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Introduction

The memoirs of Usamah ibn Munqidh, an Arab-Syrian gentleman and warrior who lived during the twelfth century, recorded events and observations he deemed important, interesting, or both. In particular, his bemused accounts of the time he spent in the crusader states with “Franks,” or Western Europeans and their descendants in the Near East, are a window into an extremely unique society. Specifically, Usamah noticed that Franks “domesticated in Syria,” or ethnic Europeans who had lived their whole lives in the Latin East, were not only a bit strange to Usamah himself but also overtly different culturally than new arrivals from Europe. His observation is part of a pattern emerging in these states, which were run by Catholic Europeans yet also had a substantial population of local peoples who had long histories of living in the region. What Usamah observed was that a distinctive religious culture developed in the crusader kingdoms because of the religious and cultural overlap amongst their inhabitants.

The crusader kingdoms, like the culture they would foster, came about as a result of both religious motivation and practical need. When Pope Urban II called a crusade at the Council of Clermont in 1095, he framed it in religious terms. The First Crusade in 1096 was mostly a French endeavor, and the crusaders captured the city of Jerusalem from the Fatimid Caliphate in 1099.¹ The crusaders who settled in the Holy Land established the Kingdom of Jerusalem (1099-1291), along with the County of Edessa (1098-1144), the Principality of Antioch (1098-1268), and the County of Tripoli (1102-1289).² Most crusaders returned home after the conquest of Jerusalem and end of the crusade, but some settled down to populate and administer

these kingdoms. After this generation aged out and passed their society on to their heirs, a society run by ethnic Europeans native to the crusader kingdoms emerged. The borders to these kingdoms were never very stable, and the Latins started losing land as soon as better cohesion emerged among their Islamic neighbors.³ The major leaders who were unifying forces and especially threatening figures to the crusader states were Imad al-Din Zengi (r. 1127-46), his son and successor Nur al-Din (r. 1146-74), Saladin (r. 1174-93), and Baybars (r. 1260-77).⁴ By far one of the largest disruptions to the crusader states and the Latin presence in the East was the Battle of Hattin, which led to Saladin’s capture of Jerusalem in 1187, and the end of the First Kingdom of Jerusalem.⁵ The Kingdom of Jerusalem persisted in a new incarnation at Acre, which was the Latin capital in the East when the crusaders did not hold Jerusalem, and which was the last Latin stronghold to fall in 1291. After this point, crusader kingdoms entirely ceased to exist on the continent.⁶

The crusader states were part of an already multicultural region. The Byzantine Empire was a major influence in the Eastern Mediterranean, and had instigated the original call for Western Christians to fight the Turks.⁷ However, the relationship between the Byzantines and the original crusaders of the First Crusade deteriorated as they experienced difficulties cooperating and ran into conflicts of interest, and the relationship between the Byzantine Empire and the crusader kingdoms never developed a guarantee of friendship or consistency.⁸ Meanwhile, the consistency of hostility between Christian and Islamic leaders decreased as well.

⁴ Jotischky, Crusading and the Crusader States, 117-31.
⁵ Barber, The Crusader States, 303-23.
⁶ Madden, The Concise History of the Crusades, 173-76.
There was certainly always conflict, but not with everyone at all times. The success of the First Crusade had rested heavily on the disunity between the many Islamic states in the East, and this heterogeneity also allowed for different types of relationships to be formed between Christian states and Islamic states depending on whose alliances stood where at any given time. In their disputes and alliances with the Byzantines and their Islamic neighbors, the crusader kingdoms participated in the politics of this pluralistic region, which was reflected in the multicultural characteristics of the kingdoms themselves.

The history of the crusader states is inherently tied to both the history of the crusades and the unique makeup of the states. The crusades and the states they created were inseparable even in the medieval view; early chroniclers do not draw a distinction at all between writing about the First Crusade and writing about the establishment and status of the crusader kingdoms. Fulcher of Chartes was one such chronicler, who participated in the First Crusade and became the chaplain of Baldwin of Boulogne, or King Baldwin I of Jerusalem once he was crowned in 1100. Fulcher’s chronicle spans 1095 to his death in 1127. Fulcher organized his *History of the Expedition to Jerusalem* into three parts, grouping into the first book the crusade, its preparations, and the establishment of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. His second and third books describe his experience of life in the crusader states. Later, Archbishop William of Tyre (1130-86), one of the European-descendant inhabitants of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, used Fulcher’s chronicle as one of his many sources for a similarly ambitious project, recording

---


This chronicle begins with the preparations for the First Crusade and continues to 1184, shortly before the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin in 1187. William, like Fulcher, was able to provide detailed accounts of the historical timeline he was present for, and he connected the history of the crusader kingdoms directly to the history of the crusades.

A number of modern historians have a similar approach to the history of the crusader states, looking at both the states and crusading together. One of the first such modern scholars was Steven Runciman, who paired the crusades and the crusader states for a historical study in his seminal three-volume *A History of the Crusades* (1951-54). His historiographical ideas are now considered outdated by other crusade historians, but his approach pairing crusade and crusader-state history has been influential to later historians. For example, Thomas Madden’s introductory book *The Concise History of the Crusades* (2005) includes relevant information about the crusader kingdoms throughout the story of the crusades. Andrew Jotischky’s *Crusading and the Crusader States* (2004) also covers this overarching subject. Malcolm Barber’s *The Crusader States* (2012) tackles the topic broadly and incorporates the crusades organized for the kingdoms from the perspective of the crusader states. This type of research provides a sense of the interconnectedness of crusading and crusader states, but it can gloss over cultural elements in the crusader kingdoms in favor of the political and military history that is prominent for the crusades. While useful for the historical narrative, such crusade-oriented

---

historical approaches fail to emphasize the ways in which the kingdoms endured and adapted between crusades.

In contrast, some authors picked subtopics within the category of “crusader states.” For example, religion in the crusader states has drawn scholarship that narrowed in to intensively investigate one small aspect. For example, Andrew Jotischky exclusively examined monasticism in the crusader states in *The Perfection of Solitude* (1995), dedicating a large portion of the book to the Carmelite order specifically.\(^{17}\) The history of the military orders is another narrowly-focused subset of scholarship that has many further specializations. Sometimes historians focus on one order, like Malcolm Barber in his book *The New Knighthood: A History of the Order of the Temple* (1994), and sometimes they do comparative or thematic work.\(^{18}\) Some examine the military orders in Europe or after the fall of the Levantine crusader states in 1291, like the Malcolm Barber collection *The Military Orders: Fighting for the Faith and Caring for the Sick* (1994).\(^{19}\) Jonathan Riley-Smith has done extensive work on all aspects of these orders’ development. This narrower approach has also been used for diplomatic history, as in Jonathan Phillips’s book *Defenders of the Holy Land: Relations Between the Latin East and the West, 1119-1197* (1996), which focused on the crusader kingdoms’ relationship with the West.\(^{20}\) While all of this crusader-kingdom-oriented scholarship provides better detail and more effectively illuminates these states’ culture, it is frequently too narrow to fully evaluate the


states’ broader religious culture. Taking advantage of the breadth and depth in previous scholarship both, it is possible to do a less polarized study on this religious culture.

One of the most successful types of scholarship to balance breadth and depth for a subtopic has been on religious coexistence in the crusader kingdoms. Joshua Prawer studied the Jewish experience of the crusader kingdoms in *The History of the Jews in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (1988). Christopher Hatch MacEvitt’s *The Crusades and Christian World of the East: Rough Tolerance* (2008) bridges the topics of the crusades and religious coexistence in the crusader states by including analysis of interaction between crusaders and the natives of the lands these crusaders invaded. Brian Catlos’s book *Muslims of Medieval Latin Christendom, c. 1050-1614* (2014) also expands its scope into Europe and is therefore more focused on religious coexistence as a whole than the history of the crusader kingdoms. However, as valuable as this scholarship and the reality of religious coexistence in the crusader kingdoms is for understanding the religious culture, such research is best understood against a broader examination of Latin Eastern religious culture in all of its diversity.

None of the previous scholarship has quite focused on the unique religious culture described by Usamah ibn Munqidh across the crusader kingdoms. This thesis tries a more mid-range approach with a focus on religious culture rather than the whole of the crusader states, or the broad culture of the crusader states in its entirety. However, this thesis also examines different aspects of that cultural element rather than focusing on one specific phenomenon within it. Three different themes especially characterize religious culture in the crusader states:

---

pilgrimage, monasticism, and religious coexistence. The subtopics fit in as broad case studies of this unique religious geography, selected for their prominent significance to religious and cultural life in the Latin East. However, these subtopics also support one another due to their overlapping nature, which includes important context and nuance that might be marginalized in a narrower study.

Pilgrimage was an extremely prevalent part of crusader state society, particularly in the city of Jerusalem. The Holy Land is a region where incredibly important religious sites overlap for all three of the Abrahamic faiths unlike anywhere else in the world, which was equally true in the middle ages. A wide variety of memoirs written about individual journeys and pilgrim guides published to inform travellers about the sacred places in the Holy Land provide insight into the experiences of these pilgrims. In this way, the holy sites of the crusader states directly promoted a prominent and unique pilgrimage component of their religious culture. The presence of these holy sites is a major way that the geography of the crusader kingdoms influenced the outcome of their religious culture, as holy sites impacted patterns in religious practice and even settlement.

Monasticism was a section of the crusader kingdoms’ human geography especially significant to the religious culture of these kingdoms, since monks frequently helped or communicated with both travelers and inhabitants. Monks’ lives were defined by religion, and their population and settlement patterns revealed much about the religious geography and social structure of the crusader states. Like pilgrims, monks were also drawn to the holy sites of the Levant, although in a far more permanent manner. Most significantly, the creation of the crusader states and the geopolitics in these states introduced larger scale Latin Christian
monasticism where there had not been a prominent history of it in the preceding centuries. Moreover, incorporating this type of monasticism into a new landscape created forms of religious life which had not previously existed in the West.

Because the population of the crusader states and surrounding areas was not uniform and several different religious groups living together formed their society, some level of religious coexistence was necessary in the crusader states. This made these kingdoms less religiously polarized than the crusade rhetoric ideal suggested was possible, although violence, misunderstanding, and prejudice were nevertheless consistent problems. At the same time, the crusader states created legal and administrative institutions to manage their pluralistic society, so that the government could provide a structure for managing the legal and economic interactions of people belonging to different religions, while trying to manage different religious groups as parallel communities within the same society. Pilgrims provided especially rich commentary on their encounters with different faiths in the Holy Land. Some of the individual relationships that formed organically between members of different faiths are some of the most fascinating, and such primary source evidence is valuable for drawing conclusions about religious coexistence in crusader state society as a whole. Coexistence between believers of different faiths in the crusader kingdoms appeared in many shapes, including economics, parallel religious practice, treaties, and battles, which is well represented in current scholarship. However, it is impossible to do a well-rounded examination of religious culture in the crusader kingdoms by separating out coexistence from the rest of religious culture, so it is essential to consider coexistence in the context of pilgrimage and monasticism as well.
These subtopics each demonstrate the individuality of the crusader states in the most important spheres of religious experience in the Latin East. As the kingdoms enclosed a number of key holy sites, the crusader states were a hub for international pilgrimage on a scale surpassing all other states, and the Latin monastic institutions built around these sacred places had to adapt to their environment by innovating new forms of monastic life and coexisting with Eastern neighbors. Meanwhile, the rest of the population adjusted to multicultural life. The geography of the crusader states cultivated their unique religious culture, which developed from the mix of Catholic and Holy Land traditions into a distinct combination that did not exist anywhere else in the medieval world.

Pilgrimage

Pilgrimage was one of the fundamental pillars of religious life in the crusader kingdoms, and its prevalence shaped the development of their culture. International travelers and their spiritual experiences journeying through the Holy Land participated in the religious culture of this unparalleled landscape with their prayer and patronage. While medieval contemporaries considered crusaders pilgrims, and frequently referred to them as such, this chapter considers Christian travelers with a less military purpose. For European Christians, pilgrimage had a penitential emphasis, but Jerusalem was the center of multi-faith pilgrimage as well. The Holy Land held religious significance for all three Abrahamic faiths, which caused the crusader kingdoms to be a crossing point for Jewish, Christian, and Muslim pilgrims like no other place in the world.
By the medieval period, the religious experience of European Christian pilgrimage was heavily penitential, a medieval cultural contribution to the practice.\textsuperscript{24} In the fourth century, with the beginning of the Christianization of the Roman Empire, shrine churches consecrated the holy places associated with Jesus and other key figures in Christianity, and pilgrimage to Jerusalem became a valued religious experience by the later Roman period.\textsuperscript{25} Since late antiquity, well before the establishment of the crusader states, medieval Europeans inherited an established tradition of Christian pilgrimage to the Holy Land. The penitential pilgrimage concept served as one basis for the First Crusade, so that crusaders considered themselves armed pilgrims whose most significant spiritual rewards included penance.\textsuperscript{26} Count Stephen of Blois, for example, refers to his participation in the First Crusade as his “life on pilgrimage” in a letter to his wife about his pleasant stay in Constantinople, providing an instance of the direct linkage between crusading and pilgrimage in the medieval European perspective.\textsuperscript{27} The penitential nature of pilgrimage came from personal sacrifice on the part of the pilgrim, due to the danger and difficulty of the long journey from Europe to the Holy Land.

In the eleventh century, leading up to the First Crusade, traditional pilgrimage of the non-violent kind grew notably in popularity.\textsuperscript{28} One contributing factor was that the Hungarian tribes, who had been a nuisance to their Christian neighbors for almost a hundred years, were

\textsuperscript{24} Andrew Jotischky, \textit{Crusading and the Crusader States} (New York: Routledge, 2017), 34.
\textsuperscript{25} Jotischky, \textit{Crusading and the Crusader States}, 34.
Christianized under the rule of the first king of Hungary, St. Stephen I (r. 1000-58). Rodulfus Glaber, a French monk writing in the 1040s, concluded that as a result of the Hungarians’ Christianization, their kingdom became friendly to traveling pilgrims, providing a land route to the Holy Land through their neighbor Byzantium, from which travelers could cross into pilgrim-friendly Fatimid-controlled lands, a route safer than voyage by sea and thus encouraging more people to make the pilgrimage.29 Another possible reason for the growth of pilgrimage was a sense of urgency created by circulating rumors of the approaching apocalypse.30 This growth of pilgrimage was not only in numbers, however, but also in the broadening of pilgrim types by social and economic class. Pilgrims came from all over Europe, lords and nobles, as well as ordinary townspeople, clergy, laypeople, the occasional knights, and many monks and abbots.31 The majority of pilgrims were senior clergymen or of the landowning classes, since these were the people who had the financial means to make the trip. However, they were not the only ones, and occasionally wealthy lords helped finance pilgrimage for poorer people as part of a large expedition.32 The success of the First Crusade and the establishment of a Latin East encouraged growth in pilgrimage even further.

The increase in pilgrim traffic was not a simple case of cause and effect, though. The safety of over-land travel to the Holy Land did not last until 1099, and pilgrimage to Latin Jerusalem instead became heavily characterized by danger. After the first half of the eleventh century, loss of Byzantine and Fatimid control over large portions of land over which pilgrims needed to travel broke up the convenient land passage to the Holy Land and necessitated

increased travel by sea.\textsuperscript{33} As historian Colin Morris summarizes, “two things emerge from the surviving records: there was a great deal of traffic, and the journey was always dangerous.”\textsuperscript{34} Saewulf, an English pilgrim among those who made the journey to Jerusalem in 1102, just a few years after crusaders established the Latin kingdom, experienced mortal danger both by sea and by land.\textsuperscript{35} His trip to the port of Joppa was troubled but ultimately successful: “After leaving the isle of Cyprus, we were tossed about by tempestuous weather for seven days and seven nights,” Saewulf writes, “but after much suffering, by divine mercy, at the sunrise of the eighth day, we saw before us the coast of the port of Joppa.”\textsuperscript{36} This was peril of nature outside of human control, but Saewulf’s journey was far from over. To reach Jerusalem, he needed to leave Joppa and cross over land, “a journey of two days, by a mountainous road, very rough, and dangerous on account of the Saracens, who lie in wait in the caves.”\textsuperscript{37} He goes on to describe the frightful circumstances of that trip in even more detail, recording that “numbers of human bodies lie scattered in the way, and by the wayside, torn to pieces by wild beasts. Some may, perhaps, wonder that the bodies of Christians are allowed to remain unburied, but it is not surprising when we consider that there is not much earth on the hard rock to dig a grave,” Saewulf explained to a reader he imagined to be unfamiliar with the journey and appalled by these conditions; “and if earth were not wanting, who would be so simple as to leave his company, and go alone to dig a grave for a companion? Indeed, if he did so, he would be digging a grave for himself rather than for the dead man.”\textsuperscript{38} The penitential culture of pilgrimage is understandable in light of how

\textsuperscript{33} Morris, \textit{The Sepulchre of Christ and the Medieval West}, 140.
\textsuperscript{34} Morris, \textit{The Sepulchre of Christ and the Medieval West}, 140.
\textsuperscript{36} Saewulf, “The Travels of Saewulf,” 99.
\textsuperscript{37} Saewulf, “The Travels of Saewulf,” 101.
\textsuperscript{38} Saewulf, “The Travels of Saewulf,” 101.
difficult and unpleasant it was for participants to travel to their destination and then return home again, if they ever made it at all. In this sense, through its danger, pilgrimage to the Holy Land was an equalizer for all those different people who committed to it, as Saewulf himself muses: “For on that road, not only the poor and weak, but the rich and strong, are surrounded with perils…” Fortunately, despite the gruesome and threatening surroundings he faced, Saewulf arrived at Jerusalem unharmed, was able to visit the holy sites he longed to see, and returned home safely, although the threat of attack continually hung over his return journey by sea.

More accessible pilgrimage attractions existed within Europe, at Rome and Santiago for example, but the Holy Land and Jerusalem in particular had a prestige beyond all other places, the very center of the world from the medieval European perspective. A visual representation of the importance of Jerusalem can be found in the T and O map, which depicts in visual form an understanding of the separate continents as first described by seventh-century archbishop Isidore of Seville: a T drawn over a circularly-cropped map that divides Europe, Africa, and Asia so that the city of Jerusalem is at the intersection of the T, in the very center of the map. In this way, Jerusalem was placed quite literally at the center of the world. The Scriptures themselves revolved heavily around Jerusalem, of course, which meant that devout Christians frequently had the city on their minds however far away from it they themselves might be physically. Thietmar, a thirteenth-century German magister (meaning “master” or “teacher”), prefaced his pilgrimage chronicle with a reflection on the motivation for his journey: “I resolved in my heart to visit, in

---

42 Isidore of Seville, The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville, trans. Stephen A. Barney, W. J. Lewis, J. A. Beach, and Oliver Berghof (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 285. The Bünting Clover Leaf Map is an even better visual representation of this worldview but it did not appear until 1581.
43 Hunt, Four Paths to Jerusalem, 114.
so far as I was able, the places that our Lord Jesus Christ [...] had sealed and sanctified with His bodily footprints, those which our venerable fathers inhabited [...] and the dwellings dedicated to the saints lying within them. For I burned greatly with ardent desire to see personally those things, which at different times I had heard from the scriptures in cloudy and obscure language."44

Thietmar is an excellent example of a medieval pilgrim motivated by religious feelings to travel to the Holy Land and visit the locations most important to his faith. Authoritative and skillful preachers like Bishop Jacque de Vitry further encouraged Catholics to take on the hardships of pilgrimage for the salvation of their souls.45

Most special of all was the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, built over the site of Christ’s tomb, and it took center stage as the primary pilgrimage attraction in Jerusalem year-round. Europeans constructed a number of churches modeled off of it.46 The annual miracle of the descent of the Holy Fire (or Holy Light) in the Sepulcher on Holy Saturday, the day before Easter by the Orthodox calendar, was the subject of much admiration and immense pilgrim traffic. Abbot Daniel of Kiev, a Russian pilgrim who traveled to the Holy Land in 1106, wrote extensively about his experience with the Holy Fire, which he found to be deeply spiritual and moving. That Friday morning, Daniel had requested King Baldwin I (r. 1100-18) to allow him to set a lamp on the Holy Sepulcher “in the name of the whole Russian country” so that it might be lit during the miraculous event, and was overjoyed when Baldwin granted his request “with peculiar kindness and attention."47 When it was time for the ceremony of the Holy Fire itself, he

46 Madden, The Concise History of the Crusades, 47.
described that large crowds of pilgrims gathered to attend the event, so that inside the Holy Sepulcher and its surrounding spaces “every place is filled with an innumerable multitude,” to the point of stampedes becoming a serious problem from the crowding. Based on Daniel’s account, the experience itself justified the extreme popularity of the event: “This Holy Light is like no other flame, for it burns in a marvellous way with indescribable brightness,” Daniel claimed; “Man can experience no joy like that which every Christian feels at the moment when he sees the Holy Light of God.” Daniel’s Muslim contemporaries were less impressed, positing theories about how to achieve the trick, but Christian pilgrims were not discouraged, and any year that the Holy Light did not appear was met with crushing disappointment.

The Holy Sepulcher was certainly not the only church to receive crowds of the faithful. Shrine churches heavily populated the landscape, frequently accompanied by an order of monks, with some of these churches more prominent than others. For example, the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem was another extremely famous church that most pilgrims to the Holy Land were determined to visit, while other churches were more likely to be sought out only by pilgrims with a special interest in them. Thietmar, for example, was desperate to visit the shrine of St. Catherine of Alexandria. He struggled and lucked his way through many obstacles on his way there from Acre, including hostile weather, water troubles, and even capture and imprisonment. Not every single pilgrim attraction was a church (Thietmar was more excited to see the body of St. Catherine than her shrine), but churches featured most prominently as both attractions in their own rights and alongside holy locations and objects.

50 Malcolm Barber, Crusader States (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012), 68.
The increase in pilgrim traffic to Jerusalem after the First Crusade led to the appearance of guidebooks written by pilgrims for other pilgrims, describing routes through the holy sites so that the aspiring pilgrim would know where to go and what to expect. Some pilgrim chronicles doubled as guidebooks, such as that of John of Würzburg, a German priest who visited Jerusalem in the 1160s. Others provided explicit instructions rather than merely offering an account of an individual pilgrim experience on which to base plans. Occasionally, a single text spawned derivatives, updated versions, and related texts over the years, which reflected some of the changing circumstances in the Holy Land. For example, new pilgrim chronicles and guidebooks were produced after Saladin’s capture of Jerusalem in 1187 outlining the popular pilgrim circuits as they were available to European Christians post-1187. Additional, more up-to-date pilgrim guides became available in the following years, after Baybars (r. 1260-77) succeeded the Mamluk sultan Kutuz in 1260 and his militant foreign policy upset the status quo established by Sultan al-Kamil (r. 1218-38) and Holy Roman Emperor Frederick II (r. 1220-50), later extended by the sultanate and King Louis IX of France (r. 1226-70). For example, Philip of Savona, a Franciscan monk, wrote a typical pilgrim guide sometime between 1268 and 1289, which started on the road to Nazareth, included an itinerary of the sites available to Christian

55 Madden, The Concise History of the Crusades, 166-67; Jotischky, Crusading and the Crusader States, 258.
56 Jotischky, Crusading and the Crusader States, 258-59.
pilgrims within Jerusalem, as well as descriptions of Mount Sion, the Mount of Olives, Bethlehem, the Jordan River, and more, with each of their surrounding areas and related holy sites detailed too. 57 Newer pilgrim guides had more up-to-date information about which holy sites remained open to Latin Christian pilgrims under a new status quo. Not all pilgrim guides were for Western European Christians, though: there were a number of them for and by Orthodox Christians as well, in much the same style as the Western European ones. 58 A single Muslim pilgrim guide, written by the Ayyubid emissary and ascetic traveller ‘Ali ibn Abi Bakr al-Harawi, also survives, and includes a section about the author’s visit to Latin Jerusalem among his detailed accounts of the Islamic holy sites to be found across the Middle East, West Asia, North Africa, and the Mediterranean. 59

The constant element of danger did not prevent pilgrims from committing to the journey, so danger affected not only the culture of European pilgrimage but also the culture of the crusader states themselves, since the Latin Easterners were compelled to respond to the pilgrims’ needs. Services for Christian pilgrims had existed on a small scale before 1099, 60 but after the First Crusade and the establishment of the crusader states there was major growth in institutions dedicated to serving the needs of pilgrims from the West. The monastic orders that originated and were based in the crusader kingdoms, the Knights Templar and the Knights Hospitaller,

cooperated with the secular governments of the kingdoms, which, like most medieval
governments, gladly allowed the Church to shoulder much of the weight of social services.\textsuperscript{61} The Templars were committed to the protection of pilgrims traveling between holy sites, while the Hospitallers divided their efforts between protection and services like hospices, and of course their name-sake Hospital, which offered the best medical treatment known to the western world even to non-Christian pilgrims.\textsuperscript{62} They also administered burial services for pilgrims, essentially offering care both in life and death for any who fell ill on their pilgrimage.\textsuperscript{63} Pilgrims’ Castle, built about 1217 and abandoned with the fall of Acre in 1291, run by the Templars, was a familiar landmark for pilgrims traveling down the coast south of Acre and just one sign of their presence.\textsuperscript{64} In some cases, these monks would even try to offer help on an individual level: “While William of Dampierre was here in Jerusalem, some felons criminally burned down his property,” the Master of the Hospital explained in a letter to King Louis VII of France (r. 1137-80), requesting on William’s behalf that this grievance be addressed by the king, who was responsible for the “safety and protection” of French pilgrims’ “possessions and assets” while they were away.\textsuperscript{65}

The crusader kingdoms’ governments themselves not only supported the work of the Templars and Hospitallers in social service projects and the protection of pilgrims.\textsuperscript{66} They were

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{61} Barber, \textit{Crusader States}, 106-7.
\item \textsuperscript{63} Riley-Smith, \textit{Templars and Hospitallers As Professed Religious}, 21.
\item \textsuperscript{64} Hunt, \textit{Four Paths to Jerusalem}, 115.
\item \textsuperscript{65} Gilbert of Assailly, “Gilbert of Assailly, Master of the Hospital, to Louis VII, King of France (c.1167),” in \textit{Letters From the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims, and Settlers in the 12th-13th Centuries}, ed. Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2013), 70.
\item \textsuperscript{66} Barber, \textit{Crusader States}, 87, 162.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
also devoted to the maintenance of holy sites and the associated shrine churches and relics, enhancing the pilgrimage experience in addition to developing the material culture of their states. The prized holy sites of the crusader kingdoms were not preserved statically by their governments, but instead expanded and beautified these objects of veneration over the course of decades. The construction and renovation of churches was the primary focus of these efforts to elevate the magnificence of holy sites and pilgrimage destinations, but this improvement program overall supported the production of devotional art even beyond church buildings. Reliquaries, for example, were one of the most significant types of art produced by the crusader states. The reliquary of the True Cross was the most important, although the term “reliquaries” is more accurate, since multiple different ones were crafted in Jerusalem over the years, and kings like Fulk I of Jerusalem (r. 1131-43) occasionally gave away splinters of the Cross as gifts outfitted in their own vessels, while numerous pieces of wood of dubious origin allegedly taken from the Cross also circulated Europe. Reliquaries, for example, were one of the most significant types of art produced by the crusader states. The reliquary of the True Cross was the most important, although the term “reliquaries” is more accurate, since multiple different ones were crafted in Jerusalem over the years, and kings like Fulk I of Jerusalem (r. 1131-43) occasionally gave away splinters of the Cross as gifts outfitted in their own vessels, while numerous pieces of wood of dubious origin allegedly taken from the Cross also circulated Europe. The improvements to pilgrim destinations naturally involved predominantly religious artwork, although secular art existed as well.

Queen Melisende of Jerusalem (r. 1131-53) was especially active in patronage during the 1130s and 1140s, who commissioned some of the most important artistic and building projects, to the benefit of pilgrims. Under her supervision, the most important pilgrimage destination in the whole Kingdom of Jerusalem, the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, was renovated to better accommodate its important role in Jerusalem society. This renovation project was absolutely

---

enormous, and included significantly expanding the size of the building, as well as extensively
redecorating the inside with additional mosaics and the outside with carvings, moldings, and
further new mosaics depicting biblical scenes.\textsuperscript{70} John of Würzburg described and praised several
of the specific artistic details of the renovated Sepulcher, including the mosaics, painted figures,
and silver dome, in his pilgrim guidebook.\textsuperscript{71} Melisende also sponsored new mosaics in Al-Aqsa
Mosque, believed to be the Temple of Solomon, among many other building projects.\textsuperscript{72} Pilgrims
were one of the main beneficiaries of the Holy Sepulcher’s renovation and many of Melisende’s
other projects, since these artistic efforts were focused on improving the very holy sites that
pilgrims were coming to see.

Pilgrims themselves contributed to the art world of the crusader states as commissioners
and consumers. Some travellers purchased and brought home with them souvenirs like personal
devotional objects as mementos of their trip. Back in Europe, a market for relics from the Holy
Land flourished.\textsuperscript{73} Although Abbot Daniel of Kiev distinguished himself from the average, or at
least poorer, pilgrim due to his personal interactions with King Baldwin I among other factors, he
exemplified the enthusiasm of pilgrims for both relics and mementos when he acquired a holy
keepsake for himself. Daniel returned to the Church of the Holy Sepulcher to retrieve his
still-burning lamp a few days after witnessing the Holy Fire, and the keeper of the keys of the
Holy Sepulcher gave him a small memento, requesting him to keep it a secret: “seeing my love
for the Holy Sepulcher, [the keeper] pushed back the slab that covers the part of the sacred Tomb
on which Christ’s head lay, and broke off a morsel of the sacred rock; this he gave me as a
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blessed memorial [...] I left full of joy, enriched by the Divine grace, and bearing in my hand a gift from the sacred place [...] I went on my way rejoicing as if I were the bearer of vast wealth..."\(^{74}\) Of course, if all the multitudes of pilgrims Daniel described had acquired their own relics from the Tomb the same way, they would take the whole Tomb away in pieces, in part why the Sepulcher was guarded against unauthorized visitors. The government put measures in place to prevent this sort of unauthorized pilgrim “souvenir hunting” at other holy sites, too. As an alternative, pilgrims could instead purchase artistic items that were actually intended to be keepsakes sold on the Street of Palms, including high-end reliquaries forged by professional gold- and silversmiths for the most wealthy pilgrims, but also more affordable options including cheap reliquaries and other miscellaneous objects, like palm fronds.\(^{75}\)

An especially clear example of the mutual dedication of pilgrims and the crusader state governments to the beautification and development of holy sites is the renovation of the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem. This church came under Frankish control more or less undisturbed since its reconstruction under the rule of Justinian I, and its renovation was not a singular event so much as a process of continual development over the decades, beginning with the first settlers of the crusader states, who expanded it by constructing accomodations for a bishop and a group of Augustinian monks, as well as a hospital. From about the year 1130, a series of paintings on the columns in the nave was directly funded by pilgrim donations, later integrated into a new 1167 mosaic redecoration program.\(^{76}\) The artistic culture of the crusader kingdoms would not have been the same without pilgrim contribution.

\(^{75}\) Barber, Crusader States, 223-24, 313.
\(^{76}\) Barber, Crusader States, 246-47.
Pilgrims’ movement through the crusader kingdoms affected the use of space especially strongly in the city of Jerusalem. The crown, the patriarchate, and the two military orders competed for building space, but all were involved in facilitating the movement of pilgrims through the city. The Hospitallers, for example, needed room for their hospital, which was big enough for a thousand beds as estimated by Theoderic, a German pilgrim who visited Jerusalem in the 1160s. Pilgrims approaching from the south side of the Holy Sepulcher in the mid-twelfth century would first see the new Calvary chapel bell tower and its decorated façade, where the patriarch preached. The Street of Palms, which catered to pilgrims’ souvenir demands, connected the Holy Sepulcher and the Hospital. In the peak pilgrimage season, spring and summer, large numbers of pilgrims needed housing accommodations, which was a revenue stream for property owners with accommodations available for rent in Jerusalem and port cities. The city was structured to meet these population needs rather than as a trade center, like Acre or Tyre.

The geography and construction of the crusader states evolved to encourage Orthodox pilgrimage as well as Catholic pilgrimage. Relations with native Eastern Christians were given a mixed start because the crusaders’ arrival in the Levant had been a disruption in the lives of many of the natives, although actually attacking their fellow Christians was forbidden to the crusaders, at least in theory. Ties between the crusaders and the Byzantine Empire were tense. Some of the early state-building crusaders were anxious to establish a strong hierarchy of Western Christian “supremacy” over Eastern Christians, while others sought Orthodox support.
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for the new states. Orthodox Christians desired to see the holy sites of their faith just as much as Catholic Christians did, and faced the same dangers to do so. Visitation by transitory pilgrims was less controversial than other consistent signs of Eastern Christian life in the crusader states, like monastic settlement and the participation in political life, but as these other aspects of Orthodox life flourished and grew into the framework of the local religious culture, they drew Orthodox pilgrims. As historian Andrew Jotischky concludes in his analysis of the pilgrimage journeys of Abbot Daniel and John Phocas: “That two pilgrims from different ends of the Orthodox world—Russia and Crete—exposed themselves to considerable danger to visit these sites is testimony to the importance of the monasteries among members of the Orthodox community.” Abbot Daniel was treated well by both the Latin political elite and those in charge of the holy sites he visited, with multiple individuals going out of their way to improve his pilgrimage experience. Non-Latin Christians administered to shrine churches visited by Western and Eastern Christians alike, and Orthodox clergy maintained an altar in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher. They also supervised a significant part of the ceremonies associated with the miracle of the Holy Fire, once reinstated after an initial eviction.

Frankish rule over Jerusalem did not promote Muslim pilgrimage to the city in the way that it encouraged Christian pilgrimage, but there were still Muslims moving through the city and the kingdoms, some of them pilgrims visiting holy sites. Usamah ibn-Munqidh, a Syrian Muslim who lived from 1095 to 1188, had mixed experiences with the Franks over the years. On his visits to Jerusalem, though, he was allowed to do his daily prayers in al-Aqsa Mosque, which the
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Franks used as a church, under the protection of some Templars.\textsuperscript{87} Ibn Jubayr, a Spanish Muslim living in Granada, set out for his long-awaited pilgrimage to Mecca in February 1183, and visited a number of Latin-controlled cities and territories over the course of his journeys across the Middle East.\textsuperscript{88} He wrote down his observations about Acre and Tyre, expressing his overall negative opinion of the Franks, and he even traveled on the same ship as a large number of Christian pilgrims who had already completed their visits to Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{89} The ascetic wanderer al-Harawi visited Jerusalem and its nearby holy sites in 1173, many of those he described overlapping with the destinations important to Christian pilgrims.\textsuperscript{90} Al-Harawi also made note of a number places where the Franks had not altered the constructions of their Muslim predecessors. At al-Aqsa Mosque, for example, he observed that “all inscriptions and the ornamentation are gold-inlaid. The Franks did not alter any of the verses of the Mighty Qur’an, or the names of the caliphs.”\textsuperscript{91} The regions under Latin control were clearly not uniformly hostile to Muslim pilgrims, even while the political tensions between Muslims and Christians continued to affect the experiences of all pilgrims in the Holy Land.

Benjamin of Tudela’s \textit{Itinerary} provides an account of an entirely different type of pilgrim experience that nevertheless overlaps in many places with the experiences of Christian Europeans. Benjamin was a rabbi and traveler who visited the crusader states in the 1160s as part of his exploration of West Asia, recording the logistics of travel between cities and the information he learned about the places he visited. On the city of Acre, for example, he
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comments: “This city is the frontier town of Palestine and in consequence of its situation on the shore of the Mediterranean and of its large port, is the principal place of disembarkation of all pilgrims who visit Jerushalaim by sea.”92 Reaching Jerusalem, he encountered the Hospitallers and their hospitals, made mention of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, and, of course, wrote about the sites he valued as a Jew.93 For example, he noted the stables of Solomon, which John of Würzburg also admired.94 “you also see the stables which were erected by Sh’lomo [constructed with large stones] the like of which there is nowhere else to be met with. You further see to this day vestiges of the canal, near which the sacrifices were slaughter’d in ancient times and all Jews inscribe their name upon an adjacent wall.”95 Benjamin’s account is an example of how different types of pilgrims visiting the same places drew different conclusions from their experiences based on their reasons and priorities for the trip.

The overall experience of the city for Benjamin, however, was overshadowed by the Christian presence in the city where a Catholic pilgrim’s experience might have been heightened by it. Literary critic Adam Kirsch found a sense of “embarrassing anticlimax” between the lines of Benjamin’s description of Jerusalem, pointing out that the city, although old and revered, was actually fairly small compared to urban centers he visited, like Constantinople, and that the holy sites like the canal Benjamin described were only ruins.96 It is true that the crusader states were not expending effort to draw Jewish pilgrims in the way that they were enhancing Christian pilgrimage sites, but Jewish pilgrims did not let that define their own experiences, even if it did
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influence them. In Benjamin’s case, he elevated his own experience over that of the multitudes
of Christian pilgrims by making some distinctions in his visit to “the large place of worship
called St. Abraham, which during the time of the Mahomedans was a synagogue,” outside of the
city.97 According to Benjamin, the Frankish pilgrims were falling victim to a con: “The Gentiles
have erected six sepulchres in this place, which they pretended to be those of Abraham and
Sarah, [et al]; the pilgrims are told, that they are the sepulchres of the fathers and money is
extorted from them.”98 Benjamin, however, apparently knew better than to fall for these fake
tombs and visited the true ones: “if any Jew come, who gives an additional fee to the keeper of
the cave, an iron door is opened [...] the visitor descends [...] and at last reaches a third [cave],
which contains six sepulchres [...] A lamp burns in the cave and upon the sepulchres
continually...”99 In this way, Benjamin, and presumably other Jewish pilgrims, found their own
special moments despite the predominance of Christians in the city and surrounding areas.

Benjamin was not the only Jewish pilgrim to visit Latin Jerusalem, of course; two other
notable European Jewish pilgrims were Rabbi Petechiae of Regensburg (1175), who met only
one Jew living in Jerusalem at the time, and Rabbi Jacob ha Cohen (1180), who wrote a short
account of an odd vision he had on Mount Carmel.100 Overall, the Jewish pilgrim experience in
the crusader states reflected the same fragile character as Jewish life in Europe: it could change,
sometimes very rapidly, in accordance with shifts in government or popular sentiment.101 This
can be seen in the massacres of European Jews that had been a consequence of the popular
agitation at the start of the First Crusade, and again in 1099, when the crusaders captured

97 Benjamin of Tudela, The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela, 70.
98 Benjamin of Tudela, The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela, 70.
99 Benjamin of Tudela, The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela, 76-77.
100 Hunt, Four Paths to Jerusalem, 107.
Jerusalem and they massacred its population, including the resident Jews. Revered poet Yehuda Halevi (c. 1075-1141) poignantly expressed a sentiment of being trapped between Christian and Muslim power amongst his poetry, and he himself died near or at Jerusalem on his end-of-life pilgrimage to the holy city. Nevertheless, Jews continued to make a place for themselves in European and crusader state society, including in pilgrimage to Jerusalem during the crusader state era, as the Jewish devotion to Zion was entirely independent of crusaders and their state-building efforts, and would persist long after they were gone.

Jewish pilgrimage to Jerusalem had been on a slow decline, but it experienced an uptick in the early 1200s after Saladin’s conquest of the city in 1187. In 1210, French Jew Rabbi Samuel ben Samson made a pilgrimage to Palestine with his prominent and respected companion, Rabbi Jonathan ha Cohen, and recorded his experience visiting Jerusalem and other Palestinian holy sites. The rabbis’ arrival at Jerusalem was evidently a deeply emotional experience: “rending our garments on beholding it […] we wept bitterly…” Like Benjamin, Samuel and Jonathan visited the Jewish holy places, and Samuel remarked on Muslim interaction with many of the same holy sites, noting their shared places of veneration. In 1211, possibly encouraged by Samuel’s journey, three hundred French and English Rabbis also made the pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Then, in about 1217, Yehuda al-Harizi, a poet and Spanish Jew known for his satirical work “Tahkemoni,” also traveled through Jerusalem during his journeys.
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in the Middle East. While there, he and his companions made disapproving notice that the
Muslims had constructed buildings over the site of the Jewish Temple, but were pleased to note
that Jews were allowed to live peaceably within the city. Muslim authority over the city
seemed to support Jewish pilgrimage in a way that Christian rule had failed to do.

For Western Christian Europeans, the penitentiary culture of pilgrimage continued to be
affirmed after the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin, remarkably unchanged by the upheavals in
the political landscape. In 1192, Richard of London and his party were among the pilgrim
groups to first take advantage of the treaty between Saladin and King Richard I of England (r.
1189-99) that guaranteed Christians’ access to the holy sites of Jerusalem. These pilgrims
moved hurriedly in groups to deter potential attackers, feeling unsafe and leaving a record of
unease and mistrust. The dangers that had followed Saewulf and other earlier pilgrims
remained prominent as well: “The bishop of Acre and several honorable men from our
brotherhood who were en route to you to discuss the question of the Holy Land, as well as many
pilgrims of noble and humble birth, perished in the heavy seas. This was God’s will, but the
whole Christian population felt and bemoaned the loss,” wrote the Master of the Hospital in a
letter to a colleague in England.

Use of pilgrimage as formal punishment and atonement
developed out of these circumstances, too. For example, after Englishman Herbert of Patsley
committed a murder in 1207, a settlement with the court and the family of the victim sent him on
a seven-year pilgrimage to Jerusalem with the duty to pray for the soul of the man he murdered

109 Introduction to “Judah-Al-Harizi, ca. 1216,” in Jewish Travellers (801-1755), ed. Elkan Nathan Adler (New
Delhi/Madras: Asian Educational Services, 1995), 111; Hunt, Four Paths to Jerusalem, 115; Yehuda al-Harizi,
110 Hunt, Four Paths to Jerusalem, 115.
111 Hunt, Four Paths to Jerusalem, 111.
112 Geoffrey of Donjon, “Geoffrey of Donjon, Master of the Hospital, to William of Villiers, Prior of the Hospital in
England (1201),” in Letters From the East, ed. Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate, 95.
and otherwise serve God in the Holy Land. Court records do not state whether he went, but Herbert’s penalty for returning to England before the end of his seven years was death.\textsuperscript{113} The association between pilgrimage and penance had had decades to increasingly ingrain itself in Western European religious culture and export to the Holy Land.

Orthodox Christians were generally better received in post-1187 Jerusalem than Western Christians, who intermittently were at war with Islamic leaders in the Holy Land. Thietmar, for example, made his journey to the shrine of St. Catherine in disguise as a different type of Christian: “setting forth on my journey from Acre dressed as a Georgian monk and with a long beard, I pretended to be what I was not, and went along the sea shore.”\textsuperscript{114} Evidently, Thietmar felt far better equipped to face the journey to St. Catherine, but he still had the misfortune of being captured by “Saracens” near Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{115}

The Holy Land was a particularly unique place because it drew pilgrims of multiple religions, especially to the city of Jerusalem. For European Christian pilgrims, the medieval era made its cultural mark by infusing pilgrimage with strong penitential purpose. Characterized by danger, pilgrimage to Jerusalem, the most important destination, reinforced this penitential culture. The crusader kingdoms constructed institutions to support pilgrims, through the Church and administrative institutions both, and guarded and maintained the holy sites in their jurisdictions. Jewish pilgrimage, such as the experience of Benjamin of Tudela, overlapped with the Christian pilgrim experience but did not quite mirror it, and instead underwent growth after Islamic recapture of Jerusalem. Muslim pilgrims traveled through Christian-controlled cities too, although their pilgrim experiences were not as proactively supported by the crusader states as
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Christian pilgrims’ were. Orthodox Christian pilgrims found themselves in a strange middle-ground, neither preferred nor wholly rejected by Islamic and Christian political authorities vying for control of the holy places. The spiritual geography of the crusader states drew pilgrims like no other landscape in the world, and this continued pilgrimage shaped religious life in the crusader states into a uniquely multicultural experience.

**Monasticism**

Like pilgrims, monks were also drawn to the holy sites of the crusader kingdoms, although in a far more permanent manner. The creation of the crusader states introduced Latin Christian monasticism on a comparatively large scale to a region that did not have a prominent history of this type. Europeans imported established Latin monasticism and layered it over Eastern monasticism that had long been present. As a result, Eastern and Western monks often lived in close proximity to one another in the crusader states. The crusader state environment also led to the creation of military orders, which were an innovation then exported back to Europe and popularized there as well. Monasticism in the crusader kingdoms was tied to the spiritual geography of the Holy Land, as monks of all types gravitated toward holy sites, seeking closeness to these locations’ biblical history, to venerate and maintain the shrines in these places, or, in the case of the military orders, protect them and the people around them. The unique religious geography of the crusader states was a result of each and combinations of these factors: imported European monasticism, native Eastern monasticism, and innovation in Latin monasticism.
As a general rule, before the crusades, there were no European-style cenobitic monasteries in the region to provide an already-established monastic community for the new crusader states to adopt into their kingdoms. The two exceptions to this rule, monasteries that predated and continued after the First Crusade, ran hospitals for Latin pilgrims. One was located on the Mount of Olives and another, Saint Mary Latin, was in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{116} Any other such Latin monasteries that existed in this region disbanded over time during the rule of one Islamic leader or another.\textsuperscript{117} On the other hand, hermits who settled in the Holy Land actually kept the Latin monastic presence there more or less constant before the crusades, but these hermits existed as only a small handful within a heterogeneous population of Christian hermits.\textsuperscript{118} As a whole, the Latin monastic presence in the Levant prior to the First Crusade was not significant enough to provide the groundwork for the monastic presence that would develop in the crusader states, which meant that Latin monasticism in the crusader states evolved on a foundation without a strong Latin characteristic.

The Latin characteristic was instead imported from Europe, which meant that the monasticism of the crusader states was heavily based in European ideas about monastic life. Especially relevant to the developing monastic culture of the crusader states was the significance of holy places, as viewed by Western European monastic thinkers. The acquisition of the holy places in the Levant was a primary goal of the First Crusade, so that these holy sites would then be under Christian protection and continually accessible, and the crusaders built their states
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around the holy places as institutions responsible for this protection.\textsuperscript{119} Holy sites were helpful for personal spiritual development because they were elements of the real world that related directly to the more abstract aspects of the faith, helping connect worshippers to past events in a physical way that written or spoken teachings could not.\textsuperscript{120} The two most prominent contributors to the considerations on what the relationship between monks and holy sites should be were the abbots Bernard of Clairvaux and Peter the Venerable of Cluny. They agreed on the value of pilgrimage to the holy places for laity, but worried about the distraction these destinations posed for European monks: if the cloister itself was to be considered paradise, as they both asserted, it stood to reason that the earthly location of the cloister was irrelevant, and the holy places of the Levant were not more spiritually significant than the cloister, either.\textsuperscript{121} These arguments were not able to prevent the migration of monks to the crusader states, though, whether for pilgrimage or more permanently. For example, in 1127 Stephen of La Ferté, at the time the abbot of Saint-Jean-en-Vallée in Chartres, ignored Bernard of Clairveaux’s fervent protests and went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem, where he remained, became Patriarch of Jerusalem within a year, and went on to have a career defined by intense conflict with King Baldwin II until his sudden death in 1130.\textsuperscript{122} The holy places in the Latin East were so attractive to worshippers that new monastic orders in the crusader states often anchored themselves to shrine churches and other holy sites, or devoted themselves to serving pilgrims who traveled to the Holy Land to visit these places.\textsuperscript{123}
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Bernard and Peter were not, however, strictly opposed to the general idea of monks in the crusader states living near the holy places, an arrangement that brought together the characteristics of both the cloister and the sacred sites. Bernard, for example, was one of the most influential supporters of the Knights Templar, a monastic order founded in Jerusalem, and their ethos.\footnote{Bernard of Clairveaux, “Bernard of Clairveaux, In Praise of the New Knighthood (1130s),” in The Templars, ed. Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate (New York: Manchester University Press, 2002), 215-27.} Had the abbots tried to prevent Latin monastic orders from operating in the Levant, it would have been an impossible uphill battle: whether migrants from Europe or Latin natives of the East, people were determined to form monasteries in the crusader kingdoms. Peter the Venerable also offered his thoughts on these monasteries and their special circumstances, still emphasizing the importance of inner holiness over locational holiness. He reasoned that being in a specific place, no matter how holy, could not imbue a person with holiness in replacement of actually living a holy lifestyle. Instead, Peter suggested that monks in the Holy Land had even higher standards of holiness to meet due to their privileged location.\footnote{Jotischky, The Perfection of Solitude, 14.}

Monastic organization methods were another significant conceptual import to the crusader states from Western Europe. European monks participated in established traditions for both eremitical and cenobitic life. Some monks, usually cenobites, lived under a high level of ecclesiastical supervision, while other monks, often hermits, did not. All proper monks adopted a rule to live by, whether written specifically for a single group or applicable across many, such as the Benedictine Rule. For example, Peter the Venerable and Bernard of Clairvaux both lived by the Benedictine Rule, although they argued the details of the best way to practice it.\footnote{Peter the Venerable, “Letter 28,” trans. S.R. Maitland, in The Dark Ages: A Series of Essays Intended to Illustrate the State of Religion in the Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, and Twelfth Centuries, 2nd ed. (London: Francis & John Rivington, 1845), 373-78, 387-90.} Some
monks were ordained priests, others were not. Individual monks sometimes moved between lifestyles or entire institutions transitioned from eremitical to cenobitic over time as they grew in population and their rules became less ascetic. The patterns of Catholic-style monasticism were superimposed on top of a long-established foundation of Orthodox and other eastern Christian monasticism in the Holy Land. An arrangement such as this meant that the monks constructing the new monastic society in the crusader states would not replicate either foundational source completely, and instead integrate elements of both into an entirely unique form of Latin monasticism.

The monastic developments in the crusader states influenced European monasticism as well, most clearly in the form of the military orders. A military order is a type of Roman Catholic monastic order characterized by a significant military capacity, with conceptual origins dating back to roughly 1120. The most significant ones oriented toward work in the Latin East were the Knights Templar and the Knights Hospitaller, whose full titles are, respectively, the Poor Fellow-Soldiers of Christ and of the Temple of Solomon and the Order of Knights of the Hospital of Saint John of Jerusalem. A number of these orders spread across Europe and the Middle East, where they became active in European affairs as well. For example, the Teutonic Knights were leaders of the Baltic crusades. Much of the military order operations in Europe, especially those of the Templars and Hospitallers, were oriented toward collecting European resources for financially supporting their chapters in the crusader kingdoms.
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These military orders developed in the Latin East because of the military conditions facing the crusader kingdoms. Reinforcements of crusaders from Europe, when they came, arrived in waves and returned home at the end of their expeditions, while the kingdoms they left behind were established with the intent of permanence and had defenses to maintain between crusades. Fulcher of Chartres, who was King Baldwin I of Jerusalem’s chaplain and a participant in the First Crusade, outright states the necessity of these defenses: “it was necessary that the land and the cities taken from the Turks with such difficulty should be carefully guarded,” he writes, “These if rashly left unprotected might be conquered in a sudden attack by the Turks, now driven back as far as Persia. In this case great harm would befall the Franks, both going to Jerusalem and returning.” Even armed soldiers often struggled to defend themselves while moving between the recently-established kingdoms: “Often many Franks were killed by Saracens lurking around the narrow paths along the way or were captured when they went in search of food. [...] Some marveled that he [King Baldwin I] dared march through so much hostile territory with so few men.” Fulcher—and Archbishop William of Tyre, consulting his account some forty years later—subsequently recorded an ambush that Baldwin’s traveling party faced on the journey from Edessa to Jerusalem upon the death of Godfrey of Bouillon. The sense of danger pressing in on all sides of the crusaders and their new kingdoms repeatedly appears in Fulcher’s chronicle, and the military orders would push back against it. In an environment of such frequent fighting, a military force as inconsistent as seasonal European
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crusader pilgrims was an enormous disadvantage. What the crusader kingdoms needed was permanence, a standing army that was continually reliable.\textsuperscript{134} This is the role that the military orders came to fill, which is why they developed in the Latin East and not out of mainstream European monasticism.

The Iberian Peninsula was the only European region with conditions comparable enough to the Latin East for the possible convergent evolution of monasticism with a military bent. The Iberian military orders, of which there were four, began to appear roughly forty years after the ones in the Levant.\textsuperscript{135} Over time, both the Templars and Hospitalers constructed substantial chapters in Iberia as well.\textsuperscript{136} The regions shared some broad similarities, such as the fragmented nature of political geography and the proximity between Muslims and Christians, that account for their comparability. The military orders were, however, quickly and enthusiastically imported into Europe, as evidenced by the extensive institutional presence of the Templar and Hospitaller orders on the continent and the Europe-oriented Teutonic Order’s activity.

The Templars were clearly a product of the First Crusade and the combative Latin East environment: in 1119, a group of former crusaders who settled in the Kingdom of Jerusalem took monastic vows and committed themselves to the special duty of defending pilgrims from Jerusalem’s hostile surroundings. The Patriarch of Jerusalem and the newly-crowned King Baldwin II supported their endeavor. Their leader was Hugh of Payns, a knight and pilgrim from Champagne, and the king provided the fledgling order with space in what the crusaders believed was the Temple of Solomon, al-Aqsa Mosque, which at the time also served as the residence of
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the king.\textsuperscript{137} Fulcher of Chartres was the contemporary chronicler during the formation of the Knights Templar and the Knights Hospitaller, since he continued to record until 1127. For uncertain reasons, though, he does not mention the military orders at all. One possibility is that they were still too early in their establishment to be deemed significant enough.\textsuperscript{138} However, as seen above, the \textit{History} does provide a detailed account of the perilous environmental conditions motivating the military orders. For example: “There were among them [inhabitants of the land surrounding Ascalon] robbers who were accustomed to lurk between Ramla and Jerusalem and to kill our Christians.”\textsuperscript{139} Writing later, William of Tyre dates an invasion of Antioch by the Turkish satrap Gazi to the year after the Templars formed their order.\textsuperscript{140} In this way, the politics of the land that the Templars settled informed their purpose.

The Templars became the quintessential military order. Fighting in the name of protection of their faith was their purpose and devotion, the central concept that bound the Templars together as an order. Hugh “Peccator,” author of a concerned letter ca. 1128 advising the Templars on avoiding the traps of the devil in carrying out their new monastic initiative. The Templars kept this letter with copies of their Rule, and it summarized their mission as “carrying arms against the enemies of the faith and peace in defense of Christians.”\textsuperscript{141} The Templars themselves described the role of professed knights to combine “knighthood with religion” and

\textsuperscript{137} Riley-Smith, \textit{Templars and Hospitallers}, 10-11; Barber, \textit{The New Knighthood}, 7.
\textsuperscript{138} Fulcher of Chartres, \textit{A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem}, 3-4; Barber, \textit{Crusader States}, 134-35.
\textsuperscript{139} Fulcher of Chartres, \textit{A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem}, 144.
\textsuperscript{140} William of Tyre, \textit{A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea}, 1:528.
repeatedly referenced their duty to provide “defence for the Holy Church” in their first Rule, written down in 1129.\textsuperscript{142} The whole order focused on this military purpose.

The revolutionary nature of the “military” in “military order” should not overshadow the Templars’ total commitment to the religious life, however. They did not see a conceptual divide between their military and monastic characters; even as their military importance increased, they remained devoted to their fundamentally monastic structure.\textsuperscript{143} Their first rule (dated 1129) balances introductory assertions of the Templars’ call to holy knighthood with rules that overwhelmingly pertain to regulation of the cloistered life of the brothers. In the first seventy rule-subsections only four provide instruction explicitly concerning the brother knights’ duty to bear arms. For comparison, there are five concerning the brother knights’ hair and clothes, part of the regulation of the brothers’ lives as cloistered monks. The many other rules for the knights also focused on their behavior and possessions off the battlefield rather than on it.\textsuperscript{144} In approximately 1165, the first French Rule supplemented this original rule and elaborated on the customs of the communal life. However, the French Rule also provided significantly more extensive and detailed instructions for warfare-related activities, such as making camp and forming squadrons.\textsuperscript{145} The evolution in the rule of the Templars reflects evolution in their role in the crusader states: the Templars wrote down the first rule as a small, new order dedicated to protecting pilgrims, but by the time they began to make formal modifications and develop a military manual, their military responsibility had grown enormously in scale.\textsuperscript{146} Later accounts
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of the Templars’ origins still emphasize the Templars’ monastic nature, despite the institution’s increasingly influential military role. The Jacobite Patriarch of Jerusalem, Michael the Syrian (1126-99), introduces the founding Templars as knights, but he dedicates much more detail to their traditional monastic duties, like service to the poor. Michael outright attributes the Templars’ prominence to their monastic practices: “they imposed upon themselves a monastic rule of life, not taking a wife, not bathing, having no personal possessions […] This way of living began to make them famous.” 147 Ernoul, the squire of Balian II of Ibelin, wrote about the founding Templars’ discontent that they “do not fight and yet the need is there in the land,” their subsequent resolution to do service through combat, and their attachment to the Temple of Solomon. 148 As a whole, the Templars were not more dedicated to knighthood than monasticism. They formed their order to combine the professions, which chroniclers recorded in both the Templars’ own documents and those of their contemporaries as they described this new vocation.

In 1139, the pope officially recognized the Templars as a legitimate permanent order under his own authority. 149 Innocent II (r. 1130-43) issued the first papal bull of Templar privileges, Omne datum optimum, protecting and even demanding the independence of the order, besides its subordination to the pope himself. This bull made clear the inviolability of the Templars’ property rights above the authority of both secular and ecclesiastical figures. 150 The most revolutionary characteristic that Innocent II approved for the holy knighthood was permitting their priests to be subordinate to knights in the brotherhood. This subordination was
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foremost to the Master of the Temple, who was not an ordained priest but had supreme authority over all the Templars, including ordained brothers.\textsuperscript{151} Innocent also took steps to ensure their financial stability by exempting them from paying tithes and permitting them to collect their own instead, as well as permitting them to keep any wealth they captured fighting their enemies.\textsuperscript{152} Later popes also both reaffirmed the privileges of and pressed forward the prominence of the Templars as an independent institution with the bulls \textit{Milites Templi} and \textit{Militia Dei} in an effort to support their own power base.\textsuperscript{153} In practice, the Templars were not as independent of all influence outside the pope’s as he may have hoped, since they did not exist in a vacuum and needed to consider other more proximate authorities like the Patriarch of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{154}

Contemporary views of the Templars demonstrate both enthusiastic praise and firm criticism. Bernard of Clairvaux was one of their most significant supporters, writing prolifically to encourage his various readers to celebrate the Templar vocation, which he argued was far superior to the secular knighthood.\textsuperscript{155} Peter the Venerable, although initially more cautious, also accepted the Templars’ value, claiming he “harbored a particular [...] reverence for your person [Master Everard of Les Barres] and for the holy knighthood.”\textsuperscript{156} In an 1129 letter, Prior Guigo du Pin of La Grande Chartreuse recommended that the brothers be “on [their] guard regarding spiritual battles,” and remember that “it is pointless to wage war against external enemies

\textsuperscript{151} Barber, \textit{The New Knighthood}, 57; Riley-Smith, \textit{Templars and Hospitallers}, 35; Innocent II, “\textit{Omne Datum Optimum},” 62-63.
\textsuperscript{152} Barber, \textit{The New Knighthood}, 57; Innocent II, “\textit{Omne Datum Optimum},” 62-63.
\textsuperscript{154} Barber, \textit{The New Knighthood}, 58-59.
\textsuperscript{155} Bernard of Clairvaux, “\textit{In Praise of the New Knighthood},” 215-27.
without first overcoming internal ones,” which he specifies to be vices. On the other hand, Hugh “Peccator” explicitly refers to contemporary criticism: “brothers, we say this because we have heard that certain of your number have been troubled by some people of no wisdom, as though [...] your profession were illicit or harmful.” Bishop of Acre and Cardinal Jacques de Vitry (1180-1240) recognized the Templars as a legitimate and laudable order, but also preached caution against the traditional vices of pride, greed, wrath, and overinvestment in secular life. Some later writers, including English author John of Salisbury (Bishop of Chartres 1179-80) and William of Tyre, expressed stronger disapproval with spiritual degradation of the order. Archdeacon of Oxford Walter Map (1140-1210) and Cistercian Abbot Isaac of L’Etoile in Poitou (ca. 1100-ca. 1170) were even harsher critics of the Templars, concluding that the military orders never should have existed in the first place. Isaac of L’Etoile in particular passionately refuted the concept of conversion by violence, and wrote that the Templars were hypocrites for committing egregious violence against “infidels” and then viewing themselves as martyrs when those “infidels” defended themselves or sought revenge. As historian Malcolm Barber summarizes, “the feeling that the Templars were an unnatural hybrid [of monasticism and knighthood] persisted” in the continuous undercurrent of criticism, but the influence and
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popularity of the Templars persisted until their order’s dramatic and violent end in 1312. The Templars represented the new monastic development of a military order, founded in crusade ideas developed in Europe but only fully evolved into its own institution under the pressures of the crusader-state landscape. As a result of being tailor-made for the crusader kingdoms, they left a mixed legacy in Europe.

The Knights Hospitaller differed significantly from the Templars because they had two main focuses to which they devoted their order: military and healing. This order, like the Templars, grew out of the early crusader-state environment, but the origins of the Hospital predate its military function, and at its deepest roots even predate the existence of the crusader states. The Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem evolved out of the Order of St. Mary Latin, which operated a hospital for pilgrims from the West in pre-crusade Jerusalem, and had its independence formalized in 1113 by Pope Paschal II, who declared the papacy “much pleased with the pious earnestness of [the order’s] hospitality.” In this bull of independence, Paschal describes the Hospitallers’ activities as “support and maintenance of pilgrims” and “relieving the necessities of the poor,” with no military component at all. The Hospitallers retained their devotion to pilgrims and the poor, but evolved far beyond these roots in their participation in the Latin society of the Levant. Perhaps the clearest manifestation of this influence on the development of the order is the Hospitallers’ evolution into a military order, one that was different from that of the Templars but no less militaristic. Crusade historian Jonathan Riley-Smith has concluded that “the first evidence for an embryonic military wing is to be found

as early as 1126,” and that “the Hospital’s militarization, like the Temple’s, seems to have been born out of the religious aspirations of para-crusading or mercenary knights in Palestine.” 167 In this way, the Hospitallers combined the military character encouraged by the crusader state environment with the healing character preserved from the order’s hospital foundational origins, which the Templars did not have.

Crucial to the survival of the Hospitallers as an order was their successful integration of their dual focuses. Dedicating one order to two separate missions would pull it apart in the continuing conflict over which purpose to prioritize at any given moment. The Hospitallers themselves faced such a crisis in 1170 after Master Gilbert of Assailly overextended the resources of the order on military ventures while neglecting the parallel duty of financing the care for the poor and sick. 168 Fortunately for the preservation of their order, the Hospitallers were able to resolve this crisis, although it did take almost an entire decade. In the face of papal admonishment for straying from their founding cause, the Hospitallers created a new philosophy that integrated the two dedications as different but compatible aspects of their duty to care for the poor, whether by sheltering them in hospitals or defending them from attack. In this way, the fighting and healing purposes of the order were not different ends, which would divide the order, so much as they were the two sides of the same coin. 169

The Temple and the Hospital, as the earliest military orders originating in the same city, had a number of similarities and influences on one another. Both were concerned with the protection of pilgrims and Christendom, and had similar military duties such as holding castles.
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They were certainly not identical, however. Most obviously, the Temple lacked the nursing dimension of the Hospital. They had separate properties, and different systems of internal governance. The two orders were responsible for extensive mutual military work and leadership after the fall of the First Kingdom of Jerusalem in 1187, participating in the crusades to try and recapture the Holy City. For example, during the Third Crusade: “the Templars formed the vanguard [of the army] and the Hospitallers the rearguard. Both of them acted energetically and displayed an image of great valor.” Jacques de Vitry mentioned both orders present on the Fifth Crusade in a letter to Pope Honorius III (1216-27).

Besides the military orders, Latin-style cenobitic monks settled the crusader state landscape by ousting and replacing established Orthodox, Jacobite, Armenian, Georgian, or other Christian groups, or by renewing abandoned sites that had once housed such communities. The crusader kingdom governments were the active force behind this replacement program from early in the existence of the crusader states, starting with Godfrey of Bouillon installing twenty canons at the Holy Sepulcher. The crusaders who settled their new kingdoms soon began reparations to holy sites outside of Jerusalem, such as St. Mary on Mount Sion, preparing them for Augustinian canons or other Latin monks to inhabit. The English pilgrim Saewulf noted that “the church of St. Mary in the [Valley of Jehoshaphat], where she was honourably buried by the Apostles after her death; her sepulchre, as is just and proper, is revered with the greatest
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honours by the faithful, and monks perform service there day and night.”175 Saewulf made his pilgrimage in 1102-3, so this site was restored and inhabited within a few years of the capture of Jerusalem. Many, although not all, of these locations were shrine churches like St. Mary. Latin monks founded a small number of entirely new monasteries as well, notably late-arriving Premonstratensians and a small number of Cistercians who entered a monastic landscape already adapted to Latin settlers and did not chance upon an existing or formerly-occupied Orthodox monastery convenient for them to adapt to their interests.176 Orthodox and Latin monks occasionally even cooperated in running these shrine churches, such as the case of the Mount of Olives Church of the Ascension, which was transformed into an Augustinian monastery under the joint supervision of a Latin priest and an Orthodox stylite in 1101.177 Despite disturbances like being ousted from a particular location, Orthodox monks remained present and practiced throughout the crusader kingdoms, although they had less influence with and support from the states than Latin monks did.

Continuous contact between Western and Eastern monks in the crusader kingdoms was especially apparent in hermit communities. Hermits were a long-time fixture of the religious landscape of the Holy Land, but the establishment of the crusader states encouraged an increase in the population of hermits from the Latin tradition, who had only a minimal history in the region preceding the eleventh century. Hermits, particularly ones who went out into the wilderness alone, lived religious lives of high self-regulation as opposed to the constant supervision characteristic of cenobitic communities. At the same time, in the crusader kingdoms

176 Barber, Crusader States, 135-36, 242; Jotischky, The Perfection of Solitude, 58.
Latin hermits and hermits of native religious traditions could be living practically side by side. For example, in the Valley of Jehoshaphat, the ancient tombs carved into the mountains attracted many different types of hermits: Latin, Armenian, Jacobite, Greek Orthodox, and Georgian. 178 This communication and close-quarters relationship was the result of layering Western monasticism over Eastern monasticism for hermits in the crusader states.

Spiritual geography was a defining characteristic of monasticism in the crusader states that diverged from the European monastic ideas brought to the Holy Land. This geographic significance developed in a fundamentally different setting with an entirely different spiritual landscape than Western Europe. Influential European monastic leaders Bernard of Clairvaux and Peter the Venerable had argued the preeminence of the cloister itself over any earthly location, no matter how holy, but monks in the crusader kingdoms continued to concentrate on holy locations, including shrine churches or anchorite dwellings. For example, the Carmelites, a contemplative order of Latin hermits who became an order of mendicant friars, first appeared on the historical record about a century after the First Crusade. They chose a biblical site to settle, one that had been occupied by Orthodox monks as early as the fourth century. 179 Other monastic orders founded in the crusader kingdoms, such as the Templars, also had a location-oriented dimension. The Templar founders named their order after the Temple of Solomon in Jerusalem, and their successors continuously fought to recapture the Holy City after 1187. The Hospitallers similarly named themselves after their founding hospital, and both military orders worked to defend pilgrims, who travelled to the crusader kingdoms for the explicit purpose of visiting the sacred places that monks frequently made their homes. The Carmelites attached themselves to Mount

Carmel. Even though Latin monks were late arrivals in comparison to Orthodox monks, they built close attachments to biblical locations or shrine churches just like native Christians had been doing for centuries.

This shared focus on holy sites inevitably created neighboring communities of Latin and Orthodox monks. In the mid-thirteenth century, the Carmelites lived only a short distance from an Orthodox monastery, both monasteries appearing together in pilgrim guides. One such pilgrim guide states “there is a very beautiful and delightful place in which live the Latin hermits, who are called the friars of the Carmel [...] from the abbey of the Greeks to the hermits is a league-and-a-half,” while another such pilgrim guide also estimated their distance at one league apart. This close proximity between Latins and native Christians was common across the crusader states as many monks gravitated to holy sites, in this case Mount Carmel, which shared the veneration of multiple types of Christianity and attracted many kinds of visitors.

Although Latin monasticism in the crusader states originated from a European context, exporting it to the context of crusader Palestine created a new heterogenous monastic landscape different from all of its origins. The military orders that developed out of the crusader state environment were the Templars and the Hospitallers. The Templars were the exemplary military order fighting for their faith, while the Hospitallers incorporated fighting into their founding mission to care for the poor. The concept of a military order was a revolutionary new idea that grew out of the philosophical groundwork laid during the crusades, and the Templars and

---

182 “Pilgrimages and Pardons of Acre,” 229.
Hospitallers themselves were granted papal privileges and legitimized according to the context of crusading Europe and of course the crusader states themselves. The Latins of the crusader kingdoms created a network of Western monasticism alongside native Eastern monasticism as Christian monks of many types shared the spiritual geography of the Holy Land. This network of Western monasticism included members of long-established orders, like Augustinian canons, and new orders, like the Carmelites and of course the military orders. The conditions of monastic innovation and coexistence created a religious landscape in the crusader states unlike anywhere else in the world.

Religious Coexistence

The participants of the First Crusade brought their faith to a religiously diverse landscape. The Latin settlers built their new societies overlapping this diversity, with the result that their crusader kingdoms took on different shapes than their European nations of origin. One way these Latin settlers approached state-building was to set up a Latin elite at the top of the social hierarchy, but their court system incorporated accommodations for the inevitable need for these communities to interact in the legal sphere. Moreover, trade with neighboring Islamic states developed. However, trade was not always undisturbed and violence frequently broke out between Christians and Islamic states, although many of these cases did not originate from religious causes. Internal conflict was fairly common as well. Despite the crusader rhetoric of the defensive war against the “infidel,” Muslims and Christians were not constantly at war living their day-to-day lives in the crusader states. Many civilians were not motivated to violence by religious ideology, and sometimes even shared religious experiences with those of other faiths.
Occasionally, an individual might even be inspired to a change of faith, but otherwise opportunities to practice different religions parallel to one another were common in the crusader states and their Islamic neighbor states. Travelers of many religions and monks of different sects frequently encountered one another.

Over time, the Latins of the crusader kingdoms became more multicultural themselves as they participated in the pluralistic lifestyle of their kingdoms and surrounding regions. Most significantly, European-descendant people native to the Levant had different, more friendly attitudes toward their neighbors of different religious types than non-acculturated Latins from Europe, who viewed the native peoples of the Levant with suspicion and hostility as encouraged by the ideology of the crusades. The uniquely intermediate cultural perspective of these acclimated Latins reflects the distinctive religious geography of the crusader states themselves as a semi-European outpost in the already-diverse cultural landscape of the Near East.

The Holy Land that the crusaders found was already home to a collage of different religious groups. A variety of native Eastern Christians settled the landscape, the three biggest populations being Melkites (Christians of Orthodox tradition), Jacobites (Syrian Orthodox), and Armenians, while smaller Christian populations included Maronites, Nestorians, and Georgians.

183 The Muslims of the Near East were hardly a monolith, either. There were both Sunnis and Shi'ites, often forming mixed communities, and a great deal of variety within the Shi'a believers as well, especially the Isma'ilis. The different Isma'ili types included the Fatimid caliphate in Egypt, as well as the Nizari who split off from them and appeared to both their Sunni neighbors and the Franks most memorably as the mysterious “Assassins,” sometimes allying with the

Franks and at other times attacking them.\textsuperscript{184} Spanish Muslim pilgrim Ibn Jubayr frequently mentions the Maghribis he encountered or observed, who he describes as friendly and especially respectful of pilgrims.\textsuperscript{185} The Druze religion, which originated out of Islam, had adherents in the region as well.\textsuperscript{186} Even Jewish communities were heterogeneous: Rabbinic Jews were the biggest population, and one of three total Talmudic academies in the world at the time was located in Palestine, but there were also Karites, who do not follow the Talmud, and of course Samaritans, who only recognize the first five books of the Hebrew Bible.\textsuperscript{187} The Jewish center of the Levant circa 1099 was Tyre.\textsuperscript{188} These many religious communities were not strictly segregated, instead many types of people intermingling on a daily basis, but settlement patterns frequently grouped co-religionists into their own “quarter” within a larger settlement, particularly if they were part of a minority population.\textsuperscript{189}

The crusaders built their kingdoms on top of the existing cultural landscape, including these populations, leading to the development of varied relationships among the Franks and the many other religious groups, varying by time and circumstance. An example of solidarity between Jews and Muslims was their united defense of Jerusalem against the crusaders in 1099, contrasted with the hostility between the Latin crusaders and the defenders and the awkward fourth-party of sidelined native Eastern Christians expelled from the city during preparations for the crusaders’ approach.\textsuperscript{190} Once the violence against Jews and Muslims in the immediate
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post-crusade circumstances of the first decade of Latin rule petered out, Muslims gradually returned to the areas that were part of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, especially urban areas. Even while Jews and Muslims were officially prohibited from living in Latin Jerusalem, Benjamin of Tudela estimated two hundred Jews living in the city, which he described as “full of people whom the [Muslims] call Jacobites, Syrians, Greeks, Georgians, and Franks, and of people of all tongues.” He further wrote that these Jews evidently had a government-sanctioned monopoly on the dyeing industry in the city, which “contains a dyeing-house, for which the Jews pay a small rent annually to the king, on the condition that besides the Jews no other dyers be allowed in Jerusalem.”

According to Benjamin, Acre also had a similarly-sized community of two hundred Jews. He further recorded a community of five hundred Jews in Tyre, who “own seagoing vessels,” and formed their own corner of the economy: “there are glass-makers amongst them who make that fine Tyrian glassware which is prized in all countries.” Visitors of many origins passed through the kingdoms, especially in making pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Latin-controlled cities were clearly not homogenous, and people outside of the nobility interacted with different types of believers on a daily basis.

As a result of this overlap, the crusader kingdoms were structured differently than the European nations from which the first generation of Latin settlers of the First Crusade came. Jerusalem had been the goal of the First Crusade, but other territory conquered was taken for
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practical reasons along the way, including the fertile land and crucial ports of contact to Europe and economic centers on the Mediterranean coast, as well as Christian-majority areas. Access to different soil types and grazing land influenced the locations of medieval settlements, a long-time pattern not unique to crusaders. Palestine was already populated with towns by 1099 and the physical geography of these towns remained largely the same after the First Crusade. However, the human geography of the region was altered by crusader-era developments, which differed from Western European patterns too. For one, crusader state towns never developed into communes, as some European cities did, and, more significantly, the legal system that set up the class structure of the crusader states was notably different from its European relatives. Rurally, Latins were heavily outnumbered by native Syrians. Native populations, including Muslims, were major economic contributors in both the urban and rural spheres, which brought many different types of people into contact. For example, Muslims and Christians commonly rented property from one another.

Interactions among religiously heterogeneous populations in the Levant led to the difference in structure between crusader kingdoms and European kingdoms, because each crusader state government was concerned with maintaining a Latin elite hierarchy, which was not a structural consideration at all in Europe. For this purpose, crusader kingdom administrators constructed targeted laws, especially economic and property policies, and an enforced social
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Almost all Franks who were not otherwise included in society as knights or clergymen had burgess status, which guaranteed full rights of citizenship. For those who were not burgesses, the Latins created a system comparable to that of the Islamic caliphates for classifying minority religions in their society, even including a poll tax, capitatio, comparable to jizyah. The class system was designed to keep the status of non-Latins below that of Latins, for example by keeping Muslims from positions of political authority and designing separate courts. Property laws served as bars to keep the best properties from leaving burgess hands, made deliberately discriminatory in order to prevent Muslims from getting these Latin properties, especially based on the desirability of locations within a city or other settlement.

Some of these discriminatory techniques capitalized on the technical difficulties Jews and Muslims had with Christian oath-swearing practices, which were a part of the process for transferring property in court, providing a clear advantage for native Eastern Christians by comparison. The legal system grew complex due to the need for accommodating a variety of different religious believers in society, and even developed a certain extent of “legislative uniformity” among Latin-ruled settlements.

The court system developed for the Kingdom of Jerusalem shows the approach for providing legal services to different communities but also creating accommodations for the inevitable need for these communities to interact in the legal sphere. The initial approach to creating the legal system was based on maintaining separation between Latins and natives. The
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Cour des Bourgeois was the lower court that was the civil and criminal legal body for non-noble burgesses, who the law explicitly defined as Latin Christians.\(^\text{208}\) A Cour des Syriens was established for native Christians. Then, by the early thirteenth century, the Cour des Syriens was merged into another court, the Cour de la Fonde, which applied to Jews, Muslims, and Eastern Christians, especially when considering cases between Latin and non-Latin parties, at least in Acre.\(^\text{209}\) The legal system grew increasingly complex to accommodate the different needs of many types of subjects, take into consideration their interactions especially in the economic sphere, and also promote the interests of the ruling class.

Rules for debt collection give good insight into the attitude of the government as written into the laws themselves, demonstrating both the separation and interaction of religious groups in daily life and the ever-important economic sphere. The general procedure for handling a dispute between two parties of different religious affiliations who had not made prior court records of their agreement was to involve witnesses of the appropriate religious background to support the claim of the injured party. For example, “if a Jacobite makes a claim in court against a Samaritan, concerning a debt which he owes him, and the Samaritan denies the debt, it is rightly his business to have two Samaritans as guarantors.”\(^\text{210}\) The contrasting claims of the Jacobite and the Samaritan disputing parties are not sufficient evidence in and of themselves, or appropriate to be weighed against one another because they are of two different faiths. Therefore, the Jacobite claimant must provide two corroborating witnesses, who are also Samaritans, to prove that he


has brought the Samaritan to court for a legitimate reason. The overarching principle is thus summarized: “...a Saracen cannot be a guarantor against a Jew, nor a Jew against a Saracen, nor a Saracen against a Jacobite, nor a Jacobite against a Syrian, for a debt, or for an inheritance, or for any other business, if it is not conducted in court, for the law decrees that concerning this rule, the guarantor must be of the same nationality as the one who makes the claim.” 211 This particular system does not internally rank the privilege of each religious group against the others, but does make distinctions on the basis of religious affiliation, even though these cases arose from interfaith economic dealings.

Further distinctions arose with court procedures for dismissing cases in which the claimant lacked appropriate witnesses against the defendant. For example, “if it happens that a Frank makes a claim against a Syrian in court to have what the Syrian owes him, and the Syrian denies owing it, and the Frank has no guarantor for it, the law decrees that the Syrian must swear on the holy cross that he owes him nothing; and by way of this ceremony the Syrian must be acquitted.” 212 Here, since the dispute is between two Christians, it involves Christian oath-swearing. For comparison: “If a Frank makes a claim in court against a Saracen to have what the latter owes him, and the Saracen denies owing it, and the Frank has no guarantor for it, it is right that the Saracen must swear on the law that he owes the Frank nothing, and thereupon he must be acquitted.” 213 The Muslim defendant is still obligated to make an oath of his innocence, but not in a Christian manner. Latin privilege does appear here in these oath-swearing practices, as Frankish defendants were evidently not expected to swear on the cross in the way that Syrian Christians were, or on the law in the way that Muslims did: “if a

211 “Laws of the Kingdom of Jerusalem,” 95.
212 “Laws of the Kingdom of Jerusalem,” 94.
213 “Laws of the Kingdom of Jerusalem,” 94.
Saracen makes a claim against a Frank in court to have what the Frank owes him, and the Frank does not have it for him, and the Saracen has no guarantor for it, the law decrees that the Frank should not make an oath to the Saracen, if he does not acknowledge the debt at all.\textsuperscript{214} The connecting feature is the expectation that the claimant produce witnesses of the appropriate religious background in order for the case to move forward at all. This was an equalizer present even in a law system written to favor the ruling religious group.

Latin Christians settled the coast for its convenient access to trade by sea and the sea route to Europe, but they also traded with their Islamic neighboring states. The tax code of Jerusalem highlights such trade in the example of a tax on a product merely passing through the Kingdom of Jerusalem, “the duty of flax which is imported from Babylon to Damascus.”\textsuperscript{215} In fact, trade across religious lines was not only acknowledged but also regulated in the tax code: “one should take, on the shoes which the Saracens purchase [...] one tenth [of the value].”\textsuperscript{216} A few taxes were adjusted for each type of merchant, showing preferential treatment to some, such as the law that “one should take on licorice, Saracen and Syrian, 1 and \(\frac{1}{2}\) tenths [per 100 b.], but on French [licorice] one should take only 13 b. per 100 b. as duty.”\textsuperscript{217} Prefacing it as an “astonishing” state of affairs, Ibn Jubayr wrote that “though the fires of discord burn between the two parties, Muslim and Christian, two armies of them may meet and dispose themselves in battle array, and yet Muslim and Christian travellers will come and go between them without interference. [...] the Muslims continuously journeyed from Damascus to Acre (through Frankish territory), and likewise not one of the Christian merchants was stopped or hindered (in Muslim
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Ibn Jubayr explained that the peaceful passage of merchants was possible through the tax and trade agreements between Islamic and Christian states, which to him seemed to exist entirely independently of military and political hostilities between the very same leaders: “the Christians impose a tax on the Muslims in their land which gives them full security; and likewise the Christian merchants pay a tax upon their goods in Muslim lands. Agreement exists between them, and there is equal treatment in all cases.” These tax laws and Ibn Jubayr’s observations indicate that the crusader kingdoms engaged in organized economic activity with their non-Christian neighbors.

Unfortunately, Ibn Jubayr’s understanding of undisturbed caravans was only one piece of the picture, as trade and travel were occasionally interrupted violently. In one incident in 1157, King Baldwin III of Jerusalem attacked a group of Arab and Turcoman shepherds grazing their flocks on Baldwin’s land under the explicit protection of a treaty, leading to re-eruption of war between Baldwin and Nur al-Din, with an attack on a Hospitaller convoy as part of the retaliation. Perhaps most famously, Saladin held a grudge against Reynald of Châtillon for a similar attack. According to Ibn Shaddad, Saladin’s biographer, “this accursed Reynald was a monstrous infidel and a terrible oppressor, through whose land a caravan from Egypt (God defend it) had passed [in 1182] when there was a truce between the Muslims and the Franks. He seized it treacherously, maltreated and tortured its members and held them in dungeons.” To add insult to injury, when the unfortunate prisoners tried to remind him of the truce, “he replied,

---

'Tell your Muhammad to release you.'”222 After the news of Reynald’s conduct reached Saladin, “he vowed that, when God gave him into his hands, he would personally slay him,” a threat he carried out in 1187 after the Battle of Hattin.223 For their part, Christian pilgrims and other travelers were frequently threatened as well. The German pilgrim Thietmar, for example, “fell into a snare” outside Bethlehem and was “captured by the Saracens and taken to Jerusalem.”224 The frightened Thietmar was freed through a series of coincidences, in which he befriended another prisoner, a Hungarian noble who knew some Hungarian Muslim students who were able to request their release.225 Undoubtedly, many others were not so lucky.

Interfaith violence was an on-going issue, as armed conflict frequently broke out between Christians and Islamic states, and travelers were particularly under threat of attack. Many of these cases were largely non-religious in origin, such as leaders competing for territory and political power, although religion was often still involved in some way. Usamah, who had even referred to some Templars as his friends,226 wrote at length about his experiences in battle against Franks, starting with a story about how he stabbed his lance through an enemy knight but only succeeded in wounding him non-lethally, offering his reader advice on avoiding such a mistake in the future.227 He also recounted some upsetting episodes in which Latin leaders broke their own guarantees of safety. For example, there was an incident in which King Baldwin III of Jerusalem (r. 1142-62) interrupted Usamah’s family’s travel to rob their ship, although Baldwin and his men ultimately did not actually harm the people on it, and he also wrote another story of
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a man who was tortured by some Latin soldiers at the orders of Tancred (Regent of Antioch 1100-03 and 1105-12) despite having previously secured a guarantee of safety from the very same regent. Christian travelers were equally threatened, as expressed by Saewulf’s fearful journey between Joppa and Jerusalem, marked by unburied corpses and the danger of “Saracen” bandits around every turn. Chroniclers Ibn al-Athir and William of Tyre also record extensive military history, including recurring conflicts between Christian and Islamic states.

Plenty of ordinary people, both traveling pilgrims and inhabitants of the Holy Land, were not involved in ideological warfare and even shared parts of their religious experiences with those of other faiths. Travelers often mingled, both at their destinations and on their journeys. Ibn Jubayr rented lodging from a Christian, and sailed from Damascus to Acre “with some Christian merchants in the ships they had got ready for the autumn sailing.” Leaving Acre for Nazareth, Thietmar also traveled “with certain Syrians and Saracens.” Going beyond peaceable toleration and finding religious common ground was not unheard of, either. Ibn Jubayr considered it “strange how the Christians round Mount Lebanon, when they see any Muslim hermits, bring them food and treat them kindly, saying that these men are dedicated to Great and Glorious God and that they should therefore share with them.” Thietmar, not long after dismissing the people of Damascus as impure and corrupt in their habits, described a series of miracles an icon of Mary had performed for Muslim visitors in a nearby Christian town. Even Ibn Jubayr was enchanted by a Christian wedding he witnessed in Tyre, calling it “an

---

alluring worldly spectacle deserving of record” and commenting “God protect us from the seduction of the sight.” Ibn Jubayr was also rather outraged at fellow Muslims living peacefully under Frankish rule, for example on farmsteads around Acre, where the “headman [was] a Muslim, appointed by the Franks to oversee the Muslim workers.” Near Tyre, he wrote that “there were some whose love of native land impelled them to return and, under the conditions of safeguard written for them, to live amongst the infidels.” Ibn Jubayr himself was evidently more zealous than these others he encountered, declaring that “there can be no excuse in the eyes of God for a Muslim to stay in infidel country, save when passing through it, while the way lies clear in Muslim lands.” However, in the crusader states, Christians and Muslims continued to live and work as neighbors regardless of such critique.

Residents of the Levant region tended to form personal relationships across a number of different types of religious differences. Within the category of Christianity, crusader state royals sought marriage alliances with Byzantine and Armenians royals. For example, Baldwin II married Morphia of Melitene (r. 1118-26), an Armenian noblewoman, while Amalric I (r. 1163-74) married Maria Komnena (r. 1167-74). “Some have taken wives not only of their own people but Syrians or Armenians or even Saracens who have obtained the grace of baptism,” wrote Fulcher of Chartres in his musings on the passage of time and the way many former

---
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 crusaders had wholeheartedly embraced life in the new kingdoms. Interfaith marriages even existed on a very small scale, evidenced by the laws written to be stumbling blocks to Latin loss of property through such unions and general efforts to prevent them from happening at all.

The crusader kingdoms adapted and became more multicultural, for example in their art and architecture. After taking over Jerusalem and constructing their new states, the Franks inherited the artistic culture that was already present in the Levant while also importing the art styles prevalent in Western Europe. As a result, early crusader art was heavily European in influence, but it became culturally blended as the crusader kingdoms produced their own artworks over time. Queen Melisende’s artistic patronage, including building projects like construction of the Armenian cathedral of St. James, reflected her multi-ethnic background in their multicultural sources of style, technique, and inspiration. In this way, her patronage showcased the increasingly multiculturalism of artistic styles in the crusader states. The original Church of the Nativity built by Emperor Justinian I (r. 527-65) and its 1167 redecoration were both overwhelmingly Byzantine in style, since the building and the mosaics were all done by Byzantine craftsmen, reflecting both the eastern inheritance of the crusader states and the immediate cultural influence of a period of good diplomatic relations with the Byzantines. Therefore, besides its evidence of a partnership between pilgrims and government in financing the religious artworks of the crusader states, the renovation of the Church of the Nativity also
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provides evidence for political and geographic influences on the artistic and material culture of the crusader states.

The multicultural religious landscape meant the existence of religious spaces for minority faiths inside areas controlled by a different dominant religion, namely Islamic prayer spots in Latin-controlled territory and Christian prayer spots in Islamic-controlled territory. During the Latin rule over Jerusalem, Muslim pilgrims had a place to pray set aside at al-Aqsa.246 Usamah wrote about his experience praying at the al-Aqsa Mosque ca. 1140,247 and ‘Ali ibn Abi Bakr al-Harawi visited the same mosque in 1173.248 Similarly, Ibn Jubayr passed through Acre and Tyre in 1184 and, in between cursing the Latins for occupying Acre, he mentioned that “God kept undefiled one part of the principal mosque, which remained in the hands of the Muslims as a small mosque where strangers could congregate to offer the obligatory prayers,” even as “mosques became churches and minarets bell-towers” all throughout the rest of the city.249 On the other hand, Christian pilgrims continued visiting Jerusalem after the Battle of Hattin in 1187 with the payment of a fee once Saladin installed four Orthodox Christian priests in charge of the Holy Sepulcher.250 Thietmar, during his brief stay in Damascus in 1217, discovered that “in and near Damascus each nation freely practices its own rite. In it there are moreover many churches of the Christians.”251 In 1229 Saladin’s nephew and Sultan of Egypt al-Kamil ensured Latin Christian pilgrim access to Jerusalem and its surrounding holy sites in his deal with Holy Roman

---

Emperor Frederick II.\textsuperscript{252} Under Latin rule and Islamic rule both, Jews had their own synagogues and religious courts.\textsuperscript{253} Adherents of different religions were able to practice their faiths alongside one another in the crusader states and the nearby Islamic states, despite the presence of ruling classes with their own religious preferences.

Levantine monasteries also provided spaces for eastern and western Christian religious traditions to mix. For Western monks, who were new arrivals by comparison to the long history of Eastern monks in the region, Eastern monks “provided venerable traditions and living examples from which the Latin eremitical settlement might draw their influences and inspiration.”\textsuperscript{254} An aspiring Frankish hermit could learn about the eremitical life from a variety of role models. Physically located away from the oversight of traditional authority figures like bishops, neighboring hermits of different traditions could communicate with one another as freely as they desired. Therefore, other dimensions of interaction between Eastern and Western Christianity, such as the elite politics between the papacy in Rome and the Patriarchate of Constantinople, were very distant from the eremitical communities in the crusader kingdoms.\textsuperscript{255} The Carmelites may even have originated as a community of Orthodox and Latin hermits forming a mixed order, which was uncommon but had precedent in other regions with both Latin and Orthodox inhabitants, like Italy.\textsuperscript{256} Pilgrims and monks, by virtue of their shared attraction to the holy sites of the crusader states, frequently interacted as well. Orthodox pilgrims Daniel of Kiev and John Phocas were naturally interested in visiting Orthodox monastic sites, but Latin
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pilgrims often visited Orthodox-managed holy sites and vice versa. The shrine of St. Catherine visited by the German pilgrim Thietmar was a famous Greek monastery on Mount Sinai founded in the sixth century and continually populated through the Latin occupation, difficult to access but popular with pilgrims who had the capability to make the trip, like Thietmar himself.257

Religious conversions occasionally appeared in various memoirs, although it is impossible to tell how often this actually happened in the sense of an overall trend. Ibn Jubayr expressed particular dismay at a Maghribi man who became a Christian monk after he “had mixed with the Christians [in Acre], and taken on much of their character.”258 A young Frankish man who spent time in captivity in Usamah’s father’s household converted to Islam, practicing its tenents faithfully by Usamah’s judgement. However, later in life, after Usamah’s father had sponsored his marriage to a woman from “a pious family,” this man moved with his wife and small children to a Frankish settlement, where he and the children turned to practicing Christianity.259 “May Allah, therefore, purify the world from such people!” Usamah concluded, leaving the wife’s opinion on the matter unaccounted for.260 The military orders seem to have been especially concerned with preventing their members from considering a change of faith, as “regulations of military orders commonly specify penalties for those who deserted to the Muslims, and in some instances conversion to Islam is also mentioned.”261 However, there is little evidence that this was a common problem in these orders, and even when it did happen, “discontent within a military order, rather than rejection of the faith, may often have been the

motive for desertions to the infidel." The Catholic Church insisted on freedom for slaves who converted to Christianity and underwent baptism, although in practice such an opportunity was not necessarily accessible, and this type of conversion absolutely did not guarantee rights equal to those of Latin burgesses. Living in such a religiously diverse landscape encouraged individuals to explore new types of spirituality, but not to the extent of the development of major trends in religious conversion.

Far more common and much less extreme than outright conversion was the blending of cultural lines between practitioners of different religions. For example, as evidence that Latins well-acculturated to life in the Near East were far more bearable than newly-arrived Latins, Usamah recounted in his memoir a friend’s experience in Antioch. This friend went to dinner with a retired Frankish knight, who reassured his wary guest that he only ever ate food prepared by his Egyptian cooks and “pork never enters [his] home.” On the other hand, Thietmar made note of Damascenes who left their city to visit a nearby Christian-populated town to “drink wine secretly,” since guards supervised the gates of Damascus to ensure no one brought any into the city itself. In both of these cases, Muslims and Christians appreciated each other’s food-related cultural practices on what was evidently a regular basis.

Internal conflict among co-religionists was also fairly common, as allegiances between political leaders were not drawn strictly according to religious affiliation. Islamic states frequently fought with one another, as testified by the lengthy military history of Ibn al-Athir’s chronicle. Internal divisions among the Latins in the crusader kingdoms cropped up periodically.

as well. Alice of Antioch (Princess of Antioch 1126-30) started an unsuccessful power struggle with her father, Baldwin II, in 1130, and then another one with Fulk of Anjou between late 1135 and early 1136. 266 In 1155, Reynald of Châtillon attacked Byzantine Cyprus, an ally of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, in retaliation for a delayed payment from Manuel I Komnenos (r. 1143–80). 267 At the state level, Islamic and Christian political leaders did make treaties and even alliances with one another. Conflict was not defined by religion, even while leaders often used religious language as justification for their political and military goals.

European-descendant people native to the Levant had different attitudes toward life in a multicultural society than recent arrivals from Europe. As Usamah observed: “Among the Franks are those who have become acclimatized and have associated long with the Moslems. These are much better than the recent comers from the Frankish lands. But they constitute the exception and cannot be treated as a rule.” 268 As evidence, he relayed a story of being harassed by one such newly-arrived Frank on one of his trips to Jerusalem. “When I used to enter the Aqsa Mosque, which was occupied by the Templars, who were my friends, the Templars would evacuate the little adjoining mosque so that I might pray in it,” Usamah explained. 269 “One day I entered this mosque, repeated the first formula, ‘Allah is great,’ and stood up in the act of praying, upon which one of the Franks rushed on me, got hold of me and turned my face eastward saying, ‘This is the way thou shouldst pray!’ A group of the Templars hastened to him, seized him and repelled him from me.” 270 This happened again, as Usamah returned to his
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prayer and the man tried to bodily face him eastward once more when the Templars were no longer looking, so that the Templars had to take the man out of the building. The Templars apologized and told Usamah that “this is a stranger who has only recently arrived from the land of the Franks and he has never before seen anyone praying except eastward.” Usamah seemed to accept their explanation, but he left the mosque anyway, and for his memoir he mused that he had “ever been surprised at the conduct of this devil of a man [...] and his sentiment at the sight of one praying towards [Mecca].” Usamah’s friend who dined with the retired knight in Antioch was accosted by a woman accusing him of being the man who killed her brother in battle. The retired knight himself was able to come to the innocent man’s defense and disperse the hostile, potentially violent crowd that had gathered. In both of these cases, Usamah and his friend were attacked by Latins unfamiliar with having Muslim neighbors, and defended by well-acculturated Franks.

However, Latins native to the Near East depended on European support for military support and for a portion of their trade economy, which meant they continually sought such European visitors. For example, in approximately 1165, Patriarch of Jerusalem Amalric of Nestle wrote a general letter to potential crusaders in support of Master of the Hospital Gilbert of Assailly’s trip to Europe to rouse aid for the Holy Land: “come to free [...] the sacrosanct places, consecrated by the bodily presence of our Savior. If you wish to benefit from the redemption that was earned there by the most precious blood of Jesus Christ, hurry to liberate them.” In

---

1188, Patriarch of Antioch Aimery of Limoges wrote a similar letter to King Henry II of England, asking him to send military help to the crusader states: “we eat our bread in tears, [...] the few of us that have stayed on in the Christian land will be beheaded [...] we pray that you bring your powerful aid quickly to the Holy Land. Should you delay, the Lord’s Sepulcher [...] will be forever disgracefully subject to foreign nations.”276 Such appeals were intended to intensify and take advantage of European Catholics’ religious zealotry so that they would send supplies and men to the crusader states, but this attitude did not help newcomers understand or participate in a multicultural society where Christians and Muslims sometimes had meals together and people prayed in different directions. In 1290, a group of Venetians murdered some Muslim villeins and their Eastern Christian companions who were going about their usual trading business in Acre, but the council convened to decide the fate of the Venetians ruled that as newcomers they could not be punished according the the laws of Acre.277 This was irregular even in its own context,278 and perhaps indicates the pressures on the society of the Second Kingdom so shortly before the final overthrow of the Latin East.

The Latin settlers who stayed after the First Crusade built their new kingdoms in a region with a diverse population, leading to nuanced individual relationships and complicated social ties between the different groups of people. The Latin settlers set up social and legal hierarchies to favor themselves set aside from other religious groups, but avenues for economic interaction with local populations in and around the crusader states developed nevertheless. However, violence was persistent in this politically unstable region, and besides traditional warfare,

travelers fell victim to bandits or raids. On the other hand, not everyone participated in religious
violence or exclusionary ideology, and many accounts left records of friendly interfaith
interactions. The Latins settled in the Near East lived in multicultural kingdoms and were more
likely to befriend members of different faiths than their contemporary visitors from Europe.
These Latins who adapted to the diverse cultures of the crusader states both influenced and
adopted the unique religious environment of their homeland, which was expressed in their
relatively open attitudes toward religious coexistence.

Conclusion

Religion was easily one of the most significant cultural components of the crusader
kingdoms, if not the most significant cultural element of all. The crusader kingdoms were states,
political entities with borders and administrators and economic institutions, but the crusaders
established these states as an extension of their spiritual dedication to their crusade. Religion
was a defining part of the daily lives of their inhabitants, and motivated not only crusaders, but
also settlers and throngs of visiting pilgrims to journey to the Latin East. The holy sites of these
kingdoms attracted pilgrims on an unparalleled scale, while monks, clerics, administrators, and
other inhabitants of the crusader states adapted their institutions and lifestyles to the multicultural
environment, thus contributing to the evolution of a unique culture, particularly a unique
religious culture. In these circumstances, understanding religious culture is essential for
understanding the crusader states, and even the high significance of spirituality in medieval
worldview. Following the narrative, political, or military history of the crusades without
studying the kingdoms continued to exist between crusades overlooks the religious culture that
continued to flourish in these interims. In the spiritually-charged landscape of the crusader kingdoms, a distinctive religious culture developed as Western and Eastern traditions met at this edge of Christendom.

The crusader kingdoms, especially the city of Jerusalem, were a crossing point for pilgrims of multiple religions. Pilgrimage was an active part of religious life, and for European Christian pilgrims, the dangerous journey was a penitential experience. For Jewish pilgrims, the experience of the crusader states was less welcoming than pilgrimage to Islamic-ruled Jerusalem, but numerous Jewish pilgrims visited crusader Jerusalem regardless. The institutions constructed in the crusader kingdoms to support pilgrimage were geared toward Christians, particularly Latin Christians, so Jewish and Muslim pilgrims were notably less proactively supported, although they did find assistance and accommodations as necessary. The crusader states were hospitable to Orthodox Christian pilgrims, if preferential to Catholic ones, while Islamic states clearly preferred Orthodox visitors over Latin Christian ones. The Church and administrative institutions of the crusader kingdoms guarded and maintained the holy sites in their jurisdictions, often through monks settled at such sacred places. The spiritual geography of the crusader states drew pilgrims whose religious experiences in the Holy Land contributed to the multicultural religious life of this region.

Christian monasticism in the Levant had been overwhelmingly Eastern in tradition for centuries. After the creation of the crusader states introduced Latin monasticism to the Holy Land on a much larger scale than ever before, Eastern and Western monks became neighbors, often living in close proximity near the same holy sites. The monks who settled biblical locations sought spiritual inspiration from venerated land, or were otherwise responsible for
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maintaining shrines and even receiving pilgrims. The military orders worked to protect people and places under their supervision, having developed as a response to violence toward travelers, especially pilgrims, and on a broader scale threats to the crusader states as a whole. Originally a product of crusading and the hostile crusader state environment, the military orders were enthusiastically exported to Europe. Imported European and native Eastern monasticism were components for monastic innovation and coexistence in the crusader states, where these conditions created a religious landscape unlike anywhere else in the world.

Beyond monks, other Latins likewise adjusted to multicultural life in the Levant and set up their own households and institutions. Fulcher of Chartres most famously described this process: “We have already forgotten the places of our birth; [...] Some tend vineyards; others till fields. People use the eloquence and idioms of diverse languages in conversing back and forth. [...] mutual faith unites all those who are ignorant of their descent. [...] He who was born a stranger is now as one born here.”279 As a result of this acculturated population described by Fulcher, the crusader kingdoms took on different shapes than their European allies. For one, Latin settlers crafted social and legal hierarchies in their own favor, but they also soon developed institutional structures to support legal and economic exchanges amongst many different groups of people. Most significantly, acculturated Europeans and European-descendant people native to the Levant had relatively open attitudes toward religious coexistence. In this way, they were unlike non-acculturated Latins who had only recently arrived from Europe and expressed far more negative attitudes toward non-Catholics. This distinction between acclimated and

non-acclimated Latins shows the unique religious and cultural perspective fostered by life in the crusader states.

Violent conflict persisted in this politically unstable region, but those Muslims and Christians who were neither soldiers nor motivated to violence by religious zealotry went about their lives trading and traveling with one another, perhaps a little warily but peacefully all the same. As Ibn Jubayr observed, “the soldiers engage themselves in their war, while the people are at peace and the world goes to him who conquers. Such is the usage in war of the people of these lands; and in the dispute existing between the Muslim Emirs and their kings it is the same, the subjects and the merchants interfering not.” Mystified, Ibn Jubayr concludes: “The state of these countries in this regard is truly more astonishing than our story can fully convey. May God by His favor exalt the word of Islam.” 280 People of different faiths sometimes even shared religious experiences, for example a conversation reported by the pilgrim Thietmar, in which “a certain Saracen told [him] that the cistern from which was drawn the water that was turned into wine, still contains water having the flavor of wine.” 281 With so much exposure to diverse belief systems, individuals occasionally decided to convert to a new faith. More universally, though, the crusader states and their Islamic neighbor states accommodated different religious believers so that they could practice without interfering with one another.

These three themes of pilgrimage, monasticism, and religious coexistence are integral elements of religious culture that overlap and should be assessed in the context of one another. The elements of religious culture are neither segregated from one another nor evolving in a

vacuum, so this method of combining breadth and depth is essential for a balanced approach to examining these specific topics in their wider context and their related nature.

    Europeans established the crusader kingdoms, which meant that the kingdoms also reflected change back into Europe. Returning crusaders and pilgrims brought home relics and wrote pilgrim guides or memoirs. New monastic orders formed branches in Europe and began accumulating property and prestige. Medieval European religious culture would not have grown and changed along the lines that it did without this continuous contact and interaction with the crusader kingdoms. In this way, the unique religious culture of the crusader kingdoms found its significance beyond the geographic and temporal boundaries of the states themselves, and made its way into the wider medieval world.
Primary Sources


Secondary Sources


