

Oleg A. Sokolov

Franks in the Post-Crusade Merits of Jerusalem (*Fada'il al-Quds*): Narratives and Conceptualization¹

DOI: 10.55512/wmo636697

Abstract: Merits of Jerusalem (*Fada'il al-Quds*), which belong to the genre of Islamic sacred geography, constitute a valuable but still under-researched source for studying the memory of the Crusades in the Levant and Egypt after the expulsion of the Crusaders from the Holy Land. Analysis of the most popular works of this genre created after 1291 shows that in the subsequent centuries the theme of the Crusades and the violation of the Islamic sacred spaces by the Franks played an increasingly important role in treatises of this type. In the works from the late 15th c., a comprehensive narrative of the Frankish invasion was established, centered around the struggle for Jerusalem and the figure of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, while contemporary Islamic historiography had not yet developed a comprehensive history of the conflict with the Franks at that point. The works of the period under review also blame the Franks for interrupting the transmission of Islamic knowledge.

Key words: Crusades, Islamic history, Arab history, Jerusalem, Palestine, sacred spaces

Introduction

Sacred spaces of Palestine, and especially Jerusalem itself, have been a subject of conflict many times throughout history. Examining the cultural memory of the various stages of this struggle in the Middle Ages is significant for studying the background of dramatic events in the region during the 20th and 21st cc. One of the most important periods, the memory of which it is essential to analyze, is the epoch of the Crusades.² The usual main sources for this kind of research are treatises of medieval historians and writings of

© Oleg A. Sokolov, Faculty of Asian and African studies, St. Petersburg State University (olegs1291@gmail.com)

¹ The study was funded by the Russian Science Foundation grant No 24-78-10027, <https://rscf.ru/en/project/24-78-10027/>.

² HILLENBRAND 1999: 589–590, SOKOLOV 2023a: 13–15.

travelers.³ The image of the Crusades as it was presented in folk culture of the Levant and Egypt has also been explored recently.⁴ In this paper, I will discuss in detail *Fada'il al-Quds* (the Merits of Jerusalem), a genre of medieval Islamic sacred geography, which represents another significant type of sources that have previously been understudied in the context of the image of the Crusades and the perception of the Franks⁵ (Western Europeans) in the cultural memory of the Middle East in the Late Middle Ages.

As noted by Fadi Ragheb, author of the most recent and in-depth study on the *fada'il* tradition, the *fada'il* literature is a large corpus of Muslim writings from early to late medieval period. These writings were composed to extol the religious '*faḍīla*', merit or excellence, of different topics, such as the Qur'an, the Companions of the Prophet, and Muslim cities. *Fada'il al-Quds* are religio-historical writings on medieval Islamic Jerusalem that were composed to praise the religious and historical importance of the city in Islam.⁶ A comprehensive bibliography of recent research on the *Fada'il al-Quds* genre can be found in recent publications by Ragheb.⁷ The seminal study of manuscripts of this genre is the fundamental work by 'Asālī.⁸

Fada'il are an important type of sources that have been studied extensively in the last decades, but these treatises have mainly attracted attention of scholars of sacred spaces and Islamic shrines in the Levant. They have not been widely considered a useful source for studying the memory of the Crusades, despite being a popular type of literary work in the Islamic culture of the Mamluk era, when this genre flourished.⁹ *Fada'il*, however, are significant for memory studies precisely because they constitute a rich source of images of the Franks as they were being depicted after the Crusades. I will limit the discussion to the period prior to the Ottoman Conquest, during which the popularity of the *fada'il* genre decreased.¹⁰

This study is aimed to examine the contexts in which the Franks are mentioned in the post-Crusade works of the genre, as well as how the Frankish presence in the Holy Land was understood and conceptualized. Of particular

³ BAUDEN 2014, GABRIELI 2010.

⁴ SOKOLOV 2023b.

⁵ Until the early 20th c. the Western Europeans were denoted in Arabic by lexemes *fīrandj*, *ifrandj* or *farandja* i.e. the Franks.

⁶ RAGHEB 2020: 79.

⁷ RAGHEB 2020: 75–122; RAGHEB 2023: 69–99.

⁸ 'ASALĪ 1981.

⁹ RAGHEB 2023: 73.

¹⁰ Ibid.

interest are the contexts describing actions of the Franks towards Islamic sacred spaces. This article, in a way, serves as a continuation of Suleiman Mourad's research comparing the treatises of the *Fada'il al-Quds* genre from the era before the Crusades with those written during the Frankish occupation of the Holy Land.¹¹ I focus specifically on the historical accounts about the Franks found in *fada'il* from the 14th and 15th cc. For the scrutiny and classification of historical narratives about the Franks in post-Crusade *fada'il* I apply the methods of the history of ideas, focusing on the concepts and constructs the authors of *fada'il* created in relation to the Franks and the history of the Crusades. Hayden White, discussing the process of creating historical narratives, focused on "the universal need not only to narrate, but also to give to events an aspect of narrativity".¹² Based on this, the approaches to the organization of texts of the treatises are also examined.

This kind of study also requires the method of discourse analysis. As Keith Jenkins noted, "history is one of a series of discourses about the world. These discourses do not create the world but they do appropriate it and give it all the meanings it has".¹³ Thus, it is essential to examine not only the events that the author of a historical work incorporates into the constructed images of the past and the cause-and-effect relationships he establishes among them, but also the terms and the literary means by which he presents the subject of the narrative. This approach enables us to obtain supplementary, sometimes crucial, information about the character of cultural memory regarding the subject under study. It should also be noted that although the Crusaders in the treatises under consideration are mentioned not only as the Franks, but also contextually as 'Christians' and 'infidels', the study is limited to examination of the contexts in which the lexemes *firandj*, *ifrandj* and *farandja* are used. Since the article is mainly focused on the portrayal of the Franks as an ethnic group, it is essential in what contexts the authors employ these specific terms.

Sources of the study

Five of the most prominent and widely circulated works of the *fada'il* genre, written by Muslim authors between the end of the Crusades in 1291

¹¹ MOURAD 2010: 3–8.

¹² WHITE 1987: 4.

¹³ JENKINS 2004: 6–7.

and the Ottoman conquest of Egypt and the Levant in 1517, have been selected as primary sources for this research.¹⁴

1. *Bā'ith al-nufūs ilā ziyārat al-quds al-mahrūs* (The motivator of souls to visit the protected Jerusalem) by Abū Ishāq ibn al-Firkāh (1262–1329). Manuscript V280 from Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig (Leipzig). Copied 1129 H (1717 CE), 28 ff.¹⁵

2. *Muthīr al-gharām ilā ziyārat al-quds wa al-shām* (The introducer of passion about visiting Jerusalem and al-Sham) by Shihāb al-Dīn al-Maḥdīsī (d. 1363). The critical edition under consideration is based on the Manuscript 1667 from the National Library of France (Paris).¹⁶

3. *Al-Rawḍ al-mugharras fī faḍā'il al-bayt al-muqaddas* (The flourishing garden of the merits of Jerusalem) by Abū al-Naṣr Tādj al-Dīn al-Ḥusaynī (1387–1470). Manuscript 22860 (Ādāb 674), Azhar Library (Cairo). Copied 1061 H (1651 CE), 195 ff.¹⁷

4. *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa bi-faḍā'il al-masjid al-aqṣā* (A gift to friends about the merits of al-Aqsa) by Shams al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (1410–1475). The critical edition under consideration is based on the Manuscript 1829 from Dār al-kutub (Cairo).¹⁸

5. *Al-Uns al-djalīl bi-ta'rīkh al-quds wa al-khalīl* (The glorious history of Jerusalem and Hebron, 1496) by Mudjīr al-Dīn al-'Ulaymī (1456–1522). The critical edition under consideration is based on the Manuscript B.L. 8516 from the British Library (London).¹⁹

It is necessary to note the key difference between the most famous post-Crusade *fada'il* and the *fada'il* of the Crusader period, which consists in the fact that in the two most famous *fada'il* of the Crusader era the Franks are practically not mentioned. Moreover, not only the lexeme Franks (*firandj*) is absent, but also the lexemes infidels (*kuffār*, *kafara*) and Christians (*naṣārā*) are almost never found. In *Faḍā'il al-quds*²⁰ (Merits of Jerusalem) by Abū al-Faradj 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn 'Alī ibn al-Jawzī (1116–1201) the lexem

¹⁴ RAGHEB 2023: 73; KRACHKOVSKY 1957: 504–510.

¹⁵ Ibn al-Firkāh, Abū Ishāq. *Bā'ith al-nufūs ilā ziyārat al-quds al-mahrūs* [The motivator of souls to visit the protected Jerusalem]. Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig (Leipzig), Ms. V280.

¹⁶ AL-MAQDISI 1994: 41–46.

¹⁷ Al-Ḥusaynī, Abū al-Naṣr Tādj al-Dīn. *Al-Rawḍ al-mugharras fī faḍā'il al-bayt al-muqaddas* [The flourishing garden of the merits of Jerusalem]. Azhar Library (Cairo), Ms. 22860 (Ādāb 674).

¹⁸ AL-SUYŪṬI, 1982: I, 34–38.

¹⁹ AL-'ULAYMI 1999: I, 42.

²⁰ IBN AL-JAWZI 1980.

firandj is mentioned once,²¹ the same as *kuffār* (in the context about King Sulaymān (Solomon), and *naṣārā* is not mentioned at all. In *Faḍā'il bayt al-maqdis*²² (Merits of Jerusalem²³) by Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wāḥid al-Maqdisi (d. 1245) *firandj* and *naṣārā* are not mentioned, while *kuffār* are mentioned once in a quotation from a hadith.²⁴

In post-Crusade treatises the situation is different. While the Franks are still not mentioned in *Bā'ith al-nufūs*, in *Muthīr al-gharām* and *al-Rawḍ al-mugharras* they appear in important contexts. Furthermore, in *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* and *al-Uns al-djalīl* they are cited in many dozens of passages. Before proceeding to the analysis of the narratives about the Franks, it is worth noting that *Bā'ith al-nufūs* seems to be typologically similar to *fada'il* from the Crusader period, as they are characterized by Suleiman Mourad,²⁵ since it is also short and focuses on 'Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb's (582/583–644) conquest of Jerusalem. In this treatise the term *kāfir* is mentioned once in the context about the deeds of prophet Ibrāhīm (Abraham), while *naṣārā* is not mentioned at all.

Conceptualization of the Frankish invasion

Muthīr al-gharām and *al-Rawḍ al-mugharras* do not give a general overview of the struggle against the Franks, noting only the facts of their capture of Jerusalem in 1099 and the reconquest of the city by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn in 1187.²⁶ In contrast, *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* and *al-Uns al-djalīl* provide a much more complex perspective. Let us examine two significant aspects of how the Frankish presence in the Levant is conceptualized in the last two mentioned sources.

²¹ Hillenbrand notes that Ibn al-Jawzī praised Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn (1137–1193) for recapturing Jerusalem, but he is mentioned in this treatise in only one small fragment. HILLENBRAND 1999: 179. However, Ibn al-Jawzī describes in detail the history of the struggle against the Franks in his main historical work *al-Muntaẓam fī ta'rīkh al-mulūk wa al-umam*.

²² AL-MAQDISI 1988.

²³ The translation of the title coincides with the one of Ibn al-Jawzī's work because two different names of Jerusalem, al-Quds and Bayt al-maqdis, are used in the Arabic titles of these treatises.

²⁴ On less widespread *fada'il* of the Crusades era, see: HILLENBRAND 1999: 238; MOURAD 2010: 4–8.

²⁵ MOURAD 2010: 7–8.

²⁶ The images of these events in the post-Crusade *fada'il* will be analyzed in the next section.

The first aspect is the creation of a coherent narrative around the conflict with the Franks, starting with the events of the First Crusade. These sources provide a detailed account of the battles against the Crusaders and relevant information regarding their desecration of holy places, with particular focus on the events of the First (1096–1099), Third (1189–1192), Fifth (1217–1221), and Sixth (1228–1229) Crusades. Regarding the reasons for defeats and the loss of control over Jerusalem, *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* and *al-Uns al-djalīl* highlight internal conflicts among Muslims as the primary cause.²⁷

Description of events following the Sixth Crusade varies slightly in these two sources. In *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa*, after a description of the surrender of Jerusalem to Frederick II (1194–1250), there is a detailed account of the capture of the city by al-Nāṣir Dawūd (1206–1261), the ruler of al-Karak, in 1239. This passage emphasizes his bravery and the symbolic importance of his victory²⁸. According to al-Suyūṭī: “*al-Nāṣir defeated the infidels and polytheists, the enemies of the [true] faith, on the day of their greatest holiday, in which they gather for infidelity, wine drinking and raising of the cross as they ordinarily do on the days of their holidays*”.²⁹

The narrative about the history of Jerusalem and the conflict with the Franks in *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* ends at this point, and the author presents events as if in 1239 the city was conquered by Muslims and never lost again. That is, the work does not mention al-Nāṣir Dawūd’s surrender of Jerusalem to the Crusaders in 1243 nor the reconquest of the city by the Khwarezmians in 1244. In turn, *al-Uns al-djalīl* provides a detailed report of Frederick II’s capture of Jerusalem,³⁰ followed by the capture of the city by al-Nāṣir Dawūd in 1239³¹ and its subsequent transfer back to the Crusaders,³² and finally the conquest of the city by Khwarezmians in 1244.³³ According to Haim Gerber’s evaluation of the information about the Crusades in *al-Uns al-djalīl*: “Then we are given an account of fresh efforts by the Franks to take Jerusalem, a description of the wrangling over the destruction of the city’s walls in 1219 (an effort to prevent another massacre), the ceding of the

²⁷ See, for example: AL-SUYŪṬĪ 1982: I, 281–282; AL-‘ULAYMĪ 1999: I, 65.

²⁸ AL-SUYŪṬĪ 1982: I, 286–289.

²⁹ Ibid.: I, 288. Intṣara al-nāṣir ‘alā al-kafara wa al-mushrikīn a’dā’ al-dīn yawm ‘īdihim al-akbar allādhī yadjtami’ūn fīhī ‘alā al-kufr wa sharb al-khamr wa raf’ al-ṣalīb ‘alā ‘ādātihim fī ayām a’yādhim.

³⁰ AL-‘ULAYMĪ 1999: I, 555–556.

³¹ Ibid.: II, 31–34.

³² Ibid.: II, 34–35.

³³ Ibid.: II, 36–38.

city to the German emperor in 1229 and the final reconquest in 1244. With this event Mujir al-Dīn's account of the Crusades breaks off. There are no more episodes concerning Jerusalem, so there is no further reason to deal with the Crusades, as he himself states".³⁴

This statement, however, does not seem to be entirely accurate, since Mudjir al-Dīn actually describes all the key episodes of the confrontation with the Franks in the Mamluk period, but in the section on the outstanding rulers of Jerusalem. Among them, after 'Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb and Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, he singles out Baybars (1223–1277),³⁵ Qalāwūn (1222–1290)³⁶ and al-Ashraf Khalīl (1262–1293).³⁷ This part of Mudjir al-Dīn's description of the final stage of the fighting against the Crusaders is separated from the main narrative that begins in 1099 and ends in 1244 with the section about Jerusalem's sacred spaces. Nevertheless, the reader is informed about the ending of the conflict, since Mudjir al-Dīn describes the expulsion of the Franks until the fall of Acre in 1291. He especially emphasizes the finality and irreversibility of the cleansing of the Levant from them: "*And [the lands of] the Levant and the coasts were purified from the Franks, after they had set against the lands of Egypt and possessions of Damascus and other [lands of] of the Levant*".³⁸ And further: "*And the fall of the Franks and the destruction of their state in the lands of Islam and the coasts happened in a manner from which there is no return*".³⁹

In *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa*, a similar concept of the eternal exile of the Crusaders is found, which Shams al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, however, associates with the recapture of Jerusalem by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn in 1187: "*And mentioning of its*⁴⁰ *conquest by the sultan, the victorious king Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Yūsuf bin Ayūb and rescuing it from the hands of the Franks and elimination of their traces from it and returning al-Aqsa and the noble Dome of the Rock to how they have to be, and the lasting of it until now and until the Day of Judgment, if Allah wills*".⁴¹

³⁴ GERBER 2008: 63.

³⁵ AL-'ULAYMĪ 1999: II, 151–155.

³⁶ Ibid.: II, 155–157.

³⁷ Ibid.: II, 157–158.

³⁸ Ibid.: II, 158. Wa taṭahharat al-shām wa al-sawāḥil min al-ifrandj ba'da an kānū ashrafū 'alā al-diyār al-miṣriyya wa 'alā mulk dimashq wa ghayrihā min al-shām.

³⁹ Ibid.: II, 158. Wa kāna inqitā' al-ifrandj wa zawāl dawlatihim min bilād al-islām wa al-sawāḥil zawl lā rujū' ba'dahu.

⁴⁰ I.e. the conquest of Jerusalem.

⁴¹ AL-SUYŪṬĪ 1982: I, 225. Wa dhikr fath al-sultān al-malik al-nāṣir [ṣalāḥ al-dīn] yūsuf bin ayūb lahu wa istinqādhīhi min ayday al-farandj wa izālat āthārihim minhu wa i'ādat al-masdjid al-aqṣā wa al-ṣakhrā al-sharīfa ilā mā kāna 'alayhi wa istimrārihi 'alā dhalika ḥattā al-ān wa ilā yawm al-qiyāma in shā'a allāh.

The logical explanation for this may be that after this event, the sacred spaces of al-Aqsa and the Dome of the Rock were never desecrated again by the Crusaders, despite their occupation of the city between 1219 and 1244. In this context it is important that *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* and *al-Uns al-djalīl* thus provide a symbolic conclusion of the conflict with the Franks. Moreover, although this structural element is also found in the works of post-Crusade Arab historians, in their works the events of the conflict are listed alongside other wars in the Islamic world, either divided among dynastic histories or biographies.

It is essential for us to note that the accounts of the conflict with the Franks constitute significant parts of *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* and *al-Uns al-djalīl*,⁴² as these works detail the struggle against the Crusader presence, with Jerusalem undoubtedly at the heart of the narrative. Based on this, a significant feature of *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* and *al-Uns al-djalīl* is their conceptualization of the conflict from 1099 to 1244 as a continuous and comprehensive narrative of the struggle against the Franks in the Levant and Egypt. It is noteworthy that these works were created several decades before *al-I'lām wa al-tabyīn fī khurūj al-farandj al-malā'īn 'alā diyār al-muslimīn* (The Exposition and Explanation of the Cursed Franks' Departure to Muslim Lands) by Aḥmad al-Ḥarīrī (d. 1526), which was the first historical work entirely dedicated to the history of the Frankish invasion.

The second important aspect is the representation of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn as the main figure in the narratives about the Franks. In the historiographical construct of the struggle against them which was formed in the post-Crusade period, Nūr al-Dīn Zankī (1118–1174), Baybars and Qalāwūn played a key role, but they are hardly mentioned in *fada'il* (with only a brief mentioning of Baybars and Qalāwūn in *al-Uns al-djalīl*), since they were not involved in the reconquest of Jerusalem. Although the prominence of the image of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn in *al-Uns al-djalīl* has been noted by scholars such as Donald Little,⁴³ Diana Abouali,⁴⁴ Haim Gerber⁴⁵ and Jonathan Phillips,⁴⁶ all of

⁴² With regard to *al-Uns al-djalīl*, Haim Gerber noted this, but not in the context of conceptualizing the war with the Franks as it is presented in Islamic sources. See: GERBER 2008: 63.

⁴³ LITTLE 1995: 241.

⁴⁴ ABOUALI 2011: 179. Along with *al-Uns al-djalīl*, Diana Abouali also briefly mentions *Muthīr al-gharām* in connection with the promotion of the image of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn.

⁴⁵ GERBER 2008: 63.

⁴⁶ PHILLIPS 2020: 333. Among post-Crusade *fada'il*, Phillips briefly mentions only *al-Uns al-djalīl*, noting the central role of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn in it.

these authors focused specifically on the depiction of this historical figure. For our study of the image of the Franks, it is important that *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* and *al-Uns al-djalīl* offer an alternative perspective on the struggle against the Crusaders through the lens of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's leadership, which is unusual for the parallel historiographical tradition of the Mamluk period that ascribed the glory of defeating the Franks to him, Nūr al-Dīn and the abovementioned Mamluk sultans. It is also worth noting that historical writings from the 14th and 15th cc. highlight the struggle against the Franks in Egypt, giving detailed descriptions of the Fifth (1217–1221) and Seventh (1248–1254) Crusades, while the *fada'il* narratives, although they include the confrontation with the Franks in other regions, are centered on Jerusalem. As noted in *al-Uns al-djalīl*: “Then I mention the dominance of the Franks and their capture of Jerusalem after that due to the weakness of the Fatimid state and their bad organization, then I mention righteous conquest with which God Almighty delighted by the hands of the sultan the victorious king Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn”.⁴⁷

Likewise, the concept of the conflict with the Franks in *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* is focused on Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, as the author equates the conquest of Jerusalem in 1187 with the conquest of the city by ‘Umar bin al-Ḥaṭṭāb, which he refers to as *al-faḥayn al-‘azīzayn*⁴⁸ (the two precious conquests). At the same time, the recapture of Jerusalem by al-Nāṣir Dawūd in 1239, although it is surely less significant, is presented as a glorious continuation of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's deeds. When describing the capture of the city by al-Nāṣir Dawūd, the author quotes the poem about the ritual purification of Jerusalem, in which the ruler of Karak is associated with Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn:⁴⁹ “And the victorious one purified it firstly and the victorious one purified it finally”.⁵⁰ Thus, all three mentioned conquests of the city by Muslims in *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* appear to be connected through the character of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn.

⁴⁷ AL-‘ULAYMĪ 1999: I, 65. Thumma adhkurū taghallub al-farandj wa istilā’ahum ‘alā bayt al-maqdis ba‘da dhalika li ḍu‘af dawlat al-fāṭimiyyīn wa sū’ tadbīrihim thumma adhkurū al-faḥ al-ṣalāḥī allādhī yasurruhu allāh ta‘ālā ‘alā yad al-sulṭān al-malik al-nāṣir ṣalāḥ al-dīn.

⁴⁸ AL-SUYŪṬĪ 1982: I, 126.

⁴⁹ Word play: Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's *laqab* ‘*al-malik al-nāṣir*’ (the victorious king) and al-Karak ruler's name al-Nāṣir (the victorious).

⁵⁰ AL-SUYŪṬĪ 1982: I, 289. Fa nāṣir ṭahharahu awwalan wa nāṣir ṭahharahu ākhiran.

Narratives of the fall (1099) and reconquest (1187) of Jerusalem

As for the events of 1099,⁵¹ all four treatises describe the capture of Jerusalem during the First Crusade (1096–1099), focusing on the fate of its Muslim population and plunder of sacred spaces.

In *Muthīr al-gharām*, following the account on the conquest of Jerusalem by ‘Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb, there is a passage describing the capture of the city by Crusaders following the siege during the First Crusade: “*The Franks were besieging it for more than forty days and captured it on the morning of Friday of [that] year, and a large number of Muslims were killed there in one week, and in al-Aqsa mosque more than seventy thousand were killed, and they took from the Dome of the Rock golden and silver vessels which cannot be counted, and the Muslims in other lands of Islam became very anxious because of that*”.⁵² Further, there is a brief mention of the conquest of other towns by the Franks along the Levantine coast. The statement about Muslims’ great worry reflects a prevalent tendency to emphasize the importance of liberating Jerusalem from Frankish occupation, which developed during the times of Nūr al-Dīn, and intensified under Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn’s rule.⁵³

In *al-Rawḍ al-mugharras*⁵⁴ and *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa*⁵⁵ the history of the conquest of Jerusalem by the Crusaders is given with references to *Muthīr al-gharām* and contains the same facts. *Al-Uns al-djalīl*, in turn, provides a more detailed report on the capture of the city. It describes the killing of an immense number of Muslims, plunder, and a three-day siege of the al-Aqsa

⁵¹ For a detailed analysis of the Islamic discourse on the fall of Jerusalem in 1099, see the article by Konrad Hirschler (HIRSCHLER 2014: 37–76).

⁵² AL-MAQDISI 1994: 168–169. Aqāma ‘alayhi al-farandj nayyif wa arba‘in yawm wa malakūhu ḍuḥā nahār al-djum‘a min al-sana wa qutila fihi min al-muslimīn khalaq kathīr fī muddat usbū‘ wa qutila fī masjid al-aqṣā mā yazīdu ‘alā sab‘in alf wa akhadhū min ‘inda al-ṣakhra min awānī al-dhahab wa al-ḥiḍḍa ma lā yaḍbituhu al-ḥaṣr wa inza‘adja bi sababihi al-muslimūn fī sā’ir bilād al-iṣlām ghāyat al-inzi‘adj.

⁵³ The reaction of contemporary Muslims to the capture of Jerusalem in 1099 is difficult to assess, as there is limited information available from the historical records. See HILLENBRAND 1999: 69–74.

⁵⁴ Al-Ḥusaynī, Abū al-Naṣr Tādj al-Dīn. *Al-Rawḍ al-mugharras fī faḍā’il al-bayt al-muqaddas* [The flourishing garden of the merits of Jerusalem]. Azhar Library (Cairo), Ms. 22860 (Ādāb 674): 81v.

⁵⁵ AL-SUYŪṬĪ 1982: I, 246–247.

Mosque.⁵⁶ Additionally, it includes a narrative about the flight of surviving residents and their request for assistance from Caliph al-Mustazhir (1078–1118) in Baghdad.⁵⁷ The passage about the massacre of seventy thousand Muslims, first appearing in the work of Ibn al-Jawzī (1116–1201), was further disseminated through the writings of Ibn al-Athīr (1160–1233) and replicated in subsequent sources.⁵⁸

A correlation of the examined descriptions of the capture of Jerusalem by the Franks allows us to draw the following conclusions. We observe the preservation of a traumatic narrative of the conquest being replicated within the *fada'il* genre, as *al-Rawḍ al-mugharras* and *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* cite *Muthīr al-gharām* on this. However, it is remarkable that the narrative of *Muthīr al-gharām* does not follow the three-part structure for describing the fall of the city (massacre, plunder, delegation to the caliph), which Hirschler attributes to Ibn al-Jawzī and Ibn al-Athīr, instead, only two elements, massacre and plunder, are given in it. Thus, the popular post-Crusade *fada'il* provide their own two-component short narrative, which differs from the much more detailed three-component one popularized in the post-Crusade historical literature. Among the popular *fada'il* under consideration, only *al-Uns al-djalīl* differs from the rest, since this treatise is based precisely on the post-Crusade Arab historiographical tradition, and presents a classic three-component structure. Thus, it is possible to supplement the statement of Hirschler, who noted that “the development of jihād-treatises and treatises on the merits of Jerusalem thus mirrored the development in historiographical texts, where the increasingly hegemonic Islamic narrative replaced the previously broad range of perspectives”.⁵⁹ In this case, it is safe to distinguish two different narratives about the capture of Jerusalem in the post-Crusade *fada'il*: one originated from historical writings of the late 12th c. and has become established within the *fada'il* tradition since *Muthīr al-gharām*, while the other one represents a direct adaptation of the dominant historical narrative of the 13th–15th cc.

⁵⁶ Hirschler noted that the narrative created by al-ʿUlaymī for the first time in the written tradition mentions the three-day ultimatum to leave al-Aqsa. Al-ʿUlaymī replaced with it Ibn al-Athīr’s passage about the three-day siege of the Tower of David. See: HIRSCHLER 2014: 68.

⁵⁷ AL-ʿULAYMĪ 1999: I, 445–448.

⁵⁸ HIRSCHLER 2014: 54.

⁵⁹ Ibid.: 70.

Another important narrative about the Franks in the considered *fada'il* is the story of the reconquest of Jerusalem by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn in 1187.⁶⁰ In *Muthīr al-gharām*, in the section on prominent personalities of the city, the mention of the very fact of the reconquest precedes the section on sermons, including the first *khutba* read after the capture of the city: “*Jerusalem remained in the hands of the Franks more than ninety years, until Allah conquered it by the hand of the victorious king Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn*”.⁶¹ However, in the following section, al-Maqdisī refers to the opponents of the Sultan by the general terms ‘Christians’ and ‘infidels’, not mentioning the Franks, while citing the texts of sermons and commenting on them, as well as providing information about the deeds of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn.⁶² In *al-Rawḍ al-mugharras*, which relies heavily on *Muthīr al-gharām* and refers to it, the passages about the reconquest are relatively brief, while the Franks are referred to using an almost identical phrasing.⁶³

The latest treatises *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* and *al-Uns al-djalīl* give voluminous, detailed, yet similar descriptions of the capture of the city that comprise the following components: the siege, discussions regarding the terms of capitulation, the process of the Crusaders’ withdrawal, descriptions of the alterations they made to the sacred spaces of the Dome of the Rock and al-Aqsa.⁶⁴ These *fada'il* also describe how these shrines were reclaimed by the Muslims after the recapture, as well as the first *khutba* after the expulsion of the Franks. In terms of the facts presented, these two works provide a similar picture, but *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* gives more details regarding the siege, while its depiction of the recapture of Jerusalem is more extensive overall due to the fact that this work is considerably more emotional and filled with literary flourishes, while *al-Uns al-djalīl* presents a narrative which is closer to the style of *khiṭaṭ* (historical chronicle) genre.

⁶⁰ For a detailed analysis of the Islamic discourse on the reconquest of Jerusalem, see the article by Javier Albarrán (ALBARRÁN 2024: 161–182), which focuses mainly on the views of Muslim historians and theologians.

⁶¹ AL-MAQDISI 1994: 367. Lam yazil al-bayt al-muqddas fī ayday al-farandj nayyif wa tis‘īn sana ilā an fatahahu allāh ta‘ālā ‘alā yad al-malik al-nāṣir ṣalāḥ al-dīn.

⁶² In her analysis of the image of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, Diana Abouali only notes that this historical figure is mentioned in *Muthīr al-gharām*. ABOUALI 2011: 179.

⁶³ AL-ḤUSAYNĪ, Abū al-Naṣr Tādj al-Dīn. *Al-Rawḍ al-mugharras fī faḍā'il al-bayt al-muqaddas* [The flourishing garden of the merits of Jerusalem]. Azhar Library (Cairo), Ms. 22860 (Ādāb 674): 82r.

⁶⁴ AL-SUYŪṬĪ 1982: I, 247–275; AL-‘ULAYMĪ 1999: I, 474–486.

These two *fada'il* also give a similar description of the changes made by the Franks in al-Aqsa and the Dome of the Rock, with quotations borrowed from 'Imād al-Dīn al-Isfahānī (1125–1201), Ibn al-Jawzī, Ibn al-Athīr and Abū Shāma (1203–1267): “*And as for the Dome of the Rock, the Franks built a church and an altar above it <...> and decorated it with pictures and monuments and assigned places for monks and a stand for the Gospel*”.⁶⁵ Both *fada'il* also contain the story of the Franks cutting off a piece from the Dome of the Rock and selling it in Constantinople for its weight in gold.⁶⁶ At the same time, *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* provides more details, in particular, the story about the Footprint of the Prophet, which the Crusaders called the Footprint of Christ, taken from 'Imād al-Dīn al-Isfahānī: “*And [they] dedicated to the Footprint a small gold-plated dome on columns erected from marble and said [that it was] a footprint of Christ*”.⁶⁷ The treatises also actively emphasize the ritual cleansing of Jerusalem from the Franks after its conquest by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn. For example, al-Suyūṭī says that: “*Jerusalem was consecrated from filth of the Franks, people of the taint*”.⁶⁸

Both works, after the passages regarding the capture of Jerusalem, also discuss the impact it had on Europe and describe how large forces of the Franks departed from there to wage war against Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn. For instance, *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* reports that an envoy from the Holy Land attempted to assemble forces of the Franks in Europe following their crushing defeat: “*And he dramatized this for the Franks and the arrogance of ignorance took them and they were gathering until the number of men and money [which] cannot be counted came to them*”.⁶⁹ We also find a passage regarding the gathering of troops even from the most remote Frankish regions in *al-Uns al-djalīl*: “*Refugees from the infidels arrived in the farthest lands of the Franks, and they were impersonating the image of Christ, peace be upon him, and the image of the Prophet, may God bless him and grant him peace, with a club in his hand, and he was chasing Christ to strike him, and Christ was running away from him, and they raised hideousness and noises in their*

⁶⁵ AL-SUYŪṬĪ: I, 270–271; AL-‘ULAYMĪ 1999: I, 484. Wa ammā al-ṣakhrā fa kāna al-farandj qad banū ‘alayhā kanīsa wa madhbah <...> wa qad zayyanūhā bi al-ṣuwar wa al-tamāthīl wa ‘ayyanū bihā mawāḍi‘ al-ruhbān wa maḥaṭṭ al-indjīl.

⁶⁶ AL-SUYŪṬĪ: I, 272; AL-‘ULAYMĪ 1999: I, 484.

⁶⁷ AL-SUYŪṬĪ 1982: I, 271. Wa afradū bihā li mawḍi‘ al-qadam qubba ṣaghīra mudhahhaba ‘alā a‘midat al-rukhkham muntaṣība wa qālū maḥall qadam al-maṣīḥ.

⁶⁸ Ibid.: I, 261. Taqaddasa al-quds min radjas al-farandj ahl al-fisq.

⁶⁹ Ibid.: I, 276. Fa a‘zzama dhalika ‘alā al-frandj wa akhadhathum al-ḥamiyya ḥamiyyat al-djāhiliyya wa ḥashadū ḥattā intahā ilayhim min al-ridjāl wa al-amwāl mā lā yuḥṣā.

lands because of that, and their kings strengthened, prepared and equipped troops to march to the lands of Islam to fight king Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn”.⁷⁰

Thus, it is important to note that *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* and *al-Uns al-djalīl*, the most remote in time from the reconquest of Jerusalem, describe in detail the resacralization of the city by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, unlike *Muthīr al-gharām* and *al-Rawḍ al-mugharras*, authors of which limit themselves to nothing but a brief mention of the event itself. This is crucial because it allows us to observe a shift in the structure and composition of the latest *faḍā'il*, in which a detailed account of events leading to the expulsion of the Franks has become an essential part in creating the image of Jerusalem's importance to Islam. The idea of a large-scale gathering of Frankish troops for the war against Muslims is also notable in this context.

Franks and the sacred spaces of Jerusalem

In addition to the stories about the desecration of the main shrines of Jerusalem, al-Aqsa and the Dome of the Rock, the Franks are also mentioned in connection with other sacred spaces. One common theme is the story of the prophets' tombs. This tradition was allegedly initiated by Shihāb al-Dīn al-Maqdisī in his work *Muthīr al-gharām*. Citing a hadith, “there are the tombs of thousands of prophets in Jerusalem”, he blames the Crusader occupation for the loss of knowledge about these sites by Muslims: “*There are graves and monuments, remnants of which are seen but not known, and a lot of them were erased and grinded down because of the Franks' occupation of the city for a long time*”.⁷¹

Al-Rawḍ al-mugharras also mentions a hadith about the graves of thousands of prophets in Jerusalem and states that knowledge of them has been lost; however, it does not mention the Frankish occupation in this context.⁷²

⁷⁰ AL-‘ULAYMĪ 1999: I, 475. Waṣala al-mustanfirūn min al-kuffār ilā aqṣā bilād al-farandj wa maththalū ṣūrat al-masīḥ ‘alayhi al-salām wa ṣūrat al-nabī ṣallā allāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam wa bi yadihi ‘aṣā wa huwa yaqṣidu al-masīḥ li yaḍribahu wa al-masīḥ munhazim minhu wa aqāmū al-shanā’ wa al-ghawghā’ fī bilādihi li dhalika wa ishtadda mulūkūhum wa a’tadū wa djaḥḥazū al-‘asākīr li qaṣd bilād al-islām wa muḥārabat al-malik ṣalāḥ al-dīn.

⁷¹ AL-MAQDISĪ 1994: 190. Fa inna thamma qubūr wa ma‘ālim yurā athāruhā wa lā tu‘lam wa kathīr minhā indarasa wa ‘afā li istīlā’ al-farandj ‘alā al-bilād mudda ṭawīla.

⁷² AL-ḤUSAYNĪ, Abū al-Naṣr Tādj al-Dīn. *Al-Rawḍ al-mugharras fī faḍā'il al-bayt al-muqaddas* [The flourishing garden of the merits of Jerusalem]. Azhar Library (Cairo), Ms. 22860 (Ādāb 674): 29v.

This passage is not found in *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa*, but is mentioned twice in *al-Uns al-djalīl*. Firstly, Mudjīr al-Dīn refers to the graves of the prophets and the Franks in relation to the history of Jerusalem's gates: "*And the gates known as Gates of Jericho were erased because of the long time and the Franks' occupation and no trace is left <...> and also the graves of the prophets, their place is unknown because of the long time and the Franks' occupation of the Holy land*".⁷³

Later, the author once again cites this story in the section about the sacred spaces of Palestine surrounding Jerusalem, pointing out that there are thousands of graves of the prophets in Jerusalem, many of which were forgotten during the Frankish rule, and indicating that this is a quote from *Muthīr al-gharām*.⁷⁴

Another widespread narrative is the story of the grave of 'Ubāda ibn al-Ṣāmit, a companion of the Prophet (583–655). As mentioned in *Muthīr al-gharām*, 'Ubāda died in Palestine and was buried either in Jerusalem or Ramla. However, the exact location of his tomb is currently unknown due to the Frankish occupation: "*Now, however, his grave is known neither in Jerusalem nor in Ramla, and this is only because of the Franks' occupation of this land for more than ninety years, [may] God diminish them, and their occupation caused destruction of the monuments, which had been known and famous before that*".⁷⁵ *Al-Rawḍ al-mugharras* also suggests that his grave was forgotten due to the presence of the Franks in the area, "as stated in *Muthīr al-gharām*". However, the quote is shortened in comparison with the original text of *Muthīr al-gharām*, as it does not specify for how long the Franks were present in Jerusalem, nor does it mention any other forgotten graves in the same passage.⁷⁶ In *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* and *al-Uns al-djalīl*, the tomb of 'Ubāda ibn al-Ṣāmit is mentioned using phrases from *Muthīr al-gharām*. However, while Shams al-Dīn al-Suyūfī provides a reference to

⁷³ AL-'ULAYMĪ 1999: I, 432. Wa al-bāb al-ma'rūf bi bāb arīḥā qad indarasa li ṭūl al-mudda wa istilā' al-farandj wa lam yabqa lahu athar <...> wa kadhalika qubūr al-anbiyā' lā yu'lam makānuhā li ṭūl al-mudda wa istilā' al-farandj 'alā al-arḍ al-muqaddasa.

⁷⁴ Ibid.: II, 139.

⁷⁵ AL-MAQDISĪ 1994: 315–316. Fa ammā al-ān fa lā yu'raf lahu qabr bi bayt al-maqdis wa lā bi al-ramla wa mā dhalika illā li istilā' al-farandj 'alā tilka al-nāhiya nayyif wa tis'in sana khadhalahum allāh ta'ālā fa indarasa bi sabab istilā'ihim ma'ālim kānat qabla dhalika ma'rūfa mashhūra.

⁷⁶ AL-Ḥusaynī, Abū al-Naṣr Tādj al-Dīn. *Al-Rawḍ al-mugharras fī faḍā'il al-bayt al-muqaddas* [The flourishing garden of the merits of Jerusalem]. Azhar Library (Cairo), Ms. 22860 (Ādāb 674): 99r.

this source,⁷⁷ Mudjir al-Dīn does not.⁷⁸ In all four works, however, the Franks are held responsible for the oblivion of ‘Ubāda’s grave.

It is also worth noting that although *al-Uns al-djalīl* is the most recent of the sources under consideration, it provides the most detailed information regarding the Franks’ presence and the sacred sites of Jerusalem. For example, Mudjir al-Dīn mentions that Dāwud’s grave⁷⁹ was in the hands of the Franks, and now it is in the hands of Muslims: “*The grave of Dāwud, peace be upon him, in the church of Zion,*⁸⁰ *which is outside of Jerusalem from the side of qibla, [and it was] in the hands of the Franks <...> The grave of Dāwud is in this place, it is now in the hands of Muslims*”.⁸¹ He also mentions the use of extant Muslim religious buildings by the Franks, for example, the fact that the Hospitallers were housed in *zawiya al-Darkāt*.⁸² “*And it was a house of the Hospitallers in the time of the Franks*”.⁸³

Another topic related to the Franks in *al-Uns al-djalīl* is their role in interrupting the tradition of transmitting Islamic knowledge: “*And no longer was mentioned what I wanted to say about the biographies of the best men of noble Jerusalem from among those who were in it in the past times before the Franks’ occupation of it and I have not managed to find anything else because of the long time and the break of ancestors’ knowledge by the infidels’ occupation of the Holy land*”.⁸⁴ In this regard, Mudjir al-Dīn speaks in particular about the death of famous sheikhs during the capture of Jerusalem by the Franks. In the case of Sheikh Abū al-Qāsim Makkī bin ‘Abd al-Salām al-Rumaylī (d. 1099), he gives several versions of his death at the hands of the Franks: “*And when the Franks took Jerusalem in the year of 492, they took him prisoner <...> when they learned that he was from Muslim scholars and no one paid a ransom for him, they stoned him to death at the doors of*

⁷⁷ AL-SUYŪṬĪ 1982: II, 29.

⁷⁸ AL-‘ULAYMĪ 1999: I, 386.

⁷⁹ I.e. David.

⁸⁰ Nowadays, Abbey of the Dormition.

⁸¹ AL-‘ULAYMĪ 1999: I, 218. Inna qabr dāwud ‘alayhi al-salām bi kanīsat šahyūn wa hiya allātī bi zāhir al-quḍs min dīḥat al-qibla bi ayday ṭā‘ifat al-farandj <...> inna qabr dāwud fī hadhā al-mawḍi‘ huwa al-ān bi ayday al-muslimīn.

⁸² Built by al-Muẓaffar Ghāzī (d. 1247).

⁸³ AL-‘ULAYMĪ 1999: II, 98. Wa kānat fī zaman al-ifrandj dār al-isbitār.

⁸⁴ Ibid.: I, 441. Wa qad intahā dhikr mā qaṣadtuhu min tarādjim al-a’yān bi al-quḍs al-sharīf mimman kāna bihi fī al-zaman al-sābiq qabla istīlā’ al-farandj ‘alayhī wa lam aẓfar bi ḡayr dhalika li ṭūl al-azmina wa inqitā’ akhbār al-salaf bi istīlā’ al-kuffār ‘alā al-arḍ al-muqaddasa.

Antioch".⁸⁵ The author also cites another version, according to which the sheikh was killed by the Franks in Jerusalem. Another sheikh, whose death at the hands of the Franks is mentioned by Mudjir al-Din is Abū al-Qāsim 'Abd al-Djabbār al-Rāzī (d. 1099): "He moved to Jerusalem and followed the path of piety and self-limitation to God Almighty until he became a martyr by the hands of the Franks, [may] God Almighty curse them".⁸⁶

It should also be noted that *al-Uns al-djalīl* contains references to activities of the Franks after the end of the Crusades. These include, for instance, information about Frankish pilgrims visiting the Church of the Holy Sepulchre;⁸⁷ funding of Christian churches and monasteries in Jerusalem by the Franks;⁸⁸ abduction of inhabitants of Alexandria by Frankish raiders;⁸⁹ the reconquista in Spain⁹⁰ as well as references to the anticipation of new Frankish invasions by residents of the Levant.⁹¹

Conclusion

In summary, it is worth noting that references to the Franks and their presence in the Holy Land can be found in four out of five of the analyzed popular *fada'il* written after the Crusades: *Muthīr al-gharām ilā ziyārat al-quḍs wa al-shām*, *al-Rawḍ al-mugharras fī fadā'il al-bayt al-muqaddas*, *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa bi-fadā'il al-masjid al-aqṣā*, and *al-Uns al-djalīl bi-ta'rīkh al-quḍs wa al-khalīl*.

A key feature of the mentions of the Franks in these *fada'il* is that in the chronologically most recent works, *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* and *al-Uns al-djalīl* that date back to the last quarter of the 15th c., considerable parts are dedicated to the struggle against the Franks. While Jerusalem is at the center of the narrative, these works also describe the fighting against the Franks throughout the

⁸⁵ Ibid.: I, 435–436. Wa lammā akhadha al-farandj bayt al-maqdis fī sanat ithnayn wa tis'in wa arba'mi'a akhadhūhu asīr <...> lammā 'alimū annahu min 'ulamā' al-muslimīn fa lam ystafikkūhu aḥad fa ramaūhu bi al-ḥadjāra 'alā bāb anṭākiya ḥattā qatalūhu.

⁸⁶ Ibid.: I, 436. Intaqala ilā bayt al-maqdis wa salaka sabīl al-wara' wa al-inqitā' ilā allāh ta'ālā ilā an istashhada 'alā yad al-farandj la'anahum allāh ta'ālā.

⁸⁷ Ibid.: II, 134.

⁸⁸ Ibid.: II, 124.

⁸⁹ Ibid.: II, 443.

⁹⁰ Ibid.: II, 377.

⁹¹ Ibid.: II, 134. The story of the keeper of the mausoleum 'Alī bin 'Alīl, who stored weapons there in case the Franks returned (the passage is mentioned in GERBER 2008: 64; PHILLIPS 2020: 333).

Levant and even Egypt. While much attention is given to the Crusades period in the writings of the post-Crusade Arab historians, in their works, unlike in *fada'il*, events of the conflict with the Franks are dispersed among other wars and conflicts in the region or spread among histories of different dynasties and biographies of notable figures. Therefore, a significant aspect of *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* and *al-Uns al-djalīl* is the development of a conceptual framework for the confrontation with the Franks between 1099 and 1244, i.e. the creation of coherent and complete narratives that describe the struggle against them.

It is also important that *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* and *al-Uns al-djalīl* present a narrative about the struggle against the Franks with a focus on Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, which is unusual for the parallel historiographical tradition of the Mamluk period, in which his glory of the victor of the Franks is shared with Nūr al-Dīn and Mamluk sultans. Moreover, *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* correlates the conquests of Jerusalem by 'Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb (637) and al-Nāṣir Dāwud (1239) with Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's conquest.

The descriptions of the capture of Jerusalem by the Franks in 1099, contained in *Muthīr al-gharām*, *al-Rawḍ al-mugharras*, and *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa*, represent a two-part narrative (massacre, plunder), which differs from the more detailed three-part (massacre, plunder, delegation to the caliph) narrative popularized in the post-Crusade historical writings. Among the popular *fada'il* I have examined, the three-part narrative is only present in *al-Uns al-djalīl*, as this treatise largely relies on the post-Crusade Arab historiographical tradition. Thus, two different narratives of the capture of Jerusalem exist in post-Crusade *fada'il* literature: one that originated from historical writings of the late 12th c. and became established within the *fada'il* genre, and another one that directly utilized the dominant narrative from the historiographical tradition of the 13th–15th cc.

As for the capture of Jerusalem in 1187 by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, it is important to note that *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa* and *al-Uns al-djalīl*, the latest of the considered *fada'il*, describe in detail the resacralization of the city by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, unlike *Muthīr al-gharām* and *al-Rawḍ al-mugharras*, which merely mention this event and the first *khutba* after the conquest. This is remarkable as it demonstrates a shift in the structure of the *fada'il* of the last quarter of the 15th c. with a more detailed account of the removal of the Frankish occupation forming an integral part of their narratives, which contributed to the establishment of Jerusalem's significance within the Islamic tradition.

In addition to the reports on the desecration of the main sacred spaces in Jerusalem, i.e. al-Aqsa and the Dome of the Rock, by the Franks, they are also referenced in connection with other holy sites. Another point is the disruption of the tradition of knowledge transmission, leading to the oblivion of the graves of the prophets and other Muslim figures because of the long Frankish occupation.

It is crucial that the Franks have been imprinted in post-Crusade *fada'il* precisely as a threat to the sacred spaces, and two centuries after the Crusades this genre continued to be enriched by works that paid great attention to the Frankish invasion. These findings are essential for further research on the images and perceptions of Europeans in the Levant and Egypt during the Late Middle Ages and Modern period.

References

- ABOUALI, Diana 2011: "Saladin's Legacy in the Middle East before the Nineteenth Century". *Crusades* 10(1): 175–189.
- ALBARRÁN, Javier 2024: "The conquest of conquests: the Islamic discourse regarding the reconquest of Jerusalem (1099–1187)". *Imago temporis: medium Aevum* XVIII: 161–182.
- AL-MAQDISI, Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wāḥid 1988: *Faḍā'il bayt al-Maqdis* [Merits of Jerusalem]. Damascus: Dār al-fikr.
- AL-MAQDISI, Shihāb al-Dīn 1994: *Muthīr al-gharām ilā ziyārat al-quds wa al-shām* [The introducer of passion about visiting Jerusalem and al-Sham]. Beirut: Dār al-djīl.
- AL-SUYŪTĪ, Shams al-Dīn 1982: *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣa bi-faḍā'il al-masjid al-aqṣā* [A gift to friends about the merits of al-Aqsa]. Cairo: Al-Hay'a al-miṣriyya al-'amma li al-kitāb.
- AL-'ULAYMI, Mudjir al-Dīn 1999: *Al-Uns al-djalīl bi-ta'rikh al-quds wa al-khalīl* [The glorious history of Jerusalem and Hebron]. Hebron: Maktabat dandīs.
- 'ASALĪ, Kāmil 1981: *Makhtūtāt faḍā'il bayt al-maqdis* [Merits of Jerusalem manuscripts]. Amman: Manshūrāt madjma' al-lugha al-'arabiyya al-urdunī.
- BAUDEN, Frédéric 2014: "Taḳī al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-Maqrīzī". In: *Medieval Muslim Historians and the Franks in the Levant*. Ed. by A. Mallett. Leiden: Brill: 161–201.
- GABRIELI, Francesco 2010: *Arab Historians of the Crusades*. London: Routledge.
- GERBER, Haim 2008: *Remembering and Imagining Palestine: Identity and Nationalism from the Crusades to the Present*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- HILLENBRAND, Carole 1999: *The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- HIRSCHLER, Konrad 2014: "The Jerusalem Conquest of 492/1099 in the Medieval Arabic Historiography of the Crusades: From Regional Plurality to Islamic Narrative". *Crusades* 13(1): 37–76.
- IBN AL-JAWZĪ, Abū al-Faraj 1980: *Faḍā'il al-quds* [Merits of Jerusalem]. Beirut: Dār al-āfāq al-djadīda.
-

-
- JENKINS, Keith 2004: *Re-thinking History*. Routledge: London & New York.
- KRACHKOVSKY, Ignatij 1957: *Izbrannye sochineniia. Tom IV. Arabskaia geograficheskaia literatura* [Selected Works. Vol. IV. Arabic Geographical Literature]. Moscow; Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- LITTLE, Donald 1995: "Mujir al-Din al-'Ulaymi's Vision of Jerusalem in the Ninth/Fifteenth Century". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 115(2): 237–247.
- MOURAD, Suleiman 2010: "Did the Crusades Change Jerusalem's Religious Symbolism in Islam?" *Al- 'usūr Al-Wuṣṭā. The Bulletin of Middle East Medievalists* 22(1&2): 3–8.
- PHILLIPS, Jonathan 2020: *The Life and Legend of the Sultan Saladin*. London: Vintage.
- RAGHEB Fadi, 2020: "City as Liminal Space: Islamic Pilgrimage and Muslim Holy Sites in Jerusalem during the Mamluk Period". In: *The Friday Mosque in the City: Liminality, Ritual, and Politics*. Ed. by H. Ugurlu, S. Yalman. Chicago: Intellect, the University of Chicago Press: 75–122.
- RAGHEB Fadi, 2023: "Sharing the Holy Land: Islamic Pilgrimage to Christian Holy Sites in Jerusalem during the Late Medieval and Early Modern Periods". *Jerusalem Quarterly* 95: 69–99.
- SOKOLOV, Oleg 2023a. "The Crusades in the Arab Social and Political Discourse of the 19th–early 20th Centuries". *Crusades* 22(1): 100–114.
- SOKOLOV, Oleg. 2023b. "Vanquishers of the Crusaders: Mujāhidūn Characters in Arabic Folk Epics". *Religions* 14(8): 1042.
- WHITE, Hayden 1987. *The Content of the Form. Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
-