006. It was only in 2010 that the manuscript came to my attention and the project could be concluded.

On an editorial note: The number of footnotes of the original has been significantly reduced. References to secondary sources were only adopted if explicitly referred to in the main text or if they are indispensable for following the text's argument. References to primary sources, however, were generally retained in order to make the text's line of argument transparent. The bibliography lists all primary and secondary works used in the German original, even if not cited in this translation, to give an insight into the works consulted. Despite the publication of newer editions for many of the primary sources, the original references were retained to ensure consistency. Full transcription of Arabic terms has been limited to the references and some terminological discussion in the main text where it was indispensable. In all other cases diacritics are omitted, though *hamza* (ّ) and *'ayn* (ع) have been retained throughout the text.

I am thankful to the libraries that made this project possible: Sue Killoran (Harris Manchester College Library, Oxford) generously granted access to Peter Holt's manuscript and Malcolm Raggett (Centre for Digital Africa, Asia and the Middle East, SOAS library) provided invaluable technical

---

<sup>11</sup> Praver, J.: *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem: European Colonialism in the Middle Ages*, London 1972. Praver, J.: The Roots of Medieval Colonialism, in: V.P. Goss (ed.): *The Meeting of Two Worlds: Cultural Exchange between East and West during the Period of the Crusades*, Kalamazoo 1986, 23–38.

<sup>12</sup> Waterson, J.: *Sacred Swords: Jihad in the Holy Land 1097–1291*, Barnsley 2010. It goes without saying that simplistic books such as Bartlett, W.B.: *Islam's War against the Crusaders*, Stroud 2008 adopt this approach even more clearly.

assistance in digitizing the typewritten manuscript. S. Namir Henrikson (SOAS) meticulously edited the first digital draft of the work and Emma Diab (New York University) and Suzanne Ruggi (Salisbury) saved me from a number of linguistic mistakes and rendered the translation into clearer, more readable English. The Faculty of Arts and Humanities, SOAS, supported this project financially in its initial stages. I am grateful to Michael Brett, Jonathan Phillips, Gerald Hawting, Yehoshua Frenkel, Doris Behrens-Abouseif and the anonymous reader for offering advice at different stages of the project. My thanks go also to Andrew and Harriet Holt and particularly to Michael Köhler who has supported the translation of this book in many ways. I am most profoundly indebted to the late Albrecht Noth, one of the co-supervisors of the PhD thesis underlying this book, who introduced me to it when I was an undergraduate student at the University of Hamburg.

Konrad Hirschler  
London, October 2012



## INTRODUCTION

'In the field of Crusades studies the history of institutions has increasingly replaced the history of events. The former has become the dominant approach.'<sup>1</sup>

This assessment of the historiography of Crusades succinctly summarises the development of the field since the 1930s and particularly since the end of the Second World War. Nineteenth-century studies on the crusading period had focused on the critical edition and discussion of the sources. Early overviews of the history of this period, in turn, were characterised by historical positivism and they mainly narrated the history of events, especially the history of specific expeditions to the East, only occasionally combined with cultural history. Since the 1930s, however, research has turned towards the 'Crusader states' with a particular emphasis on the legal and social structures of the formation of these states and the history of settlement. In addition, themes such as economy, war, church and art were subject to examination.<sup>2</sup>

This reorientation has significantly expanded our knowledge of the political, legal, administrative, social and economic conditions of the states that were founded in the course of the Crusades. Nevertheless, turning away from the history of events had the effect of virtually stopping research on the Frankish-Muslim relations during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, especially concerning the political and legal history of the relationships of the Frankish states with their Muslim neighbours. An additional reason for this development was that Western historians could—and can—access the Arabic sources from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries only in translation. It is not by chance that the decreased interest in the history of relationships coincided with the point when the information of the two partial translations of Ibn al-Qalanisi (d. 555/1160) had been integrated into scholarship.<sup>3</sup> Since this point no significant translation of Arabic sources pertinent to the Crusades has been published. Those few contributions that have during the last decades advanced our

---

<sup>1</sup> Mayer, *Aspekte*, 84.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 82–5; Cardini, *Studi*. The best bibliographies are Atiya, *Crusade*; Mayer, *Bibliographie*; Mayer, *Literaturbericht*. *The Bulletin of the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East* (since 1981) contains a regular bibliography of relevant publications.

<sup>3</sup> Gibb, *Damascus Chronicle* and Le Tourneau, *Damas*.

knowledge on Frankish-Muslim relations were either authored by orientalists or those few medievalists who had Arabic.<sup>4</sup> These studies have especially focused on the period of Saladin (1169–1193),<sup>5</sup> the Ayyubids (1193–1260)<sup>6</sup> and the early Mamluks (1250–1291).<sup>7</sup> However, they primarily deal with specific Frankish-Muslim treaties or are biographies and dynastic histories in which the relationships of the rulers with the Franks are only one among many subjects. Although these studies have elucidated some aspects of the policies and technicalities of treaties they do not offer a continuous history and interpretation of Frankish-Muslim state relations from the First Crusade onwards. The few attempts in this regard have been very brief publications whose medievalist authors have insufficiently taken into account the Arabic sources and no monograph on the development and the context of Frankish-Muslim relations in the Middle East, especially during the twelfth century, has been published yet.<sup>8</sup>

The groundbreaking studies by Prawer on settlement and by Riley-Smith on administration have shown that the Crusaders adopted a number of existing administrative institutions during the process of state formation. However, with regard to their relationships the view has persisted in the field that the Frankish states remained outposts of the Christian world and foreign elements in the largely Islamic Middle East. The image of the period as one of Christian-Islamic confrontation that the majority of Western sources—less so the work by William of Tyre (d. 1186)—projected reinforced this view. These Latin and Old French sources were for the most part written in Europe often by authors who had previously gone to Syria and Palestine as ‘armed pilgrims’. Modern studies have heavily relied on these sources and Arabic sources—as far as available in translation—have been only used as supplementary material. In addition, the use of these sources has been highly problematic as evident in the history of reception of Usama b. Munqidh’s (488–584/1095–1188) autobiography. Older research considered it as the classical example of the Frankish-Muslim *modus vivendi* of the twelfth century that displays a spirit of tolerance and proves the acculturation of the Franks in the

---

<sup>4</sup> Most significantly, Cahen, *Syrie* and his subsequent studies.

<sup>5</sup> Especially, Ehrenkreutz, *Saladin*; Möhring, *Saladin*; Möhring, *Salahadinus Tyrannus*; Lyons/Jackson, *Saladin*.

<sup>6</sup> Gottschalk, *Friedensangebote*; Gottschalk, *Untergang*; Gottschalk, *Al-Kāmil*; Dahlmanns, *Al-Malik al-‘Ādil*; Humphreys, *Saladin*.

<sup>7</sup> Richard, *Partage*; Holt, *Treaty with Acre*; Holt, *Treaty with Genua*; Holt, *Treaties*; Holt, *Baybars’s Treaty*; Thorau, *Baibars*.

<sup>8</sup> Riley-Smith, *Peace*; Hiestand, *Kreuzzug und Friedensidee*.

Middle East.<sup>9</sup> More recently this perception was turned around and Usama b. Munqidh re-emerged as the main witness for the cultural discrepancy between the two camps and for the 'spirit of counter-crusading' that supposedly developed on the Islamic side in reaction to the Crusades.<sup>10</sup> The study of the reception of *jihad* propaganda by Muslim rulers in chronicles and poetry of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, especially by Sivan, has further contributed to interpreting Frankish-Muslim relations as one of a confrontation between Christianity and Islam (cf. chapter II). Interestingly, modern Arabic historiography has adopted this concept and has represented the *jihad* against the Crusades as a precursor for successfully fighting back European imperialism. The foundation of Israel has only increased the topicality of the Crusades, especially for Middle Eastern authors.<sup>11</sup> Yet, was the history of Frankish-Muslim relations in the Middle East really a confrontation between Christendom and Islam; was it really characterised by the spirit of crusading and counter-crusading as Western sources suggested and as modern historiography partly argued? If this was indeed the case, were the examples of Frankish-Muslim cooperation—that are well known to modern historiography—merely isolated occurrences that should be explained in terms of 'tolerance' and 'policies of *modus vivendi*'?

Against the background of these questions, the present study analyses the Frankish states' legal and political relations with their Muslim neighbours in the Middle East. The study's aim is not only to list examples of cooperation documented in Latin, Arabic, Greek and Christian Oriental sources. Rather, the central point is to analyse alliances and treaties involving the Frankish states with regard to their rationale, their supporters and their detractors on both sides. Was there a Frankish or Islamic policy of alliances, what were the underlying political concepts and what developments are traceable? What was the actual relevance of the ideas of crusading and *jihad*? A final aim of the study is to analyse the legal framework that was used for contacts between Frankish and Muslim rulers. Was there also development over time with regard to the content and instruments of treaties? A crucial point of the method proposed here in order to address these questions is that Arabic sources cannot merely supplement Western sources, but that they have to be used in

---

<sup>9</sup> Munro, *Christian*; Duncalf, *Influences*.

<sup>10</sup> Haddad, *Muslim Eyes*.

<sup>11</sup> Sivan, *Crusades*; Ende, *Glaubensheld*; Altoma, *Treatment*; Ochsenwald, *Crusader*.

conjunction and that they have to be considered to be of equal value. In some regards, the Arabic sources are even to be preferred over the Latin or Old French counterparts. Most of the Frankish and Western sources were either authored with reference to specific Crusades or pilgrimages or they are 'official' historiography—as in the case of William of Tyre. The Arabic texts, by contrast, ignore any concept of Crusade or *jihad* history. Consequently, they offer more than just the Islamic perspective on events and processes that are known from Western sources. Arabic sources are not only more numerous, but their main advantage is that they report on the Franks within the general history of the Middle East. Exactly this advantage disappears in the published translations that often include only those passages that concern the Franks.

The Oriental sources (Arabic, Syriac and Armenian) are particularly rich on account of the plurality of genres and—in the case of chronicles—their annalistic-compiler character. If the works were not commissioned panegyrics, the authors generally compiled the relevant reports on an event without reworking them or commenting upon them. This is valid for the universal chronicles of Ibn al-Athir (d. 630/1233) and Sibṭ b. al-Jawzi (d. 654/1262) as well as for the local chronicles—a genre that has no counterpart on the Frankish side—of Ibn al-Qalanisi (Damascus) and Ibn al-'Adim (d. 660/1262, Aleppo). In addition, we have biographies (e.g. by Baha' al-Din Ibn Shaddad (d. 632/1234)) on Saladin and by Ibn 'Abd al-Zahir (d. 692/1293) on Baybars and Qalawun, dynastic histories (e.g. Abu Shama's (d. 665/1268) *Rawdatayn*), autobiographies (e.g. by 'Umara al-Yamani (d. 569/1174) and Ibn Munqidh) as well as historical geographies (e.g. by Yaqut al-Rumi (d. 626/1229), 'Izz al-Din Ibn Shaddad (d. 684/1285) and al-Idrisi (d. 560/1165)). Of particular value are the epistles that have been preserved in manuscripts or that were inserted into narrative sources, especially the letters by the head of Saladin's chancery, al-Qadi al-Fadil (d. 596/1200), and anthologies of poetry that offer crucial insights into the history of mentalities and sometimes also into the background of specific Frankish-Muslim alliances. Outstanding examples for this are *Kharidat al-qasr* by 'Imad al-Din al-Katib al-Isfahani (d. 597/1201) and the *Diwan* of the Egyptian Wazir Tala'i b. Ruzzik (d. 556/1161). The chancery sources, such as al-Qalqashandi's (d. 821/1418) *Subh*, are crucial for understanding the technicalities of treaties. Only these texts reproduce

complete texts of Frankish-Muslim treaties and oaths, even though they only go back to the second half of the thirteenth century.<sup>12</sup>

Thus, Arabic sources do not only offer additional information on cases of Frankish-Muslim cooperation, the Muslim perspective on the Crusades and insights into Frankish-Muslim 'daily life'. Rather, they provide most crucially the possibility of analysing the history of the Frankish states as part of the Syrian history (i.e. al-Sham, the region between the Sinai, the Cilician Gate and the Euphrates). This approach allows an outright classification of conflicts between Frankish and Muslim rulers as confrontations between Christianity and Islam to be avoided. On this basis, the present study does not start with the First Crusade, but rather three decades earlier as the characteristic constellation of alliances and powers that the Franks encountered had come into being around 1070. The study focuses on the twelfth century, but includes also the thirteenth century for the analysis of Frankish-Muslim treaties' technicalities. This is because the legal instruments that had been developed in the twelfth century to resolve conflicts continued to be used in the thirteenth century and were to some extent even further developed in this period. The thirteenth century is, however, of less interest for the policies of alliances. After the end of the Third Crusade (1192) the Frankish states mostly stopped playing a major role in the Middle East and became increasingly dependent on European support. Consequently, they ceased to be an important alliance partner for the Muslim states, except for Antioch's reliance on Aleppo until 1216 and the alliances between the kingdom of Jerusalem and the Ayyubid rulers of Syria between 1240 and 1244.

---

<sup>12</sup> On specific source genres, especially for the twelfth century, cf. Ahmad, *Notes*. Further overviews cf. Cahen, *Syrie*, 1–104; Cahen, *Editions*; Elisséeff, *Nūr ad-Dīn*, I, 1–85; Gottschalk, *Al-Kāmil*, 2–19; Hartmann, *An-Nāṣir*, 12–60; Schregle, *Sultanin*, 9–27; Little, *Introduction*. On Western sources cf. Mayer, *Bibliographie*, 44–61; Knoch, *Studien*; Morgan, *Chronicle*; Morgan, *Rothelin*.



## CHAPTER ONE

### THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SYRIAN SYSTEM OF AUTONOMOUS LORDSHIPS (C. 1070–1099)

The Frankish acquisition of territory during the First Crusade and subsequent years unquestionably marks an important turning-point in the history of the Middle East. The Crusaders transplanted legal, administrative, ethical and cultural models and principles into alien surroundings, which had hitherto been characterised by quite other structural elements and mentalities. Nevertheless, the formation of the Crusader states did not lead to a revolutionary change in the structure of Syria and northern Mesopotamia (*al-Jazira*) for two reasons. Firstly, the wave which founded Frankish lordships and states did not take place in a polity unified legally, ethnically or confessionally, but in an area of extreme diversity. It was to be of crucial significance for the history of the Frankish states that leaders of Turkish origin took power in the great cities of Syria and northern Mesopotamia during the three decades preceding the First Crusade. None of those petty Turkish lordships was capable of sustaining the role of a major power for long, in contrast to the previous period where the Byzantine Empire and Egypt had played this role. In lieu of this, there developed a system of Syrian states (or autonomous lordships), which was marked by the interest of the separate rulers in maintaining their power. This system functioned through the particular structure of rivalries and alliances, which had become well entrenched and which also continued to exist after 1098–99. Secondly, the formation of the Frankish lordships resembled that of their Turkish counterparts in that they were not accompanied by a widespread movement of colonization. In the countryside, neither Turks nor Franks altered the structure of settlement and organization of the land to any significant extent, while occasionally altering them in the towns to various degrees.

The establishment of the Franks in the Middle East thus did not entail a complete reorganization of the region, but for the most part took place within existing structures, as with the Turks. The characteristics of the pre-existing Syrian system of autonomous lordships were crucial for the inter-state relations that developed after 1098–99. The present work therefore does not begin with the year 1098, 1099 or 1100, but includes the last

three decades of the eleventh century. The following two sections will highlight the development of the Syrian system of autonomous lordships with its special characteristics as well as the policy of the Crusaders in regard to alliances and treaties up to 1099 and a consideration of their motives. The resultant findings will be of fundamental significance for understanding Frankish-Muslim relations in Syria after the acquisition of territories by the Crusaders.

THE SYSTEM OF AUTONOMOUS LORDSHIPS BEFORE THE  
FIRST CRUSADE (C. 1070–1099)

In the introduction to his translation of the chronicle of Ibn al-Qalanisi, Gibb distinguishes the six different powers which competed for lordship and territory directly before the coming of the First Crusade.<sup>1</sup> He identifies long-established rulers, i.e. (1) the Shiite Fatimid dynasty, which had ruled Egypt since 969 and (2) local amirs, judges (*qadis*) and tribal shaykhs of Arab descent. These were distinct from groups of recent arrivals in Syria, most importantly (3) the Seljuk princes from Mesopotamia, which had been under Seljuk control from 1055, who started to penetrate Syria, (4) the Turkish amirs coming to Syria as tribal chiefs or Seljuk governors and seeking to establish or extend autonomous rule and (5) independent Turcoman tribes, who came to Syria in the last third of the eleventh century in the course of the Turkish migration westwards.<sup>2</sup> Finally, the sixth power was the rural, urban and nomadic population of Syria itself, having greater or less political capacity. In towns, this population was organized in the corporations, the militia (*ahdath*) and the magistrates, who participated in the newly awakened urban autonomy movement.<sup>3</sup> In the countryside, the population was organized in tribes and self-contained confessional communities. This variety of antagonistic actors stands at the end of a process marked by the regionalization and particularization of the conditions of lordship in the Middle East.

The traditional partition of Syria into an Egyptian-dominated and a Byzantine-dominated sphere had come to an end during the 1060s in consequence of the struggle for power within Egypt and the weakness

---

<sup>1</sup> Gibb, *Damascus Chronicle*, 14–32.

<sup>2</sup> Cahen, *Pénétration*.

<sup>3</sup> Ashtor-Strauss, *Administration*; Cahen, *Mouvements*; Havemann, *Institutionen*.

of the Byzantine Empire due to the victorious advance of the Seljuks.<sup>4</sup> This provided a basis in Syria for a revival of the old movement for urban autonomy. In almost all the great cities the governors, installed by alien lords, were increasingly involved in struggles for supremacy. In some cases, such as Tyre and Tripoli, dynasties of local *qadis* even superseded the governors. Furthermore, individual governors and amirs strove to make themselves independent. It is of particular significance, however, that the newly awakened particularism and the lack of a strong authority made it possible for individual Seljuk rulers and Turcoman groups, who penetrated Syria as part of the Seljuk armies or on their own initiative, to establish lordships. With them a new external actor appeared in Syria.

The highly sensitive network of relationships and the political landscape in Syria towards the end of the eleventh century were shaped by different factors, such as shifting coalitions, the opportunistic loyalties of the local dynasties and confessional communities, as well as the ambitions of tribal leaders and Seljuk commanders to establish their own spheres of rule. In the course of the First Crusade, it was not a case of the West clashing with the East or faith clashing with infidelity in two blocs, as described in the Frankish chronicles. The penetration of the Crusaders merely added a further factor to the game of the antagonistic powers in Syria. The Crusaders possessed no new political or military qualities in the eyes of Oriental contemporaries. The question of their integration in the previously existing structures, that is the question of confrontation and coexistence, had challenged the Turks just as it did the Franks two or three decades earlier. To analyse the relationship of the Frankish states in Syria with the Islamic world, it is first necessary to consider the constellation of powers which the Crusaders encountered in 1097–98. This constellation had developed in four main phases: The beginning of Fatimid-Turkish antagonism (1070–79), the antagonism between northern and southern Syria and the beginning of the fragmentation of power in central Syria (1079–85), the dissolution of the great lordships in northern Syria through Sultan Malikshah and Fatimid recuperation in the south (1085–92) and finally Aleppo and Damascus under rival Seljuk princes: the formation of coalitions up to the arrival of the First Crusade in Syria (1092–98).

---

<sup>4</sup> Wiet, *Egypt*, 239–45; Wüstenfeld, *Geschichte*, 254ff.; Mäjid, *Zuhūr*, 369–91; Cahen, *Pénétration*, 30–4; Vismara, *Bisanzio*, 46–7; Hamdani, *Relations*; Zakkar, *Emirate*, 129–183; Salibi, *Syria*, 84–121.

The Turcoman chief Atsiz b. Abaq succeeded in establishing himself in Palestine at the beginning of the 1070s. In this he was favoured by the anarchic conditions in Egypt and southern Syria and the decline of the Fatimid power in Palestine and southern Syria, exemplified in the rise of local powers in Tyre and Tripoli. By 1074 Atsiz was able to subdue the whole of Palestine as far as Ascalon and in 1076 he even succeeded after five years of warfare in entering Damascus, which until then had remained under Fatimid sovereignty.<sup>5</sup> After treaties with Tyre and Tripoli had given him access to the markets of both these harbour towns, he felt strong enough to attack Egypt by the end of 1076.

This enterprise and its consequences are of interest for the history of the Crusader states for two reasons. First, religious propaganda clearly accompanied the Fatimid defensive struggle against the troops of Atsiz. The Egyptian wazir recruited as warriors 3,000 pilgrims, who were on their way to the Hijaz at the time of the invasion, with the argument that 'to repulse this enemy is better than the pilgrimage'. During the fighting, fugitives assembled for mourning rituals, supplications and Quran recitations in the mosques in accordance with the Fatimid caliph's command, 'Seek refuge with God Most High and flee unto Him; stay in the Friday mosques and other mosques; fast, pray and abstain from alcohol and forbidden things.'<sup>6</sup> In other words, defence against the Muslim (but not Shiite) intruders was plausibly propagated not only as an Ismaili *jihad*, but even as being better than one of the five Islamic duties enjoined in the Quran. Second, Palestine immediately revolted against Atsiz after his defeat in Egypt. Of special importance was the rebellion of Jerusalem since the Turcomans had deposited their families and moveable possessions there. The people of Jerusalem divided up the Turcomans' women among themselves and sold their full-grown sons into slavery. Thereupon Atsiz marched on the city with his last levies and held a gruesome court of criminal justice. Thousands of men fell victim to the victors' massacre. Only those who had fled to the Holy Places of Islam were spared against the payment of a heavy ransom. A little later, the entire population of Gaza was also slaughtered. The parallel to the subsequent relationship between the Crusader states and their Islamic neighbours is obvious. The conflict between Atsiz and the Fatimids shows clearly that the defensive

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibn Zāfir, 76; Ibn Muyassar, 42–3; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 95–6, 108–9; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 99–100; al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, II, 315.

<sup>6</sup> Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, ed. Sevim, 182.

struggle of the established dynasties, particularly of the Shiites against the Turcomans, was conducted under religious auspices and was accompanied by excesses in no way inferior to those which marked the coming of the Crusaders. The appearance of the Franks thus brought merely a new power into play, but no other quality.

After the reduction of Egyptian influence in southern Syria, the emergence of city-states on the coast and the establishment of Turcoman lordships from 1070 onwards, two further components developed in the years from 1079 to 1085 which were to stamp the political history of Syria for decades: first, the antagonism between a strong Damascus and the cities of northern Syria (Aleppo with its catchment area in northern Mesopotamia and Antioch with its hinterland of Cilicia) and second, the regionalization of political rule in central Syria. The revival of the rivalry between Damascus on the one side and Aleppo and Antioch on the other is linked with the formation of Tutush's power in Syria. Tutush's brother, the Seljuk Sultan Malikshah (1072–92), had sent him to Syria in response to a call for help from one of the parties contending for power in Aleppo.<sup>7</sup> Tutush, however, could not take Aleppo in 1079, but a pressing appeal reached him from Atsiz for support in the south against the Fatimids. Tutush hastened to Damascus, procured the execution of Atsiz and from the end of 1079 found himself in secure possession of the city.<sup>8</sup> Tutush's principal aim in the subsequent period was to control Aleppo, the second great centre of Syria and the springboard to the Seljuk heartlands in Mesopotamia. When, directly after his success in the south, he laid waste to the regions south-west of Aleppo and even briefly besieged the city, the townspeople turned to the Arab governor of Mosul, Muslim b. Quraysh. Muslim thereupon took possession of Aleppo in June 1080 when the Aleppine militia under their chief Ibn al-Hutayti surrendered it to him.<sup>9</sup>

The subsequent conflict between Muslim b. Quraysh and Tutush is of importance for the later history of the Crusader states because it permitted the survival of different petty powers that were able to shift their allegiance between the two adversaries. Of outstanding significance are the lordships of Shayzar and Hims. In 1081 'Ali b. Muqallid b. Munqidh, one of the most influential men in Aleppo before it lost its independence in 1080, succeeded in purchasing the fortress of Shayzar from the Greek Orthodox

<sup>7</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Bughya*, 46–7.

<sup>8</sup> Ibn 'Asākir, *Wulāt*, 18–19; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 112; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 111; Ibn Muyassar, 46; al-'Aẓimī, 362.

<sup>9</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 67–70, 73–5.

bishop of al-Bara after several months of siege.<sup>10</sup> About the same time the Turcoman Khalaf b. Mula'ib was able to establish himself in Hims in central Syria.<sup>11</sup> Muslim b. Quraysh did not succeed in bringing these two new lordships under his jurisdiction, unlike other minor Turcoman or Arab lordships or city-states. On the contrary, his struggles with Tutush compelled him to seek a settlement with them in July 1082. In 1083, he even ceded Rafaniyya and Salamiyya to Khalaf b. Mula'ib in a peace treaty (*sulh*), so that Khalaf could protect his rear against Tutush in his northern operations.<sup>12</sup>

Alongside the existence of different petty Turcoman and Arab lordships in central Syria, there developed during the period of Muslim b. Quraysh's rule a second feature of the constellation of powers which was to be effective in the following decades. This was the political isolation of Aleppo, resulting from the endeavours of various Seljuk and Turkish rulers in Damascus, Anatolia or Mesopotamia to seize the town. Egypt alone was an ally for the rulers of Aleppo and two instances of contact between Aleppo and Egypt appeared already under Muslim b. Quraysh. In 1083, Muslim's plan for the capture of Damascus miscarried as the promised Egyptian reinforcements failed to appear. In 1083–84 when Sultan Malikshah besieged him in Amid/Diyar Bakr, he even offered the Fatimids recognition of Egyptian suzerainty if they would help him against the sultan. This step proved to be fruitless only because the sultan had to reach reconciliation with his opponent due to a revolt in eastern Iran, Khurasan.<sup>13</sup> The strong reservations of Muslim rulers and governors in northern Syria regarding all Seljuk operations and their occasional approaches to Egypt continued beyond the time of Muslim b. Quraysh as essential factors in the mutual relationships of the individual rulers in Syria. After the establishment of the Crusader states, the ruler of Aleppo's fear that the sultan threatened his independence was to be of decisive significance for the lack of a united Islamic resistance against the Franks.

The clashes between strong power complexes in northern Syria and the revival of Egyptian influence on the coast and in central Syria marked the period from 1085 to 1092. Yet, the construction of great lordships and

<sup>10</sup> Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 67–70, 77–8.

<sup>11</sup> Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 79.

<sup>12</sup> Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, ed. Sevim, 209.

<sup>13</sup> Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, ed. Sevim, 236; Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 84–6. In 1083 there was also a rapprochement between Tutush and the Fatimids which was to be sealed by a betrothal. This plan was criticized, and perhaps prevented, by the *qadi* of Tripoli.

leading powers was prevented and encroachment on Syria was denied to external rulers. The cause of this was that Sultan Malikshah, who won the struggle over power in Aleppo through his campaign of 1086, pursued with his Wazir Nizam al-Mulk a policy of decentralization of power in Syria. This policy aimed at the establishment of a balance of power between the Euphrates and Sinai. Equilibrium between lordships of approximately equal strength, subordinate to Malikshah, should provide for the safeguarding of the sultan's suzerainty over Syria, while preventing further expansion by his brother Tutush.

The background for the sultan's intervention in northern Syria was a conflict that broke out in the first half of 1085 between Muslim b. Quraysh of Aleppo and the Anatolian Seljuk ruler Sulayman b. Qutulmush. Sulayman had occupied Antioch in December 1084, hitherto subject to the Byzantine Philaretos.<sup>14</sup> In June 1085, he defeated and killed Muslim b. Quraysh, but in spite of his success Sulayman was in no position to take possession of Aleppo.<sup>15</sup> Ibn al-Hutayti, the leader of the city militia, refused him entry, calling on Sultan Malikshah and even Tutush of Damascus for help as the sultan's coming was delayed. Only in June 1086 did Sulayman and Tutush meet south of Aleppo. Sulayman lost the battle and did not survive the fight.<sup>16</sup> Tutush, however, was no more successful than his fallen adversary in gaining complete possession of Aleppo. Even after Tutush had made his entry into the city through a surprise attack and had induced the militia to surrender, the commander of the citadel, in accordance with an earlier oath, would only hand over the fortification to the sultan himself.<sup>17</sup> Tutush had to withdraw to Damascus in the first half of August before the vanguard of the army of his brother, the sultan.

After the campaign of the Seljuk sultan, who entered Aleppo on 3 December 1086 and marched into Antioch before his return to Iraq, a completely altered constellation of powers presented itself between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean Sea. Malikshah had handed over all territories on the Euphrates from Saruj and Harran in the north to the River Khabur in the east to the son of Muslim b. Quraysh.<sup>18</sup> The sultan reduced the rule of the Byzantine Philaretos to Marash after the latter

---

<sup>14</sup> According to al-'Azīmi, 365, Sulayman took the citadel only in January 1085. The previous history is marked by clear differences among the chronicles.

<sup>15</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 88–92; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 139–141.

<sup>16</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 134; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 97.

<sup>17</sup> Al-'Azīmi, 366; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 147–8; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 98–9.

<sup>18</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 148; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 100–1.

had submitted and accepted conversion to Islam.<sup>19</sup> Truly loyal governors were appointed to Antioch, Aleppo and Edessa (al-Ruha). The sultan considerably reduced the lordship of the Banu Munqidh of Shayzar on the Orontes, but allowed it to survive.<sup>20</sup> Finally, extensive territories on the Euphrates around Qal'at Ja'bar were handed over to Salim b. Malik, the commandant of the citadel of Aleppo, in return for the surrender of his fortress.<sup>21</sup> The newly decentralized division of powers prevented any encroachment by Tutush on Mesopotamia during the sultan's lifetime and remained the most important feature of the political landscape of northern Syria beyond the First Crusade.

At the same time, southern Syria witnessed developments which were of significance for the history of the Frankish states following the First Crusade. At this point, nothing remained of earlier Fatimid rule over the region apart from a coastal strip with probably Caesarea as its most northerly point. The *qadis* of Tyre and Tripoli had been autonomous since the beginning of the 1070s. Whether they still recognized at least a *de jure* Egyptian suzerainty is not altogether clear. All the remaining territories had gradually come under Tutush's rule, amongst them the Palestinian hill-country with Jerusalem, which Tutush had granted to the Turcoman Amir Artuq in *iqta'*.<sup>22</sup> From 1087, however, the situation in Egypt had been consolidated to the point that the Wazir Badr al-Jamali could contemplate new offensives in Syria. Fatimid armies conquered the Palestinian coast and besieged Damascus with the result that Tutush had to seek support even in Aleppo and Edessa.<sup>23</sup> His situation became even more delicate when in 1089 an Egyptian army not only captured Acre, Sidon and Jubayl but also regained Tyre after some two decades of independence. Thereupon Khalaf b. Mula'ib of Hims and Famiya also placed himself under Fatimid suzerainty. Tutush had to ask the northern Syrian governors

<sup>19</sup> Barhebraeus, 231.

<sup>20</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 149–150; Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhir*, 8.

<sup>21</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 149–150; Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhir*, 8; Barhebraeus, 231; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 101; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Bughya*, 200–3. Salim was the cousin of Muslim b. Quraysh.

<sup>22</sup> 'Izz al-Dīn b. Shaddād, *A'lāq* (Lubnān), 98–99, 102. Beirut and Sidon appear to have been in Tutush's possession since 471/1078–79. In 472/1079–80 the Egyptians briefly regained Sidon. Tutush took Ba'labakk in the summer of 476/1083, after the withdrawal of Muslim b. Quraysh from Damascus. It was under Fatimid suzerainty. Cf. 'Izz al-Dīn b. Shaddād, *A'lāq* (Lubnān), 44–5; Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, ed. Sevim, 200; Ibn Taghribirdī, V, 115–6.

<sup>23</sup> According to Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 145, an Egyptian army had already encircled Damascus in Rabi' I 478/1085.

once more for help.<sup>24</sup> Khalaf's contacts with the Fatimids and his raids against the rulers in central Syria had become so threatening that the sultan ordered Tutush to join with the northern Syrian governors to end the rule of Khalaf over Hims and Famiya.

During the subsequent events, however, the political structure created by Malikshah in the north proved itself to be an effective means against Tutush's endeavours to extend his power. After the capture of Hims, Aqsunqur of Aleppo delivered the city to Tutush only on the sultan's express instructions. However, he handed over Famiya to the amir of Shayzar, although he had been at war with him in the previous year.<sup>25</sup> The governors of Aleppo and Edessa frustrated the almost certain capture of Tripoli by Tutush a year later. They deserted the besieging army after the ruler of the city, the Qadi Jalal al-Mulk, had bribed them so that they recognized his probably forged diploma of appointment to Tripoli from the sultan. Arguing that an attack on the city would imply rebellion against the sultan, the two governors abandoned Tutush who was forced to give up his project.<sup>26</sup>

The conflict between the various claimants to the succession of Sultan Malikshah, who died in 1092, marked the fourth and final phase from 1092 to 1098. Tutush finally fell victim to this conflict in 1095, following Aqsunqur of Aleppo and Buzan of Edessa, and his sons started to dispute for supremacy. This phase offers a confusing oscillogram of ever-varying coalitions between individual lordships as old lordships survived and new autonomous petty lordships developed. Since the structure of the Syrian system of autonomous lordships assumed during this phase a form current until the first decade of the twelfth century, the development between 1092 and 1098 requires a fuller presentation.

On the death of Malikshah in 1092, Tutush had succeeded his brother as sultan. Accompanied by the north Syrian governors, who complied with him willy-nilly since Malikshah's sons were still minors, he had himself proclaimed sultan in February 1093 at al-Rahba on the Euphrates, halfway to Baghdad. However, as his followers Aqsunqur and Buzan deserted with their troops in Persia to Berkyaruq, one of Malikshah's sons on whose

---

<sup>24</sup> Al-'Azīmī, 367–8; Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 120; Ibn Muyassar, 50; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 176, 202–3; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 105–6; al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, II, 326; Ibn Taghribirdī, V, 128; 'Izz al-Dīn b. Shaddād, *A'lāq* (Lubnān), 165–6. Tutush had obviously subdued the coastal towns. Al-'Azimi mentions Beirut as having been conquered in 1089.

<sup>25</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 105–6; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 408. Cf. Derenbourg, *Ousāma*, 28.

<sup>26</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 203; 'Izz al-Dīn b. Shaddād, *A'lāq* (Lubnān), 84; Ibn Taghribirdī, V, 132–3.

succession the Iranian Seljuks were agreed, Tutush was forced to give up all his conquests and to flee to Damascus.<sup>27</sup> His revenge was not slow in coming. In 1094, Tutush defeated the partisans of his rival Berkyaruq near Aleppo, strengthened only by Bedouins and the governor of Antioch, Yaghisiyan who alone remained faithful to him.<sup>28</sup> Aqsunqur and Buzan paid for their treachery by death. Just nine months later, however, on 26 February 1095, Tutush encountered Berkyaruq's army near present-day Tehran where he was defeated and killed.<sup>29</sup>

For half a century, until 1154, no lordship of comparable strength to Tutush's realms was to arise. The territories which Tutush had gathered between 1092 and 1095 fell apart once again after his death into the independent and rival power centres which had already existed before 1094–95, before 1086 and partly even before the Turkish invasions. The disputes between the sons of Tutush were decisive for this. Ridwan b. Tutush was the first to return to Syria after his father's death and he took possession of Aleppo. Shortly afterwards his Atabeg Janah al-Dawla<sup>30</sup> and his younger brother Duqaq reached Aleppo, though Duqaq quickly accepted an invitation from his father's governor in Damascus, where he made himself independent. The sons of Tutush required a year to consolidate their power. Ridwan in Aleppo procured the murder of two of his younger brothers and rivals. Duqaq in Damascus similarly disposed of the governor whose invitation had made possible his access to power. The arrival of Atabeg Tughtegin, already a man of trust under Tutush, strengthened Duqaq. The fraternal struggle which thereafter broke out between Ridwan and Duqaq dominated the political life of Syria up to the time when the first Crusaders arrived.<sup>31</sup>

The first phase of the dispute saw all the local lords of northern Syria, except Yaghisiyan of Antioch and some Arab tribal chiefs, on Ridwan's side. Ridwan and his retainer Sukman b. Artuq, to whom he had surrendered Saruj after initial disputes, succeeded in enlarging their possessions, specifically Tall Bashir (the Turbessel of the Crusaders), Manbij,

<sup>27</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 220–2; Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 122–4.

<sup>28</sup> Al-ʿAzīmī, 370; Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 126–7; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 232–5; Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhīr*, 15; Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Zubda*, II, 110–3.

<sup>29</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 129–30; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 244–5; Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Zubda*, II, 119.

<sup>30</sup> Atabeg was the title of a Turkish officer to whom the tutoring and upbringing of a prince was entrusted. An atabeg often became the husband of the prince's mother, which might even happen during the lifetime of the prince's father. Janah al-Dawla was the stepfather and atabeg of Ridwan, as Tughtegin was to Duqaq.

<sup>31</sup> Gibb, *Chronicle*, 129–32; Salibi, *Syria and in addition Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Bughya*, 138–41.

Buza'a and Marra/Ma'arrat al-Nu'man became theirs.<sup>32</sup> None of the further operations, however, led to an effective resolution of the conflict between Tutush's sons. Neither Ridwan's unsuccessful siege of Damascus, nor his subsequent confinement by the Damascenes in Jerusalem, which his partisan Sukman b. Artuq controlled, nor the victory of the north Syrian allies over Duqaq and Yaghisiyan at Qinnasrin to the south of Aleppo in the year 1097 were effective. The reversal of alliances of 1097 was the turning-point to the second phase of the conflicts. A profound alienation developed in the summer of that year between Ridwan and his Atabeg Janah al-Dawla and the atabeg fled in fear for his life with his wife, Ridwan's mother, to Hims, where he made himself independent of Aleppo.<sup>33</sup> That gave Yaghisiyan of Antioch the opportunity to change front and to go over to Ridwan, where he took the place of the fugitive Janah al-Dawla. Ridwan provided him with a position similar to that of the atabeg and his marriage with the daughter of Yaghisiyan confirmed the alliance.<sup>34</sup>

In order to isolate Duqaq in Damascus, Ridwan undertook an even more risky move. Like Muslim b. Quraysh and Khalaf b. Mula'ib before him he sought an approach to Egypt. On 28 August 1097, the names of the Shiite Fatimid Caliph al-Musta'li (487–95/1094–1101) and of his Wazir al-Afdal were for the first time mentioned in the Friday prayer in Aleppo before that of Ridwan. This subordination of the Sunni Ridwan to the suzerainty of the Ismaili Shiite caliph, hoping (admittedly in vain) for rich gifts and armed help against Damascus, had, however, to be withdrawn after a month under pressure from Ridwan's indignant allies, Sukman and Yaghisiyan.<sup>35</sup> As the north Syrian allies mustered their armies before Shayzar for an operation against Hims a little later, news reached them of the appearance of the first Crusader troops. Ridwan, Sukman and Yaghisiyan could not agree on common action and returned hastily to the territories they held.<sup>36</sup>

The analysis of the phases of development and characteristics of the Syrian system of autonomous lordships and constellations of alliances

<sup>32</sup> Main sources are Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 131–3; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 123–7.

<sup>33</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 133; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 255; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 127.

<sup>34</sup> Al-'Azīmī, 372; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 127; Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 133.

<sup>35</sup> The 'Abbasid *khutba* had been the rule in Aleppo since 1070 (Al-'Azīmī, 372; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 127–9; Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 133). The Fatimid *khutba* was introduced in Shayzar in 1097. Ibn Muyassar, 64, believed that Ridwan proposed this. It is probably correct that, as most other sources suggest, an Egyptian delegation called on him to recognize the suzerainty of the Caliph al-Musta'li, who had held office since 1095.

<sup>36</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 133; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 129.

between c. 1070 and 1098 permits the establishment of the following three points. Firstly, the periods of weakness of the Byzantine and Fatimid Empires had resulted in phases in which the relationships of rulers were increasingly regionalized and particularized. A common Islamic consciousness was not recognized in view of the variety of antagonistic Egyptian, Arab, Turcoman and Seljuk claims to power. On the contrary, the Fatimid defence of Egypt against the Turcomans was even propagated as a *jihad*. Secondly, none of the rival powers was able to assume the hegemony that Byzantium and Egypt had held earlier. In consequence, the disputes about supremacy in the north and the policy of 'divide and rule' enforced by Sultan Malikshah in 1086 permitted the survival of the local lordships which arose after 1070. In addition, it was not possible for anyone from 1095 at the latest to control the Turkish amirs originally appointed as governors. This made it possible for them to emerge as independent lords of cities *de facto* if not *de jure*. Thirdly, the dominant theme of the conflict within Syria was the antagonism between Damascus and Aleppo, which since 1095 had been fought in the form of a Seljuk succession-struggle. All the Turkish amirs and governors who had obtained possession of the most important cities since 1076 became partisans. On the other hand, the Arab local lords in central Syria, on the coast and the Euphrates, and likewise Fatimid Egypt acted in all the disputes largely as neutrals. Besides a few schemes for alliances, they did not directly intervene in the Turkish rivalries.

The important Syrian rulers and their alliance policies in 1097 were as follows: The most powerful north Syrian city-lords, Ridwan of Aleppo and Yaghisiyan of Antioch, were in 1097 in alliance with Sukman b. Artuq of Saruj and Jerusalem against Duqaq of Damascus and Janah al-Dawla of Hims. The north had a majority of Shiites, Antioch of Christians, the Sunnis predominated in the south and Arabs ruled the central Syrian lordships. Apart from Shayzar and Tripoli, which maintained friendly relations with each other, two further lordships existed in 1097, Famiya and Jabala. Khalaf b. Mula'ib had become the Egyptian governor of Famiya in 1096 after the death of Tutush and had immediately made himself independent.<sup>37</sup> Jabala had achieved independence from Tripoli under the Ra'is (headman) Ibn Sulayha shortly before the arrival of the Crusaders.<sup>38</sup> These local lords of central Syria maintained as far as possible neutrality in the Turkish and

<sup>37</sup> Ibn Muyassar, 63; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 408; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 122.

<sup>38</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 139; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 310–2.

Seljuk disputes. The same applied to the Arab lordship of Qal'at Ja'bar on the Euphrates and to the Armenian Toros, who had taken power in Edessa after the death of Tutush. The coastline south of Jubayl<sup>39</sup> was under Egyptian suzerainty. Fatimid rule in the formerly independent port-cities was, however, not firmly established. Tyre in particular, which had only been reconquered in July 1093 from a rebellious governor,<sup>40</sup> remained insecure. Already in February–March 1097, a Fatimid army had again to reconquer it as the new governor had yet again made himself independent of Cairo.<sup>41</sup> After a period of internal disturbances in 1094, due to the deaths of both wazir and caliph, Egypt resumed with this action a more active Syrian policy and endeavoured to use the quarrels among the Seljuks to extend the Fatimid position in Syria. In reality, the Fatimid governors appear to have concluded treaties largely at their own discretion, both with the Turks before 1099 and also with the Franks after the First Crusade. There is hardly any firm information about the extent and position of the second great lordship in Palestine, Jerusalem. Turkish amirs of the Artuqid family held it as an *iqta'* subordinate to Damascus since the days of Tutush. However, since Sukman b. Artuq was in alliance with Ridwan of Aleppo in 1097, Jerusalem must have been in reality independent.

The picture as outlined encompasses solely the ruling centres of trans-regional political importance. The extent of urban control over rural districts and the position of the alien Turkish rulers vis-à-vis the native urban population depended entirely on the wavering power of the city-lords and the accessibility of the respective territories. It is especially worthy of notice for Aleppo and Damascus that their lords had to reckon in their policies with the opposition of the magistrates and the city militia and furthermore, in Aleppo, the added opposition of the confessional groups. The inconsistency and vagueness of the chronicles and geographical works does not allow definite statements, even about important regional centres such as Hamah or Tiberias.<sup>42</sup> From local chronicles, the autobiography of Usama b. Munqidh and Western sources further minor lords are known at least by name. These include, for example, the amir families of Marda and Buhtur of the Lebanese Gharb, the Banu Muhriz of Qadmus,

---

<sup>39</sup> William of Tyre, VII, XXI, 310, mentions the place as belonging to Tripoli, although it was taken by Egypt in 1089.

<sup>40</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 124–5; Ibn Muyassar, 51.

<sup>41</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 133–4; Ibn Muyassar, 64.

<sup>42</sup> Cahen, *Syrie*, 38–9. Local Damascenes chronicles, such as the one by Ibn al-Qalānisi, also have little information about events beyond the authors' hometown.

the lords of castles whom the Franks encountered in central Syria and the amir 'Amrun of Kahf in north Palestine and east of Jordan, called 'the great countryman' (*grossus rusticus*) by the Franks.<sup>43</sup> As well as Bedouin groups, self-contained settled religious minorities were of particular significance as treaty partners or opponents; the Druze in Jabal Summaq and southern Lebanon, Shiite Nusayris in Jabal Bahra and Christian minorities such as the Maronites in northern Lebanon.<sup>44</sup> The regionalization of political power since the Turkish invasions allowed these groupings to form more or less independent petty lordships in their regions. They did not always succeed in completely freeing themselves from the local city-lords; their permanent pressure for autonomy is, however, a constant factor in the development of political relations among Syrian states. The most significant of these groups, were the Nizari Ismailis ('Assasins' or 'Batiniyya'), which had split off in 1094 from the Egyptian Fatimids and were attempting to establish a foothold in Syria at the same time as the Crusaders. Although they first succeeded in founding a lasting complex of lordships in the 1130s, they were already able in the first decade of the century to win over parts of the Shiite population of northern Syria, under the protection of Ridwan, through the operation of agents from a missionary and propaganda base in Aleppo. One of their first centres was Sarmin, where such a base continued to exist until the last third of the thirteenth century.<sup>45</sup> The temporary rule of the Franks over Sarmin, which repeatedly changed its possessor in the time of Ridwan, appears not to have disturbed the continuing presence of the Nizaris.

#### FRANKISH-MUSLIM ALLIANCES AND TREATIES DURING THE FIRST CRUSADE (1097–99)

On account of the complex political situation in Syria in 1098, the Franks did not confront an Islamic bloc in Syria, but an abundance of rival lordships under amirs and rulers of different ethnic and religious affiliations. At this point, it must be asked who the Crusaders actually were, what aims they pursued and how the relations of the Crusaders with the Muslim

<sup>43</sup> Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 87; Albert of Aix, VII, XVII–XVIII, 518–9.

<sup>44</sup> In 1099 Maronites advised the Franks to take the coastal route to Jerusalem. Nothing is known of the internal organization of the Maronites in this period. On the Maronites and the Crusades cf. Salibi, *Buhturids*; Salibi, *Maronites*.

<sup>45</sup> Ibn Shihna, 164; Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 151.

rulers of Syria were formed. Although the First Crusade is unusually well documented in primary sources and its historical background has been thoroughly discussed, there are still difficulties in defining the actual goal of the Crusades. This rests to some extent in the fact that the numerous sources which provide information on the Councils of Piacenza and Clermont in 1095, on the preaching of the Crusade in the year 1096 and on the various expeditions to Asia Minor were all recorded after, sometimes considerably after, the events which they report. In every case we have thus to deal with interpretation through hindsight. Yet, the difficulties in defining the actual goal of the Crusades rest also in the fact that completely different groups undertook the First Crusade.

The Crusade was not an organized campaign under unopposed military or ecclesiastical leadership but a movement, supported by individuals whose motivations for taking the cross were as varied as their social and ethnic ties. The influence of the individual groups participating in the Crusade on its actual form, the formulation of its goals, the ways to accomplish these goals and on the relationships with the Muslim opponents differs to a large extent over the successive phases of the movement between 1095 and 1099. By the time the crusading princes wrote to the pope from northern Syria on 11 September 1098, after the battles in Asia Minor, the capture of Antioch, the victory over the Turkish relieving force under Kirbogha and not least the death of the papal legate Adhemar of Le Puy on 1 August 1098, their army had other structures and motives from those of the people at the Council of Clermont three years before. It was also only partially identical with the bands of the People's Crusade, which the Rum Seljuks had already destroyed in October 1096 at Civetot on the Sea of Marmara.<sup>46</sup> It may thus be asked what goals the Crusaders had at the moment they reached the frontier of that region where all their conquests were to be restored to the Byzantine Empire in accordance with the arrangement with Alexius Comnenus? Furthermore, what knowledge did they have of the religious and political situation in Syria? By what criteria was the amorphous mass of the Crusaders structured? Is it possible to discover mutually differing interests and ways of acting and did this influence the possible conclusion of treaties with Muslim rulers?

In the past, attempts were made to single out the profile of 'the true Crusader', who set out as an armed pilgrim in the service of the spiritual

---

<sup>46</sup> Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, 161–5. The remainder of the People's Crusade under Peter the Hermit attached themselves to the princes' armies (Hagenmeyer, *Chronologie*, VI, 255).

authority and without any ambition to rule, a selfless athlete of Christ on the way to Jerusalem to free the sepulchre of Christ. Whoever did not correspond to this pattern could simply be regarded as a deviant or a false pilgrim. Such an interpretation, which is already discernible in sources with a strong religious impetus, meets the objection that the motive to preach the Crusade, to support it or even to take the way to Syria oneself, was not based on one and the same religious enthusiasm for all contemporaries, as is shown in the chronicle of Raymond of Aguilers.<sup>47</sup> The necessary premise for a sharp differentiation between true and false Crusaders would lie in the existence of a clear and generally accepted programme for the Crusade. It appears that a programme of this kind—the Crusade as an armed pilgrimage to free the Holy Places—was not presented to the Crusaders from the outset. What was for the Normans and Bohemond little more than an extensive conquering expedition, which happened to be sustained by religious sentiment, was for a clerical participant in the Crusade such as Raymond of Aguilers (or the later editors of his *Gesta Francorum*) an *opus Dei*, prefigured in the Bible and part of salvation history.<sup>48</sup>

What interest groups and conceptions then influenced the First Crusade? For the initiator of the First Crusade, Pope Urban II (1088–99), the conquest of the Holy Places was seemingly not a primary objective. His summons to take the cross is to be seen in the wider framework of the papal endeavours for union between the Roman and Eastern Churches, separated by schism since 1054. Urban's historical achievement lies in his having linked together the theory of Holy Church with popular thinking about the penitential pilgrimage to acquire religious merit or an indulgence for ecclesiastical penance. With the Crusade, the pope brought about the synthesis of both elements while also fulfilling the Byzantines' request for help in 1095–96. Urban was concerned in the first place with help for the brothers-in-faith in the East, the union of the Churches and also support of the Truce of God movement. An ecclesiastical expedition to liberate Jerusalem was probably only one of his aims in Clermont. There is much evidence that the idea of the liberation of Jerusalem was pushed into the foreground only through the momentum and subsequent development of the crusading propaganda that Urban had initiated. Although in the pope's view, Jerusalem as the goal of the march was presumably

---

<sup>47</sup> Raim. Aguil., 137.

<sup>48</sup> Rousset, *Origines*, 134–51.

subordinate to the actual point of the Crusade, the provision of help for Byzantium, the thought of Jerusalem was already implicitly included in the planning of the Crusade in regard to the organization of the undertaking as an armed pilgrimage. Among the masses, where the idea of the Crusade was transformed in the years 1095–96 from an initiative by the papal curia into an idea supported by mass enthusiasm, and in the propaganda the boundary between the indulgence for ecclesiastical penance and the remission of the punishment of temporal sins in the world to come (*remissio peccatorum*) was blurred. As a consequence, the original plan for the reconquest of lost Anatolian provinces was changed into a campaign of revenge against the heathen. The end of this development was for many Crusaders the idea of a just war to drive the enemies of God out of the proper seat of Christianity, hallowed by the life of the Saviour himself.<sup>49</sup>

This conception had little in common with Urban's intentions and nothing at all with that of the Byzantine emperor. At the court of Alexius Comnenus there was a complete lack of understanding of the mentality of the groups of Crusaders who had been arriving in Constantinople since 1096. Alexius had been able to secure the continued existence of the Empire in Anatolia since his accession in 1081 through numerous alliances with the Turkish amirs of Asia Minor and the Seljuk Sultan Malikshah.<sup>50</sup> His alliance with Qilij Arslan of Konya even survived the Crusade and helped him to fend off the Norman Bohemond of Antioch when the latter invaded the Balkans in 1106–7. A pragmatic procedure marked the emperor's policy, rather than the mentality of the crowds of pilgrims coming from Europe who had set out to combat the heathen. His request to the pope at the Council of Piacenza for help from Western troops thus merely signified the emperor's resumption of the Byzantine tradition of increasing the number and effectiveness of the imperial troops by contingents of foreign soldiers. For his part, Pope Urban at the Council of Clermont in 1095 had called on the poor as well as the knightly nobility to make the expedition to the East, perhaps in order to emphasize the pilgrimage character of the Crusade. However, he had demanded that wealthy Crusaders should provide those who could not equip themselves appropriately with weapons. In addition to the unforeseen resonance of the preaching of the

---

<sup>49</sup> Rousset, *Origines*, 72–87; Hehl, *Kirche*, 82–89; Russel, *Just War*.

<sup>50</sup> Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, 72–86. Vryonis, *Decline*, 103–117; Zbinden, *Ritter*, 95–98; Cahen, *Pénétration*, 51–2.

Crusade, this appeal to the poor contributed to the fact that the Crusaders who arrived in Constantinople were considerably different from the soldiers whom Alexius awaited. That the crusading movement took a direction that neither Rome nor Byzantium had wished meant that pope and emperor were no longer capable of organizing it. Thus it is necessary to ask whether it was possible that Urban II and Alexius Comnenus could have influenced the Crusade after the Crusaders had left the region under actual Byzantine rule in June 1097.

For the Byzantine side the answer was not difficult. In the winter of 1096–97 and the following spring months, the Byzantine emperor had succeeded in insisting that most of the Frankish leaders arriving in Constantinople should swear homage and fealty to him. In this way, Alexius subordinated the princes in the crusading army as vassals. Accordingly, at the siege of Nicaea, which the Byzantines and Crusaders carried out together, the role of commander clearly fell to the emperor. After its successful conclusion, the position of Alexius was so strong that on this occasion he was able to move all the Crusader chiefs (except Bohemond's subordinate Tancred) to accept homage and fealty. In the subsequent period, up to the siege of Antioch, the army of the Crusaders included a force under Tatikios, which influenced the progress of the enterprise and could oversee the observance of the legal relations established between Alexius and the Crusaders. However, the Byzantine position no longer had any representative with the Crusaders after the departure of the Byzantine contingent under Tatikios at the beginning of February 1098. The emperor himself turned back while advancing on Antioch when Frankish fugitives informed him in June 1098 of the alleged annihilation of the crusading army in Philomelium (Akshehir) by the Turkish relieving force under Kirbogha of Mosul.<sup>51</sup> Only Raymond of Toulouse unambiguously kept to the oath he had sworn to Alexius—possibly more in consequence of his enmity to Bohemond than out of a feeling of personal responsibility to the emperor. Alexius had no success thereafter in influencing the course of the campaign and in accompanying it with diplomatic initiatives to make it useful to Byzantine external policy. Neither by the promise of a new auxiliary force, which imperial envoys presented in April 1099 to the Crusaders outside 'Arqa (while demanding that they should await the coming of this force),<sup>52</sup> nor through the advocacy of Raymond of

<sup>51</sup> Hagenmeyer, *Chronologie*, VI, 532 and VII, 305–6.

<sup>52</sup> Raim. Aguil., 125–6. Cf. Hagenmeyer, *Chronologie*, VII, 446–7.

Toulouse, could Alexius regain influence among the Crusaders. The decision to break off the siege of 'Arqa and to advance 'under God's leadership' directly to Jerusalem fell directly against the count's advice and regardless of the emperor's auxiliaries, as the eyewitness Raymond of Aguilers makes credible. Raymond, influenced by Byzantine gifts and anxious about his lines of supply, could not make headway against the common opinion, which reproached Alexius with continuous deceit.<sup>53</sup>

With the dissension between Franks and Byzantines, the Crusade had developed in another direction than Urban II and Alexius Comnenus planned. However, the transformation of the papal project was due not least to the fact that the position of the supporters of the papal concept was anything but dominant in the army, although for different reasons. To all appearances, the pope had entrusted the overall management of the Crusade to Bishop Adhemar of Le Puy as his deputy and the military leadership to Raymond of Toulouse. In fact, Adhemar also played a significant role as mediator, propagandist and mentor of those fighting pilgrims who were not of knightly status (as a military-leader he did not stand out particularly); but he died as early as 1 August 1098 in Antioch and thereby the army lost the leader appointed by the pope.<sup>54</sup> The other legates of Urban II in the crusading army, Arnulf of Choques and Alexander, did not occupy a position as high as Adhemar. As chaplains, they clearly belonged to the households of their lords, Robert of Normandy and Stephen of Blois, and they had no authority over the Crusaders in general. Until the arrival of the new legate in the autumn of 1099, Archbishop Daimbert of Pisa, Rome no longer had anyone among the Crusaders to represent its concept of the course of the Crusade. Urban could not comply with the request of the crusading princes, expressed in their letter of 11 September 1098, to place himself at the head of the expedition to Jerusalem.<sup>55</sup> The pope died on 29 July 1099, having already planned in April to proceed in person to the East. If after Adhemar's death there was anyone at all who could still have influenced the Crusade according to Urban's ideas, the count of Toulouse, chosen by the pope in 1095 for the military leadership, was the man. Raymond of Toulouse was, however, never in a position to assume the role of supreme commander in the army. When the ambitions of the Normans from southern Italy to set up their own principality in Antioch

---

<sup>53</sup> Raim. Aguil., 125–6.

<sup>54</sup> Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, 136–7, 141, 164; *Gesta Francorum*, XXX, 10, p. 389. Cf. Raim. Aguil., 84.

<sup>55</sup> Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, 164.

and Cilicia became clear during the march through Anatolia in 1097, it was not Raymond, but Godfrey of Bouillon who was the protagonist of the anti-Norman party. Even after the departure of important princes such as Hugh of Vermandois (who during the advance through Italy had received a papal banner of St. Peter, which could have been interpreted as meaning a special designation by Urban) and Stephen of Blois, chosen as *dominus* and *gubernator*, Raymond possessed no paramount position. Certainly at the end of December 1098 in Ma'arrat al-Nu'man he placed himself at the head of the *pauperes* as *dux et dominus*, who pressed for the continuance of the march to Jerusalem while the princes were discussing the right to the possession of Antioch.<sup>56</sup> Raymond also endeavoured by means of payments, to move the other princes (with the exception of Bohemond) to advance.<sup>57</sup> However, the count of Toulouse could not assert himself thereafter either against the body of the Crusaders or against the other princes.

As this survey shows, the pope's and the emperor's concepts of the Crusade no longer had any significance, at the latest from the summer of 1098. Of decisive importance for the further management of the project and relations with the Muslims was rather the dialectic of interests between the two remaining groups of supporters, the body of simple pilgrims and the knightly aristocracy, who were not united by a single high command. The non-combatants, whom the eyewitness Fulcher of Chartres already during the siege of Nicaea in 1097 estimates at five-sixths of the Crusaders capable of fighting, stood rather in the tradition of the pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Yet, for the knights, and especially for the princes in the army, material interests were at least equally decisive.<sup>58</sup> Hence, on several occasions after the conquest of Cilicia, open conflict appeared between the army leaders who were pursuing competing interests and the *pauperes* or *peregrini*, as the author of *Gesta Francorum* called them in contrast to the princes.<sup>59</sup>

1 November, the deadline fixed for the southward advance after the victory over the Turkish relieving-force outside Antioch in July 1098, had passed without the princes making any preparations for departure as they were occupied with territorial conquests. At this point, the mass of simple pilgrims under the newly installed bishop of al-Bara put Raymond under

---

<sup>56</sup> Raim. Aguil., 99.

<sup>57</sup> Raim. Aguil., 100.

<sup>58</sup> Fulcher, Carnot., I, X, 4, 183.

<sup>59</sup> For instance *Gesta Francorum*, XXXIV, 2, p. 412.

pressure. He should either make himself the leader of the expedition to Jerusalem or the people would demand of him the Holy Lance found in Antioch and proceed southwards under God's leadership.<sup>60</sup> Already in the first half of November 1098, when a princely court of arbitration sought to settle the quarrel between Raymond and Bohemond over Antioch, voices were raised in the army that the place under dispute should simply be razed to the ground in order to allow their departure.<sup>61</sup> When Raymond added a further element to the quarrels with his wish to garrison Ma'arrat al-Nu'man, which had been captured in the meantime, the *pauperes* demolished the place, thus compelling departure for the south.<sup>62</sup> Before 'Arqa and Tripoli, the count of Toulouse was again unable to assert himself against the majority, who were unwilling to defer the march to Jerusalem to capture the two places.<sup>63</sup>

These events make the conflict of interests between the 'poor pilgrims' and the knightly aristocracy sufficiently clear. Raymond of Aguilers, whose *Historia Francorum* most clearly reflects the standpoint of the simple pilgrims and clerics, laments that the knights repeatedly set their private interest in making conquests above the common goal.<sup>64</sup> The chronicler's reproach does not only touch the princes, but the knightly aristocracy in general. Already during the blockade of Antioch, which lasted from the end of October 1097 to June 1098, the leaders of the individual contingents had established their spheres of influence in the surrounding countryside. All the princes had incurred quite considerable expenditure in equipping their followers and in accordance with the pope's word in Clermont that they might expect also an earthly reward they covered the costs from their conquests.<sup>65</sup> Among them were the duke of Normandy and the counts of Flanders and Blois, wealthy ruling princes, who out of piety or because of a difficult political situation in their homelands were induced to take the cross. However, the nobles who had decided to use the Crusade to establish their own lordships constituted a special group. They took this decision either because they held only the rank of non-ruling princes or vassals by birth like Bohemond, Tancred and Baldwin, or because their

<sup>60</sup> Raim. Aguil., 99.

<sup>61</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, XXXI, 1–5, pp. 393–7; Raim. Aguil., 93–4.

<sup>62</sup> Raim. Aguil., 100. The pressure of the *pauperes* is partly to be explained by the catastrophic lack of provisions.

<sup>63</sup> Raim. Aguil., 126–7, 131. According to Albert of Aix, V, XL, 458, the longing to proceed to Jerusalem prevented a siege of the town.

<sup>64</sup> Raim. Aguil., 48–9.

<sup>65</sup> Baldric of Dol, I, IV, 15; Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, 149.

age and religiosity (like Raymond) or the giving up of their possessions for the purpose of going on the Crusade (like Godfrey) compelled them to acquire new material resources in the East.<sup>66</sup> If the First Crusade did not constitute a project of colonization, as the small number of Europeans who actually remained in the East after 1099 indicated, the most important princes of the crusading army used the opportunity for the establishment of lordships and social climbing. The primary goal of the Crusade for the simple pilgrims, the fulfilment of the vow of pilgrimage by going to Jerusalem, became thus a sort of luxury for individual nobles. For these nobles the securing of newly acquired individual lordships against Turkish, Greek or competing Frankish claims enjoyed priority. This applied to Bohemond, the first prince of Antioch, and Count Baldwin I of Edessa, who first visited the Holy Places half a year after their capture; and it was exactly the case for Raymond, who only under pressure from the simple pilgrims in Ma'arrat al-Nu'man, 'Arqa and Tripoli, renounced the idea of establishing a lordship of his own.<sup>67</sup>

Of the lords going to Jerusalem as armed pilgrims, the duke and counts of Normandy, Flanders, Vermandois and Blois, three parties were distinct and they were endeavouring already before July 1099 in reciprocal rivalry to establish permanent lordships. They were (1) Duke Geoffrey of Lower Lorraine and his brother Baldwin, (2) Bohemond of Tarento and his nephew Tancred and finally (3) Count Raymond of Toulouse and his retainer Raymond Pilet. The establishment of the Lorrainers in Edessa had for the time being resolved the antagonism between Normans and Lorrainers, which at the end of October 1097 had led to continuous quarrels at al-Massisa over the Cilician towns and even to open hostilities between the soldiers of Tancred and Baldwin. Yet the opposition between Normans and Provençals remained over the turn of the century. In January 1099 Raymond lost his position in Antioch to Bohemond.<sup>68</sup> After the resistance of *peregrini* and princes had already repeatedly frustrated his plans, he had to surrender the citadel of Jerusalem to Godfrey in July 1099. A little

---

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Yewdale, *Bohemond I*, 23–4; Nicholson, *Tancred*, 16; Hill, *Raymond IV*, 36–7. Raymond had been regarded since 1079 as a promoter of ecclesiastical reform (with which Urban II was also proceeding), although he had twice been excommunicated by Gregory VII on account of an uncanonical marriage and simony. Godfrey of Bouillon also has a bad reputation earlier in the monastic chronicles of his homeland, in spite of lavish gifts, because of attacks on ecclesiastical property.

<sup>67</sup> Hagenmeyer, *Chronologie*, VII, 497–9.

<sup>68</sup> According to Raymond of Aguilers (Raim. Aguil., 83), Bohemond had driven the Lorrainers, Flemings and Provençals out of the citadel of Antioch in July 1098.

later in mid-August, after the victory of the Franks over the Egyptians, he failed in his attempt to obtain the town of Ascalon through Godfrey's objection.<sup>69</sup> Tancred took Raymond prisoner in 1101 and made him swear not to undertake the establishment of a lordship in northern Syria. Raymond was under further pressure from the *peregrini*, whose leadership he had assumed, than were his rivals. Thus, the Crusade, following the death of the papal legate Adhemar of Le Puy and the withdrawal of the Byzantine contingent at the latest, was formed of only two groups. In order to understand the relations of the Crusaders with the Muslims in the following months up to the taking of Jerusalem, it must be asked whether the duality of interests shown to exist between the *peregrini* and the nobility, with their propensity to establish lordships, is again to be found in the image that the Crusaders formed of Islam and the Muslims.

A sharp antagonism between the world of *populus Dei* and heathendom characterised the crusading propaganda in the contemporary sources of whatever provenance. In the interpretation of Western Christendom the Crusades are regarded as struggles of universal historical, even eschatological, significance between belief and unbelief. 'Verily the West rose up against the East, a little people against a numerous nation, Europe against Asia, yea even Africa, Belief against Unbelief; we were protected by Faith, they were enshrouded in Error.'<sup>70</sup> Thus, a sermon on the occasion of an anniversary of the taking of Jerusalem ascribed to Fulcher of Chartres. Latin chronicles of the Crusade, vernacular epics of chivalry of the early crusading period, recorded papal speeches—all uniformly convey the picture of a sharp contrast between *militēs, fideles, coadiutores Christi, gens sancta*<sup>71</sup> and their Muslim adversaries, described at best as *pagani, infideles* and *gentiles*, but often enough as *excommunicata generatio, gens barbara, nefaria, nefanda, perfida* or *gentes immundae*. Especially hostile authors such as Fulcher of Chartres and Walter the Chancellor even stigmatize the Muslims as '*gens [...] spreta, degener et daemonum ancilla*' and '*satellites daemonum, erroris cariae imbuti*.'<sup>72</sup> The uniform harmony of the sources gives rise to the supposition that this pattern of black and

<sup>69</sup> Hagenmeyer, *Chronologie*, VII, 432, 492.

<sup>70</sup> *Scriptum Galeranni*, 162.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. for instance Rousset, *Origines*, 71; Riley-Smith, *First Crusade*, 59–61; Fulcher, *Carnot.*, 901.

<sup>72</sup> To cite but a few examples: *Gesta Francorum*, VIII, 2, p. 179 and IX, 7, pp. 203–4; Robert the Monk, I, I, p. 728; Fulcher, *Carnot.*, I, III, 6, 135; Walter the Chancellor, I, VI, 4, p. 75 and II, XVI, 7, p. 113. Cf. Rousset, *Origines*, 104–5; Darbishire, *Idea*, 116; Schwartz, *Bild*; Schwinges, *Kreuzzugsideologie*, 105.

white corresponds to the common opinion within the crusading army. Similarly, the motive of the savage heathen, which had been characteristic of Latin chronicles since the Carolingian period, dominated in chronicles and epics of the early twelfth century.

One root of this demonizing of heathendom in propaganda was the slight knowledge available in Europe and among the Crusaders of Islam. Even in the predominantly clerical sector of the highly educated, the state of knowledge about Islam was rudimentary and was fed more from legends and reports of Saracen atrocities than from the study of Eastern Christian, Byzantine or Spanish apologetics that were largely unknown. The generally low level of information in Europe outside the Iberian Peninsula is reflected also in the accounts of those who participated in the Crusade. They are a mixture of scanty information from legend and folklore. None of the historiographers of the Crusade who personally visited the Holy Land gives a discriminating presentation of Islam or political conditions in Syria. Two clerics who were not eyewitnesses of the Crusade, Ekkehard of Aura, a pilgrim to Jerusalem in 1101, and Guibert of Nogent, showed at least some interest. Guibert presented Islam as a Christian heresy in his *Historia*, written in the first decade of the twelfth century, a revision of the anonymous *Gesta Francorum*. In his presentation of the origin of Islam, he certainly follows a current legend, but he is correctly informed about the prophethood of Muhammad as not being the Saracens' god, the strict monotheism of Islam and its rejection of orthodox Christology and Trinitarianism.<sup>73</sup>

Among the participants in the Crusade, on the other hand, the Muslims were clearly considered not as heretics, but rather as heathens. The sources originating in their ranks employ an undifferentiated terminology (*pagani, gentiles, increduli, perfidi...*), which takes no account of the Isidorian distinction between *gentiles* as 'those still unconverted' and *pagani* as adherents of a deliberately anti-Christian religious system. An eloquent example is the letter that the leaders of the Crusade sent on 11 September 1098 from Antioch to Pope Urban II. This letter explicitly separates 'Turks and Pagans', who are to be combated, from 'Greek, Armenian and Syrian Jacobite [...] heretics', whom one would not harm.<sup>74</sup> Common to all the sources is the ethnical differentiation of the enemy into Turks, Persians, Arabs or Saracens, Ethiopians and others. The Franks

---

<sup>73</sup> Guibert of Nogent, I, IV, 127–30.

<sup>74</sup> Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, 164; Isidor of Seville, VIII, 10, 2.

were also aware of the political fragmentation of the Islamic lands into autonomous territorial lordships, of the antagonism between Turks and Fatimids and of the linked confessional separation between Sunnis and Shiites, the theological or historical grounds of which were, however, not appreciated. The picture of Islam in the *Chanson d'Antioche* of the Crusader Richard, in the version of Graindors of Douai originating at the end of the twelfth century, which Darbishire has researched, is identical with the level of knowledge of contemporary chronicles and travel literature: Islam was conceived of as a religious community, its structure was, however, not analysed. The Crusaders' idea of the constellation of powers and the constitutional classification of the individual territories and rulers in Syria also remained nebulous. Caliph and sultan were mentioned as much as Mecca was known as the goal of the Islamic pilgrimage. Topographical terms such as Baudas, Rohais, Caliptum and Coroscane or rulers' names such as Sansodine, Malquidant, Corboran, Aoxianus and Lavedelius were reproduced more or less correctly phonetically, so far as the Crusaders came directly into contact with them. On the whole, however, it was a matter of haphazard recording, not of an analytical, systematic and inquiring interest in understanding.<sup>75</sup> Accordingly, abundant phenomena were noted which appeared as curiosities to the Westerners, but geographical information not derived from the Bible, antiquity or patristic tradition was rare. The works of Raymond of Aguilers and Ekkehard of Aura reveal only some knowledge of the political situation in the Middle East following the Turkish invasion.<sup>76</sup>

This low level of interest and knowledge was not only unsuitable to a diplomatic and political outlook, but furthered the emphasis on the distance from the enemy and hence his demonization. Yet, there existed two correctives which could facilitate a link between the knightly element and the unbelievers. One was the identification of Islam with the paganism of antiquity or at least the approximation of Islam to the pantheon of the ancient religions in the mentality of the medieval West. The other was the assumed analogy between the structure of rule and religion in the West and the Orient. Both elements are marked above all in the courtly epics of the twelfth century, produced by laymen for an aristocratic public. There was a tendency during the period to subsume the whole world of religions, apart from the sphere of Christianity and Judaism, under an

---

<sup>75</sup> Darbishire, *Idea*, 115–22; Hill, *Views*, 6; Schwartz, *Bild*; 144.

<sup>76</sup> Raim. Aguil., 64, 109–110; Ekkehard of Aura, II, 1, p. 54–V, 1, p. 80.

undifferentiated concept as heathens and to include the Muslims as a whole in the category of heathens without distinguishing them from other current forms of heathendom. This opened the way to the identification of Islam with the cults of classical antiquity and the Old Testament, the content and varied forms of which had been handed down to the West. The mixture of ancient polytheistic religions and monotheistic Islam in the intellectual world of the West led indeed on the one hand to the idea that Muslims worshiped the whole ancient pantheon with the inclusion of a deified Muhammad.<sup>77</sup> On the other hand it allowed the positive appreciation of the high cultural level of Islam and outstanding personalities, like famous pagans of antiquity.<sup>78</sup>

Seeing Islam in the tradition of pagan antiquity thus suggested to the Christians of the beginning of the twelfth century a certain understanding of Islam as a religion. But it was still more significant for the Western perception of Islam as an institutional and political system that the enemy's culture was not thought of as a unique phenomenon, but as something parallel to the ordering of the Christian commonwealth. The striking symmetry in description when Christian and Muslim war-standards, battle-cries, knightly society or sacred books are compared in the sources provides sufficient proof of this.<sup>79</sup> The slighter a Frankish historian's actual knowledge of Islam, the more he tended to employ analogies to Western institutions. This is clearest in the sources which stand in the tradition of *Gesta Francorum*, according to which in 1098 Kirbogha of Mosul is said to have begun a fictional letter as follows: 'To the caliph our pope and the lord sultan our king, that most valiant warrior and to the most valiant knights of Khurasan.'<sup>80</sup> The pope of the Turks (*papa Turcorum*)<sup>81</sup> together with heathen priests not only incites to combat against the Christians in the contemporary Western accounts, but promises the forgiveness of sins and grants 'permission to slay the Christians'.<sup>82</sup> Beside him stands the sultan, who as the emperor of the Persians (*sultanus, scilicet imperator Persidis*)

---

<sup>77</sup> For instance *Gesta Francorum*, XXI, 9, p. 322, XXII, 1, p. 323 and XXXIX, 17, p. 497/8; Tudebod, 80; Fulcher Carnot., I, XV, 7, p. 220.

<sup>78</sup> This tendency only appeared in the course of the twelfth century (Schwartz, *Bild*, 38–9). From it developed the concept of the noble heathen, which appears explicitly only at the turn of the thirteenth century and not in the period of the First Crusade.

<sup>79</sup> Plocher, *Studien*, 16–20; Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, 159.

<sup>80</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, XXI, 7–9, pp. 323–5. Similarly, Guibert of Nogent, V, X, 191; Baldric of Dol, III, III, 62.

<sup>81</sup> Raim. Aguil., 110. Cf. Guibert of Nogent, V, VIII, 189.

<sup>82</sup> Guibert of Nogent, V, VIII and X, 289, 191; *Gesta Francorum*, XXI, 1, p. 313. Plocher, *Studien*, 20.

sends out his *generalissimo* (*princeps militiae soldani Persiae*) against the Crusaders.<sup>83</sup> Princes subordinate to the caliph and the sultan were designated as *reges* if they held positions as amirs, although the terminology differs with individual chroniclers.<sup>84</sup>

Islam was obviously understood not as existing in its own right, but as an anti-commonwealth analogous to the Christian commonwealth. In the eyes of the Crusaders the European feudal system logically provided the structure for the reciprocal legal relations of Islamic princes. Thus, *Gesta Francorum* reports that the son of the Turkish lord of Antioch had to render homage to Kirbogha of Mosul in 1098 and that an oath of allegiance was demanded of Ahmad b. Marwan before Kirbogha would appoint him as castellan of the citadel of Antioch.<sup>85</sup> The ambivalent picture of the Muslims, here as servants of Satan, there as heathens of equal knightly status, may with some care be assigned to the interest groups in the crusading army which have already been investigated. The picture of classical paganism may have strongly influenced clerics and *peregrine*, but knights and princes assumed or recognized among the Muslim warriors and rulers, especially the Turks, related ethical and legal ideas. According to Guibert, the Turks thus surpassed the Egyptians in such qualities as fitness for war, chivalry and personal virtue.<sup>86</sup> According to the *Gesta*, the formerly Christian Turks were even descended from the Franks. Chivalry, it says in the same place, is naturally reserved to Turks and Franks alone. Had those people only the true Faith, there would be none so fit for warfare in the world.<sup>87</sup> The hypothesis of a genealogical relationship between Turks and Franks found further extension in the West following the Crusade and in the thirteenth century even emerges in the French *chansons de geste*.<sup>88</sup>

The picture of knightly equality was not only a literary commonplace but also the common opinion among the princes of the Crusade when beleaguered in Antioch. This is proved by the fact that the crusading

---

<sup>83</sup> Fulcher Carnot, I, XV, 7, p. 220; *Gesta Francorum*, XXI, 1, p. 313. Cf. Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, 159 and Guibert of Nogent, V, VIII, 189.

<sup>84</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, XXI, 1, pp. 313–5, XXXIV, 4, p. 415, XXXIV, 10, pp. 422–4, XX, 1, p. 293; XXI, 5, p. 318; Albert of Aix, III, LIX, 379; Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, 150 (Stephen of Blois); Guibert of Nogent, V, X, 191.

<sup>85</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, XXI, 3, p. 316, XXI, 5, 318. Cf. Albert of Aix, IV, XLIV, 420.

<sup>86</sup> Guibert of Nogent, I, V, 131.

<sup>87</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, IX, 11, pp. 207–8. Cf. Baldric of Dol, II, III, 35–6; Albert of Aix, II, XXVII, 319. Admiration of the Turks' aptness for warfare appears repeatedly in the sources throughout the twelfth century (cf. Ambroise, V.5067–5070, 135).

<sup>88</sup> Rigord, 38, pp. 55–6.

princes' envoys, Peter the Hermit and his interpreter Herluin, proposed on 27 June 1098 to Kirbogha, the commander of the Turkish relieving army, that knightly duels should decide the future possession of the city.<sup>89</sup> The Turks had previously rejected an invitation to conversion. According to Albert of Aix, who wrote the relevant part of his chronicle in Europe c. 1102 on the basis of Lorrainer eyewitness accounts, mutual oath-taking and exchange of hostages were to safeguard the duels (reminiscent of a divine judgment). Even though this proposal was made in a supposedly hopeless military position, a different picture of the Muslims emerges here. According to the *jus gentium*, the 'law of nations', the heathen Kirbogha is a valid partner in negotiations and potentially in a treaty.<sup>90</sup> Certainly according to Isidore of Seville, whose definition of *jus gentium* was to find entry as the medieval *locus classicus* into the *Decretum of Gratian* and thereby into canonical tradition, agreements between states did not depend on the confessional status of the treaty partner. Peace treaties (*foedera pacis*), armistices (*indutiae*) and immunities of envoys belong exactly for this reason to *jus gentium*, because these legal institutions are known to almost all peoples regardless of their religious affiliations.<sup>91</sup>

Thus, the question arises of whether and how the interest groups in the crusading army were actually ready to enter into treaty relations with the Muslims in favour of the realization of their different aims. Or did the idea of demonizing and exterminating the heathen, in combination with the prefiguration of the Crusades by the Israelites' acquisition of Canaan according to Urban's speech in Clermont and as held by the simple *peregrini*, forbid all Crusaders alike to come to terms with Muslim princes—even while recognizing their equality of status?<sup>92</sup> It has often been observed that participants in the First Crusade did understand it as a missionary enterprise, unlike its interpretation in memoranda about the Crusade that authors such as Raymond Lull, Marino Sanudo and Pierre Dubois wrote later at the end of the thirteenth century.<sup>93</sup> Nevertheless,

---

<sup>89</sup> Raim. Aguil., 79, 81; Fulcher Carnot., I, XXI, 1, p. 248; Albert of Aix, IV, XLV, 420–1; Ralph of Caen, LXXXI, 663–4; Caffaro, I, 54.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. Albert of Aix, IV, XLV, 420–1.

<sup>91</sup> Isidor of Seville, V, 6 and V, 7.

<sup>92</sup> Baldric of Dol, I, IV, 15. Urban's interpretation of the acquisition of the land by the Israelites as prefiguring the Crusade must indeed have hindered treaty relations between Franks and Muslims. The Bible asserts that the Israelites had to lay almost all of their conquests under the ban, and it expressly includes the interdiction both of marriage and of the conclusion of covenants (Deut. 7, 2–5; Joshua 6, 17, 10, 28).

<sup>93</sup> Cutler, *Conversion*, 57. Cf. Schwartz, *Bild*, 95–8.

some remarks in the sources seem to point to the Crusaders having made the conversion of Muslim partners to treaties an indispensable condition. Thus, the *Historia belli sacri*, originating after 1131, gives an account of a Frankish embassy which departed for Egypt before the conquest of Nicaea in May or June 1097 to set before the Fatimid Wazir al-Afdal the choice of conversion and friendship or war.<sup>94</sup> On the march southwards from Antioch at the beginning of February 1099, according to another account, Raymond of Toulouse refused the treaty desired by the *qadi* of Tripoli, allegedly because the *qadi* had first to be converted.<sup>95</sup> On the capture of Antioch in 1098 on two occasions Muslim commanders changed to the Christian faith: first the commandant of a tower, Firuz, whose treachery had enabled the Franks to capture the town.<sup>96</sup> Shortly later, after the victory over the Turkish relieving army, there was a similar development. In view of the Frankish victory, the commandant appointed by Kirbogha, Ahmad b. Marwan, surrendered the citadel to Bohemond's Normans, accepted baptism with the majority of his men and obtained for those who wished to remain Muslims safe conduct to Aleppo.<sup>97</sup>

Closer consideration, however, shows that in all these cases conversion was not an essential condition for the conclusion of a treaty. Raymond's refusal to conclude a peace with the ruler of Tripoli can be explained (as will be shown) not out of religious sensibility, but out of his interest in founding a lordship of his own in the *qadi's* sphere of influence. In the cases of Firuz and Ahmad b. Marwan, according to the tenor of the sources, conversion was merely something additional to the treaty, not its condition. The change of religion might, however, seem opportune to both the converts. Firuz himself, a former Christian and an apostate of Armenian origin, might have had under Bohemond's protection little good to expect for himself and his extensive estates from the fanaticism of the *peregrini*, had he remained Muslim.<sup>98</sup> For Ahmad b. Marwan, it was

<sup>94</sup> Hist. bell. sacri, XX, 181.

<sup>95</sup> Hagenmeyer, *Chronologie*, VII, 439.

<sup>96</sup> Gesta Francorum, XX, 1, pp. 293–5. Cf. Hagenmeyer, *Chronologie*, VII, 284–5 and Cutler, *Conversion*, 57.

<sup>97</sup> Cutler, *Conversion*, 155–8. Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Zubda*, II, 137–8 confirms the versions of those Western sources mentioned in Hagenmeyer, *Chronologie*, VII, 310–1, but says nothing of a change of religion by Ahmad b. Marwan. After the capitulation on 5 July 1098, he is said to have lived in a house in Antioch. After the garrison left for Aleppo, however, it was almost completely demolished by the Armenians.

<sup>98</sup> According to Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 274, Firuz received an *iqtaʿ* from Bohemond. Did he receive it according to Western forms? Nothing is known as to his fate thereafter. If his Christian name was indeed Bohemond, as Albert of Aix, IV, XV, 399 says, he was identical

probably the case that in his desperate situation he would receive better conditions—if we do not suppose with Cutler that the victory of the Christians over Kirbogha, achieved with enormous religious enthusiasm after the discovery of the Holy Lance, had proved to him the superiority of the Christian God.<sup>99</sup> The example of Jerusalem a year later shows that the surrender of a citadel against free withdrawal could be accomplished entirely pragmatically and without conditions of a religious nature. After the capture of the city, Raymond of Toulouse took possession of the Tower of David on 13 July 1099 and allowed the Egyptian garrison to be conducted safely to Ascalon in accordance with his oath.<sup>100</sup> Finally, the appeal to al-Afdal and Kirbogha to change their religion and the corresponding counter-offer of Kirbogha to Peter the Hermit had in the given circumstances a clearly rhetorical character and surely do not constitute the actual contents of the negotiations.<sup>101</sup>

The examples cited already indicate that on the First Crusade there were contacts with hostile powers. What role did diplomacy play in the crusading army and how did the diplomatic connections with Middle Eastern states and rulers correlate with the interest groups among the Crusaders? After the capture of Antioch in 1098 and the victory over the relieving army, the council of the crusading princes decided at the beginning of July to continue the march on Jerusalem at the beginning of November. The Lorrainers, concerned with setting up territories, the Normans of Bohemond and the Provençals used the intervening time for the extension and consolidation of the lands already in their possession. Bohemond and Raymond operated in regions with a power vacuum after the death of Yaghisiyan that were mostly inhabited by Christians. On the other hand, the newly acquired positions of the Lorrainers in Edessa, Turbessel and Ravendel (al-Rawandan) were extraordinarily exposed.<sup>102</sup> Since February 1098, probably before the advance of Kirbogha's relieving army, Godfrey of Bouillon's brother Baldwin had succeeded in reinforcing his position in Edessa as sole ruler after the townspeople's revolt against his adoptive

---

to the convert Bohemond, the dragoman and agent of the Provençals mentioned by Raim. Aguil., 158–9.

<sup>99</sup> Cutler, *Conversion*, 157–8.

<sup>100</sup> Raim. Aguil., 151. Cf. *Gesta Francorum*, XXXIX, 2, p. 477.

<sup>101</sup> The *shari'a* recognizes an invitation to conversion before a struggle with non-Muslims. The Hanafi *madhhab*, to which Kirbogha as a Turk probably belonged, virtually makes the summons to Islam a duty (cf. Khaddouri, *War*, 95ff).

<sup>102</sup> On the formation of lordships in Northern Syria and Cilicia cf. Raim. Aguil., 84; Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Zubda*, II, 131–3; Yewdale, *Bohemond I*, 74–9.

father Toros. In consequence of his meagre military capacities, however, he was in need of diplomatic means to secure this.

Directly after his arrival in Edessa, Baldwin, together with an Armenian contingent under Toros' subordinate Constantine of Gargar, marched against Sumaysat, lying to the north-west, where he had been attacked on his way to Edessa. The operation ended unfortunately. Nevertheless, it succeeded in placing a large part of the heavily armed Lorrainers in the nearby castle of St. John. They made trouble subsequently for their enemy, the Amir Balduq of Sumaysat, through guerrilla warfare.<sup>103</sup> Albert of Aix describes that after the murder of Toros, the amir realized that he could no longer oppose the constant growth of Baldwin's power and offered him the sale of Sumaysat for 10,000 bezants and furthermore volunteered to serve him faithfully as a mercenary. Baldwin at first appeared unimpressed by this offer, since Balduq had shortly before wrongfully occupied Sumaysat, a possession of Edessa. Only on the advice of his men did Baldwin decide to conclude a treaty as the period of Balduq's ultimatum was threatening to run out. After its lapse, Balduq threatened that not only would he no longer keep the peace he would also burn his fortress to the ground and behead the hostages whom he had taken as security for an annual tribute from Edessa. Thereupon the business was settled. The count installed his knights in Sumaysat; Balduq went to Edessa as *condomesticus* and *familiaris* and promised in accordance with Baldwin's request to provide his wife and sons as hostages because of mistrust and in order to establish faith. The promise, however, was not fulfilled.<sup>104</sup>

A little later the Franks brought Saruj, the neighbour of Edessa to the south-west, under their control. It was at the time in the possession of the Artuqid Belek, a nephew of the Amir Sukman of Jerusalem. According to the version of the *Chronicon ad A.C. 1234 pertinens*, when Saruj appeared to be no longer tenable owing to the constant Frankish and Armenian raids, a delegation from Belek offered its surrender to Count Baldwin against certain promises, which were sworn and exchanged—perhaps in writing.<sup>105</sup> Albert of Aix states the matter differently. According to him, Belek had concluded an alliance with the count against Saruj, which had rebelled against him. The people of the threatened city had indeed first attempted to engage Turkish mercenaries for the defence, but then in view of the

---

<sup>103</sup> Albert of Aix, III, XXI, 353–4; Matthew of Edessa, 218–9.

<sup>104</sup> Albert of Aix, III, XXIV, 355–6.

<sup>105</sup> *Chronicon ad A.C. 1234 pertinens*, II, 47.

Frankish advance, had sought a peaceful settlement. Gifts were sent to Baldwin and the payment of tribute promised. According to Albert, Baldwin fixed a day for the official conclusion of the treaty and handed over the city and the citadel to a knight called Fulcher of Chartres.<sup>106</sup> The tenor of both sources is similar. According to both accounts, this resulted in the conclusion of a peace treaty secured by oaths between Franks and Turks, which included (perhaps financial) promises. Still more remarkable, and this might have been particularly scandalous for both pious Muslims and pious Christians, is that Saruj, a city inhabited by Muslims, was surrendered to Christians. The latter did indeed levy tribute, but practised no kind of forcible conversion, nor did they make other religious demands. There can be no doubt of the historicity of these events in spite of the silence of such well-informed chroniclers as Fulcher of Chartres and Matthew of Edessa, since Ekkehard of Aura seemingly also heard of them in the Holy Land three years later.<sup>107</sup>

The undoubtedly most spectacular instance of cooperation between Lorrainers and Turks during the First Crusade is better documented. At the end of August or beginning of September 1098, a call for help from 'Umar, the governor of 'Azaz, reached Baldwin in Edessa and Godfrey, whose location at the time is not quite clear. 'Umar had rebelled against Ridwan of Aleppo and needed help against a threatened punitive expedition.<sup>108</sup> This offered Godfrey the opportunity of neutralizing 'Azaz, strategically significant as a link between the Lorrainers and almost half-way between Antioch and Edessa. If Albert of Aix is purged of all panegyrics on behalf of Godfrey, the three authoritative sources provide an almost uniform picture of the event.<sup>109</sup> Either threatened or already beleaguered by Ridwan, 'Umar asked for peace and support through a Syrian Christian, whereupon Godfrey was said to have reacted at first with reserve owing to mistrust of the Turk. When his envoys informed him about Godfrey's hesitation, 'Umar sent his son Muhammad as a hostage with a second embassy so that Godfrey was reassured and concluded a treaty of peace and alliance. For reasons of security and speed, the written draft was transmitted to 'Azaz by pigeon-post.<sup>110</sup> In mid-September Godfrey and Baldwin relieved the beleaguered place, after additional Turks

---

<sup>106</sup> Albert of Aix, III, XXV, 356.

<sup>107</sup> Ekkehard of Aura, XXI, 3, pp. 211–3.

<sup>108</sup> Albert of Aix, V, VI–VII, 436–7.

<sup>109</sup> Albert of Aix, V, VI–X, 436–9; Raim. Aguil., 88–9; Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 141.

<sup>110</sup> Albert of Aix, V, VIII–IX, 437–8.

had reinforced it. Under pressure from Godfrey, Raymond of Toulouse and Bohemond joined them after initial reserve. 'Umar's sworn promise of allegiance (but seemingly not of vassalage) renewed the alliance between Franks and Turks after their victory. In a heavily symbolic ceremony, Godfrey presented to 'Umar outside the fortress a valuable helmet and a lance. While Muhammad remained in Antioch under Lorrainer guardianship as a hostage, Godfrey proceeded forthwith to Edessa.

For our investigation of the existence of alliances during the First Crusade, the way in which the chronicler Raymond of Aguilers explains the count of Toulouse's hesitant provision of aid is most instructive. After the garrison of 'Azaz had promised the surrender of the fortress to Godfrey in recompense for his support, he hastened to Antioch to mobilize the other Crusaders there. Raymond, just convalescent, only set out when Godfrey brought religious arguments into play: Raymond should help the heathen Turks for God, the fame of the Franks, and for Godfrey's sake, especially as they held out the cross against the siege-engines set up against them. Was it then that Raymond, unlike Geoffrey, made the conversion of a potential treaty partner a condition of the pact? The exceedingly condensed description of the matter by Raymond of Aguilers is not, however, completely convincing. The alleged offer by the governor, 'Umar, to surrender his fortress is suspect to begin with since, in spite of the successful conclusion of the alliance, nothing further is heard of it afterwards, even in Raymond of Aguilers' report. Would 'Umar really have rebelled with the view of surrendering his fortress to another lord within a month? Albert of Aix, who knows nothing of such an offer, presents on the contrary the legal relationship between Godfrey and 'Umar as a military alliance between partners of equal legal, but not of equal social standing, as *foedus aequum* in the terminology of Roman law, for which the inferior party had to provide hostages. This obviously corresponds to the course of the affair: it was a matter of establishing Lorrainer suzerainty over 'Azaz.<sup>111</sup>

Equally unconvincing is Raymond's argument concerning conversion. Neither Albert nor the local historian of Aleppo Ibn al-'Adim knows anything of crosses or an offer of conversion. Raymond also does not mention that the Provençals later insisted on the baptism of the freed garrison. If such a religious demand may be credited to the count of Toulouse, certainly it may not to Bohemond, who had hesitated equally long to march

---

<sup>111</sup> Cf. Tellenbach, *Zusammenleben*, 2, 7–8; Albert of Aix, V, XV, 441; Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 141.

to 'Azaz. The true reason why the other princes first put off Godfrey after he had asked for help may have been that they felt no necessity to support him in the foundation of a territorial lordship relatively near to Antioch in the face of rival self-interests. This is evidenced on the one hand by the fact that only Godfrey's very heavy pressure on Bohemond and Raymond, i.e. the threat of enmity and the denial of any further help, brought about a joint operation. On the other hand, the remark of Raymond of Aguilers shows that the count of Toulouse had at the same time planned on his own account a raid to the south in the same direction.<sup>112</sup> The instances of Sumaysat, Saruj and 'Azaz emphasize that both Godfrey and Baldwin were pragmatic in their policy and were prepared for cooperation with Muslim princes when it seemed profitable to them. Since Bohemond's actions during the First Crusade are almost completely irrelevant to the question of cooperation, the policy of Raymond of Toulouse in regard to treaties and conquests remains to be investigated.

The Provençals strove to establish a foothold south-east of Antioch in the frontier region of Aleppo and Shayzar directly after the victory over Kirbogha. In mid-July 1098, the Christian population of Tall Manas had opened the gates to a patrolling force under Raymond Pilet. A neighbouring fortress held by Muslims was stormed on the initiative of Syrian Christians in cooperation with the Franks on the 25<sup>th</sup> of the same month. According to the *Gesta Francorum*, the sole contemporary source to mention this, there occurred on this occasion a hitherto unique scene: Pilet had all the Muslims who refused conversion massacred. The Franks suffered a painful defeat from a Turkish detachment from Aleppo when they proceeded against Ma'arrat al-Nu'man two days later.<sup>113</sup> Nevertheless, Raymond of Toulouse resumed his strategy after the relief of 'Azaz with the capture of nearby al-Bara. He had Peter of Narbonne installed as bishop and endowed him with half of the town and its vicinity.<sup>114</sup> After the lapse of the November date, agreed in July 1098, for the march to Jerusalem, the pressure of the *peregrini* on the princes clearly became stronger. As already indicated, Raymond had no choice, but to put himself at the head of the pilgrim movement, in order not to forfeit his influence. This, however, indicated a conflict of interests, since the leadership of the *peregrini* did not automatically signify for Raymond the surrender of his

---

<sup>112</sup> Albert of Aix, V, XI, 439; Raim. Aguil., 88–9. Cf. Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 141.

<sup>113</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, XXX, 5–9, pp. 386–9; Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 138.

<sup>114</sup> Raim. Aguil., 91–2.

territorial ambitions for which he (albeit not so extensively as Godfrey) had arranged diplomatic contacts. The three stages of his advance southwards make this clear.

First, on 27 November 1098, the siege of Ma'arrat al-Nu'man began after the conclusion of the delicate agreement between Bohemond and Raymond in favour of the departure for Jerusalem. Provençal and Flemish troops participated in it and later Bohemond's army as well. The well-known circumstances of the siege, ending in one of the worst massacres of the crusading period, do not require further comment here. All the sources mention that Bohemond, in breach of his guarantee of safety (*aman*), slew, enslaved and pillaged numerous inhabitants gathered in a safe house.<sup>115</sup> A highly informative piece of information by the Damascene contemporary, Ibn al-Qalanisi is, however, not found in the other sources. According to this, the Franks had, before the capture of the place, frequently offered an agreement through envoys, which simply stipulated the stationing of a garrison and the sparing of lives and property in return for the surrender of Ma'arrat al-Nu'man. Since, however, the besieged were disunited over its acceptance (probably expecting further relief from Ridwan of Aleppo), no treaty was concluded.<sup>116</sup> Unfortunately, the report of this reliable chronicler stands alone and lacks confirmation on the Frankish side. If it is correct, two conclusions result: first, that Raymond had in mind for Ma'arrat al-Nu'man a legal status modelled on that of Saruj, without the extermination or expulsion of the Muslim population; secondly, that perhaps he used diplomatic means in order to gain sole possession of the town before Bohemond's arrival. We stand on firmer ground with the events of the following weeks.

Secondly, after the renewed disagreement with Bohemond and the pressure of the *peregrini* had prevented Raymond from establishing himself in Ma'arrat al-Nu'man, he advanced further south from mid-January 1099 after a foraging operation against the territories of Aleppo. Accompanied by Robert of Normandy and Tancred, whom he had taken into his employ, Raymond and the Crusaders marched by way of Kafartab, which they captured, to Shayzar and Masyaf. They stormed Hisn al-Akrad (the later Crac des Chevaliers) and a month after their departure the protracted siege of 'Arqa began. They concluded a series of treaties with Muslim rulers during these weeks. Shortly after the departure, probably

---

<sup>115</sup> Gesta Francorum, XXXIII, 7, pp. 407–8; Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 142–3.

<sup>116</sup> Ibn al-Qalanisi, 136.

in Kafartab, the Crusaders made peace (*pax*) with Abu al-‘Asakir Sultan, the ruler of Shayzar. In addition to a money-payment, the amir of Shayzar undertook not to molest the Franks within his lordship and to sell them horses and food. The course of relations with Shayzar was certainly not without problems—the amir had the land cleared of men and animals and threatened the Crusaders with a ban on trading if they did not withdraw further from the suburbs of his fortress. Nevertheless, the Franks were able to proceed unmolested, led across the Orontes by two guides from Shayzar. In addition, two non-aggression pacts were entered into with Muslim petty lords or governors, with whom treaties were concluded (against payments of cash and horses) with a sworn undertaking not to attack pilgrims.<sup>117</sup>

Thirdly, the following two and a half months up to the departure from Tripoli in mid-May 1099 can be called with complete justification the heyday of diplomatic contacts during the First Crusade. Already during the storming of Hisn al-Akrad, envoys from Hims and Tripoli had been in the Frankish camp—obviously to sound out a treaty. Impressed by the rapidity of its capture, they returned with Raymond’s permission to their lords in order to bring yet more gifts in return for the expected conclusion of a treaty. With Janah al-Dawla of Hims, who had hitherto belonged to the most decided opponents of the Crusaders along with Kirbogha, Duqaq and Ridwan, there was obviously no problem in reaching agreement over the same conditions as with Shayzar.<sup>118</sup> However, Raymond of Toulouse reacted otherwise to the offer of a treaty by the Qadi Jalal al-Mulk of Tripoli, who declared himself ready to enter faithfully into a pact and to establish friendship.<sup>119</sup> According to Raymond of Aguilers, Raymond sent a Provençal counter-embassy to Tripoli on the *qadi’s* initiative. They are said to have been so impressed by the riches of the city that they successfully urged their count to extort a higher tribute by besieging ‘Arqa. The anonymous author of the *Gesta* even reports that Raymond made the conversion of Jalal al-Mulk the requirement for a treaty.<sup>120</sup> Considering the high authority of the *Gesta*, this report is quite credible, although Raymond of Aguilers does not mention it and although it appears surprising after the previous conclusions of treaties. Possibly, Raymond of Aguilers, the Provençal chronicler who as court chaplain was in the circle closest

<sup>117</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, XXXIV, 4–7, pp. 415–9; Raim. Aguil., 102–6.

<sup>118</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 278.

<sup>119</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, XXXIV, 4–7, pp. 415–9; Raim. Aguil., 107.

<sup>120</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, XXXVI, 1, p. 438.

to the count, wished to protect his lord by silence from the reproach that he subsequently let the demand for conversion drop when concluding the treaty. Another explanation is still more plausible. Does the *Gesta* perhaps repeat the gossip going the rounds in the crusading army, possibly circulated by the leadership, as to the cause of the refusal of the treaty? The desire of the *peregrini* for Jerusalem, regardless of any strategic or political consideration, had already caused Raymond trouble in Antioch and Ma'arrat al-Nu'man and was to do so again after the siege of 'Arqa. Taking account of this, it is conceivable that his henchmen attempted to find a religious legitimization for the delay in the advance to Jerusalem caused by the siege. In the end, whichever of the two sources was correct, Raymond's actual motives for the rejection of Tripoli's offer of a treaty lay more deeply than in religious scruples. Raymond wanted to round out his possessions south of Antioch. Further developments make this clear. While for weeks the siege of 'Arqa made no progress, the Provençals, well provided for from Cyprus, displayed a lively activity in the conquest of new territories. This included the occupation of Antartus (Tortosa), the placing of the lord of Maraqqiyya (Maraclea) under Frankish suzerainty and the launching of raids against the rule of the 'Ammar family, *qadis* of Tripoli, in spite of tempting offers of a treaty.<sup>121</sup>

Raymond's lack of interest in a treaty and his choice of further time-consuming military operations was, in contrast to the opinion of the majority of the Crusaders, also not linked to the fact that he declared himself in agreement with the Byzantine envoys to await the arrival of an army under the Emperor Alexius. His alleged attempt to incite the other princes to storm Tripoli, even after the raising of the siege of 'Arqa, is not the sole indication of his position. After the princes had marched from 'Arqa, they were to conclude a treaty on the conditions submitted by Jalal al-Mulk that would facilitate their march to Jerusalem. The vision of the priest Peter Desiderius, which Raymond of Aguilers reported, is truly revealing. St. Andrew warned Raymond of Toulouse not to think of 'Arqa and other places. God would cause Jerusalem, Alexandria, Cairo and others to fall to him, if only he would faithfully proceed to the Holy Places.<sup>122</sup> The wording of this heavenly message, so little comforting in spite of everything, most clearly emphasizes how the establishment of a lordship on the coast of

---

<sup>121</sup> Robert the Monk, VIII, XI, p. 853. Cf. *Gesta Francorum*, XXXIV, 13–4, pp. 426–8; Raim. Aguil., 111–2.

<sup>122</sup> Raim. Aguil., 131.

southern Syria obsessed Raymond of Toulouse and it explains his moral attitude towards a treaty with Tripoli.

After the preceding analysis of Frankish policy in regard to alliances and treaties on a regional basis, the question remains whether the Crusaders also had an active supra-regional diplomacy towards states and lordships which were not of direct importance to the Frankish interest in conquest, but which served their aims. In connection with this, all the states neighbouring the route of the Crusaders, the Armenian principalities, Egypt, Aleppo and Damascus, come into consideration. Already during the 'Byzantine' phase of the Crusade, i.e. even before the taking of Nicaea, the Crusaders had their first contacts with the Armenian principalities of Cilicia and northern Mesopotamia. In consequence, the operations of the different parts of the army were carried out together with the Armenian princes, especially Baldwin's advance half a year later. According to the *Historia belli sacri* (c. 1140), an embassy was also sent to Egypt on the advice of the Byzantine emperor. It was composed of three Frankish envoys: Hugh of Bellafayre, Bertram of Scabrica and Peter of Picca. They were commissioned to deliver letters to the Fatimid Wazir al-Afdal, informing him of the Crusaders' intention to liberate the pilgrims' way to Jerusalem from the hands of the Muslims. Al-Afdal was given the choice of accepting conversion and becoming a brother and friend to the Christians or, if he preferred the friendship of the heathens, of becoming their enemy.<sup>123</sup> The passage is, unfortunately, found only in the *Historia*. It is, however, known to all the sources that an Egyptian embassy visited the crusading army when outside Antioch. This embassy sought to encourage the Christians in their struggle against the Turks and to provide help in the acquisition of Jerusalem in return for a non-aggression pact. Although the other sources say nothing of an embassy sent from Nicaea, the account in the *Historia* is indirectly confirmed since the Fatimid counter-embassy obviously attempted to conceal the religious gap between the two partners. The Egyptians praised Christ for the victory over the Turkish relieving army under Ridwan and Sukman b. Artuq, which they had witnessed. They furthermore emphasized the friendliness of the Fatimid regime towards both native Christians and Frankish pilgrims.<sup>124</sup> After the conclusion of the deliberations, the envoys set out on 5 March 1098 together with

---

<sup>123</sup> *Hist. bell. sacri*, XXII, 181. Albert of Aix, III, LIX, 379–80 seems to allude to a similar embassy. Cf. also Köhler, *Jerusalem*.

<sup>124</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 132; Raim. Aguil., 58; Albert of Aix, III, LIX, 379–80/7.

high-ranking Frankish ambassadors for Latakia and took ship for Egypt.<sup>125</sup> The purpose of the Frankish delegation, whose safety the Egyptians had guaranteed by oath, was obviously to reach the official conclusion of a treaty in Cairo.<sup>126</sup>

More than a year passed after the departure of the ambassadors. New movement in the negotiations came only when they returned in the spring of 1099 in the company of Egyptian envoys to the Crusaders, who meanwhile were at a stand outside 'Arqa. They reported that al-Afdal had forbidden an earlier return. After the Crusaders' victory over the Turkish relieving army outside Antioch, the capture of Jerusalem by the Fatimid wazir in the late summer of 1098 and the Frankish advance, the atmosphere between the two sides had become decidedly cooler. Certainly, Egypt displayed a friendliness of tone and sent exceedingly valuable presents to the princes, but it remained essentially tough. There was no longer any idea of a surrender of Jerusalem. Al-Afdal would merely allow unarmed groups of two to three hundred Franks admission to the Holy Places. The indignant Crusaders threatened to march on Egypt in a counter-move if Jerusalem were not ceded.<sup>127</sup> This final (for the time being) round of negotiations between Franks and Fatimids led to no outcome. In July and August 1099 the Crusaders captured Jerusalem and achieved victory over al-Afdal at al-Bissa, near Ascalon. The exchange of embassies with Egypt is, as a rule, far from thoroughly dealt with in the secondary literature and the Islamic sources are not taken into consideration—arguably because the exchange led nowhere and it did not correspond to the concept of the Crusade as a war against Islam for the conquest of Palestine.<sup>128</sup> For this reason, it is of especial value to have a source-critical analysis, since just at this point in the First Crusade the possibilities and limitations of Frankish cooperation in Palestine were manifested.

According to the traditional interpretation, al-Afdal had wrongly regarded the crusading army as acting on behalf of the Byzantines and

---

<sup>125</sup> Gesta Francorum, XVII, 4–7, pp. 270–4. Cf. Caffaro, IX, 56–7; Ekkehard of Aura, XVI, 2, pp. 169–71.

<sup>126</sup> Raim. Aguil., 58.

<sup>127</sup> Raim. Aguil., 110.

<sup>128</sup> Sybel, *Geschichte*, 352, 403–4; Röhrich, *Geschichte*, 122–3, 177–9 merely reformulate the sources. Runciman, *History*, I, 229, 273 and Runciman, *First Crusade*, 315–6, 329 has some brief comments. Gibb, *Caliphate*, 95 rejects the idea of an entente. More detailed are Grousset, *Histoire*, I, 82–5, 143–9 and Chalandon, *Comnène*, I, 206–7. Hamblin, *Army*, 214–20 is the only author to have systematically discussed the pertinent Islamic sources, but he does not focus on Frankish-Fatimid contacts.

had proposed an entente aiming at the ending of Seljuk rule in Syria as well as the reconstitution of the old partition of Syria into a northern Byzantine and a southern Fatimid sphere of hegemony. However, the Crusaders' intention to take possession of Jerusalem and thus of southern Syria wrecked this concept of restoration of the *status quo ante* 1070.<sup>129</sup> This interpretation, while certainly not altogether erroneous, does not provide satisfactory answers to a number of questions. How, in spite of such competing interests generally, was a Frankish-Fatimid agreement reached in March 1098? Why did Frankish delegates remain with the Fatimids for more than a year? Finally, why did al-Afdal, having captured Jerusalem in the late summer of 1098, subsequently defend Jerusalem and Palestine so ineffectively against the further advance of the Crusaders? If the Arabic chronicles are utilized beside the known Frankish sources, it appears possible to answer these questions. The main source for the contents of the Frankish-Fatimid negotiations is the account by the Provençal priest, Raymond of Aguilers. In a passage about the return of the Frankish envoys to the crusading army at 'Arqa, the chronicler describes the crux of the negotiations with Egypt as follows:

He [the lord of Egypt, probably the wazir] had, that is to say, doubted whether he should conclude friendship (*amicitiam*) with us or the Turks. We would agree with him as follows: if he gave us help at Jerusalem or surrendered Jerusalem with its dependent territories (*pertinenciis*), we would restore to him all his towns which the Turks had seized from him, if we captured them. But the other towns of the Turks which did not belong to his realm, we would share between us (*inter nos partiremur*). But the Turks, as was reported to us, would [...] fulfil this to him: if he engages with them in combat against us, they would venerate 'Ali, who is of the Prophet's family, grant him a certain tribute and concede to him many other things in addition as is not sufficiently known to us.<sup>130</sup>

In other words, the Franks and the Fatimids negotiated common military operations against the Turks who had penetrated Syria some three decades previously. In a counter-move, the Turkish rulers of Syrian cities, or individuals among them, were ready for the sake of an alliance with Egypt to submit themselves to Egyptian sovereignty and to name the Fatimid caliph in the Islamic Friday prayer. This latter appears to be entirely credible. Only a year previously, in fact, Ridwan b. Tutush of Aleppo, although himself a Sunni, had attempted to introduce the Fatimid

<sup>129</sup> Cf. Runciman, *History*; Runciman, *First Crusade*; Grousset, *Histoire*.

<sup>130</sup> Raim. Aguil., 109–10 (indirectly confirmed by Hist. bell. sacri, XCIX, 212).

*khutba* in northern and central Syria, in order to secure Egyptian help against his brother Duqaq in Damascus. The exact description of the different negotiating positions demonstrates the high reliability of Raymond of Aguiler's statements: he may himself have spoken to the Frankish envoys. Unfortunately, it is not possible to date the Frankish offer more exactly. Apparently, al-Afdal did not react to the Seljuk offer of alliance that the Latin chronicler described. This corroborates the seriousness of the Egyptian negotiations with the Franks, which obviously seemed more profitable to the wazir than an alliance with the Turks.

The decisive factor against the Frankish offer was, according to Raymond, letters from the Byzantine emperor to the Egyptian court informing them of the weakness of the crusading army and of Alexius Comnenus' hatred of the Franks. These letters were captured when the Egyptian camp was plundered after the battle al-Bissa near Ascalon on 12 August 1099.<sup>131</sup> There can be no doubt about Raymond's central statement, especially as he was not just an eyewitness, but the count of Toulouse's chaplain and probably also occupied with chancery business.<sup>132</sup> It has more than once been established that although the Egyptians were aware of the ethnic distinction between Franks and Greeks, they regarded the Crusade as a Byzantine undertaking in the old style.<sup>133</sup> It was not only the course of the clashes up to the summer of 1098 which must have led al-Afdal to this conclusion. His envoys also found Byzantine troops in the crusading army before Antioch. The Franks were supplied from Byzantine Cyprus, mostly by Byzantine ships. The emperor himself carried out operations in Anatolia and in July 1098 while on march to Antioch. Since the Frankish embassy from Nicaea had travelled to Egypt on Alexius' advice and by way of sea, for which a Greek ship was needed, it is quite possible that the Crusaders' emissaries were joined to a Byzantine embassy. In any case, Greek seamen and interpreters must have accompanied them and for this reason it must have looked like a Byzantine embassy. Probably Alexius had informed the Fatimids even before this of his undertakings against the common Turkish enemies. So al-Afdal probably considered the Franks as being in the service of the Byzantines and consequently as serious treaty partners. Therefore, he sent a counter-embassy to make soundings in the Frankish camp outside Antioch. There a sort of draft treaty was obviously

---

<sup>131</sup> Raim. Aguil., 109–10.

<sup>132</sup> He composed at least the count's letter of 1099 (Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, 167–74). Cf. Hagenmeyer, *Brief*.

<sup>133</sup> Gibb, *Notes*, 740–1; Sivan, *L'Islam*, 25–6; Gabrieli, *Introduction*, 224–5.

negotiated, which promised the Crusaders help and indicated a concession in the question of Jerusalem. That al-Afdal, in order to gain as much as possible from the new situation, should also have ties with neighbouring Muslim states (as the Provençal chronicler reported) is only natural. But it is of primary interest that the Crusaders, like the Egyptians, seemingly engaged in serious negotiations.<sup>134</sup>

What was the course of the contacts between Franks and Fatimids in the following months? On 5 March 1098 Egyptian and Frankish envoys departed together for Egypt, where they must have arrived a few weeks later. In Sha'ban 491/4 July–1 August 1098, certainly after the arrival of the Christian envoys, al-Afdal left Cairo with a strong army, besieged Jerusalem, granted very generous terms for capitulation some forty days later to the city's rulers, Sukman and Ilghazi, and returned home after a short stay in Ascalon.<sup>135</sup> That Egypt attempted to profit from the weakness of the Turks, brought about by the Frankish invasion, is not sufficient explanation for this expedition.<sup>136</sup> Most notably it falls completely outside the existing framework of Fatimid policy in Syria. This, as already shown, had had three objectives in the previous fifteen years: direct rule over the coastal zone, the winning of recognition for the Fatimid caliphate in northern and central Syria and expansion in the south Syrian interior with Damascus rather than Jerusalem as its goal.

An attack on Damascus must have seemed promising in 1098 to a force such as that of al-Afdal. Duqaq must surely have seemed as feeble an opponent to the Egyptians as the Artuqid amirs of Jerusalem after his two heavy battles with the Crusaders. This first was on New Year's Eve of 1097 in combination with Janah al-Dawla at al-Bara and the second on 28 June 1098 with Kirbogha before Antioch. Although Damascus must have had quite another attraction for the Fatimids than the economically and politically insignificant Jerusalem, in 1098 al-Afdal gave priority to the difficult siege of Jerusalem in its arid hills over an attack on Damascus.<sup>137</sup>

---

<sup>134</sup> The exact and detailed report on the Turkish offer to Egypt proves the high degree of authenticity and reliability of Raim. Aguil., 109–10.

<sup>135</sup> Ibn Muyassar, 65–6. Cf. Ibn Zāfir, 82; Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, I, 162; Ibn al-Qalānisī, 135; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 283; Raim. Aguil., 110; Albert of Aix, VI, XXXII, 485.

<sup>136</sup> Albert of Aix, VI, XXXI, 484 and Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 283. For the secondary literature cf. for instance Runciman, *History*, I, 265.

<sup>137</sup> The administrative and economic centre of inland Palestine was not the remote city of Jerusalem, but al-Ramla, which was probably Fatimid. Further to the north Tiberias was significant. In the Muslim period Jerusalem was only of religious significance, and even this should not be overestimated before the mid-twelfth century (Sivan, *Caractère*, 179–82).

Even if al-Afdal had been interested in the conquest of the Palestinian highlands with a view to securing the coast held by Egypt, an operation against weak Damascus would have been more sensible, because after its conquest Jerusalem would have been completely isolated and unable to hold out very long.<sup>138</sup> What, then, was the attraction for al-Afdal of the capture of Jerusalem, since he thereby placed himself in dispute with the Crusaders? The wazir knew from his conversations with the envoys sent from Nicaea, if not earlier, that Jerusalem was the goal of the Franks and he was also aware that Jerusalem was worthless to impede an attack on Egypt. In general, it is remarkable that in spite of the momentary strength of Egypt, no adequate defending force opposed the Franks during their entry into the region of Fatimid suzerainty. It is interesting that in one line of Islamic historical tradition, al-Afdal would have allowed not Jerusalem, but Damascus to be captured in 1098. This report is quite obviously incorrect. It is, however, evidence that some chroniclers could envision Egyptian policy in 1098 only as following the customary course of the previous decades, i.e. as being directed against Damascus.<sup>139</sup>

Both Ekkehard of Aura, who as a pilgrim visited the site of the event two years later, and also the *Historia belli sacri* (c. 1140), report that the members of the Frankish embassy sent to Egypt in March 1098 visited Jerusalem during their absence from the crusading army. Ekkehard says that the ambassadors were present in al-Afdal's besieging army and that he threatened the Artuqid lords of the city, alluding to his Frankish allies, that if they did not surrender the city to him, the Crusaders would fall upon them. On the other hand, the *Historia* says that al-Afdal and a Frankish delegation had seen the miracle of the Holy Fire in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Easter (10 April 1099). The ambassadors may have believed that the purpose of the capture of Jerusalem in their presence was to hand it over to the Crusaders. The wazir, however, had put Jerusalem in a position of defence and then dismissed them with his own ambassadors to 'Arqa.<sup>140</sup> It is not clear how reliable these accounts are, especially as the *Historia* may not be completely independent of Ekkehard. It is known, however, from other sources that after the taking of the city, al-Afdal

---

<sup>138</sup> To besiege Jerusalem was in any case technically difficult, as the Crusaders were to discover, since the barrenness and lack of water presented logistical problems. For this reason al-Afdal sought from the outset for the Artuqids to surrender by generous terms such as gifts and freedom to withdraw.

<sup>139</sup> The oldest source is 'Imād al-Dīn, *Bustān*, 115. Cf. Ibn Abī al-Dam, 138v-39r and Ibn al-Dawādārī, VI, 450.

<sup>140</sup> Ekkehard of Aura, XVI, 3-4, pp. 171-2; *Hist. bell. sacri*, CII-CIII, 214-5.

paid special attention to the Holy Places and the native Christians.<sup>141</sup> All this indicates that Egypt examined very seriously the Crusaders' offer as reported by Raymond of Aguilers. The capture of Jerusalem conformed to the content of the conversations before Antioch and the proposals of the Frankish envoys in Cairo. Al-Afdal attacked the Artuqid lords of Jerusalem, who in the region of Edessa and as allies of Kirbogha had proved themselves to be keen opponents of the Crusaders. As the new lord of Jerusalem, al-Afdal had the chance to purchase concessions with regard to the support of the Crusaders for his plans of revenge against the Turks. It cannot be determined whether al-Afdal had got as far as surrendering the city, granting the Christians a special legal status or only offering freedom of entry for pilgrims and an absence of discrimination against Christians. Even in the first case the gain from an alliance with the Crusaders would have far outweighed the loss of Jerusalem for the Fatimids. It seems plausible that al-Afdal possibly captured Jerusalem in order to be in a better position for negotiating with the Crusaders if two premises are taken into consideration; namely, that already during the eleventh century Jerusalem and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre had played an important part in negotiations between the Byzantines and the Fatimids and furthermore that since al-Afdal saw the Crusade as a Byzantine undertaking, he had no fear of the establishment of a kingdom of Jerusalem as a new political power in Palestine.

Until the summer of 1099, the talk among the Franks was still only of the liberation of the Holy Places. The phrase *terra sancta*, by contrast, implying a Christian claim to the possession of all Palestine and the coastal region of northern Syria, still makes no appearance whatsoever in the accounts by eyewitnesses of the First Crusade. Relevant to this is the demand of the Franks to al-Afdal, according to Raymond of Aguilers, for the cession of Jerusalem *cum pertinenciis suis*, which in accordance with the contemporary administrative structure could mean, not the whole of Palestine, but at most the non-Egyptian Palestinian highlands, i.e. the Artuqid lordship. Various elements indicate that no clear ideas held sway among the Crusaders concerning Jerusalem and that they might possibly have been satisfied with the cession of those territories near to Jerusalem that the Emperor Frederick II obtained in his treaty of 1229 with the

---

<sup>141</sup> Raim. Aguil., 110; Albert of Aix, VI, XXXII, 485. According to William of Tyre, VII, XXIII, 314–5, there was discrimination against the Christians before the Crusaders' attack, as it was feared that they would collaborate with the Franks.

Ayyubid Sultan al-Malik al-Kamil.<sup>142</sup> These elements include the speedy advance of the crusading army on Jerusalem without any methodical conquest of Palestine as a whole, the fact that until immediately before the taking of the city there were no legal notions about its later fate, the low number of Franks staying there as well as the previous realization of the territorial ambitions of individual Frankish princes in northern Syria.

In this connection it is instructive that Muslim chroniclers beginning with Ibn Zafir, one of the earliest and best reporters of this period, also believed in an Egyptian interest in cooperation with the Crusaders. The Wazir al-Afdal, it is said, regretted after the creation of a Frankish state in Jerusalem that he had weakened the Muslim cause with his operations of 1098. This regret, thinks Ibn Zafir, was thoroughly out of place, since al-Afdal himself had shown a sympathetic attitude to the Frankish invasion of the Palestinian coastal region, as he wished to install them as a buffer against renewed Turkish attacks on the Nile valley. Al-Afdal therefore did not want to limit the Crusaders to northern Syria; on the other hand, he was not interested in a strong Frankish state that would threaten Egypt no less than the Turks.<sup>143</sup> This position no longer appears so inconsistent as it seemed at first sight, if one calls to mind the previous findings: that al-Afdal's negotiations with the Franks seemed to enable him to restore Egyptian rule in Syria, that the Franks had still no idea of setting up a strong state in Palestine, but were solely concerned with Jerusalem as a holy city and finally that in the preceding decades there had been precedents for negotiations with the Byzantines over the status of the Holy Places. As mentioned, the wazir had every reason to connect the Crusade with Byzantium.

Nevertheless, the negotiations between the Franks and the Fatimids came to nothing. The Frankish embassy was detained in Egypt, which Raymond of Aguilers ascribes to the Byzantine emperor's letters to al-Afdal. Lilie has cast doubt on the existence of this correspondence and of the whole of Raymond's account, ascribing it to the anti-Greek bias of the chronicler. He argues that no other sources confirm Raymond and that his report is illogical, firstly because Byzantium had no reason to incite Egypt against the Crusaders and the Fatimids would not have agreed to a proposal such as Raymond described, since it would have violated their

---

<sup>142</sup> The Christian sources express disappointment that al-Afdal did not voluntarily give away Jerusalem: Raim. Aguil., 110; Ekkehard of Aura, XVI, 4, p. 171; Albert of Aix, VI, XXXII, 485.

<sup>143</sup> Ibn Zāfir, 82. Cf. Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 273.

hemisphere; secondly, because there is no reason for al-Afdal to have taken the emperor's letters with him to Ascalon, where they are said to have been captured.<sup>144</sup> These arguments against Raymond are unconvincing. It has already been shown that Egypt could have drawn much profit from the Crusaders' offer and also Byzantine diplomacy had taken up the question of the Holy Places before the Crusade. Al-Afdal's capture of Jerusalem is only to be understood against the background of the Frankish offers. Furthermore, Raymond possessed in his position all the prerequisites to be well informed. Had his account of the capture of the Byzantine letters rested on invention pure and simple, such an audacious untruth would surely not have remained uncontradicted among the numerous eyewitnesses who read his work. That other sources give no information about the letters proves little. By contrast, Oriental sources believe that Alexius repeatedly conspired against the Crusaders, although on other occasions.<sup>145</sup>

Furthermore, the Byzantines no longer had any control over the Crusade after July 1098. The Byzantine troops in the army had withdrawn before Kirbogha's arrival. Thereafter Alexius Comnenus was concerned to prevent the creation of autonomous Frankish lordships, as Lilie himself observes. He demanded the handing over of Antioch without allowing it to come to an open breach and endeavoured to hinder the departure of the Crusade. Hence, it is only natural that Alexius was also interested from 1098 in preventing a possible alliance between the Crusaders and the Egyptians. Finally, that al-Afdal brought the Byzantine correspondence to Ascalon is more probable than otherwise. Although the Crusaders first rejected at 'Arqa his offer to allow unarmed pilgrims free access to Jerusalem and developments moved towards a conflict between Franks and Fatimids, the Egyptians seemed not to have given up hope of a diplomatic solution. Ibn al-Athir and Ibn Muyassar (d. 677/1278), who are among the best informed chroniclers of the history of the period, report that directly before the battle of al-Bissa an envoy was sent to the Franks, censuring them for the taking of Jerusalem.<sup>146</sup> In spite of the hardening of the Egyptian position during the conversations at 'Arqa, the Fatimids probably still

---

<sup>144</sup> Lilie, *Byzanz*, 51–2.

<sup>145</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, X, 273; Chronicon ad A.C. 1234 pertinens, II, 40.

<sup>146</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, X, 286 and Ibn Muyassar, 67, lack corroboration. However, since both conform fully with Christian sources in regard to the events of the conquest of Jerusalem, the statement has a certain value.

believed in a negotiated solution until the summer of 1099. Apparently, the Frankish siege of Jerusalem surprised them. It is thus plausible that al-Afdal should have brought the papers concerning the Franks with him from his chancery.

Having regard to the state of the sources, all considerations of supra-regional relationships during the First Crusade rest on circumstantial evidence. Raymond of Aguilers' description of the course of negotiations, however, seems well-founded. As long as Egypt judged the Crusade to be a Byzantine undertaking for the recovery of territory, al-Afdal was ready to resume the entente with Byzantium, which had been effective as late as the second third of the eleventh century. He was also prepared to make some concessions in regard to Jerusalem which would hardly have been painful compared to the expected profit. A letter from the emperor dating from late summer or early autumn 1098 had made the Fatimids aware of the breach between Byzantium and Crusaders in the meantime. From the Egyptian point of view, the Franks had become a freely acting power which no longer had full Byzantine support. Since Egypt had as little interest as Byzantium in the founding of Frankish states, which would threaten Egypt like the creation of the Turkish lordships two decades before, al-Afdal gave up his plans for an alliance. The Frankish envoys lost their accreditation in al-Afdal's eyes with the letter from Byzantium and were detained following Islamic usage, which stipulated the nullification of the immunity of unaccredited envoys. Only when the Crusaders began to penetrate the Fatimid sphere of influence at 'Arqa did al-Afdal endeavour to neutralize the danger arising from the Franks. For this he not only made military preparations in Palestine, but he also sent gifts, released the envoys and offered freedom of pilgrimage for the Crusaders. However, he could not surrender Jerusalem, since an autonomous Frankish state founded in the south would most probably not be satisfied with Jerusalem. The Crusaders reacted sharply to the wazir's offer that was, compared with his earlier promises, very limited. They deemed themselves betrayed and seriously discussed an attack on Egypt at al-Ramla at the beginning of June 1099. This scheme failed on account of the weakness of the available forces and of the *peregrinis'* pressure finally to proceed to Jerusalem. For this reason the Franks also left the Fatimid coastal towns south of Tripoli unmolested.<sup>147</sup> The Crusaders were uninterested in attacks on

---

<sup>147</sup> Al-Ramla: Raim. Aguil., 136–7. With 'Arqa and Antartus the Crusaders reached the region in which the Fatimid *khutba* was recognized.

these places and skirmishes occurred only in the surroundings of Sidon. During the fortnight the Franks needed to travel from 'Arqa to al-Ramla, treaties were concluded with Beirut and Acre. In both cases, the Crusaders were provided with food after they had promised not to destroy the crop. The Crusaders obtained assurance on oath that in the event of their victory over the Fatimids, those places would be surrendered or at least placed under Frankish suzerainty.<sup>148</sup> Nothing more clearly demonstrates that under the pressure of the *peregrini* the advance to Jerusalem had precedence. Since the treaty with Tripoli, the princes were forced to set aside their endeavours to establish states and to be satisfied with unsure promises of later surrender.

In summary, at the time of the arrival of the First Crusade in northern Syria Pope Urban II and the Emperor Alexius Comnenus lost all direct influence on the execution of the enterprise. In the course of the preaching of the Crusade since 1095, the idea of the liberation of Jerusalem had taken the place of the original plan of coming to the help of Byzantium against the Turkish attacks. The religious emotions aroused by the propaganda for the Crusade, as well as the dire economic situation in France at the end of the eleventh century and ever-present feuds, inadequately restrained by the Truce of God movement, resulted in the inclusion in the crusading movement of great bodies of unarmed pilgrims to Jerusalem, *pauperes* or *peregrini*. From the summer of 1097 and the taking of Nicaea, the remainder of these bands together with the contingents of knights of the different princes formed the crusading army, in which their numbers surpassed those of the knights many times. The Crusaders of knightly and aristocratic origin were differentiated into two groups, one which understood the Crusade as above all an armed pilgrimage and another which was primarily concerned with the taking of land and the foundation of lordships. To the latter belonged the Lorrainers Godfrey and Baldwin, the Norman Bohemond and the Provençal Raymond. It became clear that the divergence of interests between these two groups stamped the further course of the Crusade, at latest from the siege of Antioch in the winter of 1097–98. As leader of the *peregrini*, Raymond of Toulouse found himself in a particularly precarious situation. The pressure of the pilgrims to advance on Jerusalem made it impossible for him to establish a lordship in the north.

---

<sup>148</sup> Caffaro, IX, 56. Beirut: Albert of Aix, V, XXXIX, 458. Acre: Raim. Aguil., 135.

What does this signify for the relations of the Crusaders with the indigenous peoples and the amirs and rulers of the Muslim states in the Middle East? Obviously, the Crusaders did indeed regard the Muslims as heathen and the idea of slaying the heathen was thoroughly pervasive in the treatment of defeated Muslims, especially among the *pauperes*, *peregrini* and the Provençals. Frankish conduct was more flexible only if it was a case, as in Saruj, of the foundation of a lordship and if there was no pressure from the part of the simple pilgrims. Yet on the other hand, similar structures were ascribed to the Islamic world and to the Christian commonwealth. Not least because there was supposed to be a genealogical relationship between Franks and Turks, and the military performance of the Turks was impressive, it was not hard for the Frankish chivalry to recognize their opponents as of equal status. The consciousness of this equality of status among knights probably made it simpler to enter into treaty relations with individual Muslim rulers in spite of the widespread heathen-killing mentality among the Crusaders. For this there were two motives. In the first place, Frankish-Muslim treaties served the purpose of the foundation of states. In both cases in which the acquisition of land took place in the neighbourhood of Muslim lordships, alliances and treaties accompanied this, which came into existence from a position of Frankish strength and from Muslim initiative. Oaths and hostages secured these treaties and they mostly included the Muslim payment of tribute. The conversion of the Muslim party might have been made a requirement for the conclusion of the treaty only in the case of Tripoli—but it is very significant that this served tactical aims only and was not grounded on religious scruples. The demand was later allowed to lapse. In the second place, several treaties secured the unhindered advance of the Franks to Jerusalem on which the *peregrini* insisted. In some cases this resulted in the placing of Muslim lordships under Frankish suzerainty, quite certainly in the case of Maraqqiyya, possibly also in that of Tripoli and Beirut. This was manifested in the payment of tribute and the raising of Frankish banners on the city walls. It is difficult to decide whether the treaties were purely a matter of neutrality and peace or whether the Muslim party understood these treaties (which have been transmitted only in Latin sources) also as subordination to Frankish overlordship. The Crusaders themselves always considered all treaty partners as their tributaries and justified the conclusion of the agreements to the pope by the small number of their troops.<sup>149</sup>

---

<sup>149</sup> Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, 170.

Equally, no hesitation in the conclusion of treaties with the Crusaders can be ascertained on the Muslim side. Small lordships offered little resistance to the Crusade; they provided guides as well as hostages and even sold military goods. In this way they continued their policy of neutrality, which in the three previous decades they had pursued during the conflicts among the Seljuks and those between the Turks and the Fatimids. Aleppo and Damascus concluded no agreements with the Franks.<sup>150</sup> If, however, the evidence of the sources is not misleading, the Crusader princes were also ready for supra-regional diplomatic contacts to secure the success of their undertaking. The first impulse to this came very probably from Byzantium. If the relevant circumstantial evidence is close to the actual development, the Franks and Egypt were ready for a far-reaching alliance against the Turks; even the ways of partitioning rule and the joint possession of captured cities were discussed. Egypt integrated the Crusade into its conception of the recovery of the Syrian possessions lost to the Turks. The taking of Jerusalem by the Wazir al-Afdal in the summer of 1098 can plausibly be explained only as the consequence of an alliance between the Franks and the Fatimids. The causes of the failure of these contacts are to be found in the fact that the Egyptians were informed of the discord between Byzantium and the Crusaders and started to fear the establishment of a Crusader lordship in Palestine. It was not the princes who aspired to establish states, but the mass of simple pilgrims who urged on the march to Jerusalem who prevented a union with Egypt.

Thus, an abundance of relations through treaties, alliances and perhaps even suzerainties arose already during the First Crusade. The variety of interests of the groups participating in the Crusade and the idea of the equality of status between Frankish and Turkish knights facilitated this development. The Syrian system of autonomous lordships in 1098–99, in turn, favoured the treaty policy of individual Frankish leaders. The rivalry between the great metropolitan cities and the lack of a supreme power contributed to the fact that the Crusaders did not confront a united Muslim Syria. The traditional policy of neutrality of the petty Arab lordships of central Syria and the antagonism between Fatimids and Turks (both marked out as specific characteristics of this system) were congenial to the Frankish interest in treaties. The Crusaders were integrated as a new element in the structure of alliances and conflicts in the Middle East—and apparently allowed themselves to be integrated without difficulty.

---

<sup>150</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 275.

The factors which favoured or impeded the treaty policy during the First Crusade—such as the endeavour to extend and secure states or the difference of interests between founders of states and pilgrims—must be kept in mind when investigating Frankish-Muslim relationships in the twelfth century. The events from 1097 to 1099 give a first impression of the subsequent Frankish-Muslim relationships in the twelfth century.



## CHAPTER TWO

### RELATIONS BETWEEN THE FRANKISH, TURKISH AND ARAB STATES IN THE PERIOD OF THE SYRIAN AUTONOMOUS RULERS (1098–1158)

Western scholars have chronologically divided the history of the first Latin kingdom of Jerusalem in different ways. Historians of the Crusades as a rule saw a turning-point in the years 1144–48, i.e. when the Turks captured Edessa and the Second Crusade took place. This applies for example to Runciman, Setton or Mayer.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, works concerned with the history of the Frankish states, generally designated as ‘the Crusader states’, modified this scheme by additional period boundaries. The concept of a history of Crusader states as a history of rulers in the older literature, particularly by Röhricht and Grousset, led to the stressing of the death-dates of strong rulers such as Baldwin I (1118), Amalric I and Nur al-Din (both 1174) as further breaks.<sup>2</sup> Subsequent research has to a large extent taken over this periodization but also legitimated it differently. According to Runciman and Setton, the establishment of the Crusader states was concluded c. 1118; according to Sivan, the first attempts at Muslim resistance ended at this time and the entry of the sovereigns upon the scene emerged as something new.<sup>3</sup>

A concern to establish ‘leading ideas’ unmistakably marked almost all chronologies. Grousset thought it was possible to arrange such ideas in a dialectic between monarchy and anarchy on the Muslim and Frankish sides. For Praver, an awakening of the Muslim world followed the foundation of the Frankish states, from which finally resulted a balance of power.<sup>4</sup> Sivan believed that the development of Muslim resistance to the Franks could be observed from the ‘first attempts’ to the ‘apogee’ with Saladin. The thesis of Ben-Ami is similarly directed. According to this, a reciprocal strengthening of the spirit of Holy War on the Muslim as on the Frankish side led to a reinforcement of monarchical centralism and also

---

<sup>1</sup> Runciman, *History*, esp. vol. 2; Setton, *History*; Mayer, *Crusades*.

<sup>2</sup> Röhricht, *Geschichte*; Grousset, *Histoire*.

<sup>3</sup> Sivan, *L'Islam*. The only exception is the periodisation in Richard, *Royaume Latin*.

<sup>4</sup> Praver, *Histoire*, I, 395.

to the rise of charismatic movements, e.g. the knightly Orders, displacing the conventional elite of Syria.<sup>5</sup>

In this connection, a distinctive terminology with concepts such as 'awakening' or 'rousing' is often employed in order to describe the development of specific ideas. It seems that models of this kind have as their basis a teleological concept of Frankish and Muslim history in Syria, looking back from the end of the first Latin kingdom of Jerusalem after the battle of Hattin on 3/4 July 1187. Thus, conditions in the twelfth century became more or less clearly represented as the confrontation of blocs, Islam and Christendom, the course of which led to a union of the Muslim potential and thereby in the eyes of many authors necessarily to victory over the Christians.<sup>6</sup> Here it may only be noted that it should be thoroughly considered whether events such as the battle of Hattin and the consequent Ayyubid conquests, or the Third Crusade, provided meaningful breaks in the history of the Frankish states in the Middle East. They only partially affected the Frankish lordships and in general they did not alter the structure of their relations with the neighbouring Muslim states. As far as the latter point is concerned, the breaks of 1174, 1183 or 1192–3 are of greater significance.

The Latin and the Arabic chronicles developed already to some extent a similar teleological concept of history. In connection with the enthronement of Baldwin IV in Jerusalem in 1174, William of Tyre reflected on the reasons why the Muslims had pushed the Franks on to the defensive. Was the blame due to the sinfulness of the present generation, the vanished military superiority over Muslims who had lost the capacity to fight by a long period of peace or above all to the end of the fragmentation of the Muslim rulers? The individual Muslim cities had previously had independent rival lords. To fight against them had offered comparatively little danger, for the individual city-lords had felt no less fear of their Muslim competitors than of the Franks. In these circumstances, alliances against the Christians had been prevented. Only when 'Imad al-Din Zengi had taken Edessa and Nur al-Din Damascus, and united previously autonomous lordships in their hands, had a new situation arisen.<sup>7</sup>

Muslim Arabic historians also thought in similar categories of blocs and unification. Among them was the Damascene biographer of Zengi,

---

<sup>5</sup> Ben-Ami, *Social Change*, 121 and 158.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. for instance Elisséeff, *Nūr ad-Dīn*, II, 290/1.

<sup>7</sup> William of Tyre, XXI, VII, 1015/16.

Nur al-Din and Saladin, Abu Shama. His concept was clearly of this kind when, based on a passage of Ibn al-Athir's pro-Zengid *History of the Atabegs* of Mosul, he described the situation of Muslim Syria at the end of the first third of the twelfth century in these gloomy terms: 'The lands of the Franks had spread, their troops had increased, their tyranny had grown, their hands stretched out towards the lands of the Muslims. Those who dwelt there had become too weak to prevent their attacks and their raiding continued incessantly.' Abu Shama further explains that the Frankish realm reached from Mardin in the east to Egypt. The routes linking Mesopotamia to Damascus were almost wholly severed, while taxes, protection money, condominiums (*munāṣafāt*) and the liberation of Christian slaves were wrung out of the Muslims. But then God looked graciously on the land of the Muslims and installed 'Imad al-Din Zengi as ruler. He had carried out raids into the heart of the Frankish lands, liberated fortresses and castles and avenged in blood the asserters of God's unity.<sup>8</sup>

The theory of a concentrated Frankish attack on the Islamic world, which after Spain and Sicily started in the East with the First Crusade, may be in the background of this concept of Abu Shama. Al-Sulami and a century later Ibn al-Athir in his universal chronicle, *al-Kamil*, represented this theory. In his tract about the *jihad*, composed directly after the start of the twelfth century, the Damascene jurist al-Sulami attempted to formulate a programme of Muslim reaction to the recent emergence of the Frankish states.<sup>9</sup> In addition to the moral rearmament of individual Muslims, the taking of *ad hoc* military measures such as an alliance between Egypt and Damascus and operations in support of the blockaded Muslim coastal cities, al-Sulami saw in the uniting of all the Muslim local rulers the long-term means of driving out the Franks. At the end of his argumentation, the ideal of a Muslim state united under the caliph shines out.

Eight decades later all the Muslim territories from Egypt to the Tigris lay in fact directly or indirectly in a single hand, that of Saladin. Previously, 'Imad al-Din Zengi and his son Nur al-Din had retrieved between 1128 and 1174 extensive tracts of land from the Franks in northern Syria. Is it, as al-Sulami implied, that the clash between Latin Christendom and Islam on the one hand and the unification of the Islamic world on the other were the 'leading ideas' (in a Rankean sense)<sup>10</sup> in twelfth-century Syria?

<sup>8</sup> Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/1, 76–7.

<sup>9</sup> Al-Sulamī, ed. and tr. by Sivan, *Génèse*; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 182/3.

<sup>10</sup> Ranke, *Epochen*, 9.

Did the Islamic history of Syria follow a preconceived programme? Ayyubid propaganda sought to raise this impression from about 1174, employing Saladin's *jihad* to legitimate his claim to sovereignty and impugning the claims of his rivals. It is the aim of the following investigation to analyse this historical image with reference to the relations between the Syrian local lordships. Do they deviate from earlier models? Can doctrines of policy concerning alliances, treaties and confrontation be investigated? Who propagated them, who combated them and what were their motives? It is to clarify whether Frankish 'expansionism' prevented the emergence of a Frankish-Muslim system of autonomous lordships and how the Frankish states reacted to the so-called unification of Islam. Did the various policies of Frankish-Muslim alliances remain an episode during the First Crusade? Finally, can the policy of Frankish states be described as Christian, and that of Turkish and Arab states as Islamic, in the sense of traditional concepts of the Holy War on the one side and of *jihad* on the other?

THE TERRITORIAL EXPANSION OF THE FRANKISH LORDSHIPS  
AND THEIR INTEGRATION (1098–1112/13)

From the investigation of the alliances and treaties which the Crusaders concluded from 1097 to 1099 with Muslim rulers in northern and central Syria, it is already clear what fields of interest and what motives of economics or power-politics on both the Frankish and the Muslim side led to truces and even to alliances. In the present section, it will be asked whether or how far the Crusaders' seizure of land altered the antagonism between regional lordships, the basic plan of which was sketched at the beginning of this work. Can one speak of an integration of the Frankish states in the previously existing constellation of powers? Or were conflicts between Christians and Muslims after 1099 the chief characteristic of politics in Syria, in accordance with the theories of the Holy War and the *jihad*? At least the majority of the chronicles which appeared after the end of the twelfth century, especially those in Arabic, adopted this interpretation. Were the 'internal' disputes among the Franks and among the Muslims basically different from those between Franks and Muslims?

The following investigation covers the period to 1112–13, i.e. up to the firm establishment of Frankish rule in Edessa, Antioch, Jerusalem and Tripoli. The two years 1112–13 moreover mark approximately the break to the period in which the campaigns of Turkish armies from outside Syria led to new developments of the policy regarding alliances and treaties.

Since the foundation of lordships and the contacts between Franks and Muslims in northern and central Syria took place independently of one another in time, and under different structural conditions, the two topics will at first be handled separately.

The political history of northern Syria in the phase of the establishment of the Frankish lordships, and the consolidation of their central territorial holdings after the First Crusade, has been described in detail in the literature and needs not to be repeated here.<sup>11</sup> Only two problems are of interest. First, what changes did the Frankish acquisition of land bring for the mutual relations of the centres of supra-regional significance, Antioch, Edessa, Aleppo, Hims and also the principalities in the catchment area of the Orontes? Secondly, how can one characterize the use of treaties and diplomacy, with the aid of which developed the relations of the Norman state in Antioch and the Lorrainer state of Edessa further to the north-east with their Muslim neighbours, and how were they motivated? To answer these two questions, the relations between Antioch and Aleppo will be taken as an example. After the failure of the negotiations in Rugia between the Frankish princes over the sharing of power in northern Syria, and the departure of the main body of the Crusaders to the south about the end of the year 1098, Antioch was in the possession of Bohemond I and his Norman followers. Thereby in the two most important cities of northern Syria, Aleppo and Antioch, a Muslim Turkish and a Frankish (or more precisely, a Norman) ruler confronted one another. Their common ground lay in the fact that both were drawn from knightly elites, distinct from their urban, rural and Bedouin subjects in ethnicity, language and partly also religion. If one traces the relationship between Antioch and Aleppo to the time of the first Turkish campaigns to Syria from the east, often designated 'counter-Crusades', and to the end of the lives of the two outstanding princes, Tancred of Antioch and Ridwan b. Tutush of Aleppo (1112–13), five distinct phases stand out.

During the first phase, from 1098 to 1100, the Normans expanded from Antioch south-eastwards into the territories around Sarmin, Zardana and Ma'arrat al-Nu'man. With the defeat which they inflicted on the forces of Ridwan at Kalla in July 1100, they were able to consolidate for the time being their supremacy in this region. According to Ibn al-'Adim, Bohemond thereupon not only launched more extensive raids, but even made

---

<sup>11</sup> Yewdale, *Bohemond I*, 87–102; Nicholson, *Tancred*, 127–224; Cahen, *Syrie*, 227–266.

preparations for besieging Aleppo.<sup>12</sup> In the following three years from 1100 to 1103, the second phase exactly corresponding to the time when Bohemond was a prisoner of the Turkish Amir Ibn Danishmend, numerous Norman conquests must have been given up. Yet, they were lost not to Ridwan, but to his old rival Janah al-Dawla of Hims. Tancred, who was regent in Antioch from the spring of 1101, sought battle only with the Byzantines in Cilicia and Latakia, not with Muslim rulers, until his uncle's release.

Only after Bohemond's return to Antioch was a regular agreement achieved between Antioch and Aleppo (1103). Lorrainer and Norman troops responded to a raid by the Aleppine governor of 'Azaz with the capture of al-Muslimiyya (15 km. north of Aleppo) and levied tribute (*qata'i'*) from the surrounding territories. Finally they entered into negotiations with Ridwan, which led to an agreement. For 7,000 dinars and ten horses the Franks released their prisoners with the exception of the amirs. Different sources indicate that a more extensive peace settlement was reached in al-Muslimiyya than is expressly known since it is evident that thereafter Bohemond taxed the tracts of land of al-'Awasim and Qinnasrin to the north-west and south-west of Aleppo.<sup>13</sup> Our knowledge of this first treaty between Antioch and Aleppo assumes a wider dimension if one brings in the report of the geographer Ibn Shaddad, which rests on the statement of the Shiite historian Ibn Abi Tayy'. Both of them came from Aleppo. According to this author, the clauses of the peace treaty (*musalaha*) required of the Aleppines, in addition to an annual tribute (*qati'a*) paid in money and horses, the installation of a bell in the citadel mosque and the erection of a cross on its minaret. The bell was actually rung for years at twilight, midnight and daybreak. The cross, however, on the intervention of the *ra'is*, the Qadi Ibn al-Khashshab, and after consultation with the Franks, was transferred to the church of St. Helena, where it was to be seen as late as 1124.<sup>14</sup> Accordingly, in 1103 Bohemond I concluded a treaty which made Ridwan a tributary of Antioch for an unspecified period and insisted on emphasizing the dependence of Aleppo through the ostentatious presence of Christian symbols in the residence of his treaty partner. The question whether the cross and bell served as tokens of lordship and were to make Norman suzerainty clear will concern us later.

<sup>12</sup> Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 143-4.

<sup>13</sup> Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 145-6; Ibn al-Athir, *Kamil*, X, 345.

<sup>14</sup> 'Izz al-Din b. Shaddad, *A'lāq* (Aleppo), 40-1.

In the third phase between 1104 and 1106, fighting between Aleppo and Antioch broke out anew after the debacle of the campaign of Lorrainers and Normans against Harran, which ended with the overwhelming defeat of the Franks on the Balikh (7 May 1104) at the hands of the Amirs Chokurmish of Mosul and Sukman b. Artuq. Tancred, who was again regent after the departure of Bohemond to Europe, and was also temporarily the lord of Edessa after the battle of Balikh as a result of the capture of Baldwin II, however, reversed all the Turkish gains after his victory over Ridwan at Artah. When Ridwan turned against Chokurmish of Mosul, in May at latest, there existed again a truce (*hudna*) between the two sides. It may be supposed that in 1106 only the agreement of al-Muslimiyya (1103) had been continued.<sup>15</sup> Tancred may incidentally have offered a treaty (*sulh*) shortly before the battle of Artah.<sup>16</sup>

From the summer of 1106 until the end of 1110, the fourth phase, peace prevailed between Tancred and Ridwan. The unsuccessful rebellion of the governor Khutlugh in 503/1109–10 only briefly disturbed this state of affairs. He was prepared to make an exchange of 'Azaz with the Normans. After the acquisition of Famiya on the Orontes, in this space of time Tancred's operations were directed against the Byzantines in 1106–7 and 1109–10, the amirs of Shayzar in 1108 and 1110 and the dominions of the 'Ammar family of *qadis* on the coast in 1109 and 1110, but not against Aleppo. On the contrary, the years from 1108 to 1110 marked a period of intensive military cooperation between Normans and Aleppo. It was the result, for one thing, of Tancred's intention to return Edessa to Count Baldwin II on his release from Muslim captivity only in return for an oath of vassalage. Its second main cause lay in the rivalry between Ridwan and Jawali Saqao of Mosul over supremacy on the Euphrates.

The conflict of Normans and Lorrainers in 1108 was far more than only a feudal dispute among Franks and it forcibly emphasizes that the Frankish treaty and alliance policies were part of the history of the entire north Syrian and north Mesopotamian region. The direct aim of Baldwin II, the restoration of his county of Edessa, was indeed attained through the arbitration of the patriarch of Antioch in September 1108, after the Lorrainers and their Armenian ally Kogh Vasil had repeatedly raided the territory of Antioch. This restored the *status quo ante*, but it did not put an end to

<sup>15</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 157; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 405–6.

<sup>16</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 393; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 150–1 has no report on this matter.

the confrontation between Normans and Lorrainers. For Baldwin owed his release through Jawali to the fact that the Turk urgently needed supporters for his struggle against the Amir Mawdud, whom Sultan Muhammad (1105–18) had sent against him. Baldwin's promise of help for Jawali had been the most important condition of his release. With this alliance, Jawali became directly involved in the conflict between Edessa and Antioch. On the other hand, Jawali's own attack on Ridwan of Aleppo involved Baldwin and Joscelin I of Courtenay, the lord of Turbessel, in the Turkish power struggle on the Euphrates, and thereby in a new clash with Tancred. The course of this struggle, in which Tancred and Ridwan were victorious, is here not of such great interest as the arguments with which Ridwan persuaded Tancred to support him against Jawali. Ridwan may have suspected that Jawali was endeavouring to capture Aleppo. If he succeeds, he is said to have explained to Tancred that 'there remains for the Franks together with himself no longer a place (*la maqam*) in Syria. [...] It is right that we, thou and I, should be one against him to drive him out of these territories.'<sup>17</sup> In the ruler of Aleppo's argument we find one of the first instances of a kind of common strategic thinking of the Syrian local states, which was to underlie the entente between the Burids of Damascus and the kingdom of Jerusalem against Zengid expansionism three decades later.

The fifth phase from 1110 to 1112–13 makes clear the limits of this way of thinking. The alliance between Aleppo and Antioch lasted just as long as Jawali's attempts to establish a foothold in Syria with the help of his Lorrainer allies. When in 1110 the Turks under Mawdud, who had forced Jawali out of Mosul two years before, inflicted a severe defeat on the united Franks on the Euphrates, this was the signal for Ridwan to drive the Normans out of the territories south-west of Aleppo. What followed strongly resembles the events of the years 1104–5. Tancred quickly succeeded in reconquering all the places just lost, including the castles of al-Atharib and Zardana and then concluded a treaty (*sulh, muwada'a*) over the clauses of which the sources differ. Very probably he again obliged Aleppo to release prisoners and to render an annual tribute in money, horses and textiles.<sup>18</sup> Tancred had to go again to al-Atharib at harvest time in 1111 to push through the contents of the treaty conditions.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Ibn Abī Ṭayy' in Ibn al-Furāt, I (ed. Shamy), 86/7, arab. 53. Similar in Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 464–5.

<sup>18</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 170–1; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 482; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 155–6.

<sup>19</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 157.

Nevertheless, when a new danger from the east threatened the Frankish and Muslim dominions in Syria, the relationship between Aleppo and Antioch became close again. In the summer of 1111, Ridwan refused to support the army of a Turkish coalition under Mawdud, referring to the treaty concluded with Antioch. The Turks took their revenge with frightful devastation in Ridwan's lands and (at least according to Albert of Aix) killed his son while he was a hostage.<sup>20</sup> Ridwan's behaviour seems all the more informative if one takes two things into account. In the first place, Mawdud's advance was in response to the uproar of an Aleppine deputation in Baghdad composed of traders and religious personalities, which had complained particularly of the supposed superiority of the Franks as displayed in the conquest of Tripoli and the treaties of 1110–11.<sup>21</sup> In the second place, Ridwan enforced his neutrality against his own subjects and demanded hostages of the townspeople, forbade them access to the walls and relied upon a Nizari militia which was devoted to him and (in the view of the chroniclers) upon criminal elements for defence.<sup>22</sup> After the withdrawal of the army of the Turkish coalition, tension flared up again between Aleppo and Antioch until Tancred's death in 1112. The Normans captured 'Azaz and refused a truce. Ridwan reacted by concluding an alliance with Tughtegin of Damascus.<sup>23</sup>

After this survey, relations between Franks and Turks in the first decade and a half following the arrival of the First Crusade in northern Syria can be described in more general terms. The military actions between Antioch and Aleppo were almost all typical raids directed at the castles and territories south and north of both cities. They are in no way different from the campaigns of the Turkish lords of both states before 1098. In this sense, it was the natural catchment areas of both cities that were disputed before and after 1098. The possession of these territories was of strategic interest, but above all significant because their produce enabled the respective rulers of both states to maintain larger contingents of troops.<sup>24</sup> After the Norman acquisition of territory, there were at first no direct attacks on either Antioch or Aleppo. On the contrary, during much of the time from 1098 to 1112 treaties for fixed periods secured in accordance with Islamic usage an armistice (lat. *amicitia*; arab. *sulh*, *muwada'a*, *hudna*), for

<sup>20</sup> Albert of Aix, XI, XXXIX, 682; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 486.

<sup>21</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 173; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 483; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 157.

<sup>22</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 175; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 159–60.

<sup>23</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 163; Albert of Aix, XI, XLIII, 684.

<sup>24</sup> Ralph of Caen, CLIV, 714.

which tribute-payments or hostages for outstanding sums were imposed on Aleppo. The clashes between Normans and Byzantines in the north, Normans and Provençals in the south, and the struggle of various Turkish lords about power over Mosul and on the Euphrates decided the history of northern Syria, not the conflict between Antioch and Aleppo. It is further evident that the treaties, in addition to their economic significance for the provisioning of the towns and the financing of troops, helped the rulers to avoid fighting several opponents at the same time. The truces could even end in alliances between Franks and Turks, for Tancred and Ridwan, facing a common threat to their position, did not shrink from acting jointly in 1108 and somewhat less clearly in 1111. Such readiness for a pragmatic policy of coexistence—shown here for the example of Antioch and Aleppo—was not in any way exceptional.

Ibn Danishmend released Bohemond I from captivity in 1103. There had previously been an extensive diplomatic tug-of-war between the Byzantine emperor, the Turkish sultan of Konya, the Frankish count of Edessa and the Armenian prince Kogh Vasil. All of them attempted either to share in the ransom money or to get possession of Bohemond by means of the highest possible offer. Ibn Danishmend finally gave preference to the treaty terms proposed by Bohemond himself over a financially more attractive offer from Constantinople, as Bohemond not only committed himself in 1103 to a payment of 100,000 besants but also to an alliance against Byzantium and Konya. In his description of this agreement, Albert of Aix, whose sources are unknown, makes use of expressions which leave no doubt of the vassal-like position combined with military duties for which Bohemond declared himself prepared on behalf of Ibn Danishmend.<sup>25</sup> One further example is when Tancred succeeded in acquiring Famiya on the Orontes on 14 September 1106. The Nizaris, who were under orders from the Qadi Abu al-Fath (or Abu al-Qinij) of Sarmin and who were in league with Aleppo, had previously murdered the ruler of the city, Khalaf b. Mula'ib.<sup>26</sup> The surrender of the city is of interest for several reasons. During the siege, Tancred's retinue included two sons of the murdered ruler: Musbih, who had sought flight to Shayzar from the murderers, and his brother, who hastened north from service in Damascus to avenge his father. Both spurred Tancred on against the Nizaris. He had already stood

<sup>25</sup> Albert of Aix, XI, XXXV, 612.

<sup>26</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Bughya*, 129–30; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 208–210.

briefly before Famiya in the spring of 1106. They made an alliance with him and were rewarded for their wartime service.<sup>27</sup>

It is also noteworthy that Tancred did not take Famiya by force of arms. Instead of this, he concluded terms of surrender and a safe conduct with Abu Tahir, the leader of the Nizaris from Aleppo. This secured future payments of tribute to Tancred and guaranteed safety of life and limb for Abu Tahir as well as security for the inhabitants. Tancred pushed the fulfilment of this agreement through in spite of the desire of Khalaf's sons for revenge. According to Albert of Aix, Tancred defended his loyalty to the agreement on the grounds that it was not the custom of Christians to break an oath once given, even when dealing with a perverse and perjured partner.<sup>28</sup> The sons of Khalaf remained in Tancred's service and were allocated several villages. However, Albert of Aix's phraseology: '*filios [...] occisi principis in regione civitatis Femiae plurimis praecepit locis*', leaves open the question whether Tancred's gift of land constituted a valid enfeoffment.<sup>29</sup>

In the spring of 1111, Tancred was again in league with an Arab or Turkish amir at the siege and capture of the fortress of Bikisra'il, about 20 km. east of Jabala.<sup>30</sup> This was a case of a regular coalition as with Ridwan of Aleppo in 1108, but Tancred took also Turkish troops into service as in the case of Famiya in 1106. If the remuneration of their leaders followed in the form of enfeoffments, this would be the first-known case of the inclusion of non-Christians in the Frankish fief system in Syria. The sources are, however, too imprecise for this to be safely asserted. Ibn al-Qalanisi also confirms that there were Turkish troops at the Norman court in Antioch.<sup>31</sup> Another Arab contemporary, Usama b. Munqidh gives an account of 'Ali, the slave of a certain Ibn Abi al-Rayda, who in the service of the Frankish lord of Kafartab carried out raids against the Muslims after the death of Khalaf b. Mula'ib.<sup>32</sup> Nothing, however, better illustrates Tancred's policy towards the Turks than the case of the Seljuk Prince Ibn Tekish. Ibn Tekish's cousin, the reigning Sultan Muhammad (1105–18), forced him from Iraq. He went to Syria, was rebuffed in Hamah as well as Hims and after a stop in Aleppo only found temporary asylum in Antioch. Highly

<sup>27</sup> Albert of Aix, X, XXI, 641; Ibn al-'Adim, *Bughya*, 129–30; Ibn al-Athir, *Kamil*, X, 208–210.

<sup>28</sup> Albert of Aix, X, XXIII, 642; Ibn al-Athir, *Kamil*, X, 210; Ibn al-Qalanisi, 189.

<sup>29</sup> Albert of Aix, X, XXIV, 642.

<sup>30</sup> Albert of Aix, XI, XLV, 685; al-'Azimī, 380.

<sup>31</sup> Ibn al-Qalanisi, 183.

<sup>32</sup> Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 94–5.

honoured there, he served with the Norman lord's Turkish troops and only after Tancred's death did he go further by way of Sidon to Egypt. It is possible that Tancred had allotted lands to him or a money-fief, as was usual at the start in the kingdom of Jerusalem.<sup>33</sup>

The cooperation of Turks and Normans, the fact that a member of the Seljuk ruling house could seek asylum in Antioch, the carrying out of treaties concluded with Famiya and Shayzar,<sup>34</sup> the rivalry with the Provençals shown in Tancred's arrest of Raymond of Toulouse in 1102 and the enduring conflict between Antioch and Edessa after 1104—all this is clear evidence that the proceedings of Normans and Turks after 1098 cannot be designated as 'Christian' or 'Islamic', according to the ideology of the Holy War or *jihad*. It was much more a continuation of the power-politics of rival lordship centres from the period before 1098. This pattern of relationship is designated here as 'Syrian', using Cahen's term.<sup>35</sup> An essential characteristic of this Syrian thinking was that, in spite of all rivalries, the individual states would stand together in the event of a threat from outside Syria, even against the resistance of the non-Frankish or non-Turkish population as in 1108 and 1111.

That can be seen in the north Syrian region, not only for Antioch but also for Edessa, Aleppo and Hims. Baldwin II of Edessa and Joscelin I of Turbessel (like Bohemond I in 1103) did not hesitate in 1108 to purchase their release from Turkish detention by an alliance. They engaged themselves to assist Jawali of Mosul against his enemies, Ridwan of Aleppo and Mawdud, whom the sultan had sent against him. The complete religious indifference of Lorrainer policy clarifies an event in 502/1108–9 in Saruj, which had a Muslim population, but belonged to the county of Edessa. The *ra'is*, a convert to Christianity from Islam, offended Baldwin's Turkish allies by invectives against Islam. When the Muslims beat him, thus threatening the outbreak of conflict between Franks and Turks, the count had him executed on the grounds that this was of use neither to them nor to the Muslims, so saving the alliance with Jawali.<sup>36</sup> Their common enemy at this time was another Muslim-Frankish coalition, that between Aleppo and Antioch.

<sup>33</sup> Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 183 and 189.

<sup>34</sup> Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 84–50 and 52.

<sup>35</sup> Cahen, *Syrie*, 241: 'Tancred sera... habile aussi à contracter alliance avec tous les éléments indigènes, bref ce sera un Syrien.'

<sup>36</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 462.

Equally significant is the relationship of Ridwan in Aleppo to Janah al-Dawla in Hims during the establishment of the Frankish states in northern Syria. Since the summer of 1097, i.e. before the arrival of the First Crusade, there was mutual hostility between the two rulers. Neither the foundation of Norman rule in Antioch, nor that of the Lorrainers in Edessa, was able to effect a reconciliation of the two rival Turkish rulers. In 495/1101–2, Janah al-Dawla conquered all the territories that Ridwan had been able to hold or to regain from the Normans. His campaigns were directed as much against Antioch as against Aleppo. Only at one single moment was there a rapprochement between Hims and Aleppo, when Duqaq of Damascus, having acquired al-Rahba on the Euphrates by exchange became a threat to the hostile local lordships in northern Syria.<sup>37</sup> It is significant that it was not the Franks, but a danger from the Muslim side, which brought the rulers of Aleppo and Hims together. It was not for long, however. The Nizaris under Ridwan's protection assassinated Janah al-Dawla in 1103.<sup>38</sup> Islamic solidarity was also no criterion in the policy of the amirs of Shayzar and Famiya on the Orontes. Usama b. Munqidh tells how the troops of both lordships met on 25 July 1104 for a joint attack on Asfuna near Kafartab, which the Franks held. What at first sight looked like an alliance of coreligionists for the *jihad*, very soon proved to be a trap devised by Khalaf b. Mula'ib for his rivals from Shayzar. Instead of attacking the Franks, Khalaf let his men fall suddenly upon their allies, who were only able to save themselves with difficulty.<sup>39</sup> It is particularly clear in this incident how tribal and dynastic rivalries overlaid Islamic obligations. The question whether the foundation of the Frankish states provoked a common Muslim reaction will be answered later, but it can be concluded at this point that the First Crusade did not permanently confuse the alliance relationships which had existed since 1097 in northern and central Syria. The fact that Norman and Lorrainer princes replaced Turkish and Armenian rulers in Antioch and Edessa did not alter the interests of the different states, their rivalries or hence their alliance relationships. The sense of local rulership continued to govern policy. Aleppo remained at odds with Damascus as well as Hims and the petty lordships on the Euphrates and Orontes, while they survived, remained neutral as far as they could.

<sup>37</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, X, 363; Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 145–47.

<sup>38</sup> The oldest Arabic sources are summarized in Ibn al-'Adim, *Bughya*, 121–3.

<sup>39</sup> Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 38 and 71.

In contrast to the situation of northern Syria with its variety of rival rulers who favoured the conclusion of alliances and treaties between Franks and Muslims during and immediately after the First Crusade, developments in southern Syria were different. The foundation of the two Frankish states in the north took place in historic centres of rule and presented no essential innovation on local rulership which had existed for decades. From the first moment, the inter-Seljuk conflicts in Iraq and the decline in the power of the Arab tribes affected the policy of the Normans and Lorrainers to just the same degree as that of the Turkish rulers of Mosul, Aleppo or Hims. These factors hardly affected the south, because of the greater geographical distance from the centres of Seljuk power. Instead of the variety of regional rulers in the north, there were here only two power centres of greater than local significance: Fatimid Egypt and Turkish Damascus that had been in Seljuk hands since 1079. The rivalry between these two about supremacy over the coastlands, Palestine and central Syria had for the previous three decades been the decisive factor in the south. The structure of rule within these two dominant power complexes is not to be seen as analogous to that of modern territorial states. The governors of the larger cities, especially in the Egyptian sphere of power, had sufficient autonomy to enter into separate treaty relationships with the Franks. Damascus exerted a stricter control than Egypt over the subordinate centres dependent on it, especially Ba'labakk and Busra, which adjoined the developing kingdom of Jerusalem. Only in 1104 did the Franks find the opportunity to enter into direct contact with the governors of these regions where resistance to the Atabeg Tughtegin was concentrated during the succession-crisis in Damascus following the death of Duqaq.

In regard to the character of the foundation of the Frankish states, the situation in Palestine was different from that in Antioch or Edessa. Before the Crusade, Jerusalem was not the centre of traditionally independent rulers, but was subordinate under the Artuqids to the rulers of Damascus like Ba'labakk and Busra and since 1098 lay under a Fatimid governor. It is no longer ascertainable what lands belonged to the *iqta'* of Jerusalem under the Artuqids. However, it is doubtful whether Galilee and impossible that the coastal plain, economically the most productive parts of Palestine, were included. An independent state of Jerusalem, such as was constituted in 1099 and situated between Damascus and Egypt, consequently altered as a strategic factor and treaty partner the existing status quo, with which it had first to be integrated. A second special problem for

the south lay in the fact that among the Crusaders there was no uncontested legal concept of the form of the state in Jerusalem. The religious character of the Holy Places, and the character of the Crusade as an ecclesiastical enterprise, made at first a purely secular and feudal organization of the conquests, like that in the north, considerably more difficult.

Godfrey of Bouillon, the first Latin ruler of Jerusalem, and his mainly Lorrainer knights had been in competition since the summer of 1099 over the claim to be ruler with two other secular princes, Raymond of Toulouse and Tancred. At the beginning, Godfrey was certainly uncontested in Jerusalem itself, but that was not the case for the coastal plain and Galilee. After the battle of al-Bissa on 12 August 1099 against Fatimid troops, Raymond of Toulouse could not succeed in his intention of founding a principality of Ascalon, independent of Jerusalem or not more than feudally linked. Tancred, the Norman, who took his conquests in Galilee as a fief from Godfrey without thereby giving up his autonomy,<sup>40</sup> became a rival to the Lorrainers only a year later when he raised after Godfrey's death a claim to succeed him as *advocatus Sancti Sepulchri*. Tancred's surrender of his Palestinian possessions in order to assume the regency of Antioch in 1101 after the capture of Bohemond finally brought this conflict to a close.

However, the plans of the papal legate, Daimbert of Pisa, which aimed at the establishment of patriarchal rule in Jerusalem and Jaffa, caused the specific difference from the two northern states. Although Daimbert was unable to carry through his concept against Godfrey's successor, Baldwin I, it influenced the relations of Jerusalem with the Egyptian coastal towns and Damascus by delaying the establishment of a 'secular' monarchy. On 25 December 1099, Daimbert received consecration in Jerusalem as successor to Arnulf of Chocques, who had been uncanonically appointed. He invested on the same day Bohemond with Antioch and Godfrey with Jerusalem. In return Godfrey made the patriarch a gift of which the most important part consisted of the estate of the Greek patriarch in Jerusalem.<sup>41</sup> Daimbert was still by no means content with the creation of a patriarchal immunity alone. By 2 February 1100, Godfrey had partially to give way to his demand for the cession of Jerusalem and Jaffa by conceding to the Holy Sepulchre a quarter of the city and the port of Jaffa.<sup>42</sup> Two months

---

<sup>40</sup> S. Paoli, *Codici*, I, 200, no. CLVI.

<sup>41</sup> William of Tyre, IX, XV, 387.

<sup>42</sup> William of Tyre, IX, XVI, 388; X, IV, 405.

later, on Easter Day (1 April 1100), he had to give further ground under pressure from Daimbert; he became a vassal of the Holy Sepulchre and ceded all Jerusalem with the citadel and Jaffa to the patriarch. However, according to the account of William of Tyre, Godfrey made a reservation and proposed that the donation should actually be realized when he had captured Cairo or other cities. It was finally decided that in the event of his decease without a male heir, his entire possessions should pass to the church.<sup>43</sup>

The controversy between Godfrey and Daimbert, which is of the utmost interest from the point of view of constitutional and ecclesiastical history, has repeatedly occupied scholars, but for the history of Jerusalem it was only briefly of primary significance. For Daimbert could not gain his object in the end, inasmuch as the firmness of the Lorrainer knights secured the succession of Baldwin I of Edessa after Godfrey's death on 18 July 1100. At this decisive moment, Daimbert had to dispense with the Pisan fleet, which had previously given him the necessary support. A Venetian contingent had defeated it off Rhodes.<sup>44</sup> This set the course for a secular ruler in Jerusalem. The constitutional dispute between secular and spiritual authority was, however, so important for the development of relations between Franks and Muslims because, beside the discontinuity in the distribution of power in southern Syria occasioned by the foundation of the Frankish states, it made the definition of the territorial extent and therewith the title of the ruling power more difficult at the start. Through the patriarch's claim to power, Godfrey was pushed into a posture of expansion towards the Muslim coastal cities, since he was compelled to find compensation somewhere for his potential losses to the church. He might indeed style himself *advocatus Sancti Sepulchri*, but not 'king'. Law required him to surrender all allodial rights in the most important city and the sole port within his power. A letter from Archbishop Manasses of Rheims to Bishop Lambert of Arras indicates that Godfrey had attempted soon after the capture of Jerusalem to assume the title of king, but nothing more was heard of it after Daimbert's arrival in Palestine. Nevertheless, Godfrey's successor was able to obtain coronation as king on Christmas Day 1100—significantly in Bethlehem, not the capital,

---

<sup>43</sup> William of Tyre, X, IV, 405; cf. subsequently IX, XVI, 388. Other sources have no reports on this.

<sup>44</sup> *Translatio s. Nicolai*, VI, 257–8; Anna Komnena, ed. Leib, vol. III, XI, X, 1–10, pp. 41–46 reports a Byzantine victory over the Pisans.

Jerusalem.<sup>45</sup> Although Baldwin also held the title of *rex Ierosolimitanus*, this is first certainly established only for the year 1106.<sup>46</sup> The titulature is vague in earlier documents, but betrays the expansive character of the claim to royal power. Tancred designated Godfrey's dominion in 1100 as *regnum Asye*.<sup>47</sup> The Patriarch Ebremer referred in 1102–3 in the protocol to a document to *Balduino vero rege inclito et christianissimo regnum Babylonie* [i.e. Cairo] *disponente*.<sup>48</sup> And presumably in 1104, Baldwin recorded the rights of the republic of Genoa in the coastal cities to be conquered with its support, including Cairo itself. This universal claim, founded in conflict with the Church and the indefinitiveness of the original legal concept of the polity, necessarily excluded a policy of status quo.

Furthermore, the dependence of Jerusalem during the whole of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries on the influx of pilgrims from Europe is not to be underestimated as a cause of the problem of alliances in northern and southern Syria. After the departure of those Crusaders who were not anxious to take land, Godfrey had only a few hundred knights at his disposal. No military operation of much significance in the history of the kingdom was effected without the engagement of European pilgrims and soldiers. In maritime operations, the Frankish kings had to rely on the help of foreign fleets, chiefly Italian or Byzantine. In a crisis such as 1119–23, 1169 or 1183, express calls for help were sent to the West.<sup>49</sup> The dependence of Jerusalem's treaty policy on the arrival of Italian fleets in particular was especially noticeable in the early years of the kingdom, as its own capacities were very slight and the main direction of its expansion was towards the Fatimid coastal cities. Between the interests of the Genoese, Pisans and Venetians and those of the Frankish kingdom of Jerusalem there lay, nevertheless, a gulf somewhat corresponding to the conflict of aims between the Crusaders who returned to Europe and the Franks who settled in Syria. This gulf had already influenced the willingness to engage in alliance policies during the Crusade. Desire for booty as well as the striving for trading privileges and rights of possession combined with thoughts of the meritoriousness of fighting the heathen, stood in a particularly delicate state of tension with a deliberate royal policy of

---

<sup>45</sup> Fulcher Carnot, II, VI, 1, p. 384; Albert of Aix, VII, XLIII, 536–7; Caffaro, XII, 60 interestingly transposes this to Jerusalem.

<sup>46</sup> S. Paoli, *Codici*, I, 1, no. I.

<sup>47</sup> S. Paoli, *Codici*, I, 200–1, no. CLVI.

<sup>48</sup> Rozière, *Cartulaire*, 71–72, no. XXXVI.

<sup>49</sup> 1119–23: RRH, 102; Andrea Dandolo, 269–73. 1169: William of Tyre, XX, XII, 960; Ernoul, III, 24–5. 1183: William of Tyre, XXIII, I, 1133.

negotiation and alliance in the first decade of the kingdom of Jerusalem, since the king could not dispense with European help.

With regard to the expansion of the young Frankish states and their treaty policy, the years preceding the arrival of the army of the Atabeg Mawdud of Mosul in southern Syria (1113) fall into three phases. First, an Artuqid phase (1099–1101), in which Godfrey and Baldwin ruled over approximately the territories that Sukman and Ilghazi b. Artuq had controlled until 1098. Secondly, a phase of expansion towards the coast (1101–12), in the first half of which, to 1106, the conquest of the coast from Jaffa to Acre was achieved and the Franks maintained themselves against Fatimid attempts to recoup their losses. In the second half, from 1108 to 1112, Frankish expansion was directed against the port-cities of Lebanon from Tyre to Tripoli. Not only the break between 1105 and 1108 but also the appearance of Damascus beside Egypt as an opponent of the Franks in the second half, separated the two periods. Thirdly, a phase of expansion into Transjordan (1105–1111/13), which comprised the direct conflict with Damascus, and the first treaty settlements aiming at a regionally limited balance with the Seljuk adversary. What kinds of treaties were concluded in these phases and what were the motives on the Frankish and Muslim sides?

The principal source for the period of the Artuqid phase (1099–1100) is Albert of Aix, whose informants for the first years of the kingdom are unknown. Unfortunately, his statements are for the most part uncorroborated and Muslim chronicles have nothing to report on the first Frankish-Fatimid treaties. Albert gives the following account of an agreement between Godfrey and the Fatimid coastal town of Arsuf in the autumn of 1099: Godfrey, in vain, had besieged the town while Raymond of Toulouse was encouraging it to resist. The reconciliation of Godfrey and Raymond, and the latter's withdrawal to the north, had isolated Arsuf and it concluded a peace treaty (*de . . . pace foedus*) with Godfrey, in which provision was made for the payment of tribute by the Muslims and (*pro stabilitate fidei et pacis*) an exchange of hostages.<sup>50</sup> It was presumably a treaty for a limited period of time. In about late autumn, the Muslim hostages escaped and Arsuf thereupon refused the tribute without releasing their Frankish hostages. For this, Godfrey besieged Arsuf until December and afterwards stationed a strong garrison in al-Ramla, which disturbed Arsuf

---

<sup>50</sup> Albert of Aix, VI, LI–LIII, 498.

with raiding and made work impossible in the fields during spring.<sup>51</sup> Since no help was to be expected from Egypt, the Muslims, according to Albert, again promised the Franks tribute and as security Godfrey received the keys to the gates and towers of the city. On this occasion it was an unequal treaty.

After the Franks had strengthened their position on the sea by the refortification of Jaffa and new pilgrims had arrived in Palestine for Easter 1100, a joint embassy from Ascalon, Caesarea and Acre solicited, according to the chronicler's statement, a peace treaty of Godfrey. In addition to the horses and mules which they brought as a gift, the coastal cities promised a monthly tribute of 5,000 besants. The truce applied only to the mainland and not to the war at sea.<sup>52</sup> Under Godfrey a number of agreements with Arab tribal chiefs were also achieved which brought the Arabs peace and freedom to trade in Jerusalem and Jaffa. Nothing is known of any reciprocal benefit for the Franks.<sup>53</sup> The governors of Ascalon, Caesarea, Acre and Tyre agreed in March 1101 upon a treaty similar to that of spring 1100 with Godfrey's successor, Baldwin. In return for money-payments, he conceded to the cities a truce and freedom of movement for 'the cultivation period', i.e. to Whitsun (9 June).<sup>54</sup> This treaty expressly excluded Arsuf so Baldwin and a combined Genoese/Pisan fleet attacked it after Easter (21 April).<sup>55</sup>

All these agreements had in common that they came about on the initiative of the Fatimid side so that the coastal cities, in view of their subordinate position, had to send tribute, chiefly in the form of cash, to Jerusalem. Whether an exchange of hostages was also usually the rule, as in the first treaty with Arsuf, must remain open. The treaties were in all likelihood for limited periods, as Albert expressly states for the March 1101 treaty. Had the agreement of spring 1100 been for an unlimited period, there would have been no need for Baldwin and the coastal cities to have reached an entirely similar pact—unless one presumes that the whole agreement became obsolete because of Godfrey's death in the summer of 1100 and that hence it was no supra-personal treaty. However, in this case the coastal cities would have presumably renewed it earlier, but in

---

<sup>51</sup> Albert of Aix, VII, I–III and VI, IX–XII, 507–9 and 511, 512–5; Fulcher Carnot., II, VIII, 5, p. 398.

<sup>52</sup> Albert of Aix, VII, XIII–XIV, 515–6; Ekkehard of Aura, XIX, 2, pp. 195–6.

<sup>53</sup> Albert of Aix, VII, XIV, 516.

<sup>54</sup> Albert of Aix, VII, LI, 541.

<sup>55</sup> Albert of Aix, VII, LIV, 542–3; Fulcher Carnot., II, VIII, 1–7, pp. 393–400; Caffaro, XI–XV, 59–63.

November 1100 Baldwin made a raid on Ascalon. Nothing is known of the technical details of the conclusion of the treaties.<sup>56</sup>

The motives of the contracting parties are clear in the sources. In consequence of war-damage and the flight of parts of the population before the Crusaders, the economic situation of the Frankish lands was desperate and the pilgrim-route to Jerusalem unsafe.<sup>57</sup> Godfrey and Baldwin I had trouble in paying their troops and in securing the provision of food and war equipment. Albert of Aix stresses that Baldwin agreed to the treaty of 1101 and also to the liberation of 45 Damascene prisoners for 50,000 besants out of his need for money (*pecunia inaudita*).<sup>58</sup> Tancred in Galilee, if Albert is correct, also concluded treaties *sub ratione solidorum*.<sup>59</sup> Godfrey's renunciation of the right to the tribute from Arsuf, which he ceded to Robert of Apulia for a lump sum, had already shown that he was in need of money.

The treaties brought about the beginning of an active trading exchange, especially between Ascalon and Jerusalem. In the agreements with the Arab shaykhs, the commerce even made up the actual contents of the treaties, which stipulated that the Franks were to be supplied with horses, clothing and food.<sup>60</sup> The measures dealing with order and customs duties which began in Godfrey's time with the *Assise d'an et jour* and in 1120 still occupied the assembly of the kingdom at Nablus indicates how difficult it remained to supply depopulated Jerusalem for decades.<sup>61</sup> The new security of movement, which was expressly repeated in the treaty of March 1101, was not only of service to trade but also reduced the danger to pilgrims on their way to Jerusalem. Even during an armistice, they were under considerable threat from Bedouins and robber-bands like those which Baldwin attacked in the second half of 1100.<sup>62</sup> The treaties of spring 1100 and 1101 were typically concluded at the start of the Easter pilgrimage season. The Frankish motives for the negotiations thus lay in their lack of money and their need to secure supplies and the pilgrimage.

On the other hand, the clauses of the agreement of spring 1101 as reported by Albert of Aix reflect the Fatimid interests, namely undisturbed

<sup>56</sup> Cf. in general Fulcher Carnot, II, IV, 1, pp. 370–372.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. especially Saewulf, 836–39, 847–50; William of Tyre, IX, XIX, 393.

<sup>58</sup> Albert of Aix, VII, LI, 541.

<sup>59</sup> Albert of Aix, VII, XVII, 518 and XVIII, 519.

<sup>60</sup> Albert of Aix, VII, XIII–XIV, 515–6; Ekkehard of Aura, XIX, 2, pp. 195–6.

<sup>61</sup> William of Tyre, IX, XIX, 393–4.

<sup>62</sup> Fulcher, Carnot, II, IV, 2–4, pp. 372–5; Albert of Aix, VII, XXXIX–XL, 533–5.

cultivation and secure movement.<sup>63</sup> Since no military help was to be expected from Egypt, these aims could only be achieved by way of treaty. It may, however, be asked whether the policy of the coastal cities already amounted to no more than this and whether the later impression is correct that for the Muslim party the agreements offered only a temporary solution until the next Egyptian offensive. Even if the accounts by Albert of Aix and William of Tyre of the cordial relations between Godfrey and the governors of the Fatimid coastal cities are regarded with scepticism on account of their obscure origin, legendary speeches and laudatory intent, there still remain sufficient indications of an amicable coexistence of Franks and Fatimids at times.<sup>64</sup> The Normans, Flemings and Provençals of the First Crusade, as they withdrew northwards, had been able to obtain their provisions from the markets of Acre, Tyre, Sidon, Beirut and Tripoli, as Albert of Aix mentions.<sup>65</sup> In just the same way, the troops of Bohemond and Baldwin were able to get food supplies not only in Baniyas but also in Tripoli and Caesarea shortly before Christmas 1099.<sup>66</sup> When in the next summer Baldwin came a second time to Jerusalem, to succeed his brother, he was supplied with food from every place of significance between Tripoli and Acre. Qadi Fakhr al-Mulk b. 'Ammar of Tripoli even warned the Franks of troops from Damascus and Hims who set up an ambush on the Kalb River.<sup>67</sup>

What were the reasons for this readiness for cooperation? Albert of Aix is surely right when he sees these offers of provisions as arising *plus causa timoris quam amoris*. On the other hand, the coastal cities had little to fear as weak bands of Franks passed by, particularly in winter after the harvest. Not every place maintained friendly relations with the Franks. Nevertheless, the conduct of most of the coastal cities clearly contrasted with the aggressive posture of the Turkish states in Syria, especially the repeated friendly acts of Tripoli after the tribute treaty of 1099 with the Crusaders. It is conceivable that at this time it was still not clear to Egypt and Tripoli that the Franks would later turn against the coastal cities and consequently no Fatimid army appeared in Palestine in 1100. It is quite likely at first that Frankish rule in Jerusalem was seen as limited to

---

<sup>63</sup> Albert of Aix, VII, LI, 541.

<sup>64</sup> Albert of Aix, VII, XIII, 515 and XVIII, 519; cf. William of Tyre, IX, XXII, 397–99.

<sup>65</sup> Albert of Aix, VI, LIV, 499.

<sup>66</sup> Fulcher, Carnot., I, XXXIII, 7, pp. 326–7 and 14, p. 331.

<sup>67</sup> Fulcher, Carnot., II, I, 5, pp. 355–7; III, 8–9, pp. 365–7. Cf. Albert of Aix, VII, XXXIII–XXXIV, 528–531.

the locality just as that of the Artuqids, who had ruled there before the Crusade, and that the independence of the Genoese operations at sea as well as of Tancred in northern Palestine from those of the Lorrainers in Jerusalem was recognized. Coexistence between Franks and Fatimids, trade between the coast and the hill-country, perhaps even involving Frankish access to the markets in the ports such as the Turcoman Atsiz had once had, would be very useful to Egypt and Tripoli. Finally, the Egyptian interest in a Frankish buffer against the Seljuks had, as already indicated, favoured the success of the First Crusade. The universality of the Frankish claim to dominion and the dependence on the arrival of new pilgrims, however, prevented the development of a durable status quo. From the Frankish point of view, the treaties only interrupted the expansion of Jerusalem, but did not take its place.

In the second phase, especially the years between 1101 and 1110, the Franks succeeded in conquering the Palestinian and Lebanese coast apart from Ascalon and Tyre. The agreements of this period, with which the kingdom of Jerusalem discarded its quasi-Artuqid limits, give further information about the motives of the supporters of a Frankish treaty policy. How did the conditions look to the capitulating Muslim inhabitants? Praver has advanced the view that the taking of Sidon (1110) marked a break in the way that the Franks dealt with subjugated townspeople. Whereas they had previously been exterminated or expelled, it had become the rule to spare them.<sup>68</sup> In this opinion, Praver can only have had the kingdom of Jerusalem and Tripoli in mind, for in the northern Frankish states there were towns with Muslim inhabitants under Norman or Lorrainer rule from the start, including important places such as Saruj and Famiya. However, an investigation of the Frankish conquests in Palestine and on the Lebanese coast also shows a more complex situation for southern Syria.

The extermination, enslavement and expulsion of the Muslim population was, as in Jerusalem (1099), the regular consequence when a place was taken by storm, e.g. Hebron (1099), Haifa (1100), Caesarea (1101), Antartus (1102) and Beirut (1110).<sup>69</sup> For the most part, non-combatants were enslaved rather than killed. City notables such as the *qadi* (*sacerdos*

<sup>68</sup> Praver, *Settlement*.

<sup>69</sup> Hebron: Albert of Aix, VII, XXVI, 523–4. Haifa: Albert of Aix, VII, XXV, 523; Translatio s. Nicolai, XLII, 277; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 139. Caesarea: Albert of Aix, VII, LVI, 544; Caffaro, XVII, XVIII, 64–5; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 139. Antartus: Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 344; Albert of Aix, VIII, XLIV, 582–3; Fulcher, Carnot., II, XVII, 1, pp. 433–4; Caffaro, XXIII, 69. Beirut: Ibn al-Qalānisi, 168; Fulcher, Carnot., II, XLII, 1–2, pp. 534–6.

*civitatis*) of Caesarea were allowed to purchase their freedom. The elimination of the Muslim inhabitants seems to have been a consequence of the military operations rather than a programme of the conqueror. At all events, the terms of capitulation that the Franks laid before Haifa (1100) and Caesarea (1101), which were subsequently rejected, indicate that the Venetian bishop in the besieging army would leave the inhabitants of Haifa to choose between conversion and the payment of an annual tribute, free departure without their possessions or life in servitude.<sup>70</sup> According to the eyewitness Caffaro, the Patriarch Daimbert offered the Muslims of Caesarea free departure with all they could carry. Only the rejection of these terms led to the massacre. A few weeks before the taking of Caesarea, the inhabitants of Arsuf capitulated on 9 May 1101 in return for free departure and received from King Baldwin free escort to Ascalon.<sup>71</sup> A basic difference between the terms offered to Haifa in 1100 and the agreement with Sidon, which Praver holds to be epoch-making, is not recognizable. About 500 people of Sidon including the notables and the garrison departed in 1110 for Damascus and Ascalon with all the possessions they could carry. The rest, the cultivators, submitted to Frankish rule.<sup>72</sup> Nevertheless, previously in the spring of 1104, when the population of Jubayl surrendered to Count Raymond of Toulouse and a Genoese fleet, the Muslim inhabitants were able to stay—although pillaged in breach of a promise of security (*aman*).<sup>73</sup> The same was true of the cities of Jabala and Baniyas, captured by Tancred in 1109.<sup>74</sup>

The incidents which took place on the taking of Acre (26 May 1104) and Tripoli (12 July 1109) are of particular interest for Frankish treaty policy. The Muslim chronicles unanimously report that both were taken by force.<sup>75</sup> On the other hand, Fulcher of Chartres (an eyewitness) and Albert of Aix differ from this. According to them, free departure with all the possessions they could carry to a place of their own choice had been arranged

<sup>70</sup> Translatio s. Nicolai, XLI, 276.

<sup>71</sup> Caffaro, XV, 63. Arsuf: Albert of Aix, VII, LIV, 542–3; Fulcher, Carnot., II, VIII, 3–4, pp. 397–8.

<sup>72</sup> Albert of Aix, XI, XXXIV, 679; Fulcher, Carnot., II, XLIV, 6–7, p. 548; Ibn al-Qalānisī, 171.

<sup>73</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisī, 143; al-ʿAzīmī, 377; Ibn Zāfir, 87; Caffaro, XXVI, 71–2; Albert of Aix, IX, XXVI, 605–6.

<sup>74</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisī, 163–4; al-ʿAzīmī, 380; William of Tyre, XI, IX, 467; Usāma b. Munqidh, *Iʿtibār*, 71 (who is reporting on Jabala, not Jubayl).

<sup>75</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisī, 144 and 163; al-ʿAzīmī, 377 and 379; Ibn Zāfir, 87; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 373, 476.

in the terms of surrender. On both occasions, however, Baldwin's allies—the Genoese in 1104, the Genoese and Pisans in 1109—broke these treaties and massacred or enslaved the Muslim populations who were prepared to surrender.<sup>76</sup> Albert of Aix expressly stigmatizes the use of force as a felony (*scelus*). He reports how King Baldwin I, in indignation, wanted to take violent revenge on the Italians and the Patriarch Ebremer had difficulty in reconciling the two sides. The fact that Italians who were strangers to the country occasioned the breaches of the treaties, while Baldwin as count of Edessa had already ruled over Muslims and appeared as the protagonist for the sparing of the defeated inhabitants, reveals an internal conflict among the Franks. While the Genoese were concerned with booty and pillage, the Frankish leaders in the East sought not only to avoid losses but also to get possession of the captured cities with as little damage as possible. It may be presumed that in Acre and Tripoli, as similarly in Jubayl, Baniyas, Jabala and Sidon, only the higher levels of those active in religious and political matters, perhaps also in commerce, would have left the towns. The mass of the Muslim inhabitants would have presumably provided the basis for further settlement. This must have been of absolute importance to Baldwin, considering the chronic lack of a working-force in Palestine, which caused the Muslim peasantry to be offered comparatively good living conditions. The Aleppine historian Ibn Abi Tayy', for example, states that this economic argument led to the stopping of the killing at the capture of Tripoli in 1109. The Muslims were allowed to remain as payers of a poll-tax (*jizya*).<sup>77</sup> Financial and economic considerations, not toleration or humanity, influenced the Frankish treaty policy here, as with the agreements during the Artuqid phase (1099–1101).

The financial orientation of Baldwin's policy and the conflict of interests between the supporters and the opponents of treaties become still clearer from an example in 1106. While the Franks, reinforced by English, Flemish and Danish pilgrims, were getting ready to besiege Sidon, the Muslim inhabitants offered Baldwin during secret negotiations a 'mighty' sum of money and a considerable annual tribute for the future. The king, lacking money to pay outstanding wages, was tempted to accept, but did not dare at first for fear of his bellicose European allies. When, however, his vassal Hugh of Tiberias died on a raid for booty into Transjordan, Baldwin used

<sup>76</sup> Acre: Fulcher, Carnot., II, XXV, 1, p. 463; Albert of Aix, IX, XXVIII–XXIX, 606–7. Tripoli: Fulcher, Carnot., II, XLI, 3–4, pp. 532–3 names the *minores Januensium* as perpetrators.

<sup>77</sup> Ibn Abī Ṭayy' in Ibn al-Furāt, MS Vindob. A.F. 117, fol. 38v–39r.

this as an excuse to break off his preparations. He declared to the leaders of the pilgrims in Acre that a siege was unthinkable without Hugh and his brother, who died a few days later. The pilgrims returned home angrily and shortly afterwards Baldwin collected the sum of 15,000 besants promised by Sidon.<sup>78</sup> The difference of interests between the Franks of the East and the pilgrims as well as its effect upon the treaty policy cannot be illustrated more clearly. Financial considerations also led to the lifting of the blockade on Sidon in the summer of 1108 and the failure of the connected siege of Tyre.<sup>79</sup> The problem of the conflict of aims between Franks and Europeans, between concepts of negotiation and conflict, accompanied the entire history of the Frankish states in the East and was only solved through intrigue as in 1106 and on several other occasions, e.g. during the Second Crusade.

The relations of the kingdom of Jerusalem with Seljuk Damascus were at first not so intensively subject to the determinism depicted for the relationship with the coastal cities, arising from financial need, problems of provisioning and the aims of European pilgrim-groups. The military operations between the two states were not a matter of sieges, but of raids. The Franks fought them with their own forces and aimed at the interruption of the caravan route to Egypt as well as the seizure of the economically productive territory of Transjordan. There was no direct confrontation between Damascus and Jerusalem until 1105 after Tancred (1099–1100) founded the principality of Galilee and after the allies Duqaq of Damascus and Janah al-Dawla of Hims unsuccessfully attempted to intercept Baldwin at the Kalb River on his way to Jerusalem in November or December 1100.<sup>80</sup> Until 1105, the Damascenes also refused to support Egypt against the Franks and drove forward their expansion to the Euphrates. In the course of the subsequent conflict a series of alliances and treaties were concluded. Duqaq b. Tutush, the ruler of Damascus, died on 8 June 1104. Shortly before his death, he had installed the Atabeg Tughtegin as regent for his son, a minor. However, instead of the son, Tughtegin and his wife Safwat al-Mulk (who was also Duqaq's mother) enthroned Duqaq's brother Ertash, hitherto a prisoner in Ba'labakk. Just a few weeks later, in Safar

<sup>78</sup> Albert of Aix, X, III–VIII, 632–5. On the death of Hugh cf. Ibn al-Qalānisi, 151; Fulcher, Carnot., I, XXXVI, 1–2, pp. 509–11.

<sup>79</sup> Tyre: Ibn al-Qalānisi, 159; Ibn Muyassar, 78; al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, III, 37–8. Sidon: Albert of Aix, X, XLVIII–XLIX, 653–5; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 162.

<sup>80</sup> Albert of Aix, VII, XVI–XVIII, 517–9 (Galilee); Albert of Aix, VII, XXXII–XXXIV, 528–30; Fulcher, Carnot., II, II–III, 357–65; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 138–9.

(23 October–20 November 1104), Ertash fled for fear of Tughtegin back to Ba'labakk and entered into alliance with the governors Gümüshtegin of Ba'labakk and Aytegin of Busra and raided the fruitful territories of the Hawran. In a search for allies, Ertash and the governors turned next to King Baldwin of Jerusalem. The answer was favourable and the Turks proceeded to the Frankish court to plan joint action against Damascus.

Not only did the Muslim chroniclers recount these facts but also Albert of Aix, who reports the conclusion of a proper treaty between Baldwin and Ertash. It was decided that Ertash, in return for military service in the ranks of the Frankish knights, should receive help in the struggle against Damascus. His Seljuk detachment did in fact stand by the Franks in their victory over the Egyptians on 27 August 1105, reinforced by a Damascene contingent. Baldwin, however, did not fulfil his part of the treaty for unknown reasons and in the same year Ertash went into exile on the Euphrates without having achieved anything.<sup>81</sup> Tughtegin was able to achieve a reconciliation with Gümüshtegin of Ba'labakk just before the battle and shortly afterwards to win back Busra from its governor Aytegin after a more prolonged siege. Nevertheless, this single occasion brought no lasting cooperation between Jerusalem and these two centres in Damascene territory which traditionally strove for independence. A new alliance ensued only in the summer of 1147 with Busra and Sarkhad on the initiative of the governor Altintash. By contrast, Gümüshtegin of Ba'labakk sought to use Baldwin's help again in his rebellion against the Atabeg Tughtegin. He called on the Franks to raid Damascene territory.<sup>82</sup>

The agreements between Jerusalem and the Fatimid governor of Ascalon in 1111 may be seen as a parallel to these alliances between the Turks and the Franks. Of these, the Muslim chronicles give a more precise account than those of the Franks. According to Arabic sources based on Ibn al-Qalanisi, the governor Shams al-Khilafa bought a truce (*hudna*) against the payment of tribute and induced Tyre to also pay 7,000 dinars for a year and three months. The Egyptian Wazir al-Afdal, ill-content with this, sent an army to Ascalon in Shawwal (April–May) to remove the governor because of his treaty policy. Thereupon Shams al-Khilafa came out in apparently open rebellion and entered into a league with Baldwin. The two concluded an agreement that provided for the governor to receive

---

<sup>81</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 145; Ibn Muyassar 75; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 376; Albert of Aix, IX, XLVIII, 621–2.

<sup>82</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 166–7; al-'Azīmī, 380.

reinforcements of men and corn from the Franks (Albert of Aix speaks of 300 knights) and provided for the contingency of the handing over of the city against compensation. The Egyptian garrison was expelled from the city as the governor suspected that it sided with the Fatimids. To avoid the surrender of this important frontier fortress, the Wazir al-Afdal attempted to reassure the governor, who was relying on Armenian recruits in the meantime. He received *inter alia* Ascalon in *iqta'*. In the summer of 1111, however, Berbers of the Kutama tribe living in the city murdered Shams al-Khilafa and Ascalon returned to Fatimid control.<sup>83</sup>

What conclusions about the policy of the alliances and treaties between Franks and Muslims may be drawn from the alliances of 1104, 1109–10 and 1111? In every case the initiative came from the Muslim side. The search of rebellious Muslim rulers and governors for military support motivated it. Cooperation with the Franks was obviously as unproblematic to Ertash, Gümüshtegin, Aytegin and Shams al-Khilafa in the south as to Ibn Tekish, Jawali or Ridwan in the north of Syria. There are, however, indications that more lay behind the alliance relationships between Muslims and Franks than simply the power calculations of pretenders or rebels. Ibn al-Qalanisi and Guibert of Nogent indicate that at least in the case of Ascalon, interest in an undisturbed interchange of trade was an essential motive in the readiness to enter into a treaty. The Arabic sources emphasize that Shams al-Khilafa negotiated in 1111 against the opposition of the people of his city. Yet the fact that his murderers went on to pillage even the notaries (*shuhud*) of the city gives reason to ask whether parts of the commercially active upper stratum of the city supported his policy of negotiation.<sup>84</sup> The rebellion resembles the efforts for autonomy of the coastal places in the last decades of the eleventh century. Busra and Ba'labakk were also centres of fertile regions and direct neighbours of the kingdom of Jerusalem. The making of contacts by Gümüshtegin of Ba'labakk in 1111 followed directly on a condominium treaty (*munasafa*) between Baldwin and Tughtegin of Damascus which would pacify parts of the Biqa' ruled by Ba'labakk and make them fiscally exploitable by both sides.<sup>85</sup>

On the Frankish side, there was no doubt that alliances could be concluded with Muslims. According to Guibert of Nogent, it was a lack of

<sup>83</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 172; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 480–1; al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, III, 46–7; Albert of Aix, XI, XXXV, 679–80. The only other Frankish report by Guibert of Nogent, VIII, 1, 261–3 is of legendary character.

<sup>84</sup> Guibert of Nogent, VIII, 1, 261–3; Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 172.

<sup>85</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 171.

money which caused Baldwin to consent to the treaty with Ascalon. Again, financial needs and trading interests, as well as military advantages, were recognizable as Frankish motives for treaty-making. Typically enough, the kingdom of Jerusalem had during its first years no thoroughly thought-out alliance policy. The Frankish role in the different alliances remained passive, whence no longer-term positive consequences ensued for Jerusalem. At least Baldwin's actions qualify the remark of Albert of Aix that the ruler was no longer inclined to cooperate with the Turks after his bad experiences in the county of Edessa (1098–99).<sup>86</sup>

The phase of these alliances from 1105 to 1112 is significant for treaty policy as the period in which the first condominiums between Franks and Muslims originated. The military encounters between Damascus and Jerusalem between 1105 and 1112 were for one thing the result of the attempts of the king and the princes of Galilee to establish a foothold east of the Jordan and for another of Tughtegin's relief operations for the beleaguered coastal cities. There is no need to describe them here once again. In 499/1105–6 Tughtegin captured and destroyed the Frankish fortress known in Arabic sources as Qasr Bardawil in the mountain range of the Jawlan and in 500/1106–7 another castle in the same district. In 1107 the Franks razed a Damascene fortification in Wadi Musa, south of the Dead Sea. Tughtegin's attempt to establish a sort of landmark there under the commander Sabawa, who had fled to him from northern Syria, came to nothing in view of the Frankish attacks.<sup>87</sup> Finally, at the beginning of 1112 Tughtegin captured the fortress of Habis Jaldak on the Yarmuk in a relief operation for Tyre.<sup>88</sup>

In 1108 the lord of Tiberias, Gervase of Bazoches, fell into the hands of Tughtegin during a raid and refused conversion when it was offered to him. He was not allowed to redeem himself and as King Baldwin refused to ransom him with Acre, Haifa and Tiberias, he was executed. Nevertheless, Baldwin thereupon made a four-year truce (*istihlah*, *hudna*) with Tughtegin.<sup>89</sup> Ibn al-Qalanisi gives information about a treaty which is either identical with it or is a connected agreement. It provided for a division of the crop yields of the Transjordanian districts of al-Sawad and Jabal 'Awf. A third was to go to each of the Turks and the Franks, the last third being

<sup>86</sup> Guibert of Nogent, VIII, 1, 261–3; Albert of Aix, V, XXI, 445.

<sup>87</sup> Albert of Aix, X, XXVIII–XXX, 644–5; Ibn al-Qalanisi, 158–9.

<sup>88</sup> Ibn al-Qalanisi, 178; Ibn al-Athir, *Kamil*, X, 490.

<sup>89</sup> Ibn al-Qalanisi, 161–2; Ibn al-Athir, *Kamil*, X, 467; Albert of Aix, X, LIV–LVII, 656–8; Fulcher, Carnot., II, XXXVI, 1–2, 509–11.

left to the peasants.<sup>90</sup> Presumably in 1111, after a breach of treaty that the chronicler ascribed to Baldwin, the agreement was re-established. The Franks were to receive in addition half of the yield of al-Sawad, Jabal 'Awf, al-Jabaniyya and the neighbouring districts belonging to the tribe of Al Jarrah.<sup>91</sup> The initiative to these treaties seems to have come from the Franks every time. This is clearest in Baldwin's initiative in 1113 by which he sought at the last minute to prevent a joint attack on the kingdom by Tughtegin and the Atabeg Mawdud of Mosul. The king ordered the lord of Tiberias, Joscelin of Courtenay, to offer Damascus a treaty of peace and friendship. The Franks would cede the fortress of Thamanin and Jabal 'Awf in exchange for Habis Jaldak and half of the yield of al-Sawad.<sup>92</sup> Both Baldwin and Joscelin had incidentally concluded their first alliances and treaties with Muslims years before in the county of Edessa, where, as has been seen, alliances between Franks and Muslims had been quite usual already since 1098.

Ibn al-Qalanisi and sources dependent on him are aware of two other condominiums in the year 503/1109–10. On the one hand, the Muslims conceded to Jerusalem a third of the yield of the (southern?) Biqa' on the pattern of the previously concluded treaties. On the other hand they conceded the same, perhaps somewhat later, to Count Bertrand of Tripoli, possibly for the northern section of the Biqa'. In addition, Bertrand received the fortresses of al-Munaytira and 'Akkar at the northern end of the Biqa' and tribute from the districts included in the armistice around Masyaf, Tufan and Hisn al-Akrad.<sup>93</sup> The division of the crop yields did not last long *de jure*, since they took place in the frame of treaties of limited duration. Nevertheless, new military operations and breaches of treaties did not render them obsolete *de facto*, since they were obviously repeatedly extended or reconstituted. This legal instrument made it possible, in spite of the concurrent fighting around the Lebanese seaports, to exploit specific regions both economically and fiscally. Since the end of the kingdom of Jerusalem's first decade, condominium arrangements existed for the whole of the frontier zone from the Dead Sea to Hims. They indicate that in spite of all raids a *modus vivendi* between Franks and Turks had been stabilized and that Jerusalem was recognized in Damascus as a treaty partner. This is the meaning of the anecdote in Ibn al-Athir,

---

<sup>90</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 164.

<sup>91</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 174.

<sup>92</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 184.

<sup>93</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 156 and 171.

according to which Baldwin I wrote to Tughtegin after Count William Jordan of Tripoli's victory over the Turks in March 1108: 'Do not think that I shall abrogate the truce because of your defeat. Far worse befalls kings than has befallen you and then their affairs reverted to their correct order.'<sup>94</sup>

It has been shown in this section that the kingdom of Jerusalem entered during the different phases of its establishment in numerous alliances and treaties with its Muslim neighbours. The analysis of the motives for negotiation and of the development of condominiums shows in particular to what extent fiscal, economic and political considerations conditioned these alliances and treaties. Already at this early stage, treaty relations led to conflicts with European pilgrims. Such an abundance of alliances as in the north could not be concluded in the south by reason of the less developed system of autonomous lordships and the specifically different conditions of the origin of the kingdom of Jerusalem. Nevertheless, as in the north, the conflicts of the Franks, Fatimids and Damascenes cannot be summed up as clashes between Christians and Muslims. The investigation has made it clear that the Fatimid coastal cities and independent Tripoli were at the beginning endeavouring to come to a settlement with the Franks. Their policy did not differ from that towards the Muslim Artuqids, Tutush or Atsiz. Qadi Fakhr al-Mulk b. 'Ammar of Tripoli only appealed to Islamic solidarity after the Provençals had encircled the city, having previously maintained good relations with the Franks.

It may be asked whether the Fatimid armies, which attacked the kingdom from the south almost yearly until 1106, had the sole aim of reconquering the coast. At any rate, nothing is known of major operations against Jerusalem or the hill country. A further indication of this is that Egypt only sought to renew the struggle in September 1101, after the start of Frankish expansion. The previous two years had been a phase of stability, characterised by intensive treaty-making—the Fatimids were ready to come to terms with the Franks as long as their rule did not endanger the Egyptian position on the coast. In consequence, a policy of reconquest was not opportune for the Wazir al-Afdal. It would not only have led to economic difficulties, but would again have made the Turkish rulers of Syria direct neighbours of the Fatimid state and a potential threat to Egypt. The policy of the Franks to bring the entire coast into their possession,

---

<sup>94</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 469.

and not the Egyptians' lack of readiness to negotiate, can explain the permanent state of war between Ascalon and Jerusalem until 1111.<sup>95</sup>

For their part, the Turkish powers in Syria did not support any of the Egyptian attacks on the Franks until 1105. In 496/1102–3 Duqaq refused an application for help from the Egyptian wazir and his successor supported the Fatimids with only a small contingent in 1105, since he gave priority to the besieging of Busra.<sup>96</sup> There were no further joint military operations and Damascus was seemingly as interested as Egypt in having a Frankish buffer state between the two of them. Islamic solidarity does also not explain the Damascene attacks to relieve besieged Fatimid coastal cities. Apart from the fact that the Turks could have had no interest in an expansion of Frankish power, they received payment for their intervention in favour of Sidon and Tyre. Albert of Aix declares that in 1108 Tughtegin not only attacked Sidon but also threatened to recall the Franks who had withdrawn, because the city was not able to pay the sum promised for his intervention.<sup>97</sup> He assisted the Tyrians in April 1112 for a similar offer. Only when they later refused to pay did he assert that he had brought up the relieving force solely for a reward from God.<sup>98</sup> A few months later the governor of Tyre, 'Izz al-Mulk Anushtegin, voluntarily submitted to Tughtegin.

It follows that Fatimids and Turks obviously did not perceive the First Crusade, which only altered the geopolitical landscape effectively in the case of Jerusalem, as a decisive break in history integrating the Frankish states into their policies. This took place to a stronger degree in northern Syria than in the south because of the similar origin and structure of Turkish and Frankish lordships in this region. The basic lines of Egyptian and Turkish power-politics in the last decades before the First Crusade were the Turco-Egyptian conflict waged under religious symbols, the rivalry among the Turkish-ruled urban centres of Syria and the attempts of Arab tribal dynasties to assert themselves against the Turks. These remained almost untouched throughout the Frankish acquisition of territory until 1112. It would consequently be inappropriate to present the history of Muslim Syria at the beginning of the twelfth century as collective powerlessness (often pejoratively styled 'fragmentation' due to local lordships) in the face of Frankish penetration. Instead of this supposedly

<sup>95</sup> For instance Albert of Aix, IX, LI, 624 on an offer for a treaty from Ascalon.

<sup>96</sup> Ibn Muyassar, 74–5; al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, III, 32 and 35.

<sup>97</sup> Albert of Aix, X, LIII, 656.

<sup>98</sup> Albert of Aix, XII, VII, 692–3; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 178–81.

passive acceptance of the crusading movement, the Egyptian and Turkish side rather developed active policies of making Frankish power, in spite of the threat that it presented, subservient to their respective interests. The Franks responded to such Muslim offers of cooperation and treaties for concrete economic and political motives. Yet a more developed concept, namely the doctrine of the preservation of a Syrian status quo, started to mark the treaty policy towards the end of this period of the Frankish states' consolidation. The abundance of alliances and treaties, in spite of the Frankish and Turkish rulers' efforts at expansion, allows one to speak of an integration of the 'Crusader states' in the Syrian system of autonomous lordships.

THE PARADIGM OF THE 'COUNTER-CRUSADE':  
THE SYRIAN LORDSHIPS AND THE ADVANCE OF TURKISH  
ALLIED ARMIES FROM THE EAST (1098–1128)

In two respects the years 1109–10 are a landmark in the history of the Frankish lordships in Syria. In the first place, with the capture of the port cities of Tripoli, Jabala, Baniyas, Beirut and Sidon the territorial expansion of the two southern states reached a temporary conclusion. On the coast, only Ascalon and Tyre had still not passed into Frankish possession. After the failure of the siege of Tyre in the winter of 1111–12, the expansion of the kingdom was halted, especially as the murder of the governor Shams al-Khilafa had destroyed the Frankish protectorate over Ascalon and thus also all hopes of the acquisition of the last Fatimid possession in Palestine. Soon after the joint attack of Mawdud of Mosul and Tughtegin of Damascus on Tiberias in 507/1113–14, King Baldwin offered Tughtegin's new governor in Tyre, Mas'ud, a truce of which we only know that it guaranteed safety of traffic for Muslim merchants and travellers in return for a cash-payment<sup>99</sup>—peace lasted on the Lebanese coast after this agreement for nearly a decade.

The condominium treaties, by means of which the rulers of Jerusalem and Tripoli on the one side and Damascus on the other shared the produce of their frontier zones, were an expression of the settled balance of power in the south by 1109–10. In the north, the two Frankish states had rounded out the nucleus of their territories. They were completely

---

<sup>99</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 188–9.

integrated in the political landscape of the Turkish, Arab and Armenian lordships of northern Syria and Mesopotamia with a policy comprising both raids and alliances. The change of rulers after the deaths of Tancred (1112) and Ridwan (1113) brought about no substantial change in the relations of Antioch and Aleppo. The historian Ibn al-Athir took into account the consolidation of the Frankish states by 1109–10 in the conception of his chronicle. He brought together truces between ‘the’ Franks and the Muslim rulers of Aleppo, Tyre, Shayzar and Hamah concluded in reality at entirely different dates and linked them en bloc to his account of the capture of Sidon.<sup>100</sup> According to his statement, the Muslim rulers had found themselves induced to offer these treaties by the Frankish successes on the coast and in northern Syria. The Frankish-Muslim agreements signal the achievement of an—admittedly temporary—*modus vivendi*.

At about the same time, Turkish armies started a series of campaigns against Syria. These armies are said to have received the command of the Seljuk sultan for *jihad* against the Franks. In the literature of the history of the Crusades, these campaigns are frequently subsumed under the title of ‘counter-Crusades’ and embedded in a counter-Crusade paradigm. This paradigm has found a twofold expression. Older works argued that after a first decade of Frankish rule in Syria without concentrated resistance, a period of Islamic reaction proceeding from Mesopotamia began. According to Stevenson, caliph and sultan recognized their responsibility for the welfare of the Islamic world and from 1110 onwards organized the counter-Crusade, long requested by Qadi Fakhr al-Mulk b. ‘Ammar of Tripoli and Tughtegin of Damascus.<sup>101</sup> Grousset describes the campaigns of Mawdud from 1110 to 1113 and of Bursuq b. Bursuq in 1115 in this way as counter-Crusades.<sup>102</sup> Prawer has indeed held the designation of the Turkish attack of 1111 as a pan-Islamic *jihad* to be exaggerated; nevertheless, he emphasizes that it was the expression of the ideas of the Holy War spreading in Syria and Iraq.<sup>103</sup>

There exists a wide consensus over 1110 as the date of the beginning of these counter-Crusades, although Ben-Ami holds the view that the Franks had to deal with Muslim counter-Crusades from the start.<sup>104</sup> The parallel drawn between the Crusades and the military undertakings of Muslim

<sup>100</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, X, 482.

<sup>101</sup> Stephenson, *Crusaders*, 87 and 96.

<sup>102</sup> Grousset, *Histoire*, I, 449, 460–3, 487, 495f.

<sup>103</sup> Prawer, *Histoire*, I, 290, 294.

<sup>104</sup> Ben-Ami, *Social Change*, 119.

princes against the Franks, designated simply as *jihad* in Arabic, ensues for the holders of the counter-Crusade idea from two points. Firstly, the campaigns were formally directed against unbelievers and secondly central institutions of the respective religions, the caliphate and the papacy, supposedly initiated them. The specific aims of the so-called counter-Crusades have, however, not been more closely investigated. Supposedly, the pleas for help personally conveyed by the Qadi Fakhr al-Mulk b. 'Ammar, the ruler of Tripoli, to the caliph and the sultan in 1108 and the activities of the already mentioned delegation from Aleppo in 1111 triggered the pan-Arab reaction to the consolidation of Frankish rule in Syria.<sup>105</sup>

However, Atiya and Sivan have interpreted the counter-Crusade paradigm more broadly based on their investigations of Syrian *jihad* propaganda of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and to a large degree independently of any analysis of power-politics. For both the term 'counter-Crusade' signifies a process continuing for at least a century and a half, aiming at the liberation of Jerusalem and the Holy Land from the Christians. This process is represented as happening in two phases: first, the development of intensive *jihad* propaganda and secondly, material reconquests.<sup>106</sup> Sivan thinks that the first signs of the taking up of the idea of *jihad*, propagated in pious Muslim circles by the Turkish or Fatimid rulers, can be traced in the year 1110. From 1118, the Islamic states accompanied fighting against the Franks with intensive *jihad* propaganda in order to consolidate support among their own subjects. Yet, they did not subordinate their policies to the contents of the *jihad* concept of Islamic law or at this point place the existence of the Syrian Frankish states in question. The final aim of a complete reconquest of the Frankish territories was only to arise in the middle of the twelfth century.<sup>107</sup>

Gibb had already sharply rejected the thesis of Islamic 'counter-Crusades' in the form held by Stevenson and Grousset, although his estimate of Saladin's historical role as *mujahid* against the Franks and unifier of the Islamic world shows similar traits. Gibb emphasizes that in the first half of the twelfth century no phenomenon comparable to the Crusades, sustained as they were by mass enthusiasm, is to be found. In addition, the advances of Turkish armies into Syria, apart from 1115, were not Seljuk

---

<sup>105</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 160–1; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 452–3; Ibn al-Furāt, I (ed. Shamy), 5–16, arab. 4–12.

<sup>106</sup> Atiya, *Idea of Counter-Crusade*, 356–7.

<sup>107</sup> Sivan, *L'Islam*, 39–40.

undertakings, but operations of the atabegs in Mosul.<sup>108</sup> There can be no doubt that these campaigns were, however, presented as *jihad* undertakings against the Franks and as actions in support of distressed Muslim Syria. Moreover, after the firm establishment of the kingdom of Jerusalem, Damascus and Egypt moved towards closer cooperation, as expressed in the surrender of Fatimid-ruled Tyre to Damascus (506/1112–13). Thereafter Tyre remained under Fatimid sovereignty, but ruled by a Damascene governor.<sup>109</sup> Did the intervention of Turkish forces from the east and the new entente between Damascus and Egypt reflect the reaction of an Islamic world which was unifying itself against the foundation of Frankish states, as the paradigm of the counter-Crusades maintains? To obtain clarification on this matter, the following pages will investigate the campaigns, proclaimed as *jihad*, by Turkish rulers of Mosul up to 1128 and the reaction of the Muslim rulers of Syria. 1128 was a crucial turning-point because the taking of Aleppo by 'Imad al-Din Zengi of Mosul and the death of Tugh-tegin of Damascus on 12 February 1128 decisively altered the balance of power in Syria after the failure of the Frankish attacks on Aleppo (1125–26) and Damascus (1126). Furthermore, with the re-assumption in the autumn of 1126 of the government of Antioch from its regent, King Baldwin II, the link which had for a few years existed between the policies of the kingdom of Jerusalem and conditions in northern Syria came to an end.

The first Muslim joint undertaking on a larger scale against the Franks was the campaign of Kirbogha of Mosul in the spring and summer of 1098 in response to the appeal for help from Yaghisiyan, the Turkish ruler of Antioch. There is no proof that Kirbogha was acting in his attempt to relieve Antioch on the command of the Seljuk Sultan Berkyaruq, as Cahen has intimated.<sup>110</sup> In his army were exclusively contingents of his immediate followers, princes such as Arslantash of Sinjar, reinforced by contingents from Damascus and Hims, but not Aleppo. Nevertheless, the composition of this army was still heterogeneous enough to be a main cause for its defeat by the Crusaders on 27 June 1098. Already before the battle, rivalry between Arabs and Turks in the army and the intrigues of Ridwan of Aleppo had led to the withdrawal of individual groups. Kirbogha's Syrian allies, who had been angered by his undiplomatic conduct, suddenly abandoned him during the battle. The deeper cause of the Syrians'

<sup>108</sup> Gibb, *Notes*, 741–3.

<sup>109</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 182; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 620.

<sup>110</sup> Cahen, *Syrie*, 215.

disloyalty may have lain in the fact that they, like Ridwan of Aleppo, might have felt that the Frankish seizure of territory threatened their autonomy less than the expansion of Kirbogha's power through the possible capture of Antioch, where he already held the citadel.<sup>111</sup> In spite of the presence of a group of *mujahids* in Kirbogha's army, his campaign can thus not be described as a counter-Crusade.

At this point, the fundamental divergence of interests between the rulers and the groups of *mujahids* of popular origin is already discernible. An episode of the year 1106 clearly shows the political value of the *jihād* propaganda for the rulers of northern Syria. When Ridwan of Aleppo was seeking to form an alliance with various amirs including Ilghazi b. Artuq to fight against Antioch, they persuaded him first to attack Chokurmish of Mosul, with whose soldiers and property he would then reinforce himself. While the allies were thereupon besieging Nasibin in northern Mesopotamia, Chokurmish conspired with Ridwan, offering him his help in the *jihād* if in return the latter would imprison Ilghazi, one of Chokurmish's most powerful rivals. When Ilghazi refused to be reconciled with Chokurmish and declined to fight the Franks unless he was first given Nasibin, Ridwan did in fact imprison him. However, Chokurmish did not think of fulfilling his promise to Ridwan concerning the *jihād*.<sup>112</sup>

The rhetorical character of the idea of *jihād* is completely clear in this episode, as is that of the summons for the reunion of the Muslims, which the northern Syrian amirs used to legitimate their wars among themselves. Even for Ridwan, who alone really wanted to fight the Franks, the word *jihād* was merely the means to recruit allies for his territorial disputes with Tancred of Antioch. The refusal of the ruler of Aleppo to take part in all the allied undertakings of Muslim rulers directed against the Franks, such as the campaigns of Kirbogha in 1098 and of Mawdud in 1111, indicates how his moral outlook regarding the *jihād* fared when it did not coincide with his own interests. By skilful finessing, Ridwan endeavoured to meet the danger of forfeiting his legitimacy as a Muslim ruler due to his failure to participate in the *jihād*. When in 1108 Sidon was under siege and turned to Aleppo for help, Ridwan's Christian scribe laid before his master a sober reckoning of cost-effectiveness. If he intervened in favour of Sidon, he would lose money, but if he remained inactive, his good name would be lost. Ridwan decided for the latter option. A little later he heard that the

<sup>111</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 276–7; Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Zubda*, II, 136.

<sup>112</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 405–6.

Frankish siege was becoming less intense. Only then, when the risk had diminished, was Ridwan prepared to send a contingent to help Sidon—in the vague hope of salvaging a scrap of his reputation.<sup>113</sup> When Tughtegin of Damascus asked him for support against the Frankish attacks in 1110, Ridwan did indeed declare with enthusiasm his readiness for the *jihad*, but he stalled so long that in the end the Damascene ambassador left Aleppo.<sup>114</sup> Certainly the campaign of 1106 was in no way an undertaking summoned by the caliph or the sultan as the counter-Crusade paradigm suggested. What place had the spirit of the *jihad* in the enterprises that the sultan ordered himself?

Even a verbal engagement by the representatives of central Islamic and Seljuk institutions to fight against the Franks cannot be discerned until 1106. For the late summer of this year, Ibn al-Athir reports that only after several pressing requests for help from Tripoli did Sultan Muhammad confer the city of Mosul in *iqta'* on the Amir Jawali Saqao on condition of fighting against the Franks. Nevertheless, the installation of Jawali is by no means to be taken as an indication of the growing interest of the sultan in the *jihad*. For the sultan, the assignment of Mosul to Jawali signified no more than the opportunity to relegate a retainer who had become too powerful for him in southern Persia to the periphery of his sphere of power and to neutralize him as a rival by occupying him with the expanding Frankish lordships in northern Syria and the Anatolian state of Qilij Arslan.<sup>115</sup> In addition, the sultan unburdened himself of a rebel, Chokurmish, the previous lord of Mosul, from whom Jawali had first to take the city. Significantly, the sultan had in 1106 unsuccessfully ordered not only Jawali but also his two chief rivals in Mesopotamia, Chokurmish and the Mazyadi Amir Sadaqa, to undertake the *jihad*,<sup>116</sup> in order to disburden himself of potential rivals and over-mighty retainers. Incidentally, Jawali never displayed serious determination to embark on *jihad* campaigns. By contrast, he made an alliance in 1108 with Count Baldwin II of Edessa and Joscelin of Turbessel when he was dismissed as lord of Mosul. At this point, Mawdud b. Altintegin attacked him on the sultan's orders because of his refusal to support the sultan in his fight against the

<sup>113</sup> Ibn al-Furāt, MS Vindob. A.F. 117, fol. 36v.

<sup>114</sup> Ibn al-Furāt, MS Vindob. A.F. 117, fol. 47v. Cf. also Ibn al-Furāt, MS Vindob. A.F. 117, fol. 37v on a letter from Tyre to Aleppo in 1109 and Ibn al-Furāt, MS Vindob. A.F. 117, fol. 36v–40r on an embassy from Shayzar to Aleppo in 1110.

<sup>115</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, X, 422; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 156.

<sup>116</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 156.

Mazyadi Amir Sadaqa. The sultan's peace offer in 1108, on condition of the surrender of Mosul and assistance to the Qadi Fakhr al-Mulk b. 'Ammar of Tripoli against the Franks, remained fruitless.<sup>117</sup>

The four Turkish campaigns from Mosul against Syria between 1110 and 1113 are linked with the name of the Atabeg Mawdud b. Altintegin. The counter-Crusade paradigm ascribes to him the role of a protagonist in the struggle against the Franks as a predecessor of Saladin.<sup>118</sup> Did Mawdud's undertakings, then, contain substantial new elements? A Turkish army was mustered on the sultan's orders in the spring of 1110 to fight the Franks after the former lord of Tripoli, the Qadi Fakhr al-Mulk b. 'Ammar, had undertaken a further journey in search of help. They were brought together from the troops of Mawdud, Sukman al-Qutbi of Tabriz and Mayyafariqin as well as the Turcomans of Ilghazi b. Artuq of Mardin. They besieged Edessa unsuccessfully from 3 to 12 May. An encounter with a Frankish and Armenian fighting force under King Baldwin I also came to no result and Mawdud's sole success lay in the pillage of the region and the slaughter of unarmed Armenian refugees. Mawdud's failure like that of Kirbogha in 1098 was due to the heterogeneity of his fighting forces rather than to the Franks. His allies, the two old rivals Ilghazi and Sukman b. Qutbi, fell out and abandoned Mawdud together with their contingents.<sup>119</sup>

Tidings did not change for Mawdud on his second 'counter-Crusade' on the sultan's orders. During the siege of Turbessel, the Frankish lord, Joscelin, established such good relations with Ahmad-II of Maragha, one of Mawdud's allies, that he persuaded the Turkish army to withdraw.<sup>120</sup> Ilghazi had not even taken part in the campaign, but had only sent his son Ayaz. Two other allies, Bursuq b. Bursuq of Hamdhan and Sukman b. Qutbi, quarrelled. In conjunction with Ahmad-II, both were more interested in taking Aleppo than in marching against Tripoli, which the Franks had captured the previous year. Even the rich presents of Tughtegin of Damascus did not change their minds. The Turkish army disintegrated as quickly as it had mustered. Bursuq fell ill and abandoned the campaign, Sukman died and Ahmad-II hastened back in order to take up his succession.<sup>121</sup> Only Mawdud remained in Syria until the winter of 1111 and, together with Tughtegin, engaged in an unsuccessful war of position with

<sup>117</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 463 and later chroniclers.

<sup>118</sup> Fink, *Mawdūd*; Stephenson, *Crusaders*, 87–96.

<sup>119</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 169–70; Matthew of Edessa, 270–3; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Bughya*, 160–1.

<sup>120</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 175; Matthew of Edessa, 275.

<sup>121</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 159–61; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 486–7; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 176–7; Ibn al-Furāt, MS Vindob. A.F. 117, fol. 54r.

the Franks at the request of the Amir Sultan of Shayzar, who was besieged by Tancred.<sup>122</sup>

Mawdud undertook a campaign against Edessa and Saruj on his own initiative in 1112. His last enterprise, a year later, was directed against the kingdom of Jerusalem, beginning with a raid on the county of Edessa. Together with his retainer Tamirak of Sinjar and Ayaz b. Ilghazi, and reinforced by Tughtegin of Damascus whom he had called to help, he obtained a victory over King Baldwin I, Tancred and Pons of Tripoli at the Sea of Galilee on 30 June 1113. Thereupon Mawdud allowed the pillage of Frankish territory up to Acre. He was murdered in the Umayyad Mosque a few weeks later (October 1113), allegedly by the Nizaris.<sup>123</sup> That marked the end of the campaign.

The following characteristics distinguished the 'counter-Crusades' under Mawdud: At best two of the campaigns, the enterprises of 1110 and 1111, can be described as genuine allied undertakings. Rulers who were not immediate retainers of Mawdud participated only in these two campaigns. In the heterogeneous composition of these two armies lay also the reason for their failure. Many rulers only participated in the *jihad* until their desire for booty was satisfied and left as soon as the campaign threatened to be unilaterally advantageous to one of the other participants. Thus, Mawdud's attacks in 1110 and 1112 on Edessa were certainly in accordance with the sultan's orders, but essentially these campaigns were nothing but enterprises against the most threatening rival of Mosul in northern Mesopotamia and so coincided with the personal interest of Mawdud as lord of Mosul. It is therefore no wonder that his allies left him in the lurch in 1110 and that he had to fight on his own in 1112. The character of the campaign of 1110 as a 'counter-Crusade' is furthermore questionable if one takes into consideration the statements of Christian sources that the enterprise was initiated in collusion with Frankish instigation—either from Edessa or Antioch—to damage the respective Norman or Lorrainer opponent. If this is the truth, the campaign of 1110 is reduced to a normal northern Syrian and northern Mesopotamian clash over territory in the style of the wars of 1106 and 1108, conducted in the name of the *jihad*.<sup>124</sup> For Mawdud, only the attack on Galilee in 1113 was not directly aimed at

<sup>122</sup> Fulcher, Carnot., II, XLV, 1–9, 549–57; Albert of Aix, XI, XL–XLII, 682–4; Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 50–1.

<sup>123</sup> Matthew of Edessa, 282–4; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 184–7.

<sup>124</sup> Albert of Aix, XI, XVI, 670; Albert of Aix, XI, XXI–XXII, 673–4 assumes that Tancred took the initiative to call in the Turks. Matthew of Edessa, 270, by contrast, reports that the initiative was taken by Baldwin II of Edessa and Joscelin I of Turbessel.

extending his power. Nevertheless, the campaign was not devoid of self-interest, since, as Ibn al-Qalanisi reports, the suspicion had shortly before arisen at the sultan's court that Mawdud wanted to instigate a rebellion. By his involvement in the *jihad*, Mawdud seems to have intended to prove himself a loyal retainer and warrior against the infidels in accordance with the command of his Seljuk master.<sup>125</sup>

On balance, the results of the investigation of the so-called counter-Crusade projects from Jawali to Mawdud is that the explanation of the Turkish campaigns is not to be found in the unification of the Islamic world against the Crusaders, but in the power struggle in Iraq and the territorial interests of the changing governors of Mosul. A new devotion of the caliph or the sultan to the *jihad* around 1110 is not, as Stevenson thought, discernible. It is also not clear what the aim of the so-called counter-Crusades was, beyond the taking of booty and the struggle against Edessa, pushed by Mosul. None of the enterprises attempted to besiege a Frankish capital—certainly not Jerusalem, which might perhaps have been possible in 1113—and so 'to purge Asia of the Franks'. The plan, also in 1111, to retake Tripoli, captured by the Franks in 1109, found no supporters. Sultan Muhammad failed to ever participate in person in a campaign against the Franks, although he made announcements accordingly in 1110 after the fall of Tripoli and in 1111 in letters to Aleppo after the riots of the Aleppine delegation in Baghdad.<sup>126</sup> The sultan's sole concession to his reputation as protagonist in the *jihad* and to public opinion in Baghdad, which urged him to intervene, was to send his son Mas'ud, a minor, to Mawdud. Mas'ud, who was brought up in Mosul, also accompanied Aqsunqur al-Bursuqi on his 'counter-Crusade' in 1114. How little value was placed on the *jihad*, if it did not contribute to the expansion of the sultan's power, is repeatedly shown. For example, when Sultan Mahmud (1118–31) had to dismiss Aqsunqur al-Bursuqi as *shihna* of Baghdad under pressure from the caliph in 1123, he commissioned him with the *jihad* and sent him to Mosul. As for Jawali in 1106, this was a transfer for disciplinary reasons.<sup>127</sup>

The course of the last two allied enterprises under the sultan's orders, in 1114 and 1115, make even more obvious that the so-called counter-Crusades, once divested of their propagandist clothing, were simply products of the political ambitions of the rulers of Mosul and the sultans. The

<sup>125</sup> Ibn al-Qalanisi, 184.

<sup>126</sup> Ibn Abī Ṭayy' in Ibn al-Furāt, MS Vindob. A.F. 117, fol. 39v (on 1110); Ibn al-Furāt, MS Vindob. A.F. 117, fol. 47r–v (on 1111).

<sup>127</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 622.

project of a concerted attack on the Franks, like that pursued by Aqsunqur al-Bursuqi when he succeeded the Atabeg Mawdud of Mosul in 1114, failed wretchedly at the outset. Ilghazi b. Artuq of Mardin, who had already previously kept himself out of Mawdud's campaigns as far as possible, refused to support Aqsunqur in his operations. Ilghazi was not prepared to act as a retainer of Mosul, nor was he interested to assist Aqsunqur in an expedition mounted as a *jiḥād*. The so-called counter-Crusade of 1114 ended after a pillaging raid on the county of Edessa in a severe defeat for Aqsunqur in a purely Muslim battle against an Artuqid fighting force under Ilghazi.<sup>128</sup>

For the last example of a 'counter-Crusade', the struggle against the Franks was only of secondary importance. This was the army sent by Sultan Muhammad from northern Mesopotamia to Syria in 1115 under the command of Bursuq b. Bursuq of Hamadhan and the new lord of Mosul, Juyush Beg. The sultan commanded the army first to bring to their senses the Amirs Ilghazi and Tughtegin, who had not only been insubordinate since 1113, but in Tughtegin's case blamed for participation in the murder of Mawdud. Only after that were the Franks to be attacked. Consequently, the campaign was simply an attempt by the sultan to extend Great Seljuk power westwards and to reorganize Syria according to his political outlook. This was understood in Syria as his intention. Bursuq and Juyush Beg found support only from the Banu Munqidh of Shayzar, beset equally by Antioch and Aleppo, and from Qirkhan b. Qaraja of Hims, a disloyal vassal of Tughtegin. According to the sultan's will, the conquests of the allied army were to be handed over to him. This incidentally paralysed the enthusiasm of the amirs of the Turkish army, concerned as they were for the extension of their own power.<sup>129</sup>

The Turkish campaigns thus served objectives which did not give priority to the aim of expelling the Franks. However, repeated calls from Syria, as well as the response in the mosques of Baghdad and the caliphal court, had without doubt contributed to their instigation. Among these were the journeys in search of help by the Qadi Fakhr al-Mulk b. 'Ammar in 1108 and 1110, repeated letters from Damascus, the embassy from Aleppo of the Qadi Ibn al-Khashshab to Baghdad in 1111 and in 1115 the offer of Lu'lu' al-Yaya, the regent to Ridwan's successor, to surrender Aleppo to an army from the sultan.<sup>130</sup> Thus, in view of the expansion of the Frankish states,

<sup>128</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 501–2; Matthew of Edessa, 287; Michael Syrus, 216–7.

<sup>129</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 509–10; Ibn al-Furāt, MS Vindob. A.F. 117, fol. 83v–84v.

<sup>130</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 174.

was the thought of a solidarity born from the consciousness of Islamic unity closer to the Muslim rulers of Syria than to those of Iraq and is it legitimate, at least in this sense, to speak of 'counter-Crusades'? What position did Damascus assume in regard to the 'counter-Crusades'?

Symptomatic of Damascene policy in regard to Turkish allies is an event in the autumn of 1104. The ruler of the city, Tughtegin, sorely ill, summoned to its defence the Turcoman Amir Sukman b. Artuq who was about to advance against the Franks together with Chokurmish of Mosul. Tughtegin's entourage reacted with dismay. 'If you hand over Damascus to the Amir Sukman b. Artuq [...], what then will become of yourself and us? Don't you know what befell Atsiz when he called on the Sultan Taj al-Dawla b. Alp Arslan [i.e. Tutush]? How he [i.e. Tutush] hastened to kill him without granting him and his people any delay?' Tughtegin then regretted his rash request for help and was delighted to learn that Sukman had died on the way to Damascus.<sup>131</sup>

This incident, which the Damascene local historian Ibn al-Qalanisi transmitted, will serve as a *locus classicus* for the basis of the policy of Muslim rulers in Syria in regard to reinforcements from the east. The history of the rule of the Turcoman chief Atsiz in Damascus from 1076 to 1079 held for Damascus as for Egypt a trauma which lastingly influenced alliance policy. Every intervention by Turkish armies from the east confronted Damascus, Aleppo and the smaller lordships with the dilemma of weighing up the possible advantages of cooperation with a 'counter-Crusade' against the Franks and the danger that a successful allied operation presented to the autonomy of their own rule. This was not only expressed in 1098 in the tension between Kirbogha and the Syrian amirs. When in 1110 Tughtegin was accompanying the Qadi Fakhr al-Mulk b. 'Ammar on his second journey to Baghdad for help, he heard rumours that the sultan had distributed the Syrian *iqta's*, including Damascus, to amirs in his retinue. Thereupon Tughtegin turned back, especially as he learnt that his own governor in Ba'labakk was compromising him with the sultan.<sup>132</sup>

Tughtegin did indeed reinforce the troops of Mawdud and his allies outside Edessa in 1110, but he sent only a detachment while he himself remained in Syria. It was only in 1111 that he allowed himself to appear

<sup>131</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 146.

<sup>132</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 166; Ibn Abī Ṭayy' in Ibn al-Furāt, MS Vindob. A.F. 117, fol. 48v.

before Mawdud in northern Syria. Tughtegin must, however, have recognized that the allied Turks not only had no interest in reconquering Tripoli but also harboured 'evil intentions' against him which extended to a murder plot by Ridwan of Aleppo and one of the amirs in the army. For this reason during the operations he entered into secret negotiations with the Franks and only supported Mawdud when he, abandoned by his allies, no longer presented a danger to the independence of Damascus.<sup>133</sup> Tughtegin only claimed the help of Mawdud in 1113 because King Baldwin I had shortly before called into question the status quo between Damascus and Jerusalem as regulated in the condominium treaty with his campaigns for booty in the Damascene provinces of Hawran and Bathaniyya to the south of Damascus.<sup>134</sup> However, when Mawdud wanted to winter in Damascus after the successful campaign of 1113–14, Tughtegin's alliance with him became acutely dangerous. Everything indicates that Tughtegin had to take a share of the blame for the murder of his ally in the Umayyad Mosque. Both Franks and Muslims regarded Tughtegin as instigator of the murderers.<sup>135</sup> Matthew of Edessa even represents the attack as a preventive measure to which Tughtegin had recourse when he learnt of Mawdud's intention to have him killed.<sup>136</sup> Immediately after the death of his ally and opponent, Tughtegin incidentally agreed on a treaty with King Baldwin I which apparently restored the previous status quo between the two states and secured the frontiers for years to come.<sup>137</sup>

These examples demonstrate the suspicious position assumed by Tughtegin in face of the military campaigns launched from the east, the aid of which Damascus sought only in the event of an extreme threat. In 1127, shortly before his death and fourteen years after Mawdud's murder, Tughtegin was still acting according to the maxim of placing the independence of Damascus above the ideal of an Islamic empire committed to the *jihād*. He resolved on fighting Mas'ud b. Aqsunqur al-Bursuqi when the latter was planning the conquest of all the Syrian lordships, whether ruled by Franks, Turks or Arabs, in the name of *jihād*.<sup>138</sup> Thus, the Turkish allied

<sup>133</sup> Ibn Abī Ṭayy' in Ibn al-Furāt, MS Vindob. A.F. 117, fol. 54v–55r; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 177; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 487; Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhir*, 18.

<sup>134</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 183–4; Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, ed. Haydarabad, VIII, 42.

<sup>135</sup> Cf. Fink, *Mawdūd*. Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 497; Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhir*, 19; Fulcher, Carnot., II, LI, 4, 577; Albert of Aix, XII, XVIII, 700; William of Tyre, XI, XX, 487.

<sup>136</sup> Matthew of Edessa, 285–6.

<sup>137</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 190.

<sup>138</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 216–7.

operations were no counter-Crusades, nor did the major Muslim rulers in Syria understand them as such. This is true of Damascus and Aleppo alike. Ridwan maintained close treaty relations with the principality of Antioch, but refused his support to every Turkish alliance against the Franks. He even declined offers of an inter-Syrian alliance by his arch-rival Tughtegin. He did indeed seek help from Damascus when Tancred besieged the fortress of 'Azaz in 1112, but in 1113 he participated in the campaign of Mawdud and Tughtegin in Galilee only with so small a token contingent that Tughtegin angrily brought to an end the nominal suzerainty of Aleppo over Damascus.<sup>139</sup> The Aleppine 'republic of notables'<sup>140</sup> followed the same line after Ridwan's death in 1113. The north Syrian city-state continued to pay tribute to the principality of Antioch apart from a short interval in 1113. On the other hand, entry into the city was refused to Bursuq b. Bursuq and his allied army in 1115 (just as to Mawdud in 1111), although an appeal for help to the sultan in Baghdad from the regent of Aleppo, Lu'lu' al-Yaya, had partly initiated the campaign of 1115. Aleppo concluded a further truce with Roger of Antioch in 1117 under al-Yaya's successor Yaruqtash. Antioch not only received a cash-payment and the fortress of al-Qubba south of Aleppo but also the right to farm the tolls on the caravan-route to the south, which the pilgrims to Mecca used.<sup>141</sup>

Aleppo's resistance under its various rulers to the Muslim allied armies entailed willy-nilly the subjection to a sort of Norman protectorate. The reason for taking this stance was rooted in more than just the fear that Aleppo would again have to get on with Antioch on its own once the allied Muslim fighting forces had withdrawn. Ibn al-'Adim states that the political leaders of Aleppo were really interested in the Franks' remaining in Syria because only the existence of Frankish states could help to maintain the independence of Aleppo.<sup>142</sup> This explains why the city-commandant and regent Yaruqtash called for help from both Ilghazi b. Artuq and Roger of Antioch, when Aqsunqur al-Bursuqi twice attempted in 1117 to take Aleppo, which the sultan had granted him in *iqta'*. Both rulers wished to avoid the establishment of a trusted agent of the sultan such as Aqsunqur in Muslim Syria. As ruler of Mosul, al-Rahba and Aleppo, he would concentrate so many sources of power that the balance of strength in northern Syria would be completely thrown out. Muslim or Christian,

<sup>139</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 186; Ibn al-Furāt, MS Vindob. A.F. 117, fol. 69v.

<sup>140</sup> Cahen, *Syrie*, 269.

<sup>141</sup> Al-'Azīmi, 384; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 179 and 181; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 199.

<sup>142</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 173.

Turcoman or Frank—the interests of Roger and Ilghazi were identical. When Aqsunqur demanded the surrender of Aleppo, he received the city's answer: 'We want nobody from the east!'<sup>143</sup>

At this point, it becomes clear that a decade and a half after the First Crusade, Franks and Muslims in Syria had developed a relationship which went beyond the establishment of a simple *modus vivendi* and may be designated as pan-Syrian solidarity. For the Turkish rulers, the Frankish states were not only potential treaty partners but also possible allies, since for them the existence of Frankish states presented a lesser evil than an expansion of the power of the Fatimids or the Seljuk sultan. The attempt of external powers to secure a foothold in Syria was felt as a common threat and led to leagues between Franks and Turks, as the alliance of Aleppo and Antioch against Jawali in 1108 had already proved. The great Syrian alliance between the rulers of the four Frankish states with Tughtegin of Damascus, Lu'lu' al-Yaya of Aleppo and Ilghazi of Mardin, which came together in 1115 as a reaction to the 'counter-Crusade' of Bursuq b. Bursuq emphasized this even more clearly than the dependence of Aleppo on Antioch. Although the statements of the sources about the conclusion of this alliance are not completely in agreement, the tenor of the different accounts is, however, the same as far as concerns its motivation: the Turkish allied enterprise under Bursuq in 1115 was a consequence of the killing of Mawdud and was as much directed against the Franks as against Ilghazi and Tughtegin.<sup>144</sup> Since Tughtegin was of the opinion that he could no longer defend his realm once Bursuq defeated the Christians,<sup>145</sup> he entered into a full-fledged treaty of peace and alliance of limited duration (including oath and provision of hostages) with Count Roger and King Baldwin I.<sup>146</sup> According to his opinion, the Parthians (as the non-Syrian Turks are sometimes styled in historically minded Frankish sources to differentiate them from the Syrian Turks) represented a far greater danger in peace than in war.<sup>147</sup> As a result of this treaty, a Syrian Muslim and Frankish army and an Eastern Muslim and sultanic allied fighting force stood facing one another at Shayzar in the late summer of 1115.

<sup>143</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 180–1. Cf. Ibn al-Qalānisi, 199.

<sup>144</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 503; Fulcher, *Carnot*, II, LIII, 2, 582; Albert of Aix, XII, XX, 702; William of Tyre, XI, XXIII, 493; Matthew of Edessa, 292.

<sup>145</sup> Fulcher, *Carnot*, II, LIII, 2, 583; William of Tyre, XI, XXIII, 492–3.

<sup>146</sup> Walter the Chancellor, I, II, 6, pp. 66–7; William of Tyre, XI, XXIII, 492–3.

<sup>147</sup> Walter the Chancellor, I, II, 6, pp. 66–7.

It would, however, be wrong to see the alliance brought into being by Tughtegin in 1115 as an *entente cordiale*. It was not the result of a new ideology of toleration or of friendship between Franks and Muslims, but was born from sober political calculation. One of Roger's most powerful vassals, Robert Fulco of Zardana, who had formed a close friendship with Tughtegin, was to discover this in his own person, when as a prisoner in Aleppo in 1119 his so-called friend killed him.<sup>148</sup> According to Ibn al-ʿAdim, Tughtegin was concerned to prevent a decisive battle during the campaign of 1115, 'for if the Franks defeat the sultan's armies, they will take the whole of Syria; but if they are defeated, the sultan's armies will dominate all that they have.'<sup>149</sup> There were also grievances on the Frankish side. Thus, the chronicler Walter the Chancellor describes Roger and Tughtegin only as quasi friends and calls the subsequent dissolution of the allied fighting forces of Franks and Muslims a work of God, who has taken His own away from the fellowship of Belial, i.e. from working together with the Muslims.<sup>150</sup> Fulcher of Chartres however, who in other places expressed the Syrianizing of the Franks in emphatic terms<sup>151</sup> and described their earlier campaigns against Muslim adversaries as the service of God and pilgrimage, presents the alliance plainly and uncritically.<sup>152</sup> In the chronicle of the Damascene writer Ibn al-Qalanisi, the alliance of 1115 is simply ignored as too inglorious for the *mujahid* Tughtegin.

Both the stabilization of the Frankish-Muslim system of autonomous lordships in Syria, as also the limits of the pan-Syrian solidarity become clear in the reaction to the campaigns of Bursuq b. Bursuq and Aqsunqur al-Bursuqi. Frankish-Muslim alliances, like those among Muslims, possessed only an *ad hoc* validity. If the Syrian rulers stood together against a common threat, this did not signify the renunciation of internal rivalry and expansion. Although Tughtegin continued to offer resistance after 1115 to every encroachment of the sultan on Syria, as his preparations in 1127 against Masʿud b. Aqsunqur al-Bursuqi of Mosul indicated, he entered, however, into alliances to set limits to the expansion of Frankish power if this involved no risk to Damascene autonomy. To the aim of independent rule, a balance between the Frankish and Muslim states of Syria (Mosul

<sup>148</sup> Usāma b. Munqidh, *Iʿtibār*, 88; Ibn al-ʿAdim, *Zubda*, II, 192–3; Walter the Chancellor, II, XIV, 1–8, pp. 107–9.

<sup>149</sup> Ibn al-ʿAdim, *Zubda*, II, 175.

<sup>150</sup> Walter the Chancellor, I, II, 6, p. 67 and I, IV, 5, p. 70.

<sup>151</sup> Fulcher, Carnot., III, XXXVII, 3–8, 748–9.

<sup>152</sup> Fulcher, Carnot., II, LIV, 5, 589.

and the Artuqid principalities of northern Mesopotamia being included) was most useful. Thus, in the spring of 1116 Tughtegin, during a visit to Iraq, was reconciled to Sultan Muhammad and obtained a diploma of appointment which committed to him the administration of Syria, with the right to levy the *kharaj* and with the obligation of protecting the Muslims.<sup>153</sup> These rights remained purely theoretical, but they legitimated Tughtegin's rule over Damascus and safeguarded him against the sultan. Only on this basis could he enter into the following alliances against the Franks.

Tughtegin and Aqsunqur al-Bursuqi of Mosul jointly defeated Count Bertrand of Tripoli in 1116, when he was making a raid for booty in the Bīqā'. After this operation the two Muslim amirs concluded a pact of friendship and support and Aqsunqur gave assurances that he would return to the *jihād* in Syria 'when the occasion should arise'.<sup>154</sup> This formula concisely expresses Damascene strategy. Neither the existence of Frankish states, nor perhaps Frankish rule over Jerusalem, is put in question, but a possible alteration of the status quo. In the same vein, the subsequent allied operations of 1119 and 1120 with Ilghazi b. Artuq and Dubays b. Sadaqa and those of 1124 and 1125 with Aqsunqur al-Bursuqi of Mosul into northern Syria had therefore only the character of raids. They represented reactions to the Frankish attempts at expansion towards Aleppo, but were not counter-Crusades for the expulsion of the Franks. Out of financial constraints alone, Turcoman leaders such as Ilghazi were not able to mount larger campaigns.<sup>155</sup> In relation to Egypt, the same principle guided Damascus. A joint operation between Tughtegin and the Fatimids, who had only been leagued together since 1113 by their shared rule over Tyre, took place only in 1118, when Tughtegin reinforced the Fatimid fighting force outside Ascalon at the request of Egypt. For his support, Tughtegin was richly repaid in arms, horses, tents and robes of honour, as he had been some years earlier following his relief action for Sidon and Tyre, without the alliance having achieved any result.<sup>156</sup> In the winter of 1123–24, while King Baldwin II was a prisoner in Kharput, Aqsunqur of Mosul and Tughtegin successfully invited the Egyptians to attack

<sup>153</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 193–7; cf. Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 514.

<sup>154</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 198.

<sup>155</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 569.

<sup>156</sup> Ibn al-Ma'mūn, 13–4; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 543; al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, III, 53–4; Fulcher, *Carnot.*, III, II, 1–3, 617–9; William of Tyre, XII, VI, 518–9.

the apparently uncovered southern flank of the kingdom of Jerusalem.<sup>157</sup> Damascus remained longer in alliance with the Fatimids without, however, further joint operations ensuing even during the Frankish siege of Tyre in 1124.<sup>158</sup> The irregular Egyptian attacks on the kingdom were as a rule unconnected with the actions of Tughtegin or the north Syrian amirs, but coincided with the phases in which the power of the state in Jerusalem was weakened through the king's absence, sickness or death.<sup>159</sup>

It fits the picture of the stabilization of the Syrian system of autonomous lordships that the contractual instruments which originated in the first decade of the twelfth century to secure a *modus vivendi* between Frankish and Muslim rulers continued to function in spite of the hard fighting which was carried on in northern Syria between 1119 and 1125. For example, the condominium over the east Jordan territories continued at least until 1118, when Tughtegin refused a prolongation, whereupon a Frankish detachment captured the fortress of Habis Jaldak and defeated the Damascenes.<sup>160</sup> In July 1121 Baldwin II, in a raid east of Jordan in retaliation for a Damascene pillaging raid on Galilee, destroyed a newly erected fortification in Jarash, with which Damascus had sought to consolidate its influence in Transjordan along the pilgrimage route into the Hijaz and the caravan road to Egypt.<sup>161</sup> Since the campaigns of King Baldwin II in the autumn of 1125 and January 1126 into the territory east of Jordan followed the end of a truce, as Frankish sources expressly testify, there must have been treaties between Damascus and Jerusalem. Their origin and contents have not been transmitted, but they very likely prolonged previous condominium treaties.<sup>162</sup> These agreements were limited as to duration and regional scope. In consequence of this, Baldwin and Tughtegin could without further ado confront one another as opponents in northern Syria for years while peace reigned in the land east of Jordan. There even existed, at least for merchants and pilgrims, traffic between Jerusalem and Damascus.<sup>163</sup> The sole enterprise actually initiated in this period for the extension of the kingdom of Jerusalem was the siege of Tyre, which capitulated to the Franks in July 1124. Following the example

<sup>157</sup> Ibn Muyassar, 94–5; al-Maqrīzī, *Ittī'āz*, III, 99–100; Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 210.

<sup>158</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 215.

<sup>159</sup> Albert of Aix, XII, XXIII, 703–4 (on 1117).

<sup>160</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 543–4. Cf. Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 199; Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, in: RHC Or., III, 561.

<sup>161</sup> Fulcher, Carnot., III, X, 1–6, 643–5.

<sup>162</sup> Cf. Fulcher, Carnot., III, LVI, 1–2, 772 and L, 1–15, 784–793.

<sup>163</sup> As indicated by Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 202.

of earlier conquests, the Muslim population was given freedom to leave with all possessions, but whoever wished might continue to live in the town without any infringement of his rights of ownership.<sup>164</sup> As regards accounts of the terms of the capture of Tyre, two are especially informative. Fulcher of Chartres stated that the Muslims might remain 'according to custom'. William of Tyre, in turn, reported that the Franks and the Venetians observed the treaty, although the non-elite participants in the besieging army rebelled against this settlement because it forbade the *minores* to take booty.<sup>165</sup> The arrangement of the treaty, following as it did earlier examples, and its observance make clear once again that the *modus vivendi* of Franks and Muslims had economic motives and that the leaders carried it through against the interests of the simple pilgrims.

The centre of the military clashes in Syria between 1119 and 1128 thus did not lie at the frontiers of the kingdom of Jerusalem, but rather in the north. The cause was the power vacuum in Aleppo. The period in which these struggles took place should, according to the supporters of the 'modified counter-Crusade paradigm', be the years in which Frankish-Muslim relations decisively changed. Sivan bases this on a turning of the Muslim rulers to the idea of the *jihad*. On the other hand, Cahen, writing before Sivan, produced the geostrategic argument that Aleppo had since 1118 been in the hands of strong amirs supported by bands of Turcomans from northern Mesopotamia, to whom it was easier to assemble local forces against the Franks, since alliances of this kind (unlike the previous enterprises of the sultans) did not imply the danger of an expansion of Great Seljuk power. According to this, the break at 1119 must have signified, at least for northern Syria, not only the end of the just noted pan-Syrian solidarity but also of the efforts for a *modus vivendi* pursued since the beginning of the century. A study of the history of Aleppo from 1119 to 1125 is needed to prove this line of argument. What was the significance of the idea of *jihad* when the sultan initiated no campaigns? Can the turning of the Muslim rulers to *jihad* propaganda, as observed by Sivan, be observed in actual historical events?<sup>166</sup> What guidelines decided the political dealings of the Frankish and Muslim rulers and the notables of Aleppo from 1118 to 1125?

---

<sup>164</sup> Fulcher, *Carnot.*, III, XXXIV, 1–2, 733–35; William of Tyre, XIII, XIII, 573–5; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 621–2; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 211.

<sup>165</sup> Fulcher, *Carnot.*, III, XXXIV, 1–2, 733–35; William of Tyre, XIII, XIII, 573–5.

<sup>166</sup> Sivan, *L'Islam*; Cahen, *Syrie*, 283–4.

Roger of Antioch completed the rounding out of his principality in the south in 1119 by taking the last independent Arab fortresses, above all that of al-Marqab, and turned against Aleppo in spite of the treaty of 1117, which was still in force. As the continuous Norman raids made the supply of provisions to the Muslim metropolis of northern Syria difficult and as Roger began with the siege of 'Azaz, which covered Aleppo on the north, the people of Aleppo called on Ilghazi b. Artuq for help. He thereupon took possession of the city at the end of 1118. With his weak fighting force, however, he could give no further help to 'Azaz. The fortress capitulated and Aleppo bought a peace treaty by the surrender of Tall Hiraq and the continued payment of a tribute of 1,000 dinars for four months. Meanwhile, Ilghazi mustered troops in his north Mesopotamian heartland and made an alliance with Tughtegin.<sup>167</sup> Thereafter, Ilghazi's Turcomans pillaged the eastern territories of the principality of Antioch from the end of April 1119 and on 20 June he gained a decisive victory which cost Prince Roger his life at the battle of the Field of Blood, north of the Frankish fortress of al-Atharib. Al-Atharib and Zardana were in fact lost to the Normans. However, Frankish reinforcements under King Baldwin II, for whose arrival Roger had not waited long enough, were able to stabilize the position against Ilghazi and Tughtegin through their firm stand in the battle of Tall Danith on 14 August 1119. This brought military operations in 1119 to an end. Next spring the same opponents (the Muslims reinforced by the Arab Amir Dubays b. Sadaqa) stood again in opposing ranks in the same place, but there was no fighting. Ilghazi thereupon concluded an armistice with Baldwin II, who had held the regency in Antioch since Roger's death. This settled the status quo until the end of 514/21 March 1121.<sup>168</sup> The castle of Zardana was slighted. Until April 1123, the Franks made up in a series of raids and the subsequent agreements all the territorial losses of 1119, since Ilghazi was either tied down by fighting with the Georgians or, as in the summer of 1122, remained without military success against the Franks.

How are the events between 1119 and 1123 to be judged in the light of the counter-Crusade paradigm? The Norman raids and Roger's attack on 'Azaz must plainly be judged as breaches of treaty. Similarly, his attempt to expand at the expense of Aleppo must be seen as a withdrawal from the previous line of coexistence maintained through treaties and the payment

---

<sup>167</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, X, 182–6; Ibn al-Furāt, MS Vindob. A.F. 117, fol. 137v–138r; Matthew of Edessa, 297–8.

<sup>168</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 196; Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 202. Cf. Matthew of Edessa, 302–3.

of tribute. Roger wished for an alteration of the status quo without, however, attacking Aleppo directly. However, the conditions of life became so difficult for the Aleppines that they had to call on Muslim amirs for help. Ilghazi's campaign of 1119 was without doubt led and propagated as a *jihad* and his victory of the battle of the Field of Blood was celebrated as a triumph of Islam over Christianity.<sup>169</sup> The people of Aleppo, and also independently Ilghazi, must have asked for help in Baghdad and Ilghazi's army included volunteer *jihad*-fighters, amongst whom (truly disliked as he was by the Turcomans) was the Aleppine Qadi Ibn al-Khashshab. Before the battle against Roger, Ilghazi pledged his amirs to enthusiasm and steadfastness in their *jihad*.<sup>170</sup> For his victorious engagement, the Turcomans celebrated the amir and the Caliph al-Mustarshid awarded him robes of honour.<sup>171</sup> Both sides represented the battle as a clash between Christendom and Islam, as exemplified on the Frankish side by Fulcher of Chartres' militant religious terminology.<sup>172</sup> Joscelin I of Edessa, when raiding Aleppine territory in 1124, even caused the destruction of mosques, to which the Qadi Ibn al-Khashshab in Aleppo replied by the conversion of Christian churches into mosques.<sup>173</sup> In the siege of Aleppo in 1124–25 the Franks outraged Muslim religious sentiments excessively.<sup>174</sup> It may be asked, however, whether these occurrences were more than *ad hoc* outbreaks of religious feelings in the course of struggles between opponents of different faiths or whether they were on the Islamic side the actual expression of a counter-Crusade ideology. The latter would be proved if c.1118 the current policy of *modus vivendi* with the Franks had been replaced in favour of concerted *jihad* operations arising from the thought of Islamic unity. What was the situation?

The local chronicle of Aleppo by Ibn al-ʿAdīm, the main source for the history of northern Syria in the twelfth century, makes it unequivocally clear that the people of Aleppo did not call in Ilghazi in 1118 as a ruler or an ally but as a mercenary, who was to stop Roger's expansion for an amount of cash raised by a levy. Ibn al-Khashshab, the leader of the

<sup>169</sup> Al-ʿAzīmī, 386; Ibn Abī Ṭayyʿ in Ibn al-Furāt, MS Vindob. A.F. 117, fol. 140v; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 555. Cf. Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 201.

<sup>170</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 545 and 554; Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Zubda*, II, 188.

<sup>171</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 568.

<sup>172</sup> Fulcher, Carnot., III, IV–VI, 624–33 and IX, 1–7, 638–42 *passim*. Walter the Chancellor, II, IV–VII, 85–91 and XII, 1–11, 103–105.

<sup>173</sup> Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Zubda*, II, 214–5; ʿIzz al-Dīn b. Shaddād, *Aʿlāq* (Aleppo), 40–1; al-ʿAzīmī, 393.

<sup>174</sup> Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Zubda*, II, 223–5.

Shiites in Aleppo, at first even refused Ilghazi entry into the city. Only when the Turcoman declined to fight on these terms were the Aleppines under pressure of necessity compelled to let him in. His first measures were to render powerless the nominal ruler Sultanshah b. Ridwan and his supporters, to occupy the citadel and to confiscate the treasure of the former dynasty. Since only a few troops accompanied Ilghazi, he gave no thought to a *jihad*, but attempted to enter into negotiations with the Frankish besiegers of 'Azaz.<sup>175</sup>

The position of the Aleppines in 1118 was thus identical with their conduct in 1117, when on the grounds that they would have no ruler from the east they asked Roger and also Ilghazi for help.<sup>176</sup> In spite of his success against the Franks, tension between the notables of Aleppo and Ilghazi consequently persisted, as Walter the Chancellor was aware. When Belek, a nephew of Ilghazi, wanted to install himself in Aleppo in the early summer of 1123, after his uncle's death, in order to better fight the Franks, as he professed, he succeeded only after devastating the fields and resorting to a stratagem of war. The Shiite notables around Ibn al-Khashshab indeed supported his seizure of power, since the ruler of the city, Badr al-Dawla Sulayman, had started to rely on the Sunnis.<sup>177</sup> But Belek had again to do something to confirm his position in the city just at the beginning of 1124. He expelled a high official of the Nizaris and replaced the *ra'is*.<sup>178</sup> Belek still had trouble in asserting himself against the intrigues of the notables of Aleppo, although his raids reduced the Frankish pressure and he secured his own position as ruler through marriage with a daughter of Ridwan.

The request for help from Ilghazi in 1118 does thus not mean that the Aleppines abandoned their Syrian policy of autonomy because of the Franks, nor that Ilghazi had a counter-Crusade in mind. His attacks were not allied undertakings legitimated by the sultan, but independent operations with the aim of securing Aleppo for himself and allowing no Frankish predominance in northern Syria. They were solely directed against fortresses such as al-Atharib, Zardana or 'Azaz, from which the Franks commanded the immediate environs of Aleppo. Ilghazi's armies also received no contingents from the sultan. On the contrary, Aqsunqur al-Bursuqi, whom Sultan Mahmud installed for a short time in the spring of

<sup>175</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 185–6.

<sup>176</sup> Walter the Chancellor, II, XIII, 2–3, 105–6.

<sup>177</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 210, 212; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 611; Ibn al-Furāt, MS Vindob. A.F. 117, fol. 190r–v.

<sup>178</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 216–7; al-'Azīmī, 393.

1121 under express orders for the *jihād*, participated in none of Ilghazi's campaigns, nor was he invited to do so.<sup>179</sup> Apart from Ilghazi's own retainers, he received cooperation only from Tughtegin of Damascus in 1119 and 1120, a Syrian amir who had been closely leagued with Ilghazi since the death of Mawdud in 1113, and after 1120 also from another old ally, Dubays b. Sadaqa of Hilla, the amir of the Mazyad Bedouins. But Dubays was a resolute enemy of the caliph and had sought refuge with Ilghazi from the sultan's attack. He wanted to construct a new power base for himself in Syria. Ilghazi expressly refused the caliph's request to surrender Dubays.<sup>180</sup> In other words, both sultan and caliph neither initiated nor supported the fighting in northern Syria. Rather, this was a purely Syrian dispute, arising from the weakness of Aleppo and Roger's endeavour to alter the status quo. To speak of a sudden change in the relationship of Franks and Muslims would be beside the mark.

The treaties concluded between the Franks and Aleppo after 1120 convey the same impression. Since the agreement that concluded the campaign of Ilghazi and Tughtegin in 1120 and guaranteed a cease-fire between Antioch and Aleppo until the next spring, there were limited treaties almost every year. According to Frankish interpretation, these agreements bound only King Baldwin II as regent of Antioch and Ilghazi as ruler of Aleppo, i.e. they were seen to be limited to the territories of Antioch and Aleppo. While they remained in force, raids by Edessa on Aleppo, by Antioch on Shayzar and clashes between Ilghazi and King Baldwin in other territories could occur because these treaties did not bind the Franks and the Muslims in general.<sup>181</sup> Interestingly enough these treaties also contained further condominium arrangements. Already by 1120 separate villages in the districts of Jabal Summaq, Hab, Laylun and 'Azaz (south-west, west and north of Aleppo) had become Frankish. On the expiry of these treaties in the spring of 1121, Shams al-Dawla Sulayman b. Ilghazi, his father's representative in Aleppo, made further concessions in these districts. Above all, the immediate environs of Aleppo, or rather their taxes, were equally divided. Even a mill was subject to this division and the disputed fortress of Tall Hiraq was slighted so that it would no longer be at the disposal of either side.<sup>182</sup> Already at the conclusion of this treaty King Baldwin II had set out to recover al-Atharib. Its Muslim garrison, however, refused to

<sup>179</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 588; Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhir*, 24.

<sup>180</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 202–3; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 565–6 and 568.

<sup>181</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 196–7, 204.

<sup>182</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 196–7, 199.

surrender as the treaty required. As late as the autumn of 1121, an agreement between the Franks and Aleppo broke down on the question of its surrender. Soon afterwards, in the context of a full year's armistice, Ilghazi conceded to the Franks the possession of all the villages belonging to the fortress rather than the fortress itself.<sup>183</sup> Only in April 1123 did Ilghazi's successor in Aleppo, Badr al-Dawla Sulayman, cede al-Atharib itself to the Franks by treaty.<sup>184</sup> Since a slight Frankish predominance marked all these treaties, it is probable that the partition of the region around Aleppo in 1121 was not done away with until at least 1123. More certainly, it was not a matter of a division of land, since these were not border regions, but lands which lay within the scope of Frankish booty raids and were essential for the provisioning of Aleppo. Therefore, one should rather think of a condominium based on a sharing of produce after the fashion of the condominium treaties concluded between Jerusalem and Damascus for the Transjordanian lands from 1108. After 1121, a condominium clause is part of the regular repertoire in Frankish-Turkish treaties in northern Syria as well. Aqsunqur al-Bursuqi of Mosul and Aleppo agreed upon a condominium over Jabal Summaq westwards of Ma'arrat al-Nu'man in 1125 and in the spring of 1126 Joscelin I of Edessa concluded a condominium treaty with Aqsunqur which placed the territories between Aleppo and 'Azaz in joint possession, but permitted fighting in all other regions.<sup>185</sup>

This last agreement shows clearly the function of the condominium treaties that constituted a *modus vivendi* in view of the military stalemate. They guaranteed the economic supplies of the cities and the fiscal exploitation of disputed lands and thus were in one respect economically motivated. They offered genuine compromises, which allowed the contracting rulers to withdraw for a while from the north Syrian stage and thus were in another respect politically motivated: King Baldwin II of Jerusalem acted in Antioch only as regent, while for Ilghazi and Aqsunqur al-Bursuqi the real heartland of their respective power lay in northern Mesopotamia, not in Syria. To all three, northern Syria was of merely peripheral interest. Even when the treaties brought peace for only a limited period and the temporarily stronger side tended to do away with the condominium (as Antioch demanded in the summer of 1126), they expressed the intention of restoring the situation existing in the north until 1118.<sup>186</sup>

<sup>183</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 196–7, 203.

<sup>184</sup> Al-'Azīmī, 391; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 196–7, 215; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 610.

<sup>185</sup> Al-'Azīmī, 396; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 231–2. Cf. Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 628–9.

<sup>186</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 233.

The treaties between Franks and Muslims are moreover an expression of the feeling of equal status of the ruling elites, the nobilities. According to Ibn al-'Adim's account, King Baldwin II in July 1122 could not conceive that Ilghazi would actually break the existing treaty: 'Since we have sworn to him and he to us, we have not broken [the treaty] and we have protected his land in his absence, whereby we are nobles (*shuyukh*).'<sup>187</sup> In fact, the treaties seem generally to have been kept. The number and character of the treaties, as well as the implied sense of honour towards one another, indicate that after 1118 northern Syria could not have been the stage of the conflict of Crusade and counter-Crusade, in spite of all the raids and all the emphasis on religion during the struggles. The only concern for the Turkish and Arab amirs was the independence of their dominions and hence the endeavour to prevent any decisive alteration of the power-constellation. The only exception to the rule may have been the conduct of Ilghazi's nephew, Belek, who, having established himself north of the county of Edessa in Khanzīt and Aleppo, was ready to fight outside his sphere of influence before Tyre against the Franks. It is only this basic position of the north Syrian rulers that can explain that Timurtash, the younger son and the successor of Ilghazi in Aleppo and Mardin, released King Baldwin II, whom Belek had made prisoner in the middle of April 1123. Timurtash agreed with Baldwin, in return for his release, on the payment of a large sum of money, a quarter of which was payable at once, as well as on the cession of 'Azaz, al-Jazr with al-Atharib and Zardana, and Kafartab, i.e. the strategically and economically important territories to the north and south-west of Aleppo. The condominium over Jabal Summaq presumably ended with the transfer of Kafartab. Until he had fulfilled his obligations, the king had to provide hostages.<sup>188</sup> Timurtash would effectively safeguard Aleppo by this agreement and be able to regain the fortresses whence the Franks dominated the approach to Aleppo and had organized raids during Baldwin's captivity. The very existence of Antioch was, however, in no way placed in question. Through this restoration of the balance of power in the north, Timurtash was, without danger to Aleppo, free to return to Mardin in his north Mesopotamian heartland, where Artuqid and Seljuk inheritance disputes following the death of Ilghazi had had a detrimental effect.

<sup>187</sup> Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 204.

<sup>188</sup> Fulcher, *Carnot.*, III, XXXVIII, 1, 749–751; William of Tyre, XIII, XV, 576–8; Matthew of Edessa, 312–3; Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 89; Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 221–2.

It results from this that Timurtash did not pursue a *jihad* policy, but wished on the contrary to avoid a major engagement in northern Syria. He even attempted to safeguard his rule in Aleppo by releasing Baldwin II and requiring him to swear that he would oppose Dubays b. Sadaqa, who after being expelled from Iraq had harboured ambitions on Aleppo since 1121 and was gathering partisans in the city to this end.<sup>189</sup> The manner in which Baldwin II was entertained in Aleppo, clothed in royal robes and set free, exemplified that religious antagonism was of no significance in political dealings and that the rulers on both sides could accept each other and feel united in their ethos.

Baldwin II, however, did not fulfil his side of the treaty. Shortly after his arrival in Antioch, he sent word to Timurtash that the patriarch had forbidden him to surrender 'Azaz. The king's role in this breach of the treaty remains unclear, but it is questionable whether Baldwin II should be held guilty of deceiving Timurtash without further evidence, since it is doubtful whether as regent in Antioch he had the right to cede territory at all. The law of regency in Antioch has not come down, but the nobles of the principality already placed restrictions on Baldwin in 1119 regarding the redistribution of fiefs. This, and the patriarch's resistance to the treaty with Timurtash, makes it probable that Baldwin II needed at least the agreement of the princely court of Antioch for the surrender of 'Azaz.<sup>190</sup> With regard to Timurtash, he justified the breach of the treaty by the veto of the patriarch, whom he was bound to obey and who had assumed responsibility for the non-observance of the agreement.<sup>191</sup> The king's argument in any case reveals that in Antioch and Jerusalem a treaty with infidels was not considered as *ipso facto* invalid, but its non-observance was deemed a breach of oath. The fact that Timurtash and the Franks negotiated further throughout September 1124 shows that a peaceful settlement was endeavoured, at least out of regard for the welfare of the hostages, who came partly from the royal family. This had the approval not only of Timurtash and Baldwin but also that of the nobles of Antioch. Only when these negotiations led to no result did Baldwin II decide to attack Aleppo to release the hostages—or so writes Fulcher of Chartres.<sup>192</sup> That Timurtash had already left Aleppo during the talks to

<sup>189</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 221–2.

<sup>190</sup> Walter the Chancellor, II, X, 2, pp. 98–9.

<sup>191</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 222.

<sup>192</sup> Fulcher, *Carnot.*, III, XXXVIII, 2, 751.

fetch reinforcements from his heartland directed developments towards a conflict anyway.

The four-month siege of Aleppo which followed the negotiations is perhaps the clearest indication of the relevance of the idea of the *jihād* and the measure of the integration of the Frankish rulers in the Syrian system of autonomous lordships. The initiative to the campaign came indeed not from the Franks, but from Dubays b. Sadaqa—the Arab amir from Iraq whom Baldwin II had promised Timurtash to fight on his release. Dubays had fled to Syria after the forces of the Caliph al-Mustarshid had defeated him in February 1124 and he found refuge with Malik b. Salim of Qalʿat Jaʿbar on the Euphrates.<sup>193</sup> Already in 1121 Dubays had demanded the handing over of Aleppo from Ilghazi in return for his help in a campaign against the Georgians.<sup>194</sup> After his flight from Iraq in 1124, he found himself in the same position as in 1121. Expelled from Hilla, he attempted to acquire a new lordship in Syria and conspired with a faction in Aleppo. Dubays was able to win over the Franks in September 1124 by hinting at these contacts and at the support that he had among the people of Aleppo as a Shiite. According to the mutually agreeing accounts of Ibn al-ʿAdim and Ibn al-Athir, he concluded a formal treaty of alliance with Baldwin II, reinforced by an oath in which the city of Aleppo was promised to him in the event of its capture and according to which the moveable property, the prisoners and also some places in the territory of Aleppo should fall to the Franks. The lord of Qalʿat Jaʿbar had mediated the alliance.<sup>195</sup> As a result of this agreement a fighting force drawn from Antioch, Edessa and Muslims mustered before Aleppo in mid-October 1123. About a third of it was said to be composed of Muslims.

This alliance of Franks and Muslims is for a number of reasons instructive for the treaty policy in Syria. The sources say quite clearly that the Franks were not concerned with either the annexation of Aleppo to the principality of Antioch, nor with setting up a further Frankish lordship there. Apart from the cession of the specified villages, their war aim was limited to the liberation of the hostages and the usual pillaging. The existence of the lordship of Aleppo would remain inviolate. It was, however, planned to subordinate it to the Frankish states, since Dubays declared

---

<sup>193</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 208; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 607–10; Sibṭ b. al-Jawzi, ed. Haydarabad, VIII, 1, 109–11.

<sup>194</sup> According to the rumor reported in Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Zubda*, II, 200.

<sup>195</sup> Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Zubda*, II, 222–3; Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Bughya*, 228–9; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 623. Cf. Matthew of Edessa, 314–5.

himself ready to rule Aleppo as a Frankish governor.<sup>196</sup> As the situation never came about owing to the failure of the siege, the legal form of Dubays' subordination to the Franks, and whether it was to be of a feudal nature, remains unclear. There had presumably never been a Muslim governor in Frankish service. Related legal situations such as the function of Balduq of Sumaysat as the *condomesticus* of Baldwin I of Edessa (1098–99) and Tancred's land grant to the sons of Khalaf b. Mula'ib (1106) might, however, have served as precedents. The relationship between the Franks and Dubays may have amounted to suzerainty, but there was no indication that Baldwin would have insisted on the installation of a Frankish garrison in Aleppo.

Dubays b. Sadaqa was not the only Muslim ally of Baldwin and Joscelin in 1124. Malik b. Salim of Qal'at Ja'bar, the mediator between Dubays and the Franks, Sultanshah b. Ridwan, the Artuqid Amir Yaghisiyan of Balis and Toghril Arslan of Malatya also joined the siege army. Qal'at Ja'bar was the place of refuge not only for Dubays but also for a whole troop of exiles from Aleppo. Among them was Sultanshah, who had been the nominal ruler of Aleppo until 1118 when Ilghazi dethroned him. Yaghisiyan of Balis had fallen out with his Artuqid kinsman Timurtash. Toghril Arslan of Malatya joined the army because he was in conflict with the brother of the lord of Mardin and Aleppo, Shams al-Dawla Sulayman of Mayyafariqin, and his rule in eastern Anatolia was threatened on several sides.

Seen in this light, the alliance of Franks and Muslims reveals itself in truth as an anti-Artuqid league, whose Frankish, Arab and Turkish partners certainly had entirely different motives, but who were united in the intention of ending Artuqid rule over Aleppo, which had gone on since the end of 1118. For the Arab and Turkish partisans of Baldwin II the real stumbling block was Artuqid rule, not the existence of Frankish states in northern Syria. Antioch and Edessa, on the other hand, offered themselves as alliance partners. The alliance of 1124 was not the sole expression of this standpoint. For example, the people of Aleppo had already called in Roger of Antioch in 1117 for help against Aqsunqur al-Bursuqi. Toghril Arslan of Malatya had sought Frankish support against his Seljuk, Danishmend and Armenian enemies in eastern Anatolia. Finally, 'Isa, the brother of the rebellious lord of Manbij (80–90 km. north-east of Aleppo) called upon

---

<sup>196</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, X, 623. Cf. Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 222–3.

Joscelin I of Edessa in April 1124 to help in repelling the Artuqid besiegers under Belek and Timurtash.<sup>197</sup>

*Jihad* propaganda played no part in these political dealings of the rulers, although it led to religious excesses by both the besiegers and the besieged, affecting the Muslims outside Aleppo, members of the Oriental churches within Aleppo and Muslim and Christian religious buildings on both sides.<sup>198</sup> An indication of the indifference felt towards the idea of the *jihad* is that a fiery appeal of the Qadi Ibn al-Khashshab to the Muslim besiegers around Dubays had no impact. He exhorted them not to forget the Holy War and not to abandon Aleppo to the lust of the infidels, for if the Franks seized this city, Islam, at least in the vicinity, would be unable to defend itself against them.<sup>199</sup> In this appeal he typically combined a religious argument, the branding of the alliance of Franks and Muslims as an impious league, with a political one, namely that which Ridwan had already employed with regard to Tancred in 1108, the 'no place' (*la maqam*) doctrine. According to this line of argument, if the alliance should lead to the taking of Aleppo, it would throw the balance of power out of plumb in favour of one side—here the Franks. The idea of the independence of the Syrian rulers and the balance of power had, as already indicated, been at first the basis of the alliances between Franks and Muslims against the Turkish campaigns launched from the east, sometimes at the sultan's command. Ibn al-Khashshab did not, however, in his argument allude to a balance between individual Syrian rulers, but between the infidels and Islam. The loyalty of Dubays and his allies to the agreement with Baldwin II even after this appeal is clear proof that for the Muslim allies of the Franks the two great categories of 'unbelief' and 'Islam' were not decisive in political dealings. This is likewise indicated in the account of Ibn al-'Adim according to which the news of a serious sickness of Aqsunqur al-Bursuqi was celebrated in the camp of Dubays. Cries of 'God is the Greatest' and 'There is no God but the True God' expressed their joy that a *jihad* campaign by Aqsunqur to relieve Aleppo seemed now impossible.<sup>200</sup>

The *jihad* idea and the appeal to Islamic unity played therefore a role only for the people of Aleppo who were in actual danger, but lacked significance for the policy of the Muslim rulers. Accordingly, the ruler of

<sup>197</sup> Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 218.

<sup>198</sup> Ibn Abi Ṭayy' in Ibn al-Furāt, MS Vindob. A.F. 117, fol. 179v–180r; Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 223–6; 'Izz al-Dīn b. Shaddād, *A'lāq* (Aleppo), 41.

<sup>199</sup> Ibn Abi Ṭayy' in Ibn al-Furāt, MS Vindob. A.F. 117, fol. 197r–v.

<sup>200</sup> Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 228.

Aleppo, Timurtash, set out after the death of his brother Shams al-Dawla Sulayman in 1124 to secure for himself the latter's possession of Mayyafariqin and thus did not attempt to help besieged Aleppo. For this reason, Timurtash allowed negotiations about an alliance with Aqsunqur to peter out. The delegation from Aleppo, urging him for support, was staved off and finally became accused of betrayal because Timurtash suspected that he was being lured into a trap in view of the hopeless situation of Aleppo. He had the envoys, a *qadi* and the *naqib al-ashraf* of Aleppo, placed under guard in order to render impossible their further journey to Mosul, although in vain.<sup>201</sup> Only with Aqsunqur did the envoys of Aleppo find a hearing. Officially commissioned by the sultan with the *jihad*, he could hardly refuse the envoys' requests out of consideration for his master. After all, one of the besiegers, Dubays b. Sadaqa, was a resolute enemy of caliph and sultan. Moreover, religious aspects (the vow to support the Muslims if he recovered from a serious illness) and political ambitions (the extension of his rule to Aleppo and the possibility of hurting his Artuqid rival Timurtash) contributed to Aqsunqur's decision.<sup>202</sup>

Even with Aqsunqur's intervention, pan-Islamism did not start to move north Syrian politics in the direction of *jihad* activity. At the end of January 1125 he compelled the Frankish and Muslim besiegers to withdraw from Aleppo and on 9 May he captured Kafartab, together with Tughtegin of Damascus. But shortly afterwards the united Franks defeated him at 'Azaz. Thereupon Baldwin II and Aqsunqur concluded the armistice which made Jabal Summaq a condominium. Baldwin II was able to ransom the hostages handed over in 1124 and both rulers returned to their heartlands.<sup>203</sup> In July 1126 they again confronted one another before al-Atharib. A treaty between the two sides, like that which had been achieved shortly before between Aqsunqur and Joscelin I, broke down over the question of the annulment of the condominium requested by the Franks. Agreement had already been reached that Baldwin II would return Rafaniyya, which he had just captured, if Aqsunqur ended the siege of al-Atharib and that apart from this the agreement should confirm the status quo of the previous year.<sup>204</sup> The two armies thereupon separated without result.

<sup>201</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Bughya*, 205–9. Cf. Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 623–4.

<sup>202</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Bughya*, 209–11.

<sup>203</sup> Fulcher, *Carmot.*, III, XLIV, 2, 770; Matthew of Edessa, 318; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 231.

<sup>204</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 233–4.

Thus, Aqsunqur only strove to free Aleppo from Frankish pressure and he was ready to set up a new *modus vivendi* with the Franks as was indicated in the limited armistice and the related regulations for the condominium. The treaty with Joscelin I brought peace to the disputed lands between Aleppo and 'Azaz as a condominium. Yet, elsewhere, for example further south, it permitted fighting and incidentally made clear the tendency to impose local limits on clashes. In other words, the north Syrian fighting from 1124 to 1126 was not a case of a meeting of *jihad* and Crusade, but of a regional conflict in which religious symbols and propaganda were indeed used on both sides, but which was in no way conducted as warfare between Islam and Christendom. The cause of the clashes was not the *jihad* ideology, but a political interest, i.e. not to allow the Frankish states and their allies in northern Syria, hostile to the sultan, to become predominant. Also, no revision of the policy of independence in favour of the unification of Islam against the Franks can be recognized in the conduct of the notables of Aleppo, who had extensively stressed the unity of the Muslims and the obligation to the *jihad* during the siege, once they had got over the danger. In 1127 the Ra'is Abu al-Fada'il b. Badi' brought about the overthrow of the governor, Tuman, after sharp clashes. There was even a veritable revolt against the encroachments of his successor, Khutulugh Abah. The governor's opponents were divided into two groups, a Sunni faction wishing to restore the former ruler Badr al-Dawla Sulayman (1122–23) and a Shiite faction supporting Ridwan's son Ibrahim as pretender.<sup>205</sup> In their opposition to the governor sent from Mosul both parties fell back upon representatives of former regimes under whom Aleppo had been autonomous and the notables had had a strong position against the ruler of the city. By contrast, money averted the attacks of Joscelin I of Edessa and Bohemond II of Antioch during the conflict and his attacks in no way led to the unification of the parties against the Franks. That the *jihad* idea functioned as a catalyst to overcome the particularism of Syrian local rulers can consequently not be established.

The behaviour of Tughtegin, who supported Aqsunqur in May 1125 and the summer of 1126, reinforces this argument. During the siege of Aleppo by Baldwin II and Dubays, Tughtegin made no attempt to intervene in favour of the city, although the sultan had officially entrusted him with the 'protection of the Muslims' since 1116. As long as it was a matter of a

---

<sup>205</sup> Al-'Azīmi, 398–9; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Bughya*, 216–21; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 237–8.

local conflict in the north, he remained passive. Only in May 1125 when the Franks reacted to Aqsunqur's intervention with a concentration of forces from their southern states, did Tughtegin take part, perhaps prompted by Aqsunqur, because the conflict was escalating from a local clash and its results would concern Damascus. Damascus and Jerusalem had been at peace up to that point. Tughtegin had all the more impulse to an engagement in 1126 because the Franks had previously considerably harmed him by two campaigns against Damascene territory in autumn 1125 and January 1126 as well as by Baldwin II and Pons of Tripoli's capture of Rafaniyya. However, already a year later Tughtegin was prepared to enter into warfare against Mas'ud, the son and successor in Mosul of the murdered Aqsunqur, who intended to conquer Syria including its Muslim lordships.<sup>206</sup> To safeguard the independence of Damascus, Tughtegin grasped after 1126 the same means as Ridwan of Aleppo before him. He depended increasingly on the Nizaris, conceded them growing influence in Damascus and handed over to their leader, Bahram, the important boundary fortress of Baniyas, east of the upper reaches of the Jordan, which thereafter became one of their centres.<sup>207</sup> It may also have been Nizaris who murdered Aqsunqur in Mosul in 1126. Against the Frankish attack in January 1126 Tughtegin sought allies in the Nizaris' militias and some Turcoman amirs, but never turned to Mosul for help. All these measures indicate that until the death of Tughtegin in 1128 there was no alteration in the Damascene policy of maintaining a balance of power and autonomy. The politics of a counter-Crusade explain neither his political dealings nor the fighting in northern Syria.

The preceding examination of the paradigm of the counter-Crusade and the relations between the Frankish, Turkish and Arab states of Syria make it possible to summarize the structure of Frankish-Muslim relations in the phase following the establishment of the Frankish lordships. The thesis of the advocates of the counter-Crusade paradigm, that with the end of the first decade of the twelfth century the particularism of the Muslim states had given place to a united reaction against the Franks, has been proved untenable. It has become clear that the idea of Islamic unity does not explain the *jihad* campaigns to Syria that the sultan ordered from as early as 1106. Rather, the conflicts in Iraq and the sultan's, as well as the rulers of Mosul's, efforts at expansion explain these campaigns. Furthermore,

---

<sup>206</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisī, 216–7.

<sup>207</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisī, 213, 221.

it can be seen that the Turkish rulers of Syria showed caution or disapproval of the allied armies from the east, since they rightly suspected in them a threat to their own autonomy. As a study of the cases of Aleppo and Damascus reveals, securing this independence by a balance of power among the individual rulers of Syria was the supreme political requirement. Yet even this principle did not lead to a union of the petty Muslim states against the Franks. On the contrary, when Mosul or the sultan endangered the balance of power, a community of interests and alliances between Franks and Muslims was established. This was first indicated in 1108 in the league between Tancred and Ridwan against Jawali and Baldwin I of Edessa and fully revealed in the pan-Syrian alliance against the allied army under Bursuq b. Bursuq in 1115. These alliances are the most important indication of the integration of the Frankish rulers in the Syrian system of autonomous lordships. If the community of interests between Franks and Muslims disintegrated and the threat to the status quo arose on the contrary from Frankish rulers, as in 1116 from Pons of Tripoli or in 1118–19 from Roger, the result was Muslim leagues against the Franks. The Syrian alliances of the Frankish rulers from 1108 onwards in comparison with the truces and condominium treaties of the phase to 1112–13, signify a further step in their integration.

The fact that the pan-Syrian ideas which linked the Frankish and Muslim rulers signified no renunciation of expansion determined the limitations of the system. It is, however, decisive that the attempts at expansion between 1112–13 and 1128 cannot be described as conflicts between Christians and Muslims. Beside Frankish attacks on Muslim strongholds and cities, such as Roger's conquests in 1117 and 1118 or the capture of Tyre, there were joint Frankish and Muslim operations against Muslim opponents. These include for example that Franks and tribal warriors of the Banu Tayy' intercepted a Damascene caravan in Transjordan in 1112<sup>208</sup> or the alliance with Dubays in 1124–25, which shows most clearly that religious antagonism played no part as a factor in politics. Joscelin I of Edessa even provoked the intervention of King Baldwin II and the patriarch of Antioch when he devastated in 1127 the principality of Antioch with Turkish allies as likewise before in 1108.<sup>209</sup> This conflict between Joscelin I and Bohemond II of Antioch was only the latest link in a chain of tensions between Frankish states. Already in 1111, Tancred had to justify

---

<sup>208</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 183.

<sup>209</sup> William of Tyre, XIII, XXII, 590–1; Barhebraeus, 253.

himself before King Baldwin I on account of his conflict with Baldwin II of Edessa and the accusation of having incited Mawdud of Mosul against the county of Edessa. According to the king's decision, the Christians were to stand together and sacrifice their lives for one another. Whoever leagued himself with the heathen could no longer remain a brother to the Christians.<sup>210</sup> This principle was in fact without consequence for the disputes about the vassal relations between Antioch and Edessa, based as they were on feudal law. Reasons of feudal law also lay behind the campaign of King Baldwin II in 1122 against Count Pons of Tripoli, who wanted to cast off the feudal dependence of Tripoli on Jerusalem,<sup>211</sup> the alliance of the three northern Frankish rulers against King Fulk and the ensuing war of 1131 between Tripoli and Jerusalem as well as the revolt of Roman, lord of Oultrejourdain, and Hugh of Jaffa, presumably in 1134. Hugh even allied with the Egyptian garrison of Ascalon against the king.<sup>212</sup> Also the stubborn opposition of the nobility and patriarch of Jerusalem to intervention in northern Syria after 1119, the rejoicing in Jerusalem over the end of Baldwin II's regency in Antioch in 1126 and the refusal of Antioch to support the siege of Tyre in 1124, show sufficiently clearly that the interests of the Frankish states were diverging and that involvement in northern Syria was a matter of concern purely to the Crown and not to the aristocracy or people of Jerusalem.<sup>213</sup>

The same goes also for the Muslim rulers. Neither Qirkhan b. Qaraja of Hims, nor Tughtegin of Damascus saw themselves obliged to desist from endeavours to expand at the expense of other Muslim lordships because of the existence of Frankish states. Qirkhan may have been a party to the murder of the ruler of Aleppo in 1114 and he took Ilghazi b. Artuq of Mardin prisoner in January 1115.<sup>214</sup> He released his prisoner under pressure from Damascus only when he had received his son as a hostage. Shortly afterwards Ilghazi besieged him.<sup>215</sup> There was repeated fighting, at least in 1117 and presumably in 1123 and 1125, between the amirs of Shayzar and the sons of Qaraja, Qirkhan of Hims and Mahmud of Hamah.<sup>216</sup> Finally, Tughtegin besieged Hims in 1123 in vain, took Hamah after the death of its ruler

<sup>210</sup> Albert of Aix, XI, XVI, 670 and XXI–XXII, 673–4.

<sup>211</sup> Fulcher, Carnot., III, XI, 1–2, 646–8; William of Tyre, XII, XVII, 536 and XIV, IV–V, 611–14.

<sup>212</sup> William of Tyre, XIV, XV–XVII, 627–30; Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 233, 236.

<sup>213</sup> Fulcher, Carnot., III, LXI, 3, 820–1 and XXXIV, 13, 739.

<sup>214</sup> Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Zubda*, II, 172.

<sup>215</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 191; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 503–4.

<sup>216</sup> Usāma b. Munqidh, *Iʿtibār*, 64, 75–6.

in 1124 (the year in which the Franks captured Tyre and Baldwin besieged Aleppo) and in May 1126 extended his power to Tadmur.<sup>217</sup> Shayzar was the goal of attacks from Antioch and Hamah in 1129.<sup>218</sup> Thus, the Muslim rulers of Syria did not form a bloc and it would be wrong to see the military clashes in Syria solely from the perspective of confrontation between Franks and Muslims. All the Syrian rulers pursued their own interests and allied only in the event of a threat to their autonomy. The appeals for help from Aleppo brought Ilghazi to power in 1119 and Aqşunqur al-Bursuqi in 1125 as a result of the weakness of Aleppo, not of an idea of Islamic unity, as the notables' opposition to the new ruler indicates. If the years from 1119 were actually a turning-point for the Frankish and Muslim states, it was not because the policy of the Muslim rulers in Syria had been newly orientated to the idea of the *jihād*, but because the constellation of powers which had existed since the death of Tutush in 1095 had decisively changed with the end of the autonomy of Aleppo and its subordination to Mosul from 1125.

Beside the alliances between Franks and Muslims, and the identical policies of Frankish, Turkish and Arab rulers in regard to expansion, there are a number of further indications of the integration of the Frankish rulers in the Syrian system of autonomous lordships. One of these is the regionally limited character of the conflicts, typically the clashes in northern Syria and the retention of the status quo in the south. The basis for this regional limitation was the apparatus of peace treaties (*sulh*, *pax*, *amicitia*), truces (*hudna*, *pax ad certum tempus*) and condominium treaties (*munāṣafāt*), instruments of limited duration and scope which originated in the first decade of the twelfth century. With the help of these instruments it was possible both to bring about brief interruptions of warfare and also to provide a legal foundation for longer periods of peace, when political and economic reasons favoured this.

A final indication of the existence of a Frankish-Muslim Syrian system of autonomous lordships which has hardly been taken into account hitherto is the function of the amirs of Qal'at Ja'bar and Shayzar as mediators. As early as 1108, Salim b. Malik of Qal'at Ja'bar on the Euphrates had acted as mediator in the release of Count Baldwin II of Edessa from imprisonment by Jawali of Mosul and in the conclusion of the alliance between

---

<sup>217</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 209–10, 214–5; al-'Aẓimī, 391–2, 397; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 617; Ibn al-Furāt, MS Vindob. A.F. 117, fol. 189v.

<sup>218</sup> Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 46.

the two rulers. After the release of Baldwin II had been agreed for a sum of money and the release of his Muslim prisoners,<sup>219</sup> he was brought to Qal'at Ja'bar and set free there. His cousin, Joscelin I of Turbessel, placed himself at his disposal as a hostage until the fulfilment of the conditions of the treaty and Salim b. Malik himself gave Jawali a guarantee for the carrying out of the treaty. In order to expedite the collection of Baldwin II's ransom, Joscelin was released when his brother-in-law and others came to Qal'at Ja'bar as hostages.<sup>220</sup>

Thus, Salim acted as 'honest broker' between the Lorrainers and Jawali in 1108. The Syrian *Chronicon ad A.C. 1234* justifies his place between the two sides on the grounds that he had been 'a famous man and a good mediator'.<sup>221</sup> While he was ruler, Qal'at Ja'bar also became a place of refuge for prominent exiles. Dubays and Badran, the sons of Sadaqa, fled to Qal'at Ja'bar from Sultan Muhammad in 1108 and stayed there after Mawdud of Mosul had replaced Jawali.<sup>222</sup> In 1113 Sa'id b. Badi', the *ra'is* removed from office by Ridwan of Aleppo, found refuge in Qal'at Ja'bar and so also his successor, Ibn al-Mawsul, in the following year.<sup>223</sup> It is stated of Lu'lu' al-Yaya, the regent for Ridwan's sons in Aleppo, that he deposited a part of his property in Qal'at Ja'bar. On three further occasions, in 514/1120–21, 518/1124–25 and 525/1130, Dubays, who had become related to Salim b. Malik by marriage, in 514, found refuge in Qal'at Ja'bar from his adversaries in Iraq, whether sultan or caliph. In 515/1121–22 the supporters of the former ruler, Ridwan, fled from the Artuqids in Aleppo with his son Sultanshah to Salim b. Malik. Salim's son and successor, Malik, reported to Zengi of Mosul in 1128 about the disorders in Aleppo and in the following year received the Ra'is Abu al-Fada'il b. Badi' when in flight from Zengi.<sup>224</sup>

Qal'at Ja'bar maintained good relations with all the north Syrian rulers and thence was able to mediate with neutrality in conflicts or to grant asylum under Salim and his son Malik. For example, it was in Qal'at Ja'bar that Ilghazi and Tughtegin made an alliance against Roger of Antioch.<sup>225</sup>

<sup>219</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, X, 460–1; Matthew of Edessa, 266; Michael Syrus, 195; Barhebraeus, 242; Albert of Aix, X, XXXVII, 648.

<sup>220</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, X, 460–1; *Chronicon ad A.C. 1234 pertinens*, II, 52–3; Fulcher, Carnot., II, XXVIII, 1, 478.

<sup>221</sup> *Chronicon ad A.C. 1234 pertinens*, II, 52.

<sup>222</sup> Ibn al-Furāt, I (ed. Shamy), 80, arab. 51; Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, X, 465.

<sup>223</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 170, 173, 186.

<sup>224</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 177, 197, 221–2, 243, 247.

<sup>225</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 186.

The amirs of Qal'at Ja'bar also maintained an excellent relationship with the Christians. Thus, the Orthodox bishop of Aleppo fled to Qal'at Ja'bar from the rioting of the Qadi Ibn al-Khashshab.<sup>226</sup> The autobiography of Usama b. Munqidh contains a further example. When Joscelin I of Edessa, who had lived in Qal'at Ja'bar in 1108 as a hostage, made a raid for booty in the Euphrates region at an uncertain date between 1125 and 1131, Malik b. Salim went out to him and encountered him. Both had long known each other and Joscelin I was under an obligation to Malik.<sup>227</sup> He honoured Malik and returned to him all the prisoners and herds taken in the raid. It was also Malik who arranged the league between Dubays, Sultanshah and Baldwin II in 1124.<sup>228</sup> He himself remained typically neutral, so that in 1125 he was able to receive from Aqsunqur b. al-Bursuqi, the adversary of the alliance which he had arranged, Baldwin's hostages, his daughter Iveta and Joscelin I's son, whom Aqsunqur had released in Shayzar.<sup>229</sup>

This is already an indication of a connection with Shayzar, whose amirs at times assumed a similar role of providing asylum and mediation. It is known that the Banu Munqidh of Shayzar repeatedly offered asylum to refugees, e.g. in 1098 to Muslim families from Ma'arrat al-Nu'man, in 1106 to a son of Khalaf b. Mula'ib of Famiya, in 1109 to the former ruler of Tripoli, Qadi Fakhr al-Mulk b. 'Ammar and in 1113 to the *da'i* of the Nizaris, Ibrahim, who had fled from the persecution of Alp Arslan of Aleppo.<sup>230</sup> Although between different truces the Banu Munqidh supported the allied operations backed by the sultan in 1111 and 1115, stood at the side of Ilghazi and Tughtegin against Roger in 1119 and between 1122 and 1124 were repeatedly involved in fighting with the Franks, their relations with Tancred and Roger of Antioch were not strained. Usama b. Munqidh's autobiography proves this. For example, the Amir Sultan granted in 1112 Tancred's request for a European knight on pilgrimage in Syria to be allowed to visit Shayzar, as he wished to become acquainted with Muslim knights. The Banu Munqidh escorted a knight going to Jerusalem from Famiya to Rafaniyya at the wish of Count Roger in 1116. Usama also recounts that the Frankish lord of al-Munaytira asked in Shayzar for the sending of a physician.<sup>231</sup>

<sup>226</sup> Chronicon ad A.C. 1234 pertinens, II, 69–70.

<sup>227</sup> Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 67.

<sup>228</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 221.

<sup>229</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 231 and Matthew of Edessa, 318.

<sup>230</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 150, 164–5; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 169.

<sup>231</sup> Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 51, 65, 97–99.

The good relations with the Franks and the character of Shayzar as neutral ground came in useful for Timurtash b. Ilghazi of Aleppo when he set about organizing the release of King Baldwin II. Timurtash had Baldwin brought to Shayzar, whereupon the Amir Sultan and his brother Murshid, Usama's father, mediated the ransom.<sup>232</sup> The manner of the exchange strongly resembled that in 1108, when Baldwin II, then count of Edessa, was released with the help of the amir of Qal'at Ja'bar, because the amirs sent some of their own children to Aleppo for the captive. For their part, they set Baldwin, who was exceedingly honourably received in Shayzar, at liberty as soon as his daughter Iveta, Joscelin's son and a number of Frankish and Armenian knights had come to Shayzar as hostages.<sup>233</sup> Only in 1125 did the Muslim hostages in Aleppo succeed in gaining release, when Iveta and Joscelin II were handed over to Aqsunqur. The knights, however, apparently remained in Shayzar and became free after the ransom had been paid. Usama recounts that when they were going home, Qirkhan b. Qaraja of Hims attacked them and that he himself rescued them from the Muslims at his uncle's command. In thanks for their mediation, Baldwin II remitted to the amirs of Shayzar the tribute (*qati'a*) due to the principality and Usama states that their influence was powerful in Antioch under Baldwin II.<sup>234</sup>

The tasks of Shayzar and Qal'at Ja'bar as places of refuge and mediators between the Syrian rulers, not only between Franks and Muslims, were thus similar. The Syrian *Chronicon ad A.C. 1234* characterizes the Banu Munqidh also, like the amirs of Qal'at Ja'bar, as 'a good sort of people, friendly to all and good mediators at any time'.<sup>235</sup> It is not surprising that the links between the two lordships were close. According to the *Chronicon*, the Banu Munqidh and the Banu Salim b. Malik belonged to the same Arab tribe.<sup>236</sup> Usama repeatedly describes the close chivalrous relations between the two rulers: 'Shihab al-Din Malik b. Salim and my father [...] were friendly and were linked together by letters and messengers.'<sup>237</sup> He also mentions the sending of captives and of a hunting bitch. The Banu Munqidh maintained similar friendly relations with the Armenian ruling

<sup>232</sup> Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 89.

<sup>233</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 231; Matthew of Edessa, 318; Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 89; Fulcher, Carnot., III, XXXVIII, 1, 750–1.

<sup>234</sup> Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 76, 89.

<sup>235</sup> *Chronicon ad A.C. 1234 pertinens*, II, 85.

<sup>236</sup> *Chronicon ad A.C. 1234 pertinens*, II, 85.

<sup>237</sup> Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 167.

house of the Rupenids.<sup>238</sup> Again it is clear, as previously with the conclusion of treaties between Franks and Muslims, that the same knightly way of life was the basis of contacts crossing confessional lines between individual ruling houses. The mediating function of the Arab lordships of Shayzar and Qal'at Ja'bar, and their utilization by Franks and Turks, are a further feature of the Syrian system of autonomous lordships and of the integration of the states founded by Franks. It is sufficiently characteristic that an end came to the good relations between Shayzar and Antioch at the moment when the regency of Baldwin II in Antioch reached a conclusion. The fortunes of the principality now lay in the hands of Bohemond II, a man fresh from Europe and unacquainted with the subtleties of Middle Eastern diplomacy.<sup>239</sup>

SYRIAN ALLIANCE POLITICS FROM THE EXPANSION OF THE ZENGID  
DOMINIONS TO THE FRANKISH-BYZANTINE RAPPROCHEMENT (1128–58)

Aleppo opened its gates to the envoys of the Atabeg 'Imad al-Din Zengi about the end of the year 1127. Thereby Zengi succeeded in taking over the succession from Aqsunqur al-Bursuqi and his son Mas'ud, after having already in the previous months brought Mosul and northern Mesopotamia into his possession. Zengi made his state entry into the metropolis of northern Syria in 1128. With Zengi's assumption of power, the struggles between Sunni and Shiite groups were temporarily brought to an end.

The union of Mosul and Aleppo in Zengi's hands marked a significant break in the history of the system of Syrian autonomous lordships, which had come into existence after the death of Tutush in 1095 and was further developed after the Frankish territorial acquisitions. As a part of the Zengid dominions, Aleppo was lost as a future partner of the Franks in alliances and treaties aiming at the preservation of its independence. Unlike in the years from 1119 to 1127, there were for a long time no internal struggles in and around Aleppo that had given the principality of Antioch, the county of Edessa or the surrounding Muslim lordships the possibility of coalitions. The Frankish rulers, like their Turkish and Arab counterparts in Syria, had to reckon in northern Syria instead with a significant supra-regional power of a potentially expansive character, whose interests might

---

<sup>238</sup> Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 96–7, 147, 166–7.

<sup>239</sup> Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 89–90.

be situated elsewhere than those of the rest of the Syrian local states with their concern for autonomy. What was the orientation of Zengid policy, what was the role of *jihad* ideology among the Zengids and did the policy of Zengi and his son Nur al-Din (after 1146) agree with or deviate from the strategy hitherto pursued by the Syrian rulers? Finally, one must investigate how the Syrian autonomous states reacted to the alteration of the structure of alliances which came with the end of the autonomy of Aleppo. The internationalization of the conflicts in Syria, revealed in the pro-Byzantine turn of policy in the Frankish states and the struggle for power in Egypt from c. 1158, set the point in time at which the investigation closes. This internationalization stood at the end of the Zengids' efforts to unite in their possession the Muslim states of Syria: Damascus (1154), Ba'labakk (1155) and Shayzar (1157) fell into the hands of Zengi's son, Nur al-Din Mahmud. Apart from the Frankish states, only the Syrian Nizaris were able to maintain their independence against the Zengids in the fortresses of Jabal Bahra.

The prestige usually attributed to 'Imad al-Din Zengi as protagonist of the *jihad* and forerunner of the aim of concentrated warfare against the Franks by reason of the unification of the Muslim autonomous states is essentially due to two facts. The first is that with the conquest of Edessa in 1144, Zengi obtained the first spectacular success against a centre of Frankish power, which was rated as the portent of a later attack on Jerusalem by the contemporary *jihad* propagandists and the poets Ibn al-Qaysarani and Ibn Munir, both refugees from the Franks. However, thoughts of driving the Franks out of Jerusalem were practically non-existent before Nur al-Din came to power in 1146. Secondly, the Zengids found in Ibn al-Athir a well-disposed biographer, a panegyrist even in his *History of the Atabegs of Mosul*, who suitably stressed Zengi's campaigns against the Franks as *jihad* operations.<sup>240</sup> Through Abu Shama's combined history of the Zengids and Ayyubids, *Kitab al-rawdatayn fi akhbar al-dawlatayn*, the description of Zengi as the inexorable opponent of the Franks was harmonized with the self-presentation, originally directed against the Zengids, of the Ayyubids as *mujahids*. He found entry into the historiographic tradition as the first link in the chain of three Muslim heroes of the counter-Crusade—Zengi, Nur al-Din, Saladin.<sup>241</sup> Grousset duly commented on Zengi's assumption

<sup>240</sup> Cahen, *Syrie*, 58–60; Elisséeff, *Nūr ad-Dīn*, I, 36–9; Gibb, *Notes*, 745–54.

<sup>241</sup> Holt, *Crusades*. 38–9.

of power with the words: 'In future the counter-Crusade will have a leader. This leader may die, but another will always take his place.'<sup>242</sup>

From the point of view of Ibn al-Athir, who presented Zengi as the God-sent saviour of Syrian Islam, the Holy War was the true *raison d'être* of Zengi's rule in Mosul and Aleppo. The unprotectedness of Muslim Syria before the covetousness of Frankish expansionism, which Ibn al-Athir painted in the gloomiest colours, reverting to events completely outside Zengi's period of rule, was to be the argument that moved the sultan and his wazir in 1127 to concede Mosul and Aleppo in *iqta'* to a strong ruler, namely Zengi, and to pass over the infant brother of the late ruler, Mas'ud b. Aqsunqur al-Bursuqi.<sup>243</sup> Ibn al-Athir also represents Zengi's acquisition of Hamah in 1129 in a historical-theological light. After the successful repulse of an Artuqid attack in Mesopotamia, Zengi in 1130 is shown as having put all his desire and endeavour into a combat with the infidels, capturing al-Atharib, then besieging Harim and compelling the Franks in a peace treaty to establish a condominium of the territories belonging to Harim.<sup>244</sup>

Ibn al-Athir himself, however, makes clear in both his historical works that the Frankish danger was no more than a pretext of the Zengid party to procure for Zengi nominal supremacy over Mosul and Syria by the sultan's diploma of appointment. The actual cause of his advancement was simply a palace intrigue. By material promises and warnings about the regent for the late ruler's infant son, Zengi's agent Nasir al-Din Jakir succeeded in inducing the two negotiators sent to the sultan from Mosul to plead for Zengi's appointment. Even a few months later, only the expenditure of large sums of money enabled Zengi to prevent the withdrawal of Mosul and its assignment to Dubays b. Sadaqa.<sup>245</sup> This was the same Dubays who in 1123–24 had besieged Muslim Aleppo in alliance with King Baldwin II and Count Joscelin I of Edessa and who had sought refuge for a while with the amirs of Qal'at Ja'bar and the Frank Joscelin I of Edessa in 1131 while fleeing from the Caliph al-Mustarshid in Iraq.<sup>246</sup> Dubays' Frankish alliances thus in no way discredited him. Against this background, the argument of the pro-Zengid Ibn al-Athir, linking the Holy War with Zengi personally, loses some of its effect. Zengi's wars against the Artuqids and

<sup>242</sup> Grousset, *Histoire*, I, 669.

<sup>243</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, X, 643–5; Ibn al-Athir, *Bāhir*, 34–5.

<sup>244</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, X, 662–3; Ibn al-Athir, *Bāhir*, 39–42.

<sup>245</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, X, 654.

<sup>246</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 247; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Bughya*, 230.

the conquest of their territories from Nasibin to Harran (extolled by Ibn al-Athir as action to help the inhabitants who were under threat from the Franks) serve even less to prove that his activity was meant for the *jihad* in the first place. While the chronicler places the capture of al-Atharib as early as 1130, by which he would prove Zengi's immediate involvement against the Franks, all other sources placed it in 1135. In 1130 there was nothing more than a petty operation in the territories south-west of Aleppo, in which the suburb of al-Atharib was destroyed—possibly not even by Zengid troops, but by Turcomans.<sup>247</sup>

Instead of that, Zengi (acting much as did Khalaf b. Mula'ib of Famiya towards the amir of Shayzar when outside Asfuna in 1104) simply used the *jihad* in an attempt to extend his sphere of power in Syria. He concluded a formal treaty with Taj al-Muluk Buri (Böri) of Damascus in 1130, which committed Damascus to a relieving contingent in a campaign against the Franks.<sup>248</sup> However, at their first meeting Zengi took Buri's brother Sevinj and some of the amirs of the Damascus contingent prisoner in order to gain possession of its dependency Hamah. Finally he even had his ally Qirkhan b. Qaraja of Hims imprisoned, supposedly the instigator of the treachery. Yet, the capture of Hims evaded Zengi because of the resistance of the citadel.<sup>249</sup> A year later in October 1131, Sevinj was exchanged for Dubays b. Sadaqa, who in the course of his flight from the caliph had shortly before fallen into captivity in Damascus.<sup>250</sup> This, it should be noted, was against the caliph's opposition. Zengid troops intercepted the caliph's envoy Ibn al-Anbari at al-Rahba on his return from Damascus and detained him for some time. With Dubays as an ally, Zengi in the next period involved himself *inter alia* in the clash between the caliph and the Seljuks in the east, but did not play an active part in Syrian politics or fighting against the Franks. A number of attacks by Turcoman tribal groups against Frankish territories occurred in northern Syria during his absence, exemplified in their victory over Count Pons of Tripoli in 1133. Clashes between Frankish troops and Sawar, the Zengid governor in Aleppo, were rare. Sawar became active only in 1134 when King Fulk and Count Joscelin II of Edessa achieved decisive victory against the Turcomans in the north.

<sup>247</sup> Al-'Azīmi, 406; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 247.

<sup>248</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 227–8.

<sup>249</sup> Al-'Azīmi, 403; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 227–8; 'Imād al-Dīn, *Bustān*, 121; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 245–6; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 658–9.

<sup>250</sup> Al-'Azīmi, 405; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 231–2; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 668–9.

The result of this survey must be that there is nothing to support the presentation by Ibn al-Athir and the editors of his works that Zengi's acquisition of power in northern Syria rang in a new age of Muslim resistance to the Franks. Neither official Zengid propaganda for the *jihād*, nor a special Zengid interest in the Frankish states in general can be detected prior to 1137.<sup>251</sup> On the contrary, the example of the betrayal of Sevinj proves that Zengi's idea of the *jihād* was used as a tool in the expansion of his own power, exactly as the preceding investigation into his predecessors in Mosul since the beginning of the twelfth century has indicated. If Ibn Wasil is correct in his history of the Ayyubids, Zengi even had his treachery towards the Damascenes legitimated by a *fatwa*.<sup>252</sup> Unfortunately, the chronicler gives no information about the reasoning of the *mufti* from whom it was sought, but possibly he legitimated the occurrence on the grounds that the sultan's diploma of appointment for Zengi in Mosul, northern Mesopotamia and Syria implied the nominal rule over Hamah, Hims and Damascus.<sup>253</sup> Whether or not that is the case, the event documents that for Zengi his own claim to rule took precedence over the struggle against the Franks. But it is still more significant that until 1135, apart from this episode, Zengi never intervened in Syria. The emergence of a powerful Zengid principality and the subsequent alteration in the long-standing balance of powers had thus still no major effect on the Syrian system of autonomous lordships. A glance at the history of the Frankish and Muslim rulers of Syria from 1128 to 1135 makes this clear.

After the death of Tughtegin on 12 February 1128 two closely related events occurred in Damascus under his son and successor, Taj al-Muluk Buri: A pogrom by the Sunni inhabitants directed against the Nizaris, on whom Tughtegin had relied since 1126, and the murder of their sympathizer, the Wazir al-Mazdaqani. There is no confirmation in other sources for Ibn al-Athir's rumour that the wazir had previously offered the Franks to surrender Damascus in exchange for Tyre, but that the plot was discovered and foiled in time before the date of surrender agreed with the Franks.<sup>254</sup> In any case, the kingdom of Jerusalem profited from the confusion in Damascus, even though their attack on the town was a failure. They took over the frontier fortress of Baniyas, that Tughtegin had previously handed over to the Nizaris, in return for compensation for its

<sup>251</sup> Cf. Sivan, *L'Islam*, 44–5; Prawer, *Histoire*, I, 314–5.

<sup>252</sup> Ibn Wāsil, I, 42.

<sup>253</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 650. Cf. al-'Aẓīmī, 401; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 243.

<sup>254</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 656.

commander Isma'īl.<sup>255</sup> The nature of the compensation, perhaps the grant of a fief, cannot be known exactly, but in any event, the commander died two years later in Baniyas.<sup>256</sup> The whole incident emphasizes the close connections between the Franks and groups in Damascus and subordinate cities, as has been shown for Ba'labakk and Busra for the years c. 1108–10.

The Burids in Damascus even appealed for help to the caliph (incidentally without any response) and alluded in their recruitment of Arabs and Turcomans for the struggle against the Frankish attackers of 1129 not only to the lure of money but also the duty of fighting the infidels. Furthermore, Ibn al-Qaysarani celebrated the ruler Buri in a poem for his *jihad* against the polytheists. Yet, the events of 1129 in no way led to a reorientation of the policy of Damascus with its concern for the safeguarding of independence and the *modus vivendi*.<sup>257</sup> A treaty with Jerusalem must have existed again just a little later. At all events Ibn al-Qalanisi speaks of an exchange of notes in 527/1132–33 concerning attacks on Muslim merchants in Beirut, which, since the Franks were wilfully breaking the existing treaty of security, would be followed by Damascus' recovery of Baniyas.<sup>258</sup> The Frankish raid in the Hawran in 1134, answered by an attack on Galilee and Acre, must likewise have breached an existing truce.<sup>259</sup> Because of William of Tyre's lack of chronological precision, it cannot be decided whether this treaty was identical with the *pax temporalis* reported in the Latin chronicles. This was concluded at the request of Damascus about two years after the recovery of Baniyas and brought about the release of the Frankish prisoners. Or was it the agreement already mentioned for the renewal of the truce, which restored peace in the autumn of 1134?<sup>260</sup> There is also nothing precise to be learnt from the sources about the fate of the condominium in Transjordan, which certainly existed until 1118. Yet, in view of the unchanged power relations in southern Syria, it appears probable that repeated conclusions of treaties retained it.

<sup>255</sup> Al-ʿAzīmi, 401; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 224–6; ʿImād al-Dīn, *Bustān*, 121; Ibn Abī Ṭayy' in Ibn al-Furāt, II (ed. Aldahir), 16–7, arab. 12 and 18–20, arab. 14–5; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 657; William of Tyre, XIV, XIX, 634 and XIII, XXVI, 595–598 (speaks of an 'Emir Ali').

<sup>256</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 224–6.

<sup>257</sup> Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, ed. Haydarabad, VIII, 1, 130–1; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 225; Ibn al-Qaysarani is quoted in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/1, 141–2.

<sup>258</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 236–7; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 648–85; William of Tyre, XIV, XVII, 631.

<sup>259</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 242–3.

<sup>260</sup> William of Tyre, XIV, XIX, 634. Cf. also Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 12.

The relations between Damascus and Jerusalem were thus unchanged since the mid-1120s, with individual campaigns occasionally propagated as Holy War or *jihad* alternating with longer periods of peace secured by treaty. At the same time, Tughtegin's successors by no means renounced the extension of their power at the expense of Muslim rulers. In the summer of 1133 Shams al-Muluk Isma'īl (1132–35) retook Hamah, which had come into Zengi's possession in 1130 through his betrayal of Sevinj. He then laid waste the lands of the amir of Shayzar and in November 1133 he captured the fortress of Shaqif Tirun, which belonged to a certain al-Dahhak b. Jandal al-Tamimi.<sup>261</sup> At the turn of the year 1135, Shihab al-Din Mahmud (1135–39) obtained the city of Hims, which could no longer be defended against Zengi, by exchange from Qirkhan's son whom Zengi had held prisoner since 1130.<sup>262</sup> In the same period until 1137, repeated internal crises occurred over the filling of the office of *ra'is*, the wazirate and the power at the summit of the state itself.

The situation of the Frankish states was not very different. Until 1135, only Turcoman campaigns and fights with rival states disturbed their security, not Muslim *jihad* operations. A more important indication of the position of the Franks in the Syrian system of autonomous lordships is the fact that in the course of the succession after the death of Prince Bohemond II of Antioch in 1130 and King Baldwin II of Jerusalem in 1131, there were two revolts, in which separate parties sought to secure Muslim help. Alice, Bohemond II's widow and the daughter of the king of Jerusalem, attempted to take over the rule in Antioch herself in 1130 after her husband's death and to this end turned for help to Zengi. However, her gift to him, a valuably equipped steed, fell into the hands of Baldwin II, who took Antioch in a surprise attack and wrecked Alice's plans.<sup>263</sup> An alliance with Zengi failed through the king's swift intervention, unless the already mentioned campaign against al-Atharib and Ma'arrat al-Nu'man is to be counted as a reaction to Alice's request.

Presumably, the revolt of Count Hugh of Jaffa and Prince Roman of Transjordan is to be dated to 1134. Mayer connects it with the struggles between King Fulk (1131–43) and his wife Melisende, a daughter of Baldwin II, supported by a party of the nobility, about the leading role in

<sup>261</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 238–9, 241; Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 111–2; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 6–7, 11.

<sup>262</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 252; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 38.

<sup>263</sup> William of Tyre, XIII, XXVII, 599–600. The revolt is also mentioned in al-'Aẓīmī, 403; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 247; Michael Syrus, 230.

the kingdom of Jerusalem.<sup>264</sup> The constitutional aspects are not of concern here, but William of Tyre's report that the count had entrenched himself in Jaffa and established contact with Egypt, having been accused of *lèse-majesté* because of a rumoured affair with the queen and being unready to take part in a judicial duel. Hugh is said to have sailed to Ascalon where he made a treaty and encouraged the Egyptian garrison to campaign against Arsuf.<sup>265</sup> In spite of this alliance, the revolt failed and was ended through the patriarch's mediation, because a majority of Hugh's vassals broke with him when King Fulk besieged Jaffa.

These instances show that even if the agreement of the count of Jaffa with the governor of Ascalon was the cause of the defection of his most important vassals, the differences among the individual Syrian states and the outbreaks of religious emotion (e.g. during the siege of Aleppo in 1123–24 and Damascus in 1129), were not strong enough to prevent requests for the assistance of Frankish or Muslim fighting contingents by neighbours of the other faith. It is not less significant that Zengi made no attempt to profit from Alice's offer of alliance in 1130. In 1131, during his absence in the east, Zengi's representatives were again unconcerned to gain from the disputes between the Frankish lords expressed in the alliance between the three northern Frankish states against King Fulk of Jerusalem. Until Zengi's return to Syria at the beginning of 1135, until his campaign against Damascus and the conquest of the parts of the principality of Antioch lying east of the Orontes, there was consequently no change in the *modus vivendi* which had prevailed since the establishment of the Franks in Syria, no noticeable shift in the policy of all of the lordships aimed at autonomy and limited expansion of power. Since there were no interventions of rulers from outside Syria comparable to the so-called counter-Crusades of the previous two decades, initiatives for general alliances were lacking in this period. The only recognizable motives for political dealings were the endeavours for independence and expansion of the individual Syrian lordships. Zengi's powerful principality in the north was nowhere felt as a threat to the status quo, as Alice of Antioch's request for help makes clear, since at first he did not endanger the other states. The campaigns and rivalries which characterized the relationships between the individual lordships are not to be explained as arising from religious antagonism, nor do they show the construction of a Christian or a Muslim bloc. That

---

<sup>264</sup> William of Tyre, XIV, XVI–XVIII, 629–631.

<sup>265</sup> William of Tyre, XIV, XVI, 629.

non-material processes, such as the frequently assumed evolutionary dynamism of the *jihad* idea, influenced the conclusion of alliances and treaties in this period, or were the motive for military campaigns, is not ascertainable for Zengi's policy or that of any Syrian ruler.

At the beginning of the year 1135, the picture underwent far-reaching changes inasmuch as the opportunity presented itself to Zengi to expand his rule in Syria. As Ibn al-Qalanisi reports, the despotic rule of Shams al-Muluk Isma'il in Damascus had aroused such strong resistance that when he learnt of Zengi's determination to attack Damascus, he offered to surrender it to him, perhaps because he believed that he could no longer hold out against the Damascenes. Shams al-Muluk Isma'il urged Zengi to hasten and even threatened that otherwise he would hand over the whole lordship to the Franks. When the secret diplomacy of the ruler, who had already had his possessions sent to Sarkhad, became known, a faction was formed among the Damascene notables who were anxious for their positions and lives in the event of Zengi assuming power. None other than Isma'il's mother, Safwat al-Mulk, joined this faction. At her instigation the ruler was murdered on 1 February 1135 and his brother Shihab al-Din Mahmud took his place.<sup>266</sup> When Zengi appeared before Damascus shortly afterwards, he encountered to his astonishment a city prepared to resist him, while he had nothing to match their troops. Hence, he offered peace to Shihab al-Din Mahmud on condition that Damascus submitted to his suzerainty.<sup>267</sup> It may have contributed to his generosity that during these events an emissary of the caliph recalled him to Iraq. Yet, in spite of the peace just concluded Zengi arrested the Damascene governor of Hamah and annexed the city to his sphere of control. After that, he captured the places belonging to the principality of Antioch on the route from Aleppo to Hamah in the spring of 1135 and compelled Shayzar to submit. While he threatened the Tripolitanian fortress of Ba'rin, his troops attacked Hims. After successful operations against Count Pons of Tripoli, he had the environs of Hims thoroughly devastated before he withdrew from Syria in August 1135.<sup>268</sup> Calm did not prevail in northern Syria during his absence. In the spring of 1136 Zengid troops from Aleppo and Hamah

---

<sup>266</sup> Al-'Aẓīmī, 408; Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 245–7; 'Imād al-Dīn, *Bustān*, 123; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 255–6; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 20–1.

<sup>267</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 248.

<sup>268</sup> The only source is Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 259.

laid waste extensive parts of the principality of Antioch and destroyed Latakia.<sup>269</sup>

This campaign with which Zengi resumed his policy of expansion in Syria, interrupted since the arrest of Sevinj in 1130, leads up to a new period of alliances following the undifferentiated phase of alliance strategies in Syrian history since Aqsunqur al-Bursuqi of Mosul had intervened in 1124. In 1135, the power of the Zengid state had for the first time shown itself as a serious threat to Muslim and Frankish states, for Damascus, Hims, Shayzar, Antioch and Tripoli alike. This presented the Syrian rulers with the same situation that had existed in the years from 1110 to 1115, when the campaigns of Turkish allied armies coming from Mesopotamia and Persia threatened their autonomy. Yet, after 1135 a further danger to the Syrian lordships was added to Zengi's attempts at expansion—the campaigns of the Byzantine Emperor John Comnenus in 1137–38 and 1142–43 in Cilicia and northern Syria. The emperor's declared aim was 'to unite Antioch and Constantinople, to advance thence into the Holy Land, to heap gifts on the Holy Tomb whence the Lord was resurrected and to cleanse the whole region thereabouts of barbarians',<sup>270</sup> in other words, to extend the area of Byzantine rule southwards and thereby to do away with the existing political structure of Syria. How did the current Syrian rulers react and with what policy did Zengi confront the Byzantine advance? The following investigation of the course of events from the spring of 1137 to the summer of 1140 provides a vivid model of the motives of Zengi and the Frankish and Muslim autonomous lordships in political bargaining.

In 1136, while Zengi was still in Mosul, a battle took place between Count Pons of Tripoli and a troop of Turcomans from Damascus under the Atabeg Bazwaj in which the Franks were defeated. Pons was killed in flight in Lebanon and Bazwaj captured the Frankish fortress of Wadi Ibn al-Ahmar.<sup>271</sup> This was apparently a Turcoman booty raid in the traditional manner, which only later, because of its unusual success, played off in diplomacy against Egypt and in the hindsight of the chroniclers was blown up into a *jihad* enterprise.<sup>272</sup> While the contemporary Ibn al-Qalanisi spoke only of Turcomans on the side of Damascus, the later chronicler Ibn al-Athir added that volunteers for the *jihad* were also

<sup>269</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, XI, 41; Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 260–1.

<sup>270</sup> Niketas Choniates, tr. Gabler, 72.

<sup>271</sup> Ibn al-Qalanisi, 258; Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, XI, 50; William of Tyre, XIV, XXIII, 64off.

<sup>272</sup> Al-Qalqashandī, VI, 449–51.

present.<sup>273</sup> A little later Bazwaj took advantage of the fighting of King Fulk and Raymond II of Tripoli to plunder the unfortified city of Nablus.<sup>274</sup> He was put to death in Damascus on 19 April 1138 by order of the ruler on returning from an expedition against the Franks.<sup>275</sup>

On the other hand, there are signs of cooperation between Franks and Muslims elsewhere in the same period. Zengi returned from Mesopotamia in May 1137 and afterwards attempted to take Hims, which had been handed over to Damascus at the turn of the year 1135 for fear of Zengi. The governor of the city was Mu'in al-Din Unur. Lacking success, Zengi raised the siege on 11 July and turned against the neighbouring Tripolitanian fortress of Ba'rin. Thereupon Count Raymond II of Tripoli called on King Fulk of Jerusalem for help. Zengi succeeded, however, in defeating the Franks and renewed the siege of the fortress, in which the remainder of the Frankish army had taken refuge. The contemporary Aleppine chronicler al-'Azimi reports that the Frankish campaign against Zengi had been thought of as assistance for Hims when under siege.<sup>276</sup> Even though at the arrival of the army of Jerusalem Zengi was no longer threatening Hims, but rather Ba'rin, there is something to support this statement. Previously Zengi had threatened both places in 1135 and his attack in 1137 once again endangered territories of both states, Tripoli, feudally dependent on Jerusalem, and Damascus. It seems moreover that there were good relations between the county of Tripoli and Hims. When in 1142 or 1144 Raymond transferred the western areas of his county to the Hospitallers, among the privileges ceded were the fishing-rights in the Lake of Hims (Buhayrat Qadas),<sup>277</sup> which were perhaps parts of a condominium over the waters south-west of Hims. Even the contemporary geographer al-Idrisi reckoned the port of Antartus, belonging to the county, as the port of Hims.<sup>278</sup> King Fulk's campaign could thus really have been the first outcome of a community of interests of the Franks and the governor of Hims directed against Zengi. Mu'in al-Din Unur, the governor and successor of Bazwaj as *isfahsalar* (supreme commander) and atabeg, became in early 1140 the architect of the first firm alliance against Zengi.<sup>279</sup>

<sup>273</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 258; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 50.

<sup>274</sup> William of Tyre, XIV, 647.

<sup>275</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 264.

<sup>276</sup> Al-'Azīmī, 412; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 261.

<sup>277</sup> RRH, no. 212, 53.

<sup>278</sup> Al-Idrīsī, 375.

<sup>279</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 264.

The further course of the siege of Baʿrin is not less informative for the policy of Zengi and the Syrian rulers. At first Zengi refused the request of the besieged troops for free departure, but then granted it for a payment of 50,000 dinars, when news reached him of the approach of a relieving army and the arrival of the Emperor John Comnenus in Antioch. Zengi liberated his prisoners and concluded an armistice with the king in the middle of August 1137.<sup>280</sup> On the conclusion of the treaty, Fulk even received a robe of honour from his Muslim opponent. This not only indicates Zengi's recognition of the Frankish ruler, but basically implies the nominally subordinate position of the recipient of the honour to the one conferring it. In fact, Ibn al-Qalanisi interpreted the circumstances of the conclusion of this treaty as an act of subordination of the Franks to Zengi, without the legal significance being made clear in the text itself.<sup>281</sup> Perhaps this refers merely to a subordination of the Franks under the Zengid conditions of treaty. Since probably shortly beforehand there was also an armistice and treaty of security between Zengi and Shihab al-Din Mahmud of Damascus, a truce suddenly came about among all the important Frankish and Muslim Syrian rulers at the moment of the arrival of the Byzantine emperor before Antioch.<sup>282</sup>

The model of political and diplomatic dealing that became clear in the course of events between March and mid-August 1137 shows the readiness to cooperate against Zengi's policy of extending his power. It indicates moreover that Zengi also, when facing an external threat to his dominion, strove immediately for a settlement with Damascus and the Frankish rulers. In this respect, his policy conformed exactly to the basic model of the Syrian alliance policy of the Frankish and Muslim lordships. The further developments until the late summer of 1138 also make this clear. In August–September 1137, an exchange of ambassadors and presents between John Comnenus and Zengi took place, which temporarily eased the situation between the two rulers. Thereupon the emperor returned to Cilicia and spent the rest of the year in warfare against the Rupenid Prince Leon.<sup>283</sup> As soon as Zengi thought that the danger from Byzantium was thereby averted, he broke his agreement with Damascus. In September–October he renewed the siege of Hims, then of Baʿlabakk and demanded

---

<sup>280</sup> Al-ʿAzīmi, 412; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 259; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 52; William of Tyre, XIV, XXIX, 650–1.

<sup>281</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 259; Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Zubda*, II, 262.

<sup>282</sup> Al-ʿAzīmi, 412; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 262.

<sup>283</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 263; Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Zubda*, II, 263.

a sum of money from the city. Thereafter he took the fortress of al-Majdal and received the submission of the governor of Baniyas. Only at the turn of the year did he leave Damascene territory and again besieged Hims. There, he received news of the breach of the truce by the prince of Antioch and of the capture of Muslim merchants in spring 1138. The report of the Byzantine-Frankish attack on Buza'a, north-east of Aleppo, followed at the beginning of April 1138.<sup>284</sup> The further Byzantine attack on Aleppo and the emperor's conquests in northern Syria thereupon induced Zengi to end for a second time his conflict with Damascus. The motives and basic pattern of Zengid and Frankish policy is nowhere illustrated more clearly than in the conduct of the two sides during and after the siege of Shayzar in April/May 1138.

The counter-measures that Zengi had resorted to in regard to the Byzantine advance included diplomatic activity as well as military preparations. While he was at Salamiyya, awaiting the progress of the siege of Shayzar, he turned to John Comnenus by means of secret embassies in order to convince him that the Franks feared the emperor and would abandon him immediately, if he gave up his present position. By contrast, in embassies to the Frankish rulers among the besiegers Zengi goaded on their anxiety with the argument that 'if he conquers one stronghold in Syria, he conquers the whole of your land.'<sup>285</sup> Fittingly, William of Tyre reproached Prince Raymond of Antioch and Count Joscelin II of Edessa of a lack of enthusiasm during the siege in his *History* and spoke of the emperor's violent rage over his two Frankish vassals.<sup>286</sup> Other sources also rate the lifting of the siege of Aleppo and the attempt to capture Shayzar with all its difficulties as the result of a Frankish betrayal of the emperor.<sup>287</sup> The background of this suspicion is the content of the treaty which Raymond of Poitiers, the prince of Antioch, concluded with the emperor in September 1137 after the Byzantine troops had started the siege of Antioch. Raymond had declared himself the emperor's liege vassal and swore to hand over Antioch, if John transferred Aleppo, Shayzar, Hims and/or Hamah to him.<sup>288</sup>

The Frankish rulers could not be interested in the fulfilment of this agreement, which would become tangibly closer with the capture of

<sup>284</sup> Al-'Azīmi, 413-4; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 263; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 263-4.

<sup>285</sup> The oldest source for this is Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 58 whose source is unknown.

<sup>286</sup> William of Tyre, XV, I, 655-7.

<sup>287</sup> Chronicon ad A.C. 1234 pertinens, II, 85; Gregory the Priest, 323.

<sup>288</sup> William of Tyre, XIV, XXX, 651-3.

Aleppo or Shayzar. After the conclusion of the campaign in Antioch, Joscelin II even staged a popular rising in order to prevent the handing over of this city to the emperor.<sup>289</sup> It is therefore plausible that the Franks actually wanted the Byzantine campaign to fail and Zengi sought to deepen the conflict of interests between Byzantines and Franks by diplomatic means—even if his diplomacy may not have been the real reason for the lifting of the siege and the conclusion of peace between the emperor and Sultan, the amir of Shayzar. Neither King Fulk of Jerusalem nor Raymond II of Tripoli joined the Byzantine campaign in 1138, while Raymond of Antioch and Joscelin II of Edessa, who were bound by treaty to support the emperor, obviously contributed nothing to the success of the enterprise. This proves that the Franks did not strive for an alliance with Byzantium and any alteration of the status quo. The Frankish rulers adopted the same attitude towards John Comnenus in the winter of 1142–43 on his second advance into Syria. Prince Raymond of Antioch declared with reference to his constitutional position that the obligation to hand over Antioch by the treaty of 1137 was obsolete and King Fulk prevented the emperor's visit to Jerusalem by diplomatic means.<sup>290</sup>

The Frankish and Zengid interests thus lay parallel in 1138: neither the Frankish rulers, nor Zengi or Damascus wished an alteration of the status quo. Hence, it came about that, as previously in the late summer of 1137 during the first Byzantine advance, all the other conflicts in Syria apparently stopped in the spring of 1138, although neither Jerusalem nor Damascus took part in the fighting in the north. The last Damascene expedition against the Franks in February was earlier than the Byzantine campaign and the next clash took place at Baniyas in September 1138 at the earliest, after the Byzantine withdrawal from Syria.<sup>291</sup> During the siege of Shayzar, treaty negotiations even took place between Zengi and Shihab al-Din Mahmud of Damascus and these resulted in an agreement at the end of May, while the Byzantines were in Syria. Zengi married Mahmud's mother (who had procured the death of her son Isma'il in 1135 because he had sought to deliver Damascus up to Zengi) and received Hims as dowry. For this he ceded Ba'rin and other places to Mu'in al-Din Unur in compensation.<sup>292</sup> This settlement provided a compromise solution for the quarrel about Hims, which had been going on since 1130

<sup>289</sup> William of Tyre, XV, IV, 661–3.

<sup>290</sup> William of Tyre, XV, XIX–XXI, 689–92.

<sup>291</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 264, 268–9.

<sup>292</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 266–7; al-'Azīmī, 416; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 269.

and at the same time the marriage connection aimed at a lasting alliance. The agreement was not directed, however, against the Frankish rulers, but against the Byzantines and would not have come into existence without the emperor's campaign. In brief, the Byzantine campaign led to a rapprochement of all the powers in Syria and the cessation of all hostilities between them. The attitude of the Frankish and Muslim rulers, and also that of Zengi, in 1137–38 thus fits smoothly into the frame of Syrian politics, i.e. the standing together of rival Syrian lordships against a common threat from without, as was repeatedly the case from 1108 onwards. Zengi's argument to Raymond of Antioch and Joscelin II outside Shayzar, that if the Byzantines took even a single fortress in Syria, they would soon conquer the whole Frankish territory, moreover strikingly resembles the 'no place' doctrine of Ridwan of Aleppo, by which in 1108 he moved Tancred to an alliance against Jawali of Mosul.<sup>293</sup> A further indication that Zengi also in 1138 pursued a Syrian policy is his diplomacy towards the Islamic east and dealings with the *jihad* ideology which he showed in it.

When the Byzantine army besieged Aleppo in April 1138, Zengi regarded his situation as so threatened that he sent his highest dignitary, the Qadi Kamal al-Din b. al-Shahrazuri, to Sultan Mas'ud in Baghdad to ask for help, although he was aware that this might endanger his rule. During an audience with the sultan, after Ibn al-Shahrazuri had represented the Byzantines as a mortal threat, he received an actual promise of help, which, however, was not followed by action. Thereupon he reacted in the same way as the delegation from Aleppo had done in 1111 and incited an uprising. Ibn al-Shahrazuri had money distributed to a group of the rabble and non-Arabs. They instigated unrest with cries of woe in two Friday mosques and brought the excited people to the sultan's palace. When the tumult threatened to become extraordinarily dangerous, the sultan summoned Ibn al-Shahrazuri, who brought the threat to Baghdad from the Byzantines vividly before his eyes and was finally dismissed with instructions to calm the mob and take an army to Syria. Thereupon Ibn al-Shahrazuri chose 20,000 horsemen and applied to Zengi for confirmation that he still wanted the force. However, directly after the departure of the army, a messenger from Zengi brought the news of the withdrawal of the besiegers and announced that the dispatch of the relieving force was superfluous. Ibn al-Shahrazuri had then to employ all his diplomatic

---

<sup>293</sup> Ibn Abi Tayy' in Ibn al-Furāt, I (ed. Shamy), 86–7, arab. 53. Cf. Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 464–5.

skill to persuade Sultan Mas'ud to recall his marching orders since Mas'ud wished to conquer Zengi's territory on the pretext of a *jihad*.<sup>294</sup>

Three points stand out. In the first place, neither the sultan nor the people of Baghdad show any interest in the *jihad* as such. With his formal promise of help, the sultan fulfilled his duty as a Muslim ruler. On the other hand, the popular emotion, which the envoy had first to arouse through paid rabble-rousers, was in no way caused by enthusiasm for the Holy War. The people of Baghdad showed support for the *jihad* solely out of anxiety that their lands would be subsequently attacked. In the second place, Ibn al-Shahrazuri assumed from the start that, while professing the *jihad*, the sultan contemplated only the extension of his own power. But in the third place, Zengi was also not concerned with fighting the Franks or the Holy War in general, but only with the relief of his Syrian capital. Although the conflict with the emperor's army reached its culmination only after the withdrawal from Aleppo, before Shayzar, since Zengi's sphere of authority was no longer threatened, he now wanted to avoid the sultan's intervention. He acted precisely in the same manner in May 1138 when he ordered the return of the Turcomans, who were en route for Syria under the Artuqid Qara Arslan of Hisn Kayfa.<sup>295</sup> Not the Holy War against the Christians, but rather the protection of his Syrian possessions generally determined Zengid policy. To serve this end, Zengi argued and acted not only according to the Syrian 'no place' doctrine, but like the sultan he made use of the *jihad* ideology as an instrument for his purposes without actually being interested in it.

When the Byzantine troops withdrew from Syria in the summer of 1138, Zengi stood in a position of greater strength. At only one point was the *status quo ante* permanently altered: Zengi had been able to acquire Hims in the course of the emperor's campaign. Embassies with gifts of honour from the caliph, the sultan, the emperor, from Egypt and Damascus bore witness to his increased significance.<sup>296</sup> With the cessation of the external threat, the mutual relationships of the Syrian states fell back again into the traditional pattern. While Zengi reconquered the places taken by the Byzantines in the north, including al-Atharib, and laid waste the territories between 'Arqa and Aleppo, Damascus and Jerusalem came to blows again over Baniyas.<sup>297</sup> After Zengi subsequently marched against Timurtash of

<sup>294</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhīr*, 62–3; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 58–9.

<sup>295</sup> The oldest source is al-'Azīmī, 415–6.

<sup>296</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 269.

<sup>297</sup> Al-'Azīmī, 416; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 230–1; Ibn al-Qalānisī, 268.

Mardin in the spring of 1139, there were no new developments in Syria. A change came with the murder of Shihab al-Din Mahmud of Damascus in June 1139, whose mother Zengi had married a year before. The background to the crime committed against the ruler of Damascus is apparently not to be found in his policy towards Zengi or the Franks, as was the case in the murder of his brother in 1135.<sup>298</sup> Zengi, whose wife may have pressed him to take revenge for her son, made the crime the occasion for hastening back to Syria and mounting a new attack on Damascus. Meanwhile, the brother (and former opponent) of the murdered ruler, Jamal al-Din Muhammad, had been enthroned there and Mu'in al-Din Unur had been entrusted with the direction of state business.<sup>299</sup> He had defended Hims against Zengi two years before and possibly asked for Frankish help. In face of the organized resistance, Zengi at first made no attempt to attack Damascus, but besieged Ba'labakk, which fell to him, presumably on 10 October 1139. The garrison of the citadel offered to surrender ten days later, if their security was guaranteed. Zengi agreed to this, but broke his word and had everyone crucified who could not flee.<sup>300</sup>

This breach of a treaty cast severe doubts on Zengi's credibility for a second time after the arrest of Sevinj in 1130 and it confronted the elite of Damascus with a similar fate in the event of the surrender of their city.<sup>301</sup> This proved of serious consequence for Zengi in two ways. It not only destroyed any prospect of a peaceful surrender of Damascus, but was also the motive for the conclusion of a formal alliance between Damascus and Jerusalem. Just as previously in 1104, when Tughtegin was considering handing over Damascus to Sukman b. Artuq, so also in autumn 1139 the military elite, consisting of Turks, in their common interest with the chiefs of the local administration and the militia induced the town's ruler to reject the Zengid offer of exchanging his rule over Damascus with control of Ba'labakk, Hims or another city.<sup>302</sup> The whole population thus supported the resistance to Zengi in the following months and it did not arise solely from a prince's egotistic interest in ruling, as Ibn al-Athir conceded with astonishment in his *History of the Atabegs*. This is proved not only by the military resistance of the Damascenes to Zengi in the autumn and

<sup>298</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 268–9; Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, ed. Haydarabad, VIII, 1, 171–2.

<sup>299</sup> Al-'Azīmi, 417; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 269; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 68–9; Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhir*, 58–9.

<sup>300</sup> Al-'Azīmi, 418; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 269–70; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 69.

<sup>301</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 69. Cf. Ibn al-Qalānisi, 270.

<sup>302</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 271; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 73.

winter of 1139 but also by the fact that the death of Jamal al-Din Muhammad in March 1140 and the succession of his infant son Abaq (Uvaq) brought about no change in the Damascene position.<sup>303</sup>

Instead of this, Damascus and Jerusalem concluded an alliance in the first months of 1140 after which Mu'in al-Din Unur entered into negotiations with King Fulk. They were presumably conducted through Usama b. Munqidh, the nephew of the amir of Shayzar who had been living in Damascus since 1138, as his family had a good reputation at the royal court since its mediation over the release of Baldwin II in 1123.<sup>304</sup> Usama had already visited Jerusalem in 1138. When the treaty between the two rulers was finally concluded is unknown, as are its exact terms. However, Ibn al-Qalanisi and William of Tyre give some information about its form and content. The Franks pledged themselves by oath to give armed assistance against Zengi and to defend Damascus. For this they would receive a certain sum of money (William of Tyre speaks of 20,000 dinars monthly) to pay for the arms, and also Baniyas, which had belonged to the Zengid sphere of control since 1137. As well as the usual oaths of confirmation, the provision of hostages from upper-class Damascene families guaranteed the fulfilment of the treaty.<sup>305</sup> Thereupon at the end of April, Zengi moved into the Hawran and took up his position south of Damascus, as the troops from Jerusalem, Tripoli and Antioch, reinforced by contingents of pilgrims, joined forces with their Muslim allies. The allied forces began the siege of Baniyas in early May, while Zengi sent expeditions out against them from Ba'labakk. In the middle of June, the city capitulated in return for security of withdrawal, a Damascene *iqta'* for the commander and the guarantee that whoever wished to remain temporarily or permanently might live there on good conditions. Baniyas was handed over to its former Frankish lord from 1129 to c. 1133, Rainer Brus. After a further attack on Damascus and the Hawran at the end of June 1140, Zengi withdrew to the north.<sup>306</sup>

For the investigation of the policy of alliances and treaties, the successful military conclusion of the alliance or the surrender of Baniyas is of limited interest. They merely expressed the same pragmatism with its indifference to religion and the same consciousness of knightly equality

<sup>303</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Bahir*, 59.

<sup>304</sup> Usama b. Munqidh, *I'tibar*, 60–1.

<sup>305</sup> Ibn al-Qalanisi, 272; William of Tyre, XV, VII, 668–9.

<sup>306</sup> Al-'Azimi, 418; Ibn al-Qalanisi, 272–3; Ibn Abi Tayy' in Abu Shama, *Rawdatayn*, I/1, 86–7; Ibn al-Athir, *Kamil*, XI, 73–5; Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 273–4; William of Tyre, XV, IX–XI, 671–6.

with securing a suitable livelihood for the commander as had been the case since the middle of the first decades of the twelfth century.<sup>307</sup> It was much more the motives of the Franks and Damascenes which led to the conclusion of the agreement. Ibn al-Qalanisi bases Unur's offer of a treaty to the Franks on the grounds that both sides should repulse the Zengid attack before 'his might should become invincible and he should be victorious over the Frankish bands and attack their cities'.<sup>308</sup> Ibn al-Athir gives a similar account. Unur 'aroused their fear if Zengi captured Damascus. They recognized the truth of what he said, that if he captured it, he would leave them no place (*la maqam*) in Syria.'<sup>309</sup> Also, William of Tyre mentions that King Fulk and the council of princes held it best 'to give support to Unur and the Damascenes against the most monstrous and mistrusted enemy of both realms and to furnish reinforcements without recompense, lest the enemy, more powerful through our sluggishness, having gained the realm [of Damascus] should begin to increase [his] realm to our destruction.'<sup>310</sup>

In their formulation, all three sources provide *loci classici* for the Syrian system of autonomous lordships since 1108: the threat to the autonomy of the individual rulers from the advance of external powers always led to the conclusion of defensive alliances irrespective of ethnic and religious boundaries. As appears most clearly in Ibn al-Athir's formulation, the basic idea of this alliance policy was the 'no place' doctrine, according to which the individual Syrian lordships must hold together in the event of a threat from a superior power. This doctrine was brought into play for the first time in 1108 with the advance of Jawali of Mosul against Ridwan of Aleppo. Then it was the motive of the Syrian alliance in 1115 against the allied Turkish army under Bursuq b. Bursuq and of the independence policy of Aleppo until 1119. Zengi picked it up to stop cooperation between the Franks and John Comnenus in 1138. Its ambivalent character is only emphasised by the fact that it could also be the basis of alliances against Zengi, as evident after 1137. As long as Zengi did not threaten the existence of the other Syrian states, there was no alliance. If outside powers in common with Jerusalem, Tripoli, Antioch or Damascus endangered the independence of the Zengid territories, such as the Byzantines in 1137–38 and the sultan's plans to intervene in Syria, Zengi acted in accordance

---

<sup>307</sup> William of Tyre, XV, XI, 674–5.

<sup>308</sup> Ibn al-Qalanisi, 272.

<sup>309</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, XI, 74.

<sup>310</sup> William of Tyre, XV, VII, 669.

with the Syrian alliance policy and argued in terms of the 'no place' doctrine. When, however, one of the lordships, such as the north-Syrian and north-Mesopotamian dominion of Zengi in 1140, placed the autonomy of the other states in question, this resulted in a league of the other most important states.

The investigation of the course of history from spring 1137 to summer 1140 has attempted to verify this process of cause and effect. Right up to the summer of 1137, there continued to be Damascene attacks on Tripoli and Jerusalem, but thereafter a truce prevailed precisely for the period of the two Byzantine advances into Syria and for the Zengid operations in the south. Zengi's attacks in turn ensued at the moment in which pressure from outside decreased. When Zengi resumed his policy of expansion in the south after the Byzantine withdrawal, Damascus proposed a formal alliance against Zengi to the kingdom of Jerusalem. The novelty as compared with earlier alliances, which as in 1115 had come into existence on Muslim initiative and partly for mutual financial or territorial services, lies in the fact that the *raison d'être* of the alliance was no longer resistance to a brief operation from outside Syria, but defence against a ruler whose sphere of power already included parts of Syria and whose expansionist policy represented a long-term threat, as had become clear since 1135. It follows from this that the alliance was no longer concluded *ad hoc* and shortly after dissolved again as in previous decades, but became a political constant at least in the medium term. Thereby a basically different situation appeared in southern Syria from that in the north where Zengi was dominant and which had been the scene of the earliest alliances between Franks and Muslims after the First Crusade. For the principality of Antioch, significantly reduced in its territorial extent, there hardly existed any potential Muslim allies that were still independent. On the other hand, the possibilities of alliance were more varied for the count of Edessa. The course of history until the death of 'Imad al-Din Zengi in 1146 makes clear the different developments in south and north.

The alliance of spring 1140 survived its immediate success, the defeat of the Zengid attack, and it introduced a longer period of peace between Jerusalem and Damascus. Until his death, Zengi never returned to Syria. In the fighting which went on in the south until 1146, either Zengid troops, e.g. from Ba'labakk or the Egyptian garrison of Ascalon confronted the Franks.<sup>311</sup> The forces in Ascalon were repeatedly changed every year and

---

<sup>311</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 273, 274, 278; William of Tyre, XVI, VI, 712-4; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 80.

the place qualified as a frontier city (*thaghr*), the inhabitants of which, according to William of Tyre, were altogether paid from the Egyptian state treasury and supplied with grain from the Nile valley.<sup>312</sup> The last years of King Fulk's reign (1131–43) were a period of calm for the kingdom. Instead of the gain of territory, the aim of previous campaigns, measures were taken to consolidate the territory of Jerusalem. A series of foundations of fortresses in the border regions makes this particularly clear: in the plain of Ascalon, Bethgibelin/Bayt Jibrin (1136), Ibelin/Yubna (1141), Blanchegarde/Tall al-Safiyya (1143), Gaza (1149–50); in Transjordan, Crac/al-Karak (1142); in Galilee and Lebanon, Beaufort/Shaqif Arnun (1139), Saphet/Safad and Belvoir/Kawkab (1140). The best informed contemporary chroniclers of southern Syria, Ibn al-Qalanisi and William of Tyre, have nothing to report about fighting between Damascus and Jerusalem until 1147 and al-'Azimi in Aleppo merely notes a Frankish raid for booty. After Unur chased the Franks to Baniyas, peace was apparently restored.<sup>313</sup> This incident was perhaps connected with the proceedings initiated by Usama b. Munqidh in Jerusalem on the instructions of the Damascene regent. This ended in Rainer Brus of Baniyas being pronounced guilty by his peers in the royal court of having infringed the peace with Damascus. Rainer had to compensate the Muslims, but he was able to negotiate with Usama the reduction of the cash-payment to 400 dinars.<sup>314</sup> Whether al-'Azimi's information is correct or rests upon some confusion cannot be decided. The passage from Usama b. Munqidh's work shows in any case that there were indeed infringements, presumably with financial motives, but that these were also seen on the Frankish side as a breach of the peace and the law, irrespective of the fact that the victims were Muslim subjects of a foreign state. Usama b. Munqidh is also the only source to report a journey of the Damascene regent Mu'in al-Din Unur to Acre, in which he himself participated and that presumably also conducted him to Jerusalem.<sup>315</sup> It cannot be more closely dated than in the period between 1140 and 1144 (between the conclusion of the alliance and Usama's departure from Damascus for Egypt), but it probably belongs to the opening phase of the entente, since as well as the pilgrimage to Jerusalem it may have provided an occasion for negotiations for action against Zengi. In his memoirs, Usama tells of numerous friendships which he formed at this time with Frankish knights

<sup>312</sup> Ibn Muyassar, 146; al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, III, 190; William of Tyre, XIII, XVII, 581–2 and XVII, XXII, 797; Ibn al-Ma'mūn, 95–6.

<sup>313</sup> Al-'Azimī, 423, 538.

<sup>314</sup> Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 48.

<sup>315</sup> Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 99–103.

and Templars on his different visits to the kingdom.<sup>316</sup> The visit of Unur, the regent of the ruler Mujir al-Din Abaq, to the Frankish king had no precedent and the proceedings against Rainer Brus strengthened the intensity of the entente between Jerusalem and Damascus created on the basis of the 'no place' doctrine.

The relations between Franks and Muslims in northern Syria were quite different. Between 1138 and 1144 there was incessant fighting between the principality of Antioch and the county of Edessa on the one side and groups of Turcomans and the Zengid governor of Aleppo on the other. Only in 537/1142–43 did Joscelin II of Edessa and the governor meet and agree upon a truce.<sup>317</sup> A year previously, in 536/1141–42, Turcomans killed an envoy from Antioch, who was to complain to Aleppo about Turcoman raids.<sup>318</sup> Unfortunately, nothing more can be learned about the sole known truce agreement between Edessa and Aleppo, but interestingly it falls in the period of the last advance of the Emperor John Comnenus into Cilicia and Syria between September 1142 and April 1143. It thus can be seen as the expression of a rapprochement between Franks and Zengids, newly produced by the Byzantine attack. In spite of the entirely bellicose scenario in the north, the threat to the surrounding rulers from Zengi's sphere of control appears to have led to an alliance there also in the autumn of 1144, directly before the conquest of Edessa. Because Zengi conquered places in Shabakhtan as well as on the upper reaches of the River Khabur in northern Mesopotamia and attacked Amid/Diyar Bakr, the Artuqid Qara Arslan delivered the fortress of Babalu to Joscelin II, to move the count to a relief attack.<sup>319</sup> When Joscelin left Edessa for this campaign, Zengi succeeded in capturing the city, denuded as it was of soldiers. The Syrian chronicler Michael severely condemned the count for this: 'Joscelin did not understand that it was not to his advantage to fight for Turks with Turks. This was an opportunity for Zengi.'<sup>320</sup> In hindsight and against the background of the loss of Edessa, Michael was right. Nevertheless, his alliance betrays that also in the north-east the superior power of the Zengid dominions could bring Muslim and Frankish rulers together. Whether the 'no place' doctrine played a part in this must remain unanswered. Yet, doubt about this is justified, inasmuch as in Anatolia and northern

---

<sup>316</sup> Derenbourg, *Ousâma*, 186–90.

<sup>317</sup> Al-'Aẓīmī, 422.

<sup>318</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 275.

<sup>319</sup> Michael Syrus, 260; Chronicon ad A.C. 1234 pertinens, II, 88–9.

<sup>320</sup> Michael Syrus, 260.

Mesopotamia a larger number of rival rulers were in competition and *ad hoc* alliances (also between Muslims and Christians, as between Byzantium and the Turkish Danishmendids in 1148) were the rule.<sup>321</sup>

As regards the treaty and alliance policy in southern Syria from 1146 to 1154, it is of decisive importance to see that the alliance of 1140 'against the most monstrous enemy of both kingdoms'<sup>322</sup> had come into being solely for the reason that neither Damascus nor the Frankish states would maintain themselves if the rule of Zengi extended further towards southern Syria. The consciousness of equal knightly status by the Frankish and Muslim nobility may indeed have made communication easier between the two sides in the original conclusion of the alliance,<sup>323</sup> yet it was not a feeling of toleration or the orientalization of the Franks in clothing and food, but a temporary identity of political interests. William of Tyre himself, while praising Unur as 'the most faithful follower of the truce', 'lord' and 'the lover of our people', suspected that not love and friendship, but the Zengid threat stood in the background of the Damascene alliance policy.<sup>324</sup>

However, when Zengi was murdered outside Qal'at Ja'bar in mid-September 1146 and his realm broke up into a north-Mesopotamian part under his son Sayf al-Din Ghazi and a north-Syrian part under Ghazi's brother, Nur al-Din Mahmud, the danger arising from 'the most monstrous enemy of both kingdoms' temporarily ceased to exist. Repercussions on the relations between Damascus and Jerusalem were immediately noticeable. Just a few weeks after Zengi's death, Unur compelled the Zengid governor of Ba'labakk, Najm al-Din Ayyub (Saladin's father) to hand it over and then concluded truces with the Zengid governors in Hims and Hamah, possibly including the recognition of his suzerainty.<sup>325</sup> Thereafter Unur surrendered to Aleppo Zengi's murderer, who had fled to Damascus and involved himself in negotiations with its ruler Nur al-Din Mahmud. These were crowned in April 1147 by the marriage of his daughter to Nur al-Din.<sup>326</sup> The arrival of two embassies in Damascus in July and September 1147 most clearly characterized this new Damascene policy. They presented Unur with gifts and diplomas of appointment and conferred on

<sup>321</sup> Cahen, *Syrie*, 380, 383–8.

<sup>322</sup> William of Tyre, XV, VII, 668.

<sup>323</sup> Cf. the report of Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 48.

<sup>324</sup> William of Tyre, XV, XI, 675 and XVI, VIII, 716–7.

<sup>325</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 288; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 118.

<sup>326</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 288/9; William of Tyre, XVI, VIII, 717 and XI, 722.

him the honorific of Zahir al-Din wa-Mu‘inuhu. The Caliph al-Muqtafi (1136–60) in Baghdad commissioned the first, which also brought a robe of honour, and the second came in the name of the rival Shiite Fatimid Caliph al-Hafiz (1130–49) in Cairo. The former at least came in response to the visit of a delegation from Damascus.<sup>327</sup> Quite obviously, Unur had previously requested both caliphs to confirm his position, so that he obtained the grant of the same title from both sides. In brief, by the extension of Damascene territory in the south, the creation of cordon sanitaire against the north and the establishment of good relations with Aleppo, his policy aimed to set the independence of Damascus on a broader base than dependence on Jerusalem had been since 1140; and the contacts with Baghdad and Cairo also served this aim. The alliance with Aleppo in 1147 represented no danger to Damascus at that point, since the power of its new ruler, Nur al-Din, was of less importance than that of Zengi by reason of the division of the inheritance, but on the other hand it could offer protection against new advances from Mosul. In accordance with the Damascene policy of balance and equidistance, Unur by no means ended good relations with Jerusalem. The new orientation of Damascene policy after Zengi’s death resulted from its old basic principle of the balance of strength. Thus, a firm alliance with the kingdom of Jerusalem was not, from the point of view of Damascus, by itself the surest guarantee of its own independence. It seemed necessary for the purpose of counterbalancing the imbalance of the relative strengths in Syria arising from the expansionist Zengid dominions. The difference between the policy of Unur and that of his predecessors since the beginning of the century lies simply in that instead of confrontation, it rested on relations secured by treaty with the most important Syrian lordships—Jerusalem and Aleppo under Nur al-Din.

On the other hand, the Franks, as seen above, also carried out the rapprochement with Damascus from 1137 only against the background of the extension of Zengid power and the Byzantine advances. Most remarkably, the Zengid capture of Edessa on 25 December 1144, upon which followed the loss of all Frankish territory east of the Euphrates in 1145–46 and the surprise attempt of Joscelin II and Baldwin of Marash to recapture the city, which Nur al-Din foiled—all these events exercised no direct influence on relations between Jerusalem and Damascus. Apart from the sending of a relief expedition to Edessa, which in any event came too late to save

---

<sup>327</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisī, 293–5; Ibn Muyassar, 137.

the city,<sup>328</sup> the kingdom took no part in developments in northern Syria until 1149. The alliance policy of Antioch was reorientated after 1144 under Prince Raymond and his conflict with Joscelin II became still deeper after the fall of Edessa. He not only sought help from Western courts, but even went in person to Constantinople and submitted to the emperor as his liege vassal in order to request his forgiveness and to win his help against the Muslims. This reorientation took place without Jerusalem's involvement and was not pursued jointly with the kingdom.<sup>329</sup> This shows again a divergence in the alliance relationships between northern and southern Syria and the fact that neither the Frankish rulers nor their Muslim counterparts formed a bloc. The year 1144 signifies no break in relations between Franks and Muslims in southern Syria, nor in the relations between Jerusalem and Byzantium. While Zengi lived, and pursued the extension of his dominions in the north, the alliance between the Franks and Damascus remained firm. This explains why internal developments in the two allied states had no effect on the relationship between Damascus and Jerusalem; as, for example, the beginning of the tense joint rule of Queen Melisende and her son Baldwin III after King Fulk's death in the late autumn of 1143 or the power struggle between the *ra'is* of Damascus on the one hand as well as the wazir and the Amir Usama b. Munqidh on the other.<sup>330</sup> That the entente did not immediately fall apart after Zengi's death in 1146 is to be ascribed both to Unur's treaty policy and also to the fact that the *modus vivendi* between the two south Syrian states offered no cause for conflict at first. Basic alterations in the political concepts of the two neighbouring states did not determine the further course of the relations between Jerusalem and Damascus until 1154. Rather three external factors proved crucial: the revolt of Altintash, the Damascene governor, in the Hawran in 1147, the arrival of the Second Crusade in Syria in 1148 and the beginning of the second period of expansion of the Zengid dominions immediately thereafter. The relationship between Jerusalem and Damascus in this phase clearly illustrates discussions of the alliance policy, the make-up of the circle of its advocates and the significance of the 'no place' doctrine as the theoretical basis of the entente.

---

<sup>328</sup> William of Tyre, XVI, IV, 708–10.

<sup>329</sup> William of Tyre, XVI, IV–V, 708–12; Otto of Freising, *Chronicon*, VII, 32/3; *Chronicon Mauriniacense*, XII, 88; Joannes Kinnamos, II, 3, p. 35; Michael Syrus, 267.

<sup>330</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 277–8; al-'Azīmi, 423.

Gümüshtegin, who had officiated since 1105 as Damascene governor in Busra and probably also from 1131 in Sarkhad, died in 541/1146–47.<sup>331</sup> The status of the governor in the Hawran (who occupied the rank of a Damascene atabeg and *isfahsalar* from 1136) had become extraordinarily important under his aegis. Sarkhad served not only as a refuge for exiles from Damascus but also for the Fatimid Wazir Ridwan b. Walakhshi. He found asylum with Gümüshtegin in 1139, when he was expelled from Egypt, and support in his attempt, accompanied by a troop of the governor's men, to regain the wazirate.<sup>332</sup> Not only did Gümüshtegin mediate numerous diplomatic contacts between Damascus and Cairo, but he also maintained relations with Egypt on his own account, as Canard has shown and as proven by, for instance, his help for the refugee wazir.<sup>333</sup> Under Gümüshtegin the Hawran was more than simply a district subordinate to Damascus. It formed *de facto* a semi-autonomous lordship and fulfilled the function of a buffer between Damascus and Jerusalem. After Gümüshtegin's death in 1146 or 1147, a member of his household named Altintash succeeded him. Altintash suddenly went to Jerusalem with a numerous entourage in the spring of 1147, in order (according to William of Tyre) to offer to surrender Busra and Sarkhad to the kingdom for compensation, since he had fallen into disfavour with the rulers of Damascus, or (according to Ibn al-Qalanisi) to unite with the Franks in joint hostilities against Damascus.<sup>334</sup> The talks conducted by Altintash in Jerusalem led in the end to the advance of the army of Jerusalem into Transjordan. There, Unur in conjunction with Nur al-Din of Aleppo beat the army back under heavy losses and the Damascenes took the cities of Busra and Sarkhad. More important than the military consequences of Altintash's offer of alliance to Baldwin III and his mother were, however, the implications of the event for the alliance between Damascus and the Franks as well as the manner in which the heads of government in the two neighbouring states acted during the crisis of 1147.

William of Tyre recounts that after the chief men of the kingdom had decided to close with Altintash's offer, a general levy of the army was proclaimed and the troops mustered at the bridge over the Jordan near

---

<sup>331</sup> Al-Nu'aymī, 178; al-'Ilmāwī, 395.

<sup>332</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 270; Ibn Muyassar, 131–2; Ibn Zāfir, 99; Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 22–4.

<sup>333</sup> Canard, *Fāṭimides*, 111–17.

<sup>334</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 289; William of Tyre, XVI, VIII, 715.

Tiberias.<sup>335</sup> Since, however, the alliance and armistice from King Fulk's time was still in existence, it had first to be solemnly revoked against Unur and he had to be conceded the legal period of time to organize his defence. The Franks would otherwise have rendered themselves culpable of breaking the treaty. In the answer which the Frankish envoys brought back after some delay, the regent of Damascus reproached the Franks with protecting a faithless and rebellious slave in spite of the alliance. He offered to maintain the alliance and to repay to the Franks their due costs. Baldwin III thereupon informed Unur that according to a 'common resolution' it was in no way intended to break the alliance. Since, however, support could not be denied to anyone who placed his hopes in the Franks, honour would be satisfied if the governor were installed in Busra and he was then accorded treatment according to his merits and the laws of the land. 'We shall [...] avoid the causing of injury to the Damascene king, our friend, whether in going out or in returning.'<sup>336</sup>

It was known to Ibn al-Qalanisi also that the Franks negotiated with Unur to settle the conflict peacefully.<sup>337</sup> Damascus did not, however, accept their requests and because of their military preparations asked help of Nur al-Din of Aleppo. Yet, according to William of Tyre, the Damascenes were not the reason for the failure to achieve a peaceful settlement of the quarrel. He was convinced that Unur, out of fear of Nur al-Din, was urgently interested in friendly relations with the kingdom of Jerusalem and would himself have shown less hostility in the subsequent fighting with the Franks if he had power over his foreign allies. On the contrary, a tumult that non-elite participants provoked in their own army camp compelled the Frankish leaders to attack. These people accused the escort of Unur's embassy, an Arabic-speaking retainer of the king, named Bernard Vacher, of treason and demanded unconditional support for Altintash and the handing over of Busra.<sup>338</sup> The unfortunate expedition into the Hawran was thus not the consequence of political calculation, but was made only under pressure from the non-knightly fighters in the levy.

Further conclusions may be drawn from the reports of the two contemporaries William of Tyre and Ibn al-Qalanisi. Firstly, the treaty concluded in 1140 between Jerusalem and Damascus remained fully valid until the

---

<sup>335</sup> William of Tyre, XVI, VIII, 715–17.

<sup>336</sup> William of Tyre, XVI, VIII, 717.

<sup>337</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 289.

<sup>338</sup> William of Tyre, XVI, IX, 718.

spring of 1147. It was obviously effective for the long term and was possibly renewed in 1143 or 1144 after the accession of Baldwin III.<sup>339</sup> Secondly, the planned support for Altintash required a solemn revocation of the treaty with a legitimate time-limit. The necessity for this may rest either on an appropriate clause of the agreement or because it seemed to the Franks at least morally imperative. William's Latin chronicle exactly reported the conditions for the ending of a treaty as current in Islamic law of the Hanafi School, as will be shown. By contrast, the idea that a treaty with infidels was for that reason null and void and might be broken at any time was not to be found. Unur's reproach to the Christians that they were improperly supporting a rebel against his lord rather betrays, even if William of Tyre's quote was fictional, the parallel mentalities on both sides, arising as they did from the shared world of knightly life. Thirdly, the leadership of the kingdom of Jerusalem, after the passing of the Zengid threat and the reorientation of Damascene policy, was ready for conflict with Damascus for the sake of a concrete political object—direct rule over the Hawran or at least the establishment of a sort of Frankish sphere of influence. By contrast, Unur wanted to maintain peace between Damascus and Jerusalem so that he would not have to ask Nur al-Din for help, thereby opening the way to a new Zengid advance in Syria. Presumably, Unur had made use of the 'no place' doctrine to the Frankish embassy, since this is the only explanation of what happened after the return of the delegation from Damascus, when the supporters of a compromise solution gained the upper hand even in the High Court of the kingdom of Jerusalem. Fourthly, the outbreak of hostilities was finally not prevented because the decision over war and peace was no longer limited to the royal court or the High Court after the proclamation of the levy of all Franks capable of bearing arms. In the attitude of the non-elite participants, two factors appear which ran counter to the *modus vivendi* diplomacy of the aristocratic leadership of the kingdom, motivated as it was by the 'no place' doctrine and in 1147 this even gained the upper hand. These factors were enthusiasm for the fight against the infidels and the financial interest of these participants, who relied on loot to compensate them for the high expenses they incurred through the proclamation of the levy.<sup>340</sup>

It was these same two factors which had previously, in the first decade of the twelfth century, contributed to the conflict of interests between

---

<sup>339</sup> As indicated by William of Tyre's choice of words (XVI, VIII, 716).

<sup>340</sup> Mayer, *Melisende*, 123.

King Baldwin I and the pilgrims from European Crusader fleets on the question of policy towards the Muslim coastal cities. They were always effective if large, organized groups of pilgrims were visiting Jerusalem. The example of 1147 shows clearly that the same conflict of interests could break out between the royal court and the common people of the kingdom. However, little cause for this existed, since after the consolidation of the territory of Jerusalem the levy was hardly ever proclaimed. The feudally constituted army and the circle of knights salaried by the king supplied enough warriors for carrying out Frankish campaigns. Just a year later, the arrival of the Second Crusade in Palestine confronted the kingdom of Jerusalem with similar problems.

The actual trigger of the Second Crusade was, as is known, the taking of Edessa by Zengi in 1144. The embassies which asked for help in the West in 1145 both came from northern Syria and also the bull of Pope Eugenius III, *Quantum praedecessores*, addressed to the French and Italians, based the summons to the Crusade on the loss of Edessa.<sup>341</sup> It is extremely improbable that, if envoys from Jerusalem did go to Europe with calls for help, the contents of their message were help for the kingdom and not for northern Syria. Even the German king, Conrad III, expressed the purpose of wishing to liberate Edessa in a letter addressed in Constantinople to Abbot Wibald of Stavelot at the beginning of 1148—only, however, after paying a visit to Jerusalem and mustering a new army there.<sup>342</sup> This letter spoke quite generally of the fight with the heathen and more specifically of Jerusalem as the goal, instead of the recovery of the lost territories in northern Syria. This tendency had already been discernible at an earlier point elsewhere; namely in the argument of the majority of the French Crusaders, who had voted in October 1147 against the taking of Constantinople and for the march to Jerusalem.<sup>343</sup> The Provençal pilgrims under Count Alphonse-Jourdain of Toulouse even travelled directly by sea to southern Syria, without holding themselves in readiness for operations against Edessa.<sup>344</sup> And William of Tyre reports that the prince of Antioch's plan to conquer Aleppo, Shayzar and other territories with the help of French Crusaders was wrecked at the outset by the irrevocable intention of King Louis VII of France to visit Jerusalem. Typically, it was only later, when Louis VII had already left Antioch for the south, that the Patriarch

---

<sup>341</sup> Jaffé-Löwenfeld, II, no. 8796, 26 and no. 8876, 31.

<sup>342</sup> Wibaldi Epistolae, 153.

<sup>343</sup> Odo of Deuil, IV, 48.

<sup>344</sup> Chronicon Turonense, 473–4.

Fulcher of Jerusalem was sent to him to offer an official invitation to the kingdom.<sup>345</sup> All the sources prove that above all the Europeans' desire for the Holy Places was the decisive factor in the abandonment of the original goal, Edessa, in favour of Jerusalem. Other elements such as family connections (e.g. those of the Provençals with Tripoli), political incidents (e.g. the quarrel between Louis VII and Raymond of Antioch) or even a call from the kingdom played a minor role.

This development, the sudden turn of the Crusade to the south instead of northern Syria, must have caused surprise at the court of Jerusalem. Nevertheless, there can be no question that the advance of the Crusaders to the kingdom had not been part of the plan from the start. Already in April or May 1147, Baldwin III of Jerusalem together with the patriarch and the Templars seem to have won over Conrad III for action against Damascus. Jerusalem was indeed not threatened on any side in the spring of 1148; however, the relationship to Damascus was unsettled after the previous year's campaign in the Hawran and the young Baldwin III may have hoped to strengthen his weak position vis-à-vis his mother and joint ruler Melisende by a successful operation.<sup>346</sup> A little later at the assembly of Palmarea near Acre on 24 July, however, Count Dietrich of Flanders and a group of German and French Crusaders, who demanded an immediate return home to Europe, convinced Conrad. The decisive factor against this option and for an operation against Damascus was apparently in the end the attitude of Louis VII, influenced by the fiery pleas of the bishop of Langres.<sup>347</sup>

In spite of the variety of the available sources, it is not clear what share the Jerusalem court and the settler Frankish knights had in the decision whether Baldwin III should support the campaign and so be able to assert himself against the party of his mother Melisende. The most powerful argument for the attack appears to have been contained in the speech of the bishop of Langres, one of the Crusaders, namely that an enterprise must be undertaken which was 'worthy of God, the king [i.e. Louis VII] and the realm of the Franks'.<sup>348</sup> This testifies that the real impetus came from the French, but does not make clear why Damascus, and not for example Ascalon, was chosen as the objective of the attack. Presumably at least a party of the Jerusalem knightly class, perhaps Baldwin's entourage,

---

<sup>345</sup> William of Tyre, XVI, XXVII, 752 and XXIX, 755–8.

<sup>346</sup> As assumed by Mayer, *Melisende*, 127–8.

<sup>347</sup> John of Salisbury, XXIV, 55–6.

<sup>348</sup> John of Salisbury, XXIV, 55–6.

supported the French position in spite of the experiences of 1147. This stance would be in harmony with the argument that the alliance with Damascus had been concluded simply because of the common threat from the Zengids and with Zengi's death and the reorientation of Damascene policy in 1146 it no longer seemed necessary. Certainly, the conflict between Nur al-Din in Aleppo and his older and more powerful brother, Sayf al-Din Ghazi of Mosul, which was only temporarily resolved in 1147, was known.<sup>349</sup> In addition, the two brothers probably advanced separately on Damascus in the summer of 1148.<sup>350</sup> That an attack on Damascus would lead to conflict with the united power of the Zengids thus need not have been really feared, since an intervention of Sayf al-Din Ghazi of Mosul in Syria must have appeared to his brother in Aleppo just as threatening as the Franks or even Damascus. Moreover, after the Jerusalem campaign in the Hawran in 1147, there was no formal peace treaty with Damascus, even if the chroniclers have recorded no fighting between the two.

The fighting outside Damascus, the abandonment of positions in the cultivated areas of the Ghuta east of the city by the allied Crusaders and Oriental Frankish settlers and the withdrawal of the besiegers a few days later have been discussed previously and are not of interest here. However what diplomatic counter-measures did the regent of Damascus, Unur, take and what stance did the Oriental Frankish settlers adopt? Michael, the contemporary Syrian chronicler, reports that 'the inhabitants of Damascus' had warned Baldwin III during the siege about Conrad III taking the city: 'Do you imagine that if this great king rules in this city, he will let you rule in Jerusalem? [...] Accept our money and send them back over the sea to save your kingdom.' In fact, 200,000 gold dinars were said to have been paid to Baldwin III and 100,000 to Prince Elinand of Tiberias, which later proved counterfeit.<sup>351</sup> William of Tyre also in his investigation of the reasons for the failure of the siege puts forward the claim that it happened through bribery with counterfeit money. Gerhoh of Reichersberg heard the same and moreover generally deplores the greed of the Oriental Frankish settlers. Furthermore, William learnt that the nobles of the kingdom of Jerusalem wanted to foil the success of the siege, since the count of Flanders had been promised that he would be ruler of Damascus.<sup>352</sup>

<sup>349</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhir*, 87–8.

<sup>350</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 300.

<sup>351</sup> Michael Syrus, 276.

<sup>352</sup> Wibaldi *Epistolae*, 265–6; William of Tyre, XVII, VII, 768–9; Gerhoh of Reichersberg, III, I, LXI, 377.

Finally, in both of Ibn al-Athir's works is the statement that Unur had warned the Oriental Frankish settlers (*Faranj al-Sham*) that their European allies (*al-Faranj al-ghuraba'*) would take possession of their lands, if they first captured Damascus.<sup>353</sup> The almost unanimous tenor of the contemporary Western chronicles is that the obstruction or even the treachery of the Oriental Frankish settlers prevented the siege's success, wherein the king, the patriarch, the Templars or the people of Jerusalem as a whole stand accused.<sup>354</sup>

In addition, Ibn al-Athir reports (although without corroboration in the Latin chronicles) that Unur turned for help to Sayf al-Din Ghazi of Mosul. Ghazi marched with his troops to Hims and delivered a message to the regent of Damascus that he was ready to fight the Franks. Damascus must, however, first submit to his representatives so that in the event of a defeat his army could find refuge in the city. Ghazi swore that if he were victorious, he would not take possession of Damascus and would not stay longer than the withdrawal of the besiegers. Unur thereupon warned the European Crusaders of the invincible might of Ghazi and threatened to deliver Damascus to him. He intimated to the Oriental Frankish settlers, as mentioned, that they would lose their territory to the European Crusaders or, if he handed Damascus over to the ruler of Mosul, they would no longer be able to keep Ghazi out of Jerusalem. Ibn al-Athir states later that the Oriental Frankish settlers 'gathered together with the king of the Germans and caused him to fear [...] Ghazi, the multitude of his army, the succession of his reinforcements and that he would perhaps take possession of Damascus. Then no place (*la maqam*) would remain for them in the coastland.'<sup>355</sup> Faced with these arguments, Conrad consented to withdraw.

Although Ibn al-Athir's version has been rightly criticized as presumably containing legendary passages and possibly exaggerating the share of the Zengids in the failure of the Second Crusade, it is essentially neither unhistorical nor implausible. A more important reason for the failure of the attack on Damascus was certainly the resolute resistance of the besieged, inspired in part by the *jihad* ideology. It cannot be denied that the two Zengid rulers, whether called in to help or not, marched into southern Syria because of the Frankish advance. The contemporary Iraqi

<sup>353</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, XI, 130; Ibn al-Athir, *Bāhir*, 89.

<sup>354</sup> Bernhardt, *Konrad III.*, 675–7, n. 37; Röhrich, *Beiträge*, 101, n. 76; Forey, *Failure*, 14–6.

<sup>355</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Bāhir*, 89.

writer Ibn al-Jawzi states that Ghazi himself stood at Hamah on the fifth day of the siege of Damascus and that his sons had halted with 30,000 men at Balis on the Euphrates.<sup>356</sup> It is therefore reasonable for Unur to have threatened the Franks with the handing over of Damascus to Ghazi and to have made clear to them by reference to the 'no place' doctrine that the kingdom of Jerusalem must be concerned about the preservation of an independent Damascus for the security of its own existence. Even if, like Forey, one rejects Ibn al-Athir's entire account and ascribes the breaking off of the siege solely to the strength of the resistance of the besieged, notwithstanding all the Latin eyewitness accounts,<sup>357</sup> it cannot be denied that the arrival of the Zengid armies at Hims presented a threat for Damascus and Jerusalem. Whether Unur actually put forward the 'no place' doctrine to the Franks, which can no longer be absolutely established, is by no means decisive. For Damascus and the Frankish rulers, the advance of Ghazi closely resembled the dangerous situation in Zengi's phase of expansion after 1135 and the Oriental Frankish settlers recognized this. Ibn al-Athir might thus be correct in saying that the Oriental Frankish settlers, or a group of them, endeavoured by all means to engineer the withdrawal in order to prevent Damascus falling into the hands of the Zengids.

It is instructive in this connection that all sources of whatever origin assume a conflict of interests between the Oriental Frankish settlers and their European allies, quite analogous to that which existed in 1138 between the Emperor John Comnenus on one side and the prince of Antioch and the count of Edessa on the other. Michael the Syrian, followed by Ibn al-Athir and William of Tyre, says that even without Ghazi's advance, the Oriental Frankish settlers, or a group of them, had reason to work against the success of the siege. They disapproved of the establishment of a principality of Damascus under one of the Crusader nobles from Europe.<sup>358</sup> In fact, Damascus under Frankish rule would have been difficult to incorporate into the kingdom of Jerusalem by reason of its size and its economic and religious significance, even under an Oriental Frankish prince. A European Crusader noble as lord of Damascus would presumably hardly have reconciled himself to the role of a vassal of Jerusalem, but would rather have held Damascus in fief from a European king or the

---

<sup>356</sup> Ibn al-Jawzī, X, 131.

<sup>357</sup> Forey, *Failure*, 17–8.

<sup>358</sup> William of Tyre, XVII, VII, 768–9.

pope. The supremacy of the kingdom of Jerusalem among the Frankish states in Syria would in any case have been endangered and the status quo altered to the detriment of Jerusalem. If the statement in the *Lignages d'Outremer* of the fourteenth and fifteenth century is correct, that the rule over Damascus had been promised to the lord of Beirut, Guy II (c. 1147–57), there would have been a Syrian pretender to the newly founded state besides a possible candidate from the West, Count Dietrich of Flanders.<sup>359</sup> The statements about both the count of Flanders and the lord of Beirut are, however, too unsafe to venture the assertion that the failure of the campaign should be ascribed to the opposition of a party of Syrian nobles around Guy II to the claim of Dietrich of Flanders, approved as it was by the three kings in the camp of the besiegers.

The sources, unfortunately, give no clear idea of the actual significance of the latent conflict of interests between the Europeans and the Oriental Frankish settlers in the failure of the siege of Damascus. However, there are two examples, not distant in time from the Second Crusade, of clashes between members of the two groups. Both were a result of the concern of Oriental Frankish rulers for the preservation of their status in power-politics. According to William of Tyre, the attempt in the autumn of 1157 of a force of Franks and Armenians together with Count Dietrich of Flanders to capture Shayzar, which an earthquake had ruined, was a failure. The attack was broken off because the count of Flanders refused to take Shayzar, once conquered, as a fief from the prince of Antioch.<sup>360</sup> In 1157 at the latest, Count Dietrich, whom William of Tyre accuses of ambitions for Damascus during the Second Crusade in 1148, was thus ready to stay in Syria and establish a state. However, he felt it to be a disparagement of his rank as a vassal of the French Crown and prince of the Empire, to become the fief holder of a prince and not of a king.

Presumably, at the end of September or beginning of October 1148 and thus directly after the failure of the siege of Damascus, Unur and Nur al-Din captured the fortress of al-ʿAryma, a possession of the county of Tripoli, where Bertrand, a cousin of Count Raymond II of Tripoli, had established himself. Bertrand had come to Syria on the Crusade with his father Alphonse-Jourdain, the count of Toulouse. Since his father had died of poisoning before the campaign, it was presumably Bertrand who

---

<sup>359</sup> *Lignages d' Outremer*, XX, 458.

<sup>360</sup> William of Tyre, XVIII, XVIII, 849–51.

took part in the attack on Damascus.<sup>361</sup> Alphonse-Jourdain had perhaps raised a claim to the county of Tripoli for himself or Bertrand and been murdered for that reason. According to Ibn al-Athir and Ibn al-'Adim, the Muslim rulers had in any case captured al-'Aryma and taken Bertrand prisoner on the instructions of Raymond II of Tripoli in order to anticipate his attempt to drive his cousin, Raymond II, out of Tripoli.<sup>362</sup> The castle was slighted and Bertrand passed into captivity with the Muslims.

Both instances make it clear that it was not only problems of acculturation which separated the Oriental Frankish settlers from their European allies and struck Muslim contemporaries such as Usama b. Munqidh.<sup>363</sup> They indicate that by the middle of the twelfth century there had been for a long time no identity of interests between the Europeans going out on Crusade and the property-holding Franks in Syria. The Frankish states did not necessarily confront neighbouring Muslim lordships in a hostile manner, but common interests in a kind of Syrian system of autonomous lordships linked them. The basis of this community of Syrian interests was the 'no place' doctrine, according to which the Frankish states could not maintain themselves if one of the more significant Muslim lordships fell into the hands of a great power from outside Syria. This idea influenced the policy of the Syrian rulers, not only in regard to Zengi after 1135 and Byzantium between 1138 and 1142, but Damascus apparently advanced it in 1148 in opposition to the league of the European Crusaders with the kingdom of Jerusalem. The contrast of Oriental Frankish settlers and Europeans, and the quality of the connection between the Frankish rulers and their Muslim neighbours, is particularly clear when Muslim troops captured al-'Aryma on the instructions of the count of Tripoli.

There were also examples of Frankish-Muslim alliances in northern Syria in 1148–49. In 1148, Prince Raymond of Antioch and his ally, the Kurdish Amir 'Ali b. Wafa' of Masyaf, the head of the Syrian Nizaris, defeated Nur al-Din at Yaghra, north-east of Antioch.<sup>364</sup> When the prince of Antioch was killed at the end of June 1149 in a second battle against Nur al-Din at Inab, his ally 'Ali b. Wafa' was also among the dead.<sup>365</sup> The luckless alliance between Antioch and the Nizaris, whose sphere of power in Jabal Bahra was, apart from Shayzar, the last Muslim state in northern Syria

<sup>361</sup> William of Tyre, XVI, XXVIII, 754.

<sup>362</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Bāhir*, 90; Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, XI, 131–2; Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 292.

<sup>363</sup> Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 99, 103–4.

<sup>364</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 302–3; Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 292.

<sup>365</sup> Michael Syrus, 288–9; Chronicon ad A.C. 1234 pertinens, II, 115.

independent of Nur al-Din, resulted like the alliance between Damascus and Jerusalem from the superiority of Zengid power. Count Joscelin II of Edessa, whose county was after 1144 restricted to the territories west of the upper reaches of the Euphrates, may in the same period have been allied with Qilij Arslan b. Mas'ud of Albistan. In 543/1148–49 he anticipated an attack from Nur al-Din by going in person to his enemy. He asked for an armistice and Nur al-Din awarded him a robe of honour, expressive of his subordination to the Zengid lord.<sup>366</sup> His hostility to Raymond of Antioch and this treaty were the reasons why he did not come to the help of Antioch against Nur al-Din in 1148–49. The count's alliance policy did not, however, prevent (as William of Tyre wrote) the crushing of his county a little later as between two millstones by the attacks of the Rum Seljuks and Nur al-Din, and in 1150, after the count was made prisoner, it had to be surrendered.<sup>367</sup> The cooperation of Franks and Muslims against Zengi in southern Syria enjoyed a longer period of success than in the north, since the kingdom of Jerusalem and Damascus had at their disposal incomparably greater instruments of power than the north Syrian allies. Moreover, the Zengids had no possessions south of Hims.

To sum up the conduct of the Oriental Frankish settlers during the Second Crusade, the affair of the capture of al-ʿAryma, the league of the Nizaris with the prince of Antioch and the alliance policy of Joscelin II: from 1148–49 all the Frankish states of Syria stood in close relations with Muslim neighbours. This fact most clearly shows that the Second Crusade did not represent a great confrontation between Christendom and Islam and its failure did not represent an 'accident', as seen in Europe. The twelve months from July 1148 to June 1149 are the time in which the extent of the political integration of the Frankish states in the East was perhaps clearest. According to their character, however, all alliances were only leagues with the purpose of protecting the existing states against different bids at expansion; against the Zengids, but also against the efforts of the Crusaders aimed at altering the status quo. Finally, in this period the social, and to some extent also the ethnic, differentiation of the supporters and opponents of the alliance policy are recognizable in exemplary fashion.

The further development of the relations of the great Syrian states after the end of the Second Crusade remains to be considered. Unur had maintained good relations with Nur al-Din since 1147 in accordance with his

---

<sup>366</sup> Michael Syrus, 282 and 290. Cf. Ibn al-Furāt, MS Vindob. A.F. 117, fol. 189r (cited from Cahen, *Syrie*, 382).

<sup>367</sup> William of Tyre, XVII, XV, 784.

policy of equidistance from both the Zengids and Franks. Nur al-Din was, as already indicated, at first in a weaker position than his brother Ghazi of Mosul and was anxious and concerned about his independence. Unur and Nur al-Din cooperated in the capture of al-‘Aryama in 1148 and a Damascene contingent fought with the Zengids in the battle of Inab against Raymond of Antioch and ‘Ali b. Wafa’. A treaty also settled the relationship between Damascus and Jerusalem after a few fights. At the wish of the Franks, both sides renewed the old truce for two years in Muharram 544/May–June 1149, ratified it by oaths and agreed on a money-payment.<sup>368</sup> Thus, after the Crusade Unur returned to precisely the policy he had followed since the death of Zengi in 1146. This is all the more interesting since contemporary poets hailed the fights against the Franks in the Hawran in 1147 and during the siege of Damascus in 1148 as *jihād* against the infidel. Especially during the Second Crusade, religious emotion had stirred up both sides. Volunteers for the *jihād* had played an important role in the defence of Damascus and during the siege a great crowd of people had gathered in the Umayyad Mosque before the publicly displayed Quran of the Caliph ‘Uthman. Alms were distributed and men put ash on their heads, wept, prayed and humbled themselves.<sup>369</sup> A big, long-bearded priest, who had hung crosses about himself and his mule, led the Christian besiegers. The Franks went into battle behind gospels and crosses.<sup>370</sup>

The scenario during the siege thus resembled that of the Frankish-Muslim attack on Aleppo in 1124–25 and the Frankish campaign against Damascus in 1129. But the propaganda for the Holy War and the religious antagonism did not cause the Frankish or Damascene leadership after 1148 to give up their policy resting on the ‘no place’ doctrine, since the situation in the north was seriously altered in 1149. With the victory at Inab and the ensuing conquests, Nur al-Din became the uncontested ruler of almost the whole of northern Syria. When his brother, Ghazi of Mosul, died soon afterwards in October or November 1149, Nur al-Din extended his territory in the course of the inheritance disputes southwards to Hims and eastwards to the Khabur, a tributary of the Euphrates. The Zengid state treasure, held in Sinjar, also fell to him. The significance of this was that at the end of 1149, Nur al-Din suddenly found himself in a dominating position similar to that of his father Zengi before him. He made use of this at once to resume the Zengid policy of expansion in Syria. The struggle

---

<sup>368</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 304.

<sup>369</sup> Ibn al-Jawzī, X, 131.

<sup>370</sup> Ibn al-Jawzī, X, 131 and ‘Imād al-Dīn, *Bustān*, 128.

for power in Damascus between the ruler Abaq and the *ra'is* Mu'ayyad al-Din b. al-Sufi, which broke out after the death of the regent Unur in November 1149, offered the first occasion for this.<sup>371</sup> It appears that neither the Second Crusade (in spite of the religious emotions it had kindled), nor Unur's death, altered the lines of the alliance policy as regards the Damascene-Frankish alliance until 1154. This can clearly be discerned from the following four examples.

After Unur's death, Frankish troops undertook an invasion of the Hawran. Nur al-Din thereupon prepared for a counter-attack and asked Damascus to provide a thousand horsemen. The Damascene eyewitness Ibn al-Qalanisi stated that the inhabitants of Damascus 'had made a treaty with the Franks to take joint action against any Muslim forces which should attack them'.<sup>372</sup> The Franks were informed when Nur al-Din approached. In a letter to the ruler and the *ra'is*, Nur al-Din assured the Damascenes that the peasants and Bedouin of the Hawran had called him to help, and that he would not harm Damascus. He again asked for auxiliary troops and reproached the Damascenes for their remissness in the *jihad*. Thereupon he merely met the following response: 'Between us and you there is nothing, but the sword and a company of the Franks is even now on the way to aid us to repel you, should you advance upon us and beleaguer us.'<sup>373</sup> At the end of April 1150, Nur al-Din advanced to the city, but his attack faltered owing to bad weather. Finally, a treaty was concluded in mid-May. Damascus was placed under Zengid suzerainty and Nur al-Din awarded the ruler, together with the *ra'is*, a robe of honour.

The second example occurred at the beginning of May 1151 when there was renewed fighting between Damascus and Nur al-Din, who asserted again that he wished only to lead the Holy War and obtain the release of prisoners in Damascus. Nur al-Din had to withdraw about a month later as a Frankish army came to the aid of the Damascenes. The Frankish troops replenished their supplies in the markets of Damascus. Meanwhile, the ruler, Abaq, and the *Ra'is* Mu'ayyad al-Din agreed with King Baldwin III to besiege in Busra the rebellious governor of the Hawran, Sirjal, whom Nur al-Din supported. After various unsuccessful operations the Franks withdrew, presumably at the beginning of July 1151. Nevertheless, they demanded the payment of the rest of the money promised by

---

<sup>371</sup> Ibn al-Qalanisi, 307–8.

<sup>372</sup> Ibn al-Qalanisi, 308.

<sup>373</sup> Ibn al-Qalanisi, 309; similar Barhebraeus, 278 (but for year 1151).

Damascus, since Nur al-Din would not have gone away if they had not relieved the city. On 27 July Nur al-Din and Damascus again concluded a treaty of peace.<sup>374</sup>

After the conclusion of this agreement, to cite the third example, Nur al-Din sent a detachment against Sirjal of Busra, who for his part had established contact with the Franks. A little later, from the end of October to the middle of November 1151, Abaq paid an official visit to Nur al-Din in Aleppo and placed himself under his suzerainty a second time.<sup>375</sup> However, when a group of Turcomans made a raid on Baniyas and defeated its Frankish governor, the Damascenes censured this as a breach of the truce. They sent an army detachment, which defeated the Turcomans and retook their loot. A Frankish counter-attack to take revenge for the invasion turned significantly not towards Damascene territory, but to the Biqa', which was under Nur al-Din's governor in Ba'labakk.<sup>376</sup> Finally, in the spring of 1153 Nur al-Din planned an attack on the kingdom of Jerusalem in order to relieve the Fatimid city of Ascalon, which the Franks were besieging. He united his troops for this operation with those of Abaq on 11 April. Yet, the allies became so estranged outside Baniyas that an attack could no longer be countenanced. Nothing more remained for Nur al-Din but to return to Hims. The chronicler Ibn al-Athir placed the blame for the disagreement on the Damascenes; their resistance wrecked Nur al-Din's plan to help Ascalon. This allegedly led Nur al-Din to decide to take Damascus.<sup>377</sup> In the same period, Damascus was paying tribute to the kingdom of Jerusalem, of which William of Tyre was also aware. How long this had been the case is not clear. Frankish envoys are said to have collected the tribute annually in Damascus, to have had the authority to inspect all the Christian slaves there and to take away those who so wished.<sup>378</sup>

The structure of the relationship between Jerusalem and Damascus can quite clearly be discerned from these four examples. A 'contingency alliance' had existed between the two states (since when is unknown), which came into force whenever a foreign Muslim power threatened Damascus. The Franks, presumably the royal treasury, were paid for the

<sup>374</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 312–6.

<sup>375</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 317.

<sup>376</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 317.

<sup>377</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Bāhir*, 106; Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, XI, 197.

<sup>378</sup> William of Tyre, XVII, XXVI, 803. Cf. Ibn al-Athir, *Bāhir*, 106; Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, XI, 197.

military assistance. It cannot be conclusively ascertained whether this was an *ad hoc* payment or (as William of Tyre states) took place in the form of a regular annual tribute. Inasmuch as Damascus did not rely solely on this alliance but also sought a treaty-based relationship with Nur al-Din, it remained true to the principles of its policy of equidistance. When Damascus was not seriously endangered, the Franks did not behave in an absolutely peaceful manner. The expedition into the Hawran after Unur's death and the contact with the Governor Sirjal of Busra in the second half of 1151 (reminiscent of the treaty with Altintash in 1147) is evidence of this, as are the siege and capture of Ascalon in 1152–53.

In addition, it becomes clear who upheld the idea of an alliance resting upon the 'no place' doctrine. King Baldwin III is named as the party to the treaty on the Frankish side and the money Damascus paid also flowed into his treasury. The number of troops, disappointingly few in Damascene eyes, with whom Baldwin proceeded to Damascus in 1151, makes it clear that neither the general levy of the army (as in 1147) nor the entire knighthood of Jerusalem, was called up for the fulfilment of the treaty of alliance.<sup>379</sup> As in the campaigns of Baldwin II and Fulk in northern Syria, Baldwin III counted only on his immediate retainers and paid troops. For action outside the boundaries of the kingdom, the king might not call up the vassals without their consent. This means that the alliance with Damascus, like the various expeditions sent from Jerusalem to help Antioch and in the county of Edessa, was considered to be the business of the Crown alone and was as a rule carried out without contingents of the feudal knights. These knights had neither a direct financial nor a political interest in the campaigns east of the Jordan.

On the Damascene side, it was not only the ruler Mujir al-Din Abaq who supported the alliance. In all his conclusions of treaties and campaigns Ibn al-Qalanisi mentions the *ra'is* and Wazir Mu'ayyad al-Din in the same breath as Abaq. The latter was replaced in July-August 1153 by his brother Zayn al-Din and in January 1154 by a brother of the chronicler Ibn al-Qalanisi.<sup>380</sup> In all the fighting that served the defence of Damascus, the city militia under the orders of the *ra'is* fought at the side of the ruler's Turkish mounted guards (*askar*). This remained the case although repeated internal clashes occurred not only over the tenure of the post of *ra'is* but also between its holder and the ruler after 1149. However, in

<sup>379</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 314.

<sup>380</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 309–10, 314, 319, 321, 325.

external matters regarding Nur al-Din and the Franks the people, represented by the militia and the *ra'is*, acted in common with the Turkish military elite and the ruler. There is in any case no indication that the Second Crusade and the religious emotion it stirred among the Muslims made the alliance with the kingdom of Jerusalem impossible for the future in the eyes of the people of Damascus. In spite of the *jihād* of 1148, the main political priority of the Damascenes remained the independence of their city-state and with it the contingency alliance with the Franks.

This conclusion is so important because Nur al-Din accompanied his expansion against Damascus with lively propaganda after 1150, in which he presented himself as the orthodox fighter for the Faith par excellence and attacked the Damascene leadership because of its alliance policy. Thereby he emphasized that his advances to the south had only the *jihād* and the security of the Muslims in view. Sivan has argued that Nur al-Din thereby caused tension between the power-holders and the pious circles in the city, so that the alliance policy of the Turkish ruler no longer had their support and that this was a reason why Nur al-Din succeeded in capturing Damascus in 1154.<sup>381</sup> Sivan finds support in the statement of the pro-Zengid chronicler Ibn al-Athir that in 1154 Nur al-Din corresponded with members of the militia, who opened the east gate to the besiegers. Sivan likewise rightly notes that from 1150 the annals of Ibn al-Qalanisi tend to be increasingly friendly towards Nur al-Din and the Holy War.<sup>382</sup> But the sole reason for this may have been that after his five-year imprisonment in the 1140s the chronicler turned against the ruling Burid dynasty and that after 1154 the fate of his family depended on the favour of Nur al-Din under whom his brother occupied the post of *ra'is*. It may be held against Ibn al-Athir's report that neither Ibn al-Qalanisi nor the well-informed Ibn Abi Tayy' confirmed it. According to the latter, the militia did not surrender the city, but rather fought together with the ruler's Turkish guards against Nur al-Din. Only when the besiegers forced an entry into the city over an unguarded wall on 26 April 1154 did the fighting cease—out of sympathy for Nur al-Din, according to Ibn al-Qalanisi.<sup>383</sup> But this sympathy can in no way be ascribed to Nur al-Din's *jihād* propaganda. It is sufficiently explained by the aversion of the Damascene amirs to Abaq, whom all the chroniclers describe as incompetent and whom Nur al-Din

<sup>381</sup> Sivan, *L'islam*, 75–9.

<sup>382</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Bāhir*, 107; Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, XI, 198.

<sup>383</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 327; Ibn Abī Ṭayy' in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/1, 239.

had alienated from those around him by various intrigues since 1153; and likewise it can be justified by the economic distress which had befallen the inhabitants through the conflict with Nur al-Din. Since January–February 1154, Nur al-Din had stopped the deliveries of grain from the north, thereby causing a rise in prices.<sup>384</sup>

There is a further reason for doubting the effect of the Zengid propaganda that Sivan presumed, since the rulers of Damascus also, or at least Mu‘in al-Din Unur, made use of *jihad* propaganda. An inscription of 1149 in Busra tells of Unur’s erection of a mill and an oven, which were endowed for the redemption of unmarried Sunni prisoners from the ‘infidels’ prisons’. Unur bears the titles of *al-Mujahid* (warrior in the *jihad*), *al-Murabit* (warrior in a frontier fortress of Islam), *Sayf al-Islam* (sword of Islam) and *Alp Ghazi* (brave warrior against the infidels) in the inscription.<sup>385</sup> Nur al-Din also adorned himself with identical or similar epithets, so underpinning his claim to be a protagonist of Islam. Unur’s *jihad* propaganda thus emphasized participation in Nur al-Din’s fighting against the principality of Antioch after the Second Crusade and was fully equal to that of Nur al-Din. Yet in no way did it lead to the abandonment of the contingency alliance between the Franks and Damascus. A criticism of this policy is known only from Usama b. Munqidh, Unur’s former adviser. After his move from Damascus to Egypt in 1144, he reproached his former patron in a poem that he had been falsely charged with various crimes countering: ‘What have the women and children committed? You have entrusted them to the pleasure of the Franks [...] whose deeds are an offence to God the Compassionate.’<sup>386</sup> Usama’s criticism seems unconvincing in view of his close contacts with the Franks and against the background of the fact that he was himself the architect of the alliance of 1140 between the Franks and Damascus. Only after the breach with Mu‘in al-Din Unur and the court of Damascus, did he take offence at the ‘no place’ doctrine and made use of the religious scandal of the alliance policy to put himself in a good light.

Thus, the people of Damascus associated themselves with the alliance policy of their ruler up to the moment that Zengid troops penetrated into Damascus in 1154 and defence became meaningless. Only then did the militia swing over to the side of the victor. According to Ibn al-Athir,

<sup>384</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 325–7.

<sup>385</sup> RCEA, VIII, no. 3146, 254–5.

<sup>386</sup> ‘Imād al-Dīn, *Kharīdat/Shām*, I, 536.

Abaq asked the Franks for help and promised them as well as money the surrender of Baʿlabakk, which he had acquired the previous year. King Baldwin III was, however, unable to bring up his troops in time.<sup>387</sup> The enthusiasm of the people of Damascus for the *jihad* was not responsible for Nur al-Din's taking of the city. It was due to the bad organization of the resistance, the small number of defenders resulting from the territorial expansion and economic pressure of the Zengid dominions, and the tactics of surprise with which Nur al-Din successfully prevented Frankish help for Damascus.<sup>388</sup> That he was able to capture the city only by cunning and after long diplomatic preparations best illustrates the effectiveness of the contingency alliance between Damascus and the Franks.

The union of Damascus with Aleppo and the other territories of Nur al-Din in northern and central Syria in 1154 meant the end for the time being of all Frankish-Muslim alliances resting upon the 'no place' doctrine. The fear of such leagues still dominated Nur al-Din, after 1154 at least, so strongly that it held him back from forcible attempts to conquer the remaining petty Muslim states. This showed itself in the way that he took Baʿlabakk in mid-May 1155, after the governor had refused to surrender. Because of the proximity of the Franks, Nur al-Din did not allow an attack on the city. He so protracted negotiations that the governor agreed to his offer to exchange the place for a substitute.<sup>389</sup> Nur al-Din also did not venture to besiege Shayzar since its lord, Nasir al-Din Muhammad b. Munqidh, was in contact with the Franks and Nur al-Din feared that he would hand Shayzar over to them.<sup>390</sup> Shayzar only fell into his hands after August 1157, after the amir and his family had perished in an earthquake and the stronghold was extensively ruined.

By 1157, Nur al-Din had thus succeeded in subjecting Muslim Syria west of the Euphrates with the exception of the castles of the Nizaris in Jabal Bahra in central Syria. The political fragmentation into various Turkish, Arab and (after 1098) Frankish autonomous lordships, which had provided the basis for Frankish-Muslim alliances and the 'no place' doctrine, was thereby ended for the time being. Contemporaries clearly recognized this historical break and dated it to 1154, as William of Tyre commented: "Through this event our condition deteriorated [...] for instead of a powerless man, who through his weakness was so far dependent on our side

<sup>387</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhīr*, 108; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 198.

<sup>388</sup> Argued against Runciman, *History*, II, 340 who follows Ibn al-Athīr.

<sup>389</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 227/8.

<sup>390</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhīr*, 112.

that he paid an annual tribute like a subject, a tougher adversary was opposed to us. For as a kingdom divided against itself cannot stand, as the Saviour says, so many united can acquire power and rise up more strongly against enemies.<sup>391</sup> Zengid propaganda after 1150 presented the acquisition of Damascus as the necessary preliminary to the 'liberation' of Jerusalem and the coastlands. Above all Ibn Munir and Ibn al-Qaysarani, Nur al-Din's court poets who came from Palestine, proclaimed this strategy, but the ruler himself may also have supported it.<sup>392</sup> The fears connected with the 'no place' doctrines as held in Damascus and in the royal court of Jerusalem thus seem well-founded. Lastly, the 'Abbasid caliph in Baghdad, al-Muqtafi (1136–60), is said to have officially appointed Nur al-Din as ruler over Egypt and Frankish Syria in 1154 and ordered the immediate conquest of these territories.<sup>393</sup> The consequences of the capture of Damascus therefore stretched beyond Syria. But did the year 1154 effectively bring a basic alteration in the relations between Frankish and Muslim Syria? Did Nur al-Din give priority to devoting himself to the Holy War after the capture of Damascus, as the propaganda declared?

Nur al-Din and Baldwin III concluded a truce for one year on 24 May 1155, which both parties observed. Presumably, the tribute from Damascus continued to be paid to the kingdom of Jerusalem.<sup>394</sup> This is in any case certain on the renewal of the treaty in November–December 1156, which laid down a tribute of 8,000 dinars and a period of validity of one year.<sup>395</sup> Nur al-Din thus gave no thought to exploiting his newly won position of power in order to fight the Franks. He occupied himself rather with the acquisition of Ba'labakk and intervened in the succession disputes of the Rum Seljuks in Anatolia. Only in April 1156 was there fighting with the Franks and that was in northern Syria. It ended in a peace treaty which brought Nur al-Din half of the territory of Harim.<sup>396</sup> However, a Frankish attack had provoked this campaign. The cause of the peace's ending was not a highly organized campaign by Nur al-Din for the conquest of Jerusalem, but the Franks' breach of the treaty, as Frankish troops attacked a gathering of Muslim peasants and herdsmen at Baniyas at the beginning of February 1157. Both Ibn al-Qalanisi and William of Tyre condemn

<sup>391</sup> William of Tyre, XVII, XXVI, 803.

<sup>392</sup> Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, ed. Haydarabad, VIII/1, 221.

<sup>393</sup> Al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, III, 223.

<sup>394</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 331.

<sup>395</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 336.

<sup>396</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 333; Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhīr*, 109; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 207–8; Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/1, 253–8.

this raid most severely as a breach of faith. Ibn al-Qalanisi saw the reason for the attack as lying (apart from the attractiveness of loot, including war-horses) in the pressure European pilgrims exercised on Jerusalem. William of Tyre argues that the heavy indebtedness of King Baldwin III led him to follow the instigation of bad advisers.<sup>397</sup> On the Muslim side, it was preached as a Holy War and summons to the *jihad* prepared for it. Nur al-Din's army included volunteers for the *jihad* and men of religion. With this force, he besieged Baniyas from mid-May until the beginning of August 1157 and defeated the Franks on 19 June. Christian prisoners of war were put to death as treaty-breakers. It may, however, be noted that Muslim warriors from the mountain-chain of Jabal 'Amila supported the Franks.<sup>398</sup> Soon after that, in the last third of July 1157, Nur al-Din was already negotiating with the Franks to conclude an armistice.<sup>399</sup> On the whole, one gains the impression that for an entire decade after 1154 Nur al-Din was interested in a peaceful relationship with the Franks. This attitude contributed to the almost complete disappearance of the theme of the liberation of Jerusalem from Zengid propaganda from the middle of the 1150s.<sup>400</sup>

A glance at Nur al-Din's relationship with his neighbouring Muslim states and their concern with the *jihad* corroborates this picture. In 1150, Usama b. Munqidh was sent from Egypt to negotiate an alliance against the Franks, who were refortifying Gaza. Nur al-Din, however, declined on the grounds that he must first conquer Damascus. He merely allowed Usama to recruit mercenaries from his army, who reinforced the garrison of Ascalon.<sup>401</sup> Also, possibly five years later, the Egyptian Wazir Tala'i b. Ruzzik sought in vain to obtain Nur al-Din's support for a naval attack on the kingdom of Jerusalem.<sup>402</sup> From the end of April 1157, after the abrogation of a truce with the kingdom, the Egyptians proposed an exchange of ambassadors with Nur al-Din. He delayed this until March 1159.<sup>403</sup> We are informed of the agenda of the embassy through several poems which the Egyptian wazir sent to Usama b. Munqidh, again residing in Damascus since 1154. The Egyptians pressed Nur al-Din for joint action against the Franks, without at first eliciting more than a general profession of

<sup>397</sup> Ibn al-Qalanisi, 337; William of Tyre, XVIII, XI, 836–7.

<sup>398</sup> Ibn al-Qalanisi, 338–42. Cf. William of Tyre, XVIII, XII–XV, 837–45.

<sup>399</sup> Ibn al-Qalanisi, 343.

<sup>400</sup> Cf. Nicholson, *Joscelyn III*, 43–4.

<sup>401</sup> 'Izz al-Din b. Shaddad, *A'lāq* (Lubnan), 260–1. Cf. William of Tyre, XVII, XII, 777–9.

<sup>402</sup> Ibn al-Qalanisi, 331–2.

<sup>403</sup> Ibn al-Qalanisi, 338, 353; Ibn Muyassar, 155–7; al-Maqrizi, *Itti'āz*, III, 234, 236.

the *jihad*. The tone of the démarche of the Wazir Talaʿi b. Ruzzik was conceivably sharp. He reproached Nur al-Din for doing nothing for the fight against the Franks and for tolerating their rule over Palestine in such words as, ‘Say to him, “How long will you delay [the wiping out] of guilt regarding the infidels? [...] Go to Jerusalem! [...] Leave your affection for the Franks.”’<sup>404</sup> Thus, it was the Egyptians, not Nur al-Din, who pursued a policy of Holy War after 1154. Nur al-Din showed a serious interest in the Egyptian offers only in 1159, when the new league between the Franks and Byzantium, as well as the Rum Seljuks, threatened him in the north. Nur al-Din had mediated a peace between Joscelin II of Edessa and Sultan Masʿud of Konya previously in 1149 because he did not want the Rum Seljuks to penetrate into Syria. He was thus even interested temporarily in the continued existence of the most northerly Frankish state. The quarrel between Nur al-Din and the Rum Seljuks intensified after 1150. When Sultan Qilij Arslan II b. Masʿud intended to attack Frankish Antioch in the summer of 1157, this was sufficient cause for Nur al-Din to raise the siege of Baniyas in southern Syria after starting with so much *jihad* propaganda and to enter into armistice negotiations with King Baldwin III. He went north in order to set Aleppo in a state of defence. The Egyptian Wazir Talaʿi b. Ruzzik even felt compelled during the fighting between Nur al-Din and Qilij Arslan in 1160 to call upon them to make peace and fight the Franks. He had no success.<sup>405</sup>

Thus, Nur al-Din’s policy (at least until 1158) in no way differed from that of his father Zengi. For both of them the *jihad* propaganda was a proven means of legitimizing their claim to rule, of consolidating their prestige among the subjects of their heterogeneous dominions and of achieving their aims of expansion. The conquest of Damascus in 1154 did indeed change decisively the power relations in Syria, but it did not herald an ‘age of the Islamic *jihad*’. In contrast to his own propaganda, Nur al-Din refused to cooperate with Muslim states in the Holy War and preserved as long as possible peaceful relations with the Frankish states in Syria. His continuing hostilities with the Franks from 1157 go back to Christian attacks. The years 1157–58, and not 1154, signify the break in Syrian history with the reorganization of all alliance relationships in the eastern Mediterranean.

<sup>404</sup> Talaʿi b. Ruzzik in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/1, 293–4, 297–8 (also printed in Ṭalāʿi b. Ruzzik, *Dīwān*, 126, 129, 86–7).

<sup>405</sup> Ṭalāʿi b. Ruzzik, *Dīwān*, 133 (also in Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 318; transl. in Sivan, *L’Islam*, 81).

This section has shown that with Zengi's assumption of power in Aleppo in 1127–28, for the first time a great lordship, which included parts of Syria itself, threatened the autonomy of the Frankish and Muslim states. Zengi, like his predecessors, made use of the idea of the *jihad* as a means of support for his efforts at expansion. In the face of this danger, there slowly developed after 1135 an alliance between Damascus and Jerusalem resting upon the 'no place' doctrine. This rendered a penetration to the south impossible for Zengi. Zengi himself acted indeed according to the 'no place' doctrine when Byzantium and the Seljuk sultan were threatening him. The influence of this doctrine is also recognizable in different Frankish-Muslim alliances in northern Syria, but it was clearly effective in the relationship between the Frankish and Muslim rulers of central and southern Syria. Between 1140 and 1146 it led to a firm alliance between Jerusalem and Damascus, since its cause, Zengi's expansion, became a permanent danger. That complaints could be made of infringements of the treaty shows the quality of this alliance. When Zengid pressure diminished, (as is particularly clear from 1150) a sort of contingency alliance existed, which came into force in the event of acute danger to Damascus. In the absence of this, Damascus pursued a policy of equidistance. Military action between Jerusalem and Damascus were entirely possible in this phase.

The regent Unur and, from 1149, the ruler Abaq, were prominent supporters of the alliance idea. Yet the chiefs of the city administration and the militia also stood by the alliance despite Zengid propaganda. On the Frankish side, the king was above all interested in it on political and financial grounds. The nobles of the kingdom also preferred the retention of the status quo to either the possible establishment of a Frankish state under a European noble or a Zengid Damascus, as shown in 1148 and 1157. The Oriental Frankish settlers supported the Second Crusade only so long as there was no threat of Zengid intervention. A break in the history of Frankish-Muslim relations did not signify their breakdown, as William of Tyre believed decades later,<sup>406</sup> since even after the Crusade the growing power of Nur al-Din of Aleppo prompted the ruler of Damascus and the king of Jerusalem to enter into an alliance. Arrayed against the alliance policy were the propagandists and the devout among the Muslims, and among the Christians the European pilgrims and the non-elite participants, dependent materially on taking loot, as in 1147, 1148 and 1157.

---

<sup>406</sup> William of Tyre, XVII, IX, 771.

Because of this, there was continual conflict between the king of Jerusalem and the pilgrims. Lack of money could be a reason for giving way to the Europeans and breaking existing treaties, as in 1157. As far as can be seen, all the alliances between Damascus and Jerusalem go back to Muslim initiatives and commit the Muslims to the payment of money or tribute to the kingdom of Jerusalem, that is to say the royal treasury. After the conquest of Damascus, Nur al-Din did not initiate a confrontation with the Franks, in contrast to the announcements of his court poets. To him, the prevention of the penetration of other powers (Byzantium, the Rum Seljuks and Egypt) into Syria was more important than the *jihad*. In this he followed the political principles of his father Zengi. The real break in the political history of Syria was not 1154, but 1157–58.

### CHAPTER THREE

#### FRANKISH-MUSLIM RELATIONS IN THE PERIOD OF NUR AL-DIN AND SALADIN (1158–92)

It has already been indicated that Nur al-Din's capture of Damascus, Ba'labakk and Shayzar between 1154 and 1157 had decisively altered the constellation of power relations in Syria, which had framed alliances since the First Crusade. Henceforward, the castles of the Nizaris in Jabal Bahra in central Syria formed the sole territory under Muslim rule which did not belong to Nur al-Din's dominions. When the struggle for supremacy in Egypt turned out in favour of the Zengids in 1169, the encirclement of the Franks appeared to be complete and thereby the old-fashioned style of treaty and alliance policy to have come to an end. In fact, Egypt and Muslim Syria lay nominally in a single hand after 1169, apart from an interval between 1174 and 1183, which was not of great significance for power-politics. In the same measure as Nur al-Din from 1149 and later Saladin were able to extend their power in Syria, the kingdom of Jerusalem became their most powerful opponent.

This process is reflected in the chronicles. William of Tyre comments on the inglorious course of the Second Crusade with the words, 'From this day the situation of the Eastern Latins began to deteriorate', because the enemies were no longer afraid of the Christian princes and the Franks would in future be attacked ever more boldly.<sup>1</sup> With these words, William leads up to the description of Nur al-Din's crushing defeat of Antioch and the death of Prince Raymond, saying, with reference to Nur al-Din's coming into power in Damascus: 'Our situation deteriorated thereby [...]; since, instead of a powerless man, who was at our mercy (*obnoxius*) because of his weakness (*debilitas*), [...] a stronger adversary was opposed to us.'<sup>2</sup> The chronicler counted the success of the Zengid troops under Shirkuh in Egypt in 1168–69 as a further step towards the encirclement of the Franks. Following the enumeration of the advantages which the Frankish suzerainty over Egypt had guaranteed, i.e. peaceful trade, Fatimid tribute and security of travel, he goes on: 'Now on the contrary all have

---

<sup>1</sup> William of Tyre, XVII, IX, 771.

<sup>2</sup> William of Tyre, XVII, XXVI, 803.

drawn a worse lot. The fair appearance is altered and our lyre is tuned to mourning. Wherever I turn, I find [only] suspicious adversaries. Access by sea is denied to the lovers of peace, the whole neighbouring region obeys the enemies and the neighbouring realms prepare themselves for our undoing.’<sup>3</sup>

William of Tyre saw the next end of a period five years later. He describes in retrospect the situation after Nur al-Din’s death in 1174 and the danger that Saladin will encroach on Syria from Egypt as follows: ‘We had to [...] fear that if his possessions and realm are doubled, he will arise against us impetuously and weary us to yet greater effect [...]. But our efforts have been [...] foiled, since he has arisen against us so strongly by land and sea that if we did not seek to rise up by compassion from above, we should have no hope of resistance.’<sup>4</sup> Directly afterwards, William investigates the reasons leading to the apparent decline of Frankish power in the East. He recognizes in the first and second place the sinfulness of his own generation and their lack of military skill. In addition, at this point (1174) all the neighbouring realms are in the power of one ruler—a teleological process which began with the loss of Edessa to Zengi and has advanced to the establishment of the Ayyubid realm of Egypt and Syria.<sup>5</sup> William thus interprets the history of the Latins in the East since the Second Crusade as a time of progressive decline of power, accompanied by a continual concentration of power on the Muslim side, which was also partially the decline’s cause. His analysis finally culminates in a gloomy description of the situation in 1184.<sup>6</sup> A similar model of history was used in the Islamic historiography of the thirteenth century. This appears most clearly in the words with which Ibn Wasil, paraphrasing a passage of Ibn al-Athir, introduces his account of the Frankish attack on Damietta in 1169: ‘When Saladin [...] conquered Egypt [...] and Nur al-Din’s armies established themselves there, the Franks were sure of their ruin and certain that the coastland was on the edge of a sloping shore, undermined because of the Muslims.’<sup>7</sup>

Modern historians have taken over William of Tyre’s assessment directly or indirectly. The Damascene jurist al-Sulami’s demand at the beginning

<sup>3</sup> William of Tyre, XX, X, 957–8.

<sup>4</sup> William of Tyre, XXI, VI, 1014–5.

<sup>5</sup> William of Tyre, XXI, VII, 1015–6.

<sup>6</sup> William of Tyre, XXIII, Praefatio, 1132.

<sup>7</sup> Ibn Wāṣil, I, 179 based on Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, XI, 351. Cf. Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 456.

of the century for the establishment of an Islamic united front against the Franks seems to have been fulfilled, thanks to Nur al-Din's successes. The Frankish side is seen as reacting to the amalgamation of the Islamic bloc with diplomacy aiming at drawing together the Christian states, the Westerners and the Byzantines. Chalandon outlines the Frankish position in 1158 with the words: 'The hour had come when it was necessary to realize clearly that against the Muslims united under Nur al-Din's command, they would achieve no lasting successes without the support of the Greek Empire.' And Lilie makes this judgment on the failure of the later attack on Damietta: 'The loss of Egypt in 1168 [...] made the Franks fully aware of the precarious nature of their situation [...]. They were opposed by a united front, whose banners announced a Holy War against the infidels.'<sup>8</sup>

At first sight, the development of the Frankish states' relations with the Byzantine Empire and the Western monarchies after the fall of Damascus in 1154 and especially after the accession of King Amalric I of Jerusalem in 1163 appears entirely in accordance with this picture. In fact, King Baldwin III of Jerusalem endeavoured to obtain a better relationship with Byzantium. The Frankish side initiated negotiations in 1157 and these led to an agreement which was sealed by the king's marriage to a niece of the Emperor Manuel. Both sides presumably pledged themselves to a joint action against Nur al-Din in northern Syria and to the settlement of the dispute about the Byzantine claims to Antioch. Manuel's campaign in Cilicia and northern Syria in 1158–59 and the oath of fealty taken by the prince of Antioch to the Emperor Manuel at the end of 1158 realized the treaty.<sup>9</sup> This pro-Byzantine turn in the policy of Jerusalem denoted a break. Even during the latest Byzantine advances into Syria in 1138 and 1142 Jerusalem had stood aside and, as indicated, sought a compromise with Zengi and Burid Damascus. A phase of closer linkage with Byzantium did not begin only for the principality of Antioch, the feudal dependence of which on Byzantium was made clear in 1158, which had a Greek patriarch from 1165 to 1170 and which in 1178–79 had joint representation in a Byzantine embassy to England. The emperor married Maria, the daughter of Constance of Antioch, in 1161 and in 1167 he gave one of his nieces to King Amalric I of Jerusalem in marriage. The various treaty and alliance

<sup>8</sup> Chalandon, *Commène*, II, 446; Lilie, *Byzanz*, 194.

<sup>9</sup> William of Tyre, XVIII, XXII, 857–8 and XXII–XXV, 859–64; Joannes Kinnamos, IV, 18–21, pp. 181–90; Niketas Choniates, III, 108–110.

projects from 1158 to 1177, the joint siege of Damietta in 1169 and the journey of Amalric I to Constantinople in 1171 are well known and need no further description here.

The relationship of Antioch and Jerusalem with the states of the West, especially England and France, saw a similar change in the same period. During the Second Crusade it had still proved thoroughly ambivalent, but from the middle of the 1150s letters from the East to Europe have another tone. The prince of Antioch, Reynald of Châtillon, describes himself in a letter to Louis VII of France in 1155 as *de vestris naturalibus hominibus natus* and declares his readiness to fulfil the king's commands.<sup>10</sup> From the period between 1162 and January 1165 alone, fourteen letters from Jerusalem and Antioch to the French king have been preserved. Their main subject, especially after defeats such as the loss of Harim in 1164, consists of requests for help.<sup>11</sup> From the end of the 1160s at latest, these calls for help acquired a new quality. Official delegations from Jerusalem carried them to Western courts in 1168, 1169, 1171, 1173, 1180 and 1184, and acts of subordination, at least symbolically, might accompany them. Already at the end of 1163, Amalric I said in a letter to the king of France that he wished to serve him.<sup>12</sup> According to the *Annales Cameracenses*, the keys to Jerusalem were offered to Louis VII a few years later, in 1169.<sup>13</sup> In the following period, the kings of Jerusalem attempted to achieve a peace between England and France, and to bind the monarchs of both lands to the Frankish states. During his mission to Europe in 1184–85 the Patriarch Heraclius of Jerusalem offered, first to Philip II Augustus of France, then to Henry II of England, the keys to the Holy Sepulchre and the Tower of David, and also a banner. A few months later, Baldwin IV of Jerusalem provided in his will that if his infant son died during the ten-year regency, the pope, the Roman emperor and the kings of England and France should regulate his succession. It is unimportant here whether the legal basis for these measures was seen to be in Charlemagne's alleged protectorate of the Holy Places or in the idea that Latin Syria was the affair of the whole *Respublica Christiana*. It is important that the Franks of Syria, at latest from the early 1160s, appealed in the West to a feeling of responsibility for the Holy Land.

<sup>10</sup> Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani, 394 and RHGF, XVI, no. LXVII, 14–5.

<sup>11</sup> RHGF, XVI, no. XCI, 27–8, no. CXXI–CXXVI, 36–40, no. CXCIV, 59–60, no. CCXLIII–CCXLIV, 79–80.

<sup>12</sup> RHGF, XVI, no. CXCIV, 382.

<sup>13</sup> *Annales Cameracenses*, 550–1.

They asked not only for help in the form of money and weapons but also finally for a prince.<sup>14</sup>

Both tendencies, the seeking of closer relations with Byzantium and the increasing intensity of calls for help in the West, are easily represented as a factor in the formation of a Christian bloc in face of what Lillie regards as 'a united front, whose banners announced a Holy War against the infidels'.<sup>15</sup> The orientation of Frankish policy towards Byzantium and the West as a reaction to the Zengid and Ayyubid successes in Syria and Egypt is beyond dispute. However, whether a united front of Holy War increasingly confronted the Franks after 1148, whether the bases of Frankish-Muslim alliances and treaties suddenly became obsolete after 1157–58 and whether they did not continue to be effective in another form—all this requires scrutiny.

#### THE EXPANSION OF THE 'NO PLACE' DOCTRINE AND FRANKISH POLICY TOWARDS EGYPT AND BYZANTIUM (1158–74)

The dominant political problem from 1158 to 1174, from the Byzantine-Frankish rapprochement to the year of the deaths of Nur al-Din and King Amalric I of Jerusalem, was the struggle over power in Egypt. The Fatimid Wazir Tala'i' b. Ruzzik fell victim to an assassination on 11 September 1161.<sup>16</sup> The rivalries over the tenure of the wazirate in the following years had repercussions which extended beyond the Fatimid state. Called upon for help by various pretenders and groups, King Amalric and Nur al-Din were involved from 1163 to 1169 in struggles over supremacy on the Nile. From 1167, Byzantium also held itself ready for intervention, which took place only in 1169. The years between 1158 and 1174 had thus three distinct phases: the first up to the beginning of Frankish and Zengid intervention in Egypt, i.e. to 1163; the second until Saladin took over power in Cairo, when Frankish and Zengid troops confronted one another in Egypt, to 1169; and the third, during which the Fatimid caliphate was disposed of (1171) and Saladin ruled Egypt under Zengid suzerainty. The Byzantine-Frankish rapprochement, the intervention of the troops of Jerusalem in

<sup>14</sup> William of Tyre, XXI, XIV–XV, 1027–30; Gesta Henrici secundi, I, 116; Mayer, *Kaiserrecht*, 200–1.

<sup>15</sup> Lillie, *Byzanz*, 194, summarizing the view of numerous older authors such as Grousset and Runciman.

<sup>16</sup> Ibn Zāfir, 112; al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, III, 254; Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, II, 208–12.

Egypt (not Syria and northern Mesopotamia as hitherto) and the uniting of the Fatimid state with Nur al-Din's sphere of power were new factors which presumably influenced treaty and alliance relations.

The negotiations between the Franks and the Zengids over a truce after the fighting around Baniyas in July 1157 did not reach a successful conclusion. In the second half of 1157, after the devastating earthquake which struck northern and central Syria in the summer, there was fighting in the valley of the Orontes and on the marches of the principality of Antioch. Its cause lay in the Crusade of Dietrich of Flanders, mentioned above. After the failure of their attack on Shayzar in October, the allied Franks succeeded in capturing Harim in February of the following year. A severe illness compelled Nur al-Din to remain passive at this time and he was also unable to prevent the raid of Baldwin III on the environs of Damascus. On his recovery Nur al-Din undertook an attack on the territory of Sidon, but in July 1158 Baldwin III heavily defeated him in Transjordan, where he was besieging the Frankish cave-stronghold of Habis Jaldak. Thereupon he opened negotiations for a truce with Baldwin. Although they did not come to a conclusion, peace reigned in fact between Jerusalem and the Zengid dominions from the summer of 1158.<sup>17</sup> Fighting only returned to southern Syria after the intervention of Byzantium. Najm al-Din Ayyub, Saladin's father and governor of Damascus, concluded a truce of three months at the beginning of 1160 after Baldwin had made a raid for booty in the Hawran. When the Franks renewed their attacks on the lapse of the period, he negotiated a truce for two years.<sup>18</sup> It is unknown whether this treaty was prolonged on lapsing, but William of Tyre expressly notes that Nur al-Din did not make Baldwin III's death on 10 February 1163 the occasion for an attack.<sup>19</sup> Hardly less bellicose was the situation in northern Syria. In November 1160 or 1161 Reynald of Châtillon, the prince of Antioch, fell into the hands of the governor of Aleppo.<sup>20</sup> In 1161 or 1162 (the chroniclers disagree), fighting flared up again in the north and Nur al-Din besieged Harim without success. Nothing is known of treaties in this period. Only after they had been heavily defeated at the foot of Hisn al-Akrad did the Franks again offer Nur al-Din a truce, which he refused.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 351–2. Cf. William of Tyre, XVIII, XXI, 855–6.

<sup>18</sup> William of Tyre, XVIII, XXVII, 866–7; Gregory the Priest, 360/1.

<sup>19</sup> William of Tyre, XVIII, XXXIV, 879–81.

<sup>20</sup> William of Tyre, XVIII, XXVIII, 868–9; Gregory the Priest, 363; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 311–2.

<sup>21</sup> William of Tyre, XIX, VIII, 894–5; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 294–6; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, II, 312–5.

Thus, from the summer of 1158 there were no Zengid attacks in the south and two truces for limited periods were concluded. In the north, where fighting did take place, Nur al-Din planned no major enterprises until 1162. In 1160 and 1161, while the treaties with Jerusalem were in force, Nur al-Din instead attacked Qilij Arslan II of Konya, the Rum Seljuk sultan, and in the winter of 1160–61 he accomplished the pilgrimage to Mecca. Accordingly, no special commitment to the *jihad* can be discerned before 1163. Characteristic of Nur al-Din's policy is the way he reacted to the campaign of the Byzantine Emperor Manuel in Cilicia and northern Syria in 1158–59. As has already been shown, from 1150 and again from 1157 diplomatic contacts had taken place between the Fatimids and Nur al-Din on an Egyptian initiative. When the Byzantine army reached Cilicia in the autumn of 1158, Nur al-Din intensified this exchange and, going beyond lip-service for the first time, declared his readiness for cooperation in the *jihad*. His ambassador, the chamberlain (Hajib) Mahmud, handed over to the Fatimid Wazir Tala'ic b. Ruzzik a poetical summons to the *jihad* and returned to Nur al-Din in the middle of October 1158 accompanied by an Egyptian amir. He brought over 70,000 dinars in cash for the fight against the Franks, presents and weapons worth 30,000 dinars and a robe of honour which invested Nur al-Din with Damascus.<sup>22</sup> Even if the Byzantine advance was still unknown in Damascus, the league between Byzantium and Jerusalem lay certainly in the background of the exchange between Egypt and Nur al-Din. Baldwin III married Manuel's niece Theodora in September and shortly afterwards set out for Antioch.<sup>23</sup> Thus, by this month at the latest Nur al-Din knew of the alliance between the Franks and the Byzantines. His ambassadors even visited Manuel in his winter quarters in Cilicia.<sup>24</sup> On Nur al-Din's summons, the Egyptians actually attacked the Franks and Byzantines by land and sea.

Nur al-Din again sent the Hajib Mahmud from Damascus to the Nile at the beginning of March 1159. He pressed for an attack on the kingdom of Jerusalem and returned to Nur al-Din accompanied by an Egyptian amir, while 6,500 Egyptian horsemen and a fleet set out for the desired enterprise from the end of May to the middle of July 1159. The chronicler al-Maqrizi, whose account is based on older sources, expressly bases this exchange of ambassadors on the report of the arrival of the Byzantines in Cilicia.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 353; Ibn Muyassar, 156–7; al-Maqrizi, *Itti'āz*, III, 233–4.

<sup>23</sup> William of Tyre, XVIII, XXII, 857–8.

<sup>24</sup> Joannes Kinnamos, IV, 18, p. 183.

<sup>25</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 356; al-Maqrizi, *Itti'āz*, III, 233–4, 236.

Presumably also in March 1159, Byzantine envoys visited Damascus and handed over valuable gifts to Nur al-Din; an agreement was apparently also reached. Later, the conclusion of a treaty between Baldwin III and the Emperor Manuel in Cilicia also became known. When shortly afterwards Nur al-Din heard of the advance of the Byzantines towards Antioch, and of their intention of attacking Muslim territories, he proceeded at the end of March to Aleppo, set the defences in order and issued a summons to the *jihad*.<sup>26</sup>

Negotiations were, however, started from the Byzantine side without there being any significant clash. Their outcome was a truce. Manuel achieved the liberation of 6,000 Frankish prisoners and again had valuable gifts sent to Nur al-Din. Presumably, joint action against the sultanate of Konya was arranged as well.<sup>27</sup> As soon as the Greek army had withdrawn from Syria at the beginning of June 1159, Nur al-Din discharged the troops which had come from Mosul and the provinces of his dominions at his summons to the *jihad*. In the following years, as we have seen, he had no mind to seek a quarrel with the Franks, nor did he resume contact with Egypt, making no response to the exhortations to the *jihad* of the Egyptian Wazir Tala'i' b. Ruzzik. He was visibly uninterested in the planning of an Egyptian campaign, presumably in 1161 and prepared at the cost of 200,000 dinars, which the wazir did not even implement.<sup>28</sup>

This shows that Nur al-Din made use of *jihad* propaganda solely to overcome the danger lying for him in the Frankish-Byzantine alliance. The *jihad* ideology was an instrument of his power policy. It may actually have been the case, as is often asserted, that the Frankish-Byzantine rapprochement put a stop to Zengid expansion in north Syria after 1159.<sup>29</sup> In fact, Nur al-Din did not attack defenceless Antioch after destroying a force of Franks, Armenians and Byzantines and capturing Harim in August 1164, because he feared Byzantine intervention.<sup>30</sup> He even set free Bohemond III of Antioch who had been made a prisoner of war.<sup>31</sup> Both instances clearly indicate that he preferred a Frankish Antioch to a Byzantine presence. This reveals his policy as being purely power policy and as being Syrian in the sense of traditional Frankish-Muslim alliance policy. The numerous

<sup>26</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 356–7.

<sup>27</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 357–8; William of Tyre, XVIII, XXV, 863–4; Gregory the Priest, 356–8; Joannes Kinnamos, IV, 21, pp. 188–9.

<sup>28</sup> Ibn Zāfir, 112; al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, III, 254.

<sup>29</sup> For instance Chalandon, *Commène*, II, 454–5 and Lilie, *Byzanz*, 176.

<sup>30</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhir*, 125. Cf. Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 339–42.

<sup>31</sup> William of Tyre, XIX, XI, 901.

titles referring to the Holy War, which Nur al-Din bore in his inscriptions after 1158, cannot blur the impression that he made an instrument of the *jihād* ideology. They have markedly less weight when compared with the titulature of other Muslim rulers. There exist sometimes still more impressive lists of epigraphic *jihād* titles from the Rum Seljuk sultans of Konya and the Artuqid amirs of Khartbirt and Mayyafariqin,<sup>32</sup> who took little or no part in the struggle against the Franks. Even if Nur al-Din had thus been so much concerned with the honour of Islam and the liberation of Jerusalem as some sources would have one believe,<sup>33</sup> he did not follow any policy of constructing a front against the Franks which would have endangered his own power policy. There can consequently be no question of a consistent *jihād* policy.

But did the Zengids confront a Christian bloc after 1158? The treaties of 1159 between Manuel and Nur al-Din indicate that Byzantium was in no way concerned with setting up a front with the Franks. The emperor's aims were to regain Cilicia, to consolidate feudal suzerainty over Antioch and to bring Nur al-Din into an alliance against Qilij Arslan of Konya. A balanced relationship between Franks, Armenians and Zengids best corresponded to Byzantine interests. King Baldwin III of Jerusalem for his part seems to have been far from 'concluding a pact with Byzantium and with the Armenians, and establishing a federation of Christian countries extending from the Black Sea to the Nile; this pan-Christian alliance should easily resist Konya, Mosul and Aleppo, and be able also to measure itself against Islam to the east of the Euphrates.'<sup>34</sup> Baldwin did indeed seek support, but he had no wish to accept Byzantine supremacy in northern Syria. It is typical enough that William of Tyre believed that the hasty breaking off of Manuel's attack on Aleppo in 1159 was not to be criticized, in contrast to his description of the lack of success of the Byzantine and Frankish campaign of 1138, since a capture of Aleppo in 1158 would have inevitably made Byzantium the decisive power in the north.<sup>35</sup> The relationship between the Christian allies was also not without problems after the withdrawal of the emperor. Here are a few examples: Baldwin III's ordering of the regency in Antioch after the capture of Reynald of Châtillon led to tension with Byzantium. Negotiations which resulted in the marriage of

<sup>32</sup> For instance, RCEA, IX, no. 3203, 2–3; no. 3218, 11–12; no. 3271–2, 48–50.

<sup>33</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhir*, 117; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 295; Ibn al-Furāt, MS Vindob. A.F. 119, fol. 159r.

<sup>34</sup> Prawer, *Histoire*, I, 423.

<sup>35</sup> William of Tyre, XVIII, XXV, 864.

Maria of Antioch to Manuel in 1161 were largely concealed from the king of Jerusalem. In 1163 Manuel denied acceptance of the subordination of Antioch to Baldwin's successor Amalric. Byzantine contingents did indeed fight on the Frankish side against Nur al-Din between 1162 and 1164, and after the defeat of the Christian allies at Harim in 1164, the emperor himself at first planned to advance to Anatolia.<sup>36</sup>

Nevertheless, the attitude of the Franks towards Byzantium was ambivalent during this period. The appeals for help sent from the Latin East to Europe in the 1160s form the best evidence for this. King Amalric described to Louis VII of France the situation of northern Syria in 1163 as being so desperate after the capture of Prince Reynald that without Western help Antioch would fall either to the Turks or the Greeks. If Manuel were to come, Antioch would without any doubt fall into his hands and Amalric underlined that he feared the emperor more than the Turks. Louis should therefore come to the Holy Land where Amalric and all the Franks would obey his commands. After the battle of Harim on 12 August 1164, the Commander of the Templars, Geoffrey Fulcher, wrote to Louis that the Patriarch Amalric, the regent of Antioch, could perhaps withstand the Turks, but not the Byzantine emperor. And the Master of the Temple Bertrand of Blanchefort remarked at the same time in a letter to the king of France, almost identical with that of Amalric in the previous year, '[...] *quidem non est dubium, quin [Antiochia] aut in Graecorum aut in Turcorum manus veniat, et in proximo*' if help from the West fails to appear.<sup>37</sup> It will be shown in the following that the relations between Franks and Muslims remained mixed well after 1165. A crisis in the kingdom still does not explain the requests for help from Jerusalem to Europe until 1169. These requests all had as their purpose the prevention of Byzantine domination in northern Syria with the help of the French Crown.

To sum up the treaty and alliance policy in the phase from 1158 to 1163: The diplomatic rapprochement between Jerusalem and Byzantium was a consequence of the unification of almost the whole of Muslim Syria in Zengid hands. But its aim was in no way the formation of a Christian bloc against Nur al-Din. Nur al-Din was just as attractive an alliance partner for Byzantium as the Frankish rulers. The Franks sought linkage with Byzantium to stabilize the situation in northern Syria, but they mistrusted it no

<sup>36</sup> Joannes Kinnamos, V, 13, pp. 215–6.

<sup>37</sup> RHGF, XVI, no. CXXVI, 39–40; RHGF, XVI, no. CXC VII, 62–3; RHGF, XVI, no. CCXLIV, 79–80.

less than they did the Turks. The relationship between the Frankish states and Nur al-Din followed the course that it had developed in the years since he took power in Damascus in 1154, raids and treaties alternating with one another. Nur al-Din only declared his readiness for the supra-regional cooperation of Muslim powers in a *jihad* in 1158–59. Therein he acted in a similar way to his father Zengi during the Byzantine advance of 1138.

The Frankish-Muslim treaties from 1163 to 1169 must be seen against the background of the internal development of Egypt. Egypt had been insignificant for Frankish treaty and alliance policy between the taking of Tyre in 1124 and of Ascalon in 1153. It is not known whether there were agreements and whether the Fatimid policy regarding Syria went beyond the contacts of the Wazir Ridwan b. Walakhshi (1137–39) with the governor of Busra. The first diplomatic contacts between Franks and Egypt after the siege of Ascalon (the inhabitants of which were guaranteed free departure within three days and escort to the Egyptian frontier) took place in July 1154.<sup>38</sup> Frankish troops killed the Wazir ‘Abbas, who had procured the death of the Fatimid Caliph al-Zafir, when in flight to Syria. The family of the murdered caliph may have commissioned and paid for this. The Templars surrendered the son of the former wazir to Egypt, where he was put to death.<sup>39</sup> The attempt of the new wazir, Tala’i’ b. Ruzzik, to conclude a truce failed in 550/1155–56 on the opposition of his amirs.<sup>40</sup> A treaty must nevertheless have been concluded at some time, since after the abrogation of a truce Egyptian troops and fleets carried out a series of attacks from June 1157. A Frankish ambassador therefore attempted in vain in 1158 to negotiate a truce in Cairo and for the same reason a Frankish envoy appeared again on 27 March 1158.<sup>41</sup>

Seen as a whole, the relations between Egypt and the kingdom of Jerusalem seem to have followed an unsteady course between 1155 and 1163. Thus, King Baldwin III agreed in a treaty with Pisa on 2 November 1156 that in future the republic should deliver no military goods to the Fatimids. Also, the fact that the king promised to one Joscelin Pesellus between 1157 and 1159 a fief of 100 knights in Egypt after its planned

<sup>38</sup> William of Tyre, XVII, XXX, 811–3. Cf. Ibn al-Qalānisi, 321; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 188–9; al-Maqrīzī, *Itti’āz*, III, 206.

<sup>39</sup> William of Tyre, XVIII, IX, 832–4. Cf. Ibn al-Qalānisi, 329–30; Ibn Zāfir, 109; Ibn Muyassar, 152.

<sup>40</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 331–2.

<sup>41</sup> Ibn Muyassar, 155, 156; al-Maqrīzī, *Itti’āz*, III, 230, 233–4.

conquest proves that the Frankish court was contemplating aggressive designs.<sup>42</sup> These plans did not, however, get beyond the stage of projects as they lacked Byzantine support and the active Syrian policy of the Egyptian Wazir Tala'i' b. Ruzzik confronted them. The wazir had conceded an annual tribute to the Franks (it is not clear whether the king, the count of Ascalon or perhaps the Templars are intended) after the fighting between Egyptians and Franks in 1158, thereby incidentally breaking his solemn oath never to conclude peace with the Franks.<sup>43</sup> Frankish ambassadors may have picked up the money in Egypt, but from 1161 the payment seems to have been discontinued as Frankish troops advanced on Egypt in the autumn or winter of 1161.<sup>44</sup> King Amalric (the former count of Ascalon and Jaffa) undertook a campaign in the Delta in September 1163. William of Tyre bases this expressly on the failure of the Egyptians to pay tribute. In a letter to the king of France, Amalric expressed the opinion that with French help Egypt might easily be conquered.<sup>45</sup> In spite of these two campaigns, it happened that a member of the family of the Wazir Tala'i' b. Ruzzik, fleeing from the new Wazir Shawar, who had seized power in Cairo at the beginning of January 1163, deposited his property with the Franks and later received it back.<sup>46</sup>

Consequently, until the end of 1163 no clear structures emerge in the relations between Jerusalem and the Fatimids. The individual campaigns and the doubtful truces were the expression of an approximate balance between the two parties. A planned treaty and alliance policy in the real sense can be recognized only in the years after 1164. From this time onwards, the competitors for the Fatimid wazirate by their requests for help to Nur al-Din and Amalric respectively gave rise to the danger that Egypt might fall into the dominions of either the Zengids or the Franks. The question thus arises how the alliances between the Franks and Egypt after 1164 were formed and how Nur al-Din positioned himself towards developments in Egypt. Shawar b. Mujir al-Sa'di had usurped the Fatimid wazirate in Egypt at the beginning of 1163, but in August of that year his rival, Dirgham, turned him out. Thereafter, Shawar endeavoured to get support from Nur al-Din, promising to reinforce the Zengids against the

<sup>42</sup> The original deed is lost. Cf. *Tabulae ordinis*, V, 6 and Mayer, *Deperditum*, 562–6.

<sup>43</sup> Al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, III, 259.

<sup>44</sup> Michael Syrus, 317 (disputed by Mayer, *Deperditum*, 563–4).

<sup>45</sup> William of Tyre, XIX, V, 890–91; al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, III, 262; RHGF, XVI, no. CXCIV, 59–69.

<sup>46</sup> Ibn Abī Ṭayy' in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 416.

Franks with a third of the state revenue and to assign *iqta*'s to the Zengid soldiers. At the same time, however, the wazir in office, Dirgham, offered to accept Zengid suzerainty.<sup>47</sup> In spite of initial hesitation because of the potential dangers to his expeditionary force from the Frankish side, Nur al-Din decided to support Shawar. The fallen wazir and the Zengid troops under Shirkuh set out for Egypt in the middle of April 1164. Up to that point Jerusalem seems to have shown itself indifferent towards the developments in Egypt. One source even states that the invaders bought freedom of passage from the prince of Transjordan.<sup>48</sup> The situation changed in April 1164, when Dirgham asked King Amalric for help against the Zengid force as it advanced from Syria. He declared that he was prepared to pay a higher tribute, to accept perpetual subjection, to make an unlimited truce and to offer hostages, as William of Tyre says and al-Maqrizi confirms to some extent.<sup>49</sup> This subjection seems not to have differed substantially from the submission (*ta'a*) which Dirgham had previously offered to Nur al-Din. The Old French chronicle of Ernoul also states that *Mulane* (arab. *mawlana*, i.e. the Fatimid Caliph al-'Adid) offered to accept Egypt as a fief from Amalric, if he would help.<sup>50</sup> However, the conclusion of this treaty was thwarted by Shirkuh's rapid success.

The chronicles are still more precisely informed about the appeal for help to the Franks at the end of May 1164 from the restored wazir, Shawar. After his restoration he had refused to fulfil the agreements with Nur al-Din and had asked Shirkuh to go back. This led to fighting between the former allies and Shirkuh took possession of the fortress of Bilbays, north-west of Cairo. While William of Tyre mentions that Shawar had renewed Dirgham's offer of a treaty to the Franks and was prepared to offer even better terms, Arabic sources, such as Ibn al-Athir, also transmit Shawar's argument: 'He made them fear Nur al-Din, if he were to conquer Egypt. The Franks were certain of ruin if he gained possession of it and were fearful.' According to Ibn Abi Tayy', Shawar argued: 'If they possess it [i.e. Egypt] in addition to Syria, you will have nowhere to live with them and no abode any longer.' According to al-Maqrizi: 'If they establish themselves in the land, they will snuff you [i.e. Amalric] out as they like.'<sup>51</sup>

<sup>47</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, XI, 298; Ibn Abī Ṭayy' in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 420, 418.

<sup>48</sup> Chronicon ad A.C. 1234 pertinens, II, 123.

<sup>49</sup> William of Tyre, XIX, V, 892; al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, III, 264, 276.

<sup>50</sup> Ernoul, III, 23.

<sup>51</sup> William of Tyre, XIX, VII, 894; Ibn al-Athir, *Bāhir*, 121; Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, XI, 299; Ibn Abī Ṭayy' in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 421 (cf. al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, III, 276).

Unfortunately, technical details about the conclusion of the treaty, which thereupon came into force, are as unlikely to be found as an answer to the question whether Shawar did in fact place Egypt under the suzerainty of Jerusalem. Only the promise of an annual tribute and the release of the Christian prisoners in Egypt are established.<sup>52</sup> In consequence of this agreement Shawar and King Amalric besieged the Zengid troops in Bilbays from the end of July 1164. The allies and Shirkuh concluded a peace treaty in October, in which the Franks and Zengids undertook to evacuate Egypt.<sup>53</sup>

When Shirkuh made his way into Egypt for the second time at the beginning of January 1167, King Amalric stood once again at the side of the Fatimid wazir. Shawar had even been informed of the threatened Frankish invasion.<sup>54</sup> Again, the Muslim sources state that the wazir officially requested the help of the king and confirmed the same treaty conditions as in the previous year. At an assembly of the realm in Nablus, Amalric had consulted beforehand with the vassals of Jerusalem and had set out for Egypt after a vain attempt to intercept Shirkuh while still in Syria.<sup>55</sup> Ibn al-Athir commented that the Frank came to Egypt 'with the intention of taking possession of it, out of fear that Asad al-Din [Shirkuh] would occupy it, since there was no longer a place (*la maqam*) for them together with him and Nur al-Din in their land'.<sup>56</sup> In order to make sure of Frankish support as Shirkuh moved to Upper Egypt and as the campaign threatened to claim more time, Shawar not only raised the promised tribute and the payment of the expenses of the Frankish nobility. He also offered the Franks the renewal of the old alliance and a truce for an unlimited period. In response, Amalric promised the negotiators for the Fatimid caliph by a handshake that he would not leave Egypt before Shirkuh. The Franks successfully insisted that, contrary to Fatimid protocol, the treaty should be sworn to their emissaries by the hand of the Caliph al-'Adid. The tribute terms of the agreement were realized after Amalric, and Shawar under pressure from him, had concluded a truce with Shirkuh at the beginning

<sup>52</sup> RHGF, XVI, no. CXCVI, 61.

<sup>53</sup> William of Tyre, XIX, VII, 894; Ibn Abī Ṭayy' in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 423; Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhir*, 122; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 300.

<sup>54</sup> William of Tyre, XIX, XIV, 904–5; Ibn Abī Ṭayy' in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 424; al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, III, 282.

<sup>55</sup> William of Tyre, XIX, XIII–XIV, 902–5.

<sup>56</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 324. In more detail in Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhir*, 132.

of August 1167.<sup>57</sup> Shawar granted the Franks a considerable sum of money annually and allowed the stationing of a Frankish garrison in Cairo to collect the tribute and keep watch on the city gates.<sup>58</sup>

The wealth of mostly independent evidence in the sources indicates that the basis of Egyptian-Frankish treaty relations from 1164 was the 'no place' doctrine known from Syria. Having formed in the first third of the twelfth century the basis of alliances of Frankish, Turkish and Arab rulers against interventions from outside Syria, and from about 1135 against Zengid expansionism, it was expanded to the relationship between Fatimid Egypt and the Frankish states. The modalities of the alliances and treaties between Dirgham, Shawar and Amalric from 1164 to 1167 correspond amazingly to those between Damascus and Jerusalem from 1140 to 1154. In neither case do the Franks intervene on their own initiative, but only on an appeal for help. They receive money-payments for their expenses and additional promises of tribute, which show the strong position of the kingdom of Jerusalem. One might conclude from this that Frankish military aid took place solely from financial interests, unmotivated by the 'no place' doctrine. This, however, rests upon a false assessment of the political possibilities open to the Crown, which represented the alliance policy on the Frankish side. In the first place, the Egyptian payments served to pay the Frankish troops. The king relied on these monies because the Frankish intervention in Egypt was, like Baldwin II's alliances as regent of Antioch and the alliance with the Burids of Damascus, a Crown matter and somewhat unpopular with the nobility. Feudal law contained no obligation for the vassals of the kingdom to render military service in Egypt. Hence, Amalric had to pay not only the Hospitaller knights and, in 1164, the European pilgrims but also his vassals. It is significant that in 1167, directly after the conclusion of his treaty with Shawar, which immediately brought him the payment of 200,000 dinars, Amalric received reinforcements from the knights of Jerusalem. During the siege of Alexandria, which seemed to promise rich booty, further Frankish contingents set out for Egypt. Thus, it was feudal and financial impediments, not ignorance of the 'no place' doctrine, which could obstruct the alliance policy of the Crown of Jerusalem. The king needed a call for help and the money from Egypt in order to mobilize and finance his knights. The king's ability to

<sup>57</sup> William of Tyre, XIX, XVII, 909, XVIII–XIX, 910–13, XXIX–XXXI, 934–8; Ibn Abī Ṭayy' in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 427.

<sup>58</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhir*, 134; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 327; al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, III, 287. Cf. Michael Syrus, 332.

convince the assembly at Nablus in 1167 of the necessity of a special tax for the pre-financing of military aid for the Fatimids shows the importance that Jerusalem attached to the alliance with Shawar.<sup>59</sup>

Payment of expenses and tribute seem to have been the only obligations which the Fatimids agreed to in 1164 and 1167. Of a formal *subjectio*, such as Dirgham had already offered them, there was in any case no further express mention. William of Tyre describes the agreements between Shawar, the Fatimid caliph and Amalric as treaties between equals. That Shawar complied with Frankish orders, and he is certainly condescendingly characterized in William's chronicle, is not compelling evidence of a legal relationship.<sup>60</sup> Unfortunately, the sources contain no indications of the form and implications of the subordination Dirgham offered first as *ta'a* to Nur al-Din in 1163–64, then as *subjectio* to Amalric. However, it remains conspicuous that for the Egyptian wazir a subordinate legal relationship was conceivable both in regard to the Sunni Muslim Nur al-Din and to the Christian king of Jerusalem.

There remains the question as to how the alliance with the kingdom of Jerusalem was judged on the Fatimid side. After all, Egypt had temporarily been the driving force against the Franks under the Wazir Tala'i' b. Ruzzik. Different sources verify that in 1164 the Wazir Shawar was far from underestimating the danger that his Frankish allies could present. The fragment of a letter transmitted by Ibn Abi Tayy' from Shawar to Shirkuh, written just at the time when the latter was beleaguered by the Franks and Egyptians in Bilbays in 1164, makes this quite clear:

Know that I hold back the Franks against you [...] I do this for two reasons. The first of the two is that I do not wish to destroy the honour of the Muslims and strengthen the Franks. And the second is that I fear the Franks covet Bilbays, if they capture it and say to us, "[It belongs to us], because we have captured it with our swords."<sup>61</sup>

Shawar even asserted that he had bribed Frankish magnates to hold their king back from marching. It was therefore important to the Fatimid wazir to establish a balance between Zengids and Franks, and not to put himself at the mercy of one side alone—Shawar did not entertain the idea of a unity of the Muslims against the infidel. The patriarch of Antioch quite

<sup>59</sup> William of Tyre, XIX, XXII, 918–9, XXVIII, 932, XIII, 903–4.

<sup>60</sup> William of Tyre, XIX, XIV, 904–5, XXVII, 934. Cf. Schwinges, *Kreuzzugsideologie*, 182.

<sup>61</sup> Ibn Abi Tayy' in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 423. Cf. 'Umāra al-Yamanī, *Nukat*, 80, 88; Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhīr*, 132; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 324; al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, III, 288.

correctly interpreted his position in the letter of 1164 to King Louis VII of France already cited: 'He would rather reign as a tributary than lose life and realm alike.'<sup>62</sup> A further letter which Shawar wrote to an unknown addressee during the second Fatimid-Frankish campaign against Shirkuh contains the classical formulation of the policy which the wazir pursued against the Zengids. He reports about the campaign: 'Every man near and far rose up for the family of the Apostle of God and aided the banner of his praise, even the cross; their enemies were killed by another enemy and strangely so a sickness was terminated by another sickness.'<sup>63</sup>

This passage indicates clearly that to Shawar the Franks were potential enemies, yet in fact they supported the Fatimids ('the family of the Apostle of God'). Against this, no kind of affinity with the Muslim Zengids existed for Shawar. Ibn Abi Tayy' expresses the same point of view. He states that in 1167 Shirkuh implored the Egyptian wazir in a letter to make common cause with him against the Franks: 'From you I hope simply for help for Islam.' Shawar's reaction was to have the bringer of this letter put to death, to inform the Franks and to renew his oath to them. He is said to have exclaimed: 'These are no Franks; these are the relief!'<sup>64</sup>

The troops of Nur al-Din are in fact regularly designated in Egyptian sources not as Muslims, but by the pejorative term *ghuzz*, originally used for the non-Muslim Turks on the borders of the Islamic world. This is never the case with an author from the Zengid dominions such as Ibn al-Athir. It was clear to Shirkuh's amirs that the population of Egypt regarded them with hostility.<sup>65</sup> The support which the Zengid invaders found in 1167 in Sunni Alexandria, where the cooperation of the wazir with the Franks caused violent offence, remained, for the moment at least, the exception.<sup>66</sup> The wazir's alliance policy also had support from the court of the Fatimid Caliph al-'Adid. The caliph gave presents to King Amalric on his arrival in Egypt in 1167, swore to the treaty with the Franks and finally, when the alliance led to Shirkuh's withdrawal, distinguished Shawar with a robe of honour.<sup>67</sup> Shawar was also praised for his alliance in a series of poems written by high dignitaries of the Fatimid state. The poet 'Umara al-Yamani, who until 1161 had belonged to the circle of the Wazir Tala'i' b.

<sup>62</sup> RHGF, XVI, no. CXCVI, 61.

<sup>63</sup> Al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Mokhtar*, fol. 103v.

<sup>64</sup> Ibn Abī Ṭayy' in Abū Shāma, *Rawdatayn*, I/2, 425.

<sup>65</sup> 'Umāra al-Yamanī, *Nukat*, 80, 88; al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, III, 288; Ibn Zāfir, 116; Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhir*, 132; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 325.

<sup>66</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn, *Bustān*, 137.

<sup>67</sup> Sāwīrus b. al-Muqaffa', III, 88–9/arab. 53; al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, III, 286.

Ruzzik, extolled Shawar as 'the heir of Alexander' the Great for his 'support for the family of Muhammad' against Shirkuh.<sup>68</sup> He designated the Franks as 'helpers of the dynasty' in spite of their demands for money and the dangers they represented. A similar tone marks two poems of al-Qadi al-Fadil, later to be Saladin's collaborator and head of chancery, who had since 1164 been the assistant chief of the Fatimid chancery which was principally responsible for diplomacy. In the first, addressed to Shawar, he writes:

The king of the Franks marched by night to support their troops [i.e. of the family of the Prophet],  
 Out of his unbelief arose no harm in assisting the truth.  
 It is nothing other than a miracle of the Prophet,  
 Which has turned to their use those whose harm was feared.

And in a panegyric for the wazir's son al-Kamil, he expresses himself similarly to the letter from Shawar of 1167 cited above: 'You meet enemies with enemies. Call it a miracle that the crosses serve and support the Rightly Guided [i.e. the Fatimids].'<sup>69</sup>

The Fatimids thus conducted a policy directed purely to the preservation of power and thus joined with the Franks without any political or religious scruples. But it appears that closer relations also existed between the Frankish nobility and the leading Egyptian military stratum. So Yahya b. al-Khayyat, who towards the end of 1164 attempted in vain to oust Shawar from the wazirate, fled to the Franks and not to Nur al-Din.<sup>70</sup> The Franks' deep respect for Shirkuh and the chivalrous etiquette between King Amalric and Saladin after the conclusion of the truce of 1167, documented both in the Arabic chronicles and by William of Tyre, likewise reveal little of religious antagonism with political consequences.<sup>71</sup> Naturally, the chivalrous behaviour of the king of Jerusalem says little about legal and political conceptions. All the same it mediates an impression that the Frankish knights stood closer to the world of the Egyptian and Zengid administrators and soldiery than the religious propaganda would sometimes suggest. As far as relations between Egypt and Nur al-Din's Turkish troops are concerned, the alliances of 1164 and 1167 and their legitimization make entirely clear that the relations between the Fatimid

<sup>68</sup> 'Umāra al-Yamanī, *Nukat*, 73, 82.

<sup>69</sup> Al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Dīwān*, I, 200–1, 150.

<sup>70</sup> al-Maqrīzī, *Iṭṭi'āz*, III, 279, 290.

<sup>71</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhīr*, 122; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 300–1. On William of Tyre cf. Schwinges, *Kreuzzugsideologie*, 185–6.

dynasty and the 'ghuzz' Turks had not acquired any new quality because of the Crusades and the founding of the Frankish states. In 1076, a good score of years before the foundation of the Frankish states in Syria, the Wazir Badr al-Jamali had led the defence of Egypt as a *jihad* against the equally Muslim intruders under the Turcoman Atsiz. The way in which the Fatimid alliances of 1164 and 1167 against the Turks were justified is only slightly different. Unlike the religious representatives of the Sunni city of Alexandria, the Shiite leaders of Egypt and the Fatimid caliph paid no attention to the appeals to Muslim unity put forth by Shirkuh until 1167. Befittingly, al-Kamil, the son of the Wazir Shawar, broke off the contacts which he had temporarily maintained with Nur al-Din.<sup>72</sup> The relationship between the Fatimids and the Franks experienced a change only when the kingdom of Jerusalem breached the alliance in 1168.

William of Tyre, the Arabic chronicles and documentary material very well document the previous history of this Frankish campaign. First talks about a Byzantine-Frankish attack on Egypt were conducted in connection with the marriage of the Byzantine Princess Maria with King Amalric and during the wedding celebrations in Tyre in 1167. To ratify the agreements, the king sent William to the Emperor Manuel and he did not return before October 1168.<sup>73</sup> Amalric was thus contemplating plans of attack at a time when his alliance with the Fatimids was still valid. He did not, however, await the ratification of the treaty and the arrival of Byzantine troops. William of Tyre and Ibn Abi Tayy' both confirm that Amalric was under pressure from a group of Frankish magnates, to whom Gilbert d'Assailly, the grand master of the Hospitallers belonged. William of Tyre accounts for the conduct of the grand master by the heavy indebtedness of his Order, which he apparently wanted to pay off with booty and gifts or fiefs in Egypt.<sup>74</sup> Other sources state that the garrison of Cairo, which may have consisted partly of Hospitallers, informed the king of the incapacity of Egypt for defence and invited him to conquer it. Amalric is said to have refused at first, but then his knights and advisers persuaded him. The king's objections as described by Ibn al-Athir are interesting:

It seems sensible to me not to attack. Their foodstuffs stand at our disposal and their money was delivered to us. We are reinforced by them against Nur al-Din. If we attack in order to make a conquest, neither the ruler, nor

<sup>72</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Bāhīr*, 134; Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, XI, 327.

<sup>73</sup> William of Tyre, XX, IV, 945-7.

<sup>74</sup> William of Tyre, XX, V, 948-9; Ibn Abi Tayy' in Abū Shāma, *Rawdatayn*, I/2, 429.

the army, nor the people of the land altogether, nor its peasants will surrender it to us. They will fight us regardless. They will be so overcome by fear that they will surrender it to Nur al-Din. And if he takes it and installs someone like Asad al-Din [Shirkuh], that means the ruin of the Franks and their expulsion from the soil of Syria.<sup>75</sup>

The argument that the Arab chronicler here ascribes to Amalric is amazingly paralleled in the assessment that William of Tyre gives at the end of his account of the Frankish attacks on Egypt. He complains that because of greed, which underlay the breach of the alliance with the Fatimids in 1168, the riches of Egypt were no longer at the Franks' command. Peace on the western borders, trading relations, tribute to the royal treasury—these had vanished and danger threatened the kingdom on every side.<sup>76</sup> Opposition among the Franks to the attack thus referred entirely unambiguously to the financial and commercial advantages of the alliance with Egypt and to the necessity of the alliance against Nur al-Din. Whether King Amalric is to be unreservedly reckoned with this opposition is an open question. In his thorough investigation of the financing of Amalric's Egyptian policy, Mayer has rendered it likely that the Hospitallers, the Pisans and a group of vassals compelled the king to make a premature attack. They feared that if the Fatimid realm were to be conquered with Byzantine help, the fiefs and shares of booty in Egypt, already promised to them, would be shared between Byzantium and Jerusalem. Amalric and his seneschal, Miles of Plancy, on the other hand, foiled the conquest of Egypt during the campaign and only worked for higher tribute in order not to dupe Byzantium and furthermore to make the financial sources of Egypt accessible to the Crown. Because of the extensive claims for fiefs from the Hospitallers, the republic of Pisa, individual vassals and (admittedly only in 1169) the abbacy in the Valley of Jehosaphat, the prospective ruler of the land of the Nile would at once be threatened with great financial problems.

Ibn Abi Tayy' and al-Maqrizi report in fact that Amalric had demanded two million dinars from an envoy from Shawar for a truce, even before the taking of Bilbays at the beginning of November 1168. Both chroniclers have an alternative report that Amalric justified the whole campaign to Shawar by the non-payment of the Egyptian tribute. The truce concluded by Amalric and Shawar in mid-December 1168, after the burning of

---

<sup>75</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhir*, 137; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 335–6. Cf. the abridged version in Michael Syrus, 332–3.

<sup>76</sup> William of Tyre, XX, X, 957.

al-Fustat, was to bring in 400,000 dinars to the royal treasury. However, only a first instalment of a quarter of the sum was paid and the king had to do without the rest because of Shirkuh's arrival.<sup>77</sup> The financial element in the breach of the alliance with Egypt is thus quite indisputable. In addition, however, Amalric seems to have justified his campaign against Shawar by the pressure of European Franks (*qawm min wara'ā al-bahr*, people from beyond the sea). Presumably, this signified the Pisans, but also perhaps the knightly Orders. According to al-Maqrizi, the king besieged Cairo because of the Europeans, although he recognized the senselessness of the operation: 'There is no escape from besieging Cairo, since I have overseas Franks with me who are endeavouring to capture it.'<sup>78</sup> The decision to attack was finally facilitated because a group of Egyptian amirs, including Yahya b. al-Khayyat, who had fled to him, called on him to help and also because he could apparently reckon on the sympathy of Shawar's opponents in the Fatimid army.<sup>79</sup>

The breach of the agreement with Egypt becomes clearer against this background. King Amalric was under pressure from financial problems on the one hand and from a group composed of part of his vassals, the Hospitallers and the Pisans (thus partly 'Europeans') on the other. Thus, he was not in a position to either maintain the alliance with Egypt or to follow a consistent policy of conquest together with Byzantium. As we have seen, both factors, financial worries and the divergence between the interests of the king and the Europeans, had impeded the treaty and alliance policy of the kingdom of Jerusalem from the start. Presumably, a campaign appeared sensible to Amalric in 1168 because his war aims were limited and an Egyptian group supported him, so success seemed possible. He believed that Nur al-Din would not have time to react. Amalric's decision to attack and his diplomacy towards Byzantium indicate a further feature, which also had previously accompanied alliances concluded on the basis of the 'no place' doctrine: it was a case of *ad hoc* alliances, which in no way excluded the treaty parties from expansionist activities against one another if there was no acute danger from a third party. As has been shown, it was also clear to the Wazir Shawar that the Franks after 1164 basically represented a danger to Egypt. In fact a latent rivalry

<sup>77</sup> Ibn Abī Ṭayy' in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, 1/2, 430, 431, 433–4; al-Maqrīzī, *Ittī'āz*, III, 292, 291, 298–300. Cf. Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhir*, 138; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 337; William of Tyre, XX, IX, 954–5.

<sup>78</sup> Al-Maqrīzī, *Ittī'āz*, III, 297. Cf. Ibn Abī Ṭayy' in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, 1/2, 430, 433.

<sup>79</sup> Al-Bundārī, 39.

between the Turks and Jerusalem over suzerainty in Egypt already existed before 1168. The advocates of an attack are said to have argued to Amalric that after a Frankish conquest of Egypt, Nur al-Din would be compelled to conduct himself well with Jerusalem in exchange for concessions. When Amalric's plans broke down on Shirkuh's entry into Egypt, he remitted to the Fatimids half of the recently agreed tribute of 400,000 dinars to provide the wazir with the means he needed for the fight against Shirkuh.<sup>80</sup> It was, however, too late at this time for a return to the 'no place' policy.

How did the Fatimids react in 1168 towards the ending of the alliance with Jerusalem? At the same moment that the formerly Frankish allies became enemies, the tone of Egyptian propaganda changed. The poet 'Umara al-Yamani celebrated Shawar in his panegyrics as a *mujahid* and admonished him to protect Islam in Egypt from the infidel Franks. Al-Qadi al-Fadil, the confidant of Shawar's son al-Kamil, worked on the caliph's instructions to obtain a replacement of the wazir by his son and drew up appeals for help to Nur al-Din in the name of the caliph, of Shawar and of al-Kamil. He was also the author of a call to the *jihad* against the Franks, addressed to the Arab tribes of Ja'far and Talha, presumably appearing at this time and written at the wazir's directions. As a Sunni, al-Qadi al-Fadil sympathized with the group who pleaded in 1168 for cooperation with the Zengids against the invaders. However, it is interesting that he felt himself obliged in a poem to Nur al-Din, not only to assure him of the support of the leadership of the Fatimid state but also to tempt him with the riches of Egypt. The argument of the unity of the Muslims against the Franks seemed to him obviously too weak to achieve Zengid help.<sup>81</sup> Whether in fact all the higher dignitaries in Egypt favoured an application to Nur al-Din for help is also questionable and it seems that there was a party which worked on the principle that 'it is better to pay tribute to the Franks than to call in the *ghuzz*.'<sup>82</sup> Which position Shawar took is not entirely clear. First contacts with Nur al-Din were made on the caliph's instructions presumably without the wazir's knowledge, since his aversion to the *ghuzz* was known. Later, Shawar seemingly also turned to Nur al-Din, probably under pressure from the caliph. According to al-Maqrizi, he warned the caliph against an appeal to the Zengids, but the caliph preferred a league

<sup>80</sup> Bahā' al-Dīn b. Shaddād, 37–9; Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhir*, 138; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 336; Ibn Abī Ṭayy' in Abū Shāma, *Rawdatayn*, I/2, 434.

<sup>81</sup> 'Umāra al-Yamanī, *Dīwān*, 73, 90, 164; al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Dīwān*, II, 365/6, 417; al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Durr*, 34–6.

<sup>82</sup> Ibn Khaldūn, *Ibar*, IV, 166.

with Muslims to a Frankish alliance. For the wazir at least, the turn to Nur al-Din was a purely tactical measure. Shortly afterwards, he anticipated a coup by his new allies and thought of arresting Shirkuh and his amirs in Cairo. His pro-Zengid son, al-Kamil, may have foiled this plan because he preferred a Muslim Egypt to the Frankish conquest which appeared certain at the time.<sup>83</sup>

While Shawar's conduct remained thus ambivalent and decidedly tactical, the caliph, al-Kamil and presumably the majority of the Egyptian notables, backed up by emphatic *jihad* poems in the court literature, were placing their bets in 1168 on Zengid help against the Franks. Did that signify that King Amalric's attack marked the turning of Egypt towards the policy of the Holy War and a change of mind of the Fatimids in favour of the Zengids? In order to answer the question of the emergence of a Muslim-Christian front around 1168, it is necessary to look at the alliance policy of the Fatimids, the Zengids and the kingdom of Jerusalem directly after that year.

The appointment of Shirkuh and subsequently Saladin to the wazirate by the Caliph al-'Adid after the murder of Shawar on 18 January 1169 best shows the position of the Fatimids. The diplomas of appointment of both, drawn up by al-Qadi al-Fadil, have been transmitted.<sup>84</sup> With them, the caliph endeavoured to bind the *ghuzz* to himself. In the usual expressions of protocol each is designated as 'chosen friend of the imams' or 'rightly-guided leader of the missionaries of the Believers'. Since in the previous decades non-Isma'ilis like Sunnis, Imamis or even the Christian Bahram, had served the Fatimids as wazirs, it must have seemed practicable to the caliph to win over the chiefs of the *ghuzz* and to keep Egypt independent of Nur al-Din. Before his murder Shawar had planned to arrest the chiefs of the *ghuzz* and take their troops into service. By the naming of Saladin, the caliph is said to have played with the idea of making a wazir of a politically weak amir. Saladin was reckoned as the spokesman of the Asadiyya, his uncle's troops, and the detachment of troops loyal to Nur al-Din rejected him, at least at first. Nevertheless, Saladin also soon clashed with the resistance of an influential circle around al-'Adid and among the Fatimid troops of Armenian and Sudanese origin, as he himself

<sup>83</sup> Ibn Abi Tayy' in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 432; Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhīr*, 138, 140–1; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 337–8, 339; Sāwirus b. al-Muqaffa', III, 104–5/arab. 62; al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, III, 293–4.

<sup>84</sup> Al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Mukātabāt*, fols. 101v–110v.

admitted in a later letter to the 'Abbasid caliph in Baghdad.<sup>85</sup> A conspiracy against him was unmasked in August 1169, led by the eunuch Mu'tamin al-Khilafa, one of the highest officials in the caliphal palace. A few days later a mutiny of the Sudanese units in the army was crushed. During the Frankish-Byzantine attack on Damietta from the end of October to mid-December 1169, Saladin was in constant fear of an Egyptian revolt and had various notables executed.<sup>86</sup> Soon afterwards, the Fatimid caliph asked Nur al-Din in vain to withdraw the Turks from Egypt and to be content with Saladin and his followers. The caliph's struggle for greater freedom of action is clearly to be seen. Finally in May 1174, a good eighteen months after al-'Adid's death and Saladin's extinction of the Fatimid caliphate, a conspiracy for its restoration was revealed. Among its partisans were not only high Ismaili jurists and courtiers, as well as the poet 'Umara al-Yamani but also a number of Saladin's Sunni amirs and soldiers.

It is noteworthy that the sources accuse the conspirators of 1169 and 1174 of having made contact with the Franks in order to get rid of Saladin with their help. A pro-Fatimid appeal for help is likewise said to have preceded the Frankish-Byzantine attack of 1169. Consequently also after 1168 the preservation of the Fatimid state had the highest priority for the supporters of the caliphal dynasty and took precedence over cooperation against the Franks. Among the highest administrative and military leadership of Egypt, there were obviously not so many persons who, like al-Qadi al-Fadil, placed themselves unconditionally on the side of the *ghuzz*. Others thought also after 1168 that alliances with the Franks were not disqualified. In spite of King Amalric's breach of the treaty, they pursued a policy of the maintenance of power, for which they sometimes tried to use the Franks, sometimes the Zengids. Their aim was to protect the Fatimid state, as their own fate was closely bound to its existence. It is interesting that the resistance to Saladin began at a time when his measures did not yet aim at the abolition of the caliphate. The cause of this opposition is presumably to be seen in the administrative reform ordered by Saladin, which removed the rights and sinecures of the notables of the old regime, transferring them to the Turkish *ghuzz*. Thus, the cause of Mu'tamin al-Khilafa's plans for a coup may be sought in the distribution of the *iqta's* and in Saladin's despotism.<sup>87</sup> From the point of view of these notables,

<sup>85</sup> Al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Epistolae*, fols. 15r ff.

<sup>86</sup> Al-Maqrīzī, *Khīṭaṭ*, I, 215.

<sup>87</sup> Al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, III, 311.

an obligation to pay tribute to the Franks was a lesser evil than an Egypt under the Sunni *ghuzz*.

That is why it cannot be maintained that the political leadership of Egypt since the Frankish attack of 1168 had basically altered the previous alliance policy in favour of cooperation with Nur al-Din. But Nur al-Din also certainly does not seem to have sought consistently from 1164 to support the Fatimid state against the Franks or to have aimed at all at the conquest of Egypt. He did attack the Frankish rulers repeatedly between 1164 and 1167. In this way, he won Harim and Baniyas in 1164, al-Munaytira in 1166 and in 1167 he took Hunin and lay waste the north of the county of Tripoli. He was, it seems, concerned chiefly with the covering of Shirkuh's interventions in Egypt, not with the conquest of Frankish Syria. He is said to have even offered Bohemond III of Antioch a truce (*pacem et trevias*) in 1164 in order to be able to attack the kingdom of Jerusalem and compel Amalric to return from Egypt.<sup>88</sup> Nur al-Din did not use his victories of 1164 for a greatly determined attack on the kingdom while it was denuded of troops through the Egyptian campaign. Instead, after the taking of Baniyas he concluded a treaty with the Franks according to which the territories of Tiberias (or even the principality of Galilee?) were divided into equal parts and an annual tribute was conceded for the undivided territories.<sup>89</sup>

He maintained his reserve towards the campaigns undertaken first with, then against, Shawar himself. He had already greatly hesitated in 1164 to support Shawar and only the promise of a third of the Egyptian state revenue finally moved him to do so. In 1167, Shawar persuaded him through gifts and offers of tribute to prevent Shirkuh from making a new advance on Egypt. He expressly warned Shirkuh against any intervention and occupied him otherwise by granting him the lands of Hims up to the boundaries of the county of Tripoli in *iqta*.<sup>90</sup> The sources leave no doubt that the interventionist policy of the *ghuzz* was supported in the first place by Shirkuh's personal ambition to become the lord of Egypt and that he financed them to a large extent.<sup>91</sup> In the same vein, the expedition of 1168, which led to Shirkuh's seizure of power in Egypt, was not planned on Nur al-Din's initiative. He intervened because he could not tolerate the Frankish conquest of Egypt. Basically, however, he had disapproved of Shirkuh's Egyptian policy long before Shirkuh and then Saladin assumed

<sup>88</sup> RHGF, XVI, no. CXCVI, 61 (letter of Patriarch Amalric to Louis VII).

<sup>89</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 304.

<sup>90</sup> Al-Maqrīzī, *Iṭṭi'āz*, III, 289; 'Imād al-Dīn al-Kātib in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 383.

<sup>91</sup> Bahā' al-Dīn b. Shaddād, 36–9; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 324; al-Maqrīzī, *Iṭṭi'āz*, III, 282.

the Fatimid wazirate, to which Nur al-Din reacted extremely sharply. Only after the *ghuzz* assumed power in 1168 did Nur al-Din take a greater share in the developments in Egypt, since he feared that through the integration of Shirkuh and Saladin in the Fatimid system of government the land might again slip out of Zengid control. The further development of the relationship between Nur al-Din and Saladin will be addressed later. As far as the period until 1168 is concerned, one gains the impression that Shawar, Amalric and Shirkuh compelled Nur al-Din to adopt an Egyptian policy against his will. His own efforts had previously been directed towards expansion in Syria and northern Mesopotamia. Here also he made use of the *jihad* propaganda in order to bind the amirs of neighbouring territories to himself.

Finally, it remains to be asked whether the failure of the Frankish conquest of Egypt and the seizure of power of the Nile by the *ghuzz* moved the Christian states to construct a front. This seems at first glance to have been the case. A Byzantine fleet set sail from Constantinople in July 1169 for a joint attack on Egypt with the king of Jerusalem. From the end of October into December the allies besieged Damietta, although the capture and the campaign failed. Throughout the Greek sources, King Amalric is held responsible for this by having delayed the start of the enterprise, remained passive during the siege and negotiated with the Muslims behind the Byzantines' backs. The Greek chroniclers are widely followed in the modern literature. At the moment of the arrival of the Byzantine fleet, Mu'tamin al-Khilafa's conspiracy (which tried to obtain Frankish help) and the mutiny of the Sudanese army units had already failed. An attack did not promise so much success at this point and the Franks were perhaps no longer greatly interested in the enterprise for this reason. King Amalric, who had been compelled to make a premature attack in 1168 in order to avoid sharing the booty with Byzantium, seems in 1169 to have encouraged the failure of the conquest of Egypt to the best of his abilities.<sup>92</sup> While he did not venture openly to break the alliance with Byzantium, he wished to prevent a carving up of Egypt between Byzantium and Jerusalem—or was compelled to this position. Rather, as in 1168, Amalric attempted above all to gain financially from the campaign.

Final certainty about this point cannot be obtained from the sources. If, however, the Greek sources with their accusations against Amalric are right, this can only mean that a Fatimid Egypt under the *ghuzz* Wazir

---

<sup>92</sup> Chalandon, *Commène*, II, 539–46; Lilie, *Byzanz*, 190–4; Mayer, *Service*, 152–7.

Saladin (i.e. the status quo) was preferable in the eyes of the kingdom of Jerusalem to a Byzantine foothold on the Nile. In the same years of 1168 and 1169, the Franks repeatedly sought for help in Europe.<sup>93</sup> In other words, after the success of the *ghuzz* in Egypt, Amalric certainly was in need of urgent support. Yet, the majority of the Frankish nobility preferred to seek this support in the West rather than from so potentially dangerous an ally as Byzantium. While the king himself can certainly be regarded as pro-Byzantine, he could hardly assert himself against the anti-Byzantine faction composed of the vassals of Jerusalem, the clergy and the knights of the Orders. The best proof of this is the finesse which Amalric had to use to renew his contacts in 1171 with Manuel Comnenus for a conquest of Egypt. Only the journey of the king himself to Constantinople and his consent to the sending of an embassy to the West at the same time could achieve this.<sup>94</sup>

To summarize, Frankish-Muslim alliance policy in 1164–69 followed the same course as in previous decades, but led to alliances which extended beyond Syria. Nur al-Din's expansionist policy also remained in a traditional framework: in spite of his campaigns in Syria and the sending of Shirkuh to Egypt in 1164 and 1168, Nur al-Din merely captured frontier fortresses and concluded treaties with the Franks. Shirkuh's Egyptian ambitions clearly provoked reservations in Nur al-Din. Apart from propaganda, Nur al-Din's actions do not reveal that up to 1169 he had put the existence of the Frankish states fundamentally in question. For Frankish policy, it was furthermore characteristic that it principally aimed at expansion. The alliances concluded and financed by the Crown only accommodated the attempts to extend power under the 'no place' doctrine. Worry about money, divergences between the interests of the king of Jerusalem and those of his European allies, and finally the conflict among the Franks about cooperation with Byzantium and the fear of Byzantine supremacy, additionally impaired the stability of alliance relationships. In spite of the long-term agreements between Shawar and Amalric in 1167, and the installation of a Frankish garrison in Cairo, the Frankish-Fatimid alliance, like the previous alliances with Damascus, possessed an *ad hoc* character. The alliance policy shows itself to be dependent on conflicts

---

<sup>93</sup> *Annales Pisani*, MGSS XIX, 257; RHGF, XVI, no. CXX, 187–8; William of Tyre, X, XII, 960.

<sup>94</sup> William of Tyre, XX, XXII–XXIV, 980–7.

of interests among the Franks. Only thus can the breach of the treaty in 1168 be explained.

The investigation yields a further insight. The legitimization of the Frankish alliance in Egyptian political poetry until 1167 and the abruptly ensuing alteration of tone to the glorification of the Holy War in 1168 make clear in exemplary fashion the difficulty to draw solid conclusions on the history of mentalities from the Arabic poetry of the twelfth century.<sup>95</sup> The literary sources adduced are in the first place courtly poetry. Only some of the writers had a direct personal interest in the Holy War, having themselves been driven out in the course of the Frankish seizure of territory. By contrast, the *jihad* poetry of the Egyptian Wazir Tala'ī' b. Ruzzik served (apart from the legitimization of his own rule for a start) above all for the preparation of a new phase of Fatimid Syrian policy, which should regain the territories lost to the Franks. As could be seen, the wazir did not for this reason balk at concluding a treaty with the kingdom of Jerusalem. 'Umara al-Yamani composed in his first time as Fatimid court poet *jihad* panegyrics for Tala'ī' b. Ruzzik, Tala'ī's son and first successor al-Nasir Ruzzik, and the Wazir Dirgham. During Shawar's second wazirate, by contrast, he belonged to the influential advocates of the alliance with the Franks, but with the Frankish breach of the treaty in 1168 he again became a literary spokesman for the *jihad*. After Shawar's murder, 'Umara again made an about-turn and glorified the *ghuzz* and Saladin in particular. After the extinction of the caliphate, however, he was one of the most prominent leaders of the conspiracy, which was aiming in 1174 at a restoration of the Fatimids with Frankish help. For his poems, 'Umara was not only regularly paid, as he records in his autobiography, giving the amount on nearly every occasion. But he also describes how he composed *jihad* panegyrics in order to be appointed court poet in the wazir's circle and to regain the lost favour of Tala'ī' b. Ruzzik.<sup>96</sup> In this way, also al-Qadi al-Fadil was able to further his career, first in Fatimid, then in Ayyubid service.<sup>97</sup> It was not otherwise with 'Imad al-Din al-Katib al-Isfahani. He describes how in October/November 1173 Nur al-Din formally required him to glorify his latest victory over the Franks in a poem.

<sup>95</sup> For instance Sivan, *L'Islam*; Sivan, *Caractère*; Dajani-Shakeel, *Jihād*. Especially Sivan's arguments have been widely taken up in scholarship as proof for the 'spirit of counter-Crusades'.

<sup>96</sup> 'Umāra al-Yamanī, *Nukat*, 42–3, 54–7, 74–6, 79–83; 'Umāra al-Yamanī, *Dīwān*, 174–7, 269–71, 367–70.

<sup>97</sup> Dajani-Shakeel, *al-Qāḍī*, 39–70.

Later, he indeed admonished Saladin to wage war on the Franks rather than the Zengids of Mosul. Nevertheless, in 1176 he praised the military success of the usurper Saladin, whose service he had meanwhile entered at Tall al-Sultan against his nominal lord, Nur al-Din's son, and the Zengids of Mosul.<sup>98</sup> Presumably, it would be going too far to set these poets down principally as opportunists; yet one must be clear that most *jihad* poems were directly or indirectly commissioned works and thus did not express the personal convictions of the men of letters. This is true of many works by poets who fled before the Franks as, for instance, Ibn Munir or Ibn al-Qaysarani from Nur al-Din's entourage. Poems of a totally different content have come down from Ibn al-Qaysarani in particular: a love-poem to a Frankish woman, the description of a singer called Maria or the architectural beauties of Antioch, e.g. the Church of Our Lady.<sup>99</sup> Thus, in every case it must be checked whether the *jihad* poetry originated merely as commissioned by a ruler for his legitimization and his short-term aims or was something more, i.e. the expression in certain social groups of a widespread *jihad* mentality. The latter may rather be presumed in the lyrical and prose works of independent Muslim religious scholars and jurists, such as Ibn 'Asakir of Damascus or the Banu Qudama family, who fled in the mid-1150s from the Nablus region in the kingdom of Jerusalem. Unlike the court poets, they did not balk at consciously setting themselves in opposition to the ruling sultans with their literary and rhetorical exhortations to the Holy War.<sup>100</sup> The court poetry was, by contrast, an instrument of power-politics just like alliances and treaties with Frankish rulers, as could be shown. The contrast between pragmatic politics and ideology is particularly clear here.

It finally remains to show the course of Frankish-Muslim relations from Saladin's assumption of power on the Nile to the death of Nur al-Din and Amalric in 1174. As already mentioned, the dates 1169 and 1174 appear with hindsight as breaks in the steadily advancing encirclement of the Frankish rulers in Syria. Yet, the discussion of the relationship between Nur al-Din and Saladin from 1169 in the latest research has made it possible to demonstrate clearly the conflicts between the *ghuzz* in Egypt and their Zengid lord. Until the death of Nur al-Din, there was in fact no single concerted enterprise against the Franks. There is no clear and final answer to the

<sup>98</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn, *Kharīdat/Shām*, IV, 53–62; Dajani-Shakeel, *Jihād*, 111; 'Imād al-Dīn, *Kharīdat/Miṣr*, I, 18ff.

<sup>99</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn, *Kharīdat/Shām*, I, 99–102.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. Ibn 'Asākīr in 'Imād al-Dīn, *Kharīdat/Shām*, I, 277.

disputed question as to whether that was due to a deliberate policy of obstruction by Saladin (as the pro-Zengid Ibn al-Athir suggested) or to the actual financial and administrative problems of the new ruler of Egypt.

Saladin undertook a first attack on the kingdom of Jerusalem at the end of 1170. He moved on al-Darum and a little later captured Ayla on the Gulf of 'Aqaba. Nine months later, he besieged al-Shawbak in Transjordan. Presumably, Saladin remained passive throughout 1172 and in 1173 he turned against the Bedouins east of the Jordan who were allies of the Franks. By these campaigns and by the amount of the payments which the Zengid war-chest levied from the Egyptian treasury, Saladin disappointed the expectations of his overlord Nur al-Din. The tensions between the two were recognizably so great that Nur al-Din ordered an audit of the Egyptian finances in the spring of 1174 and planned armed intervention in Egypt. Nur al-Din did not publicly recognize Saladin either as the Fatimid wazir or even as a sort of Zengid viceroy in Egypt. Official documents were, at least in 1169, addressed to him as 'the amir, the supreme commander [*isfahsalar*] Salah al-Din and all the amirs in Egypt.'<sup>101</sup> While for his part Saladin was still ready to inform his overlord of his projects for expansion in *Dar al-Islam*, e.g. the sending of his brother Turanshah to the Yemen at the end of February 1174, he appears to have acted entirely as an independent ruler in his relations with the Christian states. This is clearest in the long-term alliance which he concluded between 1171 and 1173 with Frederick Barbarossa on the emperor's initiative and which was probably directed against Byzantium. In 1173, there was perhaps also an alliance with Pisa against the Normans. Nur al-Din presumably knew nothing of these diplomatic activities. In the Latin wording of the commercial treaty, Saladin is designated as *rex*; to William of Tyre, chancellor and chronicler, he is after 1171 *calipha et soldanus*.<sup>102</sup> The title of *al-Malik al-Nasir*, bestowed on Saladin with the wazirate in 1169, may perhaps explain the term *rex*. *Soldanus* may come from the waziral title *sultan al-juyush* rather than from the Seljuk title of sultan. The designation of *calipha*, however, can only be explained as an indication that Saladin was considered an independent ruler. Yet Saladin did not maintain relations with Europe alone. Without there being certain knowledge of the possible contents of

<sup>101</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, XI, 344.

<sup>102</sup> Heyd, *Commerce*, I, 398; Amari, *Diplomi*, II, no. VII, 257–61; William of Tyre, XX, XI, 958. Cf. Möhring, *Salahadinus Tyrannus*, 428.

treaties, there are signs of contacts between Jerusalem and Cairo in 1171 and again in 1174.

On 11 September 1171, a bare two years after the conclusion of the secret treaty between Amalric and the Egyptians of Damietta, the presence of Frankish and Byzantine envoys at Cairo is attested. Their business is not clear; but until April 1173, Saladin appears to have undertaken no thrusts against the Franks—perhaps a result of these negotiations. He planned instead enterprises against Barqa in Cyrenaica and the Nubian kingdom. Two and a half years later, al-Qadi al-Fadil claimed in a letter to Nur al-Din that the Fatimid conspirators around ‘Umara al-Yamani in 1174 had received a positive answer to their appeal to Amalric for help through a scribe of the Frankish king called George. Outwardly George acted as an envoy to Saladin, but secretly he sought links with the conspirators. That Saladin seemingly learnt of Nur al-Din’s death on 15 May 1174 from the Franks is a further instance of Frankish-Ayyubid relations.<sup>103</sup>

The fragment of a letter of condolence, preserved in the chancery handbook of al-Qalqashandi, provides, however, the clearest instance of contacts between Saladin and the kingdom of Jerusalem. Composed by al-Qadi al-Fadil, it expresses Saladin’s condolences, presumably to King Baldwin IV, on the death of his father Amalric (11 July 1174) and congratulates him on his accession.<sup>104</sup> In this letter Baldwin is described as protector (*hafiz*) of Jerusalem and wished well. Saladin sent off the letter of condolence directly with the Ra’is al-‘Amid Mukhtar al-Din on the arrival of the news of Amalric’s death. He mourns for the dead king and designates him as *al-Malik al-‘Adil al-A‘azz*. He goes on to convey that God has alleviated the blow of fate by the appointment of the son as heir, and thereby the preservation of the dynastic descent, and granted to him with youth and lordship two tokens of favour. The actual political content of the letter follows: Saladin reassures Baldwin of his friendship and renews his request for support.

Three points are noteworthy in this letter. Firstly, the very fact that an Ayyubid mission of condolence was sent to the court of Jerusalem; secondly, the emphasis on neighbourhood and the designation of Amalric by titles used by Muslim chanceries for Muslim rulers. Nur al-Din also bore the title of *al-Malik al-‘Adil*, here ascribed to Amalric. Thirdly, the talk of friendship and support, i.e. an alliance, is unconcealed. Möhring

<sup>103</sup> Al-Maqrīzī, *Khitāṭ*, I, 86; al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 563, 587.

<sup>104</sup> Cited with reference to al-Qalqashandī, VII, 115–6.

has therefore rightly refused to interpret the text of the letter as purely diplomatic courtesy and has set it in its historical context after Nur al-Din's death.<sup>105</sup> The significance of this harmony was in no way diminished through the king's death on 11 July 1174. It offered the opportunity not only to dissuade the Franks from supporting the Norman attack on Alexandria at the end of July but also to purchase their inactivity during the thrust planned by Saladin into Syria against the heirs of Nur al-Din. Against the background of this agreement, Saladin's restraint towards the Franks until 1174 (criticized by Nur al-Din) is clarified and also the fact that Amalric, presumably in 1173, was able to take part in the conflict between Bohemond III of Antioch and the Armenian Mleh without fear of an Egyptian attack.<sup>106</sup> For their part, the Franks offered no resistance to Saladin's expansion in Syria until 1175, when there was a reorientation of the alliance policy under the regent Raymond III of Tripoli.

The diplomatic contacts between Saladin and the kingdom of Jerusalem, and his understanding with Amalric and Baldwin IV in 1174 or earlier, clearly show that there can be no question of an encirclement of the Franks by the Muslim rulers of Egypt and Syria from 1169, as it appeared by hindsight to William of Tyre. The titulature of Amalric as *al-Malik al-'Adil* (which perhaps implies his recognition as an independent ruler in his territory) comes particularly to mind. Possibly, this title may even represent a self-designation by the Frankish king as expressed in his Arabic correspondence. The parallels between the 'foreign policy' of Shawar and Saladin, to which Möhring has referred, are thus evident.<sup>107</sup> Saladin's Egypt was between 1171 and 1174 not only a component of Frederick Barbarossa's alliance system against Byzantium, which incidentally also included the sultanate of Konya, it was also presumably in an alliance with the kingdom of Jerusalem directed against the Zengids. If one recollects that Saladin, in spite of his own contacts with the Franks, severely criticized the Damascene amirs after Nur al-Din's death because of their truce with King Amalric and that al-Qadi al-Fadil accompanied the report of Amalric's death with violent curses, Ayyubid policy appears to have indeed been double-tongued.<sup>108</sup> In any case, *jihad* ideology had no

<sup>105</sup> Möhring, *Salahadinus Tyrannus*, 434–9 arguing against Lyons/Jackson, *Saladin*, 75, 370.

<sup>106</sup> William of Tyre, XX, XXVI, 991–2.

<sup>107</sup> Möhring, *Salahadinus Tyrannus*, 435.

<sup>108</sup> Ibn Abi Ṭayy' in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 594–6; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 408; al-Bundārī, 33–5.

more than propagandist value for Saladin. He had no intention of devoting himself to the fight against Jerusalem after he had consolidated his rule in Egypt.

How did this compare with Nur al-Din's policy until his death? Since the conquest of Egypt by Shirkuh, he and his propagandists had unweariedly depicted the liberation of Jerusalem as a political aim. Nur al-Din had a pulpit prepared in Aleppo for installation in al-Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem after its recovery. At the same time he repeatedly attempted in letters and poems by al-Katib al-Isfahani, addressed to the Caliph al-Mustadi', to place himself in a true light as a fighter in the Holy War.<sup>109</sup> However, the primary aim of these initiatives was to obtain a caliphal diploma legitimating his rule. Remarkably, the diploma, which was in fact granted in 1173, included the territories of northern Mesopotamia, Armenia and southern Anatolia (Diyar Bakr, Khilat and Konya), which Nur al-Din did not rule directly. Whether he wished to interest the caliph furthermore in the fight against the Franks, as Sivan thinks, must remain open.<sup>110</sup>

These diplomatic activities already make it clear that Nur al-Din too did not devote himself primarily to the fight against the Franks in the last five years of his life. He made rather the *jihad* ideology useful to his general political aims. A glance at the undertakings which Nur al-Din implemented before his death conveys the same impression. To the Byzantine-Frankish campaign against Damietta in 1169, he reacted by relief attacks on the kingdom of Jerusalem, besieged al-Karak for a few days at the end of April 1170 and then withdrew before a Frankish force. After the devastating earthquake of 29 June 1170, a short-term truce of unknown duration was concluded with the kingdom.<sup>111</sup> In any case, direct fighting between Nur al-Din and the Franks was resumed only in the summer of 1171. Nur al-Din settled the succession in Mosul in the meantime and stabilized his supremacy in northern Mesopotamia. There must have been a truce with the principality of Antioch in this time, as Nur al-Din considered the seizure of two Egyptian ships at Latakia as a breach of an existing treaty. As his protest and demand for the restoration of the confiscated goods aroused no positive response, he captured 'Arqa in the county of Tripoli and devastated the territories of Tripoli and Antioch located to its north

<sup>109</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn al-Kātib in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 547–8; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 395; Michael Syrus, 344–5.

<sup>110</sup> Sivan, *L'Islam*, 86–7.

<sup>111</sup> William of Tyre, XX, XVIII, 973.

and east, until the Franks gave way and the treaty was renewed.<sup>112</sup> This was perhaps the truce concluded after the earthquake of 1170. In October 1171 and at the end of May 1173, Nur al-Din twice threatened al-Karak. He repulsed a Frankish attack on the Hawran in November 1172 and caused the devastation of Galilee. During the summer of 1173, he fought the sultan of Konya and then spent the last six months of his life predominantly in northern Syria without achieving anything against a new Frankish raid in the Hawran.

This conduct conveys the impression that Nur al-Din behaved in a peaceful manner towards the Franks in northern and central Syria from 1169 to 1174, apart from the punitive expedition in the summer of 1171. During the greatest part of this period truces will have existed, as Nur al-Din's attempt to resolve the conflict with Antioch at first by diplomatic means proves. Although the existence of such agreements between Nur al-Din and the kingdom of Jerusalem lacks proof, apart from after the earthquake of 1170, the episodes of warfare were limited to Frankish raids in the Hawran (1172, 1173–74) or Zengid attacks on al-Karak. With these campaigns, carried out at wide intervals, Nur al-Din attempted to secure *darb al-hajj*, the route to the Holy Places of the Hijaz and the caravan-route to Egypt. It was not in any way a question of enterprises which actually threatened the kingdom of Jerusalem. In southern Anatolia and northern Mesopotamia, territories under Muslim rule, Nur al-Din pursued a far more active policy.

Against this background it appears, to speak carefully, that it is very questionable whether Nur al-Din worked energetically towards the conquest of Jerusalem and gave this priority in the employment of the resources of his dominions. For Nur al-Din at least, *jihad* propaganda was also a means to obtain the caliph's recognition and to reinforce his supremacy over the neighbouring territories. He indeed employed this supremacy in the pursuit of aims which had only to a very limited extent to do with the struggle against the Franks. When in the spring of 1174 he concentrated troops to march into Egypt and remove Saladin, contingents from Mosul and northern Mesopotamia under his nephew Sayf al-Din Ghazi II were to hold the Franks in check in Syria.<sup>113</sup> Consequently, military assistance from neighbouring amirs was rarely voluntary. It is reported that the arrival of the news of Nur al-Din's death caused his nephew, Sayf al-Din Ghazi of Mosul,

<sup>112</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhir*, 154–5; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 373–4.

<sup>113</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhir*, 161; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 402.

to invite the people to celebrations and the drinking of alcohol.<sup>114</sup> To deny Nur al-Din's commitment to the checking of Frankish expansion is as little justifiable as to judge the struggle against the Franks as the principal concern of Zengid policy—even if propaganda seeks to convey this impression. To base the conflict between Saladin and Nur al-Din on differences of opinion about the best way to fight the Franks seems to be hazardous because of this, not only because of Saladin's Frankish alliances.<sup>115</sup>

Finally, the question remains as to the direction of the Frankish alliance policy after 1169. Although the balance of power in the Middle East was nominally altered in favour of the Zengids through Shirkuh's conquest of Egypt in that year, the military consequences feared in Jerusalem did not happen. From 1169 to 1174, the Frankish territories were more secure than previously; territorial losses on the scale of 1164 did not need to be accepted. On the other hand, the end of the Fatimid state induced King Amalric and the Frankish nobility to undertake a series of diplomatic initiatives. They largely followed accustomed roads. Petitions were sent to Europe in 1171, although the delegation sent in 1169 had not yet returned and the bishop of Lydda and the sub-prior of the Holy Sepulchre travelled to the West with a communication from the king in 1173. These efforts, however, only brought in subsidies. The negotiations of the embassy to Constantinople in 1171, led by King Amalric himself, led to more solid results at first glance. Both sides agreed upon a new attack on Egypt and Amalric possibly submitted to Byzantine suzerainty.<sup>116</sup> The legal substance of this act is not completely clear. However, it further seems that after the end of the 1160s, the influence of Byzantine culture in the ceremonial, royal symbolism and architecture of the kingdom and the court reached its zenith; so it may at least be said that after 1169 Amalric increased his bet on cooperation with Byzantium against the Muslims. After Saladin's attacks on the south of the kingdom in 1170–71, an enterprise against Egypt might have seemed urgent to Amalric and this would only have given promise of success at this time if carried out with Byzantine help.

It has already been pointed out that a considerable number of the Frankish nobles were not ready to follow the king in his Byzantine alliance policy. It was perhaps because of this opposition that the planned campaign did not take place. The Byzantines again endeavoured in 1177 to move

<sup>114</sup> Al-Bundārī, 36; Barhebraeus, 302.

<sup>115</sup> Cf. *Gibb*, Life, 10–11; Elisséeff, *Nūr ad-Dīn*, II, 671.

<sup>116</sup> William of Tyre, XX, XX–XXI, 976–8; RHGF, XVI, no. CXC VII–CXC VIII, 198–9; Joannes Kinnamos, VI, 10, p. 280.

Jerusalem to attack Egypt.<sup>117</sup> Possibly, however, it was the rapprochement to Saladin which caused Amalric to neglect a campaign against Egypt with Byzantium after 1163. The reason lies perhaps even in the appeal for help made by the pro-Fatimid magnates in Cairo to the Franks and King William II of Sicily. In any case, the situation developed ever more favourably for the Franks at this time, in spite of Saladin's accession to power, and not only because of the growing tension between Saladin and Nur al-Din. Apparently, Rashid al-Din Sinan, who became the chief of the Nizaris in Jabal Bahra in central Syria at some date after 1162, also endeavoured to establish a closer relationship with the kingdom of Jerusalem. Already in the 1140s the Nizaris had fought with the princes of Antioch against Nur al-Din. In the mid-1160s, however, they were in conflict with the county of Tripoli.<sup>118</sup> Towards the end of Amalric's reign (1174?), according to William of Tyre, Sinan offered to accept conversion to Christianity with his subjects, if his annual tribute of 2,000 gold pieces to the Templars was waived. On the way back from the king, however, the Templars murdered his envoy Boaldelle (Abu 'Abdallah?) in spite of the safe conduct he was given, which led to a serious conflict between Amalric and the Order.<sup>119</sup>

The background to this report cannot be elucidated, since no other sources report the event. William indeed also mentions that Sinan had released his followers from compliance with the Islamic *shari'a* and ordered the demolition of mosques; but he seems to combine a later occurrence with the offer of the chief of the Nizaris. It is not really credible that the offer of conversion of which the chronicler speaks, is connected with the 1174-embassy. Even though the event is as a whole mysterious, it is nevertheless indisputable that at the time in question cooperation between the Franks and the Nizaris against Nur al-Din, and later against Saladin, was in the offing. The murder of the envoy could make no difference. So likewise the chronicles accused the pro-Fatimid conspirators around 'Umara al-Yamani of having asked for help from Amalric and also Sinan. Sinan was thus as the *de facto* independent leader of his religious community in Syria an important partner for the appeal, since the conspirators were concerned to move the Nizari Ismailis who had split off from the Fatimids in 1094, to end the schism. The uncle of one of the leading conspirators, who was at this time staying with the Franks, negotiated the contact.<sup>120</sup>

<sup>117</sup> William of Tyre, XXI, XVII, 1032–5; Joannes Kinnamos, VII, 3, p. 300.

<sup>118</sup> Benjamin of Tudela, 21–2/hebr. 24–5.

<sup>119</sup> William of Tyre, XX, XXIX–XXX, 995–9.

<sup>120</sup> Ibn Abī Ṭayy' in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 565.

Altogether there is a picture of many-layered diplomatic activities from 1169 onwards, with which the kingdom of Jerusalem reacted to the failure of its efforts to secure allies and expansion against Egypt. A rapprochement with Byzantium around 1171, beside the regularly continued appeals to Europe, belongs to this. In the last two years of the reign of Amalric I, the Franks were able to prevent the threatening Zengid encirclement through an agreement with Saladin and cooperation with Sinan. The positive answer to the Egyptian conspirators proves that the plans for the conquest of Egypt were not abandoned. Yet, support for it was expected from the Normans, not from Byzantium. The construction of a Christian bloc between Jerusalem and Byzantium is therefore as little visible as a Muslim bloc.

The result of this investigation into the treaty and alliance policies from 1150 to 1174 can then be summarised as follows: In none of the three historical phases of the investigation did the political and strategic changes in the Middle East lead to the construction of a front among the Christian or the Muslim states in the region, as is maintained in some modern historical writing. Indeed, particular alliances and attempts at cooperation appeared in this direction, but in the end the interests of the parties to the treaties diverged too greatly to result in long-term alliances. As far as the Christian states were concerned, the Byzantine interest in a Zengid-Frankish balance of power in northern Syria and the fear harboured by at least part of the Frankish nobility of direct Byzantine rule in Antioch, or in any case the hegemony of the Empire, prevented lasting cooperation against Nur al-Din. Later, it was anxiety over the loss of a share of the booty and the establishment of the Byzantines on the Nile which rendered King Amalric's efforts for joint enterprises against Egypt fruitless. In various letters sent to Europe it is clearly expressed that the Franks had no friendlier feeling for the Christian (although schismatic) Greeks than for the Muslim Turks. Similarly, there were no permanent alliances directed against the Franks among Muslim rulers. Nur al-Din agreed only briefly, during the Frankish-Byzantine campaign of 1158, to corresponding Egyptian advances and maintained his reserve towards later Fatimid offers of cooperation or intervention. It cannot be recognized that the *jihad* or the cooperation of Muslim states enjoyed any priority with Nur al-Din over the policy aiming at the extension of his own sphere of power. Even the end of the Fatimid state on the Nile did not lead to the encirclement feared by the Franks, since Saladin very soon developed an independent treaty and alliance policy towards the Christian states of Europe and the Levant. The lively diplomatic activity of the kingdom of Jerusalem from

1169 included Saladin and the Nizaris as well as Byzantium and the European monarchies.

During the period under investigation there were repeated conclusions of truces and condominium treaties between Franks and Muslims. But even without the existence of treaties, over very long periods peace dominated the Frankish-Zengid borderlands. The alliances offered or concluded by the Fatimid Wazirs Dirgham and Shawar to the Franks or to Nur al-Din show how little the alliance policy could be understood in Christian or Islamic terms. Cash-payments, possibly also offers of submission, accompanied them and the 'no place' doctrine motivated them. Egyptian alliance policy, directed solely at the maintenance of power, reveals that the leadership of the Fatimid state felt no particular affinity to the Muslim Turks. As in the previous decades, financial factors also influenced Frankish alliance policy. In addition, the king had to make concessions, again in the first place for financial reasons, to the interests of the knights and European pilgrims. This made a continuous alliance policy impossible for King Amalric I. It cannot be conclusively decided whether the Frankish-Egyptian alliances, like the treaty with Damascus after 1140, were contingency alliances, coming into force only when a Zengid attack provided the *casus foederis*. The events of 1167–68, however, point in this direction. In any case, the parties to the treaty did not balk at an antagonistic policy as long as no danger threatened from a third side. In this also the series of Fatimid-Frankish alliances resemble earlier alliances in their structure.

Finally, the Egyptian treaties in particular, whether with or against the Franks under Shawar and also Saladin, have shown the tactical, official and governmental character of the *jihad* propaganda in poems and state-papers. Nur al-Din up until the end of his life also used propaganda for the Holy War as an instrument for the consolidation of his power, in order to obtain legitimization from the caliph and to bring the amirs of southern Anatolia and northern Mesopotamia under his suzerainty. In any case, direct comparisons between political dealings and propaganda have proved the tactical function of propaganda and consequently its irrelevance for the formation of relationships with the Franks. The sharpest critics of this circumstance were Muslim jurists and scholars of religion who were independent of the courts. On the Frankish side, crusading ideology acquired significance for alliance policy only because the Oriental Franks were pressed towards an aggressive policy through their reinforcements at the time from Europe. At least in the breach of the treaty with Egypt in 1168 this seems to have been the case.

## FRANKS, ZENGIDS AND NIZARIS: THE SYRIAN LORDSHIPS CONFRONTING THE EXPANSION OF THE AYYUBID DOMINIONS (1174–83)

Two deaths, that of Nur al-Din on 15 May and that of Amalric I on 11 July, make the year 1174 a break in Frankish-Muslim relations. Since the nominal successors of both rulers were minors, al-Malik al-Salih Isma'īl being eleven years old and Baldwin IV thirteen, quarrels about the regency immediately flared up both in the Zengid realm and also in Jerusalem. They rapidly altered the division of power in the Middle East and had lasting effects on the relations between Franks and Muslims in Syria.

Directly after Nur al-Din's death, and partly in consequence of the conflict about the regency among various Zengid dignitaries, the sphere of control which Nur al-Din had ruled directly or indirectly disintegrated in the summer of 1174 into four rival parts: Damascus under a group of amirs and leading administrators with Ibn al-Muqaddam as military commander; Aleppo, where in July 1174 Gümüshtegin was able to install himself as the guardian of the successor to the throne and chief of a second group; Egypt under Saladin; and Mosul under al-Salih Isma'īl's uncle, Sayf al-Din Ghazi II, who immediately after Nur al-Din's death took possession of the territories as far as the Euphrates.<sup>121</sup> Saladin only found an opportunity to intervene some months later, after the repulse of the Norman attack on Alexandria and the suppression of a pro-Fatimid revolt in Upper Egypt. At the end of October, after an appeal for help from Ibn al-Muqaddam, he took Damascus. In two phases, from 1174 to 1176 and in 1182–83, Saladin succeeded in bringing under his control all the territories previously ruled by Nur al-Din. In 1182–83 he conquered extensive territories in northern Mesopotamia and on 11 June 1183 Aleppo fell at last into his hands. Finally, Saladin had, at least in theory, the whole potential strength of Muslim Syria and northern Mesopotamia at his disposal. Only the Nizaris in central Syria were able to maintain their autonomy.

Once again, as in the last years of Nur al-Din's reign, the Franks saw themselves facing a single, expansive realm, but with the difference that Saladin actually ruled Egypt as sovereign while Nur al-Din had only been ruler in name. This, from the Frankish point of view, constituted the most threatening constellation of power imaginable. In William of Tyre's words: 'Now our people fell prey to a double fear, for what they most feared had

<sup>121</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāhir*, 175–6; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 406–7.

come to pass [...]. All our people's territory on every side and round about seemed surrounded by his [Saladin's] power and people.<sup>122</sup> The structure of power in Syria from 1174 to 1183 resembled that prevailing between 1128 and 1157–58, when Zengi and his son Nur al-Din of Aleppo had pursued the expansion of their dominion over the whole of Muslim Syria. However, on this occasion the independence of the Syrian rulers was threatened not from the north, but from the south. It has already been shown that constellations of this kind had frequently led to Frankish-Muslim alliances motivated by the 'no place' doctrine. What was the situation between 1174 and 1183?

It is clear from the preceding investigation of alliances and treaties that it had been the rulers on the Frankish side, especially the kings of Jerusalem, who had pursued the strategy of alliance towards neighbouring Muslim rulers. Certainly, financial constraints and the limited obligations and willingness of their vassals to serve in enterprises outside the realm, always limited their freedom of choice. The contingents of European pilgrims, who had other interests, and the non-knightly troops had also frequently proved a special problem for the kings. Nevertheless, the kings of Jerusalem had so far had a dominant influence on the formation of policy towards the neighbouring Muslim states. However, all that ended after the death of Amalric I in 1174. His son, Baldwin IV (1174–85), had a regent until 1176 and was thereafter of very limited capacity as a ruler due to his leprosy. In 1183 he was compelled to hand over the administration of the realm temporarily to his brother-in-law Guy of Lusignan.<sup>123</sup> At the same time, power in the kingdom had since 1174 turned increasingly into a matter of dispute between a party of Oriental Frankish settler barons and a court party, chiefly composed of new incomers from the West. The respective power relations between these groups had a decisive influence on the filling of the regency, the position of the royal deputy after 1176 and the rules for the succession. These were the positions that replaced the king in formulating the policy towards neighbouring Muslim states. A further consequence of this development was that after 1174 the kingdom of Jerusalem had practically no influence on the treaty policy of the county of Tripoli and the principality of Antioch. The centrifugal forces received a marked impetus in the kingdom itself; for example, Reynald of Châtillon from 1181–82 at the latest pursued a policy towards the Muslims which

---

<sup>122</sup> William of Tyre, XXII, XXIV, 1114, XXXIII, 1109–1110.

<sup>123</sup> William of Tyre, XXII, XXV, 1116.

was independent of the central government. Thus, there arises the question as to the consequences of the Crown's loss of power and the increase of power by individual groups of vassals for the alliance policy after 1174.

Furthermore, the following section investigates whether there was a coordinated policy of the Frankish states of Syria and their Muslim neighbours, the Zengids and the Nizaris, towards Saladin and what significance the weakness of the kingdom of Jerusalem had for the alliance policy. But the relations between Saladin and the Frankish states, whether or not they were expressly defined by treaty, must remain in view. Saladin endeavoured from 1174 to legitimate his expansionist policy at the expense of the Zengids amongst others on the grounds that it was necessary to protect the Muslims from the Franks. This position found an especially eloquent echo in the documents of the Ayyubid chancery.<sup>124</sup> From 1175 it was part of its permanent propaganda repertoire (especially towards the caliph) to identify Saladin as a protagonist of the *jihād* and to discredit his opponents because of alleged links with the Franks.<sup>125</sup> The aim of this activity was to cast Saladin's usurpation into oblivion and to obtain a caliphal diploma of appointment for the Muslim territories to which the pressure of Ayyubid expansion was especially directed. Saladin took over from Nur al-Din not merely the themes and means of broadcasting the *jihād* propaganda but also even depicted the uniting of Islam (naturally, it was implied, under his rule) as the imperative premise for the liberation of Jerusalem. In other words, he associated the question of the legitimacy of his rule with the struggle against the Franks. There is thus the question whether Saladin, with the start of his advance towards Syria, gave up the close contacts with the Franks maintained until 1174, in favour of a more aggressive line.

A truce between Saladin and his Zengid and Artuqid opponents on 29 July 1176 concluded the first phase of Ayyubid expansion from Egypt into Syria. The Caliph al-Mustadi' had already confirmed Saladin's rule over Egypt and large parts of Syria in 1175.<sup>126</sup> How had the Franks and the successors to Nur al-Din reacted so far? Directly after Nur al-Din's death, the Franks under King Amalric had begun the siege of the border fortress of Baniyas. A fortnight later however, Amalric and the Zengid group around the minor al-Salih Isma'īl in Damascus agreed on a truce (*pax temporalis*,

<sup>124</sup> For instance Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 594–5, 597–8.

<sup>125</sup> Al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 623–4.

<sup>126</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 431; Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 668–9. Cf. Lyons/Jackson, Saladin, 107/8; al-Qalqashandī, X, 135–44.

*hudna*).<sup>127</sup> The Franks withdrew and obtained in return the liberation of twenty knights as well as money-payments (*qati'a*). The Damascenes had quite simply pressed for the rapid end of hostilities, so that neither Ghazi of Mosul nor Saladin should have reason to intervene. Ibn al-Athir gives pregnant expression to their motives: 'They held peace with the Franks to be better than waiting for some coming from the West and some from the East, while they themselves were occupied with their defence [i.e. against the Franks].' According to the Muslim sources, the Damascene negotiators warned the Franks that refusal of the offer of a treaty would inevitably result in an attack by all the Zengid princes and particularly by Saladin.<sup>128</sup>

Even if the concept does not occur in this connection, it is nevertheless clear that the group of Damascene amirs under Ibn al-Muqaddam, together with Nur al-Din's widow, were turning to the Franks with an appeal to the 'no place' doctrine, and in this they were successful. The Damascenes gave priority to the maintenance of the status quo over the *jihad* since only in this way could their independence be safeguarded. They must have rightly feared that the struggle against the Franks could serve as a pretext for princes outside Syria to seize power in their own spheres of influence. This incidentally was exactly how the group of Zengid amirs in Aleppo reproached Saladin after he had occupied Damascus in October 1174.<sup>129</sup> For the moment, the Damascenes had averted this danger through their treaty with Amalric. Saladin's harsh criticism of this agreement is therefore comprehensible as intervention under the pretext of protecting the Muslims against the Franks was denied to him.

However, in the summer of 1174 the situation altered drastically. Amalric died on 11 July; therefore there was at first no further initiative to be expected on the Frankish side. Shortly afterwards some members of the junta of amirs at Damascus brought Nur al-Din's son to Aleppo and took over power there together with the eunuch Gümüshtegin. Ibn al-Muqaddam in Damascus felt himself threatened by this group. As may be seen, Nur al-Din's rule had not disposed of the old historical and confessional rivalry between Aleppo and Damascus. When the Aleppo junta also allied themselves with Sayf al-Din Ghazi II of Mosul (whose help had been counted on in Damascus), Ibn al-Muqaddam resolved to summon Saladin to Damascus. Saladin took over the rule in the city in October

<sup>127</sup> William of Tyre, XX, XXXI, 1000–1; Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, XI, 408; al-Bundārī, 33.

<sup>128</sup> Especially Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, XI, 408.

<sup>129</sup> Ibn Abī Ṭayy' in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 607; al-Bundārī, 82.

and after an interlude of diplomacy he began his attack on Aleppo. In December he occupied Hims (only the town, not the citadel) and Hamah. Unable to achieve anything decisive, Saladin withdrew on 26 January 1175. In March he won the citadel of Hims, then Ba'labakk and on 13 April 1175 he defeated the united Zengid armies of Mosul and Aleppo at Hamah. A peace treaty on 6 May with his nominal sovereign, al-Salih Isma'il of Aleppo, ended hostilities for the time being.

What had been the counter-measures of Aleppo in these months? The chiefs around Gümüştegin had not restricted themselves to the obviously successful incitement of the people to fight for al-Salih Isma'il against the usurper Saladin.<sup>130</sup> Above all an attempt was made to obtain allies. At first an appeal for help, couched in the sense of the 'no place' doctrine, went to Sayf al-Din Ghazi II;<sup>131</sup> but also Rashid al-Din Sinan, the master of the Syrian Nizaris, and Count Raymond III of Tripoli were asked for support. Raymond had been freed from years of Zengid captivity only a few months beforehand and had assumed the regency of the kingdom of Jerusalem in the late autumn of 1174. Raymond responded to the call for help in the first place by diplomatic threats to Saladin; then he compelled him to withdraw from Aleppo by marching on Hims. Muslim sources ascribe Raymond's attack to a corresponding request from Aleppo; William of Tyre to one from the Zengid garrison besieged in Hims.<sup>132</sup> Apparently, Aleppo and Mosul attempted to conclude a firm alliance with the Franks after Saladin's withdrawal. At least, the head of Saladin's chancery, al-Qadi al-Fadil, mentioned in a letter to the caliph that the Zengids had declared themselves ready to hand over Harim and Shaqif Tirun to the Franks. In addition, hostages would be returned, Frankish prisoners liberated and arrested followers of Saladin handed over, with whom the Frankish prisoners held by Saladin could be redeemed. Unfortunately, there is no Frankish or Zengid evidence for this alliance. Yet it is certain that Raymond took no further action against Saladin, but negotiated a treaty with him while an army from Mosul and Aleppo was advancing against him.<sup>133</sup> This was only concluded after victory over the Zengids had come to Saladin on 13 April 1175.

<sup>130</sup> Ibn Abi Tayy' in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, 1/2, 609; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 418–9.

<sup>131</sup> Barhebraeus, 304.

<sup>132</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 419; Ibn Abi Tayy' in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, 1/2, 611; William of Tyre, XXI, VIII, 1017–8.

<sup>133</sup> Cf. al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Epistolae*, fol. 144v.

The contacts between the Zengids and Raymond are especially interesting for the Frankish alliance policy from 1174. Their echo in the Latin and Arabic chronicles admits very exact conclusions as to the motives of Raymond and the Franks. As chancellor and a partisan of Raymond of Tripoli, William of Tyre had an accurate insight into the process of decision-making in the kingdom.<sup>134</sup> He states that every increase in Saladin's power had been observed with suspicion in Jerusalem, since this had each time alike signified a loss of power for the Franks. They wanted to see to it that, with the taking of Aleppo, Saladin would not attack them more heavily with doubled power: 'It appears safer to lend help to the boy still in his nonage [i.e. al-Salih Isma'il], not for his sake, but to maintain an opponent against our more suspicious rival.'<sup>135</sup> It was hoped thereby to weaken Saladin's attacks on the Franks.

Raymond thus held himself ready to intervene with his own forces and those of Jerusalem. Not that he advanced northwards to relieve Aleppo under siege, but (according to the evidence of the chronicler William) he waited to see which of the two rival Muslim parties would call for his help. The opportunity to liberate the hostages whom Raymond had provided for the still unpaid portion of his ransom was the decisive factor for the Zengids. The hostages were in Hims, the garrison of which was besieged in the citadel by an Ayyubid unit.<sup>136</sup> According to 'Imad al-Din al-Katib al-Isfahani, who just at this time had entered Saladin's service as secretary, the Zengids had accounted for their call to Raymond for help as follows: 'You are our freedman and our legal claim upon you is apparent.'<sup>137</sup> It would perhaps be an exaggeration to interpret this as signifying a relationship of subordination. Presumably, it is rather an allusion to Raymond's still being in debt to the Zengids, since portions of his ransom had not yet been paid. But the liberation of the hostages did not ensue, since the advance of a relieving army from Mosul gave the besieged garrison the hope of being able to dispense with Frankish help. Saladin succeeded in taking the citadel of Hims in March 1175, thereby also gaining possession of the hostages. It is significant that Raymond forthwith ended his support of the Zengids and entered into negotiations with Saladin without consideration of the further course of the Zengid-Ayyubid conflict. Saladin offered Raymond the liberation of the hostages in return for the

---

<sup>134</sup> Hiestand, *Leben*, 355–7.

<sup>135</sup> William of Tyre, XXI, VI, 1012–4.

<sup>136</sup> William of Tyre, XXI, VIII, 1017–8.

<sup>137</sup> Al-Bundārī, 84.

maintenance of Frankish neutrality. Accordingly, a truce was concluded, presumably in April 1175, with the assistance of the constable of the kingdom of Jerusalem, Humphrey of Toron, who was well known because of his good contacts with various Muslim amirs.<sup>138</sup>

From all this it emerges that on the Frankish side the consequences of Saladin's advance to Syria were clearly analysed and the result of this analysis was a reorientation of the alliance policy. However, the Franks obviously had problems in answering the question with whom they should cooperate. That Saladin found no obstruction when he took Damascus with a small force in October 1174 need not be accounted for by considerations of alliance policy—there had been close diplomatic contact with Saladin in the previous months. Presumably after the death of Amalric I, Jerusalem was still overly occupied with problems of the succession to the throne and the regency. Yet, when Saladin besieged Aleppo at the beginning of 1175 and achieved superiority over his opponents, Jerusalem was again able to act. Raymond decided at this point to assist the Zengids in order to reinstate the previous balance of power. This decision and the march on Hims only corresponded to his political interests—it was a matter of the liberation of his hostages. The case was similar in the spring of 1175. At the time when a superior army from Mosul and Aleppo moved against Saladin, and thus once again one of the Muslim sides threatened to gain the upper hand, Raymond gave up his support of the Zengids and made common cause with Saladin. Thus, it is undeniable that Raymond was not really thinking in strategic terms or wishing to prevent either side having new supremacy, but sought each time his personal advantage, so it is not clear whether strategy or self-interest was his primary criterion of decision.<sup>139</sup> For the first time since the firm establishment of the kingdom in Jerusalem in the first decade of the twelfth century it becomes plain here that the private interest of one of the great barons was of decisive weight in the formation of treaty policy. Nevertheless, the regent Raymond's conduct in 1174–75 is only the first in a series of similar occurrences which appeared after the end of a powerful Crown of Jerusalem in 1174.

The sources do not give quite such precise information about the Frankish alliance policy during the renewed outbreak of the Zengid-Ayyubid conflict in the summer of 1176. It appears certain, however, that the

---

<sup>138</sup> William of Tyre, XXI, VIII–IX, 1018–9.

<sup>139</sup> William of Tyre, XXI, VIII, 1017, 1019.

treaty of neutrality between Saladin and Raymond was at first followed, although Saladin harboured doubts as to its durability.<sup>140</sup> The Franks took no initiative until the battle of Tall al-Sultan on 22 April 1176, when Saladin gained a second victory over the united Zengid forces of Mosul and Aleppo. The Zengids had already before this battle released prominent Frankish prisoners including Reynald of Châtillon and Joscelin III, the son of the last count of Edessa, possibly with the condition that there should be Frankish assistance against Saladin.<sup>141</sup> But William of Tyre says nothing of this. There is no doubt that only after the battle of Tall al-Sultan did Raymond of Tripoli and King Baldwin IV (now of full age) attack Ayyubid territory. An expedition by the king to Damascus and enterprises by him and Raymond in the Biqa' took place in July and the beginning of August.<sup>142</sup> These attacks coincided with the time when Saladin besieged Aleppo, 'Azaz and finally the Nizaris' centre of Masyaf; his conclusion of peace with the Zengids and Artuqids at the end of July was presumably still not known in the south. It cannot be finally proved that the Frankish raids were arranged at Zengid request; but since the Aleppines asked the Nizaris (as previously in 1175) to murder Saladin, there is reason to presume that Raymond of Tripoli was again asked to help.<sup>143</sup> Again, the Franks only intervened when Saladin threatened to succeed in taking Aleppo. The Frankish-Ayyubid truce of 1175 had possibly already expired at this time.

The decisive difference between the Frankish policy of 1175–76 and the 'no place' alliances of earlier years lies in the fact that there was no strong monarch to shape the alliance policy and that the Franks had just as unpleasant consequences to fear from a clear victory of the Zengids over Saladin as from Saladin's victory. This explains the fact that the Franks always intervened only if the course of the fighting appeared to turn out unilaterally in favour of one of the parties, but concluded no firm alliances with the Zengids. It may at least be said that the Aleppines responded to Saladin's intervention in Syria with approaches for an alliance to Mosul, the Nizaris and the Franks, thereby proceeding in the sense of the 'no place' doctrine. This is particularly interesting since these Aleppines had been Nur al-Din's highest amirs and administrators when the *jihad* had

<sup>140</sup> Letter by al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Epistolae*, fol. 144v.

<sup>141</sup> Al-Bundārī, 94; Barhebraeus, 305. Cf. William of Tyre, XXI, XI, 1023.

<sup>142</sup> Especially Al-Bundārī, 106; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 437; William of Tyre, XXI, X–XI, 1020–3.

<sup>143</sup> Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 658–62.

been so intensively propagated and cooperation with the Franks officially frowned upon. It fits this context that the Franks harboured official resentment against Saladin, unlike Nur al-Din, because he was a usurper.<sup>144</sup> Raymond is said to have told him in 1175–76: ‘This is nothing that should be done, because you have done ill to your lord’s house instead of good.’<sup>145</sup> This argument against Saladin is almost word for word that of the Zengids. Franks and Zengids accordingly regarded themselves as legitimists; their rule in Syria was recognized in spite of the propaganda on both sides. Even Saladin had also indicated in his letter of condolence on the death of Amalric I in 1174, and in the titlature it contained, that he did not balk at a sort of recognition of Frankish rule, at least in diplomatic dealings. The idea of legitimization was doubtless an element in Frankish-Muslim relations at least at the level of protocol.

The extension of Saladin’s power to Syria came to a temporary end with his treaty with the Zengids in July 1176. In September he returned to Egypt. Following the already known process, the Syrian alliances broke up at this moment because the common threat ceased. In 1177 the wazir of the Nizaris was murdered in Aleppo.<sup>146</sup> The Franks arrested Artuqid envoys, who travelled to Egypt in 1176 to obtain Saladin’s oath on a document regulating the ending of all hostilities.<sup>147</sup> Their lords, the Artuqid princes of Mardin and Hisn Kayfa, had a few months previously belonged to those opponents of Saladin who endeavoured to get Frankish assistance. Nothing is known of the relationship between Antioch and Aleppo, but no reports of fighting have come down to us. Saladin installed his brother Turanshah as governor in Damascus with the express instruction to keep his eye on contacts between Aleppo and the Franks.<sup>148</sup> Instead of this, Turanshah, as Saladin’s brother, allowed himself a quite independent policy. He maintained friendly relations with al-Salih Isma‘il of Aleppo,<sup>149</sup> and apparently also concluded a truce with the Franks, although Saladin was not particularly keen on it. In any case, during the famine in Syria he exported (in 1177?) 1,000 ardabbs of grain to the Frankish territories and averted Frankish raids by money-payments.<sup>150</sup> Perhaps this had been decided in his truce with Jerusalem. In short, the existing alliance structures broke

<sup>144</sup> William of Tyre, XXI, VI, 1012–3. Cf. Hartmann, *Persönlichkeit*, 27, 37–43.

<sup>145</sup> Barhebraeus, 304.

<sup>146</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 445; Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, ed. Haydarabad, VIII, 350.

<sup>147</sup> Al-Bundārī, 122–3; Ibn Abī Ṭayy’ in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 691–2.

<sup>148</sup> Ibn Abī Ṭayy’ in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 665.

<sup>149</sup> ‘Imād al-Dīn, *Barq* (Bruce II), fol. 120r.

<sup>150</sup> ‘Imād al-Dīn, *Barq* (Bruce II), fol. 25r; al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Mukātabāt*, fols. 3r–v.

up, since without Saladin's pressure they did not correspond to existing interests and lines of conflict.

Externally, the situation of the Frankish states was thus by no means bad, as can be seen from the fact that no appeal for help to the West is known for the years 1174–79. Requests from the East, which had been sent at the beginning of the 1170s during Nur al-Din's lifetime, stimulated the pope's efforts for peace between France and England. Yet, the court of Jerusalem endeavoured to find a successor for Baldwin IV in the West. It is thus not surprising that when Count Philip of Flanders came to the kingdom in the autumn of 1177, he was offered the government and also the supreme command of a Frankish-Byzantine expedition to conquer Egypt.<sup>151</sup> The count declined both offers. The course and consequences of his stay in the East highlight the manner in which treaty and alliance policy was formed after 1174.

It is difficult to gain an exact understanding of the negotiations about the offer to the count of a leading role in the kingdom or about an attack on Egypt with Flemish participation, nor will this be attempted here. William of Tyre's *History* is the only really meaningful source at our disposal and William was strongly engaged against the count. As chancellor he led the Frankish side in negotiations with Philip about an attack on Egypt, to be carried out jointly with a Byzantine fleet. This fleet was in fulfilment of a treaty between Amalric I and Manuel Comnenus in Acre in 1171.<sup>152</sup> William ascribes the guilt for the failure of the campaign plans solely to Philip of Flanders. Since William's predilection for a pro-Byzantine alliance policy against Egypt is clear from his time under his mentor, Amalric I, a blind trust in his presentation is excluded, especially the statement that the nobility of Jerusalem were willing and ready for an attack. Even in Amalric's time the nobility were little interested in the king's Egyptian policy. Under his successor, Baldwin, the barons even gained a decisive influence over policy. Two opponents of dependence on Byzantium, Reynald of Châtillon, the former prince of Antioch, and the Seneschal Joscelin III, both members of the court party, exerted the only really decisive influence on the alliance policy since 1176. Furthermore, Raymond III of Tripoli and Bohemond III of Antioch were accused of having influenced Philip of Flanders to reject an attack on Egypt, in order to include Philip's contingent in the pursuit of their own expansionist

---

<sup>151</sup> William of Tyre, XXI, XIV, 1027–9.

<sup>152</sup> William of Tyre, XXI, XVI–XVIII, 1030–5.

intentions in Syria.<sup>153</sup> If this interpretation is correct, that the rulers of the northern Frankish states and members of the court party in Jerusalem secretly (in order not openly to violate the treaty with Byzantium) and successfully prevented the Egyptian project, this would be a second example after Raymond's policy from 1174 to 1176 of the alteration of the treaty and alliance policy through the breakdown of the royal power.

The operations carried out in central and northern Syria in 1177–78 with Philip's participation are better documented. Together with a detachment from Jerusalem, the count of Tripoli, the prince of Antioch and Armenian support, Philip attacked Hamah, which lay in Saladin's sphere of power. He was repulsed and then besieged Harim. Meanwhile, Saladin undertook a relief attack in the south of the kingdom and the Franks decisively defeated him at Montgisard near al-Ramla at the end of November 1177. The months-long siege of Harim deserves special attention.

In 1177 Harim belonged to the territory under the rule of al-Salih Isma'īl of Aleppo, who had granted it in *iqta'* to the regent, Gümüshtegin, whose relations with his master and his entourage were extremely strained. Because of this Gümüshtegin prepared to flee to Harim. He was suspected, rightly or not, of wanting to sell his fortress to the Franks.<sup>154</sup> He was arrested and tortured to death before the fortress in order to enforce its surrender and at this point the garrison possibly contacted the Franks. However, a contemporary Syrian source says that shortly before, Gümüshtegin had received a promise of help from the Franks in return for his subordination to the prince of Antioch.<sup>155</sup> The Franks are said to have plighted themselves to help by an oath on the cross and the gospel. A first contingent, hastily sent over from Antioch, was too weak to confront the besiegers from Aleppo. For the army of Philip, Raymond III and Bohemond III, repulsed from Hamah, this situation presented new possibilities. But instead of fulfilling the treaty with the garrison and rendering help, the Franks themselves besieged Harim under pressure from the count of Flanders; 'they trod their oaths underfoot', in the words of one source.<sup>156</sup> For Antioch, which had to provision the Frankish army, the protracted siege soon became a burden. This may have been a reason why Bohemond III showed himself very open to offers of peace from Aleppo. Al-Salih Isma'īl offered him a sum of money and half the villages belonging to the fortress

<sup>153</sup> William of Tyre, XXI, XVIII, 1034–5.

<sup>154</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, III, 34–5.

<sup>155</sup> Michael Syrus, 375.

<sup>156</sup> Michael Syrus, 375–6. Cf. Chronicon ad A.C. 1234 pertinens, II, 142.

(i.e. a condominium) in return for abandoning the siege. It is not known whether the condominium between Antioch and Aleppo over Shih al-Hadid, mentioned in another source, was already in existence or was also agreed in the truce concluded at the end of March 1178.<sup>157</sup> The following argument of the Aleppines was of decisive importance for the final conclusion of this agreement: they pointed out that Saladin was preparing for intervention and if the besieged surrendered Harim to him, he would establish himself in direct proximity to the Franks (and naturally the Aleppines also).<sup>158</sup> To avoid this, Bohemond thus presumably concluded a separate peace. He withdrew from Harim, thereby wrecking the siege and a little later the garrison surrendered their fortress to the Aleppines.

The example of this enterprise demonstrates that the Franks still pursued an expansionist policy, in the context of which they were ready to cooperate with Muslim rulers and form relationships of suzerainty—as had already been the case with the first princes of Antioch and counts of Edessa. It proves furthermore that their European allies pressed the Franks to confrontation. They were hardly able to adhere to the treaty relationships into which they had entered under this pressure. The example of Harim, however, emphasizes the continuing significance of the ‘no place’ doctrine for alliance policy. At the moment when the count of Flanders’ policy of confrontation began to offer Saladin a pretext for intervention, an acute threat to Aleppo and Antioch, both sides sought for a compromise behind the Europeans’ backs. The recurring divergence between the interest of the Oriental Frankish settlers in treaty relations and the European pilgrims’ will to fight the heathen was here manifested anew. It was not jealousy about the glory of victorious Europeans, but the ‘no place’ doctrine which brought Bohemond III to break off the campaign. A body of instruments were available for the balance of interests, its outstanding element being the establishment of condominiums. During the entire period of this investigation, the ‘no place’ doctrine was decisive for the policy of Mosul and the Nizaris also. But with the Frankish-Ayyubid fighting in 1177–78, the attack on Hamah and the defeat of Saladin, we also come up against a new element in Frankish-Muslim treaty policy. The following observation comes from Saladin’s secretary, al-Katib al-Isfahani:

<sup>157</sup> Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Zubda*, III, 48.

<sup>158</sup> Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Zubda*, III, 37; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 446; ʿImād al-Dīn, *Barq* (Bruce 11), fol. 26v.

One of the Frankish terms of the truce stated that if a king or magnate came from them [? *lahum*], whereby they had no power to hold him back, they might then help him and not place themselves in opposition to him; they would be his allies and not oppose him. If he then returned the truce shall come in force again as it had previously been valid. Hostile conduct should then be null and void.<sup>159</sup>

This passage once again entirely confirms the existence of a truce when the Flemings arrived in Jerusalem. Above all, however, it indicates that in the field of treaty technicalities a solution was found for the continual conflicts arising from the Franks' dependence on European help and the divergence between the Oriental Frankish settlers' policy of diplomacy and the European policy of confrontation. The 'suspension clause' and the condominiums are the two elements which the technique of Frankish-Muslim treaties differentiates from the agreements among Franks or among Muslims in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Unfortunately, it cannot be said when this clause first appeared in a treaty. It is encountered often in the thirteenth century, but there are no other instances of it in the twelfth century. One must particularly beware of the idea that it formed part of the standing repertoire of treaties from a fixed point in time—perhaps the Second Crusade.<sup>160</sup> The military influx of equally important troops of pilgrims under Henry the Lion and Stephen of Blois in 1172, or similarly 1186, did not lead to clashes; existing truces were respected. More remarkably, the next treaty between Saladin and Jerusalem (1180) was concluded as truce in force by land and sea, for indigenous people and aliens.<sup>161</sup> It seems that by this arrangement an express departure from the suspension clause was desired. Since the treaty of 1180 proved unfavourable to the Franks, this was certainly the result of Muslim pressure. Nevertheless, the suspension clause is an eloquent example of how in Syria inter-state cooperation could be organized in spite of the permanent problems arising from European reinforcements.

Al-Katib al-Isfahani's passage concerning the suspension clause incidentally gives an insight into the way in which the propagandists in the Ayyubid chancery used to work. While Saladin's secretary expressly points out that the Frankish campaign with Philip of Flanders did not breach a treaty, the head of chancery, al-Qadi al-Fadil, castigates these fights as a

<sup>159</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn, *Barq* (Bruce 11), fol. 25v (also in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, 1/2, 706).

<sup>160</sup> As implied by Hiestand, *Kreuzzug und Friedensidee*, 52.

<sup>161</sup> William of Tyre, XXII, I, 1063.

breach of treaty in a letter to Baghdad, although he obviously knew better.<sup>162</sup> Al-Qadi al-Fadil had previously in 1174 at one and the same time sent a cordial letter of condolence to Baldwin IV and shown to a Muslim addressee unconcealed joy at the death of Amalric I, whom he loaded with all kinds of imprecations. Al-Katib al-Isfahani acted similarly. He frankly acknowledges in his chronicle that in 1178 the Aleppines concluded peace with the prince of Antioch out of fear of Saladin. On the other hand, he gave the impression in an official letter that nothing was known in Aleppo of the approach of the 'saving' relief force. Another letter to Baghdad claims that the Franks may possibly have asked for peace because they had heard of Saladin's approach.<sup>163</sup> Quite obviously the Ayyubid chancery did not take truth seriously when it was a matter of depicting Saladin as a *mujahid* and serving his interests. This should be kept in view in the investigation of the reproaches later levelled by the Ayyubids because of alleged Zengid-Frankish alliances from 1181 to 1183 and the connected interpretation of the significance of the *jihad* for Saladin.

The suspension clause seems in fact to have fulfilled its purpose in 1178. Philip returned home after Easter (9 April); Saladin did remain in Syria longer, but undertook no hostile activities. When his subordinate, Ibn al-Muqaddam, rebelled because Saladin demanded that he should surrender Ba'labakk, Jerusalem did not intervene. Ibn al-Muqaddam had allegedly made contact with the Franks, and according to Michael the Syrian (who was staying in Acre just in 1179), had promised his submission on oath.<sup>164</sup> The treaty was thus observed. An expedition against Hamah likewise took place in 1178 or 1179. Arabic sources depicted it as a breach of truce and therefore as particularly heinous, and thus it served Saladin as a pretext for the public massacre of the Frankish prisoners by men of religion.<sup>165</sup> Yet, this attack was apparently not an 'official' enterprise by the king or the count of Tripoli. Perhaps it was one of the attacks of the Hospitallers, to whom the Tripolitanian territories south-west of Hamah had been transferred in 1144 with extensive rights of autonomy. Their agreement was particularly needed in truces between Tripoli and the Muslims. The Order had possessed similar privileges in Antioch since 1168. It may perfectly well be that the knights of the Order (if they were the attackers in 1178) did not feel bound by the treaty which had resumed its force after

<sup>162</sup> In Abū Shāma, *Rawdatayn*, I/2, 706.

<sup>163</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn, *Barq* (Bruce 11), fols. 26v, 42v, 45r.

<sup>164</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn, *Barq* (Bruce 11), fol. 103v.

<sup>165</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn, *Barq* (Bruce 11), fols. 96v–98v.

the ending of the fighting before Harim. Unfortunately, the Latin sources do not reveal anything of the conditions and territorial validity of this truce, while Arabic sources remain very vague. How far were Tripoli and Antioch included in it and when was it to expire? Is it possible that there were differences of interpretation about its territorial validity?

However that may be, there are other indications that in this period the knightly Orders began to act independently of the Frankish rulers towards the Muslims. When Saladin attacked the county of Tripoli in 1180, Raymond III could do nothing about it, since the knightly Orders barricaded themselves in their castles and would not assist the count in the open country.<sup>166</sup> Ernoul, one of the Old French continuators of the chronicle of William of Tyre, describes a still more blatant example. According to this, the Templars invited the king to build the castle at Jacob's Ford on the upper Jordan, later known as Le Chastellet or Bayt al-Ahzan. Baldwin IV answered that he was not allowed to erect a castle during the truce. Thereupon the members of the Order made it clear that they themselves would build the castle and simply asked for a protective escort against possible Muslim disruptive action.<sup>167</sup> Unfortunately, the veracity of this passage is doubtful. Ernoul's chronology is wrong: he places the beginning of the construction of fortress, actually 1178, in the time after the peace of 1180 between Jerusalem and Saladin. Furthermore, according to William of Tyre, the king commanded the building and he transferred that castle to the Templars only after its completion.<sup>168</sup> On the other hand Ernoul is supported by the fact that in 1178 a truce prevailed between Jerusalem and the Ayyubids and the building of the castle could have contravened this. He further reports correctly that Saladin contacted the king because of the building—a fact William omitted. Muslim sources prove that Saladin offered to discharge the king's expenditure with 60,000 dinars (later even 100,000) if the building works were interrupted.<sup>169</sup> This is the first time that there is mention of an interdict on fortification during the period of a truce's validity. Like the suspension clause, this is a legal requirement which otherwise is known only from the thirteenth century. This clause did possibly not apply to the whole kingdom, although Ernoul says *en nulle tiere*, but only for the condominia. That was certainly still the case

---

<sup>166</sup> William of Tyre, XXII, II, 1064.

<sup>167</sup> Ernoul, VII, 52.

<sup>168</sup> William of Tyre, XXI, XXVI, 1050–51.

<sup>169</sup> Ernoul, VII, 52–3.

of al-Sawad in 1178–79.<sup>170</sup> In brief, there is something to be said for taking Ernoul's report seriously as a piece of evidence for the increasingly independent policy of the knightly Orders towards the Muslims. Possibly after 1174, they sought to push through the rights which they already possessed in Tripoli and Antioch in view of the weakness of the Crown and their own increasing significance in the kingdom. In any event, Saladin and Baldwin IV again adhered to the treaty after Easter 1178.

The phase of relatively peaceful relations between Franks and Muslims in Syria came to an end. It is not known when the truce interrupted by Philip of Flanders' campaign expired. The months from presumably April to October 1179 elapsed against a background of heavy fighting between the Franks and Saladin. Frankish attacks set them off, which to all appearances were not carried out for the sake of new conquests. Saladin's secretary commented in his account of the prince of Antioch's and the count of Tripoli's raids that the Franks wanted to compel Saladin to split up his forces. The conclusion of a truce would have allowed him to concentrate his troops against the Franks elsewhere. Perhaps it was known to the Franks that Saladin had announced to the caliph—after putting down Ibn Muqaddam's revolt—that 1179 would be the year of the taking of Jerusalem.<sup>171</sup> Saladin had forced his own hand with his repeated announcements of the *jihad*. At the end of April or beginning of May, an envoy from the caliph stayed with Saladin, who was at this time involved in a territorial dispute with the Rum Seljuk Sultan Qilij Arslan. The envoy will have reminded him of his promises and Saladin endeavoured to make an impression as a *mujahid*.<sup>172</sup> The Zengids of Mosul incidentally also felt Saladin's presence in Syria as a danger, since their relations with him, which had been friendly in the meantime, cooled off again. In a letter to Baghdad, Saladin accused them of new contacts with the Franks and Nizaris.<sup>173</sup> For the third time within very few years, after the Frankish-Zengid alliances of 1174–76 and the ending of the siege of Harim in 1178 through the treaty between Bohemond III and al-Salih Isma'il, the fear of Saladin thus brought about a rapprochement between the states and rulers in Syria and northern Mesopotamia. Yet, it was a novelty that a Muslim ruler, Saladin, should no longer merely make use of the *jihad* propaganda as an instrument, but should come under massive pressure

<sup>170</sup> William of Tyre, XXII, XV, 1090.

<sup>171</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn, *Barq* (Bruce 11), fols. 112r, 46v.

<sup>172</sup> Michael Syrus, 137–8.

<sup>173</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn, *Barq* (Bruce 11), fol. 104r–v.

through his own propaganda for the legitimization of his rule, actually to move against the Franks.

The resumption of confrontation through the Franks and the building of the castles of Bayt al-Ahzan and Hunin in 1178–79, must accordingly be understood as preventive measures against the Ayyubid threat and in the context also of the reorientation of alliance policy of the other Syrian and north Mesopotamian rulers. The fights which had the heaviest Frankish casualties on the north-east borders of the kingdom of Jerusalem and in the county of Tripoli, especially the defeat and death of the Constable Humphrey of Toron, the battle of Marj ‘Uyun and the destruction of Bayt al-Ahzan, are not of interest here. By contrast, it is more informative that Saladin, in spite of his victories, made no attempt ‘to liberate for Islam’ Jerusalem or indeed the Holy Land as a whole in accordance with his announcements. Just at the end of August 1179, during the taking of the newly built Frankish castle, an ambassador of Raymond III of Tripoli was again to be found in his camp—a further instance of the independence of the count’s treaty policy.<sup>174</sup> Furthermore, it is certain that from the end of the same year at the latest, Saladin was determined to conclude a treaty with the Franks. His head of chancery, al-Qadi al-Fadil, in a letter to Saladin’s nephew Farrukhshah from the first quarter of 1180, spoke of a truce with the Franks as already a matter of fact—perhaps the preliminaries had already been negotiated.<sup>175</sup> In spite of some Ayyubid raids, the situation was sufficiently relaxed for the conflict over the throne in Jerusalem to flare up sharply in the spring. The cause was an advance of the prince of Antioch and the count of Tripoli into the kingdom. Baldwin IV feared some sort of coup and so made hasty arrangements for the succession by the marriage of his sister Sibylla to the newly arrived Guy of Lusignan.<sup>176</sup> Saladin did not exploit the friction among the Franks for his ostensible aim, the *jihad*, but he made rather diplomatic preparations for an attack on Qilij Arslan.<sup>177</sup> Exactly when Baldwin IV sent a delegation to Saladin to negotiate a truce is not known. In any case, Saladin agreed to a conclusion; according to William of Tyre, this was because of the shortage of provisions following the years-long drought. A treaty of two years’ duration, effective by land and sea, for locals and aliens, was agreed upon which gave no special advantages to the Franks. Ratified by oaths,

<sup>174</sup> ‘Imād al-Dīn, *Barq* (Bruce 11), fol. 144r; al-Malik al-Manṣūr, *Miḍmār*, 29.

<sup>175</sup> Al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Epistolae*, fols. 37v, 38v.

<sup>176</sup> William of Tyre, XXII, I, 1062.

<sup>177</sup> Al-Bundārī, 175.

it was already in force at the beginning of June. A few weeks later after a short, but violent invasion, Saladin concluded an apparently analogous truce with Tripoli.<sup>178</sup>

Muslim sources of both Ayyubid and Zengid provenance leave no doubt at all that it was not the bad economic condition of Syria, but the determination to attack the Rum Seljuks, that brought Saladin to conclude a truce.<sup>179</sup> Saladin gave this aim priority over both the *jihad* and a withdrawal to the Nile, urgently necessary in the view of his head of chancery for the audit of the desperate financial administration and for protection against revolts in Upper Egypt.<sup>180</sup> With a successful campaign in the second half of 1180, Saladin redrew the balance of power in southern Anatolia and northern Mesopotamia in his own favour and formally satisfied his *jihad* propaganda with a short campaign against the Armenian principality. The treaties with Jerusalem and Tripoli remained in force.

Thus, the patterns of policy peculiar to the system of Syrian autonomous lordships originating in the first half of the twelfth century continued in the years 1177–80, particularly the importance of the ‘no place’ doctrine and the setting aside of conflicts with the help of the range of diplomatic instruments which had developed. Besides the suspension clause, which is demonstrable in this period, two factors especially appear which gained more and more influence in the formation of inter-state relations: first, in view of the weakness of the Crown of Jerusalem, the interests of individual rulers, barons and knightly Orders on the Frankish side; secondly, the role of the *jihad* propaganda for Saladin. The consequence of the former was that it became ever more difficult to follow a unified line in the treaty and alliance policy of Jerusalem. This affected both a possible Byzantine alliance against Saladin and a coordinated reaction of the Syrian states against Ayyubid expansion such as the Zengids had apparently striven for in 1178–79. Owing to the latter factor, Saladin’s own propaganda drove him to confrontation, since he legitimated the expansion of his power at the expense of Muslim rulers as efforts for the *jihad*. Saladin could indeed not do otherwise than carry out repeated *jihad* enterprises. But the example of the fighting of 1179–80 shows that in this period at least his own interest was not to fight the Franks and that he endeavoured to make treaties at an early point. The Franks and Zengids could come to terms with the

<sup>178</sup> William of Tyre, XXII, I, 1063, 1065–6.

<sup>179</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 464. Cf. Ibn Wāṣil, II, 96–7; Ernoul, VII, 51–2.

<sup>180</sup> Al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Epistolae*, fol. 38r–v.

existence of an Ayyubid lordship in Syria in itself, as the relaxed, reciprocal contacts in the peaceful years 1176 to 1178 showed, when Turanshah was governor of Damascus. The Ayyubids became a problem for their neighbours only through Saladin's expansionist endeavours, pursued for the sake of power-politics and to legitimate his rule. Both these factors had an increasingly clear effect until 1183, the year of the taking of Aleppo and the unification of formerly Zengid Syria in Saladin's hands.

The duration of Saladin's truce with the kingdom of Jerusalem presumably extended from the spring of 1180 to April 1182. The dates are not exactly known, but the period of validity might this time also have been linked to the Easter festival, falling on 2 March in 1182. The treaties frequently lapse soon after Easter. In this way, the Franks could reinforce themselves with armed pilgrims who spent the days of the festival in Jerusalem. After his return from northern Syria, Saladin spent most of his time in various administrative, military and fiscal reorganization schemes. Among the Franks, the struggle for power between the barons' party on one side and the court party with King Baldwin IV and his mother Agnes of Courtenay on the other became meanwhile more marked. The inner details of these quarrels are only of significance here insofar as they exercised an influence on relations with the Muslims. The result was that the party of the Oriental Frankish settler barons around Raymond III of Tripoli, Reynald of Sidon and the noble Ibelin family temporarily lost their influence at court. Not only the holders of the most important court offices such as the grand master of the Templars and Reynald of Châtillon, the most powerful vassal, belonged to the opposing court party, but since 1180 also the husband of the heiress presumptive to the throne, Guy of Lusignan. Raymond's relationship with the king was so strained since he and Bohemond III had intervened in the kingdom in 1180 that he stayed out of the kingdom for two years. When he wanted to visit his principality of Galilee, a fief of Jerusalem, in the spring of 1182, Baldwin IV forbade his entry.<sup>181</sup> A further indication of Raymond's declining influence is to be seen in the defeat of his follower William of Tyre in the patriarchal election of 1180 by Archbishop Heraclius of Caesarea, the nominee of the court party.<sup>182</sup> At about the same time, the end of 1180, a serious conflict broke out in Antioch between Bohemond III and the Church as well as some vassals, because he had repudiated his wife in order to marry his mistress. In consequence

<sup>181</sup> William of Tyre, XXII, IX, 1077–8.

<sup>182</sup> L'Estoire d'Eracles, XXII, XXXVIII, 57–9; Ernoul, VIII, 82–4.

relations between Bohemond and Jerusalem rapidly deteriorated. In Jerusalem, forcible intervention was even considered and only the fear that Bohemond would perhaps make sure of Turkish support (i.e. from Saladin) brought about the failure of this project.<sup>183</sup> A deep rift thus existed during 1180–81 between the two northern Frankish rulers and Jerusalem, where the king was under the influence of members of the court party. This means not only that a coordinated Frankish reaction to Saladin's expansion became more difficult but also that the section of the nobility which since 1174 had carried forward the 'no place' policy, admittedly through their personal interests, were for the time being out of power. In the current situation of Jerusalem, this development had a particularly serious effect. Since the heavy defeats of 1179–80, when for the first time since the decade began an appeal for help was sent to Europe, when an alliance with Byzantium after the death of Manuel Comnenus following the conclusion of a Byzantine-Ayyubid treaty had become impossible and the Franks had lost the initiative to Saladin, the continuation of the traditional 'no place' alliance policy would have been the best means for securing the Frankish states.<sup>184</sup>

The history of the truce which ran until 1182 and the Zengid-Ayyubid fighting around Aleppo in 1182–83 show what consequences these developments had for the relationship between Jerusalem and Saladin. In spite of the valid truce, several Frankish attacks were carried out against Ayyubid territory. In July–August 1181 Frankish ships attacked the Egyptian coast at Tinnis. In October–November the frontier town of al-'Arish was surprised and about the same time Reynald of Châtillon made an expedition to Tayma' in the northern Hijaz.<sup>185</sup> As far as the two enterprises against Egyptian territory are concerned, we do not hear that they were breaches of the current treaty. Did its validity only extend over Syria like that of the suspended treaty of 1176? The case of Reynald was otherwise. Frankish sources report that he was guilty of openly breaching the truce by intercepting a rich Egyptian caravan—unfortunately, the exact date is not clear.<sup>186</sup> According to Ernoul who wrote in the last decade of the twelfth century and who was a follower of the Ibelins, marked opponents of Reynald and of the court party, Baldwin IV asked Reynald through a delegation composed of knights of the Orders, clerics and barons, to

<sup>183</sup> William of Tyre, XXII, VI–VII, 1071–4.

<sup>184</sup> *Gesta Henrici secundi*, I, 272–5; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, I/1, 72.

<sup>185</sup> Al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, I/1, 72, 74; al-Bundārī, 186–8; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 470.

<sup>186</sup> William of Tyre, XXII, XIV, 1087–8; Ernoul, VII, 55.

restore the stolen goods. Reynald would make a perjurer of the king, who had sworn to the truce. However, he refused to give them back and when Saladin reproached the king for breaking the treaty, Baldwin asserted that he could not overcome Reynald's obstinacy.<sup>187</sup> William of Tyre also reports Saladin's recourse to Baldwin and that Saladin threatened to cancel the treaty if his demands were not met. Apparently, the treaty was actually revoked.<sup>188</sup> But only at the beginning of May 1182 did Saladin move to Syria, thus presumably at the regular termination of the treaty. Had the negotiations perhaps dragged on so long?

This episode makes particularly clear the consequences for Frankish-Muslim relations of the weakness of the kingdom and the victory at that time of the court party over the barons' party. The king no longer had the power to enforce his authority. There was no longer any question of a baron who had breached a treaty having to answer to his Muslim accusers, as did Rainer of Brus of Baniyas (after 1140), being compelled by the Haute Cour to pay compensation.<sup>189</sup> Reynald did not feel himself bound by the existing treaty. So much is clear from the example of an analogous case in 1186, when Reynald argued against King Guy that he was the lord of his land as Guy was the lord of his, and he had no treaty with the Muslims.<sup>190</sup> Obviously, Reynald endeavoured to rule his lordship as independently of Jerusalem as did the count of Tripoli, who was also a feudatory of the king but outside the actual territory of the realm. Of similar significance is the fact that Reynald as lord of Transjordan furthermore bore the title of prince, which he had borne in his time (1153–61?) as independent prince of Antioch. Not only did Reynald not adhere to treaties concluded by the kingdom of Jerusalem, but he took the offensive against Muslims without strategic considerations. The conclusion of further agreements with treaty partners of such quality must have been of less and less genuine use to Saladin. To the indignation of the Franks, he in fact did not safeguard himself with a peace treaty when he ended his attacks on the kingdom of Jerusalem in mid-September 1182 and turned against Aleppo.<sup>191</sup> It remains unknown whether the decisive factor for this conduct was the unpredictability of Reynald of Châtillon and his supporters or reasons of propaganda. That is why the conduct of the Franks during Saladin's

<sup>187</sup> Ernoul, VII, 55–6.

<sup>188</sup> William of Tyre, XXII, XIV, 1087; al-Qāḍi al-Fāḍil, *Rasā'il* (Paris), fol. 64r.

<sup>189</sup> Usāma b. Munqidh, *I'tibār*, 48.

<sup>190</sup> L'Estoire d'Eracles, XXIII, XXIII, 34.

<sup>191</sup> William of Tyre, XXII, XX, 1102.

subjugation of large parts of northern Mesopotamia and finally Aleppo between September 1182 and June–July 1183 is particularly interesting. How threatening was the encirclement of the Frankish states assessed in Jerusalem, when it was realized with Saladin's taking of Aleppo on 11 June 1183?<sup>192</sup> Did the Franks attempt to resume the 'no place' policy of 1174–75 in these months?

Al-Salih Isma'īl of Aleppo, whom Saladin had recognized as his overlord until 1176, died on 4 December 1181. As after Nur al-Din's death, the most important political powers of the region attempted to profit thereby. 'Izz al-Din of Mosul, the cousin and appointed heir of the dead ruler, occupied Aleppo on 29 December. The Aleppines pressed him in vain thereafter to attack Ayyubid Syria and a pro-Zengid rebellion against Saladin's nephew Taqi al-Din 'Umar actually broke out in Hamah. 'Imad al-Din Zengi II of Sinjar, a brother of the lord of Mosul, also raised claims on Aleppo at this time and threatened on refusal to surrender Sinjar to Saladin. He was successful, handed Sinjar to 'Izz al-Din and entered Aleppo in May 1182. The treaty between Aleppo and Antioch of 1178 (?) lost also its validity with al-Salih Isma'īl's death. Aleppine troops besieged the condominium of Shih al-Hadid and the Franks possibly attacked Harim.<sup>193</sup> Saladin in Egypt could do nothing personally; no more than could his nephew Farukhshah, the governor in Damascus, who was in Transjordan because of Reynald of Châtillon's attack on Tayma'. However, Saladin asked his followers in northern and central Syria to intervene to maintain his rights to Aleppo, guaranteed allegedly by the Caliph al-Mustadi'.<sup>194</sup>

Al-Salih Isma'īl's death had thus brought about the breakup of the fronts between almost all the states of the region. In September at latest, when Saladin proceeded to Aleppo after attacks of various Ayyubid armies on the west and south of the kingdom of Jerusalem and on Beirut had ended, the situation altered. In contrast to Jerusalem, Raymond III of Tripoli succeeded in concluding a truce with Saladin.<sup>195</sup> At this time Aleppo must already have again concluded a truce with Antioch and the Armenians—on disadvantageous terms as it was bound up with condominiumia.<sup>196</sup> Did a new phase of the 'no place' alliances emerge with this? In any event,

<sup>192</sup> William of Tyre, XXII, XXIV, 1114.

<sup>193</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, III, 48; 'Imād al-Dīn al-Kātib in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, III, 23; Ibn Wāṣil, II, 110.

<sup>194</sup> Al-Bundārī, 185–6.

<sup>195</sup> Al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, I/1, 77.

<sup>196</sup> Al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Rasā'il* (Paris), fol. 65v.

Saladin's chancery disseminated this impression in a series of communications, for the most part to high dignitaries of the caliphal court. While Saladin was still in Egypt, al-Katib al-Isfahani claimed in a letter that the lord of Mosul had unlawfully appropriated Aleppo and made money-payments to the unbelievers. By contrast, the secretary depicted his lord Saladin as a zealous fighter against the Franks.<sup>197</sup> The accusations were more specific in a second letter to Baghdad: Mosul had joined up with the Nizaris and promised them Muslim strongholds and villages, as well as a propaganda centre (*dar al-da'wa*) in Aleppo for their service as mediators. There was an envoy from Mosul with Sinan, who had an envoy with Raymond of Tripoli who finally had an emissary with King Baldwin, as the latest despatches proved.<sup>198</sup>

The same tenor characterized all the chancery communications which Saladin had written during his campaign in the north from September 1182 to May 1183 (which were directed exclusively against Muslim Zengid and Artuqid opponents): Saladin is obedient to the caliph and carries the black 'Abbasid banners on his conquests. He alone acts in accordance with the duty of the *jihad*; his Muslim adversaries by contrast act against the caliph's wishes, evade the *jihad* and even league themselves with the unbelievers. In September 1182 Saladin, outside Aleppo, reported to Baghdad that he knew from eyewitnesses of an eleven-year agreement between Mosul and the Franks stating that there would be an annual payment of 10,000 dinars to the Franks, and furthermore that the Muslim frontier fortreffes of Baniyas, Shaqif Tirun and Habis Jaldak would be handed over with all the Frankish prisoners in the places which would be taken from Saladin with Frankish assistance. Coordinated attacks from the Zengids in the north and the Franks in Syria were the aim of this treaty. The handing over of castles and the Nizaris' receipt of money for a murder attempt on Saladin are likewise mentioned in a second letter. These assertions are repeated in decisive phases of the Ayyubid campaign of conquest; first at the end of December 1182, when Saladin ended the first phase of his offensive against Mosul with the conquest of Sinjar and based his moves, among other things, on the alleged Zengid-Frankish pact. From May to the middle of June 1183 there appeared a second series of panegyrics of Saladin as a pro-'Abbasid *mujahid* in combination with accusations that Mosul would obstruct the *jihad*, would be linked with the Nizaris and

<sup>197</sup> Al-Bundārī, 167.

<sup>198</sup> Al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Rasā'il* (Paris), fol. 68r-v.

would spur on the Franks to raiding.<sup>199</sup> At this time, Saladin planned a second siege of Mosul. He had broken off the first in December 1182 under pressure from mediators sent by the caliph.

According to these numerous contemporary accounts, a discussion about the existence of a Zengid-Frankish alliance against Saladin in 1182–83 appears superfluous. However, doubts arise for a series of reasons. The pieces of evidence for an alliance are all of Ayyubid provenance. Frankish sources such as William of Tyre and Ernoul and sources friendly to the Zengids such as Ibn al-Athir, say nothing of the like, although they do not suppress mention of the Frankish-Zengid cooperation between 1174 and 1175. William of Tyre, an advocate of ‘no place’ alliances would be just the writer from whom a corresponding statement for 1182–83 might be expected. Furthermore, an attempt to murder Saladin, which the Zengids allegedly purchased from the Nizaris in 1182 by far-reaching concessions, did not take place. The repeatedly adduced legal claim of Saladin to Aleppo by reason of a caliphal diploma of appointment is also rather incredible. In the extant copy of the relevant document from the year 1175, Aleppo is expressly excluded from Saladin’s dominions.<sup>200</sup> The Ayyubid complaint of Aleppine attacks on al-Rawandan in the first letter to Baghdad at the end of 1181 or the beginning of 1182 is clearly a piece of duplicity. Matters were quite otherwise, as Saladin had ordered the lord of the city to inflict damage on Aleppo.<sup>201</sup>

Is perhaps evidence for a Frankish-Zengid alliance to be found in the conduct of the Franks during Saladin’s campaign against the Zengids? In fact, the kingdom of Jerusalem launched into various military activities at this time. According to William of Tyre, the king and the nobility were outraged at Saladin’s arrogance in proceeding to the north without a truce and resolved to undertake an expedition with the entire levy in the territories south of Damascus. The sole tangible result of this enterprise was the recovery of the castle of Habis Jaldak, the possession of which until the summer of 1182 secured to the Franks the income from the condominium over territories east of the upper Jordan. This enterprise in October 1182 was followed by a similar one, similarly unsuccessful, in December.<sup>202</sup> Supposedly, a Frankish attack on the south-western borders of the kingdom

<sup>199</sup> Al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Rasā'il* (Paris), fols. 65r, 13r, 54v, 10r–v, 110r–v, 23v–25v. Cf. 'Imād al-Dīn, *Barq* (Marsh 425), fols. 5v, 14v, 35r–v; al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Mukātabāt*, fols. 112v–115v.

<sup>200</sup> Al-Qalqashandī, X, 137.

<sup>201</sup> Al-Bundārī, 185–6.

<sup>202</sup> William of Tyre, XXII, XX–XXI, 1102–7, XXII, 1108–9.

took place in the spring of 1183; and in the first quarter of 1183, a flotilla organized by Reynald of Châtillon attempted to extend Frankish rule over the Red Sea, perhaps even attacking Mecca and Medina.<sup>203</sup> It seems, however, that all these attacks resulted not from Zengid initiatives, but because the opportunity for booty raids and diversion manoeuvres simply seemed favourable during Saladin's absence. William of Tyre makes it clear that at first in Jerusalem there was complete uncertainty about Saladin's aims and activities in the north. They were so anxious over his successes that the levy of a special tax was decided upon in February 1183. Yet the money was used neither to finance an enterprise to assist Saladin's opponents in the north nor a further campaign against Damascus, but it served only for the defence of the country. When Saladin returned to Syria in June and completed the encirclement of the Frankish states with the taking of Aleppo it was spent the most part on improving the fortifications.<sup>204</sup> There is no indication of an alliance with the Zengids.

Both an examination of the sources for such an alliance and also a survey of the Frankish reaction to Saladin's campaign in the north, lead to the result that the existence of a Zengid-Frankish alliance in 1182–83 is unprovable and not even probable. The most concrete piece of evidence on the Ayyubid side, which speaks of an eleven-year agreement and the handing over of various castles and prisoners, is strikingly similar to that of 1175–76, where there is mention of a Zengid offer of a treaty of almost the same content. One is inclined to see nothing more than a revival of older, and perhaps more justifiable, reproaches in the passage concerning 1182. Perhaps, however, the Ayyubid data about the Zengid-Frankish contacts have nevertheless an historical kernel, although Saladin's entourage no doubt exaggerated them in order to legitimate his expansion at Muslim expense. It is by no means unthinkable that in 1182–83 Saladin's opponents came to think of resuming contacts with the Franks as in their successful 'no place' policy of 1175–76; but the main point is that no formal alliance was reached between the Zengids and Jerusalem. Although the danger of a further increase of Saladin's power was understood in the kingdom of Jerusalem, the weakness of leadership and the struggles for power obviously prevented effective counter-measures being reached in agreement with Saladin's opponents. It must be left open whether Baldwin IV planned such counter-measures, but did not carry them through

<sup>203</sup> Al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, I/1, 80.

<sup>204</sup> William of Tyre, XXII, XIX, 1101–2, XXIII, 1109–12, XIV, 1114.

against the will of the court party and the knights, or whether the king simply did not conceive them. For the first time in decades, Jerusalem in 1182–83 no longer pursued a ‘no place’ policy and remained on the defensive. Without a supplementary alliance policy, the far-stretched military operations of 1182–83 could achieve nothing against the encirclement of the Frankish states by the Ayyubid dominions. Ibn al-Athir has recorded an alleged remark by Saladin appropriate to this. When the report of the Frankish attacks on Damascus was brought to him in the north, he is said to have commented: ‘They destroy villages and we capture cities in compensation. When we return, we shall rebuild them and then we shall be strong enough to attack their lands.’<sup>205</sup>

The preceding pages have described how the Frankish lordships evaluated the alterations in the pattern of power in the Middle East from Nur al-Din’s death to the taking of Aleppo and what factors decided the manner in which they reacted. An analysis of Saladin’s policy towards the Franks and the role of the *jihad* idea in Frankish-Ayyubid relations must now supplement this. It has already been noticed that Saladin and his chancery used the *jihad* propaganda to legitimate his rule and belittled his Muslim opponents as alleged allies of the infidels. Saladin had actually as little scruple as the Zengids in concluding treaties with the Franks. During a large part of the time between 1174 and 1183, there existed agreements between Saladin on the one side and Jerusalem and Tripoli on the other. Their contents were not restricted to armistices, the exchange of prisoners and hostages or deliveries of grain. Under Saladin’s rule, the condominiums were apparently maintained. Condominiums can certainly be proved to exist in the plain between Baniyas and Hunin in the north, al-Sawad east of the Jordan and parts of the Hawran.<sup>206</sup> In a letter to the caliph, written by al-Qadi al-Fadil presumably in 1182, the currently existing treaty with the Franks is precisely described as advantageous for Islam because it had the character of a condominium.<sup>207</sup>

As under Saladin’s predecessors, these agreements regulated the *modus vivendi* in Syria and facilitated to some extent the extension of Saladin’s power at the expense of the Zengids. However, they contrasted sharply with Saladin’s claim to the *jihad* which he expressed not only in letters to the caliph but also in inscriptions on buildings or the participation of

<sup>205</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, XI, 484.

<sup>206</sup> Ibn Jubayr, 300; William of Tyre, XXII, XV, 1090; al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil (Cambridge), fol. 23v.

<sup>207</sup> Al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Rasā’il* (Paris), fol. 64v.

volunteers in the fighting against the Franks.<sup>208</sup> The longer Saladin concluded treaties with the Franks and carried on war against Muslims, the more urgent it was for him to follow up the *jihad* propaganda with deeds. There was further pressure for justification since in 1175, after his first campaign against the Zengids, Saladin was emphatically required in a diploma of appointment from the Caliph al-Mustadi' to undertake more than mere expeditions against the Franks and to liberate Jerusalem.<sup>209</sup> Until 1180 the Ayyubids responded to suspicion against their declarations, especially from the caliphal court, both with the claim that Saladin had to implement his position as regent for the child al-Salih Isma'īl and with their propaganda that presented the short phases reserved for the war against the Franks most favourably as *jihad*. Treaties with Jerusalem and Tripoli were designated as useful for Islam. In 1178, when Baghdad renewed pressure for attacks against the Franks, Saladin repeatedly explained his delays by the admittedly bad economic state of Syria, caused by a period of drought; but he promised to capture Jerusalem in 1179.<sup>210</sup> An episode in 1180 indicates that having recourse to *jihad* ideology became an increasing problem for Saladin. During his campaign in northern Syria, the Rum Seljuk Sultan Qilij Arslan asked him through an envoy how he would justify before God his conclusion of peace with the Franks, while neglecting the welfare of the Muslims and attacking Qilij Arslan. After that Saladin was obliged to make peace.<sup>211</sup> In Aleppo also the Ayyubid propaganda was not accepted, as the bitter resistance of the Turkish troops and the city militia to Saladin in 1175 and 1183 proved. In 1183 the defenders of Aleppo fought even though they were not paid anymore.<sup>212</sup>

When in 1182–83, after the death of al-Salih Isma'īl of Aleppo, the clashes between Saladin and the Zengids flared up again, the problem of the credibility of the Ayyubid declarations about the *jihad* posed itself more sharply than ever. Saladin again directed his efforts at expansion against Muslims and not against the Franks. His method of justifying his conduct in Baghdad deserves particular notice. In the first place, the fighting between the Franks and the Ayyubids immediately before and during Saladin's campaign in northern Syria and northern Mesopotamia, especially the victory of his admiral Husam al-Din Lu'lu' over Reynald of

<sup>208</sup> On Saladin's inscriptions cf. Wiet, *Inscriptions*.

<sup>209</sup> Al-Qalqashandī, X, 142.

<sup>210</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn, *Barq* (Bruce 11), fol. 46r–v.

<sup>211</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 365–6.

<sup>212</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm, *Bughya*, 288–9.

Châtillon's fleet, was strongly emphasized in propaganda and in letters to the caliph. Reasons of credibility perhaps formed another part of Saladin's decision not to conclude a truce with Jerusalem (although he did with Tripoli) in 1182 before his attack on the Zengids as he could not again allow himself to be accused of making peace with infidels in order to wage war on Muslims. Interesting above all, however, is the line followed by Saladin's chancery in drafting letters to Baghdad. Not only did it endeavour to accuse the Zengids of supposedly making deals with the Franks, but it was repeatedly emphasized that troops were needed from Mosul and Aleppo in order to wage the *jihad*. Allegedly, Saladin was in his fight against the Zengids not concerned with the acquisition of territory, but only to obtain new resources for the fight against the Franks. When it became clear to Saladin that the Caliph al-Nasir opposed his expansion in northern Mesopotamia and appointed mediators between Mosul and himself at the end of 1182, Ayyubid propaganda acquired an ever shriller tone. From Saruj in mid-May 1183 al-Qadi al-Fadil developed a far extended vision in a letter to the caliphal court. He accused the Zengids once again of usurpation in Aleppo, of failing to fight the *jihad*, of cooperation with Franks and Nizaris and of paying the infidels to attack Muslim territory. Against this he set Saladin's hope, after the taking of Mosul, of liberating not only Jerusalem and Palestine (*al-sahil*), but of carrying the *jihad* also to Constantinople, into Christian Georgia and even to the Almohad realm in North Africa.<sup>213</sup> At the same time, Saladin's chancery secretaries defamed the Zengids as disloyal and potentially dangerous to the caliph in Baghdad: they not only helped the infidels, but obeyed the caliphs only when they ran into difficulties, considered the world as an *iqta'* not as a trust (*ida'*), being only nominally obedient to the caliphs and secretly devising a restoration of the Great Seljuk sultanate.<sup>214</sup>

The terminology of Saladin's propagandists in making such assertions is particularly interesting. Al-Qadi al-Fadil designated Sayf al-Din Ghazi II of Mosul already in 1175 as a *khariji*, i.e. schismatic, who did not recognize the caliph of Baghdad.<sup>215</sup> In 1180, the head of chancery wrote to the caliph before the campaign against the Seljuks of Rum that Qilij Arslan had 'shattered the staff of Islam'. The caliph should send him orders; if he did not follow them, he would render himself guilty and it would be legitimate

<sup>213</sup> Al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Rasā'il* (Paris), fol. 36r-v; al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Mukātabāt*, fol. 116r.

<sup>214</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn, *Barq* (Marsh 425), fol. 35v.

<sup>215</sup> Lyons/Jackson, *Saladin*, 98 citing al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, Ms Mosul 93, 3, fol. 49.

to fight him.<sup>216</sup> The tone became sharper from 1182. Al-Katib al-Isfahani wrote in a letter to the governor of Aden in the Yemen that Mosul and the Franks had reached agreement 'to assault our land and beat back our attack on their land and our *jihad* that came both as a surprise to them'.<sup>217</sup> The Ayyubid prince al-Malik al-Mansur put it in his historical work that Saladin came to Syria in 1182 to attack Aleppo and lead the *jihad* against its inhabitants.<sup>218</sup> In a letter to the caliph at the beginning of 1183, al-Qadi al-Fadil even called Saladin's opponents *munafiqun*, i.e. hypocrites, a term which from early Islam designated potentially disloyal Muslims, those without inner conviction, who were believed capable of cooperation with infidels. Finally, in the late summer or early autumn of 1183, al-Qadi al-Fadil again gave a detailed reminder to Baghdad of the unreliable subordination of Mosul to the caliph. He promised that Saladin would finally carry out his duty of *jihad* against the infidels, and would subsequently call for *jihad* against 'him who gives up subordination'.<sup>219</sup>

From these pieces of evidence it must be concluded that the longer Saladin exploited the *jihad* ideology to legitimate his rule while undertaking no decisive action against the Franks, he had no recourse left but to represent his fighting against Muslims as Holy War (*jihad*). The Muslims allegedly stood on his side, while on the side of his opponents were schismatics, hypocrites, infidels, no genuine Muslims. This idea makes it still more probable that the assertions about an otherwise unsubstantiated Zengid-Frankish alliance in 1182–83 were propaganda. Saladin was increasingly compelled to label each of his military enterprises as *jihad*, whence he resorted to calumny. But the blatant quality of the propaganda itself and Saladin's permanent expansionist policy brought it about that the Ayyubid declarations of the *jihad* and loyalty found no response at the caliphal court or among other Muslim powers. Saladin could not expect support from rulers who were not subject to him, even during the Third Crusade.

On account of his attitude towards the Franks, he was under immense pressure to proceed against them after the taking of Aleppo in 1183, which he had worked towards for so long. The sources reflect this situation all too obviously. Thus, in the treaty of exchange for Aleppo with Zengi II, who received places in the Euphrates territories in compensation, it was

<sup>216</sup> Lyons/Jackson, *Saladin*, 144 citing al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, Ms Topkapı 2497, fol. 86.

<sup>217</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn, *Barq* (Marsh 425), fol. 25v.

<sup>218</sup> Al-Malik al-Manşūr, *Miḍmār*, 96.

<sup>219</sup> Al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Rasā'il* (Paris), fols. 10r, 77v–78r.

precisely laid down what contingents Zengi had to place at his disposal against the Franks.<sup>220</sup> The taking of Aleppo was depicted as a prefiguration of the capture of Jerusalem, the opening of the Antioch Gate in Aleppo as the prediction of the taking of the city of Antioch. A letter of the summer of 1183 says, 'The conquest of al-Aqsa is nearer to us than any other'; and in a second letter of autumn 1183, which describes Saladin's attacks on the kingdom of Jerusalem, the phraseology is that the capture of Aleppo has committed Saladin to raid the land of the infidels in thanks to God—'the *jihad* is the most commendable of all activities.' The *jihad* recurs in practically all state documents and diplomas of appointment from this period. An excuse from refraining from fighting the Franks no longer existed, Saladin himself proclaimed.<sup>221</sup>

It is presumably not wrong to put down to the pressure for the *jihad*, generated by Saladin himself, the Ayyubid attacks on the kingdom of Jerusalem and in particular on the lordship of Reynald of Châtillon from the second half of 1183. From the end of September to mid-October, the opponents confronted one another in Galilee, the Franks led by Guy of Lusignan as regent and spouse of the heiress to the throne. Saladin achieved no more than the plundering of a few localities including Baysan. From the end of October to mid-December 1183, and once again in August–September 1184, he besieged al-Karak and made raids west of Jordan, but each time Frankish relieving forces compelled him to withdraw. Saladin had to lead the *jihad* for the sake of his reputation after the campaign in northern Mesopotamia and the taking of Aleppo. However, whether he seriously wished to capture Jerusalem after 1183 may be doubted. His attacks were particularly directed against Reynald of Châtillon, who repeatedly showed himself to be unreliable in his adherence to treaties. As the lord of Transjordan, Reynald endangered the line of communication between Egypt and Syria and therefore the capture of al-Karak was important to Saladin. Saladin's campaign in the kingdom of Jerusalem in 1183 was also not calculated as an enterprise for the liberation of Jerusalem as ever promised in propaganda, but obviously had financial causes. Al-Malik al-Mansur, albeit a member of the Ayyubid family, accounts for it by the necessity of giving the troops an opportunity for looting.<sup>222</sup> During all these military operations, the Frankish-Muslim condominiums still continued to exist in

<sup>220</sup> For instance Ibn al-'Adīm, *Bughya*, 289.

<sup>221</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn, *Barq* (Marsh 425), fols. 85v, 88r, 108r, 114r, 91v, 134v.

<sup>222</sup> Al-Malik al-Mansūr, *Miçmār*, 152.

the north and on the frontiers of Jerusalem. Trade was in no way interrupted, as the well-known passage by the traveller Ibn Jubayr shows.<sup>223</sup>

However, Saladin was also interested in the conclusion of new treaties. In the summer of 1183 he still complied with the request of Bohemond III of Antioch for a truce (lat. *temporalis pax*; arab. *sulh, muhadana*).<sup>224</sup> Since this treaty led to the release of Muslim prisoners and allowed Saladin to concentrate on an attack on Jerusalem, it may yet have seemed justified to the propagandists for the *jihad*. Possibly, Bohemond subjected himself with this treaty to some kind of Ayyubid suzerainty, since al-Malik al-Mansur says that Bohemond placed himself under the sultan's orders and subjected himself to him. Since nothing is known of the manner of this subjection, e.g. about symbolic gestures, it is better not to interpret this passage too strictly. It is anyhow worthy of notice that immediately after taking over power in Aleppo, Saladin continued the series of treaties between Aleppo and Antioch and made no alteration in the further existence of the condominiums currently existing there. A letter of 6 May 1183 from the camp before Aleppo proves, however, that Saladin, shortly before the peak of his *jihad* propaganda campaign, was at the same time toying even with the idea of concluding a treaty with Tripoli and Jerusalem. In the letter, Amir 'Izz al-Din Jawali, who had been sent to Damascus, was informed of the previous Frankish offers and warned of the Franks' well-known faithlessness to treaties and unpredictability. An Ayyubid envoy had just returned from Raymond III of Tripoli together with his ambassador. Raymond wanted to conclude an agreement and to arrange a similar one with Jerusalem. For this alone, he asserted, he had travelled to Jerusalem. Raymond's devious nature was well known; nevertheless, Jawali was to agree a truce if it were possible and if Saladin's great-nephew, Shahanshah, was released. Jawali was only to hold further discussions with Saladin if the Franks raised higher demands than previously.<sup>225</sup>

It is not known why this treaty was not concluded. A possible reason is that Saladin was compelled to continue fighting in order to maintain his army and had to rely on booty; this he could not do in Aleppo, as the city was not taken by force. Perhaps also real suspicion of the Franks' morality about treaties played a part. Above all, Saladin would have lost all

<sup>223</sup> Ibn Jubayr (transl. Gaudefroy-Denombaynes), 334–5.

<sup>224</sup> William of Tyre, XXII, XXIV, 1024; Michael Syrus, 396; 'Imād al-Dīn, *Barq* (Marsh 425), fol. 90r, 108r; Al-Malik al-Manṣūr, *Midmār*, 151.

<sup>225</sup> The complete letter is in al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, Ms. Berlin Weitzenstein 1264, fols. 67r–69r (English summary in Lyons/Jackson, *Saladin*, 197–8.

credibility in the caliph's eyes, if, after taking Aleppo on the grounds of the needs of the *jihad*, he had gone on to conclude a treaty with the Franks. Here it is clearer than anywhere else that Saladin, unlike his predecessors, especially Nur al-Din, could not simply and without complications use the *jihad* ideology as an instrument for his own aims. Saladin's rise as a usurper, and thence his exaggerated *jihad* propaganda, compelled him to fight against the Franks. Every treaty concluded with them could become a problem of legitimization for Saladin. Not only the treaty with Antioch and the letter to Jawali indicate that he was still generally interested in agreements in 1183. To all appearances, he was also not averse to proposals of Popes Alexander III and Lucius III about an exchange of prisoners and the conclusion of a peace treaty. The pope should issue according orders to the Franks, he responded. If they did not keep to them, the Muslims would be free not to comply with the agreement. This clause proves once again that after the court party and Reynald of Châtillon had assumed power, Jerusalem was a problematic treaty partner for Saladin.

The investigation in this section has shown that old differences, already in existence before the First Crusade, (e.g. between Damascus and Aleppo, Sunnis and Shiites in Aleppo), broke out anew as a result of the fragmentation of Nur al-Din's territories after his death and the accompanying succession disputes. At the same time, Saladin and Sayf al-Din Ghazi II of Mosul were rivals for power in Syria. Therewith the typical grouping for the conclusion of 'no place' alliances experienced a renaissance. In 1175–76, a series of Frankish-Zengid arrangements were made, which were plainly concluded against the background of the 'no place' doctrine as described by William of Tyre. As previously, it was a matter of *ad hoc* alliances, initiated by the Muslims and mostly bound up with particular obligations on the Muslim side.

Unlike the previous decades after the death of Amalric in 1174, these alliances were on the Frankish side no longer carried through by a strong personality on the throne of Jerusalem. The formation of policy in Jerusalem towards Muslim neighbouring states was increasingly subject to the prevailing interests and the readiness for treaties of the then dominant noble party. The struggles for power there and the posture of the court party, temporarily victorious in 1180, contributed to the fact that in 1182–83, as it appears, 'no place' alliances with Mosul or Aleppo did not exist—contrary to the claims of Saladin's chancery during the decisive phase of the encirclement of the Frankish states by the Ayyubid dominions. The Franks recognized indeed the dangers arising for them with Saladin's further acquisition of territory and reacted with attacks on Ayyubid territory,

but no longer fitted their enterprises into an alliance policy. Bohemond III of Antioch was not alone in framing his policy towards Aleppo (and after its capture in 1183 towards Saladin) independently of the interests of Jerusalem; the count of Tripoli also, a fiefholder of the king, pursued an independent treaty policy. In the kingdom itself from about 1178–79, the knightly Orders and Reynald of Châtillon as lord of Transjordan had so strong a position that they no longer felt themselves unconditionally bound by treaties ratified by King Baldwin IV. The king could no longer ensure the carrying out of treaties. As Saladin's successes in 1182–83 finally brought all the Zengid possessions in Syria into Ayyubid hands, the ground for any further 'no place' policy was taken away. That did not indeed prevent the conclusion of new treaties, but the 'no place' doctrine, the basis of the most important Frankish-Muslim alliances since the first decade of the twelfth century found no further application.

Thus, while the Franks composed a single bloc less than ever, Saladin won all the territories of Muslim Syria except for those ruled by the Nizaris up to 1183. Saladin did not balk at the conclusion of treaties with Frankish partners during this process. These include new stipulations such as the suspension clause and possibly also a ban on fortification. Treaties secured Saladin's expansion policy, had economic grounds or gave him a period of peace in order to reform the administration of Egypt. Treaties and the interruption of the *jihad*, however, became increasingly difficult to explain in propaganda. From at latest 1182–83, Saladin was under such pressure to fight the Franks for the sake of the legitimization of his rule, that the conclusion of a treaty was hardly possible any longer. He was compelled to seek a clash with the kingdom. Yet, the Ayyubid attacks of 1183–84 were not so organized that (as the propaganda tried to make out) the capture of Jerusalem was possible. Saladin's principal aim was al-Karak, which threatened communications between Egypt and Syria. Since it is known from al-Qadi al-Fadil's letter to Jawali that Saladin also wanted to conclude a treaty in 1183, it must be assumed that his attacks on the Franks (leaving out of consideration for once the financial aspects of such enterprises, e.g. the support of the troops by booty) served only to soothe the expectations of the caliphal court, of the neighbouring Muslim rulers and of the subjects of the Ayyubids. There were consequently fundamental alterations in the bases of Frankish-Muslim relations in the years from 1174 to 1183. The cause is less the external factor of the encirclement of the Frankish states, but rather to be seen in the internal frictions of the Frankish nobility and Saladin's self-aroused compulsion to the *jihad*.

BETWEEN TREATY POLICY AND CONFRONTATION, SUBORDINATION AND  
*JIHAD*: FRANKISH-AYYUBID RELATIONS FROM THE PEAK OF THE PARTY  
 DISPUTES IN JERUSALEM TO THE END OF SALADIN'S LIFE (1184–93)

The grouping of powers between Franks and Muslims in 1183–84 offered a new and previously unknown picture. The three Frankish states were almost completely surrounded by Saladin's dominions. Internal developments in the kingdom of Jerusalem had not only ensured that Zengid-Frankish alliances did not impede Saladin on the pattern of the traditional 'no place' doctrine during the decisive phase of Ayyubid expansion in the north in 1182–83. In addition, the Franks' loyalty to treaties had become highly unpredictable for any Muslim partner. A Muslim realm of expansive character with the *jihad* as its official *raison d'être* confronted the Franks, at this point divided into a barons' party and a court party. For the situation as it appeared to the Franks, William of Tyre again offers the liveliest evidence:

Among the deeds of our princes, there is nothing to be found which would seem worthy of record to an intelligent man. [...] We have now reached the moment when we can suffer neither our faults nor their remedy, wherefore our enemies because of our sins have gained the upper hand over us.<sup>226</sup>

The victory-conscious Ayyubid *jihad* propaganda after the taking of Aleppo in 1183 stands in sharp contrast to this judgement from the pen of the chronicler and chancellor, who in the two previous decades had always been an eager advocate of Frankish-Byzantine leagues and Frankish-Muslim alliances based on the 'no place' doctrine. Saladin's victory in the battle of Hattin on 3 and 4 July 1187, which sounded the end of the first Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, seems at first glance to show the logical consequence of the development introduced since 1183. However, it is clear from the foregoing that the use of *jihad* in Ayyubid propaganda is not to be taken at face value in every case. Saladin declared himself ready to conclude treaties with the Franks even in 1183, only it had become increasingly problematic to justify these agreements to the caliph, the neighbouring Muslim rulers and the men of religion. On the Frankish side, it was Bohemond III of Antioch and Raymond III of Tripoli in particular who strove for agreements. In the field of tension between Saladin's commitment to the *jihad* and the instability of Frankish-Muslim

---

<sup>226</sup> William of Tyre, XXIII, Praefatio, 1132.

relations occasioned by the quarrel of parties in Jerusalem, was there still room for treaties or indeed alliances after 1183?

Arising from this question, the following section will discuss the development of the treaty relationships between Franks and Ayyubids after the end of the 'no place' policy, under the influence of the party quarrels in Jerusalem and the compulsion to the *jihad* weighing on Saladin. The closing date of the following investigation is set at 1192, not 1187. Thus, the numerous rounds of negotiations and agreements between the Franks and the Ayyubids, especially during the Third Crusade and the truce of 1192, will be included. These are routinely mentioned in accounts of the years from 1187 to 1192, but they are rarely examined with regard to legal relations.<sup>227</sup> As far as the motives and techniques of treaty policy are concerned, the battle of Hattin in 1187 and the loss of most of the territories under Frankish rule are without significance as an historical break, since at least some of the protagonists of both the Frankish aristocratic parties still had a substantial share in the development of relations with Saladin until 1192. Likewise, the projects for treaties, whether contemplated or actually realized, are in their contents continuous from before 1187 to 1192, in spite of some new elements brought in especially by Richard Lionheart. Only Saladin's death on 4 March 1193 marks a clear break in the history of Frankish-Ayyubid relations. Almost a half-century with wide stretches of relatively peaceful relations between Franks and Ayyubids, a phase of 'Levantine peace', followed it.<sup>228</sup>

The period from the autumn of 1184 to the summer of 1187 in the history of the kingdom of Jerusalem falls into two phases. In the first, lasting until September 1186, the barons' party had a substantial share in the direction of government affairs. However, after the death of the child-king Baldwin V they lost their position to the court party, whose protagonists succeeded by a coup in raising Guy of Lusignan to the throne, the spouse of King Amalric's daughter. The quarrel of these two groups very considerably influenced Frankish-Ayyubid relationships. In the course taken by these relations until 1187, Saladin's attitude towards the *jihad* and the character of his Frankish policy is generally discernible. While in the late autumn of 1183 Saladin was besieging al-Karak, a turn in the internal politics of the kingdom of Jerusalem was effected in favour of the barons'

---

<sup>227</sup> Cf. Röhricht, *Jerusalem*, 473–654; Grousset, *Histoire*, I, 1–120; Runciman, *History*, III, 4–77; Prawer, *Histoire*, II, 9–69; Lyons/Jackson, *Saladin*, 267–363. Stevenson, *Crusaders*, 243–87, has the most detailed description of the treaty negotiations.

<sup>228</sup> Cf. Nierman, *Levantine Peace*.

party, which had been at a disadvantage since 1180. Guy of Lusignan was removed from office as regent of the kingdom at an assembly of the realm and the coronation of Baldwin V, barely five years of age, excluded him from the throne.<sup>229</sup> Raymond III of Tripoli, the head of the barons' party, assumed Guy's task. At the end of November or the beginning of December 1183, King Baldwin IV appointed him as leader of the relieving army for al-Karak and he was nominated a little later in Acre as regent of the kingdom for ten years.<sup>230</sup> Raymond obviously soon tried to establish a peaceful relationship with Saladin. The last fighting of which we hear resulted from a Frankish attack on Faqus in the east of the Nile Delta in September 1184.<sup>231</sup> Nothing is known about its instigators, perhaps Templars from al-Darum or Guy of Lusignan as count of Ascalon and Jaffa. After that there was no more fighting until the summer of 1187. It is quite possible that an agreement with Saladin was already in existence from the autumn of 1184. However, it is certain that after the death of the leper-king Baldwin IV, Raymond III as regent for King Baldwin V concluded a truce of even longer duration, possibly in April 1185. This treaty is of interest for several reasons. It resulted from a Frankish proposal and obviously a large Frankish money-payment accompanied it. Raymond concluded it after consultation with the knightly Orders, the barons and the clergy. Finally, its most important immediate cause was a famine produced by a drought in the Frankish territory. On the conclusion of the treaty, Ayyubid grain deliveries commenced at once, which helped to overcome the crisis.<sup>232</sup>

This shows that under Raymond III's leadership, the Franks strove for peace with Saladin. The way in which the understanding came into existence is fresh evidence that after the end of a strong monarchy in Jerusalem, it had become imperative for the treaty policy to be supported, and possibly mutually agreed, by the most important political powers among the Franks—the nobles, the knightly Orders and the upper clergy. The treaty casts light also on Saladin's posture towards the Franks after 1183. Irrespectively of whether the agreement was concluded for four years, as the sources of the Ernoul group stated, or, as according to the English chronicles, for one year and then extended for three more years at

<sup>229</sup> William of Tyre, XXII, XXIX, 1127–8.

<sup>230</sup> William of Tyre, XXII, XXX, 1130, XXIII, I, 1134; Ernoul, X, 116; *L'Estoire d'Eracles*, I–II, 1–4.

<sup>231</sup> Al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, I/1, 88.

<sup>232</sup> Ernoul, XI, 124; *Gesta Henrici secundi*, I, 342, 359–60; Roger of Hoveden, II, 307, 316; al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil (Cambridge), fol. 23r.

Saladin's request, it is obvious that in 1185 Saladin had no wish to pursue a policy of *jihād*. He did not attempt to exploit the internal problems of the kingdom, the party quarrels and the famine, for the conquest of Jerusalem, not even during the court party's coup in the summer of 1186, as Frankish sources note with surprise.<sup>233</sup> At the same time there existed condominiums in all the Frankish-Ayyubid frontier regions from the River Yarmuk to the Anti-Lebanon in the north, on the borders of the principality of Antioch between Burziyya and Famiya, at Arzaghan on the Orontes and in the 'Amq on the River 'Afrin to the north-east of Antioch.<sup>234</sup> Saladin was not only negotiating with Raymond III in the spring of 1185 but also responded to Armenian requests for an agreement.<sup>235</sup> Saladin was interested in the conclusion of these treaties because he was making preparations for a new campaign in northern Mesopotamia after the failure of another round of talks with mediators appointed by the caliph about a peace treaty with 'Izz al-Din Mas'ud of Mosul. It is unnecessary to expand here upon this enterprise, but it is significant that the Ayyubid chancery sought to make Saladin's action comprehensible with arguments which were in part identical with those of 1182–83. The caliph's ambassador, Ibn al-Shahrazuri, was instructed that the reason for the Ayyubid attack was *inter alia* that the Zengids had invited the Franks to invade Saladin's dominions to compel him to divide his forces.<sup>236</sup> This is obviously not true, not only because no other source suggests it. Al-Qadi al-Fadil, the head of chancery, even expressly confirmed in a letter of 1186 that the Franks had loyally kept the truce.<sup>237</sup>

Saladin's policy and his propaganda thus still followed known lines after the taking of Aleppo in 1183 on the pretext of the needs of the *jihād*, even if his campaign in northern Mesopotamia did not have primarily expansionist purposes, but might be understood as a preventive measure. Saladin concluded peace with 'infidels', on whose loyalty to treaties under the leadership of the barons' party he could rely, and fought against Muslim rulers, although the Ayyubid *jihād* propaganda had been particularly vigorously expressed and employed to stabilize Saladin's suzerainty over parts of northern Mesopotamia.<sup>238</sup> While there had already been

<sup>233</sup> Cont. Guil. Tyr., I, VI, 57.

<sup>234</sup> Ibn Jubayr, 300; William of Tyre, XXII, XV, 1090; al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil (Cambridge), fol. 23v; Ibn Wāṣil, II, 195; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XII, 14.

<sup>235</sup> Al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil (Cambridge), fols. 22v–24r.

<sup>236</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn al-Kātib in al-Bundārī, 257.

<sup>237</sup> Al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Mukātabāt*, fols. 82v–83r.

<sup>238</sup> Al-Bundārī, 235, 240, 246.

enormous difficulties until 1183 in justifying this policy and harmonizing it with the *jihad* propaganda, Saladin even started to face problems in his own camp in 1185–86. There was nothing new in the fact that Saladin's talk about the *jihad* aroused little response outside his own dominions. He encountered just as bitter resistance from the people of Mosul in 1185 as he had encountered in 1183 from the Aleppines.<sup>239</sup> In 1185–86, however, signs of an opposition among the highest Ayyubid dignitaries multiplied for the first time. In particular the head of chancery, al-Qadi al-Fadil, was no longer ready to have Egypt bled white financially and to fight Muslims instead of Franks. During Saladin's severe illness in 1186, he moved his master to swear that on recovery, he would devote himself entirely to the *jihad* and the liberation of Jerusalem.<sup>240</sup> There were, however, further factors which made it seem advisable finally to prosecute the *jihad* more seriously. In the peace treaty which concluded the campaign of 1186 in northern Mesopotamia, Saladin obliged 'Izz al-Din Mas'ud of Mosul to provide assistance against the Franks.<sup>241</sup> Since for years it had been a part of Saladin's propaganda that the support of Mosul was indispensable for the *jihad*, the Holy War had to be waged. About the same time, during Saladin's illness, the first signs of dissolution in the Ayyubid realm also became noticeable; and when a little later his nephew, Taqi al-Din 'Umar, refused to comply with his order to come to Syria from Egypt and preferred to conquer the Maghrib, he feared that the means for the *jihad* would be lacking. 'The conquest of the Maghrib is important,' commented Saladin, 'but that of Jerusalem is more important and its advantage is more complete.'<sup>242</sup> In short, in 1186, after his second attempt to subjugate northern Mesopotamia, Saladin lay under greater pressure than ever to move against the Franks, in order to legitimate his rule externally and to stabilize it internally. In that, and not exclusively in religious profit, is to be seen the 'advantage' of which Saladin spoke, which was bound up with the conquest of Jerusalem.

Against this background, it seems that after 1186 the conflict with the Franks was inevitable for Saladin for the sake of his own credibility. Did he, however, aim at the destruction of the kingdom of Jerusalem even before the battle of Hattin on 3 and 4 July 1187? To answer this question, Saladin's conduct during the succession conflict which broke out in

<sup>239</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, XI, 513.

<sup>240</sup> Al-Bundārī, 268.

<sup>241</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn al-Kātib in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, II, 66.

<sup>242</sup> Al-Bundārī, 280.

Jerusalem in the late summer of 1186 offers important indications. The events in the three-quarters of a year preceding the battle of Hattin at the same time throw light on the position of the Frankish aristocratic parties in regard to their Muslim neighbours.

The child-king Baldwin V, for whom Raymond III of Tripoli acted as regent, died presumably at the end of August. In accordance with the succession regulations of the beginning of 1184, Raymond should have continued to act as regent of the realm until the pope, the Roman emperor and the kings of France and England had settled the succession.<sup>243</sup> Nothing came of this because the leaders of the court party, Reynald of Châtillon, Joscelin III and the grand master of the Templars, succeeded in a coup in having Sibylla, the daughter of King Amalric I, crowned by the Patriarch Heraclius. She for her part crowned her husband, Guy of Lusignan. The resistance of the opposing barons' party, which had assembled in Nablus, collapsed shortly afterwards. The opposing candidate, Humphrey of Toron (the husband of Amalric's other daughter, Isabella), had immediately gone over to the court party on the news of Guy's coronation. Thereafter, the inferior barons likewise submitted, except for Baldwin of Ramla, who gave up his fief and went to Antioch, and Raymond III of Tripoli, who returned to Tiberias. As previously from 1180 to the end of 1183, power was from September 1186 at latest in the hands of the group who were indifferent to Frankish-Muslim treaty relations. Raymond III, since 1174 the representative of a group concerned about the conclusion and maintenance of treaties, was by contrast isolated. The effects of the new assumption of power by the court party on the inter-state relationship is shown on the one hand by the relations between Raymond III and Saladin, on the other by those between King Guy/Reynald of Châtillon and the Ayyubids.

Ernoul, a contemporary source, reports that there had been talk of possible Muslim assistance in the struggle against Guy and the court party in the planning of the barons' party gathered in Nablus. Raymond III had pointed out that he had concluded a truce and no Muslim intervention was to be feared. On the contrary, support from the Muslim side could even be hoped for.<sup>244</sup> There were more material developments in the following months. After the court party had succeeded in Guy's coronation, and Raymond had to reckon with an attack from the newly crowned king as he refused to give up his resistance, he turned to Saladin with a request

<sup>243</sup> Ernoul, X, 116–7; *L'Estoire d'Eracles*, XXIII, IV, 7–8.

<sup>244</sup> Ernoul, XI, 135.

for support. Saladin promised him complete backing and apparently said that he would install him as 'an independent king of the Franks one and all'.<sup>245</sup> Not only did Saladin release without payment a number of Raymond III's imprisoned knights but also apparently, when Raymond asked for help because of King Guy's imminent attack at the end of 1186, he reinforced the count in Tiberias with troops and equipment.<sup>246</sup> The agreement between Raymond III and Saladin, the legal quality of which will be investigated, compelled King Guy to give up his intention to attack. Only in May 1187 was there reconciliation between the Frankish rivals and a breach with Saladin. Directly before this, presumably on 1 May, Raymond had allowed an Ayyubid contingent to cross his territories to carry out a raid against the kingdom, if we can believe the Ernoul group of sources. The count's conditions, that towns and villages were to be spared and the River Jordan to be repassed in an easterly direction by sunset, were respected. The Ayyubid troops placed at Raymond's disposal remained in Tiberias until the breach with Saladin.<sup>247</sup>

The dependence of Raymond and his followers on Saladin was not so singular a phenomenon. One remembers that in about 1180 in a somewhat similar situation it had been feared that Bohemond III of Antioch, who belonged to the barons' party, would secure himself with Turkish help in the event of armed intervention by Jerusalem in his principality. Both Bohemond and Raymond repeatedly concluded agreements with their Muslim neighbours. As far as Bohemond is concerned, it has already been mentioned that in 1183, possibly in the context of such an agreement, he placed himself under Ayyubid suzerainty. The conduct of the court party, dominant in Jerusalem from September 1186, stands in the sharpest contrast. Just before the beginning of A.H. 583/13 March 1187, Reynald of Châtillon attacked a caravan on the way from Egypt to Syria, thereby breaking the truce which had existed since 1185. Frankish and Muslim sources give different evidence about the background and consequences of this attack. According to Frankish accounts, Saladin demanded compensation for the damage from King Guy after this infringement, to which his high indebtedness had obviously driven Reynald.<sup>248</sup> Reynald, however, paid no attention to Guy's demands and, as already mentioned, asserted that he was the lord of his land as Guy was of his and that he stood in

<sup>245</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 527.

<sup>246</sup> Al-Bundārī, 289; Ernoul, XII, 141; L'Estoire d'Eracles, XXIII, XXIV, 34–6.

<sup>247</sup> Ernoul, XII, 144–8, 152; L'Estoire d'Eracles, XXIII, XXVI–XXVII, 37–40, XXIX, 44–5.

<sup>248</sup> Overview in Hartmann, *Persönlichkeit*, 69–73.

no treaty relationship with the Muslims. To Saladin's ambassadors, the king expressed his regret that he could do nothing; whereupon Saladin declared that the truce had been broken.<sup>249</sup> The description of the event in the Arabic sources is that Reynald himself was in treaty relations with Saladin and had received a guarantee of security for his land and people. The demands for compensation were addressed to Reynald himself, not to Guy. When these remonstrances were fruitless, Saladin swore that if he took Reynald captive, he would kill him; and he prepared for war.<sup>250</sup>

Although the reports of the two groups of sources cannot be harmonized without difficulty, it is clear that Reynald did not feel himself bound by the king's treaties and claimed the right to an equal role. This becomes clearest in the answer which he gave shortly before his execution after the battle of Hattin to Saladin's question why he had broken the treaty: 'Kings are accustomed to do so. I have only followed the usual road.'<sup>251</sup> But it was not only Reynald who paid no heed to the treaty concluded in the king of Jerusalem's name. Guy of Lusignan made a retaliatory attack on Muslim Bedouin who had placed themselves under royal protection after his dismissal as regent of the kingdom in 1184.<sup>252</sup> Perhaps the raid on some Bedouin protected by the truce of 1185 is to be ascribed to him as well as was rumoured in Egypt in the summer of 1186, a few weeks before Guy's coronation.<sup>253</sup> Or were the Templars in al-Darum responsible for this breach of a treaty? Consequently, in 1186 the central administration in general no longer played a part in relations with the Muslims and in decisions on whether or not treaties were observed. The balance of power between the two aristocratic parties in Jerusalem had rather increasingly decided these issues since 1174. The leaders of the aristocratic parties, perhaps also the knightly Orders, respected the king only as a competent authority for the representation of the realm to Saladin. Readiness for adherence or non-adherence to treaties on each occasion depended on the internal Frankish state of affairs and developments: the truce of 1185 is explained by the famine in the kingdom, the rapprochement of Raymond III to Saladin in 1186 by the *coup d'état* of the court party, and Reynald's breach of a

<sup>249</sup> Cont. Guil. Tyr., I, IX, 62.

<sup>250</sup> Al-Bundārī, 289–90; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 528, 537; Sāwīrus b. al-Muqaffa', III, 121/ arab. 72; Bahā' al-Dīn b. Shaddād, 78.

<sup>251</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn, *Fath*, 25.

<sup>252</sup> William of Tyre, XXIII, I, 1134.

<sup>253</sup> Al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Mukātabāt*, fols. 62v–63v.

treaty in 1186 or 1187 by financial problems—a factor ever more noticeable since the foundation of the Frankish states.

It can at least be emphasized that after 1184 the quality of Frankish-Ayyubid relations was subject to the variations of the internal situation of the mutually opposed dominions to a greater extent than from 1174 to 1183. Saladin's need to lead the *jihad* and also Reynald of Châtillon's breach of the truce explain the commencement of warfare against the Franks in April 1187. On the failure of his demands for compensation, Saladin issued a summons to the *jihad* to the whole of his dominions. It may, however, be doubted whether at that moment Saladin planned the great campaign of annihilation against the Franks into which his attacks after the victory of Hattin finally developed. Although the sources originating in Saladin's circle have glorified the Hattin campaign in retrospect, there are all the same indications that such an idea is questionable. Thus, the first phase of the 1187 campaign was again directed against Reynald's lordship of Transjordan, not the core territory of the kingdom of Jerusalem. On the very eve of the battle of Hattin, the majority in the Muslim council of war may have advised the avoidance of a battle and the option of separate expeditions. The decision to fight was perhaps reached because one of the amirs commented that in the east there were curses and accusations that Saladin refrained from fighting the infidels in order to make war on the Muslims.<sup>254</sup> Finally, one must remember that presumably there would not have been a battle if King Guy had not attacked under instigation from the grand master of the Templars. Whether in 1187 Saladin sought a decisive battle or simply intended a demonstration of the *jihad*, and was furthermore principally interested in the elimination of Reynald of Châtillon, he quite certainly had no intention of the complete expulsion of the Franks from Syria. This is indicated both by the conclusion of peace with Antioch at the beginning of July and also by a letter of al-Qadi al-Fadil, written presumably a few weeks after Hattin, which makes it clear that Saladin did not aim at the conquest of Tripoli, at least in 1187.<sup>255</sup> When in 1188 he extended his conquering march to the north, it was probably to prevent the passage of the feared Crusade. Was 1187 thus not the moment of the great concluding dispute between Islam and Christendom and the culmination of decades of developments (according to the hypothesis of

<sup>254</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 532.

<sup>255</sup> Muslim b. Maḥmūd al-Shayzarī, *Jamharat*, fol. 242r, cited in Möhring, *Saladin*, 43–4.

the counter-Crusade)? A closer investigation of the relationship between Raymond III and Saladin in 1186–87 is of further help here.

A number of Frankish sources and all authoritative Arabic accounts assert that even during his regency for Baldwin V in 1185–86, Raymond was already working to obtain the Crown for himself.<sup>256</sup> As has already been shown, at the peak of the succession crisis in September 1186, during the conference of the barons in Nablus, Raymond reckoned on being able to receive support from Saladin. After the coronation of Guy of Lusignan and the collapse of the resistance of the barons' party, Raymond turned again to Saladin for help with the aim of gaining in this way the royal position (*mulk*).<sup>257</sup> The legal relationship into which the two entered in 1186 is essentially more difficult to reconstruct because it is in general polemically recorded in Western chronicles, but some sources indeed do allow insights. Thus, the *Historia peregrinorum* (c. 1194) states that Raymond had made himself Saladin's *familiaris*—a formulation which corresponds approximately to Ibn al-Athir's expression, that Raymond was dependent on him (*intama ilayhi*) and showed obedience (*ta'a*).<sup>258</sup> The *Continuatio Guilelmi Tyri*, according to which Raymond declared himself ready to become a convert to Islam and to hold Syria of Saladin as a hereditary fief, makes the most extreme statement. Agreement was reached, the chronicler says, through the mediation of Saladin's nephew (Taqi al-Din 'Umar?) and allegedly the Muslim received Raymond's homage for Syria.<sup>259</sup>

This account with its various legendary traits might well be untrustworthy on its own, especially as it may have originated about 1194 in England and the passages cited probably belong to a later addition.<sup>260</sup> However, they strikingly match the accounts of two of the best informed Arab observers. Saladin's secretary, al-Katib al-Isfahani, says that Raymond 'sought refuge with our sultan and sent his ambassadors to offer the possibility of obedience'. Only fear of his co-religionists was an obstacle to conversion.<sup>261</sup> And the head of Saladin's chancery, al-Qadi al-Fadil, wrote even before the battle of Hattin to the Byzantine Emperor Isaac Angelus,

<sup>256</sup> Regni Iherosolymitani Brevis Historia, 139; Arnold of Lübeck, 166; Epistola episcopi Wilhelmi, 189–90 (authores 1188?). Cf. Michael Syrus, 404; Ibn Jubayr, 309; 'Imād al-Dīn, *Fath̄h*, 17–8.

<sup>257</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn, *Fath̄h*, 18; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 527.

<sup>258</sup> *Historia peregrinorum*, 119; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 527.

<sup>259</sup> *Cont. Guil. Tyr.*, I, XI, 66.

<sup>260</sup> Mayer, *Itinerarium peregrinorum*, 160–61; M. Salloch in the introduction to her edition, 13/4.

<sup>261</sup> Al-Bundārī, 289.

that Raymond had submitted (*alqa bi-yadihi ilayna*, 'he offered himself to us by his hand') and that the submission had been accepted (*akhadhna bi-yadihi*, 'we took [him] by his hand'). According to this letter however, Raymond only aimed at intimidating the Franks.<sup>262</sup> Through the expressions of the Arabic text (using the literal translation as the basis), one might see in al-Qadi al-Fadil's words the description of the payment of homage, or at least of a handshake, although such a far-reaching interpretation is debatable. However, both formulations are established in Arabic in the meaning of 'to submit oneself', 'to deliver oneself' and 'to help'. Whether this translation of the terminology renders the linguistic usage of a court chancery of the twelfth century can admittedly hardly be decided. In any case, Raymond submitted himself to Saladin in a way that was not entirely unambiguous and if the traveller Ibn Jubayr can be believed, Raymond was already in 1184 bound to the Ayyubids by servitude (*'ubudiyya*) and manumission (*'itq*).<sup>263</sup>

This leads to two conclusions. Shortly before Hattin in 1187, Saladin was prepared to respect Frankish rule, not only in Antioch and Tripoli but also, at least, in parts of the kingdom of Jerusalem, subject to the submission of Raymond, the pretender to the Crown whom he supported. Although, as most sources remark, the Franks' internal conflict essentially facilitated his triumph over them, nothing indicates that Saladin had only contacted Raymond in order to split the Franks.<sup>264</sup> When Nur al-Din took the Christian Armenian Prince Mleh in 1168–69 into his service and granted him an *iqta'*, he justified himself against reproaches from his own ranks on the grounds that he would only take Mleh in his service to fight against the Christians and so would be relieved of part of his burden.<sup>265</sup> No such strategy is heard of with Saladin. The first links between the two sides were, according to the Arabic sources, already forged before the assumption of power by the court party and Guy in September 1186 and the Arabic accounts testify that Saladin prepared for the *jihad* only after Reynald of Châtillon had broken the treaty. In other words, he respected the peace with Jerusalem, although Raymond had already submitted to him. Did Saladin perhaps hope to be able to control as overlord the kingdom of Jerusalem (with a King Raymond), possibly after the cession of the Transjordanian castles which were so important for him and with certain

<sup>262</sup> Al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Morasalat*, fol. 54v.

<sup>263</sup> Ibn Jubayr, 309.

<sup>264</sup> For example Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 387; al-Bundārī, 290.

<sup>265</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 387.

concessions in Jerusalem? At any rate, his thirteenth-century successors repeatedly made not entirely dissimilar offers to the Franks.

Raymond III, the leading figure in the barons' party, was not only willing to enlist Muslim help against the court party, but was ready to become Saladin's liegeman, at the latest after his opponents' victory in the succession crisis of 1186. His act of submission was not performed according to Western forms of vassalage but Muslim forms, which, however, reminded European observers of homage. The reconciliation between the count and King Guy in May 1187 prevented the connection between Raymond and Saladin from having any far-reaching consequences. There can only be speculation about its deeper causes. Ibn al-Athir suggests that the patriarch of Jerusalem threatened Raymond with excommunication and the compulsory dissolution of his marriage if he did not give up collaboration. Al-Katib al-Isfahani thinks that the count's partisans had rejected his *impium foedus*.<sup>266</sup> Perhaps Raymond was thus unable to gain sympathy among his own people for his action. In spite of the failure of this project, it cannot be asserted that the constitution of a Muslim suzerainty over Frankish territories was impossible at the end of the twelfth century. Just for the years from 1187 to 1192, the sources contain a number of references to thoughts on both sides to such legal structures. Typically, most of these cases concern prominent members of the barons' party. In 1188 Saladin, when outside Tripoli, is said to have endeavoured to bring over to his side an especially able Frank known as the Green Knight. According to the accounts of the Ernoul group, he offered the knight in a personal interview entry into his service and *grant tiere et grant avoir*, i.e. in Muslim terms, the grant of an *iqta'* amongst other things, but the knight refused.<sup>267</sup>

The Sicilian admiral Margarit suggested in 1188 to Saladin in Latakia that he should make peace with the Franks and give back the conquered territory: 'Then they would become your slaves and all obey you.'<sup>268</sup> Saladin rejected this because the *jihad* was his duty, although the admiral explained that a Crusade would follow. In 1189, presumably in April, Saladin planned to take Shaqif Arnun after his return from northern Syria. It was in the possession of Reynald of Sidon, one of the chiefs of the barons' party. The descriptions of Saladin's secretary al-Katib al-Isfahani, his army judge and biographer Ibn Shaddad and Ibn al-Athir agree that Reynald

<sup>266</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, XI, 532; 'Imād al-Dīn, *Faḥḥ*, 18.

<sup>267</sup> Ernoul, XI, 252; similar in L'Estoire d'Eracles, XXIV, XI, 120.

<sup>268</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn, *Faḥḥ*, 143; similar in Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, XII, 10.

declared himself ready to surrender the castle, if he were granted a delay until the end of Jumada II (14 August 1189) in which time he would smuggle his family out of Tyre. Tyre was in the hands of Conrad of Montferrat, with whom Reynald was at odds in 1189, and Reynald feared reprisals if he surrendered his castle. Reynald, who spoke Arabic and had a knowledge of Islamic history and *hadith*, may have designated himself a slave (*mamluk*) of the sultan or, according to another literary source, as a slave and freedman of Saladin's benevolence (*raqiq al-imtinan*, '*atiq al-ihsan*, '*abd al-qinn*). He promised to enter Saladin's service, to be obedient to him, and asked for a dwelling in Damascus and an *iqta'* for his maintenance. Saladin was thus ready to take into his service one of the leaders of the court party, a Christian, and to provide for him in Islamic form, perhaps with land. However, the project failed, as Saladin came to think that Reynald only wanted to gain time and would cheat him. He had Reynald apprehended when the garrison refused to surrender at the end of the appointed time. The resistance of the castle ceased only on 22 April 1190 and Reynald was released.<sup>269</sup>

Projects of submission and entry into service also played a significant role in the numerous diplomatic initiatives and rounds of talks between 1191 and September 1192 to bring about the ending of the Third Crusade. English sources say that Saladin offered on 6 July 1191, directly before the Crusaders' recapture of Acre, to return all his conquests apart from Ascalon and Transjordan and also the True Cross. In return, Richard Lionheart and Philip II Augustus of France were to enter his service for a year and fight the Zengid ruler of Mosul or to despatch a thousand knights and five thousand mounted sergeants for this purpose. The offer that was said to have been repeated and somewhat enlarged after the fall of Acre cannot be right in this form.<sup>270</sup> Muslim sources are ignorant of it and report that the Crusaders on their side demanded the restoration of Jerusalem.<sup>271</sup> Saladin was not at enmity with Mosul and its ruler's son, 'Izz al-Din Mas'ud, was even in Saladin's army. The Latin continuation of William of Tyre (c. 1194) incidentally indicates that Saladin made these and other offers only on tactical grounds.<sup>272</sup> Against this background, and bearing in mind that even though Saladin had no problems with Mosul, he did with the ruler

<sup>269</sup> Bahā' al-Dīn b. Shaddād, 97; 'Imād al-Dīn, *Faṭḥ*, 177–8, 238–9; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XII, 27.

<sup>270</sup> *Gesta Henrici secundi*, II, 175–6, 180; Roger of Hoveden, III, 114, 122.

<sup>271</sup> Bahā' al-Dīn b. Shaddād, 170; similar in 'Imād al-Dīn, *Faṭḥ*, 356–7.

<sup>272</sup> *Cont. Guil. Tyr.*, III, XXIII, 140.

of Sinjar and also with his eastern neighbours (owing to the simultaneous conquests in Armenia by his nephew Taqi al-Din 'Umar) and the caliph, the account given by English sources does not appear so unhistorical. The idea of taking Crusaders into service, and respecting the existence of the Frankish states under Ayyubid suzerainty, was at least not inconceivable for both sides.

An act of submission is also mentioned in the first contacts between Conrad of Montferrat in Tyre and Saladin in the beginning of October 1191. After the return of Philip Augustus to France in August 1191, the remainder of the barons' party rallied around Conrad, amongst them Balian of Nablus and Reynald of Sidon, who in 1189 had been on hostile terms with Conrad. Likewise, Guy of Lusignan and Humphrey IV of Toron, who since September 1186 were to be reckoned with the court party, stood on the other hand on the side of Richard Lionheart. The conflict between the two camps developed to such an extent that Conrad, who claimed the Crown of Jerusalem, turned to Saladin and offered him an alliance against Richard in return for the surrender of Beirut and Sidon. Al-Katib al-Isfahani writes that in a letter delivered by Reynald of Sidon, Conrad offered to conclude peace and shake hands with the sultan as a token of obedience.<sup>273</sup> Reynald is said to have returned to Conrad with al-'Adl, who had been sent in 1186 as an ambassador to Raymond III of Tripoli, and to have brought with him copies of a precisely formulated oath. The poem of the Norman eyewitness Ambroise does not actually mention submission, but a feudal relationship and Conrad's oath to hold half of Jerusalem from Saladin.<sup>274</sup> When Conrad was murdered at the end of April 1192, however, no final treaty was yet in existence.

After Conrad's death, Henry of Champagne, Richard's most important supporter among the Crusaders, took power in Tyre. He married Conrad's widow, Isabella, King Amalric's last surviving daughter, and was elected king, probably on 5 May 1192. Conrad's supporters from the former barons' party went over to Henry. After the end of the Crusade Henry is said to have established a connection with Saladin and asked for a robe of honour which he donned, though this conduct seemed shameful to the Franks.<sup>275</sup> According to Ibn Shaddad, the army judge, Henry had already informed Saladin in May 1192 that Richard Lionheart had committed Frankish Syria

---

<sup>273</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn, *Fath*, 397.

<sup>274</sup> Ambroise, V.868zf., 232.

<sup>275</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XII, 79.

to him. He requested Saladin, 'Give me back my land, whereupon I will conclude peace with you and be as one of your children'—an idea which exceedingly angered Saladin.<sup>276</sup> In this connection it may be remembered that Saladin appointed his older sons as governors. Richard proposed to Saladin on 9 July 1192 that he should restore Henry's lands on condition that Henry and his army would stand at Saladin's disposal and would comply with military orders on a campaign in the east.<sup>277</sup> A further offer in the first days of August 1192 leave no doubt that Richard thought of constituting a relationship of feudal vassalage in order to be able to conclude peace. After the successful defence of Jaffa he informed Saladin: 'It is a principle of the Franks that when one of them gives another a locality, the latter becomes his follower and servant.' Richard asked Saladin to make fiefs of Jaffa and Ascalon and promised that 'the troops of both places will remain permanently in your service, and if you need me, I shall come in the shortest time and serve you.'<sup>278</sup> Saladin did not agree to all these proposals, but it is clear from the following example that he was not categorically against enfeoffment or the grant of land to Franks in Muslim form as *iqta'*. The Old French continuators of William of Tyre transmit the report that after the conclusion of the treaty of 2 September 1192, which ended the Third Crusade, Saladin showed his 'sympathy for the great lords of the land, whom he had disinherited and who were alive.' He conceded half of the revenue of Sidon and also the locality of Sarfand to Reynald of Sidon, and the castle of Tall Qaymun near Acre to Balian of Nablus.<sup>279</sup> It is not mentioned whether a service relationship was constituted, but the places named definitely belonged to the Muslim territories according to the treaty of 2 September.

Naturally, it cannot be said in individual cases whether the Arabic, Old French or Latin expressions correctly render the legal content of the offers made by the other side. It can also not be settled in individual cases whether what is described in the sources deals with the formation of a relationship of suzerainty of the Muslim type, Western feudal relationships, simple alliances or (as may be presumed in the case of the Green Knight) the recruitment of mercenary soldiers. In any event, it is clear that the various projects were a result of initiatives made by both sides. Saladin did not agree to the offers to enter into legal relationships of the Western

---

<sup>276</sup> Bahā' al-Dīn b. Shaddād, 218.

<sup>277</sup> Bahā' al-Dīn b. Shaddād, 219.

<sup>278</sup> Bahā' al-Dīn b. Shaddād, 228.

<sup>279</sup> Ernoul, XXV, 293; L'Estoire d'Eracles, XXIV, XXVII, 199.

vassalage type as Henry of Champagne, Richard Lionheart and perhaps also Conrad of Montferrat proposed; but he was obviously prepared to reach an agreement with the Franks on Islamic forms. One factor above all stands out: members of the barons' party were involved in most cases, particularly Reynald of Sidon and Balian of Nablus, who after the death of Raymond III of Tripoli in the autumn of 1187 were the most prominent surviving leaders of the party. Reynald and Balian were the most important followers of Conrad of Montferrat, and after May 1192 of Henry of Champagne, and they may have influenced their initiatives. It is known that in November 1191 Saladin, in choosing between Richard and Conrad to conclude a treaty, inclined to the latter, since among other things the Oriental Frankish settlers were on Conrad's side.<sup>280</sup> To all appearances, only members of the barons' party were considered for Saladin's land award to Frankish leaders. Humphrey IV of Toron, for instance, had rendered just as worthy service as Balian or Reynald as ambassador and interpreter in the negotiation of the truce which brought the Crusade to an end, but he had been on the side of the opponents of the barons' party from September 1186 and during the Crusade. It fits the picture of particularly intensive contacts between Saladin and members of the barons' party that Bohemond III of Antioch visited Saladin in Beirut in 1192. Al-Katib al-Isfahani says: 'He came to do service, seeking to grasp the ropes of protection, entering into the regime of the *dhimma*.' Also Bohemond, whose wife had given Saladin important information about the European armament of the Crusade, could count upon an accommodation with Saladin and gained financial concessions in the Antiochene-Ayyubid condominium. Thus, Bohemond entered into a kind of subordinate relationship in 1192 at the latest and his good relations with the Ayyubids were maintained after Saladin's death in 1193. In 1197, for example, he met the commanders of Saladin's son, al-Malik al-Zahir of Aleppo, and gave them valuable advice about the activities of the Crusaders sent by the Emperor Henry VI to Syria.<sup>281</sup>

Saladin's land award to members of the barons' party comes at the end of a long series of contacts grounded on treaties and legal relationships between this aristocratic party and the Ayyubids. The alliance and submission of Count Raymond III of Tripoli was consequently not an isolated case. Unlike the leaders of the court party (Reynald of Châtillon, Guy of

<sup>280</sup> Bahā' al-Dīn b. Shaddād, 203–4. Cf. Ambroise, V.8691–8694, 232.

<sup>281</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn, *Fath̄h*, 446; Bahā' al-Dīn b. Shaddād, 240; Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, III, 140–1.

Lusignan, the Grand Master of the Templars Gerard of Ridefort and the Seneschal Joscelin III), the barons were prepared in 1184 to establish relations with Saladin and to carry out treaties, even after the end of the 'no place' policy. That a large number of the projects mentioned were not realized, or were only proposed during the Third Crusade for tactical reasons, does not invalidate the conclusion that on both the Muslim and the Frankish side, there was basically a readiness for concluding treaties, awarding lands and entering into relationships of suzerainty or protection, even at the peak of Ayyubid *jihad* propaganda and the party struggle in the kingdom of Jerusalem.

At least some of the projects for submission, especially the proposals of Henry of Champagne and Richard Lionheart, are closely connected with the efforts to end the Third Crusade with a negotiated peace. Soon after the Franks' recapture of Acre on 12 July 1191, a balance of power existed between the two sides. The Crusaders' rule over the localities of the Palestinian coastal plain could not be contested, while they were for their part in no position to win back Jerusalem and the chief part of the territory lost to Saladin. Against this background, there were various rounds of negotiations between Richard Lionheart, the leader of the Crusade, and Saladin's brother al-Malik al-'Adil or ambassadors of the two sides. The entire course of these conversations needs no further description here as modern historians have studied it extensively. That is not the case for aspects of the technicalities of the treaty of 1191 and the legal institutions which, in the end, made agreement possible.

Saladin's garrison commandant surrendered Acre to the Crusaders on 12 July 1191 after a siege of nearly two years. Of particular interest are the manner of the surrender and the discussions over the fulfilling of the treaty of surrender, protracted until the massacre of the majority of the Muslim prisoners on 20 August. The Arabic sources state that Conrad of Montferrat received 10,000 dinars for his service as mediator in the negotiation of the treaty. It was Conrad also who planted Christian banners on the towers and walls of the city on 12 July.<sup>282</sup> Quarrels arose between the Frankish ambassadors and Saladin on 3 August over the fixing of the instalments for the exchange of the captured Muslim garrison against the 200,000 dinars, 1,600 Frankish prisoners and the True Cross laid down in the treaty. Saladin's proposal was that the Crusaders should release all their prisoners. As they would only liberate a part of them, Saladin

---

<sup>282</sup> Bahā' al-Dīn b. Shaddād, 171; 'Imād al-Dīn, *Fath*, 357–8; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XII, 67.

requested a guarantee from the Templars that the remaining prisoners would be well treated in accordance with the treaty. They refused for fear of a breach of the treaty by the Crusaders.<sup>283</sup> Incidentally, both sides had sworn to the treaty of surrender on 12 July in the Templars' tent.

To all appearances Conrad, who had been joined by the rest of the barons' party and who possibly spoke Arabic and probably Greek, thus served with the Templars as a mediator. As seen above, Muslim-Frankish treaties often came into existence through the participation of neutral mediators; e.g. Raymond III of Tripoli had attempted to mediate a treaty between Saladin and Jerusalem in 1183. In addition to the phenomenon of mediation in the negotiation of treaties, typical for the Frankish-Muslim treaty policy in the twelfth century, there is another traditional element of Syrian treaty policy, the establishment of condominium, in the negotiations up to September 1192. It plays a part in the peace proposals of Richard and Conrad as well as Saladin. Directly after his arrival outside Acre on 7 June 1191, Richard Lionheart had already tried to meet Saladin and had proposed peace negotiations. Until his conversation on 17 October with the ambassadors of Saladin's brother al-'Adil, who was Saladin's plenipotentiary for the conducting of negotiations and the possible conclusion of a treaty, the Crusaders raised demands, partly through ambassadors, partly through discussions conducted between Richard and al-'Adil personally, for the return of the whole of Palestine or all the territories conquered by Saladin. The other side did not accept this, although after his heavy defeat at Arsuf on 7 September, Saladin was near to agreement.<sup>284</sup>

In the middle of September, however, Richard's negotiating position had deteriorated because Conrad of Montferrat was so much at odds with him that he himself negotiated with Saladin. For the first time, Richard showed himself ready to compromise and made the famous offer that his sister Joan, the widowed queen of Sicily, should marry al-'Adil and together with him rule the Frankish and Muslim parts of Palestine from Jerusalem. Saladin agreed, but did not believe that the king's proposal was viewed seriously. Outwardly, the failure of the marriage project (which incidentally would have contravened the canon law and the marriage law of the kingdom of Jerusalem) was put down to Joan's refusal to marry a Muslim; although presumably Richard intended simply to spoil the protracted

<sup>283</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn, *Fath*, 371; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XII, 67.

<sup>284</sup> Bahā' al-Dīn b. Shaddād, 163, 182, 187, 193–4, 195; 'Imād al-Dīn, *Fath*, 348, 382–3; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XII, 72.

negotiations between Saladin and Conrad of Montferrat with this offer. Although the *Itinerarium peregrinorum* reports that Richard insisted in November on the restoration of the kingdom within the boundaries as under Baldwin IV, and the continued payment of the Egyptian tribute as in the Fatimid period, the king seems to have already offered compromise formulas in this phase of the negotiations.<sup>285</sup> According to Ibn Shaddad, who took a direct part in the discussions of the Muslim leaders, Richard proposed that it should be determined which villages should be Frankish and which Ayyubid or whether all should be made condominiumia. Saladin again conferred full powers on al-ʿAdil to negotiate peace with Richard a few days later. At his request, al-ʿAdil received an aide-mémoire, which laid down Saladin's possible concessions and the territories taken into consideration as condominiumia.<sup>286</sup> From this time on, condominiumia played an important part in every round of negotiations until peace was concluded on 2 September 1192.

At the end of March 1192, three months after the failure of the Crusaders' first advance on Jerusalem, Richard gave up his claim to the whole of Jerusalem. He proposed to the ambassador Abu Bakr al-Hajib that the citadel and the Dome of the Rock should remain Muslim, but the city of Jerusalem and the villages around should be made a condominium. Conrad of Montferrat also followed similar ideas. In the discussions which dragged on between his ambassadors and Saladin until 21 April 1192, seven days before his murder, condominium settlement was under consideration both for Jerusalem and also for the villages between Frankish and Muslim territories.<sup>287</sup> In the peace discussions from 9 to 19 July 1192, shortly after the failure of the second march on Jerusalem, which were concerned with possible Frankish rights to station a garrison in Jerusalem and also the razing of Ascalon and al-Darum, there was renewed talk about the establishment of condominiumia in frontier territories and the sovereignty over the towns awaiting demolition.<sup>288</sup> In the concluding truce of 2 September 1192 the following stipulations were made: the territory from Jaffa to Tyre should remain Frankish with the exception of the more inland localities, while Lydda and al-Ramla should become condominiumia; the treaty should be valid for three years and eight months until Easter 1196; it should include all Muslim territories and also those of the Nizaris,

<sup>285</sup> *Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, IV, XXXI, 295–7.

<sup>286</sup> Bahā' al-Dīn b. Shaddād, 203, 205.

<sup>287</sup> Ambroise, V.8682f., 232; Bahā' al-Dīn b. Shaddād, 206.

<sup>288</sup> Bahā' al-Dīn b. Shaddād, 219–220.

and if the count of Tripoli and the prince of Antioch ratified it, it would also be valid for the northern Frankish lordships.<sup>289</sup>

In the negotiations to end the fighting between the Crusaders and Saladin, there appears, as the preceding exposition has revealed, a whole range of practices and proposals which until then had played no part in Frankish-Muslim relations. Among these are the repeated attempts of Richard to meet Saladin in person,<sup>290</sup> and also the projects brought on his behalf to the negotiating table of a marriage-bond or of an enfeoffment by Saladin with Jaffa and Ascalon. Typically enough, Saladin went into such proposals either not at all or only for tactical reasons. The legal institution which in his view could solve controversial territorial questions was the Frankish-Muslim condominium, known since the beginning of the twelfth century. The establishment of condominiums in Lydda, al-Ramla and Sidon in 1192, and their continued existence on the frontiers of the principality of Antioch indicate that these means of compromise were available in a situation of military stalemate. The declaration of entire towns and not only rural zones as condominiums is, however, without precedent in the twelfth century—here new legal territory was entered in 1192. The localities jointly ruled were inhabited, but were open cities without fortification. The condominiums were not regarded as a long-term solution; their duration coincided with the period of the treaty. The agreement of 1192 had in the eyes of both sides the character of a truce, which had become indispensable through the military exhaustion of both the Franks and the Muslims, and the internal problems of the respective leaders in their realms. Richard and Saladin wanted to resume hostilities in any case after the expiry of the treaty.<sup>291</sup> In such a situation, the constitution of condominiums was the chosen means. The condominiums of 1192, however, remained in existence considerably longer, since Saladin died on 4 March 1193 and Richard was prevented from planning a new Crusade by consequence of his capture by Duke Leopold V of Austria. He died on 6 April 1199. Lydda and al-Ramla remained condominiums until 1204, Sidon possibly even until 1228–29.<sup>292</sup>

This chapter's consideration of Frankish-Muslim relations from 1184 to 1192 can be summarised as follows. The relationship between Saladin and the kingdom of Jerusalem was, to a still greater extent than between

<sup>289</sup> Bahā' al-Dīn b. Shaddād, 233–4.

<sup>290</sup> Bahā' al-Dīn b. Shaddād, 163, 201.

<sup>291</sup> Ambroise, V.11810–11814, 316–7; V.12295–12299, 330; 'Imād al-Dīn, *Fath*, 435–6.

<sup>292</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XII, 195.

1174 and 1183, subject to the repercussions of the internal party quarrels of the Franks and the consequences of the *jihad* propaganda for Saladin's Frankish policy. Even after his assumption of power in Aleppo in 1183, Saladin was not determined to devote himself entirely to the *jihad*. He found treaty partners in Raymond III and the barons' party, who were both willing and in a position to conclude and fulfil agreements. In the course of 1186, however, there were developments on the side both of the Ayyubids and Jerusalem which made conflict unavoidable. After his enterprise in northern Mesopotamia in 1185–86, Saladin was placed under massive internal and external pressure finally to turn against the Franks. In the kingdom of Jerusalem, after the death of Baldwin V, the court party ousted the barons' party from power, whereupon the centrifugal forces among the barons revived and increased in strength. The king no longer had any authority to prevent breaches of treaties (in which financial as well as political reasons presumably played a part) or to provide compensation. On the other hand, Count Raymond III sought refuge from a threatened attack by King Guy by dependence on Saladin, in the course of which Ayyubid suzerainty was presumably set up.

After Reynald of Châtillon had broken the treaty, Saladin issued a summons to the *jihad* in 1187. Yet, it is very doubtful whether he intended by the attack, which he had to undertake in order not to lose his credibility as a *mujahid* entirely, to bring to an end Frankish rule over the coastal region. He may actually only have been interested in bringing Transjordan under his control. The policy which he pursued in regard to Raymond III of Tripoli provides evidence that Saladin was prepared to respect Frankish states under a leadership friendly to the Ayyubids and presumably under Ayyubid suzerainty. Whether he would have claimed the cession of Transjordan and Jerusalem or at least special rights in Jerusalem in exchange cannot be definitely decided, since Raymond had to seek reconciliation with King Guy and break with Saladin in 1187 as a result of pressure from his own followers.

Raymond's idea of wishing to secure himself with Muslim assistance, and of recognizing Saladin's suzerainty, is to be seen in connection with a range of other contacts with Saladin by members or sympathizers of the barons' party, such as Bohemond III of Antioch, Reynald of Sidon and Balian of Nablus, which are mentioned in the sources between 1183 and 1192. All these projects are concerned with the taking into service of Frankish lords by Saladin, granting lands to Franks or even the establishment of Ayyubid suzerainty. This shows the quality of the relations that was possible at the end of the twelfth century between settled Frankish barons,

most of whom spoke Arabic, and the Muslims despite all the propaganda for *jihad* and Crusade. Members of the barons' party were also influential participants in the rounds of negotiations during and at the end of the Third Crusade in 1191–92. Finally, these discussions make it clear that Saladin was not prepared to fall back on 'Western' solutions, such as Richard Lionheart's projects of marriage or vassalage, in his search for legal instruments for a settlement with the Franks. All the legal relationships discussed were either of Islamic origin, e.g. the award of *iqta*'s, or had a long tradition in the history of Frankish-Muslim relations in the East, such as the establishment of condominiumia. The historic break in Frankish-Muslim relations at the end of the twelfth century was not 1187, but 1192, regarding both the content of treaties and the persons of the negotiators.

#### A GLANCE AT FRANKISH-MUSLIM RELATIONS IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

In the history of alliance policy, the history of the so-called second Latin kingdom of Jerusalem (1192 to 1291) stood under entirely different auspices from the Frankish-Muslim relations in the twelfth century. The political history of Syria in the twelfth century had been characterised by the successes of individual Turkish military leaders and governors and also those leaders of the First Crusade who were determined to establish lordships by implanting themselves in the traditional centres of Syria and making themselves independent. This took place in a phase of increasingly decentralized political rule from c. 1070 to 1128. In consequence, there developed a system of Frankish, Turkish and Arab states, pursuing basically antagonistic interests, but drawn together against any external power's attempt to gain a foothold in Syria. The underlying idea of this policy has been described above as the 'no place' doctrine. This doctrine not only determined the treaty and alliance policy from the first decade of the twelfth century until the completion of the incorporation of almost all the previously independent lordships in the Zengid dominions of Nur al-Din in 1157–58, but in a wider form also up to the 1170s when Fatimid Egypt and the Zengid and Artuqid dominions in northern Syria and northern Mesopotamia were included. At the latest, however, Saladin's taking of Aleppo in 1183 rendered the 'no place' doctrine obsolete for alliance policy since the Frankish states were no longer part of a continuing system of independent states in Syria. They now confronted a single Ayyubid power complex under the leadership of Saladin, who used the *jihad* ideology to legitimate

his rule and to carry out his endeavours to expand his power. The function of the *jihad* ideology, which, as we have seen, had already been made an instrument of the expansionist policy of ‘Imad al-Din Zengi and Nur al-Din, finally contributed decisively, in conjunction with the internal developments in the kingdom of Jerusalem, to make Saladin’s conflict with the Franks inevitable, even if he remained ready in principle to conclude an agreement, especially with members of the barons’ party.

However, the ‘no place’ doctrine and *jihad* ideology, basic elements in Frankish-Muslim relations in the twelfth century as a means of power-politics, hardly played any part from Saladin’s death in 1193 to the end of Frankish rule in Syria. After Saladin’s death, differences broke out again—in the shape of the Ayyubid succession struggles—within the Middle East which the struggle against the Franks had obscured. Immediately before his death, Saladin had still been pursuing new plans of expansion, which, however, were in no way directed against Constantinople or the continent of Europe, as he had roundly promised the caliph in 1182, but once more against Muslim neighbours. Ibn al-Athir, who in spite of his admiration of Saladin as a *mujahid*, did not as a pro-Zengid chronicler lose sight of the expansionist trait of Ayyubid policy, uniquely reports a conversation of Saladin with his son al-Afdal and his brother al-‘Adil after the end of the fighting with the Franks, perhaps in 1193. Saladin was reported to have said: ‘We are done with the Franks and nothing remains to be done in these lands. Where should we turn?’ After taking counsel with them, Saladin decided that al-‘Adil with one or more of Saladin’s sons should take part of the army and attack Khilat on Lake Van, while Saladin himself gained control of the Seljuk sultanate of Rum. Thereafter they would unite their forces to advance through Azerbaijan to Iran, which would be at their mercy.<sup>293</sup> It might be that this anecdote merely expresses what was expected of Saladin after the end of the Third Crusade. It shows, however, how the balance between *jihad* and expansionist policies was at least evaluated outside Ayyubid territories. Saladin’s death some months later makes it impossible to determine his plans in 1193 for future endeavours, but throughout his previous decade Saladin had repeatedly referred to campaigns against Muslim enemies.

Under Saladin’s successor the *jihad de facto* stopped for long stretches so Ibn ‘Abd al-Zahir, the head of chancery to the Mamluk Sultans Baybars and Qalawun, could describe the entire period as one of indifference or

---

<sup>293</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, XII, 75–96.

weakness.<sup>294</sup> A work of chancery literature originating at the beginning of the fourteenth century says, with reference to the peaceful Muslim-Frankish relationship after the last great Muslim triumph before the Mamluks assumed power in Egypt, the victory over the Damietta Crusade (1218–21): ‘Had it gone further, the people would have fallen away and become unbelievers.’<sup>295</sup> Until 1240, i.e. about half a century after the end of the Third Crusade, a condition of ‘Levantine peace’ reigned between Franks and Ayyubids. This was interrupted only by hostilities, usually of short duration, between the expiry of a treaty and the conclusion of a new agreement, or the arrival of new Crusaders from Europe. After Saladin’s death, the newly elected but never crowned king of Jerusalem, Henry of Champagne, and Saladin’s son, al-Malik al-‘Aziz of Egypt (d. 595/1198), renewed in 1196 the truce of 1192 and again extended it.<sup>296</sup> Further treaties, each concluded after short hostilities, took place in 1198, 1204 and 1211. In these agreements, which all had the character of truces, territorial concessions were made to the Franks and the localities previously recovered on the coast (Beirut and possibly Sidon and Jubayl) were conceded. Seen as a whole, the Ayyubids followed a defensive policy towards the Frankish states of Syria. Instead of seeking warfare with the Franks, they endeavoured to develop their trading relations with the Italian maritime cities.

Military operations, insofar as they took place at all, almost always went back to Frankish attacks and were mostly connected with the arrival of European Crusaders. A discrepancy between the interests of these Europeans and those of the Oriental Frankish settlers had repeatedly appeared during the twelfth century, most clearly perhaps during the Second Crusade in 1148. This tension became clearly more acute after 1192. Above all, the *Historia orientalis* of Jacques de Vitry, who held office from 1216 as bishop of Acre, illustrates this.<sup>297</sup> Unlike their European allies, unlike also Pope Innocent III, who expressly declared during his preparations for a Crusade in 1199 that he would show no consideration for the existing truce, the Franks of Syria were interested in a peaceful relationship with the Muslims. Thus, in 1198 Syrian Frankish barons warned the Muslim garrison of Tibnin, besieged by them and by Crusaders sent by the Emperor Henry VI, against capitulation, since the Germans were not to be held to

<sup>294</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhir, *Rawḍ*, 46.

<sup>295</sup> Ibn Faḍlallāh al-‘Umārī, 101/arab. 85.

<sup>296</sup> Ibn al-Āthīr, *Kāmil*, XII, 126.

<sup>297</sup> Jacques de Vitry, *Historia*, LXXII, 1088.

the terms of surrender.<sup>298</sup> The Hospitallers of Crac des Chevaliers based in 1268 the fact that they kept shut the gates of their castle before Sultan Baybars in spite of an existing treaty on their fear that 'Western Franks' who were with them might attack the Muslims without fear of death.<sup>299</sup> The Franks were indeed dependent on reinforcements from the West and for this reason in the treaties after 1192 there is repeatedly a passage analogous to the suspension clause of 1177, but avoided if possible greater conflicts.<sup>300</sup>

By contrast in northern and central Syria, there was again even a Frankish-Ayyubid alliance in the course of the disputes between Bohemond IV of Antioch-Tripoli and the Armenian King Leon II. When at the end of December 1203 Leon surprised Bohemond in Antioch, and besieged him in the citadel, the latter proclaimed his subjection to Saladin's son, al-Malik al-Zahir of Aleppo, communicated this by pigeon post, and in fact also received help from Aleppo. Some two years later, al-Zahir took 10,000 foot-soldiers from Antioch into his service for a campaign against the Armenians.<sup>301</sup> In 1216, when the conflict was finally decided in Leon's favour, the latter wrote in a letter to Aleppo: 'The prince (i.e. of Antioch) was in the sultan's service, yet my service is more valuable than his... I have ordered my nephew, whom I have installed in Antioch, to continue in his (i.e. al-Zahir's) service.'<sup>302</sup> It is quite conceivable that these phrases express a relationship of suzerainty of Aleppo over Antioch, as was already indicated in the time of the treaties of 1183 and 1192 between Bohemond III and Saladin.

Two reports by the contemporary Ibn Nazif al-Hamawi show the closeness of the relations between the Frankish states and the rulers of local Ayyubid principalities after 1192, in spite of the critical deterioration of the mutual relationship during individual Crusades. The first of these says that directly before the arrival in Syria of the Emperor Frederick II in 1228, the Nizaris enquired in Aleppo how they should conduct themselves towards the emperor. They indicated that if an agreement were concluded with the Oriental Franks against him, successful resistance to him would be possible. Had there perhaps been conversations between Frederick's Guelf opponents among the Syrian Franks and their Muslim neighbours

---

<sup>298</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *Kāmil*, XII, 128.

<sup>299</sup> Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, *Rawḍ*, 306.

<sup>300</sup> Roger of Hoveden, IV, 68.

<sup>301</sup> Ibn Wāṣil, III, 154–5, 170–1.

<sup>302</sup> Ibn Wāṣil, III, 235.

about an alliance against the emperor, who was excommunicated by the pope? A little later the author reports that in 1233 the Ayyubid ruler of Hims, al-Malik al-Mujahid, had sent official condolences on the death of Bohemond IV in Antioch.<sup>303</sup> Both reports speak for themselves as evidence of the quality of the relations between the Oriental Franks and the Ayyubids in the first half of the thirteenth century.

The *locus classicus* for the Ayyubid position in regard to the Franks in the first decades of the thirteenth century is again found in Ibn Wasil. He states that Sultan al-Kamil decided to agree a treaty in 1121 when confronted with the question of whether to grant a safe conduct to the remainder of the Damietta Crusade or to take Damietta by force and massacre all the Franks. He argued as follows: 'These who are here are not all the Franks. If we eliminate them, we could only take . . . Damietta after a fairly long time. The kings of the Franks overseas and the pope will hear what has happened to the Franks and then they will send further reinforcements to Egypt.'<sup>304</sup> Arguments such as this lay behind the Ayyubid efforts to keep the relationship with the Franks as quiet as possible. In the light of the experiences of 1187–92, a long-lasting new dispute with the Franks would only have given rise to a new Crusade, endangering the Ayyubid dominions, which were quite loosely organized as a complex of semi-autonomous lordships governed by members of the ruling house under the frequently challenged leadership of an overlord and head of the family. The Ayyubid rulers were even prepared to cede Jerusalem for peace with the Franks and, as in 1227–28, not to have to fight on two fronts in achieving their own claims to rule against rival Ayyubid princes. In the tradition of Saladin and the twelfth-century rulers, their titles were adorned with the same *jihād* epithets and their *jihād* odes composed with the same intensity as in Saladin's time.

It has been shown above that negotiations about the status of Jerusalem were already held during the Third Crusade. During the next great crusading enterprise directed against Muslim opponents, the Damietta Crusade of 1218–21, al-Malik al-Kamil of Egypt in 1219 offered the Crusaders, who had established themselves in Damietta, wide-ranging concessions in exchange for their withdrawal. These included the restoration of the whole of the kingdom of Jerusalem with the exception of al-Karak and al-Shawbak, an annual tribute of 15,000 gold besants for Transjordan

<sup>303</sup> Ibn Naẓīf, 50/arab. 103, 178/arab. 82.

<sup>304</sup> Ibn Wāṣil, III, 97.

in addition to the True Cross and money for the refortification of Jerusalem. The same or a slightly modified proposal was once again put forward in June 1221, but without success. Sultan al-Malik al-Kamil offered the Emperor Frederick II in 624/1226–27 Jerusalem and a part of Saladin's conquests, obviously an offer identical with those of 1219 and 1221, in return for an alliance against his brother, al-Malik al-Mu'azzam of Damascus who was leagued with the Khawarazmshah Jalal al-Din. In any case, to all appearances Frederick's ambassadors, Thomas of Acerra and Balian of Sidon, returned during the first negotiations to the offer of 1221.<sup>305</sup> Since the *casus foederis* was settled for al-Kamil by the death of his brother and rival al-Mu'azzam, soon afterwards on 12 November 1227, he was no longer prepared to cede the whole coastal strip west of the Jordan. This resulted in the treaty of 11 February 1229, the famous compromise which brought Jerusalem under Frankish control once again, with the exception of the Haram with the Holy Places of Islam as well as smaller territorial concessions on the road from Jaffa, and provided for the sole Frankish possession of Sidon. When French Crusaders under the leadership of Theobald of Champagne resumed the fighting after the termination of this treaty, which lasted ten years, five months and forty days,<sup>306</sup> al-Malik al-Nasir Dawud of al-Karak recovered Jerusalem on 7 December 1239. However, a good half-year later it came back into Frankish possession until 1244 in the treaty of alliance between Theobald and al-Malik al-Salih Isma'il of Damascus directed against Egypt, this time with the inclusion of the Haram area. According to Western sources, the restoration of Palestine and Jerusalem was offered several times during the Crusade of St. Louis in 1249–54. First in 1249 or 1250 for the handing over of Damietta, which the Crusaders held, then in 1250 in the context of an alliance proposed by al-Malik al-Nasir Yusuf of Aleppo against the Mamluks of Egypt, and finally in the spring of 1252 as the requirement for an alliance agreement between Louis IX and the Mamluks against al-Nasir Yusuf.<sup>307</sup> All these offers came to nothing, because (if indeed they are historical) Louis rejected the first, while the offer of 1250 and the treaty of 1252 were not carried through. These cases bear witness to the low status of the *jihad* and Jerusalem for the rulers following Saladin, even though not every proposal concerning Jerusalem and Saladin's other conquests was realized. In his circular to

<sup>305</sup> Ibn Naẓīf, 105/arab. 51.

<sup>306</sup> Al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, I/1, 201.

<sup>307</sup> Matthaeus Parisiensis, V, 143, VI, 196, 205–6; Jean de Joinville, LXXVII, 242, XCI, 254; Rothelin, LXXIV, 628.

Muslim princes, Sultan al-Kamil justified the surrender of Jerusalem without the Haram as follows:

'The religious rituals of the Muslims and infidels in Jerusalem are a powerful article of belief, which leads the latter to attack the Muslims and their land. [...] A sensible aim is the passage of pilgrims to carry out the religious practices according to the teachings of each religious community.' He continued that this is why the sultan had left Jerusalem to the Franks in a demolished and unfortified condition. 'Thereby immense damage and fear were averted from the Muslims and security established for the duration of the truce. There could be no greater benefit and good fortune for the Muslims.'<sup>308</sup>

Even though the religious scholars of Damascus strongly opposed this policy, they could not prevent it. Fifteen years later al-Malik al-Salih of Damascus allowed the Franks—with whom he was allied against his nephew Sultan al-Salih Ayyub of Egypt—to purchase weapons in Damascus. Some 'pious' persons thereupon asked the scholar Ibn 'Abd al-Salam (from the prominent Banu al-Sulami family of jurists and fighters for the Faith) for a *fatwa* which duly declared the trade to be forbidden and ordered the mention of the ruler's name in the *khutba* to be discontinued. Isma'il had the jurist and one of his colleagues arrested and only some time later commuted al-Sulami's sentence to house arrest. Both of the incriminated shaykhs later migrated to Egypt.<sup>309</sup> Isma'il also executed the Muslim commander of the stronghold of Shaqif Arnun, who refused to surrender his castle to the Franks in accordance with the treaty, and the stronghold was handed over after its capture, as agreed.<sup>310</sup>

Thus, there appears a coexistence of Frankish and Muslim states in the first half of the thirteenth century during periods protected by truces of five to ten years' duration, only briefly broken at times by Crusades. The spirit of the *jihad* remained awake among the men of religion, but it decided policy only when, as during the Damietta Crusade of 1218–21, it was fanned at the ruler's behest, or when it could be made an instrument of the internal disputes of the Ayyubid rulers. In 1229, for instance, al-Malik al-Nasir Dawud of Damascus had the treaty of al-Kamil with Frederick II condemned from the pulpit of the Umayyad Mosque. Doctrines of alliance policy are not recognizable in the relationship of Jerusalem to the Ayyubid rulers until 1240. It is significant that the Franks did not intervene in any of the internal Muslim power struggles during the first four

<sup>308</sup> Ibn Abī al-Dam, 172v.

<sup>309</sup> Ibn Duqmāq, fol. 49r–v.

<sup>310</sup> Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, ed. Jewett, 493–4; 'Izz al-Dīn b. Shaddād, *A'lāq* (Lubnān), 155–6.

decades of the century, although the mutual estrangement of the Ayyubids after Saladin's death was well known and it was judged, in Europe at any rate, to be an opportunity for regaining the territories lost in 1187–88. There were no alliances based on the 'no place' doctrine, although similar trains of thought were certainly to be found in the varying alliances among rulers belonging to the Ayyubid family in the succession struggles after Saladin's death.<sup>311</sup> But this did not imply alliance relations with the Franks, only the necessity of the Syrian Ayyubids offering a united front against the Egyptians. Proper Frankish-Muslim alliances, apart from the one instance of the alliance, perhaps the submission, of Bohemond IV to al-Malik al-Zahir of Aleppo up to 1216, existed merely in the short phase from 1240 to 1244 and in unrealized form in 1252, when St. Louis was in Palestine. For the Franks, these agreements were simply instrumental for the acquisition of territory. They were not necessary for the continued maintenance of their territory and considerations of a more extensive alliance policy cannot account for them. The connection with Damascus from 1240 to 1244 ended on 17 October 1244 with one of the Franks' worst military disasters, the victory of Sultan al-Salih Ayyub of Egypt's army at Gaza over the allied Syrian Ayyubids and Franks. St. Louis' alliance policy from 1252 to 1254 remained ineffective since in the end Egypt and Damascus united without Frankish participation.

The last four decades to 1291 of Frankish-Muslim relations in Syria stood entirely against the background of the growing power of the Mamluks of Egypt, who in 1250 had taken the place of the Ayyubids on the Nile, the extension of their rule to Syria and also the struggle between Mamluks and Mongols. From 1255 to 1285 a whole host of treaties were concluded between the Franks and the last Ayyubid sultan in Syria, al-Nasir Yusuf who ruled until 1260, and with the Mamluk rulers resident in Cairo, Baybars and Qalawun, from 1261. It is highly characteristic of these agreements, which are most interesting in their technical details, that they were no longer concluded between the kingdom of Jerusalem and the Muslim states alone. Rather, the knightly Orders and individual Frankish barons such as the count of Jaffa or the Ladies of Beirut and Tyre appear as parties to the treaties, beside the king's deputy in Acre. In spite of the relatively long duration of these treaties, as a rule ten years or more, the individual Frankish states successively fell to the Mamluks until 1291. One can no longer speak of an alliance policy between these partners

---

<sup>311</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XII, 109–110.

of visibly unequal power, although some Frankish barons attempted to secure their lordships by dependence on the sultans. This is particularly true of John of Ibelin, count of Jaffa (d. 1266), perhaps also for Philip of Montfort, the lord of Tyre. The relations of Baybars with the Lady of Beirut are also interesting. Yet, to make a detailed investigation of the relationship between Franks and Mamluks in this period would go beyond the framework of this study.

Thus, the treaty and alliance policy current between Franks and Muslims in the thirteenth century was based on entirely different assumptions from that in the decades after the First Crusade. The Frankish states were firmly established in the thirteenth century, but to a large degree too politically and militarily insignificant to play a part in Middle Eastern clashes. It is typical that none of the Arabic sources has a word to say about the alliance policy of St. Louis in Palestine. Except for the short interval from 1240 to 1244, the period after 1192 was less a history of supra-regional diplomacy between Frankish and Muslim states, but rather a history of simply living alongside one another. There was little attempt by the Franks to exploit the inter-Ayyubid disputes until 1240, just as there was little attempt by the neighbouring Muslim rulers to intervene in the struggles between Guelfs and Ghibellines, which took place in the remains of the kingdom of Jerusalem. Only the Mamluks' accession to power altered this picture. The expansionist policy of the Mamluk sultans was again accompanied by lively *jihad* propaganda, possibly for the same reasons of legitimization as with Saladin. Not only the Frankish states and lordships fell as its victims, one after another, but also the territories of the Nizaris, almost all the Ayyubid states and finally also the kingdom of Armenia. It was not the *jihad* ideology but the power-politics of a great new centralized realm which brought to an end the existence of the Frankish states in Syria after nearly two hundred years.



## CHAPTER FOUR

### INSTRUMENTS AND IMPLICATIONS OF FRANKISH-MUSLIM LEGAL RELATIONS IN THE MIDDLE EAST DURING THE TWELFTH AND THIRTEENTH CENTURIES

The inclusion of non-Christians, especially Muslims, in the Western legal system presents a particularly interesting problem of medieval legal and institutional history. This holds true pre-eminently for the relations of Christian states and rulers with Muslims who were not reduced to the status of subjects (*subditi*) or even serfs (*servi*), but still possessed some degree of autonomy as rulers. Since the eighth and ninth centuries there had developed in the West, as Tellenbach has established, subordinate relationships recognized even by state law, whereby the Christian status of the subordinate party to a treaty was increasingly regarded as imperative—although there were still in the tenth century unbaptized vassals or, in a legally neutral term, lieges.<sup>1</sup> Roman legal categories from late antiquity such as *amicitia* between dissimilar partners (derived from Germanic law and similar to an oath of friendship) or *deditio in fidem* were extensively marginalized. Both represented relations of overlordship that paid no regard to the religious adherence of the subordinate partner. Below the level of *commendatio*, a relationship of dependency could be expressed in two forms: 'light subjection' through an undertaking to pay tribute, possibly secured by hostages; and 'heavy subjection', which as a rule implied a right to garrison and also the imposition of executive officials by the sovereign.

That these forms were also applied in regard to Muslims has been shown by Buisson, as exemplified by Norman state-formation in southern Italy and especially after 1061 in Sicily.<sup>2</sup> For Frankish-Muslim relations in the Middle East, however, the basic difficulty still arose that the forms of vassal subordination under feudal law in the medieval West could in theory hardly be applied to non-Christians, especially to adherents of a legal system not characterized by feudal concepts. There was a similar problem for Muslims. Islamic legal theory divides the world into a sphere

---

<sup>1</sup> Tellenbach, *Zusammenleben*, 6, 24.

<sup>2</sup> Buisson, *Staatsbildung*, 168–70, 181–2.

in which Islamic law is fully applied (*Dar al-Islam*) and the remaining sphere, designated the House of War (*Dar al-Harb*), with which there can be no permanent peace. Non-Muslims within the Islamic community are either given the status of *musta'minun*, i.e. members of *Dar al-Harb* staying for a year at most in Islamic territory, for example as traders or envoys, under the protection of a pledge of security (*aman*) or, if adherents of a revealed scripture (*ahl al-kitab*), they live as 'protected peoples' (*ahl al-dhimma* or *dhimmis*) under permanent Muslim sovereignty and paying a poll-tax (*jizya*). In itself the Islamic community is a self-contained legal sphere like the *Respublica Christiana*. Within the Islamic legal sphere, there reigned in theory a permanent *pax Islamica*.

Some Islamic jurisprudence, especially the Shafi'i school, recognizes in addition to *Dar al-Islam* and *Dar al-Harb* a third category, the treaty sphere (*Dar al-'Ahd*, *Dar al-Sulh*), a term denoting the non-Muslim regions which obtain peace by payment of tribute annually or by territorial concessions. Whether the recognition of Muslim sovereignty was automatically involved in the status of *Dar al-'Ahd* must perhaps be decided case by case. Most Islamic jurists, especially the Hanafis, who formed the authoritative law-school for the Turkish rulers of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, rejected this concept; they retained the sharp distinction between *Dar al-Islam* and *Dar al-Harb*, albeit allowing merely temporary truces or armistices to be concluded if they served the benefit (*maslaha*) of the Muslims. Two examples may be given to show relations of sovereignty within *Dar al-Islam* in the twelfth century. In 1150 Burid Damascus placed itself under the sovereignty of Nur al-Din of Aleppo. Ibn al-Qalanisi describes the event in these words: 'The rulers of Damascus [...] agreed to offer him [Nur al-Din] obedience, the pronouncement of the *khutba* in his name after the caliph and the sultan from the pulpit of Damascus, and the right of minting coinage in his name. Oaths were sworn thereto; and Nur al-Din invested Mujir al-Din with a complete robe of honour and collar, sending him back with honour and respect.'<sup>3</sup> Then in late 581/early 1186 Saladin's secretary, al-Katib al-Isfahani, reports as follows on Mosul placing itself under the sovereignty of Saladin: 'Then peace was established. [...] In the whole land of Mosul the sultan (Saladin) was named in the *khutba* after the discontinuation of the Seljuk *khutba*, as also in Diyar Bakr

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibn al-Qalanisi, 309–10.

and the Artuqid territories; and the dinar and dirham were minted in his name.<sup>4</sup>

These are both cases of the establishment of sovereignty on the basis of a bilateral treaty. The duty of armed support might also be involved, not by virtue of the relationship of sovereignty, but in consequence of an express requirement in the treaty. It is not known whether this was agreed in 1150 between Damascus and Nur al-Din; Nur al-Din asked for Damascene auxiliary troops against the Franks shortly before this treaty and in any event three years later. However, he does not seem to have had any express title in law, since his summons to Damascus referred to the duty of *jihad* incumbent on every Muslim. By contrast, the legal relationship constituted between Saladin and Mosul in 1186 expressly includes help in the *jihad* by Mosul, but only because this was stipulated in the bilateral treaty establishing the relationship of sovereignty. In both cases, oaths were sworn to the carrying out of the agreement. There is no mention of an oath of fealty or of homage.

Besides this form of subjection, yet another kind is found in the Muslim Middle East during the crusading period. This is not a bilateral agreement, but rests upon a unilateral legal act. Some examples may be given. The regent of Damascus, Unur, requested and received in 1147 from the Caliph al-Muqtafi in Baghdad a diploma of honour (*tashrif*) with the title of Zahir al-Din wa-Mu'inuh and a robe of honour.<sup>5</sup> In 1175, Saladin obtained a diploma of appointment (*taqlid*) for Egypt and his Syrian territories from the Caliph al-Mustadi', the complete text of which is extant.<sup>6</sup> The grant of a robe of honour (*khil'a*), woven in 'Abbasid black, again accompanied the sending of the diploma. In this manner, legal relationships of sovereignty between the caliph and Muslim rulers were established, which gave caliphal legitimacy to *de facto* rulers. However, for taking great amirs or previously *de facto* independent princes into service the award of *iqta's* predominated. When Nur al-Din took Damascus in 1155, he ordered the previous ruler of the city, Mujir al-Din Abaq, to go to Hims and had a diploma of appointment (*manshur*) drafted whereby Abaq and a number of his followers were assigned *iqta's*.<sup>7</sup> The city of Ba'labakk was apparently also handed over as *iqta'* to Ibn al-Muqaddam in the spring of 1175.

<sup>4</sup> In al-Bundārī, 267.

<sup>5</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 294.

<sup>6</sup> Al-Qalqashandī, X, 135-44.

<sup>7</sup> Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 328.

Ibn al-Muqaddam had previously surrendered Damascus to Saladin in 1174 as chief of the group of amirs and high officials exercising power.<sup>8</sup>

A canon of forms of Western and Islamic origin appears from this survey which made the constitution of legal relationships between individual partners of unequal status, whether persons or states, possible for Franks and Muslims. Instances of this include the tributary status, occasionally linked with an oath of fealty, or the 'heavy subjection', both of which, as mentioned, occurred in southern Italy and Sicily in regard to the Muslims and which also apparently belonged to the repertory of Byzantine treaty instruments in regard to Muslim partners.<sup>9</sup> Legal models have, however, also been mentioned for which a common religion was requisite for the partners or which were alien to the concepts of the other legal sphere, such as the feudal vassal relationship or the Islamic conferment of the *iqta'*. Next will be investigated which of these forms reappeared in Frankish-Muslim relationships in the Middle East during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and whether legal institutions of Western or Islamic character were applied to persons or states not belonging to the legal sphere in which these institutions originated.

The *khutba* and *sikka* express a form of subordination which may be disregarded from the outset. So far as is known at present from the sources, no Islamic territory maintaining a legal relationship with a Middle Eastern Frankish state mentioned the name of a Frankish ruler in the *khutba*. It is impossible to ascertain from the sources whether Muslim preachers (*khatibs*) practised in the few mosques and Muslim places of prayer in the Christian states which particularly the traveller Ibn Jubayr mentioned, or whether perhaps there were mosques and preachers in Saruj and other places inhabited by Muslims in the county of Edessa.<sup>10</sup> The same is true of the *sikka*. Islamic coinage bearing the names of Frankish rulers is unknown in the Middle East. Hence, the matters for investigation are limited to the legal content of tributary status, the possible adoption of Muslims into the feudal nexus of the Frankish states, the legal quality of robes of honour and the deeds of appointment or allocations of land in the form of *iqta'*.

The first instances of Muslim amirs paying tribute to the Franks occurred during the First Crusade. The Crusaders received money-payments in 1099 while on the way from Antioch southwards, from Jabala and Shayzar

<sup>8</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn al-Kātib in al-Bundārī, 148; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 450.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Vismara, *Bisanzio*, 19–21, 47–53.

<sup>10</sup> Ibn Jubayr, 303–6.

among other places.<sup>11</sup> These payments were to purchase the Crusaders' withdrawal. The situation was certainly different where the sources explicitly say that the amirs or governors not only made payments but also received Frankish banners. This seems to have happened in central Syria during the siege of 'Arqa in the spring of 1099.<sup>12</sup> Raymond of Aguilers reports that various 'inhabitants of that region' sent gifts to Count Raymond of Toulouse, requesting his ensign and seal (?) (*signa et sigilla*), explaining that 'it is the accepted custom in our army that if an ensign of any Frank is found in a town or castle, it will not be retaken by anyone.'<sup>13</sup>

This is obviously a matter of subjection to Frankish overlordship, seen by the Franks as merely a preliminary to the subsequent handing over of the place concerned. Thus, the letter sent to the pope from Latakia by the legate Daimbert of Pisa, Godfrey of Bouillon and Raymond of Toulouse reads: 'The townspeople and the lords of the castles in the region through which we have advanced, sent us envoys with many dinars and were prepared to serve us and surrender their places. However, as our soldiers are not numerous, and as they are unanimous in making haste to Jerusalem, we made these people tributaries on the receipt of sureties.'<sup>14</sup> Further reports in Frankish narrative sources seem to confirm this. In his treaty with the Crusaders, the Qadi Jalal al-Mulk of Tripoli declared his readiness not only to release prisoners and pay tribute in money and horses but also to open the markets to the Crusaders, to accept conversion and to recognize Frankish sovereignty if Jerusalem were taken.<sup>15</sup> According to Raymond of Aguilers, the governor of Acre promised to surrender 'himself and his city', if the Crusaders took Jerusalem and remained for twenty days in 'Judaea' without being attacked by Egypt or defeating the Egyptians. An intercepted letter from him to the governor of Caesarea, in which the governor is invited to slay the Christians, shows, according to the chronicler, how far he was ready to keep this promise.<sup>16</sup>

So to all appearances the Crusaders were of the opinion that these agreements over tribute constituted sovereignty. There is, by contrast, nothing about sovereignty in the Muslim sources. In the same vein, there is no indication in the Frankish chronicles and travellers' accounts

---

<sup>11</sup> Raim. Aguil., 102, 112; *Gesta Francorum*, XXXIV, 4-5, p. 415.

<sup>12</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, XXXIV, 14, p. 428.

<sup>13</sup> Raim. Aguil., 107.

<sup>14</sup> Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, 170.

<sup>15</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, XXXVI, 1, p. 438.

<sup>16</sup> Raim. Aguil., 135.

that after the capture of Jerusalem and the victory over the Egyptians, any claims to sovereignty were asserted again or even that the surrender of the places was demanded. Frankish sources do indeed report that in 1099 after the capture of Jerusalem individual contingents of Frankish troops were provisioned by the coastal towns, but in none of the relevant accounts is a relationship of sovereignty cited as the legal grounds for this. Only in the catchment area of the developing county of Edessa did it happen incidentally that a locality inhabited by Muslims placed itself under Frankish sovereignty, agreed to pay tribute and was required to accept a Frankish garrison. This was the case of Saruj which surrendered to Baldwin I, presumably some time in 1098.<sup>17</sup> Even if on this occasion, the population retained some rights to autonomy, it was a matter of subordination, not of sovereignty. The tribute which Albert of Aix mentions presumably corresponded to the *capitatio* of the non-Latin inhabitants of the Frankish states in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries—the Oriental Frankish counterpart to the Islamic *jizya* paid by *dhimmis*. Already in 1104, the head (*ra'is*) of the city was a Christian, albeit a renegade Muslim.

In the course of Frankish-Muslim relations in the Middle East after the First Crusade, there is likewise quite frequent mention of tribute paid by Muslim communities or cities to Frankish lords. The treaties of Godfrey of Bouillon and King Baldwin I with the Fatimid cities of the Palestinian coast, for example, provided for tribute to the Franks. In 1106 Sidon was able to purchase the withdrawal of the Frankish besiegers with a money-payment. During the 1120s, Damascus paid money to Jerusalem for an armistice and the alliance of the Burids of Damascus with the Latin kingdom against Zengi and Nur al-Din was achieved on condition of Muslim payments to the Frankish treasury, as were likewise the alliances with the Fatimid Wazir Shawar from 1164. There could be further examples. Most of these payments were certainly agreed in connection with an armistice treaty, in other words the armistice was purchased with a money-payment. Similar Frankish payments to the Muslims are known and the most prominent example is the money that the kingdom of Jerusalem paid to Saladin in 1185 to achieve the grant of an armistice without there being any question of Ayyubid sovereignty over Jerusalem. There is only a single reference to a connection between tribute-payment and subjection, namely in the words of William of Tyre deploring the end of Burid rule and the incorporation of Damascus into Nur al-Din's sphere of authority.

---

<sup>17</sup> Albert of Aix, III, XXV, 356–7.

He characterizes Abaq, the last Burid lord of Damascus, by saying that 'he was submissive to our people to such an extent that he paid an annual tribute like a subject.'<sup>18</sup> Apart from the fact that at the time of the alliance with Abaq, William was in Europe and his is not first-hand information, he only compares Abaq's situation to that of a subject, but does not speak directly either of the subjection of Damascus or of Frankish sovereignty. Incidentally, in the same period Damascus accepted, at least temporarily, the sovereignty of Nur al-Din as expressed in the *khutba*.

Thus, along with the tributary dependence of individual Muslim lordships on the Franks, there was to all appearances (at least as presented by the Franks) no subjection under Frankish sovereignty. If there is any Frankish sovereignty at all over Muslim states, it is only during the First Crusade and immediately thereafter. Beside the promises of tribute and subjection which the Crusaders accepted on the way to Jerusalem in 1099, possible examples include the relations of Godfrey of Bouillon and Baldwin I of Edessa with 'Umar of 'Azaz, and the treaty of Bohemond I of Antioch and Aleppo in 1103, which provided for an annual tribute and the installation of a bell and a cross on mosques of Aleppo. The forms in which these treaties were concluded all indicate the recognition of Frankish sovereignty and there is incidentally no mention of tribute in the case of 'Azaz. What these treaties were supposed to mean must remain an open question since the sources give no indication as to how the Franks made effective the claims to sovereignty which they perhaps possessed. The treaties of alliance between King Amalric I and Egypt in 1164 and 1167 seem not to have established Frankish sovereignty in any case, although tribute was paid and although in 1167-68 a troop of Franks was installed in Cairo, charged with the collection of money and the guarding of the gates. According to William of Tyre, the Franks were, shortly before in 1163, even offered *subiectio* in return for armed assistance against Nur al-Din's troops. The treaties which were then made in 1164 and 1167 were *de jure* alliances between equal parties with the oaths of both sides. There is no mention anywhere of an oath of fealty by the Fatimid wazir or the caliph to King Amalric, or of the placing of sureties.

If one does not assume that the payment of tribute by itself, without an oath of fealty or armed support, constitutes so far-reaching an act of subordination, it must be acknowledged that relations of sovereignty of Frankish rulers over Muslim princes had hardly any part, or only a small

---

<sup>18</sup> William of Tyre, XVII, XXVI, 803.

one, in the history of the Middle East during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Legal relationships such as those that existed between Christian and Muslim states in Spain will be sought in vain. In eleventh-century Spain, the Christian states of the north had already concluded treaties with individual Muslim party-kings (*reyes de taifas*, *muluk al-tawa'if*), in which the sovereignty of Christian rulers was recognized, tribute promised and the protection and assistance of the Christians assured.<sup>19</sup> Perhaps the best example of Frankish sovereignty over a Muslim lordship comes from the thirteenth century in the treaty of 1243 between Muslim Murcia and Ferdinand III of Castile. Murcia recognized Castilian sovereignty, transferred half of the revenue to the Castilian Crown and received Frankish garrisons in the most important fortresses. Negotiations with other powers required Castilian agreement; in the event of a war, Murcia had to provide troops and it received the assurance of Christian help against Muslim Granada. In return Castile guaranteed the status quo in possessions, religion and speech, as in the administration of justice.<sup>20</sup>

In the Middle East, by contrast, tributary status remained pre-eminent. The numerous agreements between Franks and Muslims were, at least after the period of the establishment of the Frankish states, indeed concluded between parties of unequal power *de facto* although equals *de jure*. On the other hand, the question must be answered whether Frankish states subordinated themselves to Muslim sovereignty. In this respect, the first interesting case is the liberation of Bohemond I of Antioch from Danishmendid custody in 1103. Albert of Aix states that in return for his liberation, Bohemond gave Ibn Danishmend a sworn promise of servitude (*servitudo*), friendship (*amicitia*) and military service (*militare obsequium*) of his fellows (*confratres*) in all faith and subjection (*in omni fide et subjectione*); but as Bohemond left the Middle East forever in 1104, it cannot be determined whether he actually subordinated himself to Ibn Danishmend or not.<sup>21</sup> Perhaps the liberation of a prisoner of war itself established a species of client relationship in Muslim eyes, as did the manumission (*'itq*) of a slave. This is also suggested in Arabic sources in regard to Raymond III of Tripoli. Considering the sources, there can only be some conjectures. It appears that the liberation of a prisoner such as Bohemond constituted a legal relationship from the Muslim point of view, but whether

<sup>19</sup> Konetzke, *Beziehungen*.

<sup>20</sup> Torres Fontes, *Reconquista*, 29–30.

<sup>21</sup> Albert of Aix, IX, XXXV, 612.

of sovereignty or clientage and whether or not it was so regarded by the Franks are open questions. Of greater interest for the question of Muslim sovereignty over Frankish rulers are two elements of Eastern origin which play an important part in the Arabic sources: the bestowal of a robe of honour (*khil'a*) and the entry into obedience (*al-dukhul fi al-ta'a*).

Arabic chronicles repeatedly mention the bestowal of robes of honour on Frankish princes on the conclusion of treaties. King Fulk was awarded a robe of honour in 1137, when he surrendered the castle of Montferand (Ba'rin) to Zengi and committed himself to the payment of tribute.<sup>22</sup> Joscelin II of Edessa received a robe of honour in 1148–49 when he asked Nur al-Din for an armistice and in 1192 Bohemond III of Antioch obtained a robe of honour from Saladin. There are numerous reports that many prisoners of war were so invested on liberation.<sup>23</sup> It is also known that King Guy of Lusignan received a robe of honour from Saladin on his liberation in 1187.<sup>24</sup> The most spectacular instance of the bestowal of a robe of honour is surely that of Henry of Champagne, who in 1192 expressly asked Saladin for a robe of honour, although the Franks deemed the wearing of such robes shameful.

Robes of honour had for the most part a significant value and were used as well for payment in the Middle East; this use must, however, certainly be excluded in the cases mentioned. In particular the caliph's bestowal of robes of honour on sultans and amirs had not only the sense of giving distinction to the recipients. Rather this symbolic act also legitimized their power and subordinated them to the caliph and a diploma of appointment might, but need not, accompany it. In states with established bureaucracies such as Byzantium or Egypt, robes of honour were particularly used at the appointment of office-holders. Thus, there was in Mamluk Egypt a meticulous ranking of robes of honour for office-holders entitled to them; the inspector of public finance (*nazir al-khizana al-kubra*) was responsible for their administration and registration. The significance of the bestowal of a robe of honour in the law of nations of this period is indicated in the case of the Turkish lord of Arzan al-Rum, who was placed under the sovereignty of the Christian king of Georgia, presumably in the 1220s. The form in which it was carried out was that the Turk put on a robe of honour from the king, flew a flag bearing a cross and ordered his son's conversion to

<sup>22</sup> Ibn al-'Adim, *Zubda*, II, 262.

<sup>23</sup> Albert of Aix, VII, XV, 516; Bahā' al-Dīn b. Shaddād, 151.

<sup>24</sup> Sāwīrus b. al-Muqaffā', III, 122/arab. 72.

Christianity to render possible a marriage-link with the royal family.<sup>25</sup> The bestowal of a robe of honour can thus really signify a taking into service. In any event, the giver of a robe of honour holds a position superior to its recipient. This was also understood on the Frankish side; for example St. Louis, when a prisoner of war in Egypt in 1250, thus refused as the only Frank a robe of honour from the Sultan Turanshah on the grounds that 'my land is greater than his; how could I wear his robe?'<sup>26</sup>

The bestowal and acceptance of a robe of honour, where Frankish lords are concerned, is consequently more than just evidence of a feeling of parity of status between Frankish and Muslim nobles, more than a mere act of courtesy. It must remain an open question whether a relationship of sovereignty was so expressed in all cases. It does indeed appear certain that sovereignty was created when the recipient of a robe of honour also 'entered into obedience' (*dakhala fi al-ta'a*) or 'into service' (*fi al-khidma*). It can be shown that the Arabic sources speak repeatedly of the performance of obedience in connection with the contacts between Saladin and members of the barons' party, especially Raymond III of Tripoli in 1186–87, Bohemond III of Antioch in 1183 and in 1192, after which he 'served' the sultan and obtained a robe of honour, and Reginald of Sidon in 1189. The way in which the act of obedience was performed, perhaps by an oath of fealty, is unfortunately unknown. In the case of Count Raymond III at least, his obedience appears in Western sources as subordination, even as feudal commendation.

If the legal subordination of Frankish lords to Muslim sultans or amirs occurred thus, they may have been performed in these forms. At all events little is heard of Frankish tribute-payments to Muslim states. The most important example is the payment in 1185, whereby the kingdom of Jerusalem purchased an armistice with Saladin, but none of the sources claim this to be proof of Frankish subjection. It must be stressed in this connection that compared to the great number of Frankish-Muslim treaties, these cases of Frankish performance of obedience or service and acceptance of robes of honour are so few as to be insignificant, especially in the thirteenth century. Even if the bestowal of a robe of honour or the legal act known in Arabic sources as 'entry into obedience' did create a subordinate relationship, as undoubtedly happened between Muslim treaty partners, the state of the sources nevertheless does not permit the formulation

<sup>25</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XII, 451.

<sup>26</sup> Al-Juwaynī, 333.

of a more precise picture of the implications and legal consequences of a relationship so created. The case of which we are best informed, Raymond III's subordination to Saladin in 1186–87, was too brief to lead to wider results such as the stationing of Muslim auxiliary troops in Tiberias, which would in itself be proof of Ayyubid sovereignty. It could also quite simply be explained as part of a normal bilaterally agreed alliance. Regarding the relationship of Bohemond III with Saladin, where 'obedience' and 'service' subsisted longer, Western sources, unfortunately, provide no information. Nothing more can thus be learnt of possible oaths of fealty, obligations of armed support or other items which would indicate a relationship of sovereignty. With all these limitations, it may be emphasized that *khil'a* and *ta'a*, at least according to Muslim sources, played a certain part in Frankish-Muslim relationships and were presumably on occasion the expression of sovereignty.

By contrast, Western legal concepts derived from feudal law had apparently no importance in the history of relationships between individual Frankish and Muslim states in the Middle East. The clearest example of this is Saladin's rejection in 1192 of Richard Lionheart's proposal to hold Jaffa and Ascalon as fiefs of the sultan. Sources of Western origin describe on a few occasions actual or projected relations of sovereignty in expressions apparently derived from feudal terminology. Thus, according to *Historia belli sacri*, written after 1140, the Egyptian Wazir al-Afdal offered in the course of his negotiations with the First Crusade either to hold his territories in future in common (*communiter*) with the Franks or to hold them in fief from the Franks (*ab ipsis eas ex tunc se tenere*).<sup>27</sup> According to Ernoul, 'Mulane' (i.e. the Fatimid caliph) offered to hold his land of the Franks in return for their help against Nur al-Din (*il tenroit se tiere de lui*); and it is said that Conrad of Montferrat was willing to 'hold' half of Jerusalem from Saladin.<sup>28</sup> These passages should not be taken literally, since Crusaders, pilgrims and chroniclers who were strangers to the East were tempted to describe the legal structures of the Islamic world in concepts taken from feudal law, perhaps because they had no other terminology at their disposal. The Franks' project to install Dubays b. Sadaqa, which fell through because of the failure of operations against the city, is the sole potential example of a Muslim state under Frankish feudal suzerainty.

---

<sup>27</sup> Hist. bell. sacri, XCIX, 212.

<sup>28</sup> Ernoul, III, 24. Ambroise, V.8682f., 232.

This relationship was no more in existence in the Middle East than the feudal submission of Frankish states under Muslim states.

However, did feudal law, vassal status or grants of *iqta'* play a part in the taking of individual Muslims into service by the Franks or vice versa? In thirteenth-century Spain at least, there were certainly a very large number of Muslims who entered the feudal nexus of the Christian states and were designated vassals in the sources, although here too it may be asked whether the vassal status of these Muslims was based on an act of commendation.<sup>29</sup> As already frequently mentioned, Muslims found themselves fighting in Frankish service. Arabic sources such as Ibn al-Qalanisi, Usama b. Munqidh or Ibn al-Athir are aware of this in the case of the principality of Antioch and the knightly Orders. It is also repeatedly stated that the Muslims of Jabal 'Amila in southern Lebanon provided the Franks with armed assistance between 1157 and 1229, but it is not clear if they were in Frankish service.<sup>30</sup> Finally, Latin documents frequently name knights bearing Oriental names such as Muisse Arrabi or Walter Qelbe Arab, or were designated as *arabicus miles*.<sup>31</sup> But that they were Muslims and not converts seems most unlikely, since Muslims could not sit in court in the kingdom of Jerusalem. Counsel in law was part of the essential rights and duties of the feudal knights, who as peers of the accused had to give judgement. How the Arabs in Frankish service were paid cannot precisely be said. They included non-combatant administrative personnel such as the *qadi* of Jabala or the scribe and wazir employed in Nablus in the 1150s, as well as Muslim warriors.<sup>32</sup> Land-grants to Muslims are, to the best of my knowledge, mentioned in only three cases. In 1106, Tancred as regent of Antioch set the sons of Khalaf b. Mula'ib, the murdered lord of Famiya, over several places (*plurimis praefecit locis*). In 1168, according to Ibn Abi Tayy', King Amalric attempted to win over the Fatimid wazir's envoy and promised him thirteen villages in *iqta'*.<sup>33</sup> In 1177, the Frankish promise of possession (*milk*) or lordship (*mulk*) tempted Saladin's great-nephew. None of the three instances lacks ambiguity. Khalaf b. Mula'ib's sons might have been appointed as headmen (*ru'asa'*), but the term *praefecit* does not unambiguously signify enfeoffment. Saladin's great-nephew, Shahanshah, was the victim of a trick: on entering Frankish territory, the Templars

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Burns, *Muslim*.

<sup>30</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 339; 'Imād al-Dīn, *Fath*, 36; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XII, 482.

<sup>31</sup> Riley-Smith, *Feudal Nobility*, 10; Præwer, *Serfs*, 208.

<sup>32</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn, *Fath*, 132; Ibn Ṭūlūn, 27.

<sup>33</sup> Ibn Abī Ṭayy' in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, I/2, 430.

arrested him; neither is it clear whether the Arabic is to be read as *milk* or *mulk*. Amalric's promised grant of an *iqta'* is also problematic. Would Amalric grant land as an Islamic *iqta'* or is the actual enfeoffment of a Muslim only what the Arabic source intends by the expression *aqta'ahu*, i.e. he gave him an *iqta'*? Even if these three cases offered unambiguous instances of the enfeoffment of Muslims, such enfeoffments with land appear to have occurred only in insignificantly small numbers over the nearly two hundred years of Frankish rule in the Middle East. It is impossible to say whether money-fiefs played a part in the payment of Muslims. For instance, was the recompense (*recompensatio*) received in 1140 by the former Muslim governor of Baniyas in the form of a share of the revenue from baths and orchards perhaps a money-fief?<sup>34</sup>

The overall impression is rather that Muslim entry into the service of Frankish armies and Orders, which certainly took place extensively, was not performed on a feudal model but on a salaried basis. There is no trace in the East of Muslim vassals as in Spain. The conferment of knighthood on a few Muslims by Frankish rulers, such as al-Malik al-Kamil by Richard Lionheart in 1192 and the Amir Fakhr al-Din by Frederick II of Hohenstaufen in 1229, was always exceptional and incidentally conferred no legal relationship.<sup>35</sup> By contrast, St. Louis is said to have expressly refused to confer knighthood on an amir unless he was prepared to become a Christian and follow him to France, where he would certainly receive considerable lands.<sup>36</sup> Even if St. Louis was particularly rigid in his rejection of close contact with the infidel, this might represent the normal course of affairs. The knighthoods conferred by Richard and the Emperor Frederick II were exceptions made by princes, who were also ready to follow other unconventional ways in concluding and entering into legal relationships with Muslim rulers.

The sources say also little about grants of land in Islamic forms, but there are at least a few credible cases. Thus, when Reginald of Sidon was besieged in 1189, he requested the grant of an *iqta'* from Saladin in return for the handing over of Beaufort (Shaqif Arnun). The 'Green Knight' with whom Saladin spoke in 1188 outside Tripoli received, as mentioned earlier, the offer of being granted land. The grant of *iqta'*s to Franks is, interestingly, mentioned only in times of intensive Frankish-Muslim conflict.

<sup>34</sup> William of Tyre, XV, XI, 675.

<sup>35</sup> Itinerarium Peregrinorum, V, XII, 325. Jean de Joinville, XLI, 108.

<sup>36</sup> Confesseur, 68.

In the thirteenth century, for example, Muslim sources report the grant of *iqta*'s to Franks after Sultan Baybars' capture of Caesarea in 1265.<sup>37</sup> After Tripoli was taken in 1289, Sultan Qalawun left two villages for a kinsman of the Frankish count. Qalawun is also supposed to have given Jubayl in *iqta*' to the son of its former Frankish lord and to have given him a robe of honour.<sup>38</sup> In connection with Saladin's frequently mentioned concession to Bohemond III of a condominium (*munasafa*) in 1192, the late compiler Ibn al-Furat states that 'There were fourteen barons with him and Saladin gave them *iqta*'s in the lands shared between him and Antioch, the yearly sum amounting to fourteen thousand dinars.'<sup>39</sup> It is not stated whether this constituted a direct relationship of service between the barons and Saladin, but there are indications, as already repeatedly mentioned, for Ayyubid sovereignty over Bohemond III and thereby over the principality of Antioch in general. Finally, it is also noteworthy that in 1263 Baybars gave Count John of Jaffa a diploma of appointment (*manshur*) after the conclusion of an armistice. The county of Jaffa was thus possibly a Mamluk *iqta*' in the last years of its existence up to 1268. In this connection, it is also mentioned that the count had offered obedience (*yabdhilu al-ta'a*).<sup>40</sup> Already since the end of St. Louis' Crusade in 1254, Jaffa had obviously occupied a special position. The county had not been included in the truce of 1255 or 1256 between the kingdom of Jerusalem and Damascus and at the beginning of the 1260s the supplies for the Mamluk army were shipped from Egypt to Syria by way of Jaffa.<sup>41</sup>

Remarkable as this case is, although one cannot say whether it established Muslim sovereignty over Jaffa or was even a legal *iqta*', it appears to be exceptional. Although Franks have entered Muslim service as combatants, they appear usually to have been remunerated in cash, not with *iqta*'s. Whether Frankish rulers made land-grants in Islamic form to Muslims, of which the incident in 1168 mentioned above is the sole instance, must remain open. The most important reason why feudal relationships between Franks and Muslims were absent in the Middle East may be seen in the circumstance that the Germanic concept of loyalty and the Christian elements in chivalry could not be communicated without problems to adherents of another and non-Christian legal system. On the

<sup>37</sup> Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, *Rawd*, 235.

<sup>38</sup> Al-Nuwayrī, fol. 20r.

<sup>39</sup> Ibn al-Furāt, *Ayyubids*, II, 120/arab. I, 152.

<sup>40</sup> Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, *Rawd*, 117-8.

<sup>41</sup> L'Estoire d'Eracles, XXXIV, III, 442; Rothelin, LXXVII, 632-3.

other hand, however, in the monetary nature of the essentially more economically developed Middle East, and in the forms already existing there for relationships of subjection and service, there were sufficient means to place adherents of another religion and legal system under obligation. The award of an *iqta'* was such a means. Since it had no specifically Islamic content, its award to non-Muslims was relatively unproblematic. Thus, the Buhturid amirs, Maronite Christians, held the Lebanese Gharb for almost the whole of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as an *iqta'* from the rulers of Damascus and later the Mamluks. On the other hand, it seems that at the same time they were partly feudatories of the Frankish lords of Beirut. This made their situation somewhat precarious at the end of the thirteenth century as the sultans accused them of playing a double game.<sup>42</sup>

To summarize, it may be said that relations of sovereignty between Franks and Muslims in the Middle East in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries did not play the same part as, for example, in Spain. The treaties concluded were usually between legally equal parties, even if their power was in fact greatly different. If relationships of sovereignty or service were established, these were carried out in forms previously customary in the East such as *khila'*, *ta'a* and *iqta'*. Elements of Western law do not seem to have been applied at the level of sovereignty and service. Whether the Franks for their part followed Islamic forms in their legal transactions with Muslims requires a detailed clarification, which can hardly be made only on the basis of an assessment of the extant chronicles and documentary sources.

#### TECHNICALITIES AND VALIDITY OF FRANKISH-MUSLIM TREATIES IN THE TWELFTH AND THIRTEENTH CENTURIES

The preceding section has shown the difficulty of making definite statements on the basis of the sources about the legal quality of relations established by grants of land and robes of honour, gifts and tribute-payments by Franks to Muslims and vice versa. In the same vein, the legal quality of acts described in Arabic sources with terms such as 'entry into obedience' and in Frankish historical writing as *subjection* is difficult to assess. It is nevertheless clear that in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the

---

<sup>42</sup> Şāliḥ b. Yaḥyā, 47–8, 73–4.

establishment of relations of sovereignty—generally in accordance with standard Middle Eastern patterns—was occasionally considered and even realized as a form of political organization. Yet Frankish-Muslim relations were normally constituted on the basis of bilateral treaties.

If the technical aspects of these treaties are now examined, the problem of sources arises still more acutely, inasmuch as none of the original documents of treaties concluded between Franks and Muslims in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries is extant. For the twelfth century, one is entirely dependent upon data mainly in narrative sources, so far as agreements between Frankish rulers and their Muslim neighbours subsequent to the First Crusade are concerned. These sources, however, only very seldom provide detailed information on the legal quality, the range of validity or the limits, ends and means of the treaty arrangements. The thirteenth-century treaties, at any rate those of 1221, 1229, 1250 and 1270, which ended the enterprise of the Crusaders at Damietta, of Frederick II, of the first phase of St. Louis' Egyptian campaign and of his Crusade to Tunis, are documented in relative detail. The only fully preserved texts of treaties are to be found in early Mamluk chancery literature and chronicles. In such sources the texts of seven treaties have been transmitted. They were negotiated in the years from 1267 to 1285 between the Mamluk Sultans Baybars (658–76/1260–77) and Qalawun (678–89/1279–90) on the one hand and individual Frankish rulers, the Templars and the Hospitallers on the other.<sup>43</sup> Of one of these treaties, the 1285 agreement between Qalawun and the Lady Margaret of Tyre, at least parts of the *expositio* have been preserved in an Old French translation.<sup>44</sup> The compiler of the most important work for chancery practice and political information, al-Qalqashandi, has taken four of these treaties as examples for the drafting of bilateral agreements in the chapter on treaties in his compilation *Subh al-a'sha fi sina'at al-insha'*. He comments in his introduction on the problem of treaties with non-Muslims from the Islamic point of view, discusses questions of protocol and the arrangement of the treaty forms and finally offers remarks on the technicalities of negotiation and diplomatic details. There are examples of oaths for the ratification of treaties elsewhere in the *Subh*.<sup>45</sup> The author's other expositions on the subject of oaths deserve notice. They are largely dependent on the extant chancery handbook of

<sup>43</sup> Holt, *Treaties*, 69.

<sup>44</sup> Tafel/Thomas, III, no. CCCXCII, 398–400.

<sup>45</sup> Al-Qalqashandi, XIV, 2–78; XIII, 311–15.

Shihab al-Din, who belonged to the chancery family of Banu Fadlallah al-'Umari. Its members appear in the list of clerks of the Egyptian *diwan al-insha'* for almost a hundred years from the end of the thirteenth century. Shihab al-Din himself worked as a chancery official until he broke with Sultan al-Nasir Muhammad in 738/1337–38.

Every presentation of the development of technicalities in treaty-making between Franks and Muslims in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries is therefore beset by the difficulty of knowing how far to rely on documentary details in the narrative sources in addition to a handful of bilateral treaties from the last three decades of Frankish rule, which are transmitted only in literary works, predominantly in Arabic. This makes statements on the corroboration of the agreements particularly problematic. Seals, signatures or monograms have not been preserved, while Muslim forms of confirmation by *tughra* (calligraphic emblem of ruler) or *'alama* (mark of ratification or initialling) are rarely discernible. Above all, hardly any general line of development for Frankish-Muslim treaty technicalities can be traced. Even worse is the documentation of unilateral legal deeds, such as gifts and safe conducts (*aman*) for envoys, merchants and occasionally also refugees upon the surrender of a city. The two most significant examples are to be found in Salih b. Yahya's (d. 840/1436) chronicle of the Buhturids: a deed of gift from 1255 by Julian of Sidon to the Maronite Buhturid amir of the Gharb, Hajji b. Karama; and another issued by Humphrey of Montfort, lord of Beirut, to the Buhturid Amir Salih b. 'Ali in 1280.<sup>46</sup> Here one is almost entirely dependent on Arabic materials, too.

Secondary literature has described treaty relations between the Germanic and Roman legal spheres on the one hand and the Islamic legal spheres on the other mostly from the point of view of legal theory.<sup>47</sup> It has also been possible to draw particularly on the treaties concerning commerce, peace and alliance between the Italian city-states and the Spanish kings with the Muslim rulers in North Africa.<sup>48</sup> However, conclusions from the study of legal theory should on no account form the basis for presenting actual Frankish-Muslim legal relations, as happens time and again even in standard works on international legal history. This holds

<sup>46</sup> Šālih b. Yahyā, 47–8, 73–4.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Brundage, *Holy War*; Russel, *Just War*; Bussi, *Condizione*; Herde, *Christians*. On the Islamic context cf. Hamidullah, *Muslim Conduct*; Khadduri, *War and Peace*; Khadduri, *Islamic Law*; Kruse, *Begründung*; Kruse, *Völkerrechtslehre*.

<sup>48</sup> On these sources cf. the bibliography in Fisch, *Krieg*, in addition to the articles by Wansborough (*Maroccan Amir's*; *Mamluk Ambassador*; *Venice and Florence*; *Mamluk Commercial Treaty*; *Safe-Conduct*) and Holt.

true also for the analysis of the commercial treaties of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.<sup>49</sup>

Authors who are primarily concerned with the description of legal practice also regularly allow a relatively large role to legal theory.<sup>50</sup> This method of procedure is problematic in several ways. Apart from the fact that in the Middle Ages no uniform position emerged in Catholic canon law on the question of the legitimacy of 'infidel' sovereignty and the validity of legal relationships with Muslims dwelling outside the *Respublica Christiana*, the discussions in Islamic and canonical jurisprudence about legal relationships in the Middle East are themselves of little particular significance. This holds true not only because of the ever-present discrepancy between legal practice and legal theory but also because the discussions of the legal theorists on the treaties studied here stand in an anachronistic relationship. Islamic law concerning non-Muslims and rules of war was already fully developed before the First Crusade. In addition, the question would remain what significance the opinions of the Sunni law-schools had, for instance, for the attitude of the Shiite Fatimids. By contrast, canon law first began to concern itself with such questions in the course of the eleventh and particularly the twelfth century and thus at a point when Frankish-Muslim agreements were already current practice in the Middle East. Finally, in the legal works of the Frankish states of Jerusalem and Cyprus, relations with neighbouring Muslim powers play an insignificantly small part and make no reference to treaty technicalities, language, writing/orality, forms of ratification or the practicalities of archives.<sup>51</sup> Even if the problem of anachronism had not occurred because contemporary legal works were available, an investigation of actual Frankish-Muslim treaty technicalities and the validity of the instruments, as perceived by the contracting parties, is confronted with the danger of working too much from legal theory. In particular, one might tend to understand the terms used in the narrative sources in the strictly theoretical significance as defined by the legal theorists, although they were here employed by authors who were not thinking as jurists. The basis of the following discussion is therefore not legal theory, but the data provided by sources such as chronicles, biographies, letters and chancery literature.

---

<sup>49</sup> To varying degrees in: Zimmermann, *Crise*, 333ff.; Stadtmüller, *Geschichte*, I, 47–51; Heydt, *Geburtsstunde*, 240–58; Nussbaum, *Geschichte*, 20–3, 59–66.

<sup>50</sup> For example Allmendinger, *Beziehungen*, 26–36; Riley-Smith, *Peace*, passim; Schwinges, *Kreuzzugsideologie*, 214–61.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. *Livre au Roi*, VII, 611, XVI, 617, XXII, 622; *Livre de Geoffroy le Tort*, XXXII, 443.

The state of the sources makes it necessary to rely particularly on Mamluk historians and administrative officials of the end of the thirteenth and the fourteenth century.

In regard to contents, the Franks and Muslims of the Middle East concluded agreements in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries concerning peace/truce, alliance, surrender of land and men, cession and liberation of prisoners of war. There are no purely commercial treaties, although it is probable that twelfth-century agreements frequently included commercial clauses; as has been shown above, the first treaties of Godfrey of Bouillon and King Baldwin I of Jerusalem with the Fatimid port-towns of the Palestinian coast particularly assisted the restoration of commercial relations. Similar regulations may also have played a part in the agreements of Jerusalem with Damascus and Egypt. It is mentioned for example, in connection with Saladin's treaty with Jerusalem in 1185, that the import of corn from the Muslim region, which was resumed after its conclusion, allegedly contributed to overcoming the famine in the kingdom.<sup>52</sup> Explicit provision for trade is indeed only known from the truce between Richard Lionheart and Saladin in 1192.<sup>53</sup> In the Mamluk sultans' treaties from 1267 to 1287 with individual Frankish lordships and the knightly Orders, commercial and customs-duty regulations and the *jus naufragii* occupy much space; for example in Baybars' treaties with the Hospitallers (1267), the Lady of Beirut (1269) and the Hospitallers again in 1271 and the treaties of Qalawun with the Templars (1282), Acre, i.e. the kingdom of Jerusalem (1283) and the Lady of Tyre (1285).<sup>54</sup>

Distinction among the treaties with respect to their contents, however, is of no significance for analysing their technicalities. Both narrative sources and the extant treaties themselves describe them all simply as peace treaties or truces (if bilateral agreements) or (if unilateral) safe conducts (*aman*). The treaties between the Muslim rulers in North Africa and the Italian city-states, which mainly comprised commercial clauses, were as well in the form of truces for a limited period and al-Qalqashandi dealt with them in the same section as the treaties with the Frankish rulers in Syria. Commercial agreements might indeed also be made as unilateral grants of privileges in the category of *aman*.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Ernoul, XI, 124.

<sup>53</sup> Ambroise, V.11787–11791, 316.

<sup>54</sup> Al-Qalqashandi, 37, 41, 47, 57–9; Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, *Tashrif*, 22, 108.

<sup>55</sup> Mas-Latrie, *Traités*, Suppl., 70–2, 73–6, 81–7.

The most common Latin designations of Frankish-Muslim agreements in the narrative sources not of legal provenance, such as narrative texts, letters and biographies, are *pax*, *treuga*, *pax temporalis*, *pax ad tempus* but also simply *foedus*, *pactum*, *amicitia* or more rarely *induciae*. These terms correspond to the Old French *païs* or *trives* and to the Arabic *ṣulḥ*, *hudna*, *muwāda'a* or grammatically derived expressions, e.g. *musālama*, *mu'āhada*, *muhādana*, *muṣālaḥa*, *mu'āqada* and more rarely *mutāraka* and *muwāṣafa*. Neither Frankish nor Muslim writers establish uniformity of usage in all cases, nor is the terminology employed differentiated according to the legal quality or duration of the treaties. Thus, the alliance of the Frankish states of Syria with Tughtegin of Damascus against the army of the Turkish alliance under Bursuq b. Bursuq in 1115 is styled by Fulcher of Chartres *pax*, by Walter the Chancellor as *foedus amicitiae*, then afterwards *simulata pax* and *conventio*, while Albert of Aix quite simply mentions Tughtegin as being *fide alligatus* to Baldwin I. William of Tyre (c. 1130–86, thus not a contemporary) speaks of *pax ad certum tempus* under sworn oath and delivery of hostages, but also uses the term *foedus*.<sup>56</sup> Similarly in the Muslim sources, the treaty between King Amalric and Ibn al-Muqaddam, the leader of the ruling group in Damascus after Nur al-Din's death, is called *hudna* by Ibn al-Athir, but for the conclusion of the treaty he uses the verb *ṣālaḥa* (to make a *ṣulḥ*, treaty) not *hādana* (to make a *hudna*, truce).<sup>57</sup> The meaning of the various terms to designate the conclusion of a treaty appeared to be so identical to the historians that their choice of specific terms must be regarded rather as a question of style than the expression of legal implications. For example, the treaty of 1175 between Count Raymond III of Tripoli as regent of Jerusalem and Saladin is described in the course of a few lines in an Arabic source as *silm* (peace), *hudna* (truce), *muṣālaḥa* (bilateral peace treaty) and again *hudna*.<sup>58</sup> Examples of this fluid terminology might be multiplied almost at will.

It is therefore better not to draw far-reaching conclusions as to the legal character of the agreements from the terminology of the sources. It may cautiously be said that in the Latin sources for the First Crusade and the period of the establishment of the Frankish states, one finds either

<sup>56</sup> Fulcher, Carnot., II, LIII, 2, 582; Walter the Chancellor, I, II, 5–6, pp. 66–7; Albert of Aix, XII, XIX, 701; William of Tyre, XI, XXIII, 492–3.

<sup>57</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, XI, 408; 'Imād al-Dīn al-Kātib in al-Bundārī, 33 (*hudna*); William of Tyre, XX, XXXI, 1000–1 (*pax temporalis*).

<sup>58</sup> Al-Bundārī, 90.

'neutral' terms such as *pactum* and *foedus* or, especially in Albert of Aix the term *amicitia* derived from Roman law, while William of Tyre speaks rather of *pax*, *pax temporalis* and *treuga* or Old French *trives*. The legal quality concealed behind such words was subject to continual change and on this basis alone nothing certain can be said from the term used in the sources as to the category and circumstances of the treaty concluded. For instance, Wielers has ascertained that in the early Middle Ages *pax* and *induciae* were widely treated as synonyms and that *pax perpetua* was paradoxically in no sense agreed to be everlasting, but as being for the lifetime of the contracting parties or for the time being.<sup>59</sup> A sharper distinction between *pax* and *treuga* as peace for an unlimited and a limited period respectively was also established in Europe only in the thirteenth century.<sup>60</sup>

As regards the terminology of the Arabic sources, it is similarly hardly possible to discover criteria according to which the chroniclers designated a treaty a *ṣulh* or *hudna*. It is, however, conspicuous that the terms belonging to the verbal form which has a reciprocal sense are frequently used in the narrative sources and almost exclusively in the extant texts of treaties. Here they convey a bilateral sense; e.g. *muwāda'a* (assurance of mutual security), *mu'āqada* (contract of mutual agreement), *mu'āhada* (mutual sworn agreement). Al-Qalqashandi notes in the chapter of *Subh* devoted to *hudna* that in treaties drafted with non-Muslim powers, the words *muṣālaḥa*, *muwāda'a*, *musālama*, *muqāḍāh* and *muwāṣafa* are all virtually synonymous terms, also a *hudna*, actually a truce granted by a stronger to a weaker party, is as a rule a bilateral agreement.<sup>61</sup> The four treaties transmitted in *Subh* are all in form of bilateral agreements, although the contracting parties are wholly unequal in power. The prominent Hanafi jurist al-Kasani, a contemporary, even held the opinion that such an agreement with non-Muslims only had the force of law if such terms as *muwāda'a* and *musālama* appeared in it.<sup>62</sup> This rule appears in fact to have been observed in the extant treaties, both the agreements of Muslim rulers with European powers and also with the Frankish rulers in the Middle East. Among the chroniclers, Ibn al-Qalanisi in particular (who was himself employed in the administration of the Burid principality of

<sup>59</sup> Wielers, *Beziehungsformen*, 4–5.

<sup>60</sup> Fisch, *Krieg*, 351–2. Cf. Huberti, *Studien*, 257–65.

<sup>61</sup> Al-Qalqashandi, XIV, 2–3.

<sup>62</sup> Kruse, *Völkerrechtslehre*, 99.

Damascus) uses the corresponding terms when reporting agreements with the Franks.<sup>63</sup>

It may cautiously be stated that the agreements between Franks and Muslims in the Middle East which had the character of peace-treaties were mostly for a limited period, although the sources do not mention this in every case or give their valid duration. One treaty alone is expressly described as being for an unlimited period; William of Tyre denotes the alliance of Amalric I with the Fatimids in 1167 as '*pacis [...] perpetuae foedera*'. The subjection (*subjectio*), which according to the same author the Wazir Dirgham offered to the Latin kingdom three years later, was designated as *subjectio perpetua* connected with *foedus perenne*.<sup>64</sup> Since the Franks found themselves in an unequivocally stronger position in 1164, it may be that they were able to impose their idea of a treaty of unlimited duration. Other sources neither confirm William of Tyre, nor expressly contradict him. Also for later periods, the thirteenth century especially, there are extant commercial privileges and treaties, e.g. of Egypt with European powers and also Moroccan-Spanish alliances, which have no temporal restrictions.<sup>65</sup> This is also true for the peace treaty (extant in an Arabic version), which ended the Crusade of St. Louis to Tunis in 1270.<sup>66</sup> It is thus imaginable that the agreements or potential alliances between Jerusalem and Damascus from 1140, or with Egypt from 1163–64, were of unlimited duration, but no definite statement based on the sources is possible.

In Islamic law, the limited duration of agreements with non-Muslims who are not subjects of a Muslim ruler is recognized as an essential condition. Such truces must, at least according to the Shafi'i opinion, not exceed four months if the Muslim contracting party is the stronger, ten years if it is the weaker; al-Qalqashandi also refers to this maxim.<sup>67</sup> The respective periods of the treaties mentioned in the sources mostly fall within the ten-year period prescribed by the law and so are clearly distinguished from the agreements marked by their contents as commercial treaties between the North African Muslim rulers and the trading powers of Europe. In their case, the ten-year limit constitutes rather the lower limit.<sup>68</sup> The sources for the Middle East do not mention treaties of limited duration

<sup>63</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 174, 202, 304, 336.

<sup>64</sup> William of Tyre, XIX, XVII, 909, VI, 892.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Fisch, *Krieg*, 374, 377.

<sup>66</sup> Sacy, *Mémoire*, 463–71.

<sup>67</sup> Khaddouri, *War*, 219–21; Kruse, *Völkerrechtslehre*, 106–7; al-Qalqashandi, XIV, 8.

<sup>68</sup> Fisch, *Krieg*, 374–6.

for more than ten years (or, as in the Mamluk treaties, for ten years ten months, ten days and ten hours) with a solitary exception: the agreement of 1252 between St. Louis and Egypt against Damascus was, according to a Western account, concluded for fifteen years; it is not mentioned in Arabic sources.<sup>69</sup> It can frequently be established that limited-duration treaties ran out around Easter or in autumn, but the sources give no reasons for this. It can only be assumed that these terminations were connected with the seasons when European pilgrims and merchants reached and left Syria by sea, while perhaps harvest and seedtime also played a part in the calculation of the duration of treaties.

The circumstance that according to Islamic law, peace-treaties and truces with non-Muslims might only be concluded for a limited period, and numerous Frankish-Muslim agreements followed this maxim, has given rise to the view that a state of peace did not subsist between Franks and Muslims, but at most a precarious truce.<sup>70</sup> This opinion, derived from crusading ideology and the concept of the counter-Crusade, may actually be questioned from the standpoint of legal theory. Even the peace of limited duration is, as aptly expressed by the Latin *pax temporalis, pax ad certum tempus*, a fully valid peace, albeit for a limited period. Furthermore, the Islamic *muwādaʿa* was more than a truce; it was a treaty of security, a mutual pledge of security between Muslims and non-Muslims. By its means, 'an Islamic and an infidel state mutually recognize themselves as existing and independent, and regulate their relationships on the basis of peaceful coexistence for the duration of the treaty.'<sup>71</sup>

This definition renders it comprehensible that acts recognizing Frankish rule such as the award of robes of honour, letters of congratulation or condolence and the use in correspondence of honorific titles for Frankish rulers (as may be found throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries), were even on the Muslim side not conditioned solely by power-policy and did not take place in a completely extra-legal sphere. That the limited-duration treaty was a principal instrument for the regulation of peaceful relations in the Middle East does not incidentally signify that these relations were thus weaker and less certain than those of Muslim and Christian states and rulers among themselves. The *pax Islamica* which should rule amongst Muslims was not just in the twelfth century a legal fiction.

<sup>69</sup> Matthaeus Parisiensis, V, 307, VI, 205–7.

<sup>70</sup> For instance Riley-Smith, *Peace*, 87–102.

<sup>71</sup> Kruse, *Völkerrechtslehre*, 82, based on al-Kasani.

It is characteristic that the chancery clerk al-Qalqashandi pays very much attention in *Subh* to pledges of security (*aman*) from one Muslim to another, which, as he himself admits, were not at all necessary in theory.<sup>72</sup> In the second part of his chapter on *hudnas*, he deals with peace-treaties between Muslims and it is not by chance that these agreements bear the same designations as those between Muslims and non-Muslims, *sulh*, *muwasafa* or *'aqd*. The limitation of duration is indeed lacking in them, but in practice these agreements were of as long or short duration as those between Franks and Muslims. If there was an appropriate political interest, longer periods of peaceful coexistence could be as well organized through the prolongation of an expiring treaty or one ending on the death of a contracting party (provided the agreement had not been drafted to anticipate this eventuality), as through an unlimited treaty. The best instance of this is the phases of Frankish-Muslim alliances in the twelfth century or the Levantine peace of the first half of the thirteenth century. Treaties concluded for ten years, as was the rule in the thirteenth century, closely approximated to unlimited treaties of peace in practice, since in view of the rapidly changing power-constellation and the varying composition of the political elite in both Muslim and Frankish states, a decade must have been seen as an incomprehensibly long period. Here it may just be noted that a limited-duration treaty, or one requiring renewal on the death of one party, was also the rule in the European West during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, especially for agreements between the kingdoms of England and France.<sup>73</sup> That within the legal jurisdiction of the *Respublica Christiana* or *Dar al-Islam*, according to theory, the conclusion of a treaty served for the renewal of peace (*pacem renovare*),<sup>74</sup> while between the two legal jurisdictions it only interrupted a state of war (at least from the Muslim standpoint), was of no practical importance.

Relatively little can be learnt from the narrative sources about the procedure in regard to Frankish-Muslim agreements. Insofar as they give detailed information on the way treaties were concluded, it was usually accomplished in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries by the drafting of written protocols, by oath or handshake, also occasionally by the provision of hostages. According to both Western and Muslim ideas, the oath of the contracting parties, and in some circumstances of the witnesses,

---

<sup>72</sup> Al-Qalqashandi, XIII, 329–52.

<sup>73</sup> Norgate, *Richard*, 323–4.

<sup>74</sup> Fisch, *Krieg*, 289.

constituted the conclusion of the treaty; the written agreement had rather the character of an aide-memoire, but was itself without value as evidence.<sup>75</sup> There is a whole range of instances to show that the agreements were set down in writing,<sup>76</sup> and this is true not only of bilateral treaties but also for the safe conducts when places were surrendered. For example, in 1187, when Saladin's secretary, al-Katib al-Isfahani, was forced when sick to write the safe conduct for Beirut as its people had refused to accept the less correct and elaborate drafts of the other scribes.<sup>77</sup> Nowhere, however, are there any indications about the language, number of copies or forms of agreements. Al-Qalqashandi does indeed preface the section of his chancery handbook devoted to bilateral treaties between Muslims and non-Muslims with some observations which are helpful in this respect. First, although every treaty has its particular subject, he puts together themes which are typically dealt with in such agreements. He summarized the formalities the chancery officials had to observe. Elsewhere he sketches the model protocol of a treaty of this kind. The typical contents of a treaty could include: (a) each party will be a friend of the other's friends and an enemy of his enemies; (b) no agreement will be reached with the other party's opponents; (c) anyone in breach of the treaty will be apprehended; (d) no hostile incursion will be made into the territory of the other party; (e) captives will be released and permitted to return with their chattels and followers; (f) annual tribute or the surrender of places or castles in pledge are agreed; (g) there will be freedom of travel and security for merchants and travellers; (h) the complete fulfilment of the agreement until the end of its period will be an obligation; (i) there will be a duty to announce the expiry of the treaty; (j) there will be an assurance of safe conduct for the subjects of the contracting parties to enable them to return safely to their own domiciles on the expiry of the treaty; (k) agreement will determine castles and places to be surrendered, and money-payments.<sup>78</sup>

Among the numerous formalities to be taken into consideration by the chancery clerks, particularly important in treaties with non-Muslims, is the provision that the duration of the agreement be expressed in solar

<sup>75</sup> Ganshof, *Histoire*, 130–1; Kruse, *Völkerrechtslehre*, 138–41.

<sup>76</sup> To name but a few: Albert of Aix, V, IX, 438; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 336; William of Tyre, XVI, VIII, 715, XV, VIII, 669; William of Tyre, XIX, XVII, 909, VI, 892; Ambroise, V.11793, 316; Oliver Scholasticus, 79, 275; Jean de Joinville, XCIX, 280.

<sup>77</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn, *Fath*, 40.

<sup>78</sup> Al-Qalqashandi, XIV, 9–11.

years and only then converted into the lunar years of the Islamic calendar. In fact, all these treaties are doubly dated by the Julian and Hijri calendars. It is furthermore significant that the official must pay attention to using the correct script and format of the document and to the naming of the contracting rulers in the *exordium*. The history leading up to the treaty concluded must also be mentioned in a *narratio*. Al-Qalqashandi also discussed questions of protocol relating to the titulature of the rulers and he underlined especially that no agreements were to be reached which were invalid as regards the *shari'ā*. It must be declared whether the rulers in person or plenipotentiaries made a treaty. If an envoy represents a contracting party, his credentials (signature/seal) must be put in writing. Al-Qalqashandi speaks in altogether greater detail about the procedure if an envoy represents one of the two sides. Thus, it must be mentioned, for example, that the representative voluntarily deems the agreements reached to be of benefit (*maslaha*) to himself and his ruler, and that the successive clauses were reported to him, and translated, if he knew no Arabic. Furthermore, the oaths must be set out in a *corroboratio*. Rulers who were present took the oaths in person; if only one of the rulers was there, his oath was put in writing, presumably to be submitted later to the other party, when the envoy obtained the latter's oath. Finally, it was imperative to repeat the date in Arabic and in the dating system of the other party. Each ruler would commission some of his dignitaries as oath-helpers and witnesses.<sup>79</sup>

Before giving the text of four Mamluk-Frankish treaties, al-Qalqashandi sketches out a typical bilateral treaty with a non-Muslim power. This model is especially interesting because it was not spun out of theory, but follows the pattern of treaties which were actually concluded and enforced. Such an agreement had to include an *exordium*, the body of the text, and a conclusion. The *exordium* consists of: (a) the *basmala*: In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate; (b) the introductory formula: This is a truce established between Sultan N and Sultan M; (c) the declaration that each contracting party undertakes to fulfil the treaty throughout its duration as their mutual benefit (*maslaha*) demands, that ambitious aspirations have been given up, that a sworn obligation to God (*'ahd Allah*) makes the fulfilment of the treaty incumbent on both parties; (d) the period of validity of the agreement. To be considered as part of the *dispositio* are the provisions concerning the cessation of all hostilities and the use in the

---

<sup>79</sup> Al-Qalqashandi, XIV, 11–15.

territories of safe conducts by land and sea for all their inhabitants and all their chattels. The obligations of the contracting parties are then set out; e.g. money-payments, partitions of territory, service in war and so forth. This part concludes with a further undertaking of both parties to fulfil the clauses as stated. God is invoked as witness of the undertaking in a combination of *sanctio* and *dispositio*, whereby oaths were to be taken according to the religious beliefs of both parties. The witnesses are then named and a statement follows on the establishment of condominiumia. Further regulations, substantially pertaining to the *dispositio*, appear in a postscript: (a) each party has the duty of protecting the other party's adjoining territories and subjects; (b) legal problems will be dealt with according to the *shari'a*; (c) fugitives will be sent back; (d) stolen property or loot will be restored. So ends the draft, which must be read aloud punctiliously.<sup>80</sup>

Although this model is somewhat deficient in organization, and the Arabic abounds in tautologies through the employment of rhymed prose (*saj'*), it allows one to form an idea of the construction of a Frankish-Muslim treaty. Holt has analysed in detail the treaties of the early Mamluk period in the second half of the thirteenth century. They are all approximately constructed on this model with the items listed in al-Qalqashandi's postscript set in the body of the treaty.<sup>81</sup> In addition to his model extant texts contain at the end, or even in the first place before the *basmala*, the sultan's *tughra* as a sign of his sovereignty. It is not known how many original copies of a treaty were made, or whether there was a Latin or Frankish original beside the Arabic text, or yet if there were bilingual instruments either interlinear or on the recto and verso of the parchment. There are examples of these in Spanish treaties and also in North African commercial treaties with the Italians.<sup>82</sup> It is conceivable that the Middle Eastern agreements were simply drafted in Arabic. In the narrative sources at any rate, whenever there is information about treaty negotiations, it is almost always the case that the Frankish envoys were Arabic speakers, e.g. Bernhard Vacher, who went to Damascus in 1147; George the Scribe, sent to Egypt in the same year; Majid, sent to Saladin by Raymond III of Tripoli in 1175; as also the negotiators in 1191–92, Humphrey IV of Toron, Reginald of Sidon, Balian of Nablus and the chamberlain Yusuf. Through his investigation of the two documents extant in Arabic, which Julian of Sidon

<sup>80</sup> Al-Qalqashandi, XIV, 29–31.

<sup>81</sup> Especially Holt, *Treaties*, 67–76.

<sup>82</sup> Burns, *Techniques*, 7–9; Mas-Latrie, *Traités*, I, 270–82.

and Humphrey of Montfort had drawn up for the Buhturids of the Gharb in 1255 and 1280 respectively, Clermont-Ganneau came to the conclusion that these two documents, transmitted in a literary source, may presumably have been originals and not merely later Arabic translations of Frankish documents. Oriental Christians generally occupied the posts of *scriba* and *dragomannus* in the Frankish lordships and it is probable that at least in the royal chancery in Jerusalem an 'Arabic department' existed.<sup>83</sup>

It may be noted in this connection that the extant treaties as well as the two Buhturid documents are dated both by the Hijra and the Seleucid era. The Julian calendar was also used in the Egyptian chancery, albeit only in treaties with European powers. An example is the treaty between Qalawun and Genoa of 1290, which is interesting because it has an interlinear Arabic-'Frankish' text and because the oaths of Genoa were sworn before the Coptic bishop of Cairo. There is no instance of such proceedings in the treaties between the Frankish states and the Mamluks. The treaty is dated according to the Julian calendar, according to the era of Constantinople, used by the bishop, and, subsequent to the statement that this treaty was first drafted in 'Frankish', according to the Hijri calendar.<sup>84</sup> The dating of the treaties between Muslims and the states founded during and after the First Crusade by the Seleucid era instead of the Julian calendar indicates the influence of the Oriental Christian and Arabic-speaking personnel of the Frankish administration on the structuring of the treaties. Their practice in dating and drafting apparently persisted even when the chief negotiator was of Frankish origin. Al-Qalqashandi provides information on the negotiations procedure used for the treaties he cites. Agreement was reached point by point and the corresponding clauses put in writing. He states that the treaties were perhaps so inartistically drafted because the Franks, on account of their inadequate knowledge of Arabic, may have found only these roughly drafted texts acceptable, rather than more artistic revised versions.<sup>85</sup> In the second half of the thirteenth century, Arabic was accordingly the language of negotiation and treaties. However, since precise details are only known from the technicalities of late Frankish-Muslim treaties, it must remain an open question what language was used in earlier periods when the Franks were the stronger side and what was

---

<sup>83</sup> Clermont-Ganneau, *Deux chartes*, 14–5, 15–6. In addition: Riley-Smith, *Lesser Officials*, 15–26; Riley-Smith, *Feudal Nobility*, 53–8.

<sup>84</sup> Sacy, *Pièces*, 33–52; Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, *Tashrif*, 166–9. Cf. Holt *Treaty with Genoa*, 107–8.

<sup>85</sup> Al-Qalqashandi, XIV, 70–1.

then the form of agreements. Did Greek play a part in the First Crusade? William of Tyre's statement that the Frankish envoys to the Fatimid caliph in 1167 pronounced the oath to be sworn syllable by syllable suggests that the Caliph al-'Adid must have sworn a Latin or Frankish oath.<sup>86</sup> Thus, Arabic does not always seem to have been the language of treaties.

This is not the place to go once again into the typical contents of treaties. In his analysis of the Mamluk-Frankish treaties, Holt has mentioned the factual questions occurring in most of them, *inter alia* the procedure regarding trade in the so-called 'prohibited goods' (*mamnu'at*, i.e. contraband such as arms, timber or horses), competence of jurisdiction, wergild regulations, compensation for theft and homicide (whether the culprit was found or not), rules for freedom of passage for merchants and travelers, extradition of fugitives and arrangements for the right of domicile of peasants under Frankish or Muslim rule.<sup>87</sup> Although every agreement also addressed other problems, there was a range of stipulations which are clearly almost traditional in Frankish-Muslim treaty terms. In addition to regulations for condominiums, which will be dealt with in the following section, there are the suspension clauses, which occur repeatedly in treaties between 1177 and 1271. The treaty of 1283 between Qalawun and the kingdom of Jerusalem contains a modified suspension clause to the effect that the Franks must give the sultan two months' notice of the arrival of a Crusade. Only in the event of information within the stated period will they cease to be bound by their oath to the treaty on the arrival of the Crusaders.<sup>88</sup> Quite frequently, and first in 1177, appears a prohibition on the refurbishment of buildings and fortifications. The best example of this is the discussion whether the Emperor Frederick II was allowed to fortify Jerusalem when regained in 1229, as he himself deemed, or not, as the Muslim sources, the pope and his own Guelf opponents in the East maintained. Frederick comments in a letter on the alleged permission to refortify Jerusalem and other places with the words, 'which at no other time was permitted to Christians'.<sup>89</sup> The peace treaties would thus seem frequently to have included a ban on fortification.

It is necessary finally to discuss the means of corroboration and ratification which played a part in Frankish-Muslim treaties. As in Europe, security for treaties was given by oath, handshake and hostages. There is

---

<sup>86</sup> William of Tyre, XIX, XIX, 913.

<sup>87</sup> Holt, *Treaties*, 71-5.

<sup>88</sup> Al-Qalqashandi, XIV, 60.

<sup>89</sup> *Historia diplomatica Friderici secundi*, III, 97.

hardly any mention of the sealing or initialling of treaties, which, however, may have similarly been the rule as in Spain.<sup>90</sup> The giving of hostages is increasingly mentioned in Frankish-Muslim relations from the First Crusade onwards, but chiefly in connection with expected money-payments or surrenders. It seems that hostages were not exchanged or given for every treaty, but only to serve as security for obligations, especially of a financial nature agreed by treaty. It was usual to give hostages for the delivery of captives, if the ransom was payable by instalments. Evidence for this use of hostages is abundant and does not need to be repeated here. The sources are as uninformative about the treatment of Muslim captives as about the custody of copies of treaties, so it is difficult to form a picture of the legal status of hostages. It has already been mentioned that according to the law of Jerusalem, the capture of the king made the *obstagium* of the queen and the vassals a duty on the model of European feudal law. Otherwise it is only known that hostages played a part in Frankish-Muslim legal relations, but not how the law of hostages worked in practice. In any event, al-Qalqashandi's treaties do not mention hostages as a method of corroboration.

It is otherwise with the handshake and the oath. Al-Qalqashandi speaks in two places about the function of the oath in the conclusion of a treaty, saying that the contracting parties ratify the agreed text with an oath. If both rulers were present in person, the oaths were annexed to the text of the treaties. If one was represented by an accredited envoy, the same procedure might be used, but it was also possible to put the oath in writing and produce it to the absent ruler for signature and authentication.<sup>91</sup> The swearing of oaths at the conclusion of treaties is in fact generally mentioned in the sources. The relationship of this to the handshake is not entirely clear. The two acts are apparently not always separable. When the expression *dext(e)ris datis* occurs in the Latin sources, it must not be automatically assumed that an agreement was sealed by a handshake, since the phrase had been used since the ninth century to signify the conclusion of a treaty.<sup>92</sup> Nor can it be rightly decided whether behind the equally familiar phrase *propria manu firmare*<sup>93</sup> lies a handshake, a physical oath or the touching of the treaty document on the swearing of

<sup>90</sup> Ganshof, *Histoire*, 47; Wild, *Sanctions*, 83–101.

<sup>91</sup> Al-Qalqashandi, XIII, 314–5, XIV, 71.

<sup>92</sup> Wielers, *Beziehungsformen*, 10.

<sup>93</sup> For instance William of Tyre, XIX, XIX, 912.

the oath as in 1221 at the end of the Damietta Crusade.<sup>94</sup> An Islamic oath, especially the *bay'a* to the caliph, could in any case be formally given by a handshake.<sup>95</sup> Is it at least occasionally possible that the mention of a handshake in the sources signifies an oath?

The sources universally speak of oath-taking when they refer to the conclusion of treaties, for which the oath is the constitutive act. As in the West, Christians took the oath on the gospels or the crucifix; there is no mention of oaths on relics in connection with treaties with Muslims. In a multitude of Latin accounts it is mentioned as entirely natural that the Muslims used an Islamic form. According to Albert of Aix, Peter the Hermit, when outside Antioch in 1098, demanded an oath of Kirbogha, '*tu in Deo Tuo*', while the Franks would swear '*in Deo suo*'. Rigord speaks of '*iuramentum legis sue*' by Saladin in 1192, while the *Itinerarium peregrinorum* characterizes another of Saladin's oaths with the words '*ritu eorum confirmare securitate*'.<sup>96</sup> Examples are numerous. The oath on the gospels, or gospels and crucifix together, was also usual for Christians in the kingdom of Jerusalem for internal legal transactions, oaths of fealty and coronation oaths.<sup>97</sup> Jews and Samaritans swore on the Torah and Muslims on the Quran.<sup>98</sup> A physical oath on the Western model, sworn on a copy of the Quran, was seemingly required from the Muslims in the kingdom of Jerusalem. Although physical oaths were not uncommon, oath-taking in the Islamic form did not absolutely require the touching of a copy of the Quran, but at most an appeal to the contents of the divinely revealed Word.

It is again only from the thirteenth-century sources that we can form a clear idea of the oaths used at the conclusion of a Frankish-Muslim treaty. The earliest known is referred to by Oliver Scholasticus, who cites for 1221 the text of al-Kamil's oath on the conclusion of the treaty which ended the Damietta Crusade and which accurately corresponds to those known later. It is thus not unlikely that in 1221, and even perhaps generally in the twelfth century, the oath was set down (and perhaps translated) as al-Qalqashandi testified for the Mamluk period. Apparently, the situation was similar at the oath-taking of 1192 with Saladin, as Ambroise indicated.

<sup>94</sup> Oliver Scholasticus, 79, 275.

<sup>95</sup> Pedersen, *Eid*, 24, 56–62.

<sup>96</sup> Albert of Aix, IV, XLV, 420; Rigord, 117; *Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, VI, XII, 403.

<sup>97</sup> *Livre de Jean d'ibelin*, VII, 30, CXCII, 310–2, CXCIV, 312; *Assises de la Cour des Bourgeois*, 171–2.

<sup>98</sup> *Assises de la Cour des Bourgeois*, 171–2.

Joinville likewise, and in more detail, describes the oaths which sealed the treaty of 1250, leading to St. Louis' release from captivity. The Mamluk negotiator swore that if the treaty was broken he should be dishonoured as one going bareheaded in penance to Mecca, as one immediately taking back his divorced wife (without her intervening marriage to a third party as the *shari'a* required) or as one eating pork. He says that the king had the oath translated and the Arabic-speaking master of the Temple assured him that it was the strongest possible Islamic oath. In response, the king swore that by breaking the treaty he would be dishonoured as a Christian denying God (i.e. Christ) and His mother, and an outcast 'from the company of the twelve apostles and all the saints'. The king rejected only a further and more comprehensive form, which led to considerable conflicts. He refused to swear that if he broke the treaty, he would be dishonoured as a Christian denying God and His law, spitting on the cross and trampling it underfoot. He deemed this to be a scandalous requirement.<sup>99</sup>

It is not clear whether forms of oath of this kind were already in use in the twelfth century. The oaths of the king and the Mamluk amirs are, however, particularly close to the oaths of Baybars and Qalawun, and the Frankish rulers and knightly Orders from 1269 to 1285. The oaths sworn by Qalawun to the treaty of 1283 with the Latin kingdom show that these oaths consisted in the Arabic version of a ninefold invocation of God, then of the Quran and the Prophet. This is followed by a commitment to fulfil the treaty, mentioning the other party, the territories included, its duration and the commencement of the period of validity. The sultan swore to maintain the agreement provided the other party did so and not to seek its abrogation by *fatwa*. In case of a breach of the treaty the *sanctio* required him to make thirty pilgrimages to Mecca, barefoot, bareheaded and fasting except on the days when this was forbidden. At the close of further penances comes the *corroboratio*: 'and God is the Trustee for what we say.' The Frankish oath to this treaty is analogous in structure. In place of the Islamic invocations there is a very extensive invocation of Christ, the cross, the Trinity, the gospels and so forth. The period of duration is given according to the Seleucid era, not the Hijra. The *sanctio* corresponds to that given by St. Louis in 1250 and mirrors that of the sultan in Christian terms: a Christian party breaching the treaty will be excommunicated, must make thirty pilgrimages to Jerusalem barefoot and bareheaded, and

---

<sup>99</sup> Oliver Scholasticus, 79, 275; Ambroise, V.11830–11831, 317; Jean de Joinville, LXXI, 196, 198.

release a thousand Muslim captives. The corroboration invokes God and Christ as Trustees; the oath is sworn on the Quran.<sup>100</sup>

A survey of the very comprehensive chapters on oaths in the chancery handbooks of the Mamluk period show that oath-forms of this kind are Islamic instruments, similar ones having been used for centuries in *Dar al-Islam* for oaths of fealty and allegiance as well as in legal proceedings. The compendia of Ibn Fadlallah al-'Umari and al-Qalqashandi contain such forms in abundance, differentiated according to the religious affiliation of the oath-takers. The forms of *sanctio* in the treaties of 1250 and 1283, as well as the prohibition on abrogating the oath by *fatwa*, appear in them.<sup>101</sup> The examples cited convey an impression of how oaths and treaties were arranged between Franks and Muslims. As a consequence of the nature of the sources however, very little can be learnt about the technicalities of treaties and oaths in the twelfth century, when the Franks were at least partly in the stronger position and could perhaps influence the forms more than in the Mamluk period. It is also not entirely clear whether a wider circle of dignitaries was generally summoned to an oath-taking beyond the contracting parties or their accredited plenipotentiaries. The refusal of a king to swear the oath in person, as did Richard Lionheart in 1192 on the grounds that it was not customary for kings, is an exceptional case in the history of Middle Eastern Frankish and Muslim oaths.<sup>102</sup> He and Saladin ratified their agreement in 1192 by a handshake with the other party's plenipotentiary. That an oath was taken by a group of persons is also known from the conclusion of other treaties. The agreement of al-Malik al-'Adil with Amalric II of Jerusalem, for example, was first sworn to by the Muslim amirs and then the oath of the Frankish leaders was taken. An agreement for the surrender of Damietta in 1219 was sworn to by the men of religion, in both camps.<sup>103</sup>

On one matter indeed the sources for the entire period under investigation leave no doubt: in what concerned the oath, Franks and Muslims regarded themselves as being answerable to God. For instance, the question as to whether a treaty with non-Muslims had any legal force whatsoever, which was much discussed in canon law, is thus of no relevance for analysing alliances and treaties between Frankish and Muslim Rulers. In Islam, perjury is deemed an extraordinary crime and this is indicated not

<sup>100</sup> Ibn al-Furāt, I (ed. Zurayq), VII, 271–3.

<sup>101</sup> Ibn Faḍlallāh al-'Umārī, *Ta'rif*, 146ff.; al-Qalqashandī, XIII, 205ff.

<sup>102</sup> Bahā' al-Dīn b. Shaddād, 234.

<sup>103</sup> Ibn Wāsil, III, 78; Gottschalk, *Al-Kāmil*, 86.

only by the *corroboratio*-forms cited, but it is also the tenor of all Islamic legal literature.<sup>104</sup> The most important Frankish sources for their part, above all William of Tyre, repeatedly emphasize that faith is also to be kept with unbelievers.<sup>105</sup> Again and again he emphatically gives support to this opinion.<sup>106</sup> Breaches of treaties were indeed frequent and Saladin's entourage entertained great doubts regarding the general loyalty of Franks to treaties,<sup>107</sup> but no doubts prevailed on the Frankish side that the treaties were legally valid. Hence, liberation from an oath is only seldom mentioned and so it is clear how cautiously absolution from sworn obligations was employed on the Frankish side. It is not known whether, in 1124, when the patriarch forbade Baldwin II of Jerusalem to fulfil the agreement sworn on his release from captivity in Aleppo, he was thereby releasing him from an oath. In 1167, at least according to Ernoul, the clergy and vassals asked Amalric I in Egypt to break off the alliance with the Fatimids and take possession of the country. He flatly rejected the idea out of loyalty to his oath and he even kept to this when the leading clerics offered to take the guilt upon themselves and to obtain his absolution from the pope. Balian of Nablus, who was temporarily released by Saladin on his word of honour in 1187, on the other hand, was absolved from his oath by the patriarch of Jerusalem in order to lead the defence of the city against the Muslims. Guy of Lusignan also obtained absolution from his oath (in 1189?), which prohibited him from taking up arms against Saladin after his release. It went otherwise with St. Louis' absolution from his oath in 1251, as it was only when the king ascertained that his Mamluk treaty partners were not keeping the terms agreed with him that he asked the papal legate to absolve him from his oath. The legate consulted the clergy and then complied with the king's request.<sup>108</sup>

These instances show that when one of the parties sought the abrogation of a treaty or release from an oath, there were serious scruples. The intensity of the commitment to God, which the oath-taker assumed by a promissory oath, can explain this. Release from an oath was only voluntarily resorted to at times of special crisis or when the treaty had already been broken. There was nevertheless the possibility of the legal premature termination of a sworn agreement, viz. by a formal revocation

<sup>104</sup> Kruse, *Völkerrechtslehre*, 127; Pedersen, *Eid*, 211–5.

<sup>105</sup> Schwinges, *Kreuzzugsideologie*, 245–61; Albert of Aix, X, XXIII, 642; XII, III, 690.

<sup>106</sup> William of Tyre, XVIII, XI, 837, XX, V, 949, XXII, XIV, 1088.

<sup>107</sup> Bahā' al-Dīn b. Shaddād, 173, 203.

<sup>108</sup> Ernoul, III, 5, XV, 175; *Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, I, XXV, 59; Rothelin, LXXIII, 627.

with notice of a deadline for its ending. This legal form was employed in both Western and Islamic legal circles. Numerous cases are known of the revocation of treaties between Franks and Muslims; e.g. between Jerusalem and Damascus in 1147, Saladin and Jerusalem in 1181, and the Franks and Baybars in 1263.<sup>109</sup> The Franks also knew that Islamic law provided a right of withdrawal from treaties with non-Muslims and that all agreements with them were validated according to the principle of *maslaha* under existing conditions only.<sup>110</sup> It was incidentally possible for Muslims to establish the nullity of a treaty by means of a *fatwa*, as occurred in 1291 before the final extinction of the last Frankish dominions on the Syro-Palestinian mainland. In some treaties of the Mamluk period, the Franks sought to eliminate this possibility by including the prohibition of such *fatwas*. No information has come down about the exact method of a treaty revocation.<sup>111</sup> Whether and when a treaty was abrogated clearly depended on current political opportunity. The violation of individual provisions of a treaty between Franks and Muslims in the Middle East, moreover, did not automatically lead to its abrogation; numerous examples have already been given of the injured party in such a case demanding satisfaction by a diplomatic mission. In the Middle East, however, no regular arbitration jurisdiction developed, such as is known in at least one fifteenth-century example in Spain. The competent representatives of both sides seem to have settled individually *ad hoc* disputes of minor significance, at least in the Mamluk period.

From this survey, it may be concluded that in spite of the basic isolation of the two legal spheres of *Respublica Christiana* and *Dar al-Islam*, there developed in the Middle East during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries a sophisticated repertory of juristic techniques for the settlement of conflicts and the regulation of peaceful cooperation. Insofar as peace or confrontation determined policy, this did not depend on legal systems, but only on the political will and motives of the leading groups involved on both sides. A central component of the legal repertory employed between Franks and Muslims was the bilateral treaty, the formal and substantial elements of which were extensively developed up to the end of the thirteenth century. The nature of the sources makes it impossible to decide the share of Frankish influence on this development, since the

<sup>109</sup> William of Tyre, XX, XIV, 1087; Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, *Rawḍ*, 152–3.

<sup>110</sup> Kruse, *Völkerrechtslehre*, 106; Khaddouri, *War*, 221; L'Estoire d'Eracles, XXIV, XXIV, 135.

<sup>111</sup> Al-Qalqashandī, XIV, 108–9.

best sources are of Islamic provenance and come from the late period of Frankish rule. Nevertheless, it is a clear sign of Frankish integration in the Middle Eastern world that they made use of Islamic and Oriental Christian forms and models.

THE FORMATION AND FUNCTION OF MUSLIM-FRANKISH CONDOMINIA  
(*MUNĀṢAFĀT*) IN THE TWELFTH AND THIRTEENTH CENTURIES

Among the terms of the seven treaties of which the text is extant, the clauses relating to the establishment and administration of condominiums occupy an extraordinarily large space beside other typical stipulations such as provision for the suspension of treaties, the prohibition on rebuilding or the law of shipwreck. From what has been said, it is clear that divisions of regions between Frankish and Muslim states and rulers were repeatedly agreed (i.e. territorial divisions but in particular condominiums) from the first decade of the twelfth century down to the latest extant agreement between the Lady Margaret of Tyre and Qalawun in 1285. The function they fulfilled is perhaps best shown by the role of the different condominium projects in the course of the negotiations for ending the struggle between the Third Crusade and Saladin in 1191–92. It was possible with the help of these devices to defuse border quarrels and to pacify regions for the benefit of both sides who would otherwise not have had access to their produce. Other conceivable solutions, e.g. the offer of Richard Lionheart to hold Jaffa and Ascalon in fief from Saladin, were in contrast unacceptable to the Muslim side, at least in this instance.

Nevertheless, the existence of Frankish-Muslim condominiums remains almost entirely unknown to modern historical writing on the Crusades and Crusader states. The specialized study of the function and organization of a condominium has been as little addressed as research on Frankish-Muslim treaty policy in general.<sup>112</sup> One of the reasons for this is presumably that the analysis of condominiums requires the Arabic sources to an even greater extent than for matters of treaty technicalities. Unlike Western sources, which provide information only extremely rarely, an abundance of instances can be found in Arabic sources, in universal chronicles, local chronicles, biographies and especially the chancery literature. By contrast, there is only a handful of data in the Frankish sources. William

---

<sup>112</sup> The most detailed contributions are Richard, *Partage*; Holt, *Treaties*; Köhler, *Munāṣafāt*.

of Tyre's *Historia* is the first non-Muslim source with information about a condominium. Describing the Ayyubid attacks on the kingdom of Jerusalem in 1182, he says that power (*potestas*) over the trans-Jordanian territory of Sueth (al-Sawad) had at that time long been divided between Muslims and Franks, and that both sides equally shared the taxes. The sources belonging to the Ernoul group state that Saladin granted half of the revenues of Sidon to its former lord, Reginald, in 1192.<sup>113</sup> In the arbitration award of 18 June 1233, made by the patriarch of Antioch in the dispute between the Templars and the Hospitallers, mention is made of a *terra partitionis* divided between the Hospitallers and the sultan of Aleppo on either bank of the River Belne at Gabula (Jabala).<sup>114</sup> Joinville reports that the Templars sought agreement with al-Nasir Yusuf of Aleppo and Damascus over a condominium during St. Louis' stay in Palestine from 1250 to 1254. Apart from these reports, there is only a further reference to a condominium in the Old French version of the treaty between the lord of Tyre and Qalawun.<sup>115</sup>

The overwhelming majority of the available reports on condominiums is derived from Arabic sources. By far the commonest term for this legal concept is *munasafa*, implying a reciprocal division in halves. It is first used in the sources as an adverb or predicate: a region is *munasafa* or is possessed as *munasafa*. In time it becomes a technical term, so the phrase 'munasafa territory' (*bilad al-munasafa*) appears by Saladin's time. It is also clear that a quite definite region is intended, remaining a condominium over decades despite the vicissitudes of external policy, as seems to have been the case for al-Sawad, east of the Sea of Galilee.<sup>116</sup> In individual cases it is difficult to deduce from the data of a chronicle whether the term signifies a division of territory, of revenues or even of sovereign power and jurisdiction. In the earliest examples known, in 1108 and 1110, Ibn al-Qalanisi only speaks of a sharing of harvest produce (*istighlal*).<sup>117</sup> On the other hand, William of Tyre's use of the word *potestas* shows clearly that the arrangements made on the establishment of a condominium would or might go beyond the division of taxes.

<sup>113</sup> William of Tyre, XXII, XV, 1090; Ernoul, XXV, 293. Cf. L'Estoire d'Eracles, XXVI, XVII, 198–9.

<sup>114</sup> Delaville-le-Roulx, *Cartulaire*, II, no. 2058, 456.

<sup>115</sup> Jean de Joinville, XCIX, 280; Tafel/Thomas, III, 398–400.

<sup>116</sup> Al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil (Cambridge), fol. 23v.

<sup>117</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 165–74.

More precise data about the way a condominium was administered cannot be deduced from the narrative sources. Fortunately, two of the treaties preserved by al-Qalqashandi contain detailed terms which permit the depiction of how condominia were organized, at least at the end of the thirteenth century. Since the relevant parts are substantially quite similar in both treaties, they can be summarized as follows:<sup>118</sup>

1. There was to be an equal division of every conceivable source of revenue in the condominium, not merely harvest produce but also the proceeds from fisheries, salt-works, threshing-floors, oil-presses and slaughter-houses. Tolls and harbour-dues were similarly divided and the peasants' socage tenures (*sukhar*) profited both sides or were entirely abolished as in 1267. Taxes were not to be raised or to be raised by the two sides in agreement.
2. There were special arrangements to meet the needs of both partners; for example in 1267 a modest lump sum was awarded to the Frankish side in lieu of straw and in 1271 the Hospitallers' personal requirements were imported duty-free.
3. A further group of clauses concerns measures for the upkeep of the land. In 1267, both parties pledge themselves to strive and be zealous for the prosperity of the same condominia and to show fairness in requiring dues or socage from individual peasants. The administration of mills and orchards would be under the jurisdiction of a representative of each side. The return to the condominia of peasants domiciled there was not to be prevented.
4. There were also some regulations for distraint on defaulting debtors and guarantees by the Muslim officials for the security of the land should they allow nomad Turcomans, Arabs or Kurds to enter.
5. As a rule, there are very detailed regulations for the definition of jurisdiction. Thus, it is laid down for example that legal proceedings and the execution of judgments shall take place according to the confessional adherence of the defendant and in the presence of a representative of the condominium partner. A precise procedure for dealing with capital crimes is laid down and regulations for compensation and wergild fixed. In brief, the two sides dealt jointly with the administration of justice. Fines were likewise divided and policing was not incumbent on one side alone.

---

<sup>118</sup> Al-Qalqashandi, XIV, 31–9, 42–51.

6. Purely administrative regulations are seldom found, since at the local level the village-based administration was respected. In the treaty of 1271, however, it is expressly stated that the removal of a headman (*ra'is*) requires the consent of both parties.

The clauses of these two treaties allow an assumption (and more is not possible because of the sparseness of the sources) as to how the first condominiums may have appeared a century and a half earlier. The technicalities of the *munasafa* were certainly long in being perfected and it is not certain that both sides regularly claimed administrative sovereignty over a condominium. For example, the treaty of 1281 between Qalawun and Bohemond VII of Tripoli laid down that the revenues of the city and harbour of Latakia shall be a *munasafa* and that the Muslims might establish a post on a bridge to protect their rights. Yet, this was not a matter of joint administration.<sup>119</sup> Sidon, a condominium since 1192, was apparently under Muslim sovereignty, yet it paid dues to the Franks or shared the revenues with them. Nevertheless, in spite of the different possibilities in the organization of a condominium, one thing was clear: condominiums served to neutralize border areas, the yields of which neither side could give up. In the second half of the thirteenth century, a period of greatly superior Muslim strength, the establishment of condominiums was regularly the first step towards their complete annexation by the Mamluk sultanate.<sup>120</sup> With their help a peaceful balance could be legally established in frontier-zones between Frankish and Muslim regions. In al-Qalqashandi's somewhat flowery phraseology, the compromise of a *munasafa* should 'check defiance' and 'strike down the glance of ambition'.<sup>121</sup>

If these were the motives for the *munasafa*, what was its origin? The *munasafa* as a legal institution existed in Islamic jurisprudence, although in the field of private law rather than in the 'law of nations'. Thus, the term was occasionally used, for example, by the Hanafi jurist al-Sarakhsi in the second half of the eleventh century, in the course of his exposition of the agrarian form of division, the *muzara'a*, although he speaks more frequently of possession in two halves (*nisfan*). In the encyclopaedic work of al-Nuwayri (677–732/1279–1332), *Nihayat al-arab*, there is a model treaty in which, for example, two partners could establish the possession of a

<sup>119</sup> Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, *Tashrif*, 210–1.

<sup>120</sup> Holt, *Treaties*, 72.

<sup>121</sup> Al-Qalqashandī, XIV, 30.

house as *munasafa*.<sup>122</sup> However, phenomena analogous to the Frankish-Muslim condominiums, i.e. joint titles of possession with implications for the administration of justice and sovereign power, do hardly exist elsewhere and before the twelfth century. One might be inclined to see the constitution of a condominium in the treaties concerning Cyprus in 28/648–49 and 69/688–89. Yet the term *munasafa* is lacking in this case and it seems moreover that it is rather a matter of a twofold tributary dependence of Cyprus on Byzantium and the caliph.<sup>123</sup> We have no details about the organization of sovereignty or justice in Cyprus during this period. A possible condominium over the island of Pantelleria is known in the thirteenth century, when the Emperor Frederick II and the Hafsiids of Tunis jointly held it;<sup>124</sup> but for chronological reasons this instance can provide no precedent for the *munasafa* known in the Middle East, it was rather the other way round. There is no precedent in Islamic law for the specific distinguishing features of the *munasafa* in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, viz. the division of official power between Franks and Muslims. A passage in the truce of 1271 between Baybars and the Hospitallers shows how this worked in practice:

Provided also that any Muslim who commits a wrong shall be liable to punishment according to the Holy Law; Our representative shall apply it if hanging or mutilation is mandatory and he shall be punished according to the Holy Law by hanging, mutilation or blinding; provided that this shall be done only in the presence of a representative from the Order of the Hospital, present as an eyewitness, who shall be cognizant of the offence and confirm it. If his offence merits a fine or indemnity in dirhams, gold, cattle or anything else of any kind, whatever is claimed shall be equally shared between the Treasury Office, the Order of the Hospital and the lord of al-Marqab.<sup>125</sup>

It would naturally be conceivable that there was a purely autochthonous development of law concerning the *munasafa*. However, twelfth-century Muslim sources, in a period of roughly equal strength of Franks and Muslims in Syria, remarkably often consider condominiums as something imposed on the Muslims by the Franks.<sup>126</sup> It is thus conceivable that the establishment of condominiums in the Middle East is one of the few cases where a Western legal institution was transferred to the East,

<sup>122</sup> Al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, I/1, 72., 98, 60–1; Al-Nuwayrī, IX, 85–8.

<sup>123</sup> Cf. Jenkins, *Cyprus*; Jenkins, *Cyprus*, 364.

<sup>124</sup> Mas-Latrie, *Traités*, II, 153–4.

<sup>125</sup> Al-Qalqashandī, XIV, 46.

<sup>126</sup> Imād al-Dīn, *Fatḥ*, 16; Ibn al-Athīr, *Bāḥir*, 33.

although this matter eludes final clarification. In the Germanic feudal law of Europe, condominiums were a frequent consequence of hereditary rights and were established both in regard to material objects such as demesnes and castles, and also supreme jurisdiction. Roman law also favoured them, as the condominium in French Languedoc shows. In precisely this period, the king of France employed the establishment of parages and joint lordships as one of the measures to extend the field of his power and to neutralize strategically important places and castles. The condominium was even used in association with the Church as a legal context for the foundation of towns. The Normans in France and Sicily particularly fell back on different versions of multiple lordship and divisions as forms of legal possession in taking lands.<sup>127</sup> In the cartularies of the Frankish rulers in the Middle East, whose leaders were largely of Norman French origin, the joint possession of individual fiefs and farms quite currently appears already a decade after the taking of Jerusalem in 1099. Within the Frankish states, condominiums with half-shares and third-shares can be found while Eastern Frankish feudal law existed. The deeds refer to this, e.g. the listing of produce to be shared by Reginald of Châtillon, lord of Oultrejourdain, with the abbey in the valley of Josaphat, analogous to the *munasafa* provisions in the treaties of 1267 and 1271. A half (in one instance a third) of the tithes on wine, olives, timber, peas, beans and so forth are to be handed over. Entire villages with their serfs could be shared.<sup>128</sup> A further argument in support of Frankish influence in the formation of condominiums is that judicial practices deriving from the Germanic tradition of the West were clearly used. An example of this occurs in the treaty of 1271:

If homicide or theft is committed within the bounds of the condominium in the territory of al-Marqab, an investigation concerning this shall take place for twenty days. If the culprit is found, he shall be dealt with in accordance with his crime. If the culprit is not identified within twenty days, the headmen of the crime's locality shall detain the nearest neighbours of the site of crime. If the culprit absconds and is not produced after twenty days, the people of the representatives of the two sides shall mulct the closest neighbours to that place in 1,000 Tyrian dinars, half to the Royal Office and half to the head of the Hospital. The officials shall not be remiss in making search; the search shall be made in concert . . .<sup>129</sup>

<sup>127</sup> For numerous examples cf. Violette, *Histoire*, II, 171–4; Luchaire, *Louis VII.*, III/1, 205–6; Koelner, *Settlement*, 1–91; Buisson, *Staatsbildung*, 165.

<sup>128</sup> Delaborde, *Chartes*, no. 41, 88–9.

<sup>129</sup> Al-Qalqashandī, XIV, 47–8.

It is indeed unknown whether the practice detailed here was already followed in the condominia from the start of the twelfth century. It calls to mind the Western principle of village responsibility, i.e. that in the event of robbery or homicide, a joint cooperative liability of the village community was provided in, for example, the Salic law.<sup>130</sup> Whether or not a Western influence was present here, it is all the same surprising that in the provisions concerning jurisdiction in the *munasafa* treaties there is very frequent mention of Islamic law, but never of the *qadi*'s legal competence. It is simply said that the representatives (*nuwwab*) of the respective sides had to make the investigations and dispense justice. Thus, we are presumably dealing with a manorial conception of law, which is not surprising since the condominia of the early Mamluk period were established in regions which had previously been completely under Frankish rule and legal administration.

Frankish legal concepts thus clearly had influence in the formation of condominia, but the extent of this influence is certainly hard to assess in view of the sources. In the thirteenth century, there were also forms of division on the Islamic side, which were not wholly dissimilar to those under Western law. Baybars made grants to his amirs in 661/1262–63 from the lands conquered from the Franks so that, for example, an amir might receive a half or a third of a village or estate in *iqta*.<sup>131</sup> Forms of agrarian division such as *muzara'a* and *musaqah* were in any case not strangers to Islam.<sup>132</sup> The historical prototype of this form of treaty, as employed by the state with regard to non-Muslims, is the Prophet's agreement with the Jews of Khaybar. Their characteristics are, firstly, their limited duration; secondly the dependence of the validity of the treaty upon its advantage (*maslaha*) to the Muslims and hence the principle that it is valid only so long as it serves their interest; thirdly, the equal sharing of the proceeds between the contracting parties; and fourthly, certain definite provisions in respect of the regulations valid among Muslims.<sup>133</sup> Thus, both Franks and Muslims had in their respective legal systems and administrative practices elements which recur in the organization of condominia. Hence, it is not surprising that the establishment of *munasafa* played an important part in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, particularly in northern Syria

<sup>130</sup> Erler, *Recht*, 42–3.

<sup>131</sup> Al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, I/2, 489–91.

<sup>132</sup> Cahen, *Notes*, 297–302.

<sup>133</sup> Almost all important Muslim legal compendia contain *muzara'a* passages, cf. for instance al-Sarakhsī, XXIII, 7ff.

on the Orontes, the Jawlan and Hawran, and in the thirteenth century on practically all the Frankish-Muslim boundaries. Altogether a good thirty relevant cases are known, although it is often difficult to ascertain (especially before the mid-thirteenth century) whether those mentioned are newly formed or old condominiums, established years or decades previously.

In other Frankish-Muslim border regions such as Sicily and Spain, the existence of condominiums seems to have played almost no part in comparison with their extent and conspicuousness in the Middle East. There was, although only in the fifteenth century, a kind of no man's land between the kingdoms of Castile and Granada, and after the peace treaty of 1412 a mixed judicial commission representing the two kingdoms exercised sovereign powers over it. In this case certainly, the aim of the agreement was not the common exploitation of the region, but its neutralization and depopulation as a boundary-strip.<sup>134</sup> So it goes too far to call this a *munasafa*. A possible reason why there were hardly any condominiums elsewhere than in the Middle East may be that in other places, as has been indicated, the constitution of sovereign relationships (in Spain, even the inclusion of Muslims in the fief-system) had an essentially greater significance in the Frankish-Muslim organization of legal relations than in the Middle East. In any case, the function of fief and vassal relationships between Franks and Muslims was largely replaced in the East by other means: the conclusion of bilateral treaties and the establishment of condominiums in their framework. In most cases these divisions of sovereignty seem to have come into existence through Frankish initiative.

---

<sup>134</sup> Salem, *Völkerrecht*, 191–2.



## CONCLUSIONS

At the end of this study of Frankish-Muslim alliances and treaties in the Middle East in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the following results may be stated in brief:

(a) The numerous recorded cases and models of cooperation for which both the supporters and the opponents and also the motives can be identified, depict no casual occurrences, but arise for the most part from following definite historically based doctrines of action (such as 'no place'), which developed in the Middle East from the end of the eleventh century. It should never be lost from sight that in this period, regardless of confrontation between Christian Franks and Muslims, the Frankish states were integrated in the political landscape of Syria; and such integration was actually the characteristic element of large parts of the period. In comparison, an historical examination of the effectiveness of confrontationist ideologies, such as crusading or the *jihad* idea, reveals that their actual influence on the organization of relationships between Syrian powers of differing religions is generally quite slight, and definitely slighter than argued hitherto. However vociferous the propaganda, it clearly appears, insofar as the rulers on both sides and the directly neighbouring states are concerned, as the instrument of underlying political, social and economic interests.

(b) The fact that the two legal systems for political and military dealings were hardly compatible did not facilitate the conclusion of alliances and treaties, but on the other hand it did not pose an insurmountable obstacle to the legal organization of mutual relationships. The hierarchical elements recognized in European legal systems in the formation of treaty or alliance relationships were difficult to transfer to relationships in the East and thus such models as grants of land and fiefs played hardly any part there. Furthermore, social and political factors were opposed to them and these hierarchical elements were easily dispensable, taking into consideration the more fully developed money economy. In their place during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the Franks increasingly accepted legal institutions that were Islamic (or if not originating from the *shari'a*, were recognized within *Dar al-Islam*), such as the award of a robe of honour to betoken the transfer of an *iqta'*.

(c) The restrictions imposed by both European and Islamic systems of law on the legal settlement of Frankish-Muslim transactions did not hinder treaty settlements in practice. An example of this is how the limitation of the duration of treaties, which could fundamentally only be truces, and the legal theory of the impossibility of lasting peace between the two sides did not in practice prevent the settlement of treaties. In fact, agreements, which were mostly imprecisely drafted in terminological terms and often not in harmony with legal theory, could acquire a quasi-permanent character through prolongation, given the political will. In this, it may be noted, that as regards their practical validity and duration, they were hardly distinguishable from state treaties within the *Respublica Christiana*. With the passage of time, and reaching full development in the thirteenth century, there were even devised technicalities, oath formularies and instruments such as the condominium. These were mostly developments of Islamic forms which were already known. Legal development consequently followed political requirements. An example of this is the inviolability of an obligation once entered into towards a party of another religion, which was deemed as lying *de facto* under supreme legal protection—irrespective of what legal theory had to say about the validity of treaties between a Christian (specifically a Frankish) and a Muslim partner.

The chosen methodology, which had two principal approaches, essentially determined the preceding findings: The investigation of the history of Frankish-Muslim relations throughout the period and as far as possible in the context of the general history of this region; and secondly, a comprehensive assessment of both Western and Muslim sources, and the formulation of questions and answers only from the simultaneous analysis of both groups of sources. At the close of this work, the cautious question remains, whether a new assessment of medieval Frankish-Muslim history, both of events and law, might not only be possible in view of the above methodology, but a real desideratum for research. A differentiated picture of the medieval Frankish-Muslim encounters might be expected to result in the course of the assembling and assessment of a wealth of cases, newly discovered or reinterpreted in the light of Arabic sources. Such a result, interesting enough in itself, would probably be more than an end in itself.

For better or worse, history is also used or misused for the purpose of legitimization and historical events as well as tendencies are even occasionally understood as direct instructions for dealing with the present. In

view of this practical relevance of history, whether intentional or unintentional, it is all the more urgent that what we comprehend as history should be confronted with changed methodologies. Applied to the Frankish-Muslim encounters of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in the Middle East, called the 'Crusades' for the lack of a better term, it might happen that both Western and Arabic scholars would no longer read the sources merely as confrontational, but would obtain the formulation of new questions from the Arabic sources in particular. If by this means a small step could be taken towards the separation of ideology from the debate about the encounter of Europe and the Islamic world in the past and a scrap of the historical burden lifted from the dialogue between Europe and the Arabs, much would already have been achieved.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

The article (al-, le etc.) is disregarded for the alphabetical order.

### ABBREVIATIONS

BFLUS: Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg  
BSOAS: Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies  
BZ: Byzantinische Zeitschrift  
DA: Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters  
DOP: Dumbarton Oaks Papers  
EI 1: Enzyklopädie des Islams  
EI 2: The Encyclopaedia of Islam  
EHR: English Historical Review  
FSI: Fonti per la storia d'Italia  
FzDG: Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte  
HZ: Historische Zeitschrift  
JA: Journal asiatique  
MGSS: Monumenta Germaniae historica. Scriptorum  
MW: The Muslim World  
NA: Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde  
RCEA: Répertoire chronologique d'épigraphie arabe  
REI: Revue des études islamiques  
RHGF: Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France  
RHC Lois: Recueil des historiens des croisades. Lois  
RHC occ: Recueil des historiens des croisades. Historiens occidentaux  
RHC or.: Recueil des historiens des croisades. Historiens orientaux  
ROL: Revue de l'Orient latin  
WZKM: Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes  
ZDMG: Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft

### PRIMARY SOURCES

Abū Shāma, Kitāb al-rawḍatayn fī akhbār al-dawlatayn al-nūriyya wa-al-ṣalāḥiyya, ed. M. Aḥmad/M. Ziyāda, Cairo 1956–1962 (altern. ed. Cairo 1287–88 a.h.).  
Alarcón y Santón, M.A./García de Linares, R., Los documentos árabes diplomaticos del Archivo de la Corona de Aragón, Madrid 1940.  
Albert of Aix, Alberti Aquensis Historia Hierosolymitana, in: RHC occ. vol. 4, Paris 1879, 265–713.  
Amari, M. (ed.), I Diplomi arabi del R. Archivio Fiorentino. Testo originale con la Traduzione letterale e illustrazioni, Firenze 1863.  
Ambroise, L'Estoire de la guerre sainte, ed. G. Paris, Paris 1897.  
Andrea Dandolo, Andrea Danduli Ducis Venetiarum Chronica per extensum descripta aa. 46–1280 d. Chr., ed. E. Pastorello, Bologna 1938–1958.  
Anna Comnène, Alexiade, ed. B. Leib, Paris 1937–1945.  
Annales Cameracenses auctore Lamberto Waterlos, canonico regul. ad S. Autbertum Cam. a. 1099–1170, in: MGSS XVI, ed. G.H. Pertz, Hannoverae 1859, 510–554.  
Annales Herbipolenses, in: MGSS XVI, ed. G.H. Pertz, Hannoverae 1859, 1–12.

- Annales Januenses, Annali Genovesi di Caffaro e de 'suoi continuatori dal MXCIX al MCCXCIII, ed. L.T. Belgrano, I, Roma 1890 (FSI 11,1), 1–75.
- Annales Pisani, Gli Annales di Bernardo Maragone, a cura di M.L. Gentile, Bologna 1930–1936, 1–74.
- Arnold of Lübeck, Arnoldi abb. Lubecensis chronica Slavorum a. 1172–1209, in: MGSS XXI, ed. G.H. Pertz, Hannoverae 1896, 101–250.
- Arribas Palau, M., Las treugas entre Castilla y Granada firmada por Fernando I de Aragón, Tetuán 1956.
- Assises de la Cour des Bourgeois, in: RHC Lois II, ed. le Comte Beugnot, Paris 1848, 1–226, Formules, *ibid.*, 383–389.
- Al-'Azīmī, La chronique abrégée d'al-'Azīmī, ed. Cl. Cahen, in: JA 230 (1938), 353–448.
- Bahā' al-Dīn b. Shaddād, Al-Nawādir al-sulṭāniyya wa-al-mahāsīn al-yusūfiyya, ed. J. al-Shayyāl, Cairo 1964.
- Baldric of Dol, Historia Ierosolymitana, in: RHC occ. IV, Paris 1879, 1–111.
- Barhebraeus, The Chronography of Gregory Abū 'I Faraj... commonly known as Bar Hebraeus, transl. E.A. Wallis Budge, London 1932.
- Benjamin of Tudela, Die Reisebeschreibungen des R. Benjamin von Tudela..., ed. L. Grünhut/M.N. Adler, Jerusalem 1903–4.
- Bernard of Clairvaux, S. Bernardi abb. Clarae-Vallensis opera omnia III, ed. nova... J. Mabillon, Epistolae, in: Migne, Patrologiae cursus completus, Paris 1862, 67–715.
- Bertolotto, G., Nuova Serie di Documenti sulle Relazione di Genova coll' Impero Bizantino. Raccolti dal Can. A. Sanguineti e pubbl. ... dal Prof. Gerolamo Bertolotto, in: Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria 28, Fasc. 2 (1897).
- Al-Bundārī, Sanā al-barq al-Shāmī, ed. F. al-Nabarāwī, Cairo 1979.
- Caffaro, De liberatione civitatum orientis, in: RHC occ. V, Paris 1895, 41–73.
- Chronicon ad A.C. 1234 pertinens, Anonymi auctoris Chronicon ad A.C. 1234 pertinens II, transl. A. Abouna, Louvain 1974.
- Chronicon de Lanercost, ed. J. Stevenson, Edinburgh 1835.
- Chronicon Mauriniacense, Ex chronico Mauriniacensi auctoribus Teulfi et aliis ejusdem loci monachis, in: RHGF, ed. Bouquet/L. Delisle XII, Paris 1877, 68–88.
- Chronicon Turonense, Ex chronico Turonensi auctore Turon. ecclesiae S. Martini canonico, in: RHGF, ed. Bouquet/L. Delisle XII, Paris 1877, 461–478.
- Comte Riant, Inventaire critique des lettres historiques des croisades, in: Archives de l'Orient latin 1a (1881) (repr. 1964), 1–89, 91–224.
- Le Confesseur de la Reine Marguerite, Vie de Saint Louis, in: RHGF, ed. Bouquet/L. Delisle XX, Paris 1840, 58–121.
- Cont. Guil. Tyr., Die lateinische Fortsetzung von Wilhelm von Tyrus, ed. M. Salloch, Berlin 1934.
- Delaborde, H.-F., Chartes de Terre Sainte provenant de l'abbaye de Notre-Dame de Josaphat, Paris 1880.
- Delaville-le-Roulx, J.M.A., Cartulaire général de l'ordre des Hospitaliers de St. Jean de Jérusalem, Paris 1894–1906.
- Dölger, F., Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des Oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453. pt 2: Regesten von 1025–1204, München-Berlin 1925.
- Dumont, J., Corps universel diplomatique du Droit des Gens..., vol. 1, Amsterdam 1726.
- Ekkehard of Aura, Ekkehardi Uraugiensis abbatiss Hierosolymita. Nach der Weitz'schen Recension, ed. H. Hagenmeyer, Tübingen 1877.
- Epistola episcopi Wilhelmi 'De excidio terre Jehrosolimitane', in: R. Röhrich, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge I, Berlin 1874 (repr. Aalen 1967), 189–193.
- Epistolae Regis Ludovici VII variorum ad eum volumen epistolarum D, in: RHGF XVI, ed. Bouquet/J.-J. Brial, Paris 1878, 1–170.
- Ernoul, Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le Trésorier, ed. M.L. de Mas-Latrie, Paris 1871.
- L'Estoire d'Eracles Empereur et la conquête de la Terre d'Outremer, in: RHC occ. II, Paris 1859, 1–481.

- Fulcher Carnot., *Fulcheri Carnotensis Historia Hierosolymitana*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer, Heidelberg 1913.
- Gabrieli, F., *Die Kreuzzüge aus arabischer Sicht, aus den arabischen Quellen ausgewählt und übersetzt von Francesco Gabrieli*, trans. B. v. Kaltenbom-Stachau/L. Richter-Bemburg, München 21976.
- Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *Gerhoh praepositus Reichersbergensis, De investigatione Antichristi liber I*, ed. E. Sackur, in: *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Libelli de lite III, Hannoverae 1897* (repr. Aalen 1956), 304–359.
- Gesta Francorum, Anonymi Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer, Heidelberg 1890.
- Gesta Henrici secundi et Ricardi primi*, ed. W. Stubbs, in: *The Chronicle of the Reigns of Henry II and Richard I*, vol. 1, London 1867.
- Gesta Ludovici VII in, Historiae Francorum Scriptores IV*, ed. A. Du Chesne, Paris 1636–1649, 390–411.
- Giraldus Cambrensis Opera, De Principis Instructione Liber VIII*, ed. G.F. Warner, London 1891.
- Gratian, *Concordantia, Corpus iuris civilis*, ed. Ae. Friedberg, pars I, *Decretum magistri Gratiani*, Leipzig 1879 (repr. Graz 1959).
- Gregory the Priest, *Chronique de Matthieu d'Edesse 962–1136 avec la continuation de Gregoire le Prêtre jusqu'à 1162*, ed. E. Dulaurier, Paris 1858.
- Guibert of Nogent, *Guibertus abbas Novigentinus, Historia Hierosolymitana quae dicitur Gesta Dei per Francos*, in: *RHC occ. IV*, 115–263.
- Hagenmeyer, H., *Epistulae, Epistulae et chartae primi belli sacri spectantes quae supersunt aevo aequales ac genuinae. Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088–1100*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer, Innsbruck 1901.
- Hist. bell. sacri, Historia belli sacri (= Tudebodus imitatus et continuatus)*, in: *RHC occ. III*, Paris 1866, 165–229.
- Historia compostellana*, in: *España Sagrada XX*, ed. H. Florez, *De Literis Patriarchae*, Madrid 1765, 309–312.
- Historia diplomatica Friderici secundi... collegit... J.-L.-A. Huillard-Bréholles III*, Paris 1852 (repr. Torino 1963).
- Historia peregrinorum*, ed. A. Chroust, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Friedrichs I.*, Berlin 1928 (repr. 1964), 116–172.
- Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, *Al-Rawḍ al-zāhir fī sirat al-Malik al-Zāhir*, ed. 'A. al-'Azīz al-Khuwayṭir, Riyad 1396 a.h./1976.
- , *Tashrīf al-ayyām wa-al-'uṣūr fī sirat al-Malik al-Manṣūr*, ed. M. Kāmil/M. 'A. al-Najjār, Cairo 1961.
- Ibn Abī al-Dam, *Kitāb al-Shamāriḫ fī al-tawāriḫ*, Ms. Oxford Bodleian Marsh 60.
- Ibn al-'Adīm, *Kamāl al-Dīn, Bughyat al-ṭalab fī ta'riḫ Ḥalab*, ed. A. Sevim, Ankara 1976.
- , *Zubdat al-ḥalab min ta'riḫ Ḥalab*, ed. Sāmī al-Dahhān, Damascus 1951–1968.
- , B. Lewis, *Three Biographies from Kamāl al-Dīn*, in: *Mélanges Fuad Köprülü*, Istanbul 1953, 325–344.
- Ibn 'Asākir, *Wulāt Dimashq fī al-'ahd al-saljūqī. Nuṣūṣ mustakhraja min ta'riḫ Dimashq al-kabir li-al-Ḥāfiẓ b. 'Asākir*, Beirut 31981.
- Ibn al-Athīr, *Al-Ta'riḫ al-bāhir fī al-dawlat al-atābakiyya*, ed. A.A. Tolaymat, Baghdad 1382 a.h./1963.
- , *Al-Kāmil fī al-tawāriḫ*, Beirut 1386 a.h./1966.
- Ibn al-Dawādārī, *Kanz al-durar wa-jāmi' al-ghurar VI*, ed. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Munajjid, Cairo 1961.
- Ibn Duqmāq, *Nuzhat al-anām fī ta'riḫ al-Islām*, Ms. Bibl. nat. (Paris) arab. 1597.
- Ibn Faḍlallāh al-'Umārī, ed. Amari: *Condizione degli Stati cristiani dell' Occidente secondo una relazione di Domenichino Doria da Genova. Testo Arabo con versione italiana...*, in: *Atti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei anno CCLXXX (1882–1883)*, ser. terza, *Memorie della classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche XI*, Rome 1883, 67–103.

- , *Al-Taʿrīf bi-al-muṣṭalaḥ al-sharīf*, Cairo 1312 a.h.(?).
- Ibn al-Furāt, U. Lyons/M.C. Lyons, *Ayyubids, Mamelukes and Crusaders. Selections from the Tārīkh al-Duwal wa-l-Mulūk of Ibn al-Furāt*. Historical Introduction by J.S.C. Riley-Smith, Cambridge 1971.
- , *Taʿrīkh al-duwal wa-al-mulūk*,
- Ms. Bibl. Pal. Vindob. Cod. (Wien) A.F. 117–119.
  - vol. 1 (501–522) (25 Aug. 1107–31 May 1128) ed. Ahmed el-Shamy, unpubl. PhD thesis, University of Wien 1972.
  - vol. 2 (522–543) (6 Jan. 1128–12 April 1149) ed. Abbas Aldahir, unpubl. PhD thesis, University of Wien 1972.
  - vol. 4, 1–2 (563–588), *The History of Ibn al-Furat*, ed. Ḥ.M. al-Shamāʾ, Basra 1386–1389 a.h./1967–1969.
  - vol. 7 (672–682), *The History of Ibn al-Furat*, ed. Q. Zurayq, Beirut 1942.
- Ibn al-Jawzī, *Kitāb al-muntaẓam fi taʿrīkh al-mulūk wa-al-umam*, Haydarabad 1357–1358 a.h.
- Ibn Jubayr, *Ibn Jubayr, Voyages*, trad./annot. M. Gaudefroy-Denomy, Paris 1949–65.
- , *Ibn Jubayr, Riḥla. The Travels of Ibn Jubayr*, ed. W. Wright, rev. M.J. de Goeje, Leiden 1907.
- Ibn Khaldūn, *Al-ʿIbar wa-dīwān al-mubtadāʾ wa-al-khabar fi ayyām al-ʿarab wa-al-ʿajam wa-al-barbar wa-man ʿaṣarahum min dhawī al-sulṭān*, Beirut 31967/68.
- Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-aʿyān wa-anbāʾ abnāʾ al-zamān*, ed. M.M. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd, Cairo 1367 a.h./1948.
- Ibn al-Maʾmūn al-Baṭāʾihī, *Passages de la Chronique d’Égypte d’Ibn al-Maʾmūn*. ed. A.F. Sayyid, Cairo 1983.
- Ibn Muyassar, *Al-Muntaqā min akhbār Miṣr*, *Choix de passages de la chronique d’Égypte d’Ibn Muyassar*, ed. A.F. Sayyid, Cairo 1981.
- Ibn Naẓīf (=Boulaid Doudou), *Der Tārīḥ al-Manṣūrī des Ibn Naẓīf al-Ḥamawī*, unpubl. PhD thesis, University of Wien 1961.
- Ibn al-Qalānīsī, *Dhayl taʿrīkh Dimashq*, ed. H.F. Amedroz, Leiden 1908.
- Ibn al-Ṣayrafi, *Al-Ishāra ila man nāla al-wizāra*, ed. A. Mukhlis, in: *Bulletin de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale* 15 (1925), 49–111.
- Ibn Shīḥna, *Al-Durr al-muntakhab fi taʿrīkh mamlakat Ḥalab*, Beirut 1909.
- Ibn Taghribirdī, *Al-Nujūm al-zāhira fi mulūk Miṣr wa-al-Qāhira*, Cairo n.d.
- Ibn Ṭulūn, *Al-Qalāʾid al-jawhariyya fi taʿrīkh al-Ṣālihiyya*. pt. 1, ed. M.A. Duhmān, Damascus 1368 a.h./1949.
- Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij al-kurūb fi akhbār banī Ayyūb*, ed. J. al-Shayyāl, vol. 1–3, Cairo 1953–77; vol. 4, ed. Ḥ.M. Rabīʾ/S. ʿĀshūr, Cairo 1972.
- Ibn Zāfir al-Azdī, *Akhbār al-duwal al-munqaṭiʿa*, ed. A. Ferré, Cairo 1972.
- Al-Idrīsī, *Nuzhat al-mushtāq fi ikhtirāq al-āfāq*, ed. E. Cerulli, F. Gabrieli et al., Naples/Rome 1974.
- Al-ʿIlmāwī, ed. Sauvaire: J. Sauvaire, *Description de Damas, Abrégé du Dāris fi tāriḥ al-madāris d’al-Nuʿaymī par ʿAbd al-Basīṭ al-ʿIlmāwī*, in: *JA* (1894), 385–501.
- ʿImād al-Dīn al-Kātib al-Iṣfahānī, *Al-Barq al-shāmī*,
- vol. 3, Ms. Oxford Bodleian Bruce 11.
  - vol. 5, Ms. Oxford Bodleian Marsh 425.
- , *Kharīdat al-qaṣr wa-jarīdat al-ʿaṣr*.
- *Qism shuʿaraʾ al-Shām*, ed. Sh. Fayṣal, Damascus 1955–68.
  - *Qism shuʿaraʾ Miṣr*, ed. A.A. Ḍayf/Iḥ. ʿAbbās, Cairo 1370 a.h./1951–1952.
- , *Al-Faṭḥ al-quṣṣī fi al-faṭḥ al-quṣṣī*, ed. C. de Landberg, Leiden 1888.
- ʿImād al-Dīn al-Qāḍī al-Iṣfahānī, *Al-Bustān al-jāmīʾ li-jamīʾ tawārīkh al-zamān*, ed. Cl. Cahen, *Une chronique syrienne du VI<sup>e</sup>/VII<sup>e</sup> siècle: Le “Bustān al-jāmīʾ”*, in: *Bulletin d’Etudes Orientales* 7/8 (1937/1938), 113–158.
- Isidor v. Sevilla, *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri XX*, ed. M.W. Lindsay, Oxford 1911.

- Itinerarium peregrinorum et gesta regis Ricardi, ed. W. Stubbs, in: *Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I*, vol. 1, London 1864.
- ʿIzz al-Dīn b. Shaddād, *Al-Aʿlāq al-khaṭīra fi dhikr umarāʾ al-Shām wa-al-Jazīra*,  
 – Aleppo: 1/1, ed. D. Sourdel, Damascus 1953.  
 – Damascus: *Taʾrikh madīnat Dimashq*, ed. Sāmī al-Dahhān, Damascus 1956.  
 – Lubnān . . . : *Taʾrikh Lubnān wa-al-Urdun wa-Filasṭīn*, ed. Sāmī al-Dahhān, Damascus 1963.
- Jacques de Vitry, *Historia orientalis: Iacobi de Vitriaco Aconensis ep. Historia Hierosolymitana*, in: *Gesta Dei per Francos sive orientalium expeditionum et Francorum Hierosolymitani historia I*, ed. J. Bongars, Hannover 1611, 1047–1172.
- , *Lettres de Jacques de Vitry (1160/1170–1240)*, évêque de Saint-Jean d’Acre, ed. R.B.C. Huygens, Leiden 1960.
- Jaffé-Löwenfeld, Jaffé, Ph., *Regesta pontificum Romanorum ab conditia ecclesiae ad annum p. Chr. natum 1198*, ed. F. Kaltenbrunner, P. Ewald, S. Löwenfeld, Leipzig 21885–1888.
- Jean (Sire) de Joinville, *Histoire de Saint Louis. Credo et lettre à Louis X.*, Paris 21874.
- Joannes Kinnamos, *Ioannis Cinnami Epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum*, ed. A. Meinicke, Bonn 1836.
- John of Salisbury, *Historia pontificalis: Joannis Saresbariensis, Historia Pontificalis*, trans., ed. M. Chibnall, London 1956.
- Al-Juwaynī, Cl. Cahen, *Une source pour l’histoire des croisades: Les Mémoires de Saʿd ad-Dīn ibn Ḥamawīya Juwainī*, in: *BFLUS 28 (1949/1950)*, 320–337.
- Konstantin Manasses, K. Horna, *Das Hodoiporikon des Konstantin Manasses*, in: *BZ 13 (1904) (repr. 1964)*, 313–355.
- Liber iurium reipublicae Genuensis I–II, Augustiae Tavinorum 1854.*
- Les Lignages d’Outremer*, in: *RHC Lois II*, ed. le Comte Beugnot, Paris 1848, 435–74.
- Le Livre au Roi*, in: *RHC Lois I*, ed. le Comte Beugnot, Paris 1841, 601–644.
- Le Livre de Geoffroy le Tort*, in: *RHC Lois I*, ed. le Comte Beugnot, Paris 1841, 433–450.
- Le Livre de Jean d’Ibelin*, in: *RHC Lois I*, ed. le Comte Beugnot, Paris 1841, 1–432.
- Al-Malik al-Manṣūr, *Miḍmār al-ḥaqāʾiq wa-sirr al-khalāʾiq*, ed. Ḥ. Ḥabashī, Cairo 1968.
- Al-Maqrīzī, *Ittiʾāz al-ḥunafaʾ fi akhbār al-aʾimma al-faṭimiyyin al-khulafāʾ*, ed. M. Aḥmad, Cairo 1387–1393 a.h./1967–1973.
- , *Kitāb al-mawāʾiz wa-al-iʿtibār fi dhikr al-khiṭaṭ wa-al-āthār*, Cairo 1270 a.h./1853.
- , *Kitāb al-sulūk li-maʾrifat duwal al-mulūk*, ed. M. Ziyāda, Cairo 1934–1958.
- Mas-Latrie, M.L. de (ed.), *Traité de paix et de commerce et documents divers concernant les relations des chrétiens avec les arabes de l’Afrique Septentrionale au moyen age*, Paris 1866–72.
- Matthaeus Parisiensis, *Chronica majora*, ed. H.R. Luard, London 1877.
- Matthew of Edessa, *Chronique de Matthieu d’Edesse 962–1136 avec la continuation de Gregoire le Prêtre jusqu’à 1162*, ed. E. Dulaurier, Paris 1858.
- Müller, G., *Documenti sulle Relazione delle Città Toscana coll’ ‘Oriente Cristiano e coi Turchi fino all’ Anno MDXXXI*, Edizione anastatica 1966.
- Muslim b. Maḥmūd, *al-Shayzarī*, see *al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil*.
- Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. I.A. (J.-L.-) van Dieten, Berlin-New York 1975.—partly transl.: Fr. Grabler, *Die Krone der Komnenen. Die Regierungszeit der Kaiser Joannes und Manuel Komnenos aus dem Geschichtswerk des Niketas Choniates*, Graz-Köln-Wien 1958.
- Al-Nuʾaymī, *Al-Dāris fi taʾrikh al-madāris*, ed. J. al-Ḥasanī, Damascus 1367 a.h./1948.
- Al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat al-arab fi funūn al-adab*, Ms. Bibl. nat. (Paris) arab. 1578–1579.  
 – vols. 1–18, Cairo 1342–1374 a.h./1923–1955.
- Odo of Deuil, *Eudes de Deuil, Epistola Odonis ad venerandum Abbatem suum Sugerium (La croisade de Louis VII, roi de France)*, ed. H. Waquet, Paris 1949.
- Oliver Scholasticus, *Historia Damiatina*, ed. H. Hoogeweg, *Die Schriften des Kölner Domscholasters . . . Oliverius*, Tübingen 1894, 159–280.

- Ordericus Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica*. The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis V–VI, ed./trans, by M. Chibnall, Oxford 1975–1978.
- Otto of Freising, *Chronicon: Ottonis Ep. Frisingensis Chronicon*, ed. R. Wilmans, in: MGSS XX, ed. G.H. Pertz, Hannoverae 1868, 83–301.
- *Gesta: Otto von Freising (und Rahewin) (Ottonis Ep. Frisingensis et Rahewin), Gesta Frederici seu rectius cronica (Die Taten Friedrichs oder richtiger Cronica)*, trans. A. Schmidt, ed. F.-J. Schmale, Darmstadt 1965.
- Paoli, S., *Codice diplomatico del sacro militare Ordine Gerosolimitano oggi di Malta*, ed. S. Pauli, Lucca 1733–1737.
- Al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil, *Epistolae*, Ms. Brit. Mus. Add. 25757.
- , *Dīwān al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil*, ed. A.A. Badawī/lbr. al-Ibyārī, Cairo 1961.
- , *Ketab al-Mokhtar*, Ms. Brit. Mus. Add. 7307.
- , *Morasalat Fadhlī*, Ms. Brit. Mus. Add. 7465.
- , *Rasā'il*, Ms. Bibl. nat. (Paris) arab. 6024.
- , Ms. Berlin Weitzenstein 1264.
- , Ms. Cambridge Qq 232 (8).
- , Ms. Mosul 93,3.
- , *Mukātabāt*, Ms. München (Bayr. Staats. bibl.) 402.
- , 'Uyūn al-rasā'il al-Fāḍiliyya, Ms. Brit. Mus. Add. 25756.
- , *Al-Durr al-naẓīm min tarassul 'Abdarrahīm*, ed. A.A. Badawī, Cairo 1378 a.h./1959.
- , as: Muslim b. Maḥmūd al-Shayzari, *Jamharat al-Islām, Dhāt al-nathr wa-al-niẓām*, Ms. Leiden or. 287.
- Al-Qalqashandī, *Ṣubḥ al-a'shā fi ṣinā'at al-inshā'*, Cairo 1331–37 a.h./1913–19.
- Quantum praedecessores*, Text der Kreuzzugsbulle Eugens III. vom 1. März 1146, Trastevere (J. L. 8796), ed. P. Rassow, in: NA 45 (1924), 302–305.
- Radulph de Diceto, *Ymagines: Radulf de Diceto, Ymagines Historiarum*, in: *Opera historica II*, ed. W. Stubbs, London 1876, 3–174.
- Raim. Aguil., *Le "Liber" de Raymond d'Aguilers*, ed. J.H. Hill/L.L. Hill, Paris 1969.
- Ralph of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi*, in: RHC occ. III, Paris 1866, 587–716.
- Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani*, Röhrich, R., *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani 1097–1291*, Innsbruck 1893–1904.
- Regni Iherosolymitani Brevis Historia*, in: *Annali Genovesi di Caffaro e de' suoi continuatori dal MXXIX al MCCXCIII*, ed. L.T. Belgrano, vol. 1, Roma 1890 (FSI 11,1), 125–149.
- Répertoire chronologique d'épigraphie arabe I–XV*, ed. Et. Combe, J. Sauvaget, G. Wiet, Cairo 1931–56. vol. 16 ed. N. Elisséeff, D.S. Rice, G. Wiet, Cairo 1964.
- Richard de Devizes, *Ricardus Devisiensis, De rebus gestis Ricardi primi*, ed. R. Howlett, in: *Chronicles and Memorials of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, vol. 3, London 1886.
- Rigord, *Gesta Philippi Augusti*, ed. H.F. Delaborde, *Oeuvres de Rigord et Guillaume le Breton I*, Paris 1882.
- Robert de Torigny, *Chronica*, ed. R. Howlett, in: *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, vol. 4, London 1890.
- Robert Monach., *Roberti monachi Historia Hierosolymitana ad annum 1099*, in: RHC occ. III, 717–882.
- Roger of Hoveden, *Magistri Rogeri de Hovedene Chronica*, ed. W. Stubbs, London 1886–1871.
- Rothelin, *La continuation de Guillaume de Tyr de 1229 à 1261, dite du manuscrit de Rothelin*, in: RHC occ. I, Paris 1859, 483–639.
- Rozière, E. de, *Cartulaire: Cartulaire de l'église du St.-Sépulcre de Jérusalem*, ed. E. de Rozière, Paris 1849.
- Sacy, S. de, *Mémoire sur le traité fait entre le roi de Tunis et Philippe le Hardi en 1270*, in: *Histoire et Mémoires de l'Institut Royal de France, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres (1831)*, 448–477.

- , Pièces diplomatiques tirées des Archives de la République de Gènes, in: *Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi* 11, Paris 1827, 1–96.
- Saewulf, *Relatio de Peregrinatione Saewulfi ad Hierosolymitam et Terram Sanctam, annis Dominicae Incarnationis 1102 et 1103*, ed. M. d'Arezac, in: *Recueil de voyages et de mémoires* IV, Paris 1889, 833–854.
- Šāliḥ b. Yahyā, *Ta'riḫ Bayrūt*. Récit des anciens de la famille de Buḥtur b. 'Alī, Emir du Gharb de Beyrouth, ed. F. Hours/K. Salibi, Beirut 1969.
- Sandoli, S. de, *Corpus Inscriptorum Crucesignatorum Terrae Sanctae, 1099–1291, testo, trad. e annot. S. de Sandoli*, OFM, Jerusalem 1974.
- Al-Sarakhsī, *Kitāb al-mabsūṭ*, Cairo 1324–1332 a.h./1902–1913.
- Sāwirus b. al-Muqaffa', *History of the Patriarchs of the Egyptian Church known as the History of the Holy Church by Sāwirus ibn al-Muqaffa', Bishop of Ashmunin*, trans./annot. A. Khater/O.H.E. KHS-Burmester, Cairo 1968–70.
- Scriptum Galeranni episcopi de miraculo Boimundi*, in: *Acta Sanctorum (Bollandiana)* 6, Nov. III, 160–168. Un sermon commémoratif de la prise de Jérusalem par les croisés attribué à Foucher de Chartres, ed. Ch. Kohler, in: *ROL* 8 (1900–1901) (repr. 1964), 158–164.
- Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, *Mir'āt al-zamān fī ta'riḫ al-a'yān*,  
 – ed. A. Sevim, *Mir'atū 'z-Zemān fī tarihi 'l-āyan*, Ankara 1968;  
 – ed. J.R. Jewett (Faksimile), Chicago 1907;  
 – vol. VIII, 1–2, Haydarabad 1959.  
 – *Muntakhabāt min kitāb mir'āt al-zamān*, in: *RHC* or. III, Paris 1884, 511–570.
- Al-Sulamī, ed./trans., in: E. Sivan, *La genèse de la contre-croisade. Un traité damasquin du début du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, in: *JA* 254 (1966), 197–224.
- Tabulae ordinis Theutonici*, ed. E. Strehlke, Berolini 1869.
- Tafel, G.L.F./Thomas, G.M. (ed.), *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig mit besonderer Beziehung auf Byzanz und die Levante*, Wien 1856–57.
- Ṭalā'ī b. Ruzzik al-Malik al-Šāliḥ, *Dīwān*, ed. M. Hādī al-Aminī, Najaf 1383 a.h./1964.
- Translatio s. Nicolai, Monachus anonymus Littorensis, Historiae de translatione sanctorum magni Nicolai, terra marique miraculis gloriosi, ejusdem avunculi alterius Nicolai, Theodorique, martyrius pretiosi, de civitate Mirea in monasterium S. Nicolai de Littore Venetiarum*, in: *RHC* occ. V, Paris 1895, 253–281.
- Tudebod, Petrus Tudebodus. *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere*, ed. J.H./L.L. Hill, Paris 1977.
- 'Umāra al-Yamanī, *Kitāb nukat al-'aṣriyya fī akhbār al-wuzarā' al-miṣriyya*, ed. in: H. Derenbourg, *'Oumara du Yémen. Sa vie et son oeuvre* I, Paris 1897, 5–154.
- , *Mukhtār min dīwān 'Umāra*, *ibid.*, 155–394.
- Usāma b. Munqidh, *Kitāb al-'tibār*, ed. H. Derenbourg; *'Ousama ibn Mounkidh. Un émir syrien au premier siècle des croisades (1095–1188)*, Paris 1886.
- , *Kitab al-'aṣā*, in: *ibid.*, *Vie d'Ousama*, Paris 1889, 499–542.
- Walter the Chancellor, *Galterii Cancellarii Bella Antiochena*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer, Innsbruck 1896.
- Wibaldi *Epistolae*, in: *Monumenta Corbeiensia* 78, ed. Ph. Jaffé, Berolini 1864, 76–616.
- Wilbrand van Oldenburg, *Wilbrandi de Oldenborg Peregrinatio*, in: *Peregrinatores medii aevi quatuor*, ed. J.C.M. Laurent, Leipzig 21873, 159–190.
- William of Tyre, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum edita a venerabili Willemo Tyrensis archiepiscopo*, in: *RHC* occ.I/1–2, Paris 1844. (new edition: Guillaume de Tyr, *Chronique*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens, H.E. Mayer/G. Rösch, Tournhout 1986.
- Yāqūt al-Rūmī, *Mu'jam al-buldān*, Beirut 1374–1376 a.h./1955–1957.

## SECONDARY LITERATURE

- Abel, F.M., La liste des donations de Baibars en Palestine d'après la Charte de 663 h. (1265), in: *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* 19 (1939-1940), 33-44.
- Ahmad, M.H.M., Some Notes on Arabic Historiography during the Zengid and Ayyubid Periods (521/1127-648/1250), in: *Historians of the Middle East*, ed. B. Lewis/P.M. Holt, London 1962, 79-97.
- Allmendinger, K.-H., Die Beziehungen zwischen der Kommune Pisa und Ägypten im Hohen Mittelalter. Eine rechts- und wirtschaftshistorische Untersuchung, Wiesbaden 1967.
- Altoma, S.J., The Treatment of the Palestinian Conflict in Modern Arabic Literature, 1917-1970, in: *Middle East Forum* 48 (1972), 7-26.
- Andressohn, J.C., The Ancestry and Life of Godfrey of Bouillon, Bloomington 1947 (repr. 1972).
- Ashtor-Strauss, E., L'administration urbaine en Syrie médiévale, in: *RSo* 31 (1956), 73-128.
- Atiya, A.S., The Idea of the Counter-Crusade, in: *Actes du XXI<sup>e</sup> Congrès International des Orientalistes*. Paris 23-31. juillet 1948, Paris 1949, 356-357.
- , The Crusade, Historiography and Bibliography, Bloomington/London 1962.
- Baldwin, M.W., Raymond III. of Tripolis and the Fall of Jerusalem (1140-1187), Princeton 1936 (repr. Amsterdam 1969).
- , Some Recent Interpretations of Pope Urban II's Eastern Policy, in: *Catholic Historical Review* 25 (1940), 459-466.
- Beaumont, A.A., Albert of Aachen and the County of Edessa, in: *The Crusades* (Munro), 101-138.
- Beck, M., Alexios Komnenos zwischen Normannen und Türken, in: *Akten des XI. Internationalen Byzantinistenkongresses München 1958*, ed. F. Dölger/H.-G. Beck, München 1960, 43-47.
- Ben-Ami, A., Social Change in a Hostile Environment. The Crusaders' Kingdom of Jerusalem, Princeton 1969.
- Bernhardi, W., Konrad III., 2. Teil. 1146-1152, Leipzig 1883.
- Berry, V.G., The Second Crusade, in: *Setton, History*, I, 463-512.
- Björkmann, W., Beiträge zur Geschichte der Staatskanzlei im islamischen Ägypten, Hamburg 1928.
- Breysig, K., Gottfried von Bouillon vor dem Kreuzzuge, in: *Westdeutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kunst* 17 (1898), 169-201.
- Brincken, A.D. van den, Die "Nationes Christianorum Orientales" im Verständnis der lateinischen Historiographen, Köln-Wien 1973.
- Brundage, J.A., An Errant Cnisdader: Stephen of Blois, in: *Traditio* 16 (1960), 380-394.
- , Holy War and the Medieval Lawyers, in: *The Holy War*, ed. Th.P. Murphy, Columbus 1976, 99-140.
- , Marriage Law in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, in: *Outremer*, ed. Kedar/Mayer/Smail, 258-271.
- Buhl, F., Munāfiqūn, in: *Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam*, ed. H.A.R. Gibb/J.H. Kramers, repr. Leiden 1974, 410-11.
- Buisson, L., Erobererrecht, Vasallität und byzantinisches Staatsrecht auf dem ersten Kreuzzug, Hamburg 1985.
- , Formen normannischer Staatsbildung, in: *Studien zum mittelalterlichen Lehenswesen*, Sigmaringen 1960 (repr. 1972) 95-184.
- , Lebendiges Mittelalter. Aufsätze zur Geschichte des Kirchenrechts und der Nomanen, ed. v. G. Moltmann/G. Theuerkauf, Köln-Wien 1988.
- , Potestas und Caritas. Die päpstliche Gewalt im Spätmittelalter, Köln-Wien 1982.
- Bulst-Thiele, M.-L., Zur Geschichte der Ritterorden und des Königreichs Jerusalem im 13. Jahrhundert bis zur Schlacht bei La Forbie am 17. Oktober 1244, in: *DA* 22 (1966), 197-226.

- , *Sacrae Domus Militiae Templi Hierosolymitani Magistri. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Templerordens 1118/19–1314*, Göttingen 1974.
- Burns, R.I., *How to End a Crusade: Techniques for Making Peace in the Thirteenth-Century Kingdom of Valencia*, in: *Burns, Moors and Crusaders in Mediterranean Spain*, London 1978, IV, 1–15.
- , *The Muslim in the Christian Feudal Order: The Kingdom of Valencia, 1240–1280*, in: *Burns, Moors and Crusaders in Mediterranean Spain*, London 1978, XI, 105–126.
- Bussi, E., *La Condizione Giuridica dei Musulmani nel Diritto Canonico*, in: *Rivista di Storia del Diritto Italiano* 8 (1935), 459–494.
- Cahen, Cl., *Atābeg*, in: *EI* 2, I, 731–732.
- , *Atsız b. Uvaq*, in: *EI* 2, I, 773.
- , *Le Diyār-Bakr au temps des premiers Urtukides*, in: *JA* 226 (1935), 219–276.
- , *Some New Editions of Oriental Sources for the Crusader Period: A Survey*, in: *Outremer*, ed. Kedar/Mayer/Smail, 323–331.
- , *Ġhuzz*, in: *EI* 2, II, 1106–1110.
- , *An Introduction to the First Crusade*, in: *Past and Present* 6 (1959), 6–29.
- , *Mouvements populaires et autonomisme urbain dans l'Asie musulmane du Moyen Age*, in: *Arabica* 5 (1958), 225–250 and 6 (1959), 25–56, 233–265.
- , *Notes sur l'histoire des croisades et de l'orient latin. Le régime rural syrien au temps de la domination franque*, in: *BFLUS* 29 (1951), 286–310.
- , *Nūr al-Dawla Balak b. Bahrām b. Artuq*, in: *EI* 2, I, 983.
- , *La première pénétration turque en Asie-Mineure (Seconde moitié du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, in: *Byzantion* 18 (1946–48), 5–67.
- , *Pre-Ottoman Turkey, A General Survey of the Material and Spiritual Culture and History, c. 1070–1330*, London 1968.
- , *La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche*, Paris 1940.
- Canard, M., *La destruction de l'église de la Résurrection par le calife Ḥākim et l'histoire de la descente du feu sacré*, in: *Byzantion* 35 (1965), 16–43.
- , *Deux épisodes de relations diplomatiques arabo-byzantines au X<sup>e</sup> siècle*, in: *Bulletin d'études orientales de l'Institut français de Damas* 13 (1949–1951), 51–69.
- , *Fāṭimides et Būrides à l'époque du calife al-Ḥāfiẓ li-Dīn-illāh*, in: *REI* 35 (1967), 103–117.
- , *Les relations politiques et sociales entre Byzance et les arabes*, in: *DOP* 18 (1964), 33–56.
- Cardini, F., *Gli Studi sulle Crociate dal 1945 ad oggi*, in: *Rivista storica italiana* 80 (1968), 79–106.
- Cartellieri, A., *Philipp II. August, König von Frankreich, Leipzig 1906 (repr. Aalen 1969)*.
- , *Richard Löwenherz im Heiligen Lande*, in: *HZ* 101 (1908), 1–27.
- Casanova, P., *Les derniers Fāṭimides*, in: *Mémoires publiées par les membres de la Mission Archéologique Française du Caire* 6 (1897), 415–445.
- Chalandon, F., *Les Comnène. Etude sur l'empire Byzantin aux XI<sup>e</sup> et XII<sup>e</sup> siècles*. Paris 1900–12.
- Charanis, P., *Aims of Medieval Crusaders and how they were viewed by Byzantium*, in: *Church History* 21 (1952), 123–131.
- , *Byzantium, the West and the Origin of the First Crusade*, in: *Byzantion* 19 (1949), 17–36.
- , *A Greek Source on the Origin of the First Crusade*, in: *Speculum* 24 (1949), 93–94.
- Clermont-Ganneau, Ch., *Deux chartes des croisés dans des archives arabes*, in: *Clermont-Ganneau, Recueil d'archéologie Orientale VI*, Paris 1903, 1–30.
- Constable, G., *The Second Crusade as seen by Contemporaries*, in: *Traditio* 9 (1953), 213–279.
- Cram, K.-G., *Iudicium Belli. Zum Rechtscharakter des Krieges im Deutschen Mittelalter*, Münster/Köln 1955.

- The Crusades and other Historical Essays presented to Dana C. Munro by his former Students, ed. L.J. Paetow, New York 1928.—cited as: *The Crusades* (Munro).
- Cutler, A., *The First Crusade and the Idea of Conversion*, in: *MW* 58 (1968), 57–71, 155–176.
- Dahlmanns, F.J., *Al-Malik al-ʿĀdil, Ägypten und der Vordere Orient in den Jahren 589/1193 bis 615/1218*. Ein Beitrag zur aiyubidischen Geschichte, Gießen 1975.
- Dajani-Shakeel, H., *Al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil: His Life and Political Career*, Ph.D. thesis University of Michigan 1972.
- , *Al-Quds: Jerusalem in the Consciousness of the Counter-Crusader*, in: *The Meeting of Two Worlds*, ed. V.P. Goss, Kalamazoo 1986, 201–221.
- , *Displacement of the Palestinians during the Crusades*, in: *MW* 68 (1978), 157–175.
- , *Jihād in Twelfth-Century Arabic Poetry: A Moral and Religious Force to counter the Crusades*, in: *MW* 66 (1976), 96–113.
- Darbishire, R.S., *The Christian Idea of Islam in the Middle Ages, according to the "Chanson d'Antioche"*, in: *MW* 28 (1938), 114–124.
- David, C.W., *Robert Curthose, Duke of Normandy*, Cambridge, Mass. 1920.
- Davis, R.H., *William of Tyre*, in: *Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages*, ed. D. Baker, Edinburgh 1977, 64–76.
- Derenbourg, H., *Oumâra du Yémen*, Paris 1897–1902.
- , *Ousama ibn Mounkidh. Un émir Syrien au premier siècle des croisades (1095–1188)*, Paris 1886–9.
- Devic, Cl./Vaissette, J., et al., *Histoire générale de Languedoc, Toulouse 1872* (repr. Osnabrück 1973).
- Dölger, F., *Vom Altertum zum Mittelalter*, in: *Dölger, Paraspura*, Ettal 1961, 54–72.
- Dressaire, L., *St. Louis en Palestine (1250–1254)*, II, in: *Echos d'Orient* 16 (1913), 221–231.
- Duncalf, F., *The Pope's Plan for the First Crusade*, in: *The Crusades* (Munro), 44–56.
- , *Some Influences of Oriental Environment in the Kingdom of Jerusalem*, in: *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1914*, Washington 1916, I, 135–145.
- Dussaud, R., *Histoire et religion des Nosairis*, Paris 1900.
- , *Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et médiévale*, Paris 1927.
- Edbury, P.W./Rowe, J.G., *William of Tyre and the Patriarchal Election of 1180*, in: *EHR* 93 (1978), 1–25.
- Ehrenkreutz, A.S., *Saladin*, Albany, N.Y. 1972.
- Elisséeff, N., *Ibn ʿAsākir*, in: *EI* 2, III, 713–715.
- , *La titulature de Nūr ad-Dīn d'après ses inscriptions*, in: *Bulletin d'études orientales de l'Institut français de Damas* 14 (1952–54), 155–196.
- , *Nūr ad-Dīn. Un grand prince musulman de Syrie au temps des croisades (511–569 H/1118–1174)*, Damascus 1967.
- The Encyclopaedia of Islam. New Edition*, vols. 1–5, Leiden/London 1960–1985.
- Enzyklopaedie des Islam. Geographisches, ethnographisches und biographisches Wörterbuch der muhammedanischen Völker*, vol. 1–4, Leiden-Leipzig 1913–1936.
- Ende, W., *Wer ist ein Glaubensheld, wer ein Ketzer? Konkurrierende Geschichtsbilder in der modernen Literatur islamischer Länder*, in: *Die Welt des Islams* N.S. 23 (1984), 70–94.
- Erdmann, C., *Die Entstehung des Kreuzzuggedankens*, Stuttgart 1935 (repr. Darmstadt 1980).
- Erlar, A., *Das Recht des mittelalterlichen Westens und der Orient*, in: *Archiv für Rechts- und Sozialphilosophie* 42 (1956), 41–49.
- Favreau-Lilie, M.-L., *Landesausbau und Burg während der Kreuzfahrerzeit. Safad in Obergaliläa*, in: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästinavereins* 96 (1980), 67–87.
- Fazy, R., *La chronique de Damas et les sources chrétiennes de la première croisade*, in: *JA* 228 (1936), 281–298.

- Ferluga, J., La ligesse dans l'empire byzantin, in: *Zbornik radova visantolokoj Instituta* 7 (1961), 97–125.
- Fillipani-Ronconi, P., *Ismailiti ed "Assassini"*, Milano 1973.
- Fink, H.S., Damascus in the History of the Crusades, in: *MW* 49 (1959), 41–53.
- , Mawdūd I, Precursor of Saladin, in: *MW* 43 (1853), 18–27.
- Fisch, J., *Krieg und Frieden im Friedensvertrag*, Stuttgart 1979.
- Fliehe, A., Urbain II et la croisade, in: *Revue de l'Histoire de l'Eglise de France*, 13, 1927, 289–306.
- Force, Marquis de la, Les conseillers latins du Basileus Alexis Comnène, in: *Byzantion* 11 (1936), 153–165.
- Forey, A.J., The Failure of the Siege of Damascus in 1148, in: *Journal for Medieval History* 10 (1984), 13–23.
- France, J., The Crisis of the First Crusade: From the Defeat of Kerbogah to the Departure from 'Arqa, in: *Byzantion* 40 (1970), 276–308.
- , The Departure of Tatikios from the Crusader Army, in: *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 44 (1971), 137–147.
- , An Unknown Account of the Capture of Jerusalem, in: *EHR* 87 (1972), 771–783.
- Frantz-Murphy, G., A New Interpretation of the Economic History of Medieval Egypt. The Role of the Textile Industry 254–567/868–1171, in: *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 24 (1981), 274–297.
- Gabrieli, F., The Arab Historiography of the Crusades, in: *Historians of the Middle East*, ed. B. Lewis/P.M. Holt, London 1962, 98–107.
- , Introduction aux historiens arabes des croisades, in: *Cahiers de la civilisation médiévale* 13 (1970), 221–228.
- Ganshof, F.L., *Histoire des relations internationales*, publ. sous la direction de P. Renourin, Le Moyen Age, Paris 1953.
- , Recherche sur le lien juridique qui unissait les chefs de la première croisade à l'empereur byzantin, in: *Mélanges offerts à M.P.-E. Martin*, Geneva 1961, 49–63.
- Ganshof, F.-L./Verhulst, A., Medieval Agrarian Society in its Prime. § 1. France, The Low Countries, and Western Germany, in: *The Cambridge Economic History of Europe*, I, ed. M.M. Postan, Cambridge 21966.
- Gibb, H.A.R., The Achievement of Saladin, in: *Saladin: Studies in Islamic History*, ed. Y. Ibish, Beirut 1974, 158–176.
- , Arab-Byzantine Relations under the Umayyad Caliphate, in: *DOP* 12 (1958), 219–233.
- , The Caliphate and the Arab States, in: *Setton, History*, I, 81–95.
- , The Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades, extr. and transl. from the Chronicle of Ibn al-Qalānisi, London 1932.
- , The Life of Saladin from the Works of 'Imād ad-Dīn and Bahā' ad-Dīn, Oxford 1973.
- , Notes on the Arabic Materials for the History of the Early Crusades, in: *BSOAS* 7 (1933–35), 739–754.
- , The Arabic Sources for the Life of Saladin, in: *Speculum* 25 (1950), 58–72.
- Gindler, P., *Graf Balduin I. von Edessa*, Halle 1901.
- Glaesener, H., D'Antioche à Tortose (Histoire et légende), in: *Revue belge de Philosophie et d'Histoire* 22 (1943), 35–58.
- Goez, W., Wandlungen des Kreuzzugsgedankens im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter, in: *Das Heilige Land im Mittelalter. Begegnungsraum zwischen Orient und Okzident*, ed. W. Fischer/J. Schneider, Neustadt, 33–44.
- Goitein, S.D., Contemporary Letters on the Capture of Jerusalem by the Crusaders, in: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 3 (1952), 162–177.
- Gottschalk, H.L., *Al-Malik al-Kāmil von Egypten und seine Zeit. Eine Studie zur Geschichte Vorderasiens und Egyptens in der ersten Hälfte des 7./13. Jahrhunderts*, Wiesbaden 1958.
- , Die Friedensangebote al-Kāmil's an die Kreuzfahrer, in: *WZKM* 51 (1948/52), 64–82.
- , Der Untergang der Hohenstaufen, in: *WZKM* 53 (1957), 267–282.

- Grabois, A., The Crusade of Louis VII: A Reconsideration, in: *Crusade and Settlement*, ed. P.W. Edbury, Cardiff 1985, 94–104.
- Grandclaude, M., Liste d'assises remontant au premier royaume de Jérusalem (1099–1187), in: *Mélanges P. Fournier*, Paris 1929, 329–345.
- Greilsammer, M., Structure and Aims of the *Livre au Roi*, in: *Outremer*, ed. Kedar/Mayer/Smail, 218–226.
- Groh, F., *Der Zusammenbruch des Reiches Jerusalem (1187–1189)*, Jena 1909.
- Groot, A.H. de, *Ḳubrus*, in: *EI* 2, V, 301–309.
- Grousset, R., *Histoire des croisades et du royaume franc de Jérusalem*, Paris 1934–1936.
- Haddad, W., The Crusaders through Muslim Eyes, in: *MW* 73 (1983), 234–252.
- Hagenmeyer, H., Der Brief der Kreuzfahrer an den Papst im Jahre 1099 nach der Schlacht bei Askalon, in: *FzDG* (1873), 400–412.
- , Chronologie de la première croisade 1094–1100, in: *ROL* 6–8 (1898–1901), VI, 214–293, 490–549; VII, 275–339, 430–503; VIII, 318–382.
- , Das Verhältnis der *Gesta Francorum* zu dem Hierosolymita Ekkehard von Aura, in: *FzDG* (1875), 19–42.
- Hamblin, W.J., *The Fāṭimid Army during the Early Crusades*, Ph.D. thesis University of Michigan 1985.
- Hamdani, A., Byzantine-Fatimid Relations before the Battle of Manzikert, in: *Byzantine Studies* 1 (1974), 169–179.
- Hamidullah, M., *Muslim Conduct of State*, Lahore <sup>3</sup>1953.
- Hamilton, B., The Elephant of Christ: Reynald of Châtillon, in: *Religious Motivation: Biographical and Sociological Problems for the Church Historian*, ed. D. Baker, Oxford 1978, 97–108.
- Hampel, E., *Untersuchungen über das lateinische Patriarchat von Jerusalem von der Eroberung der heiligen Stadt bis zum Tode des Patriarchen Arnulf (1099–1118)*, Breslau 1899.
- Hansen, J., *Das Problem eines Kirchenstaates in Jerusalem*, Luxemburg 1928.
- Hartmann, A., Al-Malik al-Manṣūr (gest. 617/1220), ein ayyūbidischer Regent und Geschichtsschreiber, in: *ZDMG* 136 (1986), 570–606.
- , *An-Nāṣir li-Din Allāh (1180–1225). Politik, Religion, Kultur in der späten 'Abbāsidenzeit*, Berlin-New York 1975.
- Hartmann, J., *Die Persönlichkeit des Sultans Saladin im Urteil der abendländischen Quellen*, Berlin 1933.
- Havemann, A., Ri'āsa und qaḏā'. Institutionen als Ausdruck wechselnder Kräfteverhältnisse in syrischen Städten vom 10. bis zum 12. Jahrhundert, Freiburg i.B. 1975.
- Heffening, W., *Das islamische Fremdenrecht bis zu den islamisch-fränkischen Staatsverträgen*, Hannover 1925.
- Hehl, E.-D., *Kirche und Krieg im 12. Jahrhundert. Studien zu kanonischem Recht und politischer Wirklichkeit*, Stuttgart 1980.
- Hein, A.-A., *Beiträge zur ayyūbidischen Diplomatie*, Freiburg 1971.
- Helbig, A.H., *Al-Qāḏi al-Fāḏil. Der Wezir Saladin's*, Leipzig 1908.
- Herde, H., Christians and Saracens at the Time of the Crusades, in: *Studia Gratiana* 12 (1967), 361–376.
- Heyd, W., *Histoire de commerce du Levant au Moyen Age*, transl. F. Raynaud, Leipzig 1885–1886 (repr. Amsterdam 1936).
- Heydte, A., *Die Geburtsstunde des modernen Staates*, Regensburg 1952.
- Hiestand, R., 'Kaiser' Konrad III., der zweite Kreuzzug und ein verlorenes Diplom für den Berg Thabor, in: *DA* 35 (1979), 82–126.
- , Kreuzzug und Friedensidee, in: *Kultur und Erkenntnis. Schriften der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Düsseldorf*, ed. R. Hiestand et al., I, Düsseldorf 1986, 46–57.
- , Zum Leben und zur Laufbahn Wilhelms von Tyrus, in: *DA* 34 (1978), 345–380.
- , Die päpstlichen Legaten auf den Kreuzzügen und in den Kreuzfahrerstaaten vom Konzil von Clermont (1095) bis zum vierten Kreuzzug, *Habil.schrift Kiel* 1972.

- Hill, J.H./L.L. Hill, The Conventions of Alexius Comnenus and Raymond of Saint-Gilles, in: *American Historical Review* 58 (1952/1953), 322–327.
- , Raymond IV, Count of Toulouse, Syracuse 1962.
- , Raymond of Saint Gilles in Urban's Plan of Greek and Latin Friendship, in: *Speculum* 26 (1951), 265–276.
- Hill, R., The Christian View of the Muslims at the Time of the First Crusade, in: *The Eastern Mediterranean Lands in the Period of the Crusades*, ed. P.M. Holt, Warminster 1977, 1–8.
- Histoire générale de Languedoc,—see: Devic, Cl.
- Hitti, Ph.K., *The Origins of the Druze People and Religion*, New York 1928.
- Hodgson, M.G.S., *The Order of the Assassins. The Struggle of the Early Nizari Isma'ili against the Islamic World*, s'Gravenhage 1955.
- Hoenerbach, W., *Islamische Geschichte Spaniens*, Zürich 1970.
- Holt, P.M., *The Age of the Crusades*, London/New York 1986.
- , Baybars's Treaty with the Lady of Beirut in 667/1269, in: *Crusade and Settlement*, ed. P.W. Edbury, Cardiff 1985, 242–245.
- , Qalāwūn's Treaty with Acre in 1283, in: *EHR* 91 (1976), 802–812.
- , Qalāwūn's Treaty with Genua in 1290, in: *Der Islam* 57 (1980), 101–108.
- , Saladin and his Admirers: A Biographical Reassessment, in: *BSOAS* 46 (1983), 235–239.
- , The Treaties of the Early Mamluk Sultans with the Frankish States, in: *BSOAS* 43 (1980), 67–76.
- Holtzmann, W., Die Unionsverhandlungen zwischen Kaiser Alexios I. und Papst Urban II im Jahre 1089, in: *BZ* 28 (1928), 38–67.
- Honigsmann, E., Ramla, in: *EI* 1, III, 1204–1206.
- Horna, K., Das Hodoiporikon des Konstantin Manasses, in: *BZ* 13 (1904), 313–355.
- Houtsma, M. Th., Tutuṣh, in: *EI* 1, IV, 1064.
- Huberti, L., *Studien zur Rechtsgeschichte der Gottesfrieden und Landfrieden*, 1. Buch, Friedensordnungen in Frankreich, Ansbach 1892.
- Humphreys, R.St., *From Saladin to the Mongols. The Ayyūbids of Damascus, 1193–1260*, Albany N.Y. 1977.
- Jenkins, R.H.J., Cyprus between Byzantium and Islam, A.D. 668–965, in: *Studies presented to D.M. Robinson*, St. Louis, Miss. 1953, 1006–1014.
- Jenkins, R.H.J., Cyprus und Intoleranz zwischen Christen und Muslimen in der Zeit vor den Kreuzzügen, in: *Saeculum* 19 (1968), 362–389.
- Kedar, B.Z., The Patriarch Eraclius, in: *Outremer*, ed. Kedar/Mayer/Smail, 177–204.
- Khadduri, M., *The Islamic Law of Nations. Shaibani's Siyar*, Baltimore 1966.
- , *War and Peace in the Law of Islam*, Richmond-London 1955.
- Knoch, P., *Studien zu Albert von Aachen. Der erste Kreuzzug in der deutschen Chronistik*, Stuttgart 1966.
- Köhler, M.A., Al-Afḍal und Jerusalem—was versprach sich Ägypten vom ersten Kreuzzug?, in: *Saeculum* 37 (1986), 228–239.
- , Munāṣafāt: Gebietsteilungen zwischen Kreuzfahrern und islamischen Herrschern im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert, in: *ZDMG Suppl. VI* (1985), 155–165.
- Koelner, R., The Settlement and Colonization of Europe, in: *The Cambridge Economic History of Europe*, I, ed. M.M. Postan, Cambridge 21966, 1–91.
- Konetzke, R., Probleme der Beziehungen zwischen Islam und Christentum im spanischen Mittelalter, in: *Antike und Orient im Mittelalter*, ed. P. Wilpert, Berlin 1962, 219–238.
- Kraemer, J., Der Sturz des Königreichs Jerusalem (583/1187) in der Darstellung des 'Imād ad-Dīn al-Kātib al-Ṣfahānī, Wiesbaden 1952.
- Krey, A.C., A Neglected Passage in the Gesta and its Bearing on the Literature of the First Crusade, in: *The Crusades* (Munro), 57–78.

- Kruse, H., Die Begründung der islamischen Völkerrechtslehre, in: *Saeculum* 5 (1954), 221–241.
- , *Islamische Völkerrechtslehre. Der Staatsvertrag bei den Hanefiten des 5./6. Jahrhunderts d.H./11./12. Jahrhundert n.Chr.*, PhD thesis, University of Göttingen 1953.
- Kühn, F., *Geschichte der ersten lateinischen Patriarchen von Jerusalem*, Leipzig 1886.
- Kugler, B., *Albert von Aachen*, Stuttgart 1885.
- , *Boemund und Tankred, Fürsten von Antiochia*, Tübingen 1862.
- , *Über den Brief der Kreuzfahrer von 1099*, in: *FzDG* 15 (1875), 157–158.
- , *Kommenen und Kreuzfahrer*, in: *HZ* 14 (1865), 295–318.
- , *Studien zur Geschichte des zweiten Kreuzzuges*, Stuttgart 1866.
- LaMonte, J.L., *To what Extent was the Byzantine Empire the Suzerain of the Latin Crusading States*, in: *Byzantion* 7 (1932), 253–264.
- , *Feudal Monarchy in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. 1100 to 1291*, Cambridge, Mass. 1932.
- Landon, L., *The Itinerary of King Richard I. with Studies on certain Matters of Interest connected with his Reign*, London 1935 (repr. Neudeln/Lichtenstein 1974).
- Laurent, J., *Des Grecs au croisés*, in: *Byzantion* 1 (1924), 367–449.
- Leib, B., *Rome, Kiev et Byzance à la fin du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle (1088–99)*, Paris 1924.
- Leiser, G., *The Crusader Raid in the Red Sea in 578/1182–83*, in: *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt (Cairo)* 14 (1977), 87–100.
- LeStrange, G., *Palestine under the Moslems. A Description of Syria and the Holy Land from A.D. 650 to 1500*, transl. from the Works of the Medieval Arab Geographers, London 1890.
- Le Tourneau, R., *Damas de 1075 à 1154. Traduction annotée d'un fragment de l'histoire de Damas d'Ibn al-Qalanisi*, Damascus 1952.
- Levi della Vida, G., *Khāridjites*, in: *EI* 2, IV, 1074–1077.
- Lewis, B., *The Assassins. A Radical Sect in Islam*, London 1967.
- , *Kamāl ad-Dīn's Biography of Rāšid ad-Dīn Sinān*, in: *Arabica* 13 (1966), 225–267.
- , *Saladin and the Assassins*, in: *BSOAS* 15 (1953), 239–245.
- Lilie, R.-J., *Byzanz und die Kreuzfahrerstaaten. Studien zur Politik des byzantinischen Reiches gegenüber den Staaten der Kreuzfahrer in Syrien und Palästina bis zum vierten Kreuzzug (1096–1204)*, München 1981.
- Little, D.P., *An Introduction to Mamluk Historiography. An Analysis of Arabic Annalistic and Biographical Sources for the Reign of al-Malik an-Nāšir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn*, Wiesbaden 1970.
- Luchaire, A., *Louis VII.—Philippe-August—Louis VIII. (1137–1226)*, in: *Histoire de France*, ed. E. Lavissee, III/1, Paris 1901.
- Lüders, A., *Die Kreuzzüge im Urteil syrischer und armenischer Quellen*, Berlin 1964.
- Lupprian, K.-E., *Die Beziehungen der Päpste zu islamischen und mongolischen Herrschern im 13. Jahrhundert anhand ihres Briefwechsels*, Vatican City 1981.
- Lyons, M.C./Jackson, D.E.P., *Saladin. The Politics of Holy War*, Cambridge 1982.
- Mājid, A., *Zuhūr khilāfat al-fāṭimiyyin wa-suqūṭuhā fi Miṣr*, Alexandria 1968.
- Massignon, L., *Nuṣairī*, in: *EI* 1, III, 1041–1045.
- Mayer, H.E., *Aspekte der Kreuzzugforschung*, in: *Geschichte und Gegenwart, Festschrift für K. Dietrich Erdmann*, ed. H. Boockmann, K. Jürgensen, G. Stoltenberg, Neumünster 1980, 75–94.
- , *Zur Beurteilung Adhemars von Le Puy* in: *DA* 16 (1960), 547–552.
- , *Bistümer, Klöster und Stifte im Königreich Jerusalem*, Stuttgart 1977.
- , *Der Brief Kaiser Friedrichs I. an Saladin vom Jahre 1188*, in: *DA* 14 (1958), 488–495.
- , *The Concordat of Nāblus*, in: *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 33 (1982), 531–543.
- , *Ein Deperditium König Balduins III. von Jerusalem als Zeugnis seiner Pläne zur Eroberung Ägyptens*, in: *DA* 36 (1980), 549–566.
- , *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, Stuttgart 1976.

- , *Das Itinerarium peregrinorum. Eine zeitgenössische englische Chronik zum dritten Kreuzzug in ursprünglicher Gestalt*, Stuttgart 1962.
- , *Jérusalem et Antioche au temps de Baudouin II*, in: *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (1980), 717–733.
- , *Kaiserrecht und Heiliges Land*, in: *Aus Reichsgeschichte und Nordischer Geschichte*, ed. H. Fuhrmann et al., Stuttgart 1972, 193–208.
- , *Latins, Muslims and Greeks in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, in: *History* 63 (1978), 175–192.
- , *Das Pontifikale von Tyrus und die Krönung der lateinischen Könige von Jerusalem. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Forschung über die Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik*, in: *DOP* 21 (1967), 141–232.
- , *Le service militaire des vassaux à l'étranger et le financement des campagnes en Syrie du Nord et en Egypte au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, in: Mayer, *Mélanges sur l'histoire du royaume latin de Jérusalem*, Paris 1984, 93–161.
- , *Studies in the History of Queen Melisende of Jerusalem*, in: *DOP* 26 (1972), 94–182.
- , *Bibliographie zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, Hannover 1960.
- , *Literaturbericht über die Geschichte der Kreuzzüge. Veröffentlichungen 1958–1967*, in: *HZ Sonderband* 3 (1967), 641–736.
- Mayer, H.E./Favreau, M.-L., *Das Diplom Balduins I. für Genua und Genuas Goldene Inschrift in der Grabeskirche*, in: *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 55/56 (1975/1976), 22–95.
- Mitteis, H., *Politische Verträge im Mittelalter*, in: *Mitteis, Die Rechtsidee in der Geschichte. Gesammelte Abhandlungen und Vorträge von Heinrich Mitteis*, Weimar 1957, 567–612.
- Möhring, H., *Byzanz und die Kreuzfahrerstaaten*, in: *HZ* 234 (1982), 601–608.
- , *Byzanz zwischen Sarazenen und Kreuzfahrern*, in: *Das Heilige Land im Mittelalter. Begegnungsraum zwischen Orient und Okzident*, ed. W. Fischer/J. Schneider, Neustadt 1982, 45–75.
- , *Heiliger Krieg und politische Pragmatik: Salahadinus Tyrannus*, in: *DA* 39 (1983), 417–466.
- , *Saladin und der dritte Kreuzzug. Aiyubidische Strategie und Diplomatie im Vergleich vornehmlich der arabischen mit den lateinischen Quellen*, Wiesbaden 1980.
- , *Saladins Politik des Heiligen Krieges*, in: *Der Islam* 61 (1984), 322–326.
- Morgan, M., *The Chronicle of Ernoul and the Continuations of William of Tyre*, Oxford 1973.
- , *The Rothelin Continuation of William of Tyre*, in: *Outremer*, ed. Kedar/Mayer/Smail, 244–257.
- Munro, D.C., *Christian and Infidel in the Holy Land*, in: *International Monthly* 4 (1903), 690–704, 726–741.
- , *The Speech of Pope Urban II. at Clermont, 1095*, in: *American Historical Review* 11 (1906), 231–241.
- Naumann, H., *Der wilde und der edle Heide*, in: *Vom Werden des deutschen Geistes. Festgabe G. Ehrismann zum 8. Oktober 1925 dargebracht von Freunden und Schülern*, ed. P. Merker et al., Berlin/Leipzig 1925, 80–101.
- Nicholson, R.L., *Joscelyn I, Prince of Edessa*, Urbana 1954.
- , *Joscelyn III and the Fall of the Crusader Staates 1134–1199*, Leiden 1973.
- , *Tancred. A Study of his Career and Work in their Relation to the First Crusade and the Establishment of the Latin States in Syria and Palestine*, Chicago 1940 (repr. 1978).
- Nickerson, M.E., *The Growth of the Latin States*, in: *Setton, History*, I, 410–447.
- , *The Seignury of Beirut in the Twelfth Century and the Brisebarre Family of Beirut-Blanchegarde*, in: *Byzantion* 19 (1949), 141–185.
- Nierman, J.H., *Aimery II of Jerusalem and his Relations with his Aiyubid Neighbors*, Ph.D. thesis New York 1971.
- , *Levantine Peace Following the Third Crusade: A New Dimension in Frankish-Muslim Relations*, in: *MW* 65 (1975), 107–118.

- Norgate, K., *Richard the Lion-Heart*, London 1924.
- Noth, A., I documenti arabi di Ruggero II, in: C. Brühl, *Diplomi e cancellaria di Ruggero II*, Palermo 1983, 189–222.
- , *Heiliger Krieg und Heiliger Kampf in Islam und Christentum. Beiträge zur Vorgeschichte und Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, Bonn 1966.
- , *Quellenkritische Studien zu Themen, Formen und Tendenzen frühislamischer Geschichtsüberlieferung. Teil 1*, Bonn 1973.
- Nussbaum, A., *Forms and Observance of Treaties in the Middle Ages and the Early Sixteenth Century*, in: *Law and Politics in the World Community . . .*, ed. G.A. Lipsky, Berkeley/Los Angeles 1953, 191–196.
- , *Geschichte des Völkerrechts*, München/Berlin 1960.
- Ochsenwald, W.L., *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem and Israel: A Historical Comparison*, in: *Middle East Journal* 30 (1976), 221–226.
- Omran, M.S., *King Amalric and the Siege of Alexandria*, 1167, in: *Crusade and Settlement*, ed. P.W. Edbury, Cardiff 1985, 191–196.
- Ory, S., *De quelques personnages portant le nom de Kumuštakin à l'époque salgūqide*, in: *REI* 35 (1967), 119–134.
- Outremer, Studies in the History of the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem presented to Joshua Prawer*, ed. B.Z. Kedar, H.E. Mayer, R.C. Smail, Jerusalem 1982.
- Paradisi, B., *Storia del Diritto Internazionale nel Medio Evo. L'Età di Transizione*, Naples<sup>2</sup> 1954.
- Pedersen, J., *Der Eid bei den Semiten, in seinem Verhältnis zu verwandten Erscheinungen sowie die Stellung des Eides im Islam*, Straßburg 1914.
- Plocher, M., *Studien zum Kreuzzugsdenken im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert*, unpubl. PhD thesis, University of Freiburg 1950.
- Porges, W., *The Clergy, the Poor, and the Non-Combattants on the First Crusade*, in: *Speculum* 21 (1946), 1–24.
- Prawer, J., *Colonization Activities in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, in: *Revue belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 29 (1951), 1063–1118.
- , *Crusader Institutions*, Oxford 1980.
- , *Etude de quelques problèmes agraires et sociaux d'une seigneurie croisée au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, in: *Byzantion* 22 (1953), 5–61; 23 (1954), 143–170.
- , *Etude sur le droit des Assises de Jérusalem: Droit de confiscation et droit d'exhérédation*, in: *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 39 (1961), 520–551; 40 (1962), 29–42.
- , *Histoire du royaume latin de Jérusalem*. transl. G. Nahon, Paris 1969–70.
- , *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, London 1972.
- , *La noblesse et le régime féodal du royaume latin de Jérusalem*, in: *Le Moyen-Age* 65 (1959), 41–74.
- , *Les premiers temps de la féodalité du royaume latin de Jérusalem—une reconsidération*, in: *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis/Revue historique du droit* 22 (1954), 401–424.
- , *Serfs, Slaves and Bedouin*, in: Prawer, *Crusader Institutions*, 201–214.
- , *The Settlement of the Latins in Jerusalem*, in: *Speculum* 27 (1952), 490–503.
- , *Crusader Security and the Red Sea*, in: Prawer, *Crusader Institutions*, Oxford 1980, 471–483.
- Ranke, L. von, *Über die Epochen der Neueren Geschichte. Vorträge dem Könige Maximilian II. von Bayern gehalten*, Darmstadt 1959.
- Richard, J., *An Account of the Battle of Hattin Referring to the Frankish Mercenaries in the Oriental Moslem States, The Battle of Hattin according to MS REG. LAT. 598*, in: *Speculum* 27 (1952), 168–177.
- , *Le comté de Tripoli sous la dynastie toulousaine (1102–1187)*, Paris 1945.
- , *La papauté et la direction de la première croisade*, in: *Journal des Savants* (1960), 49–59.

- , Un partage de seigneurie entre Francs et Mamelouks: Les "Casaux de Sur", in: *Syria* 30 (1953), 71–82.
- , La politique Orientale de saint Louis. La croisade de 1248, in: *Septième centenaire de la mort de saint Louis. Actes des colloques de Royaumont et de Paris* (21.–27. mai 1970), Paris 1976, 197–207.
- , Quelques textes sur les premiers temps de l'église latine de Jérusalem, in: *Recueil des travaux offert à M. Clovis Brunel*, II, Paris 1955, 420–430.
- , *Le royaume latin de Jérusalem*, Paris 1953.
- Richards, D.S., *The Early History of Saladin*, in: *The Islamic Quarterly* 17 (1973), 140–159.
- Riley-Smith, J.S.C., *The First Crusade and St. Peter*, in: *Outremer*, ed. Kedar/Mayer/Smail, 41–63.
- , *The Feudal Nobility and the Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1174–1277*, London/Barsingstoke 1973.
- , *The Knights of St. John in Jerusalem and Cyprus, c. 1050–1310*, London 1967.
- , *The Motives of the Earliest Crusaders and the Settlement of Latin Palestine*, in: *EHR* 98 (1983), 721–736.
- , *Some lesser Officials in Latin Syria*, in: *EHR* 87 (1972), 1–26.
- , *Peace never Established. The Case of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*, in: *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 28 (1978), 87–102.
- , *The Survival in Latin Palestine of Muslim Administration*, in: *The Eastern Mediterranean Lands in the Period of the Crusades*, ed. P.M. Holt, Warminster 1977, 9–22.
- Rittner, V., *Kulturkontakte und soziales Lernen im Mittelalter. Kreuzzüge im Licht einer mittelalterlichen Biographie*, Köln 1973.
- Röhrich, R., *Amalrich I., König von Jerusalem (1162–1174)*, in: *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung* 12 (1891), 432–493.
- , *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge, II: Deutsche Pilger und Kreuzfahrten nach dem Heiligen Lande (700–1300)*, Berlin 1874–1878 (repr. Aalen 1967).
- , *Etude sur les derniers temps du royaume de Jérusalem*, in: *Archives de l'Orient latin* 2, 1 (1884), 365–405.
- , *Geschichte des Königreichs Jerusalem (1100–1291)*, Innsbruck 1898.
- , *Zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, in: *NA* 11 (1886), 571–579.
- , *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges*, Innsbruck 1901.
- , *Zur Korrespondenz der Päpste mit den Sultanen und Mongolenchanen im Zeitalter der Kreuzzüge*, in: *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 64 (1891), 359–369.
- , *Die Kreuzfahrt des Kaisers Friedrich II. 1228–1229*, in: Röhrich, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, I, 1–112, Berlin 1874 (repr. Aalen 1967).
- , *Sagenhaftes und Mythisches aus der Zeit der Kreuzzüge*, in: *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie* 23 (1891), 412–421.
- Roscher, H., *Papst Innozenz III. und die Kreuzzüge*, Göttingen 1969.
- Rosenthal, F., *A History of Muslim Historiography*, Leiden 1968.
- Rosny, L. de, *Recherches ethnographiques sur les serments*, ed. C.-A. Pret, I, Paris 1901.
- Rousset, P., *Etienne de Blois, croisé fuyard et martyr*, in: *Genava* 11 (1963), 183–195.
- , *Les origines et les caractères de la première croisade*, Neuchâtel 1945.
- Runciman, St., *The First Crusade: Antioch to Ascalon*, in: *Setton, History*, I, 308–341.
- , *A History of the Crusades*, Cambridge 1954.
- , *The Visit of King Amalric I to Constantinople in 1171*, in: *Outremer*, ed. Kedar/Mayer/Smail, 153–158.
- Russell, F.H., *The Just War in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge 1975.
- Salem, J.K., *Islam und Völkerrecht. Das Völkerrecht in der islamischen Weltanschauung*, Berlin 1984.
- Salibi, K.S., *The Buhturids of the Ġarb. Medieval Lords of Beirut and of Southern Lebanon*, in: *Arabica* 8 (1961), 74–97.
- , *The Maronites of Lebanon under Frankish and Mamluk Rule (1099–1516)*, in: *Arabica* 4 (1957), 288–303.

- , *Syria under Islam. Empire on Trial, 634–1097*, Delamare, N.Y. 1977.
- Schacht, J., *An Introduction to Islamic Law*, Oxford 1964.
- Schack, D., *Die Araber im Reich Rogers II*, unpubl. PhD thesis, FU Berlin 1969.
- Schlumberger, G., *Campagnes du roi Amaury Ier de Jérusalem en Egypte, au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris 1906.
- , *Deux chefs normands des armées byzantines au XI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, in: *Revue historique* 16 (1881), 289–303.
- , *Renaud de Châtillon, Prince d'Antioche, Seigneur de la terre d'Outre-Jourdain*, Paris 1923.
- Schmucker, W., *Untersuchungen zu einigen wichtigen bodenrechtlichen Konsequenzen der islamischen Eroberungsbewegung*, Bonn 1972.
- Schregle, G., *Die Sultanin von Ägypten*, Wiesbaden 1961.
- Schwartz, R.W., *Das Bild von Islam und Muslimen bei den lateinischen Christen in der Zeit der beiden ersten Kreuzzüge*, MA thesis, Bonn 1975.
- Schwinges, R.Ch., *Kreuzzugsideologie und Toleranz. Studien zu Wilhelm von Tyrus*, Stuttgart 1977.
- Segal, J.B., *Edessa, "The Blessed City"*, Oxford 1970.
- Setton, K.M., (ed.), *A History of the Crusades, I, The First Hundred Years*, ed. M.W. Baldwin, Philadelphia 1955, *II, The Later Crusades*, ed. R.L. Wolff/H.W. Hazard, Philadelphia 1962.
- Sivan, E., *Le caractère sacré de Jérusalem dans l'Islam aux XII<sup>e</sup>–XIII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, in: *Studia Islamica* 27 (1967), 149–182.
- , *The Crusades as described by modern Arab Historiography*, in: *Asian and African Studies* 8 (1972), 104–149.
- , *La genèse de la contre-croisade. Un traité damasquin du début du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, in: *JA* 254 (1966), 197–224.
- , *L'Islam et la croisade. Idéologie et propagande dans les réactions musulmanes aux croisades*, Paris 1968.
- , *Réfugiés syro-palestiniens au temps des croisades*, in: *REI* 35 (1967), 135–147.
- , *Saladin et le calife al-Nasir*, in: *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 23, ed. D. Asheri/J. Shatzmann, Jerusalem 1972, II, 126–145.
- Smail, R.C., *The Predicaments of Guy of Lusignan, 1183–1187*, in: *Outremer*, ed. Kedar/Mayer/Smail, 159–176.
- , *The International Status of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1150–1192*, in: *The Eastern Mediterranean Lands in the Period of the Crusades*, ed. P.M. Holt, Warminster 1977, 23–43.
- , *Latin Syria and the West, 1149–1187*, in: *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 19 (1969), 1–20.
- , *Crusading Warfare (1097–1193). A Contribution to Medieval Military History*, Cambridge 1967.
- Stadtmüller, G., *Geschichte des Völkerrechts, Teil I*, Hannover 1951.
- Stevenson, W.B., *The Crusaders in the East*, Cambridge/New York 1907 (repr. Beirut 1968).
- Stillmann, N.A., *Khil'a*, in: *EI* 2, V, 6–7.
- Sybel, H. v., *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges*, Leipzig 1881.
- Tabbaa, Y., *Monuments with a Message: Propagation of Jihād unter Nūr ad-Dīn (1146–1174)*, in: *The Meeting of Two Worlds*, ed. V.P. Goss, Kalamazoo 1986, 223–240.
- Tellenbach, G., *Vom Zusammenleben der abendländischen Völker im Mittelalter*, in: *Festschrift G. Ritter*, ed. R. Nünberger, Tübingen 1950, 1–60.
- Thorau, P., *Sultan Baibars I. von Ägypten. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Vorderen Orients im 13. Jahrhundert*, Wiesbaden 1987.
- Torres Fontes, J., *La Reconquista de Murcia en 1266 por Jaime I. de Aragón*, Murcia 1967.
- Tritton, A.S., *The Tribes of Syria in the XIVth and XVth Centuries*, in: *BSOAS* 12 (1948), 567–573.

- Villey, M., *La croisade. Essai sur la formation d'une théorie juridique*, Paris 1942 (repr. 1980).
- Viollet, P., *Histoire des institutions politiques II*, Paris 1898 (repr. Aalen 1966).
- Vismara, G., *Bisanzio e l'Islam per la Storia dei Trattati tra la Christianità Orientale e le Potenze Mussulmane*, Milano 1950.
- , *Impium Foedus. Le Origini della "Respublica Christiana"*, Milano 21974.
- Vryonis, S., *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century*, London 1971.
- Walker, J., Ṭalā'ī' b. Ruzzīk, in: *EI* 1, IV, 688.
- Waltz, J., *Historical Perspectives on "Early Missions" to Muslims. A Response to Allan Cutler*, in: *MW* 61 (1971), 170–186.
- Wansborough, J., *A Mamluk Ambassador to Venice in 913/1507*, in: *BSOAS* 26 (1963), 503–530.
- , *A Moroccan Amir's Commercial Treaty with Venice of the Year 913/1508*, in: *BSOAS* 25 (1962), 449–471.
- , *The Safe-Conduct in Muslim Chancery Practise*, in: *BSOAS* 34 (1971), 20–35.
- , *A Mamluk Commercial Treaty with the Republic of Florence, 894/1489*, in: *Documents from Islamic Chanceries*, ed. S.M. Stern, Oxford 1965, 39–79.
- , *Venice and Florence in the Mamluk Commercial Privileges*, in: *BSOAS* 28 (1965), 483–523.
- Werveke, H. van, *Filips van de Elzas en Willem van Tyrus. Een Episode uit de Geschiedenis van de Kruistochten*, in: *Mededeelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse de Letteren*, 33 (Brüssel 1971), II, 3–35.
- Wielers, M., *Zwischenstaatliche Beziehungsformen im frühen Mittelalter (Pax, Foedus, Amicitia, Fratrnitas)*, München 1959.
- Wiet, G., *L'Égypte arabe de la conquête arabe à la conquête ottomane 642–1517*, Paris 1946.
- , *Les inscriptions de Saladin*, in: *Syria* 3 (1922), 307–328.
- Wild, P.S., *Sanctions and Treaty Enforcement*, Cambridge, Mass. 1934.
- Williams, P.A., *The Assassination of Conrad of Montferrat: Another Suspect?*, in: *Traditio* 26 (1970), 381–389.
- Wirth, G., *Der Kreuzzug, Anfänge und Vorformen*, in: *Das Heilige Land im Mittelalter. Begegnungsraum zwischen Orient und Okzident*, ed. W. Fischer/J. Schneider, Neustadt 1982, 1–12.
- Wüstenfeld, F., *Geschichte der Fatimiden-Chalifen*, Göttingen 1881.
- Yewdale, R.B., *Bohemond I, Prince of Antioch*, Princeton 1924 (repr. Amsterdam 1970).
- Zakkar, S., *The Emirate of Aleppo. 1004–1094*, Beirut 1971.
- Zbinden, N., *Abendländische Ritter, Griechen und Türken im ersten Kreuzzug. Zur Problematik ihrer Begegnung*, Athen 1975.
- Zeller, H.L., *Das Seerecht in den Assisen von Jerusalem (nach der Handschrift Venedig R. Biblioteca Nazionale di S. Marco Cod. franc. App. VI (Katalognummer XXXI) ...)*, Heidelberg 1916.
- Zimmermann, M., *La crise de l'organisation internationale*, in: *Recueil des Cours* 44 (1933), 319–437.
- Zitterstéén, K.V., *Mazyaditen*, in: *EI* 1, III, 504–505.
- , *Riḍwān*, in: *EI* 1, III, 1246–1248.
- , *Ṭuġhtegīn*, in: *EI* 1, IV, 898–899.



## INDEX

Note: The Arabic letters ‘ and ’, as well as the Arabic definite article *al-* are ignored alphabetically.

- Abaq (Uvaq) of Damascus 144, 164, 165, 167, 169, 173, 283
- Abbasids 170, 198, 235, 279, *see also* names of individual Caliphs
- Abu al-‘Asakir Sultan of Shayzar 42
- Abu Bakr al-Hajib, envoy 264
- Abu al-Fada’il b. Badi’, Ra’is 119, 124
- Abu al-Fath, Qadi of Sarmin 68
- Abu Shama 61, 128
- Abu Tahir (Aleppo) 69
- Acre 14, 76, 77, 79, 81, 97, 132, 147, 248, 258, 262–3, 295
- Adhemar of Le Puy, Bishop 21, 25, 29
- al-‘Adid, Fatimid Caliph 188, 191, 197, 198, 305
- al-‘Adil, *see* al-Malik al-‘Adil (brother of Saladin)
- al-‘Adl, envoy 259
- al-Afdal, Fatimid Wazir 17, 35, 36, 44, 45–50, 51–3, 56, 84–5, 88, 268, 287
- ‘Afrin, river 249
- Agnes of Courtenay 231
- ahdath see* militia
- Ahmad b. Marwan (Antioch) 33, 35
- Ahmad-II of Maragha 96
- ‘Akkar (Hisn)/Gibelacar 87
- Akshehir *see* Philomelium
- Al Jarrah, tribe 87
- Albara *see* al-Bara
- Albert of Aix 34, 37, 38, 39, 67, 282, 307
- on Baldwin 86
- on Bohemond 68, 284
- on Famiya treaty 69
- on Frankish-Fatimid treaties 76, 77, 78, 79
- on Latin terminology in treaties 296, 297
- on treatment of Muslim population 81, 82
- on treaty between Baldwin and Ertash 84
- on Tughtegin’s attack on Sidon 89
- Aleppo 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, 56, 91, 93, 98, 99, 101, 231, 270, 283, 313
- Antioch and 63–70, 91, 102, 103, 111, 221, 224, 234, 243
- Baldwin II and 114
- Byzantine siege of 139, 141, 183
- ‘counter-Crusade’ 107–21
- Damascus and 18, 71, 102–3, 150, 169
- Edessa and 111, 148
- governor of 15
- Jerusalem and 150
- Mosul and 123, 127, 129–31
- rapprochement with Hims 71
- Saladin and 213, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 233–4, 236, 237, 239, 241, 242, 243–4, 245, 246, 267
- siege of 119–20, 129
- tribute paid by 64, 66, 68, 102, 108–9
- Turkish detachment from 40
- Alexander, legate 25
- Alexander III, Pope 244
- Alexandria, city of 189, 191, 193, 206, 213
- Alexius Comnenus, Emperor 21, 23, 24–5, 26, 43, 47, 52, 54
- ‘Ali b. Muqallid b. Munqidh 11–12
- ‘Ali b. Wafa’ of Masyaf 161
- Alice of Antioch 133, 134
- Almohads 240
- Alp Arslan of Aleppo 125
- Alphonse-Jourdain of Toulouse, Count 155, 160–1
- Altintash, governor of Hawran 84, 151–4, 166
- Amalric I, King of Jerusalem 59, 177–8, 179, 184, 186, 193–201, 203, 210, 212, 214, 219, 226, 244, 283, 288–9, 296, 298, 310
- death of 205–6, 213, 216, 221
- embassy to Constantinople led by 209, 211
- Fatimid alliance 298
- grant of *iqta’* 288, 289
- siege of Baniyas 215–16
- titles 206
- treaty with Egypt 283
- treaty with Manuel Comnenus 222
- Amalric II, King of Jerusalem 309
- aman* (guarantee of safety) 41, 45, 69, 81, 90, 278, 293, 295, 300
- Ambroise 259, 307
- amicitia* 46, 123, 277, 284, 296, 297

- Amid/Diyar Bakr 12  
 al-'Amid Mukhtar al-Din, Ra'is 205  
 'Ammar, Banu (Tripoli) 43, 65, *see also*  
 Fakhr al-Mulk; Jalal al-Mulk  
 'Amrun of Kahf 20  
 Anatolia 12, 21, 23, 26, 47, 95, 116, 148, 170,  
 184, 208, 230  
 Antartus/Tortosa 43, 80, 137  
 Antioch, principality of 11, 13, 14, 18,  
 25–6, 28, 40, 48, 93, 94, 99, 113, 123, 138,  
 265, 270  
 Aleppo and 63–70, 91, 102, 103, 111, 221,  
 224, 234, 243  
 alliance policy of 151  
 Ayyubid sovereignty over 290  
 Baldwin II and 112, 114, 122, 127, 133  
 Byzantines and 184  
 capture of 21, 35, 36  
 Edessa and 66, 70, 71, 116, 122, 127, 148,  
 224  
 governor of 16  
 Hospitallers and 226–7  
 Jerusalem and 122, 166, 178, 231–2  
 Leon II and 270  
 Nizaris and 161, 162  
 Nur al-Din and 175, 182, 207, 208  
 patriarch of 65, 121, 190–1, 313  
 pillaged 108  
 raids on Shayzar 111  
 reduced territory of 146  
 Ridwan and 101  
 Saladin and 242  
 siege of 24, 27, 54, 139  
 and siege of Harim 223  
 Tancred's regency of 64, 65, 73  
 Turkish lord of 33  
 Tyre and 122  
 Zengids 135–6, 168, 175, *see also*  
 Bohemond I etc  
 Antiquity 31, 32, 277  
 Apamea *see* Famiya  
 al-Aqsa Mosque, Jerusalem 207, 242  
 Aqsunqur al-Bursuqi of Mosul 98–9,  
 102–5, 110–11, 112, 116, 118–20, 123, 125  
 Aqsunqur of Aleppo 15, 16  
 al-'Arayma/Arima 160, 161, 162, 163  
 Archis *see* 'Arqa  
 Arcican *see* Arzaghan  
 al-'Arish 232  
 Armenia 19, 37, 44, 85, 96, 116, 127, 160,  
 183, 206, 259, 270, 275  
 armistices 34, 67–8, 78, 87, 108, 112, 118,  
 119, 138, 153, 162, 171, 172, 238, 278, 282,  
 285, 286, 290, *see also* truces  
 Arnulf of Chocques, legate 25, 73  
 'Arqa/Archis 28, 45, 46, 49, 52, 53, 54  
 siege of (1099) 24–5, 27, 41, 42, 43,  
 207, 281  
 Arslantash of Sinjar 93  
 Arsuf/Arsur 76, 77, 78, 81, 134, 263  
 Artah/Artasia, battle of (1191) 65  
 Artuq, Amir 14  
 Artuqids of Jerusalem 19, 48, 49, 50, 72,  
 76–80, 116, 117, 124, 129, 142, 183, 220, 221  
 Arzaghan/Arcican 249  
 Arzan al-Rum 285–6  
 Ascalon 10, 48, 52, 73, 77, 78, 81, 84–6, 89,  
 90, 105, 122, 134, 146–7, 165, 166, 171, 258,  
 260, 265, 287, 312  
 Asfuna, attack on (1104) 71, 130  
 asylum 69–70, 124, 125, 152, *see also*  
 refuge  
 atabegs 16n30, 17, 72, 76, 83, 93, 128,  
 137, 152, *see also* Mawdud; Tughtegin;  
 Bazwaj  
 al-Atharib/Cerepum 66, 108, 110, 111–12,  
 113, 118, 129, 130, 142  
 Atiya, A.S. 92  
 Atsiz b. Abaq, Amir 10–11, 80, 88, 100, 193  
 al-'Awasim 64  
 Ayaz b. Ilghazi 97  
 Ayla/Elim 204  
 Aytegin, governor of Busra 84–5  
 Ayyubids 2, 51, 60, 128, 131, 176  
 expansionism 213–45  
 Franks and 246–67, 270–1  
 Jerusalem and 205, 312  
 power struggles 268, 274, 275  
 propaganda 62  
 suzerainty 243, 252, 259, 262, 266  
 in thirteenth century 269–75, *see also*  
 Saladin  
 'Azaz/Hazor 38–9, 40, 64, 65, 67, 102, 108,  
 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 118, 119, 220  
 al-'Azimi 137, 147  
 Babalu, fortress of 148  
 Badr al-Dawla Sulayman 110, 112, 119  
 Badr al-Jamali, Fatimid Wazir 14, 193  
 Badran b. Sadaqa 124  
 Baghdad 15, 67, 98–100, 102, 109, 141–3,  
 150, 170, 198, 226, 228, 235, 236, 239, 240,  
 241, 279  
 Bahram, Fatimid Wazir 197  
 Bahram, leader of the Nizaris 120  
 Ba'labakk 14n22, 72, 83–5, 100, 128, 132,  
 138, 143, 144, 146, 149, 165, 169–70, 175,  
 217, 226, 279

- Balduq, Amir of Sumaysat 37, 116
- Baldwin I, King of Jerusalem (and Count of Edessa) 27, 28, 36, 37–8, 40, 44, 59, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 84, 88, 96, 97, 101, 103, 116, 121, 122, 155, 296  
policy on Muslim captives 82–3  
treaties 85, 282, 283, 295  
truce with Tughtegin 86–7
- Baldwin II, King of Jerusalem (and Count of Edessa) 65–6, 70, 93, 95, 97, 112, 106, 108, 111, 116, 117, 118, 120, 121, 122, 125, 166, 189, 310  
Antioch 133  
imprisonment of 105, 113–14  
mediation for release 123–4, 126  
regency of Antioch 112, 114, 122, 127  
siege of Aleppo 123, 129
- Baldwin III, King of Jerusalem 151, 152, 154, 156, 157, 164, 166, 169, 170, 171, 177, 180, 181, 183
- Baldwin IV, King of Jerusalem 60, 178, 205, 206, 213, 214, 220, 226, 227, 228, 229, 231, 232–3, 235, 237–8, 245, 248, 264
- Baldwin V, King of Jerusalem 247, 248, 251, 266
- Baldwin of Marash 150
- Baldwin of Ramla 251
- Balian of Nablus 259, 260, 261, 266, 303, 310
- Balian of Sidon 272
- Balikh, battle of (1104) 65
- Balis 226, 159
- ban on fortifications 227, 245, 305, 312
- Banias/Valenium 79, 81, 90, 120, 132, 140, 142, 144, 147, 165, 171, 172, 180, 199, 215, 235, 289
- al-Bara/Albara 40, 48  
bishop of 11–12, 26–7
- Ba'rin/Montferrand 135, 137, 138, 140, 285
- barons' party 214, 231, 233, 246, 247–9, 251, 252, 255, 257, 259  
Saladin and 261–3, 266–8, 286, 290,  
*see also* Raymond III of Tripoli
- Barqa 205
- bay'a* 307, *see also* oath of fealty
- Baybars, Mamluk Sultan 269, 274, 275, 290, 292, 295, 308, 311, 316, 318
- Baysan/Bethsan 242
- Bayt al-Ahzan/Le Chastellet 227, 229
- Bayt Jibrin/Bethgibelin 147
- Bazwaj, Atabeg 136–7
- Beaufort *see* Shaqif Arnun
- Bedouins 16, 20, 78, 111, 164, 204, 253
- Beirut 14n22, 15n24, 54, 55, 79, 80, 90, 132, 160, 234, 259, 261, 269, 274, 275, 291, 293, 295, 301
- Belek (nephew of Ilghazi) 37, 110, 113, 116, 117
- Belfort *see* Shaqif Arnun
- Belne, river 313
- Belvoir *see* Kawkab
- Ben-Ami 59, 91
- Berbers 85
- Berkyaruq, Seljuk Sultan 15–16, 93
- Bernard Vacher, envoy 153, 303
- Bertram of Scabrica, envoy 44
- Bertrand, Count of Tripoli 87, 105, 160–1
- Bertrand of Blanchefort 184
- Bethlehem 74
- Bethgibelin *see* Bayt Jibrin
- Bethsan *see* Baysan
- Bible 32, 223, 307
- Bikisra'il, siege of (1111) 69
- Bilbays 187, 188, 190, 194
- Biqa' 87, 105, 165, 220
- al-Bissa, battle of (1099) 45, 47, 52, 73
- Blanchegarde *see* Tall al-Safiyya
- Blois, Count of 27, 28
- Bohemond I, Prince of Antioch 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41, 63–5, 68, 73, 283, 284
- Bohemond II, Prince of Antioch 119, 121, 127, 133
- Bohemond III, Prince of Antioch 182, 199, 206, 222, 223, 224, 228, 231–2, 243, 245, 246, 252, 261, 266, 270, 285, 286, 290 and Saladin 287, 290
- Bohemond IV, Prince of Antioch 270, 271, 274
- Bohemond VII of Tripoli 315
- booty 75, 82, 97, 98, 101, 105, 107, 112, 125, 136, 147, 154, 165, 171, 173, 180, 189, 193, 194, 200, 211, 237, 242, 243, 245, 303
- Buhturids 19, 291, 293, 304
- Buisson, L. 277
- Burids of Damascus 66, 132, 167, 189, 282–3, *see also* Isma'il; Jamal al-Din; al-Mazdaqani; Mujir al-Din; Sevinj; Shihab al-Din; Taj al-Muluk; Tughtegin; Unur
- Bursuq b. Bursuq of Hamdhan 91, 96, 99, 102, 103, 104, 121, 145, 296
- Busra 72, 84, 85, 89, 132, 152, 153, 164, 166, 168
- Buza'a 17, 139
- Buzan, Seljuk Amir 15, 16
- Byblus *see* Jubayl

- Byzantium 7, 8–9, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29,  
 30, 64, 65, 68, 136–42, 145, 148, 161, 173,  
 280  
 Ayyubid treaty 232  
 Cyprus and 316  
 Egypt and 204, 205  
 First Crusade and 47, 50, 51, 52, 53  
 Frankish alliance 177, 179, 181–4, 193,  
 194, 195, 200–1, 207, 209–11, 222–3,  
 246  
 Jerusalem and 151, 200–1  
 Norman clashes with 68  
 robes of honour 285  
 Saladin and 230  
 weakness of 18
- Caesarea/Qaysariyya 14, 77, 80–1, 290  
 Caffaro 81  
 Cahen, Cl. 70, 93, 107  
 Cairo 19, 43, 45, 48, 50, 74, 75, 150, 152,  
 179, 185, 186, 187, 189, 193, 195, 197, 201,  
 205, 210, 274, 283, 304  
 Canaan 34  
 canon law 263, 294, 309  
 Capharda *see* Kafartab  
 caravan-routes 83, 102, 106, 121, 208, 232,  
 252  
 Castel Neuf *see* Hunin  
 Castile, kingdom of 284, 319  
 Cave de Sueth *see* Habis Jaldak  
 Caymont *see* Tall Qaymun  
 Cerepum *see* al-Atharib  
 Chalandon, F. 177  
 Charlemagne, Emperor 178  
 Le Chastellet *see* Bayt al-Ahzan  
 chivalry 29, 33, 55, 126, 192, 290  
 Chokurmish, Amir of Mosul 65, 94, 95,  
 100  
 Crac des Chevalliers *see* Hisn al-Akrad  
 Christendom 3, 29, 60, 61, 109, 119, 162,  
 254  
 Christian slaves 61, 165  
 Christianity 18, 20, 31, 32  
 chivalry and 290  
 in Jerusalem 50  
 oath-taking 69, 223, 307–9  
 propaganda 29–30, 34, 55, *see also*  
 religious conversion  
*Chronicon ad A.C. 1234* 37, 124, 126  
 Church of the Holy Sepulchre, Jerusalem  
 22, 49, 50, 73, 74, 178, 209  
 Cilicia 11, 26, 44, 64, 138, 148, 177, 181, 182,  
 183  
 Civetot, on Sea of Marmara 21
- commercial treaties 204, 294, 295, 298,  
 303  
 condominia (*munasafat*) 61, 85, 111, 123,  
 212, 225, 227, 303  
 agrarian division 87, 317, 318  
 Antioch and Aleppo 224  
 Damascus and Jerusalem 101, 112  
 early 86, 88, 90  
 east Jordan territories 106, 236  
 formation and function of 112, 305,  
 312–19  
 Harim 129  
 Jabal Summaq 118–19  
 under Saladin 238, 242, 243, 249, 261,  
 263, 264–5, 290  
 Transjordan 132  
 waters near Hims 137, *see also* peace  
 treaties; treaties; truces  
 Conrad III of Germany 155, 156, 157, 158  
 Conrad of Montferrat 258, 259, 261,  
 262–3, 264, 287  
 Constance of Antioch 177  
 Constantine of Gargar 37  
 Constantinople 23, 24, 151, 155, 178, 209,  
 240  
 conversion 14, 35–6, 39, 40, 42, 55, 70,  
 210, 255, 281, 285–6, 289  
 corn imports 85, 295  
 Council of Clermont 21, 22, 23, 27, 34  
 Council of Piacenza 21, 23  
 ‘counter-Crusade’ 90–127, 134, 202n95,  
 299  
 court party 214, 222–3, 231–3, 238, 244,  
 246, 247, 249, 251–2, 253, 256, 257, 258,  
 259, 261, 266  
 court poetry 203  
 Crac *see* al-Karak  
 Crac des Chevaliers *see* Hisn al-Akrad  
 crucifix, and oath-taking 223, 307  
 crucifixion 143  
 Crusade, First 9, 17, 61, 73, 267, 275, 282,  
 287, 294  
 conflict of interests 26–7  
 cooperation between Lorrainers and  
 Turks 36–40  
 food supplies 79  
 missionary enterprise of 34–6  
 motivations for 21–9  
 ‘People’s Crusade’ 21  
 regional diplomacy 36–44  
 supra-regional diplomacy 44–57  
 treaties 21, 34–5, 37–9, 40, 41–4, 45,  
 47–8, 50, 54, 55–7  
 tributes 280–1

- Crusade, Second 59, 83, 151, 155–62, 163, 167, 173, 175–6, 225, 269
- Crusade, Third 60, 241, 247, 258, 260, 262, 267, 271, 312
- Crusade, Fifth (Damietta Crusade) 269, 271, 273, 292, 307, 309
- Crusade, Seventh (St Louis's Crusade) 272, 274, 275, 286, 289, 290, 299, 308, 310
- Crusade, Eighth (Tunis) 292, 298
- Cutler, A. 36
- Cyprus 43, 47, 294, 316
- Cyrenaica 205
- al-Dahhak b. Jandal al-Tamimi of Shaqif Tirun 133
- Daimbert of Pisa, Archbishop 25, 73–4, 81, 281
- Damascus 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 48–9, 56, 60, 61, 68, 72, 81, 99, 180, 212, 273, 291, 299
- Aleppo and 18, 71, 102–3, 150, 169
- 'counter-Crusades' 100–7, 121
- Egypt and 14n23, 76, 93, 105–6, 274
- Franks and 93, 130–1, 238
- Ibn al-Muqaddam and 213
- Jerusalem and 83–9, 90, 101, 106, 112, 120, 133, 142–4, 146–8, 149, 151, 152, 160, 162, 165–6, 173, 174, 189, 215–16, 282, 290, 295, 298, 311
- Nur al-Din and 278, 279
- Saladin and 216–17, 219, 221, 280
- Saladin's brother as governor of 221
- Second Crusade 156–61, 163
- Zengids and 130, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 143, 164, 168–74, 175, 212, 213, 278–9, 282–3
- Damietta/Dumyat 198, 207, 272
- siege of (1169) 176, 177, 178, 200
- dar al-da'wa* 235
- Dar al-Islam* 204, 278, 300, 309, 311, 321
- darb al-hajj* 208
- al-Darum/Daron 204, 248, 253, 264
- deditio in fidem* 277
- dhimma* 261, 278, 282
- Dietrich, Count of Flanders 156, 157, 160, 180
- diploma of appointment 15, 105, 129, 131, 149, 197, 215, 236, 239, 242, 279, 285, 290
- diploma of honour 279
- Dirgham, Fatimid Wazir 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 202, 212, 298
- Dome of the Rock, Jerusalem 264
- Druze of Jabal Summaq 20
- Dubays b. Sadaqa, Amir 105, 111, 114, 115–17, 118, 119, 124, 125, 129, 287
- Duqaq b. Tutush of Damascus 16–17, 18, 42, 47, 48, 71, 72, 83, 89
- Easter 49, 74, 77, 78, 226, 228, 231, 264, 299
- Ebremar, Patriarch 75, 82
- Edessa, county of 14, 19, 28, 50, 60, 65, 66, 68, 86, 87, 96, 97, 100, 122, 282
- Aleppo and 111, 148
- Antioch and 66, 70, 71, 116, 122, 148, 224
- governor of 15
- Jerusalem and 166
- Lorrainers in 28, 36, 63, 71
- Mawdud and 97, 98, 99, 100, 101
- Tancred and 65
- Turks and 59, 86, 96
- Zengi and 60, 128, 150, 155, 176
- Egypt 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 17, 18, 36, 61, 72, 136, 177, 213, 215, 222–3, 230, 232, 242, 253, 267, 271, 281–2, 282, 283, 292, 295, 298, 299, 303
- alliance policy 212
- Ascalon 147
- Damascus and 14n23, 76, 93, 105–6, 274
- financial situation 230
- Franks and 29, 44–57, 84, 179–212
- Jerusalem and 88, 105–6, 171, 186, 295
- jihad* 170–1
- Mamluks and 269, 272, 273, 274, 285
- non-payment of tribute 186, 194
- Nur al-Din and 181, 182
- robes of honour 285
- Saladin and 179, 221, 234, 235, 245, 250, 279
- Shirkuh's campaign in 175, 187, 188, 190–201, 207, 209
- treaties 283, 299
- tribute-payments 185, 187, 188, 189, 190, 196, 199, 264
- Ekkehard of Aura 30, 31, 38, 49
- Elim *see* Ayla
- Elinand, Prince of Tiberias 157
- enfeoffments 69, 70, 116, 260, 265, 288–90, 291, 321
- England 177, 178, 222, 251, 255, 300
- English chronicles 248, 258, 259
- English pilgrims 82
- 'entry into obedience' (*al-dukhul fi al-ta'a*) 285, 286, 291

- envoys 24, 38, 41, 42, 118, 127, 142, 155, 185,  
 205, 228, 235  
 Arabic speakers 303  
 authority of 165  
 Frankish and Fatimid 44–50, 52–3  
 immunity of 34  
 murder of 148, 210  
 oath-taking 302, 305, 306  
 presenting gifts 182  
 safe conduct for 278, 293  
 treaties and 302  
 written credentials 302, *see also*  
 Abu Bakr al-Hajib; al-'Adl; Bernard  
 Vacher; Bertram of Scabrica; George  
 the scribe; Hugh of Bellafayre; Ibn  
 al-Anbari; Mahmud (Hajib); Peter of  
 Picca  
 Ernoul chronicle 187, 227, 236, 248, 251,  
 252, 257, 287, 312  
 Ertash, brother of Duqaq b. Tutush 83–4  
 Eugenius III, Pope 155  
 Euphrates River 15, 65, 68  
 exile 84, 116, 124, 152  
  
 Fadlallah al-'Umari 293  
 Fakhr al-Din, Ayyubid Amir 289  
 Fakhr al-Mulk b. 'Ammar of Tripoli 79,  
 88, 91, 96, 99, 100, 125, *see also* 'Ammar,  
 Banu  
 famine 221, 248, 253, 295  
 Famiya/Apamea 14, 15, 18, 65, 68–9, 70,  
 71, 80, 125, 130, 249, 288  
 Faqus, Frankish attack on 248  
 Farrukhshah (nephew of Saladin) 229,  
 234  
 fasting 10, 308  
 Fatimids 9, 10–11, 12, 14, 17, 19, 20, 31, 56,  
 76, 282, 294, 295, 298  
 Ascalon 84, 85  
 diplomacy 44–57  
 weakness of 18, *see also* Egypt  
*fatwa* 131, 273, 308, 309, 311  
 Ferdinand III of Castile 284  
 feudal system 33, 65, 73, 116, 122, 137, 155,  
 166, 177, 183, 189, 259–60, 277, 280, 286,  
 287–90, 306, 317, *see also* oath of fealty;  
 vassalage  
 fieff 69, 70, 73, 114, 116, 132, 159, 160, 185,  
 187, 193, 194, 231, 245, 251, 255, 260, 261,  
 262, 287, 288–9, 312, 317, 319, 321, *see*  
*also* *iqtas*  
 Field of Blood, battle of the (119) 108,  
 109  
 Firuz (Antioch) 35  
 fishing-rights 137  
 Flemish troops 41, 79, 82, 222, 225  
 Forey, A.J. 159  
 France 54, 178, 186, 222, 251, 300, 317,  
*see also* individual kings of France  
 Frederick Barbarossa 204, 206  
 Frederick II, Emperor 50–1, 270–1, 272,  
 273, 289, 292, 305  
 Fulcher of Chartres 26, 29, 38, 81, 104,  
 107, 109, 114, 296  
 Fulcher of Jerusalem (Patriarch) 155–6  
 Fulk, king of Jerusalem (and count of  
 Anjou) 122, 130, 133, 134, 137, 138, 140,  
 144, 145, 147, 151, 153, 166, 285  
 al-Fustat 195  
  
 Gabula *see* Jabala  
 Galilee, principality of 72, 73, 78, 83, 86,  
 97–8, 102, 106, 132, 208, 231, 242  
 Gaza 10, 171, 274  
 Genoa 75, 82, 85, 304  
 Genoese fleet 77, 80, 81  
 Geoffrey, Duke of Lower Lorraine 28  
 Geoffrey Fulcher 184  
 George the scribe, envoy 205, 303  
 Georgians 108, 115  
 Geresa *see* Jarash  
 Gerhoh of Reichersberg 157  
 Germanic feudal law 317  
 Gervase of Bazoches, lord of Tiberias 86  
*Gesta Francorum* 22, 26, 30, 32, 33, 40,  
 42–3  
 Gharb, district of 19, 291, 293, 304  
 Ghibellines 275  
*ghuzz* 191, 193, 196–203  
 Gibb, H.A.R. 8, 92  
 Gibelacar *see* 'Akkar  
 Gilbert of Assailly 193, *see also*  
 Hospitallers  
 Godfrey of Bouillon 26, 28, 36, 38–40,  
 73–9, 281, 282, 283, 295  
 Granada, kingdom of 284, 319  
 Greek chroniclers 200  
 Greek Orthodox 11–12, 73, 177  
 Greeks 47, 51, 184, 211  
 'Green Knight' 257, 289  
 Grousset, R. 59, 91, 128–9  
 guarantee of safety *see aman*  
 Guelfs 270, 275, 305  
 Guibert of Nogent 30, 33, 85  
 Gulf of 'Aqaba 204  
 Gümüshtegin, governor of Hawran/  
 Damascus 84, 85, 152  
 Gümüshtegin of Aleppo 213, 216, 217, 223

- Guy II, lord of Beirut 160  
 Guy of Lusignan (later King of Jerusalem)  
 214, 229, 231, 233, 242, 247–8, 251, 252–3,  
 254, 266, 310  
 coronation of 255  
 court party and 256  
 reconciliation with Raymond III 257  
 and Richard Lionheart 259  
 robe of honour from Saladin 285
- Hab, district of 111  
 Habis Jaldak/Cave de Sueth 86, 87, 106,  
 235, 236  
 al-Hafiz, Fatimid Caliph 150  
 Hafsids of Tunis 316  
 Haifa 80, 81, 86  
 Hajji b. Karama, Amir of the Gharb 293  
 Hamah 19, 69, 91, 122–3, 129, 130, 131, 133,  
 135, 139, 149, 159, 217, 223, 224, 226, 234  
 Hanafis 154, 278 *see also* al-Kasani;  
 al-Sarakhsi  
 handshakes 188, 256, 300, 305, 306–7, 309  
 Harim/Harenc 170, 180, 217, 234  
 battle of (1164) 162, 178, 184, 199  
 sieges of 129, 180, 223–4, 227, 228  
 Harran 13, 65, 130  
 Hattin, battle of (1187) 60, 246, 247,  
 250–1, 253, 254  
 Haute Cour 233  
 Hawran territories 84, 132, 144, 151, 152,  
 153, 154, 156, 157, 163, 166, 180, 208, 319  
 Hazor *see* 'Azaz  
 Hebron 80  
 Henry II, King of England 178  
 Henry VI, Emperor 261, 269  
 Henry of Champagne 259–60, 261, 262,  
 269, 285  
 Henry the Lion 225  
 Heraclius, Patriarch of Jerusalem  
 (Archbishop of Caesarea) 178, 231, 251  
 Herluin, interpreter 34  
 Hijaz 10, 106, 208, 232  
 Hijri calendar 302, 304, 308  
 Hilla 11, 115  
 Hims 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 42, 63, 64, 69, 79,  
 83, 93, 99, 122, 126, 133, 135, 136, 143, 149,  
 158, 162, 165, 199, 217, 218, 271  
 as dowry 140  
 rapprochement with Aleppo 70, 71, 72  
 Saladin and 217, 218  
 sieges of 122, 137, 138, 139  
 Hisn al-Akrad/Crac des Chevalliers 41,  
 42, 180, 270  
 Hisn Kayfa 142, 221
- Historia belli sacri* 35, 44, 49, 287  
 Holt, P.M. 303, 305  
 Holy Lance 27, 36  
 homage 24, 33, 255, 256, 257, 279  
 Hospitallers 189, 193, 194, 195, 226, 227,  
 270, 292, 295, 313, 316  
 hostages 34, 37, 38, 39, 55, 56, 67, 76–7,  
 103, 113, 114, 115, 118, 122, 124, 125, 126,  
 144, 187, 217, 218, 219, 238, 277, 296, 300,  
 305–6  
 Hugh of Bellafayre, envoy 44  
 Hugh of Jaffa 122, 133–4  
 Hugh of Tiberias 82  
 Hugh of Vermandois 26  
 Humphrey IV of Toron 259, 261, 303  
 Hunin/Castel Neuf 199, 229, 238  
 Husam al-Din Lu'lu' 239
- Ibelin *see* Yubna  
 Ibn 'Abd al-Salam al-Sulami, jurist 273  
 Ibn 'Abd al-Zahir 4, 268  
 Ibn Abi Tayy' 64, 82, 167, 187, 190, 191,  
 193, 194, 288  
 Ibn al-'Adim 4, 39, 63, 102, 104, 109, 113,  
 161  
 Ibn al-Anbari, envoy 130  
 Ibn 'Asakir 203  
 Ibn al-Athir 4, 52, 61, 87, 91, 95, 128, 129,  
 130, 131, 136–7, 143, 145, 158, 159, 161, 165,  
 167, 168, 176, 187, 188, 193–4, 216, 236,  
 257, 288, 296  
 Ibn Danishmend, Amir 64, 68, 116, 284  
 Ibn Fadlallah al-'Umari 309  
 Ibn al-Furat 290  
 Ibn al-Hutayti (Aleppo) 11, 13  
 Ibn Jubayr 243, 256, 280  
 Ibn al-Khashshab, Qadi 64, 99, 109–10,  
 117, 125  
 Ibn al-Mawsul 124  
 Ibn Munir, poet xii, 128, 170, 203  
 Ibn al-Muqaddam 213, 216, 226, 228,  
 279–80, 296  
 Ibn Muyassar 52  
 Ibn Nazif al-Hamawi 270  
 Ibn al-Qalanisi 1, 4, 8, 41, 69, 84, 85, 86,  
 87, 98, 100, 104, 135, 136, 138, 145, 147, 153,  
 166, 170–1, 278, 288, 297–8, 313  
 Ibn al-Qaysarani, poet xii, 128, 132, 170,  
 203  
 Ibn Shaddad, Baha' al-Din 4, 257, 259,  
 264  
 Ibn Shaddad, 'Izz al-Din 4, 64  
 Ibn al-Shahrazuri, Kamal al-Din, Qadi  
 141–2, 249

- Ibn Sulayha, Ra'is 18  
 Ibn Tekish, Prince 69–70  
 Ibn Wasil 131, 176, 271  
 Ibn Zafir 51  
 Ibrahim, Nizari *da'i* 125  
 Ibrahim b. Ridwan of Aleppo 119  
 al-Idrisi 4, 137  
 Ilghazi b. Artuq of Mardin 48, 76, 94, 96,  
     99, 102–3, 105, 108, 109–13, 115, 116, 122,  
     123, 124, 125  
 'Imad al-Din Zengi II of Sinjar 234, 241–2  
 Inab, battle of (1149) 161, 163  
 Innocent III, Pope 269  
*iqta'* 14, 19, 35n98, 72, 85, 95, 100, 102, 129,  
     144, 187, 198, 199, 240, 260, 267, 288–91,  
     318, 321, *see also* fief  
     'Green Knight' 257  
     Harim 223  
     Raymond III of Tripoli 256  
     Reynold of Sidon 258  
     subjection and 279–80  
 Iran 12, 268, *see also* Persia  
 Iraq 13, 69, 72, 105, 114, 115, 120, 124  
 'Isa (brother of lord of Manbij) 116–17  
 Isaac Angelus, Emperor 255–6  
 Isabella of Jerusalem 251, 259  
 Isabella of Ibelin (Lady of Beirut) 274,  
     275, 295  
 Isidore of Seville 34  
 Islam 3, 4, 5, 10, 14, 29, 117, 254  
     European understanding of 30–4  
     Friday prayers 17, 46, 141  
     oath-taking 307–8, 309  
     perjury in 309–10  
     unification of 60, 61, 62, 71, 88–9, 98,  
     100, 101, 109, 118, 119, 120, 123, 177, 215,  
     *see also* *jihad*  
 Islamic law 36n101, 92, 154, 204, 210,  
     277–8, 298–300, 302–3, 308, 309, 311,  
     318, 321  
 Isma'il b. Buri, Shams al-Muluk 133, 135  
 Israelites 34, 34n92  
 Italian city-states 280, 293, 295, 303  
 Iveta 125, 126  
 'Izz al-Din Jawali 243–5  
 'Izz al-Din Mas'ud of Mosul 234, 249,  
     258  
 'Izz al-Mulk Anushtegin, governor of  
     Tyre 89  
  
 Jabal 'Amila 171, 288  
 Jabal 'Awf, district of 86–7  
 Jabal Bahra, fortress of 20, 128, 161, 169,  
     175, 210  
  
 Jabal Summaq 20, 111, 112, 113, 118  
 Jabala/Gabula 18, 69, 81, 82, 90, 280, 288,  
     313  
 al-Jabaniyya, district of 87  
 Jacques de Vitry, Bishop of Acre 269  
 Jaffa 73, 74, 76, 77, 260, 264, 265, 272,  
     274, 275, 287, 290, 312  
 Jalal al-Mulk b. 'Ammar of Tripoli 15, 42,  
     43, 281, *see also* 'Ammar, Banu  
 Jamal al-Din Muhammad Buri of  
     Damascus 143, 144  
 Janah al-Dawla of Hims 16, 17, 18, 42, 48,  
     64, 71, 83  
 Jarash/Geresia 106  
 Jawali Saqao of Mosul 65, 66, 70, 95, 98,  
     121, 123, 124, 141, 145, 243–5  
 Jawlan 86, 319  
 al-Jazr 113  
 Jean de Joinville 308, 313  
 Jehosaphat (Josaphat), Valley of 194, 317  
 Jerusalem, kingdom of 14, 17, 19, 22–3,  
     24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 35, 45, 53, 66, 72, 73–7,  
     175, 267–75, 282  
     Aleppo and 150  
     Antioch and 122, 166, 178, 231–2  
     al-Aqsa Mosque in 207  
     Arabic speakers 304  
     Artuqid phase 76–80  
     Ascalon and 84–6, 89  
     Ayyubids 312  
     Byzantium and 151, 177, 178, 181, 184  
     Cairo and 205  
     conflict with king and pilgrims 174  
     Philip, Count of Flanders 222, 225  
     Damascus and 83–9, 90, 101, 106, 112,  
     120, 133, 142–4, 146–8, 149, 151, 152–4,  
     162, 165–6, 170, 173, 174, 189, 215–16,  
     290, 295, 298, 311  
     Edessa and 166  
     Egypt and Fatimids 46, 48–50, 52, 56,  
     88, 105–6, 171, 186, 196, 295  
     enthronement of Baldwin IV 60  
     fortifications 147, 305  
     Frankish expansion towards the coast  
     80–3  
     influence of Byzantine culture on 209  
     legal works of 294  
     Mawdud against 97  
     party quarrels within 231, 232, 244,  
     247–8, 247–50, 253, 262, 266  
     pilgrims free access to 44, 52  
     rebellion against Turcomans 10  
     regency of 213, 214, 217, 219  
     request for help 184

- Richard Lionheart and 264  
 Saladin and 204, 205–6, 207, 209–11,  
 228, 229, 230, 231, 232–3, 236, 237,  
 242–3, 250–1, 282, 295, 311  
 Second Crusade and 155–9  
 technically difficult to besiege 49n138  
 Third Crusade and 258, 262, 264  
 in thirteenth century 271–3  
 Tripoli and 122  
 weakness of 230, 237–8  
 Zengis and 165
- Jews 307, 318
- jihād/jihād* propaganda 3, 18, 61, 117–19,  
 171, 246, 267, 271, 273, 321  
 Ayyubid 262  
 Mamluks 275  
 Nur al-Din 182–3, 207, 208, 212  
 Saladin 62, 215, 226, 228–9, 228–30,  
 230, 235–47, 249–50, 254, 257, 266–8  
 Zengid 128–31, 135, 141, 142, 167–8, 172,  
 173, *see also* propaganda
- jihād* poetry 181, 197, 202–3, 212
- jizya* (poll-tax) 82, 278, 282
- Joan, Queen of Sicily 263
- John Comnenus, Emperor 136, 138,  
 139–40, 145, 148, 159
- John of Ibelin-Jaffa 275, 290
- Joscelin I, Count of Edessa (*also* lord of  
 Turbessel/Tiberias) 66, 70, 87, 95, 96,  
 97n124, 109, 112, 116, 118, 119, 121, 124, 125,  
 129
- Joscelin II, Count of Edessa 126, 130, 139,  
 140, 141, 148, 150, 151, 162, 172, 285
- Joscelin III, Count of Edessa 220, 251
- Jubayl/Byblus 14, 19, 81, 82, 290
- Judaism 31
- Julian calendar 302, 304
- Julian of Sidon 293, 303–4
- ius gentium* 34
- ius naufragii* 295
- Juyush Beg, lord of Mosul 99
- Kafartab/Capharda 41, 113, 118
- Kalla, battle of (1100) 63
- al-Kamil, *see* al-Malik al-Kamil
- al-Kamil b. Shawar 192, 193, 196, 197
- al-Karak/Crac 207, 208, 242, 245, 247,  
 248, 271
- al-Kasani, jurist 297
- Kawkab/Belvoir 147
- al-Katib al-Isfahani, 'Imad al-Din 4,  
 202–3, 207, 218, 224–5, 226, 235, 241, 255,  
 256, 257, 259, 278, 301
- Khabur, river 13
- Khalaf b. Mula'ib of Hims and Famiya 12,  
 14, 15, 17, 18, 68, 69, 71, 116, 125, 130, 288
- Khanzit 113
- Kharpūt 105
- Khawarazmshah, Jalal al-Din 272
- Khilat 207, 268
- Khurasan 12
- khutba* 17n35, 47, 53n, 273, 278, 280, 283
- Khutlugh, governor 65
- Khutlugh Abah 119
- Kirbogha of Mosul 24, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36,  
 42, 48, 50, 93, 94, 100
- knightly equality 33–4, 55, 144–5, 149, 154
- knightly Orders 60, 195, 227–8, 230, 245,  
 248, 253, 274, 288, 295, 308, *see also*  
 Hospitallers; Templars
- knights/knighthoods 125, 126, 166, 288,  
 289
- Kogh Vasil 65, 68
- Konya, sultanate of 68, 182, 183, 206, 208
- Kutama tribe 85
- la maqām* *see* 'no place'
- Lady of Beirut *see* Isabella of Ibelin 274,  
 275, 295
- Lambert, Bishop of Arras 74
- land grants, *see* fief; *iqta'*
- Langres, bishop of 156
- Latakia/Laodicea 45, 64, 207, 257, 315
- Latin terminology in treaties 296–7
- Laylun, district of 111
- Lebanon 20, 76
- legal system 277–319, 321
- legal theory 277–8, 293–4, 299, 322
- Leon I, Prince 138
- Leon II, King 270
- Leopold V, Duke of Austria 265
- Lilie, R.-J. 51, 52, 177, 179
- loot *see* booty
- Lorrainers 28, 34, 36–40, 64, 65–6, 70, 71,  
 73, 74, 80
- Louis VII, King of France 155–6, 178, 184,  
 191
- Louis IX, King of France 272, *see also*  
 Crusade, Seventh
- loyalty 69, 117, 241, 246, 249, 290, 310
- Lucius III, Pope 244
- Lu'lu' al-Yaya of Aleppo 99, 102, 103, 124
- Lydda 264, 265
- Lydda, bishop of 209
- Ma'arrat al-Nu'man/Marra 26, 27, 28, 40,  
 41, 63, 112, 124
- Maghrib 250

- magistrates 8, 19  
 Mahmud, Hajib (envoy) 181  
 Mahmud, Seljuk Sultan 98, 110  
 Mahmud b. Qaraja of Hamah (d.1124) 122  
 al-Majdal, fortress of 139  
 al-Malik al-'Adil (brother of Saladin) 262, 263, 268, 309  
 al-Malik al-Afdal (son of Saladin) 268  
 al-Malik al-'Aziz of Egypt (son of Saladin) 269  
 al-Malik al-Kamil, Ayyubid Sultan of Egypt 51, 193, 196, 197, 271–3, 289, 307  
 al-Malik al-Mansur of Hamah 241, 242  
 al-Malik al-Mu'azzam of Damascus 272  
 al-Malik al-Mujahid of Hims 271  
 al-Malik al-Nasir Dawud of Damasus/al-Karak 272, 273  
 al-Malik al-Nasir Yusuf of Aleppo 272, 274, 313  
 al-Malik al-Salih Ayyub, Ayyubid Sultan of Egypt 273, 274  
 al-Malik al-Salih Isma'il of Damascus 272, 273  
 al-Malik al-Salih Isma'il b. Nur al-Din of Aleppo 213, 215, 217, 218, 221, 223, 228, 234, 239  
 al-Malik al-Zahir of Aleppo (son of Saladin) 261, 270  
 al-Malik al-Zahir Ghazi of Aleppo 274  
 Malik b. Salim of Qal'at Ja'bar 115, 116, 124, 125  
 Malikshah, Seljuk Sultan 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 23  
 Mamistra *see* al-Massisa  
 Mamluks 2, 268, 269, 272, 274, 275, 290, 291, 292, 295, 303, 304, 307, 308, 309, 311, 315, 318  
 Manasses, Archbishop of Rheims 74  
 Manbij 16, 116  
 Manuel Comnenus, Emperor 177, 181, 182, 183–4, 193, 201, 222, 232  
 al-Maqrizi 181, 187–8, 194–5  
 Maraqiyya/Maraclea 43, 55  
 Marash/Mariscum 13, 150  
 Marda, Banu 19  
 Mardin 61, 96, 99, 103, 113, 116, 122, 143, 221  
 Margaret, Lady of Tyre 292, 295, 312  
 Margarit, Admiral 257  
 Margat *see* al-Marqab  
 Maria of Antioch 177, 184  
 Marino Sanudo 34  
 Mariscum *see* Marash  
 Marj 'Uyun, battle of 229  
 Maronites 20, 290, 293  
 al-Marqab/Margat 108, 316  
 Marra *see* Ma'arrat al-Nu'man  
 massacres 10, 40, 41, 81, 82, 226, 262, 271  
 al-Massisa/Mamistra 28  
 Mas'ud, Seljuk Sultan 98, 142  
 Mas'ud b. Aqsunqur al-Bursuqi of Mosul 101, 104, 120, 127, 129  
 Mas'ud b. Qilij Arslan, Rum Seljuk Sultan of Konya 172  
 Masyaf 41, 87, 161, 220  
 Matthew of Edessa 38, 97, 124, 101  
 Mawdud b. Altintegin of Mosul 66, 67, 70, 76, 87, 90, 94, 95, 96, 99, 100–1, 122, 124  
 'counter-Crusades' under 96–9  
 murder of 103  
 Mayer, H.E. 59, 194  
 Mayyafariqin 96, 116, 118, 183  
 al-Mazdaqani, Burid Wazir 131  
 Mazyad Bedouins 111  
 Mecca 102, 181, 237, 308  
 mediation 123–7, 144, 152, 230, 235, 236, 255, 259, 263  
 Medina 237  
 Melisende, Queen 133, 151, 152, 156  
 Mesopotamia 8, 11, 12, 14, 61, 91, 95, 129, 136, 137, *see also* northern Mesopotamia  
 Michael the Syrian 148, 157, 158, 226  
 Miles of Plancy 194  
 militia, urban (*ahdath*) 8, 11, 13, 19, 67, 143, 166–8, 173, 238  
 miracles 49, 192  
 Mleh, Prince of Armenia 206, 256  
 Möhring, H. 205–6  
 Monaitre *see* al-Munaytira  
 money-payments 42, 77, 163, 189, 190, 212, 216, 221, 235, 248, 280–1, 282, 301, 303, 306, *see also* tribute-payments  
 Mongols 274  
 Mons Regalis *see* al-Shawbak  
 Montferrand *see* Ba'rin  
 Montgisard 223  
 mosques 10, 64, 99, 141, 280, 283  
 demolition of 109, 210  
 Umayyad 101, 163, 273, *see also* al-Aqsa  
 Mosul 11, 66, 93, 95, 121, 150, 207, 224  
 after Nur al-Din's death 213  
 Aleppo and 123, 127, 129–31  
 Franks and 235, 241  
 Nizaris and 235  
 Saladin and 217, 220, 236, 240, 250, 258, 278, 279  
 against Syria 96

- mourning rituals 10  
 Mu'ayyad al-Din b. al-Sufi, Ra'is 164  
 Muhammad, Prophet 30, 46, 192, 308, 318  
 Muhammad, Seljuk Sultan 66, 69, 95, 98, 99, 105, 124  
 Muhammad b. Qalawun, al-Nasir, Mamluk Sultan 293  
 Muhriz, Banu of Qadmus 19  
*mujahids* 92, 94, 104, 128, 168, 196, 226, 228, 235, 266, 268  
 Mujir al-Din Abaq Buri of Damascus 148, 166, 278, 279  
*munasafat*, see *condominia*  
 al-Munaytira/Monaître 87, 125, 199  
 Munqidh, Banu of Shayzar 14, 99, 125, 126–7, see also 'Ali; Murshid; Nasir al-Din; Shayzar; Usama  
 al-Muqtafi, Abbasid Caliph 150, 170, 279  
 Murcia 284  
 murder 148, 210, 317  
 Murshid b. Munqidh 126  
 Muslim b. Quraysh of Mosul/Aleppo 11, 12, 13, 17  
 al-Muslimiyya 64, 65  
 al-Mustadi, Abbasid Caliph 207, 215, 234, 239, 270  
 al-Musta'li, Fatimid Caliph 17  
 al-Mustarshid, Abbasid Caliph 109, 115, 129  
 Mu'tamin al-Khilafa, Fatimid eunuch 198, 200  
  
 Nablus/Neapolis 78, 137, 188, 190, 251, 255, 288  
 Najm al-Din Ayyub (father of Saladin), governor of Damascus 149, 180  
 Nasibin 94, 130  
 al-Nasir, Abbasid Caliph 240  
 Nasir al-Din Jakir 129  
 Nasir al-Din Muhammad b. Munqidh 169  
 al-Nasir Yusuf see al-Malik al-Nasir  
 Neapolis see Nablus  
 neutrality 18, 55–6, 67, 71, 124–6, 219, 220, 263, 277, 297  
 Nicaea 24, 26, 35, 44, 49, 54  
 Nizam al-Mulk, Seljuk Wazir 13  
 Nizaris 20, 67, 68–9, 71, 97, 110, 120, 125, 128, 131, 161, 169, 175, 210, 213, 220, 235, 236, 245, 264, 270, 275  
 'no place' (*la maqam*) doctrine 148, 161, 163, 169, 170, 216, 217, 220, 224, 230, 232, 234  
  
 Egyptian-Frankish treaty relations and 189, 212  
 expansion of 179–212  
 rendered obsolete 262, 267, 268  
 Ridwan of Aleppo 117, 141, 145–6  
 Unur 151, 154, 159, 168  
 William of Tyre 236  
 Zengid 173, 244–7  
 non-aggression pacts 42, 44  
 Normans 23, 25–6, 28, 35, 36, 63–70, 79, 108, 204, 206, 211, 213, 259, 317  
 North Africa 293, 295, 298, 303  
 northern Mesopotamia 7, 11, 44, 94, 97, 99, 105, 107, 112, 127, 131, 148, 180, 200, 207, 208, 212, 213, 228, 230, 234, 239–40, 242, 249–50, 250, 266, 267, see also Mesopotamia  
 Nubia 205  
 Nur al-Din Mahmud (son of Zengi) 59, 60, 61, 128, 149, 150, 153, 157, 160, 161, 162–74, 185, 285, 287  
 assessment of success 176–7  
 Damascus 278, 279, 282  
 death of 176, 179, 203, 205, 206, 208, 213, 234, 238  
 defeat of Antioch 175  
 Egypt and 186–8, 190, 191, 192, 193–4, 195, 196–8, 199–200, 213  
 expansionist policy of 201, 207–8, 214, 268  
 glorification in *jihad* poetry 202–3, 207  
 illness 180  
*jihad* ideology 182–3, 208, 212  
 pilgrimage to Mecca 181  
 policy on Jerusalem 207–9  
 Prince Mleh 256  
 relationship with Saladin 200, 203–6, 209, 210  
 Nusayris of Jabal Bahra 20  
 al-Nuwayri 315–16  
  
 oath of fealty 24, 33, 65, 177, 226, 259, 278, 280, 283, 286, 287  
 oaths/oath-taking 5, 13, 24, 54, 55, 163, 191, 223, 278, 279, 296, 304, 322  
 Baldwin II 115  
 breach of 114, 186  
 Christian 69, 223, 307–9  
 Conrad of Montferrat 259  
 to give armed assistance 144  
 Islamic 307–8, 309  
 language of 305  
 liberation from 310  
 mutual 34, 279, 283

- ratification of treaties 38, 55, 229,  
     292–3, 296, 300, 302–7  
 religious belief and 303  
 safe conduct 36, 45  
 Saladin 221, 279, 307  
 truces 163  
 in writing 302, 306  
 Old Testament 32  
 Oliver Scholasticus 307  
 Oriental Frankish settlers 157–62, 173,  
     214, 224, 225, 231, 261, 269, 282  
 Orontes River 14, 42, 63, 65, 68, 71, 134,  
     180, 249, 319  
  
 paganism 29–33, 55  
 Palestine 10, 14, 19, 20, 45, 50–1, 56, 72,  
     74, 77, 79, 80, 240, 263, 272, 275  
 Palmarea 156  
 Pantelleria, island of 316  
 peace treaties 12, 24, 34, 38, 64, 76, 77,  
     87, 108, 112, 123, 129, 133, 157, 170, 188, 217,  
     233, 244, 249, 250, 264–5, 267, 295, 296,  
     298–300, 305, 319, *see also* condominium;  
     treaties; truces  
 penance 22, 23, 308  
 perjury 309–10  
 Persia 15, 32, *see also* Iran  
 Peter Desiderius 43  
 Peter the Hermit 21n, 34, 36, 307  
 Peter of Narbonne 40  
 Peter of Picca, envoy 44  
 Philaretos 13  
 Philip, Count of Flanders 222–4, 225,  
     226, 228  
 Philip II Augustus of France 178, 258,  
     259  
 Philip of Montfort, lord of Tyre 275  
 Philomelium/Akshehir 24  
 Pierre Dubois 34  
 pilgrimages 10, 83, 106  
     to Jerusalem 44, 52, 75, 125, 155, 299  
     to Mecca 102, 107, 181  
     as penance 308  
 Pisan fleet 74, 77  
 Pisans 75, 82, 194, 195, 204  
 Pons, Count of Tripoli 97, 120, 122, 130,  
     135, 136  
 Praver, J. 2, 59, 80, 81, 91  
 prisoners  
     exchange of 238, 244, 262–3  
     liberation of 64, 66, 78, 122, 124, 125,  
         132, 138, 164, 182, 188, 195, 217, 220,  
         235, 237, 243, 262–3, 281, 282, 284–5  
     massacre of 171, 226, 262  
  
 propaganda 10, 26, 29–30, 34, 55, *see also*  
     *jihād* propaganda  
 Provençals 36, 40, 41, 43, 55, 68, 70, 79,  
     88, 155  
  
 al-Qadi al-Fadil 4, 192, 196, 197, 198, 200,  
     205, 206, 217, 225–6, 229, 238, 240, 241,  
     245, 249, 250, 254, 255–6  
 Qal'at Ja'bar 149  
     amirs of 14, 19, 115, 116, 129  
     mediation function of 123–5, 126–7,  
         *see also* Malik; Salim  
 Qalawun, al-Malik al-Mansur, Mamluk  
     Sultan 274, 290, 292, 295, 304, 305,  
     308, 312, 315  
 al-Qalqashandi 4, 292, 295, 297, 298, 300,  
     301–4, 306, 307, 314, 315  
 Qara Arslan of Hisn Kayfa 142, 148  
 Qasr Bardawil 86  
 Qilij Arslan I, Rum Seljuk Sultan of  
     Konya 23, 95, 228, 229, 239, 240  
 Qilij Arslan II, Rum Seljuk Sultan of  
     Konya 162, 172, 181, 183  
 Qinnasrin 17, 64  
 Qirkhan b. Qaraja of Hims 99, 122, 126,  
     130  
 al-Qubba, fortress of 102  
 Qudama, Banu 203  
 Quran 10, 163, 307, 308, 309  
  
 Rafaniyya/Raphania 12, 118, 120  
 al-Rahba 15, 71, 130  
 Rainer Brus of Baniyas 147, 148, 233  
*ra'is* 110, 119, 124, 133, 151, 164, 166–7,  
     *see also* Abu al-Fada'il; al-'Amid;  
     Ibn Sulayha; Mu'ayyad al-Din  
 al-Ramla/Rames 48n137, 53, 54, 76, 264,  
     265  
 ransoms 10, 68, 70, 113, 124, 218  
     Baldwin II 118, 124, 126  
     Bohemond I 68  
     by instalments 306, *see also* hostages  
 Raphania *see* Rafaniyya  
 Rashid al-Din Sinan 210, 211, 217, 235  
 al-Rawandan/Ravendel 36, 236  
 Raymond Lull 34  
 Raymond Pilet 28, 40  
 Raymond of Aguilers 21, 24, 27, 31, 39, 40,  
     42–3, 281  
     on Frankish-Fatimid diplomacy 46,  
         47, 50, 51–2, 53  
     vision of Peter Desiderius 43  
 Raymond, Count of Toulouse 24–9, 35,  
     36, 39, 54, 73, 81, 281

- conflict of interests 40–4  
 reconciliation with Godfrey 76  
 Tancred's arrest of 70  
 Raymond II, Count of Tripoli 137, 140, 161  
 Raymond III, Count of Tripoli 217–21,  
 222, 223, 227, 231, 234, 235, 243, 250, 284,  
 286, 296, 303  
 death of 261  
 mediation role 263  
 regency for Baldwin V 248, 251, 255  
 Saladin and 246, 248, 249, 251–2, 253,  
 255–7, 266, 287, 296  
 Raymond, Prince of Antioch (of Poitiers)  
 139, 140, 141, 151, 161, 162, 175  
 refuge 10, 111, 115, 116, 124, 125, 126, 129,  
 137, 255, 266  
 refugees 96, 125, 128, 152, 293  
 religious emotion 54, 134, 163, 164, 167  
 religious symbols 163  
*Respublica Christiana* 178, 278, 294, 300,  
 311, 322  
 Reynald (Reginald) of Châtillon, Prince of  
 Antioch 178, 180, 183, 184, 214–15, 220,  
 231, 232–3, 234, 237, 239, 242, 244, 245,  
 251, 252–4, 256, 266, 317  
 Reynald (Reginald) of Sidon 257–8, 259,  
 260, 261, 266, 286, 289, 303, 312  
 Rhodes 74  
 Richard Lionheart 247, 258, 259, 261, 262,  
 263–5, 267, 287, 289, 295, 309, 312  
 Ridwan b. Tutush of Aleppo 16–17, 18, 20,  
 38, 41, 42, 44, 46–7, 63, 64, 65, 67, 71, 90,  
 93–4, 117, 124  
 Jawali's attack on 66  
 murder plot 101  
 'no place' doctrine 117, 141, 145–6  
 and Sidon 94–5  
 and Tancred 66, 117  
 treaty with Antioch 101  
 Ridwan b. Walakhshi, Fatimid Wazir 152  
 Riley-Smith, J.S.C. 2  
 robe of honour (*khil'a*) 138, 150, 162, 164,  
 181, 191, 259, 278, 279, 285–6, 287, 290,  
 291, 321  
 Robert, Count of Flanders 27, 28  
 Robert of Apulia 78  
 Robert Fulco of Zardana 104  
 Robert of Normandy 25, 41  
 Roger of Antioch 102–3, 104, 108–9, 110,  
 111, 116, 121, 124, 125  
 Röhricht, R. 59  
 Roman, Prince of Transjordan 122, 133–4  
 Roman law 39, 297, 317  
 Rugia 63  
 Rum Seljuks 21, 162, 170, 172, 181, 183,  
 228, 230, 239, 240, 268, *see also* Mas'ud;  
 Qilij Arslan; Sulayman  
 Runciman, St. 59  
 Rupenids 127, 138  
 Ruzzik, al-Malik al-Nasir, Fatimid Wazir  
 202  
 Sabawa, commander (Wadi Musa) 86  
 Sadaqa, Mazyadi Amir 95, 96, 124  
 safe conducts 35, 36, 45, 69, 78, 210, 271,  
 293, 295, 301, 303  
 Safwat al-Mulk of Damascus 83, 135  
 St Andrew 43  
 St Helena, church of 64  
 St John, castle of 37  
 Saladin 2, 4, 59, 61–2, 92, 96, 175, 176, 179,  
 275, 310, 312  
 Aleppo 213, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220,  
 233–4, 236, 237, 239, 241, 243–4, 245,  
 246, 267  
 Amalric and 192, 205–6, 221  
 barons' party and 261–2, 266, 286, 290  
 bestowing robes of honour 285  
 chancery communications written by  
 235, 240  
 Conrad of Montferrat and 259, 261  
 Damascus 238, 280  
 death of 247, 265, 268, 274  
 expansionist policy 213–45, 268  
 glorified in *jihad* poetry 202–3  
 grant of *iqta'* 289, 290  
 and Jerusalem 204, 205–6, 207, 209–11,  
 228, 229, 230, 231, 232–3, 236, 237,  
 242–3, 250–1, 282, 295, 311  
*jihad* 62, 215, 226, 228–30, 235–47,  
 249–50, 254, 257, 266–8  
 oath-taking by 307–8  
 Raymond III of Tripoli and 251–2, 253,  
 266  
 Reynald of Châtillon and 252–3  
 Richard Lionheart and 259–60, 261,  
 262, 263–5, 287, 295, 312  
 rule over Egypt 197, 198, 200–1, 206,  
 213, 215  
 severe illness of 250  
 surrender of Acre 262–3  
 titles 204  
 treaty and alliance policy with the  
 Franks 211–12  
 Salamiyya 12, 139  
 Salic law 318  
 al-Salih Ayyub *see* al-Malik al-Salih  
 al-Salih Isma'il *see* al-Malik al-Salih

- Salih b. Yahya, chronicler 293  
 Salim b. Malik of Qal'at Ja'bar 14, 123,  
 124–5, 126  
 Samaritans 307  
 Samosata *see* Sumaysat  
 Saracens 30  
 al-Sarakhsi, jurist 315  
 Sardona *see* Zardana  
 Sarfand/Sarphent 260  
 Sarkhad 84, 135, 152  
 Sarmin/Sarmenia 20, 63, 68  
 Saruj/Sororgia 13, 16, 37–8, 40, 70, 97, 282  
 al-Sawad/Sueth 86–7, 228, 312  
 Sawar, Zengid governor of Aleppo 130  
 Sayf al-Din Ghazi II of Mosul 149, 157,  
 158, 163, 208–9, 213, 216, 240, 244  
 Sa'id b. Badi', Ra'is of Aleppo 124  
 Seljuks 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, 21, 23, 46, 47,  
 56, 69–70, 72, 76, 116, 130, 173, *see also*  
 Rum Seljuks  
 Setton, K.M. 59  
 Sevinj Buri 130, 131, 136, 143  
 Shabakhtan 148  
 Shahanshah (great-nephew of Saladin)  
 243, 288–9  
 Shams al-Dawla Sulayman of Mayyafariqin  
 116, 118  
 Shams al-Khilafa, Fatimid governor 84,  
 85, 90  
 Shaqif Arnun/Beaufort 257–8, 273  
 Shaqif Tirun/Tyron 133, 217, 235  
*shari'a* 361101, 210, 302–3, 308, 321,  
*see also* Islamic law  
 Shawar b. Mujir al-Sa'di, Fatimid Wazir  
 186–7, 188–202, 206, 212, 282  
 al-Shawbak/Mons Regalis 271  
 Shayzar, amirs of 11, 15, 17, 18, 41, 42, 65,  
 68, 71, 91, 103, 111, 122, 125, 126, 133, 135,  
 139, 160, 161, 169, 180, 280  
 mediation role of 123, 125–7, 144,  
*see also* Munqidh, Banu  
 Shihab al-Din Mahmud b. Buri of  
 Damascus 133, 135, 138, 140, 143, 293  
 Shih al-Hadid 224, 234  
 Shiites 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 31, 110, 115, 119, 127,  
 193, 294  
 Shirkuh b. Shadhi (Asad al-Din) 175, 187,  
 188, 190–201, 207, 209  
 Sibt b. al-Jawzi 4, 159  
 Sibylla (daughter of Amalric I) 229, 251  
 Sicily 61, 277, 280, 317, 319  
 Sidon/Saida 14, 79, 80, 81, 83, 89, 90, 91,  
 94–5, 105, 180, 259, 260, 265, 312, 315  
 Sinjar 234, 259  
 Sirjal of Busra 165, 166  
 Sivan, E. 3, 59, 92, 107, 167, 168, 202n95,  
 207  
 slaves/slavery 10, 41, 61, 69, 80, 82, 153,  
 165, 257, 258, 284  
 Sororgia/Saruj  
 sovereignty 281–2, 287, 291, 292, 303  
 act of obedience 286  
 condominium 315, 319  
 establishment of 278–9  
 Frankish 283–4, 285  
 legitimacy of 'infidel' 294  
 Muslim 215, 284–5, 290, 315  
 Spain 30, 61, 284, 288, 289, 293, 303, 311,  
 319  
 Stephen of Blois 25, 26, 225  
 Stevenson, W.B. 91, 92, 98  
 subjugation of Muslim population 80–3  
 subordination 17, 55, 102, 116, 123, 138,  
 162, 169, 178, 184, 187, 190, 223, 241, 243,  
 258–9, 270, 274, 291, 298  
 Antioch and 178, 184, 223  
*khutba* 17n35, 47, 53n, 273, 278, 280,  
 283  
 legal system and 277–88  
 oath of fealty 24, 33, 65, 177, 226, 278,  
 280, 283, 286, 287  
 religious adherence 277  
 Saladin 241, 257, 258, 261, 287, *see also*  
 tribute-payments  
 Sudanese units of Fatimid troops 197,  
 198, 200  
 Sueth *see* al-Sawad  
 Sukman al-Qutbi of Tabriz 96  
 Sukman b. Artuq 16, 17, 18, 37, 44, 48, 65,  
 76, 100, 143  
 al-Sulami 61, 176–7  
 Banu 273  
 Sulayman b. Qutulmush, Rum Seljuk  
 Sultan 13  
 Sultanshah b. Ridwan of Aleppo 110, 116,  
 124, 125  
 Sumaysat/Samosata 37, 40  
 Sunnis 17, 18, 31, 46, 110, 119, 127, 131, 168,  
 193, 196, 294  
 suspension clauses 225, 226, 227, 230,  
 245, 270, 305  
 suzerainty 54, 56, 116, 149, 165, 179, 187–8,  
 196, 212, 224, 249, 257, 260, 287  
 of Aleppo 102  
 of Antioch 183, 270  
 Ayyubid 243, 252, 259, 262, 266  
 Byzantine 209  
 of Damascus 135, 164

- of Egypt 175, 188, 196  
 Fatimid 12, 14, 19, 49  
 Lorrainer 39  
 of Maraqiyya 43, 55  
 Norman 64  
 Saladin's 249, 266  
 Zengid 164, 165, 179, 187, 212
- Tadmur 123  
 Taj al-Muluk Buri of Damascus 130, 131, 132  
 Tala'ī b. Ruzzik, Fatimid Wazir 4, 171–2, 179, 181, 182, 186, 190, 192, 202  
 Talaminiya *see* Tall Mannas  
 Tall Bashir/Turbessel 16, 36, 66, 70, 95, 96, 124  
 Tall Danith, battle of (1119) 108  
 Tall Hiraq, fortress of 108, 111  
 Tall Mannas/Talaminiya 40  
 Tall Qaymun/Caymont 260  
 Tall al-Safiyya/Blanchegarde 147  
 Tall al-Sultan, battle of (1176) 220  
 Tamirak of Sinjar 97  
 Tancred of Antioch 24, 27, 28, 29, 41, 63, 81, 94, 97, 125, 141, 288  
   acquisition of Famiya 68–9  
   'Azaz siege 102  
   conflict with Baldwin II 122  
   death of 67, 90  
   foundation of Galilee 83  
   and Godfrey 75  
   regency of Antioch 64, 65, 73  
   and Ridwan 66, 117, 121  
   treaties 78  
   Turkish policy 68–70  
 Taqi al-Din 'Umar (nephew of Saladin) 234, 250, 255, 259  
 Tatikios 24  
 taxation 82, 237, 278, 282  
 Tayy', Banu 121  
 Tellenbach, G. 277  
 Templars 148, 156, 158, 184, 210, 227, 248, 251, 253, 254, 263, 288–9, 292, 313  
 Thamanin, fortress of 87  
 Theobald of Champagne 272  
 Theodora (wife of Baldwin III) 181  
 Thomas of Acerra 272  
 Tiberias 19, 48n137, 90, 152, 199, 287  
 Tibnin/Toron 269  
 Timurtash b. Ilghazi of Aleppo/Mardin 113–17, 126, 142–3  
 Tinnis 232  
 Toghril Arslan of Malatya 116  
 Torah 307
- Toron *see* Tibnin  
 Toros 19, 37  
 Tortosa *see* Antartus  
 Tower of David 36, 178  
 trade 78, 80, 85, 86, 269, 305, *see also*  
   commercial treaties  
 Transjordan 76, 82, 83, 106, 112, 121, 132, 133, 147, 152, 180, 187, 204, 233, 234, 242, 245, 254, 256, 258, 266, 271–2  
 treaties 10, 12, 274  
   Antioch and Aleppo 64, 66, 67, 68, 102, 108, 111–12, 115  
   Artuqid phase (1099–1100) 76–80  
   Baldwin I 85, 282, 283, 295  
   Baldwin III and Pisa 185  
   breaches of 82, 108, 113, 114, 143, 153, 170, 171, 173, 198, 202, 207–8, 212, 310  
   commercial clauses and 204, 294, 295, 298, 303  
   economic motives for 85, 86, 107, 194  
   Fatimid 19, 84, 88, 212  
   First Crusade period 21, 34–5, 37–44, 45, 47–8, 50, 54, 55–7  
   language of 304–5  
   limited duration of 67, 87, 103, 112, 170, 231, 264, 299, 322  
   ratification by oath 38, 55, 229, 292–3, 296, 300, 302–7  
   revocation of 310–11  
   suspension clauses 225, 226, 227, 230, 245, 270, 305  
   technicalities and validity of 291–312, *see also* condominium; peace treaties; truces; Zengi; Nur al-Din; Saladin  
   tribute-payments 87  
   from Aleppo 64, 66, 68, 102, 108–9  
   from Arsuf 76–7, 78  
   from Damascus 165–6, 170, 174  
   Damietta Crusade 271  
   from Edessa 37  
   from Egypt 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 194, 196, 199, 264  
   from Haifa 81  
   legal system and 277, 278, 280, 281–4, 285, 286, 291, 301  
   religious conversion in place of 219  
   from Saruj 38  
   from Shayzar 126  
   from Sidon 82  
   treaty partners and 55  
   from Tyre 84  
 Tripoli, county of 9, 10, 14, 15, 18, 27, 28, 35, 43, 55, 76, 79, 90, 95, 101, 137, 146, 199, 226, 228, 290

- conquest of 67, 98  
 and Jerusalem 122  
 Nizaris and 210  
 Nur al-Din and 207  
 Raymond of Toulouse's rejection of  
   treaty offer 42, 43  
 Saladin and 227, 230  
 treatment of population 81, 82  
 unmolested by Franks 53  
 Truce of God movement 22, 54  
 truces 62, 65, 77, 84, 91, 121, 123, 125, 163,  
   212, 218–19, 290, 297–8, 302, 316, 322  
 Aleppo and Antioch 102, 111  
 Amalric 194–5, 206  
 Ayyubids/Franks 220, 227–8, 247  
 Baldwin and Tughtegin 86, 88, 90  
 Edessa and Aleppo 148  
 end of Third Crusade 261, 264, 265,  
   269  
 leading to alliances 68  
 limited periods 273, 295, 299  
 Nur al-Din 170, 171, 180–1, 182, 207–8  
 Raymond III 248, 251, 253  
 Saladin 192, 215, 221, 229–34, 240, 243,  
   253, 254, 295, 296  
 Shirkuh 188  
 Zengi 138, 139, 146, 149, *see also*  
   condominia; peace treaties; treaties  
 True Cross 258, 262, 272  
 Tughtegin, Burid of Damascus 16, 67, 72,  
   83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 90, 91, 93, 95, 97, 99,  
   100–1, 103–6, 111, 118, 296  
   death of 131  
   expansionism 122–3  
   Ilghazi and 108, 124  
   Ridwan and 102  
   siege of Aleppo 119–20  
 Tuman, governor 119  
 Turanshah (brother of Saladin) 204, 221,  
   231  
 Turanshah, Ayyubid Sultan of Egypt  
   286  
 Turbessel *see* Tall Bashir  
 Turcomans 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 18, 96, 105,  
   107, 108, 109, 120, 130, 136, 142, 148, 165  
 Turks 30, 44, 45, 56, 79, 84, 143, 148, 167,  
   184–5, 196, 252, 267, 278, 296  
   alliance with Franks 38–9  
   Artuqids 19, 116  
   Byzantium and 54  
   capture of Edessa 59  
   chivalry 33, 55  
   Fatimids and 9, 19, 31, 46, 47, 48, 51,  
   53, 56, 89–90, 212  
   *ghuzz* 191, 192–3, 198  
   and Kirbogha 21, 24, 26, 32, 33, 34, 35  
   and Lorrainers 36–40  
   and Normans 66–70  
   struggle for power over Mosul 68  
   and Syria 7, 8, 18, 46, 91–103, 117, 121,  
   136, 145  
   treaties 19, 112, *see also* Aleppo  
 Tutush, Taj al-Dawla b. Alp Arslan of  
   Damascus 11–19, 88, 100, 123, 127  
 Tyre/Sur 9, 10, 14, 18, 76, 79, 84, 86, 89,  
   90, 91, 93, 105, 113, 258, 259, 264  
 siege of 83, 106–7, 121, 122  
 Tyron *see* Shaqif Tirun  
 ‘Umar of ‘Azaz 38–9, 283  
 ‘Umara al-Yamani (poet) 191–2, 196, 198,  
   202, 205, 210  
 Umayyad Mosque 101, 163, 273  
 Unur, Mu‘in al-Din of Damascus 137, 140,  
   143, 144, 145, 147–8, 149–50, 153–4, 157,  
   158, 160, 162–3, 164, 168, 173  
 Urban II, Pope 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27,  
   34, 54  
 Usama b. Munqidh 2, 19, 69, 71, 125, 126,  
   144, 147–8, 151, 161, 168, 171, 288  
 ‘Uthman, Third Caliph 163  
 Uvaq *see* Abaq  
 Valenium *see* Baniyas  
 vassalage 24, 27, 39, 65, 68, 74, 82, 99,  
   104, 122, 134, 139, 151, 159, 160, 166, 188,  
   189, 194, 195, 201, 214–15, 231, 257, 260–1,  
   267, 277, 280, 288, 289, 306, 310, 319  
 Venetian fleet 74  
 Venice 75, 107  
 Vermandois, count of 28  
 Wadi Ibn al-Ahmar, fortress of 136  
 Wadi Musa fortification 86  
 Walter the Chancellor 29, 104, 110, 296  
 Wibald, Abbot of Stavelot 155  
 Wielers, M. 297  
 William II of Sicily 210  
 William Jordan, Count of Tripoli 88  
 William of Tyre 2, 4, 60, 74, 107, 132, 134,  
   139, 144, 145, 146, 149, 152, 153, 154, 155,  
   159, 160, 165, 169–71, 173, 187, 190, 192,  
   204, 229, 233, 236, 244, 246, 310  
   on Amalric 193, 194  
   on Bayt al-Ahzan/Le Chastellet 227  
   on condominiumia 311–12  
   defeat in patriarchal election 231  
   on end of Third Crusade 260

- on Frankish-Byzantine attack on Egypt 222
- on Latin terminology in treaties 296, 297
- on oath swearing 305
- on Raymond III of Tripoli 218
- on Saladin 213-14, 237
- on Second Crusade 175-6
- on Sinan 210
- on tribute-payment and subjection 282-3
- Yaghisuyan, governor of Antioch 16, 17, 18, 36, 93
- Yaghisuyan of Balis 116
- Yaghra 161
- Yahya b. al-Khayyat, Fatimid Amir 192
- Yarmuk, river 86, 249
- Yaruqtash of Aleppo 102
- Yemen 204, 241
- Yubna/Ibelin 147
- Zardana/Sardona 63, 66, 108, 110, 113
- Zengids of Mosul 127-46, 150, 157, 158, 162, 183-92, 196-7, 236-7, 249
  - battle of Inab 163
  - expansionism 66, 151-9, 214, 268
  - propaganda 167-8, 170, 171
  - regency quarrels 213
  - resentment against Saladin as a usurper 221
  - Saladin and 217-21, 228, 239-40
  - Shirkuh campaign against Egypt 175, 187-201, 207, 209
  - state treasure 163, *see also* Nur al-Din Zengi ('Imad al-Din), Atabeg of Mosul 60, 61, 93, 124, 127-30, 133, 134, 137, 161, 173, 174, 285
  - death of (1146) 146, 149, 150, 151, 157, 163



MAPS



Map 1 Frankish and Muslim Lordships in Southern Syria (Early Twelfth Century)



Map 2 The Kingdom of Jerusalem (Early Twelfth Century)



Map 3 Frankish and Muslim Lordships in Northern Syria and Cilicia (Early Twelfth Century)



Map 4 Frankish and Muslim Lordships in Northern Syria (Early Twelfth Century), Detail

Territories	
	Principality of Damascus
	Kingdom of Jerusalem
	Condominium 1108–1118
	Principality of Aleppo
	County of Edessa
	Principality of Antioch
	Principality of Ḥamāh
	Principality of Ḥimṣ
	County of Tripoli
	Great Seljuks
	Armenian Principalities
	Artuqids
	Danishmandids
	Byzantine Empire
	Nizari Isma'ilis
	Fatimid Caliphate
	Possession uncertain
Settlements	
	Town, usually fortified
	Town, not fortified
	Large castle or fortress
	Castle or small fortified site
	Cave castle
	Repeated or frequent change in possession

Legend