Crusades

Volume 13, 2014

Published by ASHGATE *for the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East*

Offprint from Crusades Vol. 13 (2014).

The Jerusalem Conquest of 492/1099 in the Medieval Arabic Historiography of the Crusades: From Regional Plurality to Islamic Narrative

Konrad Hirschler

SOAS, University of London
kh20@soas.ac.uk

Abstract

*This article discusses the reports on the conquest of Jerusalem in 492/1099 in Arabic chronicles. It argues that the reports on this event developed in three distinct and very diverse regional traditions in Egypt, Syria and Iraq. On the basis of the early Egyptian and Syrian evidence, it is highly unlikely that the conquest of Jerusalem was accompanied by a large-scale massacre of the entire population. This evidence shows furthermore that contemporaries did not see the fall of the town as a momentous event. The later Iraqi tradition, by contrast, introduced not only a new dimension to the massacre of the town's inhabitants, but developed two further narrative strands which were largely unknown to earlier reports: the plundering of the Dome of the Rock and the subsequent delegation to Baghdad. The development of these strands must be seen within the political and intellectual setting of Baghdad, most importantly the conflict between Sultanate and Caliphate and the profile of the Hanbalite traditionalist milieu of the city. Ibn al-Athir's famous report from the early seventh/thirteenth century almost exclusively goes back to this Iraqi strand and was an "Islamic narrative" in that it sidelined all previous regional traditions and reframed the conquest as a momentous event in terms of eschatology, martyrdom and divine intervention. This development of the Arabic reports on the fall of Jerusalem reflects the broader transformation of how relationships with crusaders and Franks were conceptualized from a pre-*jihādī *landscape to one where* jihād *propaganda moved to the centre of political discourse.*

In 2004 this journal published Benjamin Kedar's seminal article on the Jerusalem massacre in the Western historiography of the crusades. His article discussed reports ranging from eyewitness accounts to modern studies and tried to establish along the way a historically accurate picture of the events. On the basis of the medieval Latin (and also to some extent the Arabic) sources, Kedar concluded that "the massacre in Jerusalem was considerably more extensive than in other towns."[1]

I thank Bernard Hamilton and the anonymous readers for their insightful and very detailed comments on this article. The argument has greatly benefited from discussions with students in the course "The Middle East in the Period of the Crusades" at SOAS (University of London) over the last years. Further helpful comments came from participants in the "Crusades and The Latin East" seminar (Institute of Historical Research, London) where a version of this paper was presented in March 2013.

[1] Benjamin Kedar, "The Jerusalem Massacre of July 1099 in the Western Historiography of the Crusades," *Crusades* 3 (2004): 15–75, here 74.

The present article examines the reports in (mostly Muslim) Arabic chronicles written between the early sixth/twelfth century and the end of the Mamluk era in 923/1517 to ask firstly what factual material these texts contain and secondly in what ways the authors ascribed meaning(s) to the conquest of Jerusalem.[2] The argument in the following pages will thus be twofold. Firstly, it will suggest that the early Arabic sources do not imply that the conquest of Jerusalem was accompanied by a massacre that was more extensive than those in other towns. A number of contemporary or near-contemporary Arabic texts leave no doubt that a massacre did take place, but they contain no evidence of large-scale carnage of the town's population that was any greater than that which took place in cities and towns such as Antioch, Caesarea or Maʿarrat al-Nuʿmān. The article's second argument is that the conquest of the town only started to be remembered on a significant level several decades after the event itself.[3] It was only from this point onwards that the fall of Jerusalem gradually became a meaningful part of the region's indigenous history and that it was described as a full-scale massacre.

As previous scholars have remarked, especially Carole Hillenbrand, Arabic representations of the initial crusader conquest are highly diverse and do not present a uniform picture.[4] With reference to Jerusalem, I argue more specifically that three different conquest traditions developed, quite independently of one another, in Syria, Egypt and Iraq during the sixth/twelfth century. These traditions rarely agreed on what happened in the hours and days after the fall of Jerusalem and also disagreed on other issues such as the identity of the (Frankish/Byzantine) conquerors and their (Egyptian/Turkish/Muslim) opponents. It was only in the early seventh/thirteenth century with the chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr (d. 630/1233) that a non-regional conquest narrative emerged which became the hegemonic way to present the events. Ibn al-Athīr's evocative account of full-scale massacre and plunder as part of a Frankish–Muslim confrontation, hereafter termed the "Islamic narrative," has remained popular until the present for the work of those scholars who argue that the conquest was indeed accompanied by a massacre.[5] However,

[2] For an overview of the Arabic sources on the conquest of 492/1099 and their major common elements, as discussed in this article, consult Table 1 at pp. 40–41.

[3] On the formation of this period's historiographical discourses within their historical contexts, see Konrad Hirschler, *Medieval Arabic Historiography: Authors as Actors* (London, 2006).

[4] Carole Hillenbrand, *The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives* (Edinburgh, 1999), 63–66, and eadem, "The First Crusade: The Muslim Perspective," in *The Origins and Impact of the First Crusade*, ed. Jonathan Phillips (Manchester, 1997), 130–41, discusses many of the relevant sources and hints at the development of these narratives over time.

[5] Ibn al-Athīr's account features prominently, for example, in Jill N. Claster, *Sacred Violence: The European Crusades to the Middle East, 1095–1396* (Toronto, 2009), 88–89; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History* (Oxford and New York, 2004), 376; M. A. Hiyari, "Crusader Jerusalem 1099–1187 AD," in *Jerusalem in History*, ed. K. J. Asali (London and New York, 1989), 130–76, here 138; Kaspar Elm, "Die Eroberung Jerusalems im Jahre 1099. Ihre Darstellung, Beurteilung und Deutung in den Quellen zur Geschichte des Ersten Kreuzzugs," in *Jerusalem im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter. Konflikte und Konfliktbewältigung – Vorstellungen und Vergegenwärtigungen*, ed. K. Herbers et al. (Frankfurt, 2001), 31–54, here 41.

as it will be argued, his account is, to say the least, of limited value for a historical reconstruction of the conquest of Jerusalem:

> After [the Franks'] arrival they besieged the town for some forty days.[6] They constructed two towers, one on the Mount Zion side, but the Muslims burned it and killed all those inside it. After they had burned it, a call for help came as the town had been taken from the other side. They took it in the morning of Friday, seven days remaining of Shaʿbān [= 23 Shaʿbān/15 July]. The population was put to the sword, and the Franks remained in the town killing the Muslims for one week. A group of Muslims barricaded themselves into David's Tower and fought on for three days. The Franks granted them safe-conduct and they surrendered it. The Franks honoured their word, and the group left by night for Ascalon where they remained. The Franks killed more than 70,000 people in the Aqṣā Mosque, among them a large number of Muslim imams and scholars as well as devout and ascetic men who had left their homelands to live lives of pious seclusion in this venerated place. The Franks stripped the Dome of the Rock of more than forty silver lanterns, each of them weighing 3,600 dirhams, and a great silver lamp weighing forty Syrian pounds, as well as a hundred and fifty smaller silver lanterns and more than twenty gold ones, and a great deal more booty. Refugees from Syria reached Baghdad in Ramadan, accompanied by the judge Abū Saʿd al-Harawī. They held in the *dīwān* a speech that brought tears to the eye and wrung the heart. On Friday they went to the principal mosque and begged for help, weeping so that their hearers wept with them as they described the sufferings of the Muslims in this venerated town: the men killed, the women and children taken prisoner, the homes pillaged. Because of the terrible hardships they had suffered, they were allowed to break the fast.[7]

The Syrian Tradition

Ibn al-Athīr's report is not only very evocative but, more importantly for our purposes, it frames the conquest of the town with three main narrative elements: a whole-scale massacre with more than 70,000 victims in the Aqṣā Mosque, plunder of the Dome of the Rock with exact figures on numbers and weights, and a Syrian delegation that was subsequently sent to Baghdad to plead for support against the conquerors. In line with his overall approach, Ibn al-Athīr did not cite any sources for this tripartite report so we have to turn to Syrian sources that were contemporary or almost contemporary to the conquest. It is this tradition that was closest to the events in geographical and chronological terms and it is here that we might expect the origins of Ibn al-Athīr's narrative. As is well known, the fifth/eleventh and early sixth/twelfth centuries were the veritable dark centuries of Syrian historiography

[6] D. S. Richards, *The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athir for the Crusading Period from al-Kamil fi 'l-ta'rikh, part 1: The years 491–541/1097–1146* (Aldershot, 2006), 21, erroneously translates "they erected forty trebuchets."

[7] Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fī al-taʾrīkh*, ed. C. J. Tornberg (Beirut, 1965–67), X, 282–86. "Miḥrāb Dāwūd" could refer to at least four different sites in Jerusalem (see Amikam Elad, *Medieval Jerusalem and Islamic Worship: Holy Places, Ceremonies, Pilgrimage* (Leiden, 1995), 131–38), but the identification with David's Tower is, in this context, unambiguous.

Table 1 Arabic accounts of the conquest of Jerusalem

	enemies/victims of Franks	siege, length	Tower of David	victims, number	victims, Jews	massacre, one week	silver *qandīl*	*tannūr* 40 pounds	burned books	Baghdad delegation
Ibn al-Qulzumī	ghuzz									
Ibn al-ʿArabī				3,000						
al-ʿAẓīmī	Egyptians				X					
Ibn al-Azraq										
Ibn al-Qalānisī	Armies of Egypt/ of the coast		X		X					
al-Iṣfahānī										
Ibn al-Jawzī	Muslims			>70,000			ca. 40	X		X
Ibn Ẓāfir	Turks									
Ibn Shīth	Muslims				X					
Ibn al-Athīr	Muslims	ca. 40 days	X	>70,000		X	ca. 40	X		
Ibn Naẓīf										
Ibn Abī al-Damm	Muslims			>70,000						
Ibn al-ʿAdīm	Army of Aleppo									

Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī	Muslims	ca. 40 days		100,000			50	X		X
Ibn Khallikān		ca. 40 days		>70,000		X				
Bar Hebraeus				>70,000		X				
Ibn Muyassar			X						X	
Ibn Wāṣil	Muslims			>70,000	X		ca. 40			
Abū al-Fidāʾ		ca. 40 days		>70,000		X				X
Al-Nuwayrī		ca. 40 days	X	>70,000		X	ca. 40	X		X
Ibn al-Dawādārī	Muslims									
Ibn al-Wardī		ca. 40 days		>70,000		X				
al-Maqdisī	Muslims	ca. 40 days		>70,000		X				
Ibn Kathīr				>60,000			42	X		X
al-Maqrīzī	Muslims	ca. 40 days	X	>70,000		X			X	
Ibn Taghrībirdī		ca. 40 days		100,000				X		
Al-ʿUlaymī		ca. 40 days		>70,000			2,040	X		X
al-Ḥarīrī				100,000	X			X		

prior to its spectacular development in the Ayyubid and especially early Mamluk periods. Citations in later works, especially by Ibn al-ʿAdīm, show that some chronicles were written in Syria during this period. These included the lost works of little-known authors such as Yaḥyā Ibn Zurayq (b. ca. 442/1051), ʿAbd al-Wāḥid b. Masʿūd (presumably from Maʿarrat al-Nuʿmān, fl. 527/1132–33), the judge ʿAbd al-Qāhir b. ʿAlawī (presumably from Maʿarrat Maṣrīn close to Maʿarrat al-Nuʿmān, fl. 571/1176) and Abū Manṣūr Hibat Allāh (presumably from Aleppo).[8] Regrettably, it is impossible to re-establish the narratives on the conquest of Jerusalem for any of these obscure authors.

However, there are at least three early Syrian sources at our disposal, the well-known texts by Ibn al-Qalānisī (d. 555/1160), al-ʿAẓīmī (d. after 556/1161) and Ibn al-Azraq al-Fāriqī (d. after 572/1176–77). It has to be stressed that none of these authors was an eyewitness or claimed to rely on eyewitnesses in their reports as was the case in the Latin historiography of the Jerusalem-conquest with the anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum*, Peter Tudebode and Raymond of Aguilers.[9] Al-ʿAẓīmī's chronicle is the earliest surviving Syrian source, completed in 538/1143–44. The author, who spent most of his life in Aleppo, states in his reports on the year 492/1099: "Subsequently [the Franks] turned to Jerusalem and wrested it from the hands of the Egyptians. Godfrey took possession of it and they burned the synagogue."[10] This passage is not only strikingly concise, but it has none of the three constitutive elements – massacre, plunder and delegation – that were to structure Ibn al-Athīr's report a century later. Al-ʿAẓīmī includes the burning of the town's synagogue which can be taken (in light of what the author's contemporary, Ibn al-Qalānisī, had to say on this issue) as a reference to a massacre of Jewish inhabitants. However, this short reference hardly inspired Ibn al-Athīr's report on the carnage of the town's entire Muslim population.

The Damascene historian Ibn al-Qalānisī wrote a substantial part of his chronicle in the late 530s/early 1140s and his report might be contemporary with that of al-ʿAẓīmī or slightly later. In his local chronicle the author went into some more detail than al-ʿAẓīmī:

> [The Franks] attacked the town and took possession of it. Some of the inhabitants withdrew to David's Tower and many were killed. The Jews assembled in the synagogue and they burned it over their heads. They took possession of David's Tower under safe-

[8] Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Bughyat al-ṭalab fī taʾrīkh Ḥalab*, ed. S. Zakkār (Beirut, 1988), for instance II, 741, V, 2421, VI, 2699, VII, 3357. On earlier Syrian historiography, see Carole Hillenbrand, "The Arabic Sources," in *Byzantines and Crusaders in Non-Greek Sources, 1025–1204*, ed. Mary Whitby (Oxford, 2007), 283–340; al-ʿAẓīmī, Muḥammad, *Taʾrīkh Ḥalab*, ed. I. Zaʿrūr (Damascus, 1984), 14–18; Sami Dahan, "The Origin and Development of the Local Histories of Syria," in *Historians of the Middle East*, ed. B. Lewis and P. Holt (London and Oxford, 1962), 108–17.

[9] See Kedar, "The Jerusalem Massacre," 16–19, for these accounts.

[10] Al-ʿAẓīmī, *Taʾrīkh*, ed. Zaʿrūr, 360; Claude Cahen, "La Chronique abrégée d'al-Aẓīmī," *Journal Asiatique* 230 (1938): 335–448, here 373.

> conduct on 22 Shaʿbān [14 July] of this year. They destroyed the shrines and the tomb of Abraham.[11]

This report resembles al-ʿAẓīmī's account with the Jewish population having a prominent place and being clearly identified here as victims of the conquerors' massacre. The main difference is that Ibn al-Qalānisī added more detail, most importantly that (presumably Muslim) inhabitants fled to David's Tower, that "many were killed" (probably referring to the town's population in general and not only those who had tried to flee to David's Tower) and that holy sites, such as the Tomb of Abraham, were destroyed. However, if we compare this report with Ibn al-Athīr's version, the three constitutive elements are again either lacking or virtually unrecognizable. Ibn al-Qalānisī did not mention the delegation to Baghdad at all and he referred to the destruction of unspecified holy sites instead of the plunder at the Dome of the Rock. The only named holy site was the Tomb of Abraham, which in turn Ibn al-Athīr did not mention. The massacre, finally, seems to be on a far more modest scale and Ibn al-Qalānisī did not establish any link with the Aqṣā Mosque nor did he give a concrete number of victims.

The third surviving chronicle from the area affected by the crusades is even more striking in its extreme brevity in reporting the conquest of Jerusalem. This is the pro-Artuqid chronicle by Ibn al-Azraq al-Fāriqī on the history of the town of Mayyāfāriqīn. This author makes only a brief reference to the conquest when describing the Artuqid Najm al-Dīn Ghāzī's rise to power in northern Mesopotamia in the early sixth/twelfth century:

> In the year 491 the Franks appeared. They attacked and took Antioch and Tripoli. In the year 492 they took possession of Jerusalem as well as nearby Tyre and Acre. In 498 they took possession of the remaining coast so that they became more powerful. Subsequently they took Edessa and the nearby castles on the Euphrates.[12]

Ibn al-Azraq al-Fāriqī's work was not a Syrian chronicle in a narrow sense, as it centred on the Artuqid realms in northern Mesopotamia which might explain the confused chronology in this passage. Yet this does not satisfactorily explain why the author did not include more detail on the conquest of Jerusalem, but limited himself to this brief reference. Jerusalem was of special importance to this chronicler of the Artuqid realms as the dynasty's founding figure, Artuq b. Ekseb, had governed Jerusalem and died there. The dynasty only moved to northern Mesopotamia after Artuq's sons had been unable to hold the town against the Fatimids. The passage on the Frankish conquest of Jerusalem was thus part of the early history of the dynasty itself and one would have expected some more detail if this event was of

[11] Ibn al-Qalānisī, *Dhayl Taʾrīkh Dimashq*, ed. H. Amedroz (Beirut, 1908), 137. David's Tower is here merely called "the *miḥrāb*."

[12] Ibn al-Azraq al-Fāriqī, Aḥmad, *Taʾrīkh al-Fāriqī*, ed. B. ʿAwaḍ, rev. M. Sh. Ghurbāl (Cairo, 1959), 268. On this author see Carole Hillenbrand, *A Muslim Principality in Crusader Times: The Early Artuqid State* (Leiden, 1990).

outstanding significance. In addition, the author displayed considerable interest in the regions neighbouring northern Mesopotamia. He included events in Syria, Iraq and Armenia as far as they were relevant to the Artuqids, and this is especially true for southern Syria, as Ibn al-Azraq al-Fāriqī had held an administrative position in Damascus during his career.

Syrian historiographical accounts of the conquest of Jerusalem are thus characterized by the low importance that they ascribed to this event and by a tendency to single out Jews as victims. Only Ibn al-Qalānisī mentioned Muslim victims, but did so in passing ("and many were killed"). That this author did not report a large-scale massacre in his Jerusalem narrative is crucial, as he did provide more detail when describing the fall of other towns and cities. For instance, he reported for the conquest of Antioch that "innumerable men, women and children of the city were killed, taken prisoner or enslaved,"[13] and he unequivocally stated on the conquest of Caesarea that "they killed its inhabitants and plundered what was in it."[14] The only near-contemporary Syrian source that mentioned a massacre in Jerusalem beyond the Jewish population did thus not imply in any way that there was carnage more extensive than in other cities and towns.

A third common element of the Syrian historiographical tradition is that these authors, in contrast to Ibn al-Athīr's Islamic narrative, did not conceptualize the conquest as part of a broader Frankish–Muslim clash.[15] Rather they tended to see the arrival of the crusaders in general and the conquest of Jerusalem in particular as part of the regional political landscape. For these authors, the conquest was seemingly not dissimilar to what had happened in the previous decades when the town repeatedly changed hands between Artuqids, Saljuqs and Fatimids. Al-ʿAẓīmī for instance considered the conquest of Jerusalem very much a Frankish–Fatimid affair and the former "wrested it from the hands of the Egyptians," not "of the Muslims" as it became the later standard formulation in the Islamic narrative. In the same vein, Ibn al-Qalānisī did not write of "the Muslims" reacting to the fall of Jerusalem. Rather he described the military forces as the "Egyptian armies," i.e. the Fatimid forces, and, taking into account the highly regionalized political landscape of Syria, the "armies of the coast."[16] In Ibn al-Azraq al-Fāriqī's text, in turn, the Franks do not attack the "lands of Islam," as Ibn al-Athīr was to conceptualize it, but the conquered lands were simply "the coast."[17] Owing to this rather pragmatic

[13] Ibn al-Qalānisī, *Dhayl*, 135.

[14] Ibid., 139.

[15] The case is evidently different for the Syrian preacher al-Sulamī (d. 500/1106) (see below, "The Islamic Narrative"), who wrote in a very different genre (*jihād*-treatise) and acted in a different social context from the historians discussed here. In addition, his isolation "suggests a level of indifference among some of the Damascene Sunni religious establishment towards the Frankish invasion": S. A. Mourad and J. E. Lindsay, *The Intensification and Reorientation of Sunni Jihad Ideology in the Crusader Period* (Leiden, 2013), 36. On the basis of this article one might argue that this indifference was even more widespread.

[16] Ibn al-Qalānisī, *Dhayl*, 137.

[17] Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 272; Ibn al-Azraq al-Fāriqī, *Taʾrīkh*, 268.

outlook towards the crusaders' advances, the authors of this Syrian tradition also did not use curses, such as "May God forsake them" and "May God curse them," after mentioning the Franks, as became standard in later texts. Ibn al-Qalānisī was the first historian to make systematic use of these curses, but he only started to do so from the account of the year 552/1157–58 onwards.[18]

That the early Syrian authors still refrained from setting the conquest into a history of Frankish–Muslim confrontation was an expression of the pre-*jihādī* political landscape in which they were writing their works. They spent most of their life in a period, the *lā maqām* ("no place") era, when diplomatic relations between Frankish and Muslim lordships were rather close and when *jihād* had not yet become a meaningful term for conceptualizing the interaction with the Frankish lordships. The numerous Frankish and Muslim local lordships in Syria and northern Mesopotamia rather engaged in a plethora of alliances and truces that regularly crossed the religious divide.[19]

Ibn al-Qalānisī probably penned his report when Burid Damascus was still entertaining close diplomatic relationships with the kingdom of Jerusalem against the Zangid advances from the north. Al-ʿAẓīmī, who lived in Aleppo and Damascus, was composing his chronicle during the same period. Aleppo under its Saljuq rulers was, as much as Damascus in this period, striving to repel the Zangid expansion from northern Mesopotamia and repeatedly turned to Frankish Antioch for support.

Ibn al-Azraq al-Fāriqī probably wrote his chronicle later, when the political landscape in Syria had changed with the subjugation of most local Muslim principalities by the newly emerging Zangid state. However, he wrote in northern Mesopotamia, in one of those principalities that had succeeded in retaining its independence. The principal concern of these Artuqid rulers was certainly not *jihād* against Frankish principalities that were not posing a substantial threat to the existence of their polity. The link between the political landscape and the low importance ascribed to the fall of Jerusalem as it emerges from the Syrian chronicles is also evident in the writings of Usāma b. Munqidh (d. 584/1188). In his *Kernels of Refinement* he discussed the First Crusade and ascribed rather ambitious projects to the newly arrived conquerors, but strikingly there is no reference to Jerusalem. Most importantly, the defining conquest in the early crusading period was in his eyes the fall of Antioch, not Jerusalem:

> When the Franks – may God confound them – came in the year 490 [/1096–97] and conquered Antioch and were victorious over the armies of Syria, they were seized with

[18] Niall Christie, "The Origins of Suffixed Invocations of God's Curse on the Franks in Muslim Sources for the Crusades," *Arabica* 48 (2001): 254–66.

[19] M. A. Köhler, *Alliances and Treaties between Frankish and Muslim Rulers in the Middle East: Cross-Cultural Diplomacy in the Period of the Crusades,* trans. P. M. Holt, rev., ed. and intr. Konrad Hirschler (Leiden, 2013) [= M. A. Köhler, *Allianzen und Verträge zwischen fränkischen und islamischen Herrschern im Vorderen Orient* (Berlin, 1991)].

> greed and gave themselves up to fancies of possessing Baghdad and the lands of the east. So they mustered and collected themselves, and marched forth, making for those lands.[20]

This outlook has to be set against Usāma b. Munqidh's northern Syrian background. Hailing from the castle of Shayzar, the crusader conquest of nearby Antioch was certainly more relevant from the perspective of the Munqidhite family than the fall of Jerusalem in southern Syria. The fall of Antioch had considerable repercussions for the small lordship of Shayzar as it had to adapt to a new diplomatic landscape to secure its survival.

Overall, it is evident that, for the early Syrian chroniclers, Jerusalem did not hold any outstanding religious significance that by itself would have warranted a more detailed description of its conquest. With this argument I do not intend to return to previous lines of scholarship, such as that by Emmanuel Sivan. While his work has been ground-breaking in many ways, it tended to underestimate the religious significance and importance of pre-crusader Jerusalem.[21] As has been amply demonstrated, Jerusalem had played a more important role in Muslim writings from the early Islamic period onwards.[22] However, it is important to emphasize that the role of Jerusalem was not static but underwent continuous fluctuations of intensity. The example of the early Syrian chroniclers shows that, at least in their cultural milieu, Jerusalem played a very limited role and that the fall of the town did not raise religious sensibilities on a significant level. These Muslim chroniclers were not prominent religious scholars but emerged rather from the ranks of the military elite (Usāma b. Munqidh) or were administrators (Ibn al-Qalānisī was the "mayor," *raʾīs*, of Damascus, al-ʿAẓīmī was a primary schoolteacher whose father had been the *raʾīs* of Aleppo, and Ibn al-Azraq al-Fāriqī held various administrative offices during his career). While the later Islamic narrative expressed a very different attitude towards Jerusalem, it is paramount not to project its vision of Jerusalem onto the earlier Syrian reports.

However, the Islamic narrative of a Frankish–Muslim confrontation with a large-scale massacre and plunder in Jerusalem was to marginalize and supplant this early Syrian tradition. None of this tradition's three characteristic thematic elements – ascribing a low importance to the conquest, emphasizing Jewish victims, and setting the conquest into a regionalized political landscape – found an echo in Ibn al-Athīr's report. Yet, it is important to underline that some of these elements were

---

[20] Usāma b. Munqidh, *Lubāb al-adāb*, trans. P. M. Cobb, *Islam and the Crusades: The Writings of Usama ibn Munqidh* (London, 2008), 255.

[21] Emmanuel Sivan, "Beginnings of the Faḍāʾil al-Quds Literature," *Israel Oriental Studies* 1 (1971): 263–71, and idem, *L'Islam et la croisade: idéologie et propagande dans les réactions musulmanes aux croisades* (Paris, 1968). His "The Sanctity of Jerusalem in Islam," in Emmanuel Sivan, *Interpretations of Islam* (Princeton, 1985), 75–106, ascribes more importance to Jerusalem.

[22] Suleiman Mourad, "The Symbolism of Jerusalem in Early Islam," in *Jerusalem: Idea and Reality*, ed. T. Mayer and S. Mourad (London, 2008), 86–102; Elad, *Medieval Jerusalem*; Izhak Hasson, "The Muslim View of Jerusalem: The Qurʾān and Ḥadīth," in *The History of Jerusalem: The Early Muslim Period, 638–1099*, ed. J. Prawer and H. Ben-Shammai (New York, 1996), 349–85.

to survive in parallel with the Islamic narrative for another one hundred years, well into the late seventh/thirteenth century. Several later Syrian authors opted to discuss the fall of Jerusalem not exclusively in terms of the new Islamic narrative, but continued to use at least some typically Syrian elements. For instance Ibn Naẓīf (d. after 634/1236–37), a native of the northern Syrian town of Hama, used curses in the same vein as the change that had taken place in Arabic historiography, but his report is still strikingly concise and very much reminds one of the text of al-ʿAẓīmī: "The Franks – may God curse them – took Jerusalem."[23] Similar to Ibn Naẓīf is the *Bustān al-Jāmiʿ* by ʿImād al-Dīn al-Iṣfahānī (not to be confused with Saladin's secretary of the same name) who also did not yet ascribe an outstanding importance to the event. This chronicle was written in 592–93/1195–97, most probably in Aleppo: "492. The Franks took Jerusalem and al-Maʿarra. … In this year the Franks received Edessa and Saruj."[24] A third example for the low importance ascribed to the conquest in some later Syrian texts is the chronicle of Ibn Abī al-Damm (d. 642/1244) who, like Ibn Naẓīf, lived in Hama: "The Franks conquered Jerusalem. It is said that they killed in the Aqṣā Mosque more than 70,000 people." The number 70,000 is alien to this tradition and shows the increasing influence of the Islamic narrative, but this author still maintained a clear distance from the massacre report ("it is said").[25]

That some later Syrian authors retained a specific regional perspective even on the issue of the massacre is exemplified by a brief passage by Ibn al-ʿAdīm (d. 660/1262), who reported that "[i]n this year they conquered Jerusalem and they did in it as they had done in Maʿarrat [al-Nuʿmān]."[26] Certainly, the author indirectly referred to a substantial massacre in the town by comparing it with the events in Maʿarrat al-Nuʿmān. However, in contrast to the Islamic narrative, this historian from Aleppo saw the events in nearby Maʿarrat al-Nuʿmān – which he described in much detail – to be of much more relevance than what happened subsequently in Jerusalem. The characteristically Syrian perspective on the massacre is also evident in the universal chronicle by Ibn Abī al-Damm's nephew Ibn Wāṣil (d. 697/1298), another native of Hama:

> After they had taken possession of al-Ramla they besieged Jerusalem and attacked it ferociously. They took possession of it and assembled the Jews of the town in a synagogue and set it on fire. They killed more than 70,000 of the Muslims and took from the Dome of the Rock more than forty silver lanterns, each of them weighing forty Syrian pounds, and more than twenty gold ones. The Muslims had never been afflicted by anything worse than this.[27]

---

[23] Ibn Naẓīf, *al-Taʾrīkh al-Manṣūrī*, ed. P. Grjaznevic (Moscow, 1960), 159.

[24] Al-Iṣfahānī, ʿImād al-Dīn, *al-Bustān al-jāmiʿ*, ed. ʿU. Tadmurī (Saydā and Beirut, 2010), 308.

[25] Ibn Abī al-Damm, *Kitāb al-Shamārīkh fī al-taʾrīkh*, in S. Zakkār, *al-Mawsūʿa al-Shāmīya fī taʾrīkh al-ḥurūb al-ṣalībīya* (Damascus, 1995), XXI, 9674.

[26] Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Zubdat al-Ḥalab*, ed. S. Dahhān (Damascus, 1954), 507.

[27] Ibn Wāṣil, *Kitāb al-taʾrīkh al-ṣāliḥī: sīrat al-nabī wa-al-anbīyāʾ wa-al-khulafāʾ wa-al-mulūk wa-ghayrihim*, ed. ʿU. Tadmurī (Saydā and Beirut, 2010), II, 154–55.

Owing to the increasing hegemony of the Islamic narrative, Ibn Wāṣil's report was more detailed than those of his Syrian predecessors. He included two crucial elements of the Islamic narrative, the massacre of (more than) 70,000 and the plunder taken from the Dome of the Rock, and he represented the conquest as part of a Frankish–Muslim clash. However, the Syrian tradition is still traceable as the author mentioned the Jewish victims that had appeared neither in the other regional traditions nor in the Islamic narrative.

Ibn Wāṣil's text was the last that can be described in any meaningful sense as "Syrian" and the Syrian tradition with its three characteristic elements entirely disappeared from the historiographical field in the late seventh/thirteenth century. Subsequent Syrian works ascribed an outstanding importance to the conquest, did not mention the Jewish victims, always set the conquest into a framework of Frankish–Muslim confrontation and, most importantly, generally adopted the tripartite structure of the Islamic narrative. Significantly, remnants of the Syrian tradition only appeared in texts on the margins of scholarship that never acquired an authoritative status. The Jewish victims, for instance, were only mentioned again in the earliest surviving Arabic work specifically dedicated to the crusades, *The Exposition and Explanation of the Cursed Franks' Departure to the Muslim Lands*, most probably authored by a Syrian writer. This marginal work, written in 920/1514, was, in contrast to the authoritative scholarly works, composed in Middle Arabic with strong dialectical elements.[28] The expanding influence of the Islamic narrative was thus to entirely supplant the low importance that the Syrian tradition ascribed to the conquest of Jerusalem and its refusal to give much prominence to a massacre.

The Egyptian Tradition

As there are very few traces of Ibn al-Athīr's three constitutive elements in the Syrian tradition, the next step is to turn to the contemporary or near-contemporary texts of the Egyptian tradition in order to reconstruct the genesis of the Islamic narrative. This tradition is less extensive than its Syrian counterpart and its regional background is somewhat more complicated, as its most interesting author, Ibn al-ʿArabī (d. 543/1148), exemplifies. Although this author was an Andalusian scholar, his text belongs, as I will argue below, to the Egyptian tradition.[29] Ibn al-ʿArabī, a scholar from Seville, stayed in the central Islamic lands and visited Mecca, Damascus and Baghdad between 485/1092 and 493/1100. He also dwelled

[28] Aḥmad al-Ḥarīrī, *al-Iʿlām wa-al-tabyīn fī khurūj al-Firanj al-malāʿīn ʿalā diyār al-muslimīn*, ed. S. Zakkār (Damascus, 1981), 25–26.

[29] Ibn al-ʿArabī, *al-Naṣṣ al-kāmil li-kitāb al-ʿAwāṣim min al-qawāṣim*, ed. ʿA. Ṭālibī (Cairo, 1997), 371–72. This passage was first discussed by Joseph Drory, *Ibn al-ʿArabi of Seville: A Journey in Palestine (1092–95)* [in Hebrew] (Ramat Gan, 1993), who cites Ibn al-ʿArabī's work in the edition *al-ʿAwāṣim min al-qawāṣim* (Algiers, 1981), II, 498–99 (cited in Kedar, "The Jerusalem Massacre," 73). See also Joseph Drory, "Some Observations during a Visit to Palestine by Ibn al-Arabi of Seville in 1092–1095," *Crusades* 3 (2004): 101–24.

in Jerusalem for a while shortly before the crusader conquest. Back in al-Andalus he penned several works, among them *The Rightly-Guided Protection from the Disasters of Delusion*. In this work he criticised al-Ghazālī's (d. 505/1111) approach to Sufism as well as "extreme" Shiite groups and outlined his own positions and the way to salvation. The main aim of this book was to warn his contemporaries of the dangers of wrong belief that would inevitably lead to social instability and spiritual doubts.[30]

He placed his remarks on the conquest of Jerusalem in the book's final chapter where he developed his concept of an ideal syllabus for becoming a scholar. When discussing the choice of teachers he acknowledged that it was impossible for most students to study each subject with the supreme authority of their time and that it was perfectly acceptable to take a single teacher for various disciplines. He then underlined that this held true in particular for those who were studying

> in the far-away regions and the distant border lands. They are in turmoil as they are far from the Caliphate and the source of the imamate. If you had seen Syria and Iraq in the 490s you would have witnessed splendid religiosity, ample knowledge as well as all-encompassing and well-ordered security. It would be impossible to describe the splendour of its affairs and the flowering of its perfection. Then strokes of fate blew over it like winds from the north and from the south. Syria became a deserted past and the word of Islam became extinguished in the Aqṣā Mosque. On early Friday morning, twelve days before the end of Shaʿbān 492 [= 18 Shaʿbān/10 July], 3,000 were killed in these events,[31] among them worshippers and scholars, men and women as well as famous ascetics and renowned pious individuals. In these events the Shīrāzī scholar was killed in the Dome of the Chain[32] among the group of women. On account of the death of al-Malik al-ʿĀdil [the Saljuq Sultan Malikshāh] in [4]86 [*sic*: 485/1092] and [the Caliph] al-Muqtadī bi-Allāh [in 487/1094] a revolt broke out in Khurāsān and the Bāṭinīya rose up. Al-Malikshāh's sons disagreed and so the Byzantines (Rūm) could attack Syria and take possession of the third holy site of Islam.[33]

The Egyptian background of this report is evident from this tradition's two characteristic elements, namely interpreting the crusades as a Byzantine endeavour and blaming Saljuq disunity for the invasions. The Fatimids in Egypt initially understood the crusaders to be Byzantine troops and it was only when the crusaders

---

[30] Fatima Fahtah, "El sufismo en al-Andalus entre la aceptación y el rechazo a través del libro del cadí Ibn al-ʿArabi al-Išbīlī, Al-ʿawāṣim min al-qawāṣim'," in *El sufismo y las normas del Islam. Actas del IV Congreso Internacional de Estudios Jurídicos Islámicos: Derecho y Sufismo, (Murcia, 7–3 Mayo 2003)*, ed. A. Carmona (Murcia, 2006), 35–45; Binyamin Abrahamov, *Islamic Theology: Traditionalism and Rationalism* (Edinburgh, 1998), 8 and 18.

[31] The text reads "*wa-qatala fīhā*," "killed in it." In contrast to the interpretation in Kedar, "The Jerusalem Massacre," 73, the feminine pronoun cannot refer to the Aqṣā Mosque as is also evident from the use of the same "*fīhā*" when describing the death of the scholar in the Dome of the Chain.

[32] "*Baqiyat al-silsila*" reads "*bi-qubbat al-silsila*." This dome is to the east of the Dome of the Rock; see Andreas Kaplony, *The Haram of Jerusalem 324–1099: Temple, Friday Mosque, Area of Spiritual Power*, Stuttgart 2002.

[33] Ibn al-ʿArabī, *ʿAwāṣim*, 371–72.

arrived in southern Syria that the Fatimid elite became aware of their different character.[34] Ibn al-ʿArabī had been staying in Egypt when Jerusalem fell and shortly after he returned to Spain in 493/1100. Presumably, he initially received the news of the crusades with their specific Egyptian interpretation as a Byzantine campaign. Not being overtly interested in history in this polemical work, he retained this erroneous label. The second Egypt-specific characteristic of his text, blaming Saljuq disunity, reflected Fatimid perceptions of the events in Syria and further to the east. In contrast in the Syrian tradition – mostly written in regions ruled by Saljuq princes and Atabegs or subsequently by the post-Saljuq dynasties of the Zangids and Ayyubids – blaming the Saljuqs was virtually absent. The Iraqi tradition, as will be seen below, did blame the Saljuqs for the fall of Jerusalem in the framework of the rivalry between the Abbasid Caliphate and the Saljuq Sultanate. Yet, this tradition emphasized Saljuq passivity rather than disunity.

Comparing Ibn al-ʿArabī's version with Ibn al-Athīr's report, it is evident that two of the Islamic narrative's constitutive elements, the plunder of the Dome of the Rock and the delegation to Baghdad, are again missing. However, in contrast to the contemporary or near-contemporary Syrian authors al-ʿAẓīmī, Ibn al-Qalānisī and Ibn al-Azraq al-Fāriqī, Ibn al-ʿArabī's text does mention a large-scale massacre among Muslims. It is here that we find some similarity with Ibn al-Athīr's text as the author also named groups of those killed, "worshippers and scholars, men and women as well as famous ascetics and renowned pious individuals." Although Ibn al-Athīr's "Muslim imams and scholars as well as devout and ascetic men" were not identical, this is the main element from the Syrian and Egyptian traditions that indicates some (direct or indirect) influence on Ibn al-Athīr's text. In addition, Ibn al-ʿArabī was the only author of the Syrian and Egyptian traditions who gave, as did Ibn al-Athīr, a figure for those killed – although the concrete number of 3,000 remained unique to his text and did not appear in any other texts.

As this number is relatively new to modern scholarship and seems to be more realistic than the inflated 70,000 it is worth to briefly discuss it. Ibn al-ʿArabī's account in general is problematic in factual terms as he was not particularly concerned with numerical accuracy and, for instance, got the date of the conquest and the death date for the Saljuq sultan wrong. This is clearly distinct from the later Islamic narrative that generally gave a correct (or almost correct) date for the conquest, 22 or 23 Shaʿbān/14 or 15 July. A more specific second problem in Ibn al-ʿArabī's account is that the number of 3,000 victims is exactly the figure that was also cited for the massacre that had taken place in the town under Atsız some twenty years earlier.[35] After Atsız, a Turcoman commander of the Saljuqs, suffered defeat against the Fatimid troops in Egypt in 469/1077 he faced a revolt in Jerusalem. He subsequently took the town by sword and suppressed the revolt ruthlessly killing

[34] H. A. R. Gibb, "Notes on the Arabic Materials for the History of the Early Crusades," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 7/4 (1933–35): 739–54, here 740–41, and Köhler, *Alliances and Treaties*, 44–54.

[35] Kedar, "The Jerusalem Massacre," 73, n.190, briefly hints at this.

numerous civilians, forcing the population to flee to the Aqṣā Mosque and the Dome of the Rock.[36] Those sources that gave a number for the victims agree on 3,000.[37] It is thus possible that Ibn al-ʿArabī combined elements from the two main conquests that took place in the town in the late fifth/eleventh century. That Ibn al-ʿArabī probably combined these two conquests is not entirely surprising when we consider the framework in which he placed the conquest of 492/1099. His text did not conceptualize it as part of a Frankish–Muslim conflict, but rather described the conquerors – in the characteristically Egyptian way – as Byzantines. The main point of the passage was furthermore to describe how internal strife (*fitna*) or disunity among the Saljuq rulers in the east had destroyed the learned world. The "details" of this conquest, such as its date and the exact identity of the conquerors, were obviously of little interest to Ibn al-ʿArabī to make his general point on scholarship.[38]

The second Egyptian text displaying this tradition's characteristic two elements – crusades as a Byzantine endeavour and Saljuq disunity – was the composite chronicle *Biographies of the Holy Church*, the so-called *History of the Patriarchs of the Egyptian Church*. The year 492/1099 falls within the passage written by the Cairene author Ibn al-Qulzumī (fl. 521/1127) and composed before the fall of Tyre in 518/1124. It is therefore, together with Ibn al-ʿArabī's text, one of the earliest Arabic reports that we have on the conquest:

> In the days of the afore-mentioned Patriarch Michael, armies of the Byzantines (Rūm) and the Franks arrived from the Byzantine and Frankish lands in Syria in great multitudes. They gained possession of Antioch and its district and most of Upper Syria. It was at that time in the hands of the Khurasanian Ghuzz, and nothing remained of it [Syria] in the hands of the Ghuzz except Damascus and its district. Then they gained possession of the venerated town of Jerusalem and its district in the month of Ramadan in the lunar year 492 [= 23 July–21 August 1099]. We, the Community of the Christians, the Jacobites and the Copts did not join in the pilgrimage to it, nor were we able to approach it, on account

---

[36] Shimon Gat, "The Seljuks in Jerusalem," in *Towns and Material Culture in the Medieval Middle East*, ed. Y. Lev (Leiden, 2002), 1–39.

[37] Al-Dhahabī, *Taʾrīkh al-islām wa-wafayāt al-mashāhīr wa-al-aʿlām*, ed. ʿU. Tadmurī (Beirut, 1987–2000), 461–70, 34; Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, *Mirʾāt al-zamān fī taʾrīkh al-aʿyān*, ed. A. Sevim (Ankara, 1968), 186.

[38] The figure 3,000 is also problematic as it appears in so many Arabic conquest narratives. For instance, al-Malik al-ʿĀdil, Saladin's brother, quelled a revolt in Qifṭ (the ancient Coptos in Upper Egypt) in 570/1176–77 and the early chronicles merely mentioned that he killed "a great number" in the town (Ibn Shaddād, *al-Nawādir al-sulṭānīya wa-al-maḥāsin al-Yūsufīya*, ed. J. al-Shayyāl (Cairo, 1964), 48: "*khalq ʿaẓīm*"; the chroniclers Imād al-Dīn and Ibn Abī Ṭayy, as cited in Abū Shāma, *Kitāb al-rawḍatayn fī akhbār al-dawlatayn al-Nūrīya wa-al-Ṣalāḥīya*, ed. I. al-Zaybaq (Beirut, 1997), II, 337–39, also do not give any numbers). Later chronicles suddenly gave the number of victims as 3,000 (Al-Maqrīzī, *al-Mawāʿiẓ wa-al-iʿtibār fī dhikr al-khiṭaṭ wa-al-āthār*, ed. A. Sayyid (London, 2002), I, 633). The same number also appeared as the number of Muslim prisoners that were being held in Jerusalem when Saladin reconquered the town (Ibn Shaddād, *Nawādir*, 82). Beyond the crusading period we encounter it in contexts as diverse as the number of those the Byzantines enslaved when they took the northern Mesopotamian town of Raʾs al-ʿAyn in 332/943 (Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam fī taʾrīkh al-mulūk wa-al-umam*, ed. M. ʿAṭā and M. ʿAṭā (Beirut, 1992), XIV, 34) and the number of Byzantine troops executed in 285/898–99 by the Muslim troops (Ibn al-Jawzī, *Muntaẓam*, XII, 378).

> of what is known of their hatred of us as well as their false belief concerning us and their charge against us of impiety.[39]

This passage offers, irrespective of its Coptic background, a clearly Egyptian outlook on the conquest that has none of the Islamic narrative's three constitutive elements.[40] The most prominent Egyptian element in Ibn al-Qulzumī's text is the role of the Byzantines who were named as among the invaders, and in the entire subsequent passage "they" probably referred as much to the Byzantines as to the Franks. The second Egyptian characteristic, blaming Saljuq disunity, is at first glance absent. Yet the author made clear that the opponents of the invaders were not "the Muslims," but he employed the pejorative term "*ghuzz*". This term was originally used for the non-Muslim Turks on the borders of the Islamic world but in the Egyptian context denoted Turcoman mercenaries and here the author was alluding to the Ghuzz precursors of the Saljuqs. Up to the end of the Fatimid dynasty, pro-Fatimid authors used this term for the Saljuq and post-Saljuq rulers of Syria, directing it for instance against the Zangids when they started to play a prominent role in Egyptian politics under Nūr al-Dīn. In this period, no Syrian author would have used this term to describe the Zangid troops.[41] Ibn al-Qulzumī further emphasized the otherness of the Syrian rulers by adding the adjective "Khurasanian," depicting them as alien to the lands they ruled as the new set of Byzantine/Frankish invaders. He introduced these Ghuzz merely as victims of the conquests who lose their lands while he subsequently praised the Fatimids for mounting resistance – though unsuccessfully.

An important point emerging out of the two distinctive characteristics of the Egyptian tradition as evident in Ibn al-ʿArabī's and Ibn al-Qulzumī's text is that they – similar to the Syrian tradition and in contrast to the Islamic narrative – did not set the conquest of Jerusalem into the framework of a Frankish–Muslim conflict. Certainly, "Islam" features as a prominent category in Ibn al-ʿArabī's text but, compared to the Islamic narrative, the blurred profile of the conquerors and the disunity of the local lords gave his text a very different feel from what was to come. However, in another aspect this tradition anticipates the Islamic narrative and differs from the Syrian tradition. Both the Muslim Ibn al-ʿArabī and the Copt Ibn al-Qulzumī considered the fall of Jerusalem to be the defining event of the First Crusade. While the early Syrian chroniclers ascribed little significance to Jerusalem, it is evident that for a religious scholar such as Ibn al-ʿArabī Jerusalem was of central religious importance.

---

[39] Ibn al-Qulzumī, Yūḥannā b. Ṣāʿīd, *Siyar al-bīʿa al-muqaddasa* (*History of the Patriarchs of the Egyptian Church*), ed. and trans. A. S. Atiya et al., vol. II, part 3 (Cairo, 1959), ar. 249/engl. 398–99 (translation slightly modified).

[40] Later Egyptian Muslim authors who did not take up the Islamic narrative, such as Ibn al-Dawādārī (fl. 736/1335), had no problems in relying on this passage from a "Christian" chronicle (Ibn al-Dawādārī, *Kanz al-durar wa-jāmiʿ al-ghurar*, ed. H. Römer et al. (Cairo, 1960–94), VI, 451–52).

[41] Köhler, *Alliances and Treaties*, 191.

Yet, the Egyptian tradition in the Arabic historiography of the crusades suffered in most aspects very much the same fate as its Syrian counterpart: It was hardly taken up by later authors and its characteristic elements had little influence in subsequent centuries. The emphasis on the Byzantine character of the conquests disappeared and putting the blame as squarely as these two authors on the Ghuzz or Saljuq disunity was not a prominent feature of later reports. Even the salient elements of Ibn al-ʿArabī's report on the massacre fell into oblivion as later authors neither took up the number of 3,000, nor mentioned the women killed in the Dome of the Chain. Yet, as with the Syrian tradition, some traces of the Egyptian tradition were to survive before the increasing role of the Islamic narrative entirely discarded them. For instance, a century after the conquest the Egyptian chancery secretary and man of letters Ibn Ẓāfir (d. 613/1216 or 623/1226) wrote in his chronicle:

> Under his reign [the Caliph al-Mustaʿlī] their [the Fatimids'] dynasty weakened and most cities in Syria slipped from their control. The lands were divided between the Turks (*atrāk*) and the Franks – may God curse them. … In Shaʿbān they took Jerusalem by the sword, because al-Afḍal had taken it from Salmān b. Artuq on Friday, five days remaining of Ramaḍān [5]91, and appointed a governor. Yet, he had not the strength to resist the Franks. It would have been better for the Muslims if [al-Mustaʿlī] had left it in the hands of the Artuqids. When the Franks – may God curse them – conquered Jerusalem he had regrets. However, this was of no profit to him because he had looked favourably upon their arrival hoping that they would prevent the Turks gaining influence in Egyptian lands.[42]

Although this text was written before the Islamic narrative became hegemonic, it clearly shows the conceptual changes that had taken place since Ibn al-ʿArabī and Ibn al-Qulzumī had written their reports. Most importantly, this text unequivocally identified the conquerors as Franks and generously employed curses when mentioning them. In addition, as an administrator of the Ayyubid dynasty Ibn Ẓāfir obviously had little sympathy for the Fatimids and employed this section to show the Fatimid Caliph's inaptitude in dealing with the challenge. Yet the framework for this report was still to some extent a Fatimid one and the author did not – like Ibn al-ʿArabī and Ibn al-Qulzumī – conceptualize the crusades as the Frankish–Muslim conflict that was to become central to the Islamic narrative. The enemies of the Franks were not yet "the Muslims," but rather "the Turks," basically Ibn al-Qulzumī's Ghuzz. As this was a pre-Ibn al-Athīr text, it is of little wonder that the author had, like his Egyptian predecessors, nothing to say on massacre, plunder or the delegation to Baghdad.

Coming back to this article's two main questions – factuality and meaning – the Egyptian tradition is of as limited factual value as the Syrian tradition and provides little data on the conquest except the problematic figure of 3,000 victims. Ibn al-Qulzumī was not interested at all in any details of these events in faraway

[42] Ibn Ẓāfir, *Akhbār al-duwal al-munqaṭiʿa: dirāsa taḥlīlīya li-l-qism al-khāṣṣ bi-al-Fāṭimīyīn*, ed. A. Ferré, (Cairo, 1972), 82.

Syria and he neither gave the slightest indication of how the town was conquered, nor referred to any subsequent massacre. However, the Egyptian tradition as reflected in Ibn al-ʿArabī's and Ibn al-Qulzumī's text is of interest, as it was as contemporary to the events as the Syrian tradition. What we see here is thus a bifurcation of the historiographical field at its very beginnings. These two traditions hardly agreed upon any details except that invaders coming from the north took Jerusalem at some point in Shaʿbān (Ibn al-ʿArabī/Ibn al-Qalānisī) or Ramaḍān (Ibn al-Qulzumī) 492/June-August 1099 in the morning (Ibn al-ʿArabī) or in the evening (Ibn al-Qalānisī). These Frankish or Byzantine conquerors carried out a massacre of the town's Jewish (al-ʿAẓīmī?), Jewish and Muslim (Ibn al-Qalānisī) or Muslim (Ibn al-ʿArabī) population and according to some authors destroyed Jewish (al-ʿAẓīmī) or Jewish and Muslim (Ibn al-Qalānisī) sacred places in the town. Even on the details of the massacre there is no overlap between the two traditions as Ibn al-ʿArabī had nothing to say about the Jewish victims, but singled out the Dome of the Chain as a place where a massacre took place – a detail which was entirely absent from the Syrian (or any other) tradition. Moving on to the formation of the Islamic narrative, it is evident that the only factual element that Ibn al-Athīr's Islamic narrative could have taken from these contemporary and near-contemporary texts originating in Syria and Egypt was the massacre. Yet, apart from Ibn al-ʿArabī's categories of those killed, most of the concrete details (Jews, Dome of the Chain) were excluded from Ibn al-Athīr's work. In terms of ascribing meaning to the conquest, it is evident that the Syrian and Egyptian traditions again could not have been the texts where the Islamic narrative originated from. Both traditions, the Syrian more so than the Egyptian, were very reluctant to frame the conquest into a Frankish–Muslim conflict and both traditions ascribed a low importance to it. It was only the Egyptian emphasis on Jerusalem as the constitutive element of early crusader conquests which prefigured to some extent the Islamic narrative's outlook.

The Iraqi Tradition

While Ibn al-Athīr could not have built on the Syrian and Egyptian traditions to frame his narrative, the case is different for the Iraqi tradition. The first account that not only contains Ibn al-Athīr's three broad constitutive narrative elements – massacre, plunder and the delegation – but whose details also overlap to a large extent came from this rather unlikely quarter. The author of this account was the Baghdadi scholar and preacher Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1200).[43] Ibn al-Jawzī wrote his chronicle several decades after Ibn al-Qulzumī, Ibn al-ʿArabī, al-ʿAẓīmī, and Ibn al-Qalānisī put their reports down on paper. Consequently, he did not belong to the

[43] On Ibn al-Jawzī's views on the early crusades, see Joseph Drory, "Early Muslim Reflections on the Crusades," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 25 (2001): 92–101.

same category of contemporary or near-contemporary authors. However, as argued below, his report was most likely the first written version of an earlier Iraqi tradition that had started to develop with the fall of Jerusalem and that is in chronological terms comparable to the Syrian and Egyptian traditions:

> The Franks took Jerusalem on Friday 13 Shaʿbān [5 July] and they killed more than 70,000 Muslims there. The Franks stripped the Dome of the Rock of more than forty silver lanterns, each of them weighing 3,600 dirhams, and a great silver lamp weighing forty Syrian pounds, as well as more than twenty gold ones and innumerable items of clothing and other things. Refugees from Syria came and reported what had happened to the Muslims. The Damascene judge Abū Saʿd al-Harawī rose in the *dīwān*, spoke and brought those present to tears. One of those present in the *dīwān* was sent to the army to inform them of this calamity, but nothing was undertaken. Abū al-Muẓaffar al-Abīwardī thus recited a poem on this matter: [seven verses follow].[44]

In a radical departure from the Syrian and Egyptian sources of the sixth/twelfth century, Ibn al-Jawzī ascribed a very different meaning to the conquest. To underline the conquest's outstanding importance he positioned this report at the very beginning of the year's events in his chronicle. In contrast to the succinct comments in the other two traditions, Ibn al-Jawzī thus framed the conquest as the central event of that year, which entirely overshadowed all other developments. The more important contribution of Ibn al-Jawzī's report in changing the meaning ascribed to the town's conquest was to firmly frame it as a Frankish–Muslim conflict. While some pertinent elements had existed in other reports, it was only in his text that the conquerors were now facing a homogeneous group of Muslims. He replaced "Egyptians" (Fatimids) and "Turks" (Saljuqs) with "Muslims" as those being attacked, as much as "Muslims" were the victims of the massacre and those who sent a delegation to Iraq. The Dome of the Rock, as one of the two central Muslim holy sites in Jerusalem besides the Aqṣā Mosque, was introduced as a crucial setting. Finally, he gave a religious scholar, Abū Saʿd al-Harawī, a central role and he cited lines of poetry that were entirely absent from both the Syrian and the Egyptian tradition to emphasize the conquest's religious framework:

> This is war and he who lies in the tomb at Medina [the Prophet Muḥammad]
> Raises his voice and cries: "O sons of Hashim! [addressing the Caliphs]"
> I see my community slow to raise the lance against
> the enemy; I see the faith resting on feeble pillars[45]

As much as his report constituted a break in conceptual terms, it suggested a new set of factual details. The Muslims were now subject to a large-scale massacre with more than 70,000 victims, plunder became a crucial narrative element described in considerable detail, and a Syrian delegation of refugees headed by al-Harawī

[44] Ibn al-Jawzī, *Muntaẓam*, XVII, 47–48. Ibn al-Jawzī's chronicle ends with the year 574/1179.
[45] Ibn al-Jawzī, *Muntaẓam*, XVII, 48.

appeared and took up most of the space in this report. The few concrete details that the Syrian and Egyptian traditions had mentioned – the withdrawal to David's Tower, the destruction of shrines and the Tomb of Abraham, as well as the killing of the women, including the Shīrāzī scholar, in the Dome of the Chain – were entirely missing. This report thus emerged out of a historiographical void, obliterating to a large extent what had been reported previously and adding material that had been non-existent in earlier sources. The Syrian and the Egyptian traditions had hardly agreed on anything except for the bare outlines of the event. With Ibn al-Jawzī we see a third tradition that again has few overlapping areas with the other traditions. He agreed with the Syrian texts on the conquerors' Frankish identity, but apart from that one has the impression that one is reading a report on an entirely different event that is even dated differently.

Ibn al-Jawzī's radical departure from the other two traditions in terms of factual material as well as conceptual framework goes back to two main factors. On the one hand, his text must be seen as a firmly Iraqi text that had developed in Baghdad, partly in response to the political conflicts between Caliphate and Sultanate. On the other hand, this text's shape and content were closely connected to the oral tradition of popular preaching out of which it emerged. The Iraqi character of Ibn al-Jawzī's narrative must be seen against the background of his biography. In contrast to many of his contemporaries, Ibn al-Jawzī was a surprisingly sedentary scholar who never travelled to other cities in order to study with a wider pool of scholars. He was born in Baghdad in 511/1117, died in this city and remained in it throughout his life except for two pilgrimages to Mecca and his exile in the city of Wāsiṭ, south-east of Baghdad, from 590/1194 to 595/1199. Most importantly, he never visited Syria or even northern Mesopotamia. Even his chronicle, despite pretending "to be universal, is in reality above all Baghdādī"[46] and belonged first and foremost to the genre of local chronicles.

The influence of Ibn al-Jawzī's Iraqi background on his conquest narrative is evident in a number of its features, among them the inclusion of al-Abīwardī's (d. 507/1113) poetry.[47] These lines became firmly attached to the Islamic narrative and most later authors quoted them as if they were the words of an eyewitness. Yet they were composed in Baghdad in response to news of the conquest by a poet born in Khurāsān. Al-Abīwardī probably never visited Syria and made his career in Baghdad and further to the east where he died, in Isfahan. The Syrian historians of the sixth/twelfth century seem either to be oblivious to his lines or at least to have decided not to include them in their works. That al-Abīwardī's focus on Jerusalem

[46] Claude Cahen, "The Historiography of the Seljuqid Period," in *Historians of the Middle East*, ed. B. Lewis and P. Holt (London, 1962), 59–78, here 62.

[47] On al-Abīwardī see Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-aʿyān wa-abnāʾ al-zamān*, ed. I. ʿAbbās (Beirut, 1968–72), IV, 444–49 (with wrong death date); al-Dhahabī, *Taʾrīkh*, 501–20, 182–87. G. J. van Gelder, "al-Abīwardī'," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Third Edition*, ed. K. Fleet et al., http://referenceworks.brillonline.com.ezproxy.soas.ac.uk/entries/encyclopaedia-of-islam–3 (5 April 2012).

was arguably a specifically Iraqi phenomenon shows in the work of the second early poet writing on the crusades, Ibn al-Khayyāṭ (d. 517/1123?). This poet was, in contrast to al-Abīwardī, a native of Damascus and spent his entire life in Syria. However, he included no reference whatsoever to the conquest of Jerusalem in his *Dīwān* (at least in the shape as it has come down to us) and the town played in his poetry a marginal role compared to Damascus and even Tripoli.[48]

The report on the delegation that was led by the Damascene judge al-Harawī (d. 518/1124) from Damascus to Baghdad exemplifies even more clearly the Iraqi background of Ibn al-Jawzī's text and also spells out its implication for local politics. The delegation is the most innovative element in Ibn al-Jawzī's version as it was entirely absent from the Syrian and Egyptian traditions, whereas we find at least some vague references to massacre and plunder in these texts. That this delegation was absent from the Egyptian texts might be explained by their authors' limited interest in specifically Syrian events and Fatimid hostility towards the Caliph in Baghdad. One would expect, however, that Syrian authors would have shown some interest, however slight, in this delegation. This absence of the delegation from their conquest reports is all the more remarkable as al-ʿAẓīmī and Ibn al-Qalānisī included al-Harawī's obituary in their chronicles and they could have at least briefly referred to the delegation within these obituaries.[49] This absence was also not the product of Syrian authors disregarding such delegations to Baghdad: Ibn al-Qalānisī, for instance, included considerable detail on the delegation of prominent citizens from Aleppo who went to Baghdad five years later in order to call for support, and al-ʿAẓīmī mentioned the delegation from Tripoli to Baghdad some nine years later.[50]

The main reason for the absence of the Damascene delegation from sixth-/twelfth-century Syrian chronicles and its inclusion in Ibn al-Jawzī's report is that this delegation was not a specifically Syrian event, but rather relevant in the context of Iraqi politics. Ibn al-Jawzī firmly placed al-Harawī's delegation, his speech and its consequences within the political scene of Baghdad in the sixth/twelfth century. This delegation was only meaningful to the Iraqi author Ibn al-Jawzī, while the Syrian authors, and even more so the Egyptian ones, ascribed no significance to the event. Even the description of al-Harawī as a "Damascene judge" is somewhat misleading as it implies a local attachment that this scholar never had. Al-Harawī originated from the eastern Islamic lands and during his career served as a judge in

[48] Ibn al-Khayyāṭ, *Dīwān*, ed. Mardam Bek (Damascus, 1958). On the development of *jihād*-poetry see Osman Latiff, "Qur'anic Imagery, Jesus and the Creation of a Pious-Warrior Ethos in the Muslim Poetry of the Anti-Frankish Jihad," in *Cultural Encounters during the Crusades*, ed. Kurt Villads Jensen et al. (Odense, 2013), 135–51; Carole Hillenbrand, "Jihād Poetry in the Age of the Crusades," in *Crusades – Medieval Worlds in Conflict*, ed. Thomas Madden et al. (Aldershot, 2011), 9–23; Hadia Dajani-Shakeel, "Jihād in Twelfth-Century Arabic Poetry," *Muslim World* 66 (1976): 96–113.

[49] Al-Harawī's obituary: Ibn al-Qalānisī, *Dhayl*, 210; al-ʿAẓīmī, *Taʾrīkh*, ed. Zaʿrūr, 375, ed. Cahen, 395.

[50] Ibn al-Qalānisī, *Dhayl*, 173; al-ʿAẓīmī, *Taʾrīkh*, ed. Cahen 379.

many different cities, especially in the Persian-speaking lands. He came to Damascus as a preacher and was subsequently appointed judge over Syria. However, his spell in Syria was brief and he soon returned to Baghdad and moved further east where he was killed in the principal mosque of Hamadhān (Persia).[51]

The political function of the delegation in the report is closely linked to Ibn al-Jawzī's influential political role in the city. At the height of his career Ibn al-Jawzī was the Caliph's court preacher, headed an organized campaign against "heresy" and, quite exceptionally, held five professorial chairs in different *madrasas* simultaneously.[52] Parallel to his stellar rise as the most distinguished preacher, he became closely involved in the Caliphate's attempts to regain some autonomy. During the sixth/twelfth century Abbasid Caliphs repeatedly tried to escape the tutelage of the Saljuqs and other Turkish military commanders in order to re-emerge with an independent military and political power base.[53] In the framework of these policies they also drew on public preachers to secure popular support against the Saljuq Sultans. They forged an especially close alliance with the Hanbalite traditionalist milieu of the city, of which Ibn al-Jawzī was one of the most prominent representatives.[54] This is also evident from his chronicle in general, which systematically paid particular attention to the institution of the Caliphate throughout Islamic history.[55]

Ibn al-Jawzī's report on the delegation must be read against this background of the bitter conflicts and fierce competition between the Caliphate and the Sultanate in Baghdad of his period. The anti-Saljuq function of Ibn al-Jawzī's report appears in particular at the moment when, after al-Harawī had delivered his speech, one of those present went to the "*'askar*," that is the Saljuq military, to urge them to take action. However, as expected, the Saljuq military did not bother to move and "nothing was undertaken." To drive the point home this central aspect of the report is taken up in the first lines that al-Abīwardī recited, as reported by Ibn al-Jawzī:

> How can the eye sleep between the lids
> at a time of disasters that would waken any sleeper?
> While your Syrian brothers can only sleep
> on the backs of their chargers, or in vultures' bellies!

---

[51] Al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rīkh*, 501–20, 428–29.

[52] On Ibn al-Jawzī as preacher, see Ibn al-Jawzī, *Kitāb al-quṣṣāṣ wa-al-mudhakkirīn*, ed. Merlin L. Swartz (Beirut, 1986); Angelika Hartmann, "Les ambivalences d'un sermonnaire ḥanbalite: Ibn al-Ǧawzī (m. en 597/1201), sa carrière et son ouvrage autographe, le Kitāb al-Ḥawātīm," *Annales Islamologiques* 22 (1986): 51–115; eadem, "La prédication islamique au Moyen Age: Ibn al-Ǧauzī et ses sermons (fin du 6e/12e siècle)," *Quaderni di Studi Arabi* 5–6 (1987–88): 337–46; Stefan Leder, *Ibn al-Ǧauzī und seine Kompilation wider die Leidenschaft: Der Traditionalist in gelehrter Überlieferung und originärer Lehre* (Beirut, 1984).

[53] Eric J. Hanne, *Putting the Caliph in his Place: Power, Authority, and the late Abbasid Caliphate* (Madison, NJ, 2007).

[54] Ibn al-Jawzī, *Kitāb al-quṣṣāṣ*, ed. Swartz. Leder, *Kompilation wider die Leidenschaft*, 15–42.

[55] Joseph de Somogyi, "Ibn al-Jauzī's School of Historiography," *Acta Orientalia (Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae)* 6 (1956): 207–14.

> Must the Byzantines (al-Rūm) feed on our ignominy while you
> trail behind you the train of a pleasant life, like men whose world is at peace?[56]

With his report and these lines Ibn al-Jawzī emphasized that the Saljuq Sultanate had failed in the past to live up to its foremost obligation, to protect the Muslim community, and thus had little legitimacy to claim supreme political and military authority in the present. As Ibn al-Jawzī had set the conquest into a firmly Frankish–Muslim framework, the main point was not lost on his audiences in late sixth-/twelfth-century Baghdad: against the background of the vicious conflicts that were taking place between Caliphate and Sultanate in Ibn al-Jawzī's period, his report delegitimized the claims of the principal non-Caliphal contender to monopolize military might. As religious prestige and authority was one of the most important elements of the Caliphate's claims, Ibn al-Jawzī framed the report on the Jerusalem conquest accordingly and employed al-Abīwardī's poetry to underline his point. The link between the crusaders' successes and the Saljuq passivity was so important to him that he had even made the same point in his reports on the previous year, 491/1097–98. When mentioning the arrival of the crusaders, he did not fail to implicitly blame Saljuq inertness for their success and introduced already at this point the 70,000 killed in Jerusalem.[57]

Ibn al-Jawzī's innovative report did not only develop out of the background of Iraqi politics, but should also be set within the field of scholarly activity for which he was primarily renowned in his own time, preaching. He published widely on homiletics and a large number of his works were paraenetic in nature.[58] More importantly he was a practising preacher and throughout his life Ibn al-Jawzī held public preaching sessions that attracted large audiences, commoners and members of the political elite alike. Although the number of 300,000 given for the audience of his famous session in 569/1173–74 was merely symbolic, it shows the esteem in which Ibn al-Jawzī was held. The Baghdad of his period did not lack public preachers but he was arguably the most influential and popular among his contemporaries. When Ibn Jubayr, for instance, visited Baghdad in 580/1184, he devoted a long passage to the preaching sessions of Ibn al-Jawzī, which deeply impressed him:

> Eyes poured forth their tears, and souls revealed their secret longings. Men threw themselves upon him, confessing their sins and showing their penitence. Hearts and minds were enravished, and there was great commotion. The senses lost their understanding and discernment, and there was no way to restraint. … Unceasingly he repeated these verses, his emotion visible upon him, tears almost preventing the issue of words from his mouth, until we feared he would be choked. He hastened to rise and descended from the pulpit

[56] Ibn al-Jawzī, *Muntaẓam*, XVII, 47 (translation in Francesco Gabrieli, *Arab Historians of the Crusades*, trans. E. J. Costello (Berkeley, 1984), 12).

[57] Ibn al-Jawzī, *Muntaẓam*, XVII, 43.

[58] Ibn al-Jawzī, *Kitāb al-quṣṣāṣ*, ed. Swartz; Hartmann, "Les ambivalences d'un sermonnaire ḥanbalite."

> speedily, but in a haze. He had inspired hearts with fear and left men on burning coals. They accompanied him with red eyes, openly weeping, and some were rolling in the dust. Oh what a sight![59]

During the sixth/twelfth-century, the crusades played an increasing role in preaching activities in general[60] and Ibn al-Jawzī was surely part of this trend. His report on the conquest of Jerusalem itself embodies the link between Ibn al-Jawzī's historiographical interests, on the one hand, and his preaching activities, on the other. Owing to the report's paraenetic nature, Ibn al-Jawzī reproduced exactly the same version of it in his treatise on the merits of Jerusalem (*Faḍāʾil al-Quds*).[61] It would thus be highly arbitrary to describe this report as "historiographical" without taking into account the fact that it easily reappeared in other genres.

While the background of Iraqi politics explained why Ibn al-Jawzī included the delegation, the two other salient features of his report – the 70,000 victims and the plunder of the Dome of the Rock – can best be explained with reference to the paraenetic nature of the report. The number of 70,000 for the victims of the massacre experienced an impressive career as Ibn al-Athīr and many subsequent authors such as Abū al-Fidāʾ, al-Nuwayrī and Ibn al-Wardī picked it up.[62] Only a few authors altered this number further, such as Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī (d. 654/1256) and subsequently Ibn Taghrībirdī (d. 874/1470) in the ninth/fifteenth century who wrote of 100,000 victims and a further 100,000 prisoners.[63] The figure of 70,000 is rather implausible for a minor town such as Jerusalem and there are few modern historians who take this number seriously. The figure is even more unlikely to be accurate given that later chroniclers, following Ibn al-Athīr, tended to give it for the victims in the Aqṣā Mosque alone and stated that women and children were enslaved, not killed.

However, the main point here is not the factual inaccuracy of this number but rather that it was used for didactic and symbolic purposes typical of sermons. As Lawrence Conrad argued, Arabic-Islamic culture adopted the symbolic value of the number seven from its late antique environment in order to express a general idea of

---

[59] Ibn Jubayr, *Riḥla*, trans. R. J. C. Broadhurst, *The Travels of Ibn Jubayr* (London, 1952), 229–33.

[60] Daniella Talmon-Heller, "Islamic Preaching in Syria during the Counter-Crusade (Twelfth–Thirteenth Centuries)", in *In laudem Hierosolymitani: Studies in Crusades and Medieval Culture in Honour of Benjamin Z. Kedar*, ed. I. Shagrir, R. Ellenblum, and J. Riley-Smith (Aldershot, 2007), 61–75; Daniella Talmon-Heller, *Islamic Piety in Medieval Syria: Mosques, Cemeteries and Sermons under the Zangids and Ayyūbids (1146–1260)* (Leiden, 2007); Jonathan P. Berkey, *Popular Preaching and Religious Authority in the Medieval Islamic Near East* (Seattle, 2001), 58–59. On preaching, see also Linda G. Jones, *The Power of Oratory in the Medieval Muslim World* (Cambridge, 2012).

[61] Ibn al-Jawzī, *Faḍāʾil al-Quds*, ed. J. Jabbūr (Beirut, 1979), 125–28.

[62] Abū al-Fidāʾ, *al-Mukhtaṣar fī akhbār al-bashar* (Cairo, 1907), II, 211; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat al-arab fī funūn al-adab* (Cairo, 1923–2002), XXVIII, 257; Ibn al-Wardī, *Taʾrīkh Ibn al-Wardī* (Beirut, 1996), II, 11.

[63] Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, *Mirʾāt al-zamān fī taʾrīkh al-aʿyān*, in Zakkār, *al-Mawsūʿa al-Shāmīya*, XV, 6903–06, and Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Nujūm*, V, 148–49.

magnitude. Ibn Khaldūn (d. 808/1406), for instance, stated that "[n]umbers are not at all to be taken literally; the intended sense is rather that of magnitude … Among the Bedouins [seventy] is used for 'many' (*kathīr*)."[64] Ibn al-Jawzī's figure of 70,000 should thus be read in the same way as Ibn al-Qalānisī's statement that "*many* of them were killed." A quick glance at other conquest narratives shows the topos-like character of this number: The Ghaznawid ruler Masʿūd b. Maḥmūd (d. 433/1041) supposedly took 70,000 slaves when he conquered Gurgān and Ṭabaristān in 426/1035,[65] the eunuch Yāzmān killed 70,000 when he inflicted a crushing defeat on Byzantine troops in 270/883,[66] and the general Khāzim b. Khuzayma massacred 70,000 rebels in Khurāsān when he put down a revolt in 150/767.[67]

While the use of such figurative numbers did sometimes merely express notions of magnitude, they can often be read in more specific ways to understand how authors endowed reports with additional layers of meaning. With regard to the conquest of Jerusalem, it is most likely that this number developed in the Baghdadi preaching milieu for its eschatological connotations. Michael Lecker argued that the 70,000 victims at the battle of Ṣiffīn in 37/657, to cite another example, originated in an eschatological report establishing that ʿAlī's supporters were in the right and showing that this battle "was part of a scheme of world history, the understanding of which was beyond human grasp."[68] Such eschatological connotations were especially relevant for Jerusalem due to the town's role in salvation history. For instance, 70,000 prophets were said to have died of starvation on the Mount of Olives east of Jerusalem and been buried there.[69] The eschatological dimension is particularly evident in other reports, such as those that God had 70,000 killed with John the Baptist (in Jerusalem), and that He would kill "70,000 and 70,000" with the son of Muḥammad's daughter (i.e. with Ḥusayn at Ṣiffīn).[70] As this figure had become so closely tied to Jerusalem, its use in the Iraqi tradition reframed the fall of the town from the local incident in the Syrian tradition to a decisive event in the history of the Muslim community.

As much as the 70,000 victims of the massacre endowed the report with new eschatological layers of meaning, the number forty in describing the plundering

---

[64] Lawrence I. Conrad, "Seven and the tasbīʿ. On the Implications of Numerical Symbolism for the Study of Medieval Islamic History," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 31 (1988): 42–73, here 45 (Ibn Khaldūn, *al-Muqaddima*, ed. Kh. Shaḥada (Beirut, 2001), I, 129: "*wa-laysa al-ʿadad fī-hāmīʿihā maqṣūdan bi-al-dhāt wa-innamā al-murād al-kathīra fī tafāwut hādha al-marātib bi-dalīl dhikr al-sabʿīn … wa-huwa li-l-kathīr inda al-ʿarab*." (trans. Franz Rosenthal, *An Introduction to History: The Muqaddimah*, abr. ed. N. J. Dawood (London, 1967), 81).

[65] Ibn al-Jawzī, *Muntaẓam*, XV, 246.

[66] Ibn al-Jawzī, *Muntaẓam*, XII, 229.

[67] Ibn al-Jawzī, *Muntaẓam*, VIII, 122.

[68] Michael Lecker, "Ṣiffīn," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, ed. P. Bearman et al., http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopaedia-of-islam–2 (27 March 2012).

[69] E. Honigmann-[C. E. Bosworth], "al-Ṭūr," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopaedia-of-islam–2 (27 March 2012).

[70] Ibn al-Jawzī, *Muntaẓam*, V, 346. On John the Baptist see Elad, *Medieval Jerusalem*, 122.

of the Dome of the Rock played a comparably important role.[71] Ibn al-Jawzī used this number in order to substantiate his reports on plunder, which, except for Ibn al-Qalānisī's brief statement on the conquerors' destruction of shrines, were absent in the previous Syrian and Egyptian narratives. With Ibn al-Jawzī, by contrast, the conquerors take "forty silver lanterns … and a silver lamp weighing forty Syrian *ratls*." His usage of the number forty is closely tied to the prominent position of the lanterns in the Dome of the Rock. The importance of these *qanādīl*' in his text is arguably linked to the fact that they are a crucial feature of the "birds-*ḥadīths*," an important set of texts on the status of martyrs.[72] In one version, Muḥammad stated that the martyrs' souls will be in the bellies of birds who are free to forage in paradise and who nest in lanterns hung under the throne of God.[73] For a contemporary audience the reference to the forty lanterns in the Dome of the Rock, positioned in the text right after the 70,000 victims-martyrs of the massacre, would have immediately raised the concept of martyrdom and reinforced the sacrilege of the Franks' intrusion into the Muslim sacred spaces of Jerusalem.

Yet, the plunder report as we have it in Ibn al-Jawzī's version goes beyond tying the fall of Jerusalem into notions of martyrdom, and brings in direct divine intervention. The second striking element in Ibn al-Jawzī's report on the plunder of the Dome of the Rock was that according to him a lamp, *tannūr*, had been taken. The *tannūr* repeatedly appears in early Islamic texts, as either "oven" or "lamp." Most importantly, in the Koran the Deluge begins with the *tannūr* gushing with boiling water (11.40). That audiences during the crusading period were aware of the theological implications of the report on the plunder of the lamp in the Dome of the Rock is evident in texts beyond Ibn al-Jawzī. In the early seventh/thirteenth century, a treatise on the merits of Jerusalem reinvented the lamp as a portent for the arrival of the crusaders: "According to some reports, a silver lamp (*tannūr*) in its mosque, holding 500 lanterns, crashed in the year 452 [/1060]. Those residing in Jerusalem regarded it as an evil omen and said: 'Certainly, a great calamity will befall Islam!' Then the Franks attacked Bilād al-Shām and remained there until the [re]conquest of Jerusalem [under Saladin]."[74] It was certainly not by coincidence

[71] On the symbolic function of "four" in Arabic-Islamic historiography and other fields of knowledge, see Lawrence I. Conrad, "Abraha and Muhammad: Some Observations Apropos of Chronology and Literary Topoi in the Early Arabic Historical Tradition," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 50 (1987): 225–40.

[72] W. Raven, "Martyrs," in *Encyclopaedia of the Qurʾān*, ed. J. D. McAuliffe, http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopaedia-of-the-quran (27 March 2012).

[73] Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, ed. M. ʿAbd al-Bāqī (Beirut, 1978), III, 1502. On underlying concepts of martyrdom see also Etan Kohlberg, *Medieval Muslim Views on Martyrdom* (Amsterdam, 1997). See also Daniella Talmon-Heller, "Muslim Martyrdom and Quest for Martyrdom in the Crusading Period," *Al-Masaq* 14 (2002): 131–40.

[74] Ibn Shīth, *Miftāḥ al-maqāṣid wa-miṣbāḥ al-marāṣid fī ziyārat Bayt al-Maqdis*, in *Faḍāʾil Bayt al-Maqdis fī makhṭūṭāt ʿarabīya qadīma*, ed. M. Ibrāhīm (Kuwait, 1985), 255–68, here 266–67. The section's heading "*The Frankish Conquest of Jerusalem*" was not part of the original text but is an insertion by the text's modern editor. On Ibn Shīth (d. 625/1227), see al-Dhahabī, *Taʾrīkh*, 621–30, 231–32.

that according to this version the catastrophe announced by the crashing *tannūr* took place after exactly forty (lunar) years.

Ibn al-Jawzī's substantial reframing of the conquest report by introducing notions of eschatology (70,000 victims), martyrdom (*qanādīl*) and divine intervention (*tannūr*) set the conquest into the wider scheme of Islamic salvation history. The numbers and the lanterns/lamp should thus be read in a similar way as the famous statement in Raymond of Aguilers' chronicle that the crusaders rode into the Aqṣā Mosque in blood "up to the bridles of their horses" – a phrase borrowed from Apocalypse 14.20 and clearly tapping into an eschatological conceptualization of the events.[75] In order to understand the genesis of these elements and their theological connotations in Ibn al-Jawzī's report, the Syrian and Egyptian traditions are of no help as they did not introduce any such elements. Taking into consideration the peculiar profile of the Iraqi tradition, the most useful approach to explain this report is to connect it to Ibn al-Jawzī's background as a preacher. Arguably, the report as we find it in Ibn al-Jawzī's works was the crystallization of a transmission that was, from its early beginnings, closely associated with preaching activities in Baghdad. While his report thus did, indeed, emerge out of a historiographical void, one has to turn to the field of popular preaching in order to understand its history of transmission. Since the arrival of the delegation by al-Harawī in Baghdad, shortly after the fall of Jerusalem, reports on the conquest most probably circulated in the preaching milieus. These preaching activities were a thoroughly oral practice – one of the main challenges for modern scholarship on popular preaching is precisely that these sermons were hardly ever put into writing. The oral background of the Iraqi tradition is also reinforced by its emphasis on number symbolism, which is a typical feature of oral cultures in general.[76]

It took an author such as Ibn al-Jawzī, deeply rooted in the preaching milieu of Baghdad and closely involved in the politics of his day, to develop the basic elements of the Islamic narrative out of the local oral line of transmission. He artfully interweaved political concerns on the position of the Caliphate, as expressed in the delegation element, with a broader outlook on the fall of the town setting it into the community's salvation history. What used to be a rather marginal conquest in the Egyptian and Syrian traditions was now repositioned as one of the central events of the period's history. Especially because his 'universal' chronicle was de facto more of a local chronicle, the detailed report on the fall of Jerusalem (representing some two-thirds of all the events reported under that year) ascribed an outstanding importance to it. This new importance ascribed to the conquest shows even more in his treatise on the merits of Jerusalem where he had more liberty to position the report within the work, in contrast to the rather rigid structure of his annalistic work. In this treatise, he positioned the fall of Jerusalem to the crusaders right after

[75] Raymond of Aguilers, *Le "Liber" de Raymond d'Aguilers*, ed. J. Hill and L. Hill (Paris, 1969), 150, n. 2. See also Thomas Madden, "Rivers of Blood: An Analysis of One Aspect of the Crusader Conquest of Jerusalem," *Revista Chilena de Estudios Medievales* 1 (2012): 25–37.

[76] Jan Vansina, *Oral Tradition as History* (Madison, 1985), 132.

the report on the Islamic conquest of the town under the Caliph ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb (d. 23/644). The fall of the town had not only become a major event, but it was now repositioned in a long line of Christian–Muslim confrontation.

The central role of Ibn al-Jawzī in developing what was to become the dominant version of the event is evident in the silence of chronicles contemporary to him. Other chronicles that were written in Baghdad around his time have simply no interest whatsoever in the fall of Jerusalem. Ibn ʿImrānī's *History of the Caliphs*, for example, was probably written in Baghdad and emerged out of the same political background as Ibn al-Jawzī's chronicle. Yet, this work, finished between 555/1160 and 560/1165 and thus some two decades earlier than Ibn al-Jawzī's chronicle, said nothing of the conquest of Jerusalem.[77] The same goes for *The Reports on the Saljuq Dynasty*, a composite chronicle that probably originated in the eastern Islamic lands and was written in 622/1225. Its second part, dealing with the period into which the conquest of Jerusalem fell, relied on earlier sources but also had nothing to say on this event.[78] Overall, the Iraqi historiography made only some brief allusions to the crusades while the historiography of the Grand Saljuqs in Iran remained completely silent on them.[79]

In addition to the silence in Iraqi chronicles, Ibn al-Jawzī's crucial role appears even more clearly when taking into account the silence of those texts contemporary to him where, first and foremost, one would expect to see references to any full-scale massacre/plunder: the cluster of panegyric texts on Saladin produced in late sixth-/twelfth-century Syria and Egypt. None of these texts covered the year 492/1099, as they all focused on Saladin's biography, but they all discussed in detail Saladin's conquest of Jerusalem in 583/1187 and one might have expected that the fall of Jerusalem some ninety years earlier would have featured prominently. However, even though ʿImād al-Dīn devoted considerable space to Saladin's conquest, the main reference to the fall of Jerusalem in 492/1099 is a brief allusion in the Sultan's rejection of the first requests for a negotiated surrender: "I will take Jerusalem the way they took it from the Muslims ninety-one years ago. They inundated it with blood, leaving it not a moment's peace. I will annihilate their men and take their women prisoner."[80]

---

[77] Ibn ʿImrānī, *al-Inbāʾ fī taʾrīkh al-khulafāʾ*, ed. Q. al-Sāmirāʾī (Leiden, 1973).

[78] Al-Ḥusaynī, *Akhbār al-dawla al-saljūqīya*, ed. M. Iqbāl (Lahore, 1933).

[79] Claude Cahen, *Orient et Occident au temps des croisades* (Paris, 1983), 79.

[80] Cited in Abū Shāma, *Rawḍatayn*, III, 340. In the same vein, in those sections that have survived of the *Syrian Bolt*, the 492/1099 conquest of Jerusalem is not employed as a central element: ʿImād al-Dīn al-Iṣfahānī, *al-Barq al-Shāmī*, vols. 3 and 5, ed. F. Ḥusayn (Amman, 1987). See also the relevant passages in his *al-Fatḥ al-qussī fī al-fatḥ al-qudsī. Conquête de la Syrie et de la Palestine*, trans. H. Massé (Paris, 1972), 44–63, ed. M. Ṣubḥ (Cairo, 1965), 116–49. The conquest of Jerusalem in 492/1099 is not mentioned at all in his chronicle of the Saljuqs, *Nuṣrat al-fatra*, as abridged by al-Bundārī, *Taʾrīkh dawlat Āl Saljūq* (Beirut, 1978), 81ff. The transmission history of ʿImād al-Dīn al-Iṣfahānī's and al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil's texts is problematic and any statement on them must be seen in light of the fact that ʿImād al-Dīn's *Syrian Bolt* has only been partially preserved and that al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil's writings have often been preserved only as citations in other texts.

What is most striking is the absence of references in the introduction to ʿImād al-Dīn's *Eloquent Exposition of the Conquest of Jerusalem* that celebrated Saladin's reconquest of the town. In these pages, the author strove to build up the uniqueness of this event, famously even describing it as the second *hijra* and the start of a new calendar. He employed a multitude of other historical comparisons but he did not make a single reference to the fall of Jerusalem.[81] This certainly had nothing to do with airbrushing the defeat out of history. By contrast, his reference to the *hijra* implied exactly the opposite: after the period of ignorance and darkness, the *jāhilīya*, dawn breaks again with the rise of Saladin. The failure of previous rulers to defend Jerusalem and the barbarity of the Franks as it emerged from the accounts of Ibn al-Jawzī would have fitted this historical outlook very well. In general, the richness of the post-Ibn al-Jawzī sources on the conquest of Jerusalem shows that there was no tendency to avoid the topic in order to write the victory of these non-Muslim enemies out of history. The development of the conquest's remembrance rather shows that it could be easily employed in order to celebrate the Muslim community's superiority, but few authors saw this to be a meaningful interpretation during the decades following the First Crusade. It took the Iraqi tradition and Ibn al-Jawzī to reformulate and reshape the remembrance of the fall of Jerusalem.

That Ibn al-Jawzī's account was so successful in framing how later authors beyond Baghdad presented the conquest of Jerusalem goes back to the changing political landscape of the late sixth/twelfth century. This report struck a chord in the environment of *jihād* propaganda after the Zangids and Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn had framed themselves for several decades as the champions of the Muslim cause.[82] In this new milieu the previous Syrian and Egyptian narratives of the Jerusalem conquest, so typical of the *lā maqām*-period, seemed out of place. Their brief and pale descriptions as well as the absence of conceptualizing the conquest as part of a wider Frankish–Muslim conflict were now utterly outdated. Ibn al-Jawzī's evocative text, by contrast, adapted the reports on the conquest of the town to new political realities and newly emerging perspectives on the early history of the crusades. In addition, his text reflects that Jerusalem had started to play (or had continuously played) a more prominent role in the religious sensibilities of religious scholars, in contrast to the indifference displayed by the Syrian administrative authors.

The Islamic Narrative

While Ibn al-Jawzī's report constituted a major stepping stone in the development of the conquest reports, it was Ibn al-Athīr who reworked the report into its authoritative form. With his report it becomes impossible to speak of regional

[81] ʿImād al-Dīn al-Iṣfahānī, *Fatḥ*, trans. Massé, 1–12, ed. Ṣubḥ, 41–58.

[82] See Hillenbrand, *Islamic Perspectives*, on this issue.

traditions any more, as this version became hegemonic in all regions and virtually uncontested within Arabic historiography. It is thus appropriate to speak from this point onwards (i.e., the early seventh/thirteenth century) of an "Islamic narrative."[83] A broad trans-regional consensus had emerged on what happened in Jerusalem in 492/1099 and how to interpret these events.

Ibn al-Athīr partly changed Ibn al-Jawzī's report for a very mundane reason, namely that he clearly placed the report in a historical work, his universal chronicle, while Ibn al-Jawzī's version appeared in both the author's chronicle and his paraenetic treatise on the merits of Jerusalem. Ibn al-Athīr thus included, for instance, considerable factual details on the siege that would have been irrelevant for Ibn al-Jawzī's narrative. Where previous sources such as Ibn al-ʿArabī (morning) and Ibn al-Qalānisī (one siege tower, evening) offered sparse and contradictory information, he now gave a detailed account, including the length of the siege (some forty days), the siege engines used (two towers), details of the siege (burning of siege tower) and the place where the wall was climbed (north). The same attention to detail shows in his passage on the events around David's Tower, which had been absent from all earlier sources except for Ibn al-Qalānisī, who briefly referred to this element. Ibn al-Athīr provided additional detail (the siege lasted three days, the Franks granted safe-conduct, the Muslims subsequently moved to Ascalon). Most importantly, he decisively expanded the massacre-narrative giving the location (the Aqṣā Mosque) and naming the categories of those killed, possibly relying on Ibn al-ʿArabī. On both the plunder and the delegation he also gave greater detail, but these changes did not stray from Ibn al-Jawzī's narrative framework.

The vast majority of subsequent authors, with the exception of the remnants of the Syrian and Egyptian traditions discussed above, did adopt Ibn al-Athīr's broad outline. The spectacular success of his report is even evident in his minor additions such as "the Franks remained for a week in the town killing the Muslims." It was Ibn al-Athīr who first introduced this one-week element and all of the subsequent authors who cited a time period for the massacre took it up, including Ibn Khallikān and Bar Hebraeus in the seventh/thirteenth century, Abū al-Fidāʾ, al-Nuwayrī and Ibn al-Wardī in the eighth/fourteenth century, and al-Maqrīzī in the ninth/fifteenth century. However, it has to be pointed out that some of his changes had little influence in the subsequent medieval and early modern historiographical field. For instance, Ibn al-Athīr's addition that the members of the delegation to Baghdad were allowed to break the fast because of the hardships they had suffered was only taken up by one medieval author, Abū al-Fidāʾ.[84]

[83] The term is slightly misleading as Christian authors writing in Arabic also tended to adopt this narrative; see for example Ibn al-ʿIbrī (Bar Hebraeus), *Taʾrīkh mukhtaṣar al-duwal*, ed. Khalīl al-Manṣūr (Beirut, 1997), 171.

[84] Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 284; Abū al-Fidāʾ, *Mukhtaṣar*, II, 211.

The popularity of the Islamic narrative stretches well beyond the early modern period and is evident until the present day.[85] For instance, the breaking-the-fast element was revived only in the twentieth century, but then started to enjoy considerable popularity in depictions of the crusades. This was particularly due to Amin Maalouf's loose adaptation of this passage in his chapter on "The Cannibals of Ma'arra," where he rewrote events as if the delegation broke the Ramadan-fast in order to cause a scandal (inventing along the way an angry crowd and soldiers) and to alert the people of Baghdad to their plight.[86] Quite surprisingly, even the 70,000 figure has some prominence in modern texts – although often tucked away in footnotes. A recent history of the First Crusade, for instance, ascribes to the number the same degree of veracity as to Ibn al-Qalānisī's report.[87] Sometimes this number is slightly altered to a range as if this would give a more exact estimate, as for instance: "Of the sixty or seventy thousand estimated to have been within the city's walls, only a small portion escaped massacre."[88] In addition, we still find an outright credulous approach where the number is simply taken as an undisputed fact: "A horrifying massacre followed during which the crusaders spent a week slaughtering Muslims, killing at least 70,000 people."[89]

The Islamic narrative as framed by Ibn al-Athīr was not only very influential in Arabic historiography and beyond, but remained also impressively stable. While some later authors decided to reshape specific elements, this was to be the exception and it often merely involved exchanging or introducing the symbolically relevant figures four and seven. Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī (followed by Ibn Taghrībirdī), for instance, wrote of seventy lanterns robbed from the Dome of the Rock and the Aqṣā Mosque while Ibn al-Jawzī, Ibn al-Athīr and all other authors have some forty silver and some twenty gold lanterns.[90] A similar example where number symbolism was involved is al-Maqrīzī's statement that those besieged in David's Tower surrendered after some forty days, while Ibn al-Athīr and all later authors give the period as three days.[91] To give a final example, Mujīr al-Dīn al-ʿUlaymī (d. ca. 927/1521), stated that the town had been in the hands of the Muslims for 477

[85] On modern historiography, see Hillenbrand, *Islamic Perspectives*, 589–616; Anne-Marie Eddé, *Saladin*, trans. J. M. Todd (London, 2011), 463–509; Emmanuel Sivan, "Modern Arab Historiography of the Crusades," in Sivan, *Interpretations of Islam*, 3–43.

[86] Amin Maalouf, *The Crusades through Arab Eyes*, trans. J. Rothschild (London, 1984), 52–53.

[87] Asbridge, *First Crusade*, 76, n. 35: "Ibn al-Athir, p. 197, numbered the dead of Jerusalem at 70,000. Ibn al-Qalanisi, p. 48, indicates that a large proportion of Jerusalem's Jewish population were also slaughtered."

[88] Hiyari, "Crusader Jerusalem," 138.

[89] Maher Abu-Munshar, "Fāṭimids, Crusaders and the Fall of Islamic Jerusalem: Foes or Allies?", *Al-Masaq* 22/1 (2010): 45–56, here 47. The source cited is the seventh-/thirteenth-century universal history by Ibn al-ʿIbrī (Bar Hebraeus), *Taʾrīkh mukhtaṣar al-duwal*.

[90] Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, *Mirʾāt*, in Zakkār, *Mawsūʿa*, XV, 6905, and Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Nujūm*, V, 148–49.

[91] Al-Maqrīzī, *Ittiʿāẓ al-ḥunafāʾ bi-akhbār al-aʾima al-fāṭimiyīn al-khulafāʾ*, ed. J al-Shayyāl/M. Aḥmad, (Cairo, 1996), III, 23.

lunar years before the crusader conquest, delaying the Caliph ʿUmar's conquest of Jerusalem by some fourteen years.[92]

After the Islamic narrative had become dominant, only two entirely new elements entered Arabic historiography until the end of the Mamluk period some three centuries later. The Egyptian Ibn Muyassar (d. 677/1278) was the first to write that the conquerors burned copies of the Koran and other books.[93] Seemingly, this retained some regional specificity as those authors who subsequently picked it up, Baybars al-Manṣūrī and al-Maqrīzī, were both Egyptian. Arguably Ibn Muyassar embellished his report of the conquest by drawing on the topos of the destruction of libraries and book collections that conquest narratives, in general, used widely.[94] Al-ʿUlaymī introduced the second post-Ibn al-Athīr element at the end of the period considered here:

> After that [the initial massacre] they confined all [remaining] Muslims of Jerusalem in the Aqṣā Mosque and informed them that all those who had not left it within three days would be killed to the last man. The Muslims thus started to hasten and hurry to leave. On account of the crush at the gates of the Mosque many of them were killed.[95]

The three-day ultimatum recalls the three-day siege of David's Tower in Ibn al-Athīr's version, an element that al-ʿUlaymī did not include in his report. It is probable that al-ʿUlaymī fused the Aqṣā and the David's Tower reports into one single event. However, in general he remained as faithful to the tripartite Islamic narrative as most other authors of his period.

Arguably al-ʿUlaymī's introduction of a new element hints at the political and historiographical watershed that was in the making in the early tenth/sixteenth century. This is also why the last two works of the period under consideration are the two most unusual surviving medieval secondary sources for the history of the crusades. Al-ʿUlaymī's work on Jerusalem (and Hebron) was the only local chronicle on the town composed during the medieval period. The second work written in 920/1514 by Aḥmad al-Ḥarīrī is the earliest surviving work in Arabic explicitly devoted to the crusades.[96] The development of the Islamic narrative of the conquest of Jerusalem in the Ottoman "secondary" sources is beyond the scope

---

[92] Al-ʿUlaymī, *al-Uns al-jalīl bi taʾrīkh al-Quds wa-l-Khalīl* (Amman, 1973), 306.

[93] Ibn Muyassar, *Akhbār Miṣr (Annales d'Égypte: Les Khalifes Fâtimides)*, ed. H. Massé (Cairo, 1919), 39; Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdat al-fikra fī l-taʾrīkh al-hijra*, quoted in: al-ʿAynī, *ʿIqd al-Jumān* (Zakkār, *al-Mawsūʿa al-Shāmīya*, XXIV, 11010); al-Maqrīzī, *Ittiʿāẓ*, III, 23.

[94] On the destruction of book collections in Arabic conquest narratives, see Konrad Hirschler, *The Written Word in the Medieval Arabic Lands: A Social and Cultural History of Reading Practices* (Edinburgh, 2012), 129–32.

[95] Al-ʿUlaymī, *Uns*, 307–08. This seems to be a late-Mamluk/early Ottoman Syrian addition as it also appears in the treatise on the merits of Jerusalem by al-ʿUlaymī's contemporary al-ʿAlamī, *al-Mustaqṣā fī faḍāʾil al-masjid al-Aqṣā*, in Ibrāhīm, *Faḍāʾil*, 497–520, here 502.

[96] Al-Ḥarīrī, *Iʿlām*, 25–26. The other crusade-specific work is the lost work by Ḥamdān b. ʿAbd al-Raḥīm (d. after 554/1159), *Sīrat al-afranj al-khārijīn ilā bilād al-Shām fī hādhihī sinīn (The Way of the Franks Who Left for Syria in Those Years)*: Hillenbrand, *Islamic Perspectives*, 258.

of this article, but would promise fascinating insights into the genesis of modern perceptions of the crusades.[97]

The success of the Islamic narrative in the pre-Ottoman period went well beyond the historiographical genre and also appeared forcefully in a wide variety of other texts, such as *jihād*-treatises and works belonging to the merits-of-Jerusalem genre (*faḍāʾil al-quds*). The earliest example of a *jihād*-treatise composed in reaction to the crusades is the famous *Kitāb al-jihād* by the Syrian preacher al-Sulamī (d. 500/1106). Written six years after the conquest, this author included a number of references to Jerusalem, but most strikingly the conquest did not play a salient role.[98] By writing a *jihād*-treatise on the subject, al-Sulamī was evidently setting the crusades into a clear framework of a religious conflict between Franks and Muslims and he also was the first author to use curses when mentioning the Franks, decades before this became standard practice in historiography.[99] Despite his references to Jerusalem, it seems – at least judging from the surviving parts of his work – that the conquest had not yet started to be seen as an indispensable element of this narrative. Yet, if we turn to Ibn Kathīr's eighth-/fourteenth-century *jihād*-treatise, the situation has changed. The conquest now played a considerable role and the author framed it in the very familiar terms of the Islamic narrative, including the 70,000-victims element.[100]

The merits-of-Jerusalem genre reflects the same development. Ibn Shīth (d. 625/1227), for instance, had composed his treatise before Ibn al-Athīr completed his chronicle. In the vein of his time, he already started to ascribe considerable importance to the conquest and framed it as a Frankish–Muslim clash:

> They [the Franks] had planned to attack the Muslims and succeeded on Friday, the 22nd of Shaʿbān. The Muslims were performing the Friday prayer while the Jews were preparing for their Sabbath. The Franks attacked the town swiftly and found it undefended and did not encounter an equal. They spilled blood and enslaved those who were free as well as those who had been slaves. They massacred in particular the Jews.[101]

However, the Islamic narrative had not influenced his report, so the plunder and delegation were absent. In the same vein, he reported the massacre in

---

[97] The question of the Ottoman-period remembrance of the crusades is barely researched yet; one of the first attempts is Diana Abouali, "Saladin's Legacy in the Middle East before the Nineteenth Century," *Crusades* 10 (2011): 175–89.

[98] Niall Christie, "Jerusalem in the Kitab Al-Jihad of Ali ibn Tahir Al-Sulami," *Medieval Encounters* 13 (2007): 209–21. On al-Sulamī, see also Mourad and Lindsay, *Sunni Jihad Ideology*, esp. 33–36, and Emmanuel Sivan, "La genèse de la contre-croisade: un traité damasquin du début du XIIe siècle," *Journal Asiatique* 254 (1966): 197–224.

[99] Niall Christie, "'Curses, Foiled Again!' Further Research on Early Use of the *Ḥaḍalahum Allāh* Invocation during the Crusading Period," *Arabica* 58 (2011): 561–70. My thanks to Niall Christie for his advice on this passage.

[100] Ibn Kathīr, *Kitāb al-ijtihād fī ṭalab al-jihād*, in *Arbaʿat kutub fī al-jihād min ʿaṣr al-ḥurūb al-ṣalībīya*, ed. S. Zakkār (Damascus, 1984), 413–36, here 430.

[101] Ibn Shīth, *Miftāḥ*, 267.

specifically Syrian terms, in particular with the emphasis on Jewish victims and the characteristic elements of Ibn al-Athīr's report (70,000 victims, Aqṣā Mosque) were still unknown to this author. Moving on a century, the situation has entirely changed with al-Maqdisī (d. 765/1364) whose treatise on the merits of Jerusalem exhibited no Syrian characteristics, though the author was a native of Jerusalem. Rather, his text includes a faithful summary of Ibn al-Athīr's Islamic narrative, except for getting the date wrong:

> In the year 482 [1089–90] the Franks besieged Jerusalem for 40 days. They took possession of it in the morning of Friday in that year. During one week they killed many Muslims in it. In the Aqṣā Mosque they killed more than 70,000 and they took from the Dome of the Rock innumerable golden and silver objects.[102]

From now onwards references to the conquest of Jerusalem in these texts followed Ibn al-Athīr's model with only slight variations.[103] Thanks to the work by Suleiman Mourad, the conquest-specific transformation of the merits-of-Jerusalem genre can be set into the wider framework of this genre's development. It is noteworthy that the conquest of 1099 did not fuel a significant rise in the interest in Jerusalem and more specifically in the production of merits works. The number of these works only started to rise in the late sixth/twelfth century, i.e. the period that this article highlights as the turning-point when the conquest started to be remembered on a significant level. More interestingly, while the authors in this genre had been, before the crusader period, rather minor scholars closely connected to the city, they now started to be prominent scholars who had no immediate relation to it – in this sense their profiles fit those of the main protagonists of the trans-regional Islamic narrative. In addition, pre-crusader works were rather long treatises, while their later counterparts were generally short manuals that were presumably used for preaching purposes; i.e. they might have emerged in the same milieu that produced crucial strands of the Islamic narrative.[104] The development of *jihād*-treatises and treatises on the merits of Jerusalem thus mirrored the development in historiographical texts, where the increasingly hegemonic Islamic narrative replaced the previously broad range of perspectives. Ibn al-Athīr's artful combination of Ibn al-Jawzī's report with important additions from other traditions set the tone for the centuries to come well beyond the historiographical field.

---

[102] Al-Maqdisī, *Muthīr al-gharām fī ziyārat al-quds wa-al-Shām*, in Ibrāhīm, *Faḍāʾil*, 337–418, here 349–50.

[103] A final example is al-ʿAlamī, Muḥammad (fl. 948/1541), *al-Mustaqṣā fī faḍāʾil al-masjid al-Aqṣā*, in Ibrāhīm, *Faḍāʾil*, 497–520, here 501–02.

[104] On the merits of the Jerusalem-genre, see Suleiman Mourad, "Did the Crusades Change Jerusalem's Religious Symbolism in Islam?", *al-ʿUṣūr al-Wusṭā – The Bulletin of Middle East Medievalists* 22 (2010) [publ. 2014]: 3–8. See also Zayde Antrim, "A Thirteenth-Century *faḍāʾil* Treatise on Syria and Damascus," *al-ʿUṣūr al-Wusṭā – The Bulletin of Middle East Medievalists* 21/1–2 (2009) [publ. 2012]: 5–7.

Arabic and Latin Sources

Faced with the high diversity of the early traditions and the subsequent dominance of the Islamic narrative the question arises of to what extent the Arabic historiography of the crusades informs us about the actual events that took place during the conquest of Jerusalem. As the Syrian and Egyptian reports include little detail, the most interesting account to compare with the contemporary Latin sources discussed by Benjamin Kedar is Ibn al-Athīr's tripartite Islamic narrative. The overlapping areas between the Arabic and the Latin reports are few due to the early Arabic sources' brevity. In addition, the Arabic sources took no interest in a number of issues that featured prominently in Latin sources, for instance the role of individual leaders such as Tancred, Raymond of Saint-Gilles and Gaston of Béarn. While the reason for this absence is self-evident, there is another set of silences in the Arabic texts that is more interesting. A number of Latin sources (*Gesta Francorum*, Peter Tudebode, Fulcher of Chartres, Albert of Aachen, Guibert of Nogent, Baudri of Bourgueil and Robert the Monk) ascribed an important role to the fact that many Muslims sought refuge on the roof of Solomon's Temple/the Aqṣā Mosque where they were subsequently massacred. This element was entirely absent in the contemporary and near-contemporary Arabic sources of the Syrian and Egyptian traditions. The Aqṣā Mosque only started to play an important role from Ibn al-Athīr onwards. A similar example would be the siege of David's Tower: Ibn al-Qalānisī had reported it, but it was Ibn al-Athīr who added a number of details, most importantly the length of the siege (three days), the safe-conduct and the subsequent move to Ascalon. Virtually all Latin sources referred to the siege and safe-conduct with some mentioning that those who surrendered moved to Ascalon (such as *Gesta Francorum*, Peter Tudebode and Fulcher of Chartres). Ibn al-Athīr also gave a number of other details on the siege that had been absent from earlier Arabic sources (the Muslim defence focused on the southern wall, a siege tower on this side was destroyed by fire, the town was taken from the north) but were well established in the Latin sources.

The peculiar shape of Ibn al-Athīr's factual information raises the question as to the nature of his source(s) for these details and here the Latin historiography might come in. Despite the crucial role that the Iraqi tradition played in forming Ibn al-Athīr's text, all those factual details where Ibn al-Athīr's version overlaps with Latin sources are not to be found in the Iraqi tradition. As there was almost complete silence on these matters in the Syrian and Egyptian traditions as well, Ibn al-Athīr must have relied on a source that has not come down to us. A number of early Syrian sources have been lost and it is thus mere speculation which one(s) contained such details. However, as the overlap with Latin historiography is striking, it is at least a possibility that Ibn al-Athīr used Ḥamdān b. ʿAbd al-Raḥīm's *The Way of the Franks* or a similar Arabic text written by an author in close contact with the Frankish communities of Syria. As Ḥamdān must have had knowledge of the reports circulating in Latin sources, his text might have played a role in linking the two historiographical traditions.

Many of the seemingly most interesting and original factual details in Ibn al-Athīr's text are thus arguably not so much independent Arabic material but might be a reworked version of Latin reports that were included at this point into the Islamic narrative. The suggestion that Ibn al-Athīr's report might indirectly rely on Latin sources is less counterintuitive as it might seem at first glance. While little research has been done on this issue, a case like that of Ibn Wāṣil shows that such lines of transmission were possible. Ibn Wāṣil spent several months as Mamluk envoy to the Hohenstaufen court in southern Italy. His chronicle bears witness to his close interaction with the local non-Muslim society as he makes repeated references to the political conflicts between Papacy and Emperor.[105] One of the few instances in his main chronicle, *The Dissipater of Anxieties*, where he reported an event that actually took place after the year in which his text ended is a report on the Battle of Benevento between Charles of Anjou and Manfred in 1266 (misdated by him by one year to 663/1264–65).[106] Ibn Wāṣil was also the only medieval Arabic author who contributed his own anecdote to the rich material that originated in Normandy, Byzantium, France and Germany on disputed elections in the Holy Roman Empire.[107] The close interaction between Latin and Arabic traditions is finally evident from Ibn Wāṣil's reference to an unknown Latin knight when reporting on the alleged correspondence between Frederick II and al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb during the Seventh Crusade.[108] In the same vein, Ibn al-Athīr's report on the correspondence between Roger II of Sicily and a fictive Baldwin in order to explain the course of the First Crusade hints at similar lines of transmissions. Whereas his report is very much aimed at depicting the Sicilian ruler as a primitive barbarian, it shows an awareness of geo-political dynamics in the Latin Mediterranean that goes beyond the polemical level.[109]

Virtually all those factual details in Ibn al-Athīr's text that do not overlap with the Latin tradition go back to Ibn al-Jawzī's report. The information on the delegation is obviously absent from Latin sources as it was firmly embedded within the context of Iraqi politics and was of little relevance for the authors of the Latin texts. The plundering of the Dome of the Rock is more interesting because Ibn al-Athīr clearly drew on Ibn al-Jawzī and this plundering was also mentioned in the Latin tradition: specifically, Albert of Aachen and Ralph of Caen both report this.[110]

---

[105] Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij al-kurūb fī akhbār banī Ayyūb*, vols. I–V, ed. J. al-Shayyāl, Ḥ. al-Rabīʿ and S. ʿĀshūr (Cairo, 1953–77); vol. VI, ed. M. Rahim (Wiesbaden, 2010); here IV, 248–51.

[106] Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, IV, 251.

[107] Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, IV, 249–50. On this issue, see Björn Weiler, "Tales of Trickery and Deceit: The Election of Frederick Barbarossa (1152), Historical Memory and the Culture of Kingship in Later Staufen Germany," *Journal of Medieval History* 38/3 (2012): 295–317.

[108] Peter Jackson, *The Seventh Crusade, 1244–1254: Sources and Documents* (Aldershot, 2007), 47; Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, III, 247–48.

[109] Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, X, 272–73.

[110] Albert of Aachen, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, ed. S. Edgington (Oxford, 2007), 432–34; Ralph of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi*, *RHC Oc* 3:695–96. My thanks to Conor Kostick for helping me with these passages.

In contrast to the details of the siege, where Ibn al-Athīr might have relied on the Latin tradition, it is evident that this original Iraqi report is entirely independent from Latin texts. Neither Albert nor Ralph has any of the elements of the plunder (forty lanterns and lamp/*tannūr*) that were to be crucial for the Islamic narrative.

If we turn to the topic that was central to Kedar's article, the massacre, the positive evidence of the Arabic sources is of little help with clarifying the contradictory picture that emerges from the Latin sources. Neither the Syrian, Egyptian and Iraqi traditions, nor the Islamic narrative have any of the evocative detail of the Latin sources, such as slicing and burning corpses in search for gold (Fulcher of Chartres and Bartolf of Nangis), the town filled with corpses (for instance, *Gesta Francorum* and Peter Tudebode) or the killing of those Muslims who were forced to drag the corpses out of town after the first massacre (Guibert of Nogent). Even such basic information as the length of the massacre – given in the Latin sources as either one day (Raymond of Aguilers, Fulcher of Chartres, Bartolf of Nangis, Baudri of Bourgueil and "Baldwin III"), two days (*Gesta Francorum*, Peter Tudebode, Guibert of Nogent and Robert the Monk), or three days (Albert of Aachen) – is entirely absent from the Arabic sources. Only Ibn al-Athīr has something to say on this, yet he introduced a fourth time span for the massacre: one week. Finally, on the issue of the massacre's extent the Arabic sources have little to add. Ibn al-Jawzī's number of 70,000 is of as little factual value as Ibn al-ʿArabī's figure of 3,000. The most important tradition for this would be the Syrian texts, but they are either silent or have only Ibn al-Qalānisī's "many" victims.

In other words, the most informative Arabic text on the fall of Jerusalem, Ibn al-Athīr's report, is either identical to the Latin tradition or relies on Ibn al-Jawzī's text – a source that is debatable, to say the least. That Ibn al-Jawzī used terminology and imagery drawn from the Koran and *ḥadīth* is not by itself problematic, just as the employment of biblical imagery does not in itself invalidate the Latin reports on massacres. The main problem is rather that a text written in Baghdad more than half a century after the events – hardly a convincing "primary" source – introduced out of a historiographical void two elements (plunder and delegation) and significantly expanded upon a third (massacre). The wealth of information that Ibn al-Jawzī, and following him Ibn al-Athīr, had at their disposal is particularly dubious if compared with the little information that the surviving contemporary and near-contemporary texts by Ibn al-Qulzumī, Ibn al-ʿArabī, al-ʿAẓīmī, Ibn al-Qalānisī and Ibn al-Azraq al-Fāriqī provided. Overall, a comparative reading of the Arabic sources on the conquest of Jerusalem with the Latin sources yields little reliable factual material that is clearly independent from the Latin tradition.

Conclusion

The development of the Arabic historiography on the conquest of Jerusalem from (regional) diversity in the sixth/twelfth century to the dominant Islamic narrative in the early seventh/thirteenth century problematizes, on the one hand, the factuality of the accounts and, on the other, contributes to the history of perceptions of the events. In factual terms, the above discussion has shown that Ibn al-Athīr's narrative cannot be quoted as a primary source for most aspects of the conquest. It is an artful reworking of several regional traditions, perhaps even, though indirectly, Latin historiography. The most important of the "original" Arabic traditions, the Iraqi tradition, can also claim little historicity. Beyond doubt, massacre, plunder from the Dome of the Rock, and the delegation to Baghdad did take place after the town had fallen. Yet, Ibn al-Jawzī's version of these events cannot be taken as an authoritative account. With Ibn al-Jawzī's and Ibn al-Athīr's later accounts largely discarded, we are left with the very brief – and highly contradictory – texts from the Syrian and Egyptian traditions. These texts offer contemporary and near-contemporary versions of the events that are far more credible than the polished texts of the Iraqi tradition and the Islamic narrative.

When one considers these reports, it is beyond doubt that there was a massacre, as Ibn al-ʿArabī, Ibn al-Qalānisī and, arguably, al-ʿAẓīmī all reported that it did take place. Presumably, this massacre targeted the Jewish population in particular but also parts of the Muslim population. Yet, the absence of more information on the Jerusalem conquest is evidence that contemporary authors did not consider the Jerusalem massacre to be beyond what was the usual practice of medieval warfare when a town or city was taken by sword. Only the emphasis of al-ʿAẓīmī and Ibn al-Qalānisī on the burning of the synagogue indicates that this was seen to be beyond the usual practices of warfare. That Jerusalem witnessed a large-scale massacre as brutal as the one described in the Latin sources, without contemporary and near-contemporary Arabic sources recording it, simply beggars belief. The question why Latin chroniclers chose to insert the full-scale massacre into their narratives is beyond the scope of this article. Yet, the Arabic sources make it impossible to claim that it took place.

The Latin reports on the fall of Jerusalem are strikingly similar to Byzantine reports of the Sasanian conquest of the city some six centuries earlier, and it might be most fruitful to read the reports on 1099 in a comparative light. Contemporaneous (especially Byzantine) Christendom saw the Sasanian conquest of Jerusalem in 614 as an unparalleled calamity. Byzantine reports described the comprehensive destruction and profanation of Jerusalem's Christian shrines, the large-scale massacres of its Christian population and the deportation of the survivors. Yet, as Yuri Stoyanov has recently pointed out, the archaeological evidence draws a very different picture, namely that the impact of the conquest of 614 on the city was negligible. The Byzantine reports fell back on biblical typology in describing the conquest, especially apocalyptic and eschatological material, and drew heavily

on standard topoi of anti-Sasanian writings. The discrepancies between narrative sources and archaeological evidence allow thus to re-read the Byzantine conquest narratives as attempts to set the Sasanian conquest in the framework of paradigmatic biblical events.[111] In the same vein, the Latin reports on 1099 should probably be read less as the expression of "a new level of violence, leading to battles that in scale and character were truly apocalyptic,"[112] and rather as attempts to set the First Crusade into such a narrative framework. The reports were arguably embellished to underline the ritual cleansing of the Holy Land and to further the cause of crusading – tellingly "it was in revisions of such accounts by Western chroniclers who had never visited the Levant that the massacre stories achieved their most gruesome form."[113]

As for the second implication of this article, the history of perceptions of the conquest, the development of the conquest narratives is a classic example of the extent to which the importance and meanings ascribed to the crusades fluctuated over time in the Arabic sources. It was only in Iraq in the later sixth/twelfth century that the fall of Jerusalem started to be remembered as meaningful on a significant level, and the refined Islamic narrative of continuous Frankish–Muslim confrontation only emerged in early seventh-/thirteenth-century northern Mesopotamia and Syria. Authors of historical works contemporary and near-contemporary to the fall of Jerusalem, by contrast, were not overly concerned with the conquest of the town. Kedar argued with regard to the Jerusalem massacre in Western historiography that "for a historian's perception of the massacre, basic values and attitudes may be more important than exposure to sources …."[114] The findings of the present discussion show that the situation is similar in medieval Arabic historiography: new perspectives on the fall of Jerusalem emerged not because new sources became available, but because the attitude towards crusading and the Frankish presence in Syria had changed.

The remembrance of the fall of Jerusalem in Arabic historiography thus showed diversity along the chronological and the regional axes. The latter argument is not intended to resurrect the old assumption in the study of early Arabic historiography that rigid regional historiographical "schools" existed.[115] Rather, it is meant to underline this article's central contention that twelfth-century Arabic historiography is not part of some ahistorical "Muslim" discourse, but has to be studied in its

[111] Yuri Stoyanov, *Defenders and Enemies of the True Cross: The Sasanian Conquest of Jerusalem in 614 and Byzantine Ideology of anti-Persian Warfare* (Vienna, 2011).

[112] Jay Rubenstein, *Armies of Heaven: The First Crusade and the Quest for Apocalypse* (New York, 2011), 203.

[113] Rory Cox, "Asymmetric Warfare and Military Conduct in the Middle Ages," *Journal of Medieval History* 38/1 (2012): 100–125, here 118–19. See on this also David Hay, "Gender Bias and Religious Intolerance in Accounts of the 'Massacres' of the First Crusade," in *Tolerance and Intolerance: Social Conflict in the Age of the Crusades*, ed. M. Gervers and J. M. Powell (Syracuse, 1991), 3–10.

[114] Kedar, "The Jerusalem Massacre," 75.

[115] As already refuted by Albrecht Noth, "Der Charakter der ersten großen Sammlungen von Nachrichten zur frühen Kalifenzeit," *Der Islam* 47 (1971): 168–99.

specific historical contexts. This historical context is best expressed with regional markers as these usefully highlight that Ibn al-ʿArabī's text, for instance, emerged in a radically different context compared to Ibn al-Jawzī's text. This is not to argue that such regional categories are essential for studying medieval Arabic historiography in general. Rather, these are useful categories with regard to the specific example discussed in this article, the conquest of Jerusalem. However, this case study draws attention to the fact that regional categories should not be entirely discarded in the study of Arabic historiography. The paradigm of the cosmopolitan and ever-mobile medieval scholar might have obscured the parochialism and localism of a number of authors of historiographical texts.

Finally, the changes and transformations within Arabic historiography reiterate the importance of not overstating the role of the crusades even in those societies in the Arabic lands that were directly affected by them. In particular, the extent to which the conquest of Jerusalem played an outstanding role in the early crusading period is debatable, as is the extent to which large sections of Muslim societies perceived it to be a major event.[116] There is little indication in Syrian and Egyptian historiography that the fall of Jerusalem caused "shock and outrage amongst Muslim intellectuals, religious leaders and politicians over the next century and a half,"[117] or that the "Muslim world was profoundly shocked by this Christian barbarity."[118] A reading of the texts discussed in this article shows that it is also counter-inductive to argue that "the massacre of July 15, 1099 was an event that provoked horror in … the Islamic world, and was not forgotten."[119] The process worked rather in the opposite direction, as the conquest of Jerusalem was only discovered as an important place of remembrance several decades after it took place. Until the early seventh/thirteenth century the "Muslim world" apparently had very divergent ideas about what had happened on that day and what was the meaning of these events.

[116] See for instance Daphna Ephrat and Mustafa D. Kabha, "Muslim Reactions to the Frankish Presence in Bilād al-Shām: Intensifying Religious Fidelity within the Masses," *Al-Masaq* 15 (2003): 47–58; Hadia Dajani-Shakeel, "A Reassessment of Some Medieval and Modern Perceptions of the Counter-Crusade," in *The Jihād and Its Times*, ed. H. Dajani-Shakeel and R. A. Messier (Ann Arbor, 1991), 41–70; Nikita Elisséeff, "The Reaction of the Syrian Muslims after the Foundation of the First Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem," in *Crusaders and Muslims in Twelfth-Century Syria*, ed. M. Shatzmiller (Leiden, 1993), 162–72; Hadia Dajani-Shakeel, "Jerusalem and the First Crusade," in *Jerusalem's Heritage: Essays in Memory of Kāmil Jamil Asali*, ed. S. Hamarneh (Amman, 1996), 39–55; Osman Latiff, "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).

[117] Christopher Tyerman, *God's War: A New History of the Crusades* (London, 2006), 158.

[118] H. E. Mayer, *The Crusades*, trans. J. Gillingham (Oxford, 1988), 56.

[119] Nikolas Jaspert, *The Crusades*, trans. P. Jestice (New York and London, 2006), 45.