Radboud University
Faculty of Arts
Master Ancient and Medieval Mediterranean Worlds

WE WHO WERE OCCIDENTALS

The Emergence of Identity in the Crusader State of Jerusalem (1099-1187)

Master Thesis
Pim Schouten – s1035879
Word Count: 15.708
15-03-2023
Supervisor: Mariëtte Verhoeven

We who were Occidentals:

The Emergence of Identity in the Crusader State of Jerusalem (1099-1187)

Popular depictions of the Crusades often portray the conflict as a clash of civilizations. In such portrayals ”the east” is represented by the Saracens of the Middle East and “the west”, by the crusaders or Franks. Such depictions have long been nuanced within the field of history, and the term “Saracen” and its purpose in the *othering* of the Islamic world has been the subject of much research and debate.[1] As a result, more attention has been paid to the diversity of the Levant at the time of the crusade in modern historiography and the term Saracen has fallen out of favour among historians. On the other side, less attention has been paid to the term “crusader” to describe the myriad of Western Europeans who travelled to the Middle East on their armed pilgrimage. Even the term ‘Frank’, which itself was used by the local populations of the Levant to *other* the European invaders, is still often used as an umbrella term for the crusaders who remained in the Levant by historians.

This terminology doesn’t do justice to the diversity of the people it refers to, however. From the onset of the First Crusade, their army consisted of a very diverse group of people from a large part of Western Europe. Their host included nobility, peasants, clergy, soldiers and pilgrims from all over France, Flanders, parts of the Holy Roman Empire, Norman-ruled Southern Italy and the North-Italian city-states. These crusaders were soon joined by subsequent smaller hosts of crusaders who remained in the conquered territory for various amounts of time and came from as far as Norway.[2] The differences between the various groups of crusaders may have been even further exaggerated due to the importance of regional identity over “national” and ethnic identity in the middle ages.[3] This could have meant that even the various crusader groups from the different parts of France may not have felt that they had much in common with one another.

Yet many of these people stayed behind after their crusades to remain in the newly founded ‘Crusader States’, such as the Kingdom of Jerusalem, the Principality of Antioch, and

[1] For recent examples, see Nievergelt, M. “The Siege of Melayne and the Siege of Jerusalem: National Identity, Beleaguered Christendom, and Holy War during the Great Papal Schism.” *The Chaucer Review,* vol. 49, no. 4 (2015) 402–426;
and Jakobsson, S. “Saracen Sensibilities: Muslims and Otherness in Medieval Saga Literature.” *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, vol. 115, no. 2 (2016) 213–238.
[2] G.B. Doxey, “Norwegian Crusaders and the Balearic Islands.” *Scandinavian Studies* 68, no. 2 (1996) 139–160, q.v. 150.
[3] B. Bedos-Rezak “French Medieval Regions: A Concept in History.” *Historical Reflections / Réflexions Historiques* 19, no. 2 (1993) 151-166, q.v. 161.

the Counties of Tripoli and Edessa. Despite their diversity, these various groups of people were forced to unite within their new realms to be able to survive and rule the large population of local Christians and Islamic peoples who greatly outnumbered them. In order to create this unity, it appears that the various crusaders who made their home in the Holy Land managed to form a new identity through their lives in the so-called *Outremer*.

This paper serves to determine how this new identity was created among the crusaders and their descendants in the Kingdom of Jerusalem between the formation of the kingdom (1099) and the fall of Jerusalem to Saladin (1187). The Kingdom of Jerusalem has been chosen as the subject of research due to an abundance of source material on the region and its role as the largest and most influential Latin state in the Levant. The period of 1099-1187 has been chosen because it was the height of the Crusader States' influence. The period after the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin in the subsequent Third Crusade would also force many of the settled 'Franks' out of the region to replace them with a great deal of new arrivals. This changed the social and cultural structure of the kingdom.[4]

Research into the society in the Crusader States has long been defined by the relationship between the crusaders and the local populations of the Levant. Ronnie Ellenblum describes the importance of two cohabitation-models, an integration and segregation model, in his work *Frankish Rural Settlement in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (1998).[5] The first model stated that the crusaders integrated themselves into the local society and adopted many local customs. This model was rejected in the 1950's, in the works of Raymond Smail, *Crusading Warfare, 1097-1193* (1956), and Joshua Prawer, *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. European Colonialism in the Middle Ages* (1972).[6] They believed the integration model was a nineteenth century reflection of French colonial idealism, and developed the segregation-model in which they believed the Latins isolated themselves to the cities and rarely had contact with local populations.[7] Christopher MacEvitt continued the discussion in *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East: Rough Tolerance* (2009). He claimed a more nuanced stance in which interaction between Latins and local populations occurred, but was largely practical and in service of ruling the Crusader States with cultural differences ignored to prevent conflict.[8]

Another aspect of society in crusader-era Jerusalem that has often been researched are art and architecture, which can play an important role in the creation and recognition of an

[4] C. MacEvitt, *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East: Rough Tolerance* (Philadelphia 2009), 13.
[5] R. Ellenblum, *Frankish Rural Settlement in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Cambridge 1998), 3.
[6] Ibidem, 5.
[7] MacEvitt, *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East,* 16-17.
[8] Ibidem, 21-24.

identity. *A History of the Crusades* is a large collection of historical works on the crusades, and produced one of the most influential works on the topic in its fourth volume *The Art and Architecture of the Crusader States* (1977), edited by Harry W. Hazard. It discusses various aspects of art and architecture in the Crusader States of the Levant and Greece, creating a broad overview of the subject.[9] Lucy-Anne Hunt problematized the concept of "crusader art" and tried to analyse it from a post-colonial perspective in her article *Art and Colonialism: The Mosaics of the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem (1169) and the Problem of "Crusader" Art*.[10] She argued to abandon strict notions of "Western", "Byzantine" or "Eastern" styles of art, or that one might superimpose itself on another.[11] With this she argues that the artwork of the Latin States of the Levant are not a mere one-way street of the crusaders adopting Eastern styles into their Western art, but a more natural and mutual influence between the crusaders and their new subjects. Adrian J. Boas took a narrower field of research in the city of Jerusalem itself in *Jerusalem in the Time of the Crusades: Society, Landscape and Art in the Holy City under Frankish Rule* (2001). In his work Boas primarily researches physical remains of the city. He emphasises the importance of public works in the city of Jerusalem to the identity of the city, both religious, such as churches and monasteries, and otherwise like hospitals and bath houses.[12] Additionally he states that, though the city was divided in quarters often named after ethnicities, there is little evidence for a rigid ethnic division between these quarters, especially between different European groups.[13]

While these two aspects of the Crusader States have long dominated discussions about their society, modern research has increasingly focussed on different ways in which "crusader" identity can be identified. Alan V. Murray was one of the innovators on this subject, referring to the settlers of the Crusader States as "a people in the making" with a burgeoning identity of their own in his article *Ethnic Identity in the Crusader States: The Frankish Race and the Settlement of Outremer* (2014).[14] Christopher MacEvitt once again contributed by posing the eponymous question of his article *What was Crusader about the Crusader States?* (2018). Here he analyses the importance of the act of crusading to those who lived in the Latin East and had to create a

[9] H.W. Hazard, "Preface" in ed. Hazard, H., *A History of the Crusades Volume IV: The Art and Architecture of the Crusader States* (Madison 1977) xxv.
[10] L. Hunt, "Art and Colonialism: The Mosaics of the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem (1169) and the Problem of 'Crusader' Art", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, vol. 45 (1991) 69–85 q.v. 69-70.
[11] Ibidem, 70-71.
[12] A.J. Boas, *Jerusalem in the Time of the Crusades: Society, Landscape and Art in the Holy City under Frankish Rule,* (London 2001), 102, 156.
[13] Ibidem, 83.
[14] Murray, A.V. "Ethnic Identity in the Crusader States: The Frankish Race and the Settlement of Outremer" in J. Muldoon & F. Fernández-Armestro (eds.), *The Expansion of Latin Europe, 1000-1500: The Eastern Mediterranean Frontier of Latin Christendom* (London 2014) 339-350, q.v. 349-350.

working society in their realms, bringing into question how this identity was shaped.[15] A.D. Buck responded to this question in *Settlement, Identity, and Memory in the Latin East: An Examination of the Term 'Crusader States'* (2020). He attempted to nuance the findings of MacEvitt, arguing that crusading played a significant role in the forging of the social and cultural identities of the people who chose to settle in the Outremer, emphasising the importance of memorialisation of the crusades.[16] In this conclusion Buck seems to agree with Caddidy-Welch and Lester who had already explored the concept of (cultural) memory during the crusades in 2014, emphasising the importance of memory to understanding and researching the crusades.[17] They note that the idea of Cultural Memory could explain the formation of a culture around crusading and give a glimpse into the mindset of the people who went on crusade.

This essay will explore the concept of identity within the Crusader State of Jerusalem and its Latin population. It intends to examine how the Latins of Jerusalem created a new "national" identity to unite the various different cultures who settled in the new territory and how they differentiated themselves from their neighbours and European homeland. This will be explored through explicit and implicit signs in the primary sources of existing identity and through the creation and transformation of one. Through this method this research will attempt to uncover how this identity came to be. A number of concepts used to define and research identity will be applied on these sources. One such important concept is Benedict Anderson's 'Imagined Community'. Anderson's idea of an *Imagined Community* was originally applied to the modern nation state and defined it as something limited yet sovereign which is socially constructed and imagined by the people who perceive themselves as part of a group. It is considered imagined because such a community is too large and widespread for its members to know each other (Anderson notes that 'imagined' does not equal 'false' in this context but rather 'created').[18] Despite this it is still a community because it creates the feeling of a "deep, horizontal comradeship".[19] Though this concept was created with the formation of modern nation states in mind, while keeping in mind that the concept of a modern nation state cannot accurately be projected unto a medieval society, it might still be able to offer us valuable insights on the medieval Crusader States. Though its Latin population was relatively small, they

[15] C., MacEvitt 'What was Crusader about the Crusader States?', *Al-Masāq*, (vol. 30 2018), 317–330, q.v. 329-330.
[16] A.D. Buck, "Settlement, Identity, and Memory in the Latin East: An Examination of the Term 'Crusader States'", *The English Historical Review* vol. 135 (2020) 271–302, q.v. 302.
[17] Cassidy-Welch M. & Lester, A.E., "Memory and interpretation: new approaches to the study of the crusades", *Journal of Medieval History* vol. 40.3 (2014) 225-236, q.v. 234-235.
[18] B. Anderson, *Imagined communities: Reflection on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (revised edition London & New York 2006) 6.
[19] Ibidem, 7.

still numbered in the thousands, were of diverse origin and any community between them would not have existed before their arrival in the Levant, thus would have been *imagined*. Yet there still exists the feeling of *community* between them, as they differentiate themselves from both the local population as (eventually) the European population, which will be discussed later. This differentiation also allows it to be *limited*, as it means that the identity is not and cannot be all-encompassing, but is limited to a certain group of people. The only aspect of an imagined community that the new community of the Crusader States cannot cover is that of *sovereignity*, as it refers to the idea of modern sovereign statehood which would be anachronistic to apply to a medieval kingdom and is directly opposed by Anderson to the idea of an aristocratic, dynastic realm.[20]

The first chapter will be a qualitative research into two literary sources which discuss the Kingdom of Jerusalem and its people. The first of these sources is Fulcher of Chartres' (c. 1059-1128) *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem Peregrinantium* (a history of the expedition to Jerusalem). Fulcher was a catholic priest who personally participated in the First Crusade. During the crusade he came under the service of Baldwin of Boulogne (d. 1118), one of the leaders of the First Crusade and the first Latin king of Jerusalem after the death of his brother Godfrey of Bouillon (1060-1100), whom he would serve until Baldwin's death.[21] Because of this, it remains important to realise that it would have benefitted Fulcher to paint the kingdom and its founders positively. The second source is that of Usama Ibn-Munqidh (1095-1188), the *Kitab al-I'tibar.* This is an autobiographical work in which Usama describes various aspects and episodes of his life and interests such as hunting. Ibn-Munqidh's relationship with the crusaders is complex. As a warrior he often did battle with Latin armies, but as a diplomat and traveller he frequently visited the Crusader States on friendly terms as well.[22] As a result, his work shows both friendship and compassion towards the Latins as well as a sense of superiority towards them. Though this work often sketches a somewhat humorous image of ignorant crusaders, it should be noted that the work was primarily intended to be educational, the title commonly being translated as *The Book of Contemplation* or the *Book of Learning by Example*.[23] Both these sources place an emphasis on the interaction between the local population of the Levant and the Latin settlers. As such, the role of this interaction for the

[20] Ibidem
[21] E. Peters, The *First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and Other Source Material* (Philadelphia 1971), 23.
[22] P.M. Cobbs, *Usama ibn Munqidh: Warrior-Poet of the Age of Crusades* (Oxford 2005), 12-14 & 95-96.
[23] P.M. Cobbs, 'Introduction' in: Usama ibn Munqidh, *The Book of Contemplation* (vertaling: P.M. Cobb, 2008), i-xxxv, aldaar xxxiii–xxxv.

emergence of a distinctive identity will be examined. A qualitative research has been chosen because of the complex nature of the sources and their disputed roles in historiography, which will be further explained in the first chapter.

The second chapter will examine a number of letters sent from Jerusalem back to Europe and will discuss how the identity of the Latins is discussed and given shape in these letters. Letters are distinct from literary sources as, unlike chronicles and histories, they were often not written to be passed on or remembered. As such they can offer us a different view into the minds of their writers and infer to us some of their underlying thoughts and ideas.[24] These letters will be examined through the use of a discourse analysis. A discourse analysis is a method of analysing speech or writing based on the words, language and terminology frequently used in a text or multiple texts, which collectively shapes the existing discourse of the subject.[25] This discourse will then be used to uncover which terminology was prevalent among the settlers and show us insight into their self-identification. The letters selected for this process include those used during the First Crusade itself in order to provide a starting point from which to examine the changes and continuity in later discourse. Multiple letters sent to the king Louis VII of France (r. 1137-1180) in the 1160s have also been selected as they provide us different authors within the same timeframe and context, showing the collectiveness of this identity. Furthermore, it provides us with an example of interaction between the 'new' and 'old' identity, as the writers were themselves of French descent.

The final chapter will examine how Cultural Memories shaped the identity of the Kingdom of Jerusalem and its Latin inhabitants. A Cultural Memory, in short, is the way a community (either actively or passively) remembers or forgets a specific historical event, person or development.[26] These memories serve to give us a different understanding than the written sources discussed in the first two chapters as they are less tied to the social elites who could read or write (or have it done for them). Acts of remembering were often public and social events in which entire communities were involved.[27] The memory in these acts would need to be recognisable for all participants, and can thus offer us a view of a broader community beyond the elites. The chapter first discusses the role of Latin Christianity (what is nowadays better known as Catholicism, though this term was not common in the Middle Ages) as a source of Cultural Memories. This will be examined using the example of locations in Jerusalem which

[24] This concept will be further elaborated upon in the second chapter.
[25] Harris, Z.S. "Discourse Analysis" *Language* vol. 28.1 (1952) 1–30, q.v. 1-3.
[26] These concepts will be further elaborated upon in the third chapter.
[27] Cassidy-Welch, "Memory and interpretation", 231

were (or became) associated with biblical accounts among the Latins and which role such locations, and the memory associated with them, played in shaping identity. The chapter will also cover the First Crusade and the way in which the memory of this event lived on among the crusaders and their descendants in the decades afterwards.

This research will primarily refer to the settled groups as 'Latin', a term also frequently used by the settlers and their descendants, rather than 'Frank' when referring to the settlers as a whole, as to not forget the diversity of the homelands of the settlers that made the emergence of a shared identity a topic worth researching. For the sake of brevity anachronistic terminology such as "crusader" and "settlers" will be used as in this research paper an umbrella term for the various Western European groups who settled in the kingdom when distinction between such groups is not vital.

Crusader Identity in Literary Sources

The capture of Jerusalem by crusader forces in 1099 and the subsequent retreat of the Fatimid army from the Levant is often considered to have been the end of the first crusade. However, the formation of the Crusader States of Edessa, Antioch, Tripoli and Jerusalem was a process that was only about to begin. It started with the creation of various small separate states by the various leaders of the First Crusade, each differing from the other. Even following the capture of Jerusalem the Latins in the so called Holy Land stayed in flux. Many of the crusaders travelled back to Europe once their vows had been fulfilled, while smaller crusades attracted new pilgrims to the expanding Crusader States. One of the more prominent early campaigns was the Crusade of 1101, which was called to reinforce and support the new Crusader States and attracted many of those who had deserted the First Crusade.[28] Those who had abandoned their vows to the crusade were met with ridicule back in the homeland and many were pressured to return. Though the crusade of 1101 ended up failing, it did not prevent the expansion of the Latins nor deterred new crusaders from arriving. Raymond of Toulouse (1041-1105), spurned by the election of Godfrey of Bouillon (1060-1100) as the ruler of Jerusalem, gathered another band of crusaders at Constantinople to besiege and conquer the fourth Crusader State of Tripoli (1102-1109).[29] Even the king of Norway would assist the expansion of the Kingdom of Jerusalem during Norwegian Crusade (1107-1110).[30] These early smaller campaigns, born out

[28] J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, (London & New York 1993), 121-124.
[29] J. Riley-Smith, "The Motives of the Earliest Crusaders and the Settlement of Latin Palestine, 1095—1100" *The English Historical Review*, vol. 98, no. 389 (1983), 721-736, q.v. 731-732.
[30] Doxey, "Norwegian Crusaders", 139-140.

of the fear of an imminent Muslim retaliation, would dominate the politics of the fledgling realms, as well as the narratives of their early history as written by later writers such as William of Tyre (1130-1186).[31] During and between these conflicts European settlers spread throughout the Levant, occupying its cities and by at least 1128, when the threat of Islamic armies waned, even founding rural settlements.[32] As such it becomes difficult to ascertain when the first perception of a shared identity was felt among the crusading armies and especially among those who settled in the Crusader States. Many of the settlers probably did not intent to settle permanently on the outset of the crusade. Piety and dependency on the various lords who had decided to remain in the Holy Land seems to have been the primary reason for many of the settlers to stay.[33] In the Kingdom of Jerusalem for example, settlement was incentivised by the allotment of property called *fié franc* to Godfreys followers and other settlers.[34]

One of the first, and perhaps the most obvious, expressions of the emergence of such an identity comes from the catholic priest Fulcher of Chartres. Between 1101 and 1128 he writes about the history of the First Crusade and the rise of the Kingdom of Jerusalem in his chronicle *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem Peregrinantium*. In one part of this chronicle Fulcher describes the changing society of the Latins who settled in the Kingdom of Jerusalem, and the way in which they adapted themselves (or at least perceived themselves to have) to the new environment:

"For we who were Occidentals have now become Orientals. He who was a Roman or a Frank has in this land been made into a Galilean or a Palestinian. He who was of Rheims or Chartres has now become a citizen of Tyre or Antioch. We have already forgotten the places of our birth; already these are unknown to many of us or not mentioned any more. Some already possess homes or households by inheritance. Some have taken wives not only of their own people but Syrians or Armenians or even Saracens who have obtained the grace of baptism. One has his father-in-law as well as his daughter-in-law living with him, or his own child if not his stepson or stepfather. Out here there are grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Some tend vineyards, others till fields. People use the eloquence and idioms of diverse languages in conversing back and forth. Words of different languages have become common property known to each nationality, and mutual faith unites those who are ignorant of their descent. Indeed it

[31] M. Barber, *The Crusader States* (Yale 2012), 51-53.
[32] Ellenblum, *Frankish Rural Settlement*, 55-56, 73.
[33] Riley-Smith, "The Motives of the Earliest Crusaders", 732-733.
[34] Ibidem, 734-736.

is written, "The lion and the ox shall eat straw together" [Isai. 62:25]. He who was born a stranger is now as one born here; he who was born an alien has become as a native."[35]

In this text Fulcher shows a very clear recognition of changing identities among the first generation of the settled crusaders after only a few decades since the end of the first crusade. He proclaims very strikingly that the crusaders have abandoned their old identities for something new. Fulcher himself seems to have perceived this change as a form of assimilation, in which the newcomers have adopted native ways of life. Fulcher's description was adapted by 19th and early 20th century historians to support the so called integration-model, which states that the European in the Crusader States integrated themselves into Levantine societies.[36] In this model Fulcher's description of an assimilated community, that is to say a minority community which has come to become nearly unrecognisable from its host society, came to be understood instead as a process of integration. Integration, in this case, meaning the incorporation of a cultural minority or group of newcomers into the existing social structure of the region without that group necessarily losing its distinct identity.[37] This interpretation of Fulcher's passage has been substantially challenged since the twentieth century, however.

Fulcher's perception of a seeming harmony between the settled Latins and the local populations of the Crusader States is rarely taken at face value anymore to describe an integrated society.[38] Fulcher's description of a near assimilation with the native population of the region was long framed and used in a colonial context during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and was touted as a sort of medieval equivalent of the 'benevolent colonialism' that French authorities tried to project in their own Middle Eastern and north-African colonies.[39] When looked at more critically from a post-colonial viewpoint this model of integration can be heavily questioned. There is little substantial evidence of the Latins integrating fully into the local societies, especially with regards to the Islamic communities. In 1120, only a few years before Fulcher's history was finished, intercourse and intermarriage between Christians and Muslims was explicitly forbidden in the council of Nablus, which was also the only piece of legislation

[35] Fulcher of Chartres, *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem peregrinantium,* Book III.XXXVIII 3-5 (tl. F.R. Ryan, Knoxville 1969), 271-272.
[36] Ellenblum, *Frankish Rural Settlement,* 10-11.
[37] Ibidem;
and R. Alba & V. Nee, "Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration". *International Migration Review* vol. 31.4 (1997), 826-874, q.v. 864.
[38] A. Jotischky, 'Franks and the Natives in the Crusader States: The State of the Question', Third Symposium of *The Norman Edge: Identity and State Formation on the Frontiers of Europe* (2009), 2.
[39] Ibidem, 3-4.

that discussed the treatment of Muslim subjects.[40] Such relations were considered severe enough that even Christian men who were found guilty of them were to be sentenced with castration. That is not to say that there was no, nor even necessarily little interaction between the Latin settlers and the local population. The existence of rural crusader settlements alongside local Syriac Christian ones, which even included a shared church in the example of the town of 'Abud, seem to disprove the theory of total segregation as well.[41] Despite closer interaction between local Christians and the Latins in the Outremer such relationships may still have been very limited, and more motivated by pragmatic reasons.[42] This idea of rough tolerance saw the local population in a similar role within the Latin community as Jews had in Western Europe. Though framed and considered negatively by their overlords they were largely left alone and not always restricted legally or religiously, especially in the Levant where their large number relative to the crusaders made it impossible to persecute them on a larger scale.[43]

It is not likely then that this development in identity that Fulcher noticed in the Kingdom of Jerusalem can be considered part of any integration-model. Yet Fulcher still seems to recognize a difference between the crusaders before and after they had settled in the Outremer, going as far as to say they had forgotten their homeland. He seemed to have found the change apparent and important enough to write down. Perhaps it is not the integration with the local population that Fulcher is observing here then, but it might be the process of forming an Imagined Community among the crusader settlers instead. Fulcher's description seems to match the pointers of an Imagined Community mentioned in the introduction as well. It is *limited*, as Fulcher seems to exclude those who still are '*Occidentals*', when he says that they have changed and in the process 'forgotten' their places of their birth, no longer considering themselves "of Rheims or of Chartres". Fulcher even makes use of their shifting language as a way of losing their old identity. Such adherence to a linguistic unity is a vital part of the modern concept of an Imagined Community.[44] Yet what Fulcher describes is a *community*, he clearly considers himself as part of the in-group, referring to the collective community as "we". His mention of Romans, Franks, Rheims and Chartres (his own hometown), all becoming part of the region also seems to be a recognition of the diversity of the crusaders who had settled in the region. Despite this diversity Fulcher describes a sense of unity with his fellow crusaders, through their

[40] B.Z. Kedar, "The Subjected Muslims of the Frankish Levant", in J.M. Powell (ed.), *Muslims under Latin Rule* (Princeton 1990) 135-174, q.v. 165-167.
[41] Ellenblum, *Frankish Rural Settlement*, 129-133.
[42] MacEvitt, *The Crusades*, 178-179.
[43] Ibidem, 23-26.
[44] Anderson, *Imagined communities*, 68-71.

shared faith rather than their descent. In an earlier chapter of his *Gesta*, Fulcher described other such feelings of unity during his account of the siege of Antioch. There he mentioned that though the crusaders spoke different languages they could understand each other due to their shared purpose and faith.[45] To describe this awareness of community as one born through faith seems plausible. The crusaders who made it all the way to Jerusalem had gone through a great amount of hardship together. Another sign of this community among the settlers was the general scorn and dislike for the survivors of the failed crusade of 1101.[46] The failure of these crusaders, most of whom were those who had abandoned their vows during the first crusade, was often framed as a punishment from God in the Outremer.[47] The crusaders of 1101 were blamed for their sin and pride. This shows that the settled crusaders of the First Crusade differentiated themselves from the failed crusaders of 1101, a sign that they were starting to share an identity. Finally Fulcher's identity remains *imagined* as Fulcher's perception seems not entirely in line with what we know of the interaction between the crusaders and the local population of the Outremer as a whole. As such it is implied that Fulcher himself draws from only a limited amount of knowledge of the community he himself feels a part of, as well as viewing it entirely from his own perspective that may have been closer to his personal desired community than to reality.

Fulcher's observation of the changing customs among the Europeans of the Outremer was not unique. Differences between the Latins who had settled in the Levant for a significant amount of time and their European counterparts were not just noted by the settlers themselves, but also by outgroups. One of the most important Arabic sources on the "Franks" of the Levant is Usama Ibn-Munqidh (1095 – 1188), an influential Syrian nobleman, poet and warrior who grew up as the Crusader States were developing. He describes his personal interactions with the Latin settlers in his autobiography, the Book of Contemplation. This work was written around 1171, multiple decades after Fulcher first observed a changing identity among crusader settlers. Usama seems to have had mixed opinions on the Latins, describing them as equally noble and brave as foolish and ignorant, often resulting in humorous episodes in which the crusaders do not understand local customs, causing Usama great confusion.[48] Like Fulcher, Usama also makes a great distinction between the "Franks" who had lived the Levant most (if not all) their life and had interacted with the local population and those who had recently arrived from

[45] Fulcher, *Gesta Francorum,* Book I.XIII 4-5 (tl. F.R. Ryan, Knoxville 1969), 99.
[46] Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade,* 132-133.
[47] Ibidem, 133-134.
[48] Cobbs, *Usama ibn Munqidh: Warrior-Poet of the Age of Crusades*, 69.

Europe. He accounts these differences in a set of anecdotes in which he interacts with both types of "Frank":

"Anyone who is recently arrived from the Frankish lands is rougher in character than those who have become acclimated and have frequented the company of Muslims. Here is an instance of their rough character (may God abominate them!) Whenever I went to visit the holy sites in Jerusalem, I would go in and make my way up to the al-Aqsa Mosque, beside which stood a small mosque that the Franks had converted into a church. When I went into the al-Aqsa Mosque – where the Templars, who are my friends, were they would clear out that little mosque so that I could pray in it. One day, I went into the little mosque, recited the opening formula 'God is great!' and stood up in prayer. At this, one of the Franks rushed at me and grabbed me and turned my face towards the east, saying, 'Pray like this!' A group of Templars hurried towards him, took hold of the Frank and took him away from me. I then returned to my prayers. The Frank, that very same one, took advantage of their inattention and returned, rushing upon me and turning my face to the east, saying, 'Pray like this!' So the Templars came in again, grabbed him and threw him out. They apologized to me, saying, 'This man is a stranger, just arrived from the Frankish lands sometime in the past few days. He has never before seen anyone who did not pray towards the east." [49]

Already Usama is very explicit in the differences in behaviour of the Frank who only recently entered the Holy Land, and the Latins who had been familiarised with Islamic traditions. Usama even calls the Templars his friends. This is not surprising, as the Knights Templar were often deployed by the monarchs of Jerusalem to conduct diplomacy and monger peace with neighbouring states, and thus no strangers to Islamic customs.[50] Usama's distinction applied to a wider Latin population than just the military orders however:

"Among the Franks there are some who have become acclimatized and frequent the company of Muslims. They are much better than those recently arrived from their lands, but they are the exception and should not be considered representative. (…) I went along with him and we came to the home of a knight who belonged to the old category of knights who came with the early expeditions of the Franks. He had been by that time stricken off the register and exempted from

[49] Usama Ibn-Munqidh, *The Book of Contemplation* (tl. P.M. Cobbs, 2008), 134-135.
[50] Y. Friedman, "The Templars as Peacemongers", in I. Shagrir, B.Z. Kedar & M. Balard (eds.), *Communicating the Middle Ages* (London & New York 2018) 15-23, q.v. 17-18.

service, and possessed in Antioch an estate on the income of which he lived. The knight presented an excellent table, with food extraordinarily clean and delicious. Seeing me abstaining from food, he said, "Eat, be of good cheer! I never eat Frankish dishes, but I have Egyptian women cooks and never eat except their cooking."[51]

The dissimilarity between the settled "acclimated" Latins and the "new arrivals" in these passages is very clear. While the newly arrived Europeans are intolerant to Usama's practices the settled Latins show a greater understanding and even admiration for local culture. The older crusader refusing to eat anything but local cuisine is even reminiscent of Fulcher's description of the settlers having assimilated and adopted local tradition. Usama however paints a slightly less absolute picture than Fulcher. He specifically notes that the Franks who "frequent the company of Muslims" are the exception rather than the rule, though it is somewhat unclear whether this means most Latins were recent arrivals or most settlers were not as well acclimated as his example.

Like Fulcher, Usama's writings have equally been used to support the integration-model to depict a type of benevolent colonialism within the Crusader States.[52] As such the source is subject to similar criticism concerning its representation of crusader society. Usama held a unique political position in the Levant, holding territory between Arab states, the Seljuq Turks and the Crusader States. This seems to have allowed him to develop especially friendly relations with both his Latin Christian and Muslim neighbours. This position might mean that his interaction with the Franks was too unique and his texts too anecdotal to provide a representative image of the Crusader States.[53]

Nevertheless Usama's observation does tell us about the perception of the settlers by an outgroup. Though Usama referred to both newly arrived and settled Crusaders as "Franks", the Islamic term for Frank was always a very broad one with little nuance for differences between European peoples, especially during times of "Frankish" expansion.[54] For a member of an outgroup like Usama this terminology does not deny the existence of a separate identity. Usama clearly recognised a distinct type of European settler having developed in the Crusader States, differentiated from the other Europeans.

---

[51] Ibn-Munqidh, *The Book of Contemplation,* 141.
[52] Jotischky, 'Franks and the Natives in the Crusader States', 3.
[53] Ibidem, 3-4.
[54] D.G. König, *Arabic-Islamic views of the Latin West: Tracing the Emergence of Medieval Europe* (Oxford, 2015), 211-215.

Research has also shown that the Latins did adopt other aspects of Islamic culture. According to U.T Holmes the crusaders did widely adopt local crops such as sesame, carob, millet and rice and various spices such as pepper, cumin, ginger, cloves, aloes and alum once they had settled in the Outremer.[55] The settlers of the Crusader States also frequented local bathhouses and would even build their own from the latter half of the 12th century onwards.[56] These bathhouses were an essential part of medieval Middle-Eastern culture, and were adopted despite their unfamiliarity to the Latins. This form of interaction could be considered closer to appropriation than assimilation, however, and may have just been the crusaders accommodating themselves to new living conditions, adopting customs as they saw fit.[57] The later crusader bathhouses, for example, did not facilitate different bathing spaces for men and women, which was the norm in Islamic bathing culture.[58] The existence of interaction and its effects on the settlers seems certain from these accounts even if the exact nature of the interaction which fostered the changing identity remains debatable. One of the most prominent modern theories is that of Rough Tolerance, which states that interaction between crusader settlers and the local population was done out of necessity rather than an interest in local culture.[59] This might give room to a scenario in which the change in identity was an almost forced switch. Similar to how cuisine and customs changed, identity too may have changed due to an almost forced accommodation to the new living circumstances, driven by the necessity of interaction with the local populace.

Usama Ibn-Munqidh and Fulcher of Chartres both give an account in which the interaction with the local population shapes and changes Latin identity in the Crusader States. Both sources differ in their scope of the changes, with Fulcher describing a near-totally assimilated society while Usama seems to designate a more mixed batch of more and less acclimated settlers, though he still considers them "Franks" in essence. It is also telling how both sources seem to put little emphasis on the act of crusading itself as a marker of identity. While Usama does mention fights against the crusaders, his more personal interactions with the crusaders are overwhelmingly peaceful. MacEvitt also notes that crusading fervour was more significant in the Latin West than the East, where he notes fewer sermons and other calls for

[55] U.T. Holmes, 'Life among the Europeans in Palestine and Syria in the Twelfth and Thirtheenth Century', in H.W. Hazard, *A History of the Crusades Vol IV: The Art and Architecture of the Crusader States (*Madison 1977), 3-35 q.v. 17-18.
[56] B.Z., Kedar, 'Frankish Bathhouses: Balneum and furnus - a functional dyad?' in: Shagrir, I. ed., Communicating the Middle Ages Essays in Honour of Sophia Menache (Oxon & New York 2018), 121-141, q.v. 124.
[57] Jotischky, 'Franks and the Natives in the Crusader States' 4.
[58] Kedar, 'Frankish Bathhouses', 131.
[59] MacEvitt, *The Crusades*, 22-24.

the continuation of warfare.[60] The literary sources seem to imply that the identity of the settled crusaders was nurtured by the need (and perhaps desire) to adapt, either through integration into or appropriation of the local cultures and living conditions that the Latins found themselves in. This new identity was at least partially defined by whatever shape the interaction with the local population took, which differentiated the settlers from their European cousins.

Traces of Identity in Crusader Letters

The previous chapter explored the feelings of identity within the Crusader States from a perspective of literary sources written by contemporary intellectual authorities, as well as the inherent limitations of those sources. These are not the only written sources available to shape an image of the experienced identity of the Crusader State of Jerusalem. Another important source that could help explore this identity are the various letters sent between the Latins of the Holy Land and the Europeans. These letters are a valuable source because they offer us different insights into the identity of their writers and recipients than those of texts written for larger audiences. Letters allow us to gain access into a more intimate and private sphere, allowing us to discover the writers underlying perceptions and thus reflect the time and place they are written.[61]

Though the correspondence of the settled Latins in the Levant and the Europeans of the mainland was often more of a public, more formal, nature than a private one, as the letters tended to discuss political affairs such as asking for military support, rather than personal messages. The letters still offer a more personal perspective than the literary sources however as recent research has highlighted the more disputed nature of "private" letter-writing. Even in the early modern period in which "private" letters (letters whose content were meant to be kept between writer and recipient) became more prevalent there was still much overlap between private and public letters.[62] Private letters still found their way into the public sphere through processes of copying and public reading, and equally public letters are a vehicle to project the intention of the sender and thus serves to provide us with their underlying thoughts and perception as a private letter would.[63] This allows letters written from the Outremer, seemingly

[60] MacEvitt, 'What was Crusader', 328–30.
[61] R. Schulte & X. Tippelskirch, "Introduction" in Schulte, R. & Tippelskirch, X. (eds.), *Reading, Interpreting and Historicizing: Letters as Historical Sources* (Florence 2004) 5-10, q.v. 6-7.
[62] H.A. Bödeker, "Letters as historical sources – some concluding reflections" in Schulte, R. & Tippelskirch, X. (eds.), *Reading, Interpreting and Historicizing Letters as Historical Sources* (Florence 2004) 199-202, q.v. 200-201.
[63] Ibidem, 201-202.

in the public sphere, to still serve as a window into the minds of the crusaders who settled the Kingdom of Jerusalem. They allow us to identify markers of identity conveyed in these sources.

These letters were sent West by a large variety of writers from the upper classes of society, including kings and princes, clergy and monastic knights, providing a more varied perspective than the literary sources.[64] The letters themselves and the style in which they were written already represent the unique nature of the crusaders. Much attention was paid to ensuring the recipient was not insulted and as such a strong adherence was held to the rules of Latin letter writing described in the *Principles of Letter-Writing,* an influential Bolognese manual from 1135, whose principles are thought to have spread to the Crusader States in the following decades.[65] Despite this adherence the letters from the Outremer can be characterised by their abrupt ending, which skipped the customary summarizing conclusion and salutation of goodwill. With this practice the Latin settlers abused the latitude offered by the manual, whose writer admitted that it was not always possible or desirably to follow the exact order of letter-writing he described.[66] Crusader letters thus often end abruptly due to being written to ask aid against the looming threat of conflict with their Muslim neighbours, further enhancing the business-like character of the letters.

The first marker of identity that can be identified from the contents of the letters sent from the Crusader States is the use of language to refer to oneself. During the First Crusade itself the crusaders seem to have paid little attention to the matter of their varying heritages and identities. In their letters home the leaders of the crusading army had no issue creating a shared identity for the united army. Stephen of Blois (1045-1102), a French count and one of the primary leaders of the crusade wrote back to his wife in 1097 and 1098. Both times he would refer to the united crusader army as "Christian" and "We Christians" whenever he included himself, making little reference to his own homeland beyond his name, nor referring to his own soldiers specifically.[67] Though he refers to a religious identity he has no issues confronting this identity with the ethnical identities of Turks, Greeks, Armenians, Syrians and Arabs. Stephen is not alone in this categorisation, other members of the First Crusade use similar language to describe the crusading army and the peoples they encountered. Anselm of Ribemont (d. 1099),

[64] M. Barber & K. Bate, "Introduction" in M. Barber & K. Bate (tl.) *Letters from the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12th-13th Centuries* (Farnham 2010) 1-9 q.v. 1-2.
[65] Ibidem, 2-3.
[66] Ibidem.
[67] Stephen of Blois, 'Stephen, Count of Blois, to his wife, Adela (1097). Antioch.', in Barber & Bate, *Letters from the East,* 15-17;
and Stephen of Blois, 'Stephen, Count of Blois, to his wife, Adela (1098). Antioch', in Barber & Bate, *Letters from the East,* 22-25.

a minor noble from northern France, similarly confronts "The Christians" with Turks in his letter to the Archbishop of Reims, though his definition of Christian seems less restricted to the Western crusaders, as he also differentiated 'Greeks' from 'Latins', distinguishing between either language, the eastern and western branches of Christianity, or both.[68] The issue of identity seems to have only started playing a more important part once the crusaders actually settled in the Holy Land. This lack of emphasis on the diversity of the crusader army might be explained by the 'fraternizing' effect of the first crusade, whose participants are likely to have bonded due to their shared faith, purpose and dangers during the crusade.[69]

Terminology referring back the 'old' identity of the settlers, the identity of their various home regions back in Europe, would start to emerge once the process of settling took steam after the conquest of Jerusalem in 1099. Historian Thomas W. Smith noted the use of cultural identification of German-speaking peoples in the letters German author Albert of Aachen collected in his *Historia Ierosolimitana* (History of the Journey to Jerusalem), between 1125-1150 in which he discusses the rise of the Kingdom of Jerusalem during and after the First Crusade between 1099-1121.[70] Albert never personally visited the Holy Land, and was thus dependent on these letters to write his *Historia*. In the letters Albert collected, a patchwork of German-speaking identities are named, ranging from common umbrella terms such as German (*Theutonici*) itself, to the various regional identities such as Swabians, Bavarians, Saxons and Lotharingians.[71] These letters, written after the settling process had begun, show us that the original local identity of the crusaders seems to have still played an important role in self-identification during the early period of the Crusader States.

This observation might be further validated by the existence of the various different quarters that the city of Jerusalem was divided in during the crusader period. Though these quarters were mostly dividing the Europeans and the various local peoples (such as Armenians and Syrians, who had their own quarters), there was one significant exception. The Germans were the only European people to have a quarter of their own.[72] This regional self-identification seems to have played a more significant part among the German settlers than the Frankish (or French). Their identity may have played a more important role to the German crusaders due to the dominance of Franks who outnumbered their other European counterparts significantly,

[68] Anselm of Ribemont, 'Anselm of Ribemont to Manasses, Archbishop of Reims (1097)' in Barber & Bate, *Letters from the East,* 18-21.
[69] Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade,* 132-133.
[70] T.W. Smith "Scribal Crusading: Three New Manuscript Witnesses to the Regional Reception and Transmission of First Crusade Letters ", *Traditio* (2017), vol.72, 133-169, q.v. 145-147.
[71] Ibidem.
[72] Boas, *Jerusalem in the Time of the Crusades,* 89.

forming up to 80% of European settlers in some regions of the Outremer.[73] German identity may have thus been emphasised to combat the prevalence of Frankish leadership and identity among the settlers of the Crusader States.[74]

The importance of German identity in particular seems to remain prevalent in letters from Jerusalem until at least the 1160s, when German priest John of Würzburg visits the Outremer. The existence of German identity as related by John is described by historian Nicholas Paul as one in opposition to "French" identity, emphasising the lack of acknowledgement of the deeds of the German crusaders, specifically in regards to the First Crusade, and the seemingly poorer living conditions of the German settlers.[75]

The situation seems to have been significantly different among the French settlers. Letters from French settlers (and those of French heritage) placed much less emphasis on their Frankish heritage than their German-speaking counterparts. As early as the 1120s, a different type of discourse starts emerging in letters sent from the Kingdom of Jerusalem back to the West, often to France. Instead of referring to their shared Frankish-French heritage the senders of the letters start simultaneously using similar language to refer to themselves as used in the letters that were written during the First Crusade while also adding new ways with which to differentiate themselves to mainland Europe. Between 1120 and 1121 Ansell (d. ca. 1138), a Frankish participant in the First Crusade and later Cantor of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, corresponded with the Bishop and Archdeacon of Paris about the history, discovery and distribution of pieces of the Holy Cross among Christian churches in the Levant.[76] In his letters Ansell makes use of similar terminology observed in the letters of Stephen of Blois. When referring to the crusaders he simply uses the term "Christians", while using "We Latins" (*Latini*) to differentiate them from Greek, Syrian and Georgian Christians.[77] Through similar language as used during the crusade Ansell once again unifies the varying European groups together through their faith and its (shared) language in a religious context rather than by focussing on the numerically dominant French.

---

[73] Ellenlum, *Frankish Settlers*, 75-76.
[74] Murray, "National Identity, Language and Conflict in the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1096–1192," in *The Crusades and the Near East: Cultural Histories*, ed. C. Kostick (Abingdon 2011), 107–130, q.v. 112–119.
[75] N. Paul, "The Emergence of a Francophone Culture in the East: An Overview," from The French of Outremer, *Fordham University* accessed 09 Febuary 2023, https://frenchofoutremer.ace.fordham.edu/thematic-essays/the-emergence-of-a-francophone-culture-in-the-east-an-overview/.
[76] The Church of the Holy Sepulchre is a church in Jerusalem built on the sites of Christ's crucifixion and grave. The Holy Cross refers to a series of relics presumed to have been part of the cross on which Christ was crucified.
[77] Ansell, 'Ansell, Cantor of the Holy Sepulchre, to Gerbert, Bishop of Paris and Stephen, Archbishop of Paris (1120 & 1121). Jerusalem', in Barber & Bate, *Letters from the East*, 39-41.

Correspondence between the Outremer and France seem to have increased notably in the 1160's, with at least 15 letters being written from Jerusalem to the king Louis VII (r. 1137-1180) of France between 1161 and 1167. Presumably these were written in response to the increased conflict in Egypt between the crusaders and Nur ad-Din (1118-1174), the Turkish ruler of Syria and predecessor to Saladin.[78] In these letters a new type of identification seems to have become prevalent among the writers from the Latin Levant. King Amalric of Jerusalem (r. 1163-1174) himself wrote to Louis five times during this period, initially asking support as "the whole of Christendom in the East (*Orientales*) had been depleted".[79] With this sentence he seems to introduce a type of identity not dissimilar as the one described by Fulcher of Chartes at first glance: one of being Eastern. In another letter in 1163 he mentions how his predecessor Baldwin III (1143-1163) had been "the unique hope and guarantee of safety for the Eastern Church and the Kingdom of Jerusalem in Particular".[80] King Amalric seems to have placed some emphasis on distinguishing between Western and Eastern Latin Christendom, implying a different (but still connected) nature of his own Eastern kingdom of Jerusalem and the Western France. In yet another letter to the king of France he again voices this difference by discerning between the "Christians of the East" or "the Easterners" (*Orientales*), who live in "the Holy Land (*Terra Sancta*)", and Louis' own "Land of the Gauls (*Galli*)".[81] It may be telling that Amalric, despite his own French heritage, makes no reference to a shared identity as Franks. Instead he explicitly states the otherness of their homelands, therewith underlining that he did not perceive himself as part of the same (ethnic) community as the French king. The king of Jerusalem was also not alone in his pleas to the French king, nor in the discourse of the different Eastern and Western Latin Christendoms. Bertrand de Blanchefort (c. 1109-1169), grand master of the Knights Templar, while asking support and reinforcement from the French monarch, referred to the "oppression of the Eastern Kingdom and the Church" by an implied Muslim threat, and in another letter stated "that the eyes of all of Eastern Christendom, after the Lord, are on you to liberate us from such misfortunes".[82] This discourse was even used by

[78] E. Böhme, "Legitimising the Conquest of Egypt: The Frankish Campaign of 1163 Revisited*"*, in ed. P Srodecki & N. Kersken, *The Expension of the Faith* (Turnhout 2022) 269-280, q.v 269-170
[79] Amalric, king of Jerusalem, 'Amalric, king of Jerusalem to Louis VII, King of France (8 April 1163). Jerusalem,' in Barber & Bate, *Letters from the East* 52-53
[80] Amalric, king of Jerusalem, 'Amalric, king of Jerusalem to Louis VII, King of France (September 1163). Jerusalem', in Barber & Bate, *Letters from the East* 53-55
[81] Amalric, king of Jerusalem, 'Amalric, king of Jerusalem to Louis VII, King of France (1164). Jerusalem', in Barber & Bate, *Letters from the East* 56-57
[82] Bertrand of Blancfort, 'Bertrand of Blancfort, Master of the Temple, to Louis VII, King of France (September-October 1163). Jerusalem', in Barber & Bate, *Letters from the East*, 55-56;
and Bertrand of Blancfort, Master of the Temple, to Louis VII, King of France (November 1164), in Barber & Bate, *Letters from the East*, 60.

clergymen such as Amalric of Nesle, the Latin patriarch of Jerusalem of ca. 1158-1180. Amalric used similar language as his king and the grand master in his own letter sent to Louis, referring to the states of the Levant as the "Eastern Church". However, he does not make the distinction between West and East when referring to its inhabitants, simply calling them "Christians".[83] He also places a great deal of emphasis on the importance of the Levant to Christendom as a whole in an attempt to rouse the support of the French king, referring to the locations of biblical episodes. He names the city of Caesarea Philippi (also known as Banias or Paneas) as the location where Saint Peter proclaimed Christ as the son of God, and where Christ in turn referred to Peter as the rock on which he would build his church.[84]

Immediately we can notice these sources lack the referral to 'old' European identities, as the letters seem to acknowledge no shared identity with the French king beyond Christianity, upon which they choose to rely to ask the support of Louis VII. This suggests that it was primarily the descendants of the Frankish/French nobility and settlers who had little issue considering themselves a distinct people from the diverse European regions from which they descended.[85] Differences between the various French settler groups (such as Normans, Occitans and those from the Île-de-France) was much less significant than between the French and Germanic speaking settlers. This would have made it easier for these French groups (as well as the Italian-speaking groups) to integrate into the mostly dominant Northern French nobility of the Kingdom of Jerusalem.[86] This process was not uncommon in other large scale migrations of late antiquity and the early middle ages, and has been compared by historian Alan Murray to the formation of the various Germanic ethnic groups of the Great Migration period.[87] It is possible that this process of integration between the various French-speaking identities and the local Levantine influences is what allowed for this distinct "Eastern Latin" culture to flourish. The use of language of the writers of these letters when referring to themselves could also suggest to us that the settlers of the Crusader States truly may have felt a shared identity as being part of a distinct "Latin East", in which the integrated Latin-French culture developed characteristics that were self-experienced as decidedly "Eastern". Such an identity would

[83] Amalric, patriarch of Jerusalem, 'Amalric, Patriarch of Jerusalem, to Louis VII, King of France (between 1161-1164). Jerusalem', in Barber & Bate, *Letters from the East*, 55-56;
and Bertrand of Blancfort, Master of the Temple, to Louis VII, King of France (November 1164), in Barber & Bate, *Letters from the East*, 51-52
[84] Ibidem
[85] A.M. Murray, "Ethnic Identity in the Crusader States" 350.
[86] Ibidem, 342.
[87] Ibidem, 345-347.

presumably have been fostered through shared experiences and geographical isolation across multiple generations over the decades.[88]

This defined identity that recognisable in these letters once again draws parallels to an Imagined Community. The use of the same or similar terminology to refer to themselves shows us that (the upper classes of) the settlers in Jerusalem shared a similar experience of belonging to this "Eastern Latin" community. The way various linguistically similar identities, the various Frankish/French peoples, may have been integrated or even assimilated into the dominant Northern French culture (which itself was experienced as increasingly "Oriental"), even seems at least superficially similar to the process in which French regional cultures were assimilated into centralised French culture in the 19th century.[89] This comparison should not be made lightly however, as these processes happened in vastly different contexts and there's little evidence that any such process in the Crusader States was due to official policy or strategy like in the 19th century nation states. Furthermore the union of these cultures was largely based on the "sacred" Latin language, something which according to Anderson is distinctively separated from his concept of an Imagined Community.[90] A further research in the development of Frankish/French language would be necessary to make any further comparisons. Nevertheless the process of unifying these various sub-groups under a united identity referring to itself similarly shows that the feeling of community and shared identity was experienced by the writers. Also striking is that the various writers all referred to a broader identity than just the city or even kingdom in which they resided, seemingly considering all of the Latin East as a part of this community. This sense of a larger community once again invokes the "Imagined" aspect of this community, in which one identifies even with people they themselves could not have known, as was discussed in the introduction. even with people they themselves could not have known that was discussed in the introduction.

The identity that appears in the letters seems to differ from the writings of Fulcher of Chartres in the importance they place on the act of crusading itself. Neither the writing of Fulcher nor the letters discussed explicitly refer to the term "crusading", as the terminology concerning the crusades was still being developed throughout the twelfth century.[91] The absence of this terminology is not strange, and even without this exact jargon we can notice a

[88] Buck, "Settlement, Identity, and Memory in the Latin East", 301.
[89] Anderson, *Imagined communities*, 70-73.
[90] Ibidem, 70-71.
[91] C.T. Maier, "When Was the First History of the Crusades Written?" in T.K. Nielsen and K.V. Jensen (eds.), *The Crusades: History and Memory. Proceedings of the Ninth Conference of the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East*. Vol. 2 (Odense, 2021), 13-28 q.v. 15-16.

remarkable difference in the manner in which both types of sources handled the warfare between the Kingdom of Jerusalem and its Muslim neighbours. The letters themselves are often evidently martial in nature. These letters were written in the context of the war between the Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Zengid dynasty which was waged over control of Egypt between 1163 and 1169. This conflict may have been of particular note due to the importance of Egypt, which often served as a great threat to the Crusader States, as a target of the crusaders.[92] Almost all letters sent to king Louis VII from Jerusalem describe the military conflict of the kingdom and place great emphasis on the importance of the war, referring to the "oppression", "misfortune" and "threat" that Eastern Christendom was under.[93] MacEvitt, however, believes that these letters by themselves were not a sign of what he called "crusader ideology", i.e. the importance of continual and penitential warfare against the "heathens", among the settlers.[94] He stresses that a lack of "crusader" sermons and songs found from former Crusader States would suggest that the act of crusading had become less important to the identity of the Outremer, and the letters were of a practical use to align to Western sentiments. This would seem more in line with Fulcher's description of a more integrated and even assimilated society. Fellow historian Chris Buck disputes this claim however, stating that crusading vernacular (particularly the medieval French *chansons*), though usually written down in the Western world often found their origin in the Crusader States.[95] This would show that these letters are not unique due to their military context and that the act of crusading did play an active role in the minds and identity of the settlers. Of particular importance seems to have been (the memory of) the First Crusade, which will be discussed in further depth later in this research.

Religion seems to have become another important marker of identity to which the letters often refer but was largely absent in the passage of Fulcher discussed in the first chapter. The authors of the letters discussed here referred to themselves often as a part of the "Eastern Church", making it immediately apparent that much of their shared identity was derived from a shared faith. Even the word "Latin", another word the settlers used to describe themselves as in these letters, held a certain religious context as the language of the Catholic Church.[96] This seems to have been recognised in the letter of Ansell, who specifically used the word "Latin" to differentiate between the Western settlers and the other Christians of the East, rather than the

[92] B. Malcolm, "*The career of Philip of Nablus in the kingdom of Jerusalem.*" In P. Edbury & J. Philips (eds.), *The Experience of Crusading, vol.2 Defining the Crusader Kingdom* (Cambridge, 2003), 60-78, q.v. 65.
[93] Bertrand of Blancfort, *Bertrand of Blancfort, to Louis VII,* 55-56 & Bertrand of Blancfort, *to Louis VII,* 60.
[94] MacEvitt, "What was Crusader about the Crusader States?", 328–30.
[95] Buck, "Settlement, Identity, and Memory in the Latin East", 281-283.
[96] Murray, "Ethnic Identity in the Crusader States", 341.

Muslim inhabitants of the region. This is in contrast to the manuscript writers like Fulcher of Chartres and William of Tyre, who used "Latin" almost interchangeably with "Frankish" to refer to the settlers in a more ethnical sense.[97] The importance of a shared faith to the experience of "Eastern Latin" culture seems very apparent in the letters. Buck however hypothesises that the increased emphasis on religion may have been purposefully used in letters to the Latin West in order to drum up more military aid from Western monarchs.[98] Referring to their faith rather than their Frankish heritage would then serve to reach more rulers than just the French nobility.[99] However, it seems odd to avoid using the word "Frank" when writing directly to king Louis VII. This is especially true considering the numerous times the elites of the Kingdom asked Louis specifically for aid rather than sending messages to other monarchs. Furthermore, the settlers often seem to have considered their shared faith one of the most decisive reasons for their victory in the first crusade, and this discourse is likely to have remained dominant in 12th century Jerusalem.[100] The large emphasis on religion as a unifying factor also seems to be aligned with Fulcher's passage on the identity of the Latin Levant, which refers to "mutual faith" uniting "those who are ignorant of their descent".[101] This would imply that the importance of faith was not merely limited to letter writing, but prominent in Eastern Latin identity as a whole. The authors of the letters differentiate themselves from the literary sources by the amount of importance placed upon it. The letters do seem to go significantly further than Fulcher, who sees Latin Christianity as one of multiple unifying factors, rather than the dominant one it seems to be in the letters. The manner in which religion further played a role in this Latin identity will be discussed later in this research.

So far these letters seem to paint a significantly different picture of the Latin East than the written sources. That is however not to say that the markers of identity described in Fulcher's writings, notably the adoption of local Levantine customs, are totally absent in the correspondence between the Latin East and Western Christendom. One of the most important sources that corroborates the view portrayed in Fulcher's *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem* is the letter written by James of Vitry (c.1160/1170-1240). James was an influential French clergyman and theologian whose influence within the church allowed him to become Bishop of Acre (the new capital of the Kingdom after the fall of Jerusalem to Saladin) in 1214.[102] James' letter was

[97] Ibidem.
[98] Buck, "Settlement, Identity, and Memory in the Latin East", 277-278.
[99] Ibidem.
[100] Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade,* 132-133.
[101] Fulcher of Chartres, *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem peregrinantium,* Book III.XXXVIII 5.
[102] J. Coakley, "Thomas of Cantimpré and Female Sanctity" in R. Fulton & B.W. Holsinger (eds.), *History in the Comic Mode: Medieval Communities & the Matter of Person* (New York 2007), 49-62, q.v. 52.

written in either 1216 or 2017, decades after the Third Crusade changed the society of the greatly reduced Kingdom of Jerusalem. However, the people he describes as adults raised in the Levant had probably grown up in the period preceding Saladin's taking of Jerusalem. In his letter, James confirms that the descendants of Latin settlers who had lived in the Levant all their lives still made use of local customs, such as the cooling of drinks like wine with snow, which was sold at high prices according to James.[103] This was a practice that was considered Syrian culture as it was based on the drinking of syrups cooled with snow popular among the Muslim population of the medieval Levant.[104] James' impressions of "Easternised" Latin culture seems to have been significantly less positive than Fulcher's, however. James noted that the Syrians are treacherous and likely to sell out Christian secrets to Saracens, while also saying they "lack in salvation" when considering the religious differences between Latin and Middle-Eastern Christianity.[105] As a result, he considered Syrian culture to have had a negative influence on the Latin settlers. He calls the Franks who grew up with the customs of the Levant as effeminate and soft, complaining that they wore soft robes and preferred baths to battles.[106] Targeting bathhouses in particular as a cause of this softness seems to have been a direct gripe at Eastern culture. Bathing culture was one of the most significant areas of the pre-third crusade society that had continued into the new Kingdom of Jerusalem, with the military monastic orders of Acre constructing a new bathhouse in the Montmusard quarter, built at the start of the 13th century.[107] Comparing baths to battles does suggest that the importance of crusading was felt more heavily by the newly arrived James than it had been by the Eastern Latins whom he derides. This could be explained by the strong militarism which Usama Ibn-Munqidh also witnessed from new arrivals.[108] James upholding a particularly strong militarism does not necessarily mean that the Latin settlers held no importance to crusading. What James' letter does show however is the continuity and the perseverance of the decisively Eastern Latin identity among those who lived in the Holy Land before the Third Crusade remaining observably different from the perspective of Western Frankish culture.

The letters from the Latin East show us a complex and diverse interpretation of the identity of the Crusader States. Those who lived in the Crusader States seemed to think of themselves as a distinctive people from the Latin Christians of Europe, adding an evidently

[103] James of Vitry, 'James of Vitry, Bishop of Acre, to the Parisian masters and to the Ligarde of St. Trond and the convent of Ayqieres (1216 or 1217). Acre', in Barber & Bate, *Letters from the East,* 98-108, q.v. 102, 105.
[104] Holmes, 'Life Among the Europeans', 18.
[105] James of Vitry, 'James of Vitry to the Parisian masters', 108.
[106] Ibidem, 103-104.
[107] Kedar, 'Frankish Bathhouses', 122-124.
[108] Holmes, 'Life Among the Europeans', 22-23.

"Eastern" aspect to their Latin identity. The measure in which people felt 'Eastern' differed depending on context. Different aspects of Eastern Latin identity become more significant in different letters depending on this context. While outsiders like James of Vitry still noticed the influences of local cultures on the identity of the settled crusaders. The letters the settlers sent themselves rarely features this process of adopting and appropriating Levantine culture. The interaction with the local population thus seems less apparent in these sources. The context of military aid seems to have instead emphasised, or maybe projected, a more militaristically Christian identity among the settlers than the one described in manuscripts like those of Fulcher and Usama.

Latin Identity and Cultural Memory

This chapter will discuss the formation and development of a shared crusader identity in the 12th century Kingdom of Jerusalem using the concept of Cultural Memory, the way in which a society remembers and interacts with the past. Two different 'histories' and the way in which they shaped the Cultural Memory in the kingdom will be explored, and their function in the development of a unique felt identity among the crusader settlers will be elaborated upon. First we shall discuss the biblical history of the city of Jerusalem itself and the way it was remembered by the crusader settlers through appropriation of this history and the locations associated with the biblical accounts. The second historical event that will be discussed is the First Crusade, and its role as the origin of the crusader kingdom in the minds of the settlers and the memory of the 'heroes' of this crusade.

Cultural Memory as a historiographic concept discusses the manner in which historical events are remembered. French philosopher Maurice Halbwachs explains remembrance as 'a reconstruction of the past achieved with data borrowed from the present'.[109] He differentiates between autobiographical or individual memory and collective or historical memory. Individual memory is about the experiences of people, and can fade more easily than collective memory. According to Halbwachs the individual memory is almost always heavily socially influenced, and as a result exists almost exclusively in the context of collective memory. Collective memory, Halbwachs states, binds individual remembrances to each other and is a way groups of people 'remember in common the deeds and accomplishments of long-departed members of the group'.[110] The case of the remembrance of both the biblical history and the First Crusade

[109] M. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory* (tl. L.A. Coser, Chicago & London 1992), 69 .
[110] Ibidem, 53.

will thus almost exclusively explore the collective memory of the settlers as it will primarily focus on ways in which it was used to create a shared identity.

German historians Aleida and Jan Assmann built further upon the idea of Halbwachs' collective memory to create the theory of Cultural Memory. Aleida Assmann states that Cultural Memory is a practice used by a society to connect to its past and which forms a normative historical narrative for this community.[111] This collective memory is differentiated from Communicative Memory, which are the memories of day-to-day events inside a community. It is the way in which the society chooses (or doesn't choose) to remember the past, and how the people of a society let the past influence their sense of identity through choosing how to interact with this past. Jan and Aleida Assmann also differentiate between remembering and forgetting, both of which can be done either actively or passively.[112] Actively remembering according to the theory means to deliberately draw attention to that which could remind people of a historical event or process which a society finds important. Actively forgetting means to deliberately hide a past that a society does not want to remember. For example through either the creation or destruction of monuments. Passive remembrance or forgetting means to do so without intent. This might happen trough neglecting in the case of forgetting or through routine archiving for remembering. This research will limit itself to the exploration of (primarily active) remembrance rather than forgetting, as these acts provide us with more visible and identifiable markers through which to understand the development of crusader identity in the Kingdom of Jerusalem. The collective and cultural memory being shared within a community assists with the formation of a shared identity. It allows for the creation of a shared frame of reference towards the past and members of the community all had to interact through this frame of reference.[113] This meant that the frame of reference could act as either a barrier or entry point for identity, those who did not share the same Cultural Memory were excluded from the community while those who did chose to engage in it could enter the community.[114] Memory and the practice of remembrance in the Middle Ages were largely social acts.[115] They were practiced by social groups and would draw a community together into the act of remembering, allowing for the memory to play community-shaping roles while creating a sense of continuity

[111] A. Assmann, 'Canon and Archive', in: A. Erll and A. Nünning (eds.), *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook* (Berlin 2008), 97-107, there 98-99.
[112] Ibidem.
[113] T. Snijders, *Peer-to-Peer Knowledge Transfer in Religious Communities* (Amsterdam 2019) 43-44.
[114] Ibidem, 44.
[115] Cassidy-Welch & Lester, 231 .

within it. For this reason the presence of a Cultural Memory can be used to explain the formation of a new identity.

As mentioned in the previous chapters, the shared faith of Latin Christianity was an important aspect of identity binding the Latin settlers of the Levant together. Religion was likely the primary driving force that lead most crusaders to the Levant, and was one of the most notable aspects of their identity that they already had in common. The so called Holy Land of the Southern Levant and especially the city of Jerusalem played an important religious role to the crusaders as the land in which many biblical episodes, particularly those of Jesus Christ, were set in. To the army of the First Crusade who would come to found and settle in the Kingdom of Jerusalem, the land itself was a religious relic. To the crusaders this was the land in which Christ, the physical incarnation of God, had walked, performed miracles, sacrificed himself for mankind and had been resurrected.[116] This religious connection could have given the Latin settlers a frame of reference with which to understand and accept the foreign and alien environment in which they now found themselves far away from their homelands.[117] It is not surprising then, that the Latin settlers made use of the city of Jerusalem itself, and its observed biblical past, to forge their new identity. It served not only to forge a connection to the diverse group of crusaders' new home. It also linked them with their fellow settlers who, despite their varying ethnical identities, shared the same frame of reference with which to understand the city and its past. The settlers could use this biblical frame of reference on the city of Jerusalem to evoke a shared Cultural Memory of this biblical past recognisable to all the crusaders regardless of their origin.

These Cultural Memories could be evoked especially effectively in Jerusalem due to the locations of many of these biblical tales being present within the city. One example of such a Cultural Memory given shape is that of the Cenacle, the room which is traditionally held as the location of the Last Supper, the final meal held by Christ and his disciples before his arrest and crucifixion. The room was located in the Cathedral of Saint Mary of Mount Zion. Mount Zion, the hill on which this now lost cathedral stood, is located to the South-West of the Old City of Jerusalem, just outside the medieval city walls. Though the church fell into disrepair after the Latin rule in Jerusalem ended, the Cenacle room has been preserved into modern times. The Cenacle is a 15.3 by 9.4 meter large room defined by groined vault arches diving the room into

[116] Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade*, 20-21.
[117] Ibidem, 93-94.

six bays, supported by free-standing pillars and column.[118] Although most of its Christian context has now been lost, the Cenacle architecture is still of a distinguishably French Gothic style, revealing the room's European origin.[119] This leaves the exact origin of the room somewhat unclear, as the Gothic style is commonly associated with late 12th and 13th century European architecture. It is in fact the only medieval Gothic building in Jerusalem, with the rest of the crusader architecture of the city being defined by the Romanesque style. Adrian Boas suggests the room was either built late into the crusader rule over the city (perhaps even after Saladin's conquest in 1187) or being relatively advanced.[120] He also mentions the theory of the room being vandalized after the Islamic retaking of the city and rebuilt during the brief crusader rule of the city under Frederick II, though he notes that there is no contemporary evidence of vandalism.[121]

Either way, the religious importance of the room was quickly recognised by the crusaders. The Latin church was built upon the ruins of an earlier Byzantine church commonly referred to as the Hagia Sion, which was destroyed in 614 during a war between the Byzantine Empire and Persia.[122] The Cenacle itself likely already existed prior to the construction of this church and may have continued to exist and be used in some manner independently from it between the destruction of the Hagia Sion and the construction of the Saint Mary of Zion by the crusaders.[123] Through constructing a new Latin church on top of the previous Byzantine one the crusaders not only physically appropriated the location, it also allowed them to appropriate the biblical history associated with it. The Cenacle itself was likely enclosed by the crusader church in its entirety.[124] Boas notes that multiple writers of the time described the church as heavily fortified, as it was located outside the walls of the city.[125] This process may have cut it off from its previous use prior to the construction of the Saint Mary which might have seen the use of the Cenacle, and thus the Cultural Memory it represents, become exclusive to the Latin settlers and their church. The church of Saint Mary of Zion and the Cenacle once again became a large centre of religious practice under crusader rule of the city. Many different biblical events were

[118] M. Verhoeven, "Jerusalem as Palimpsest: The Architectural Footprint of the Crusaders in the Contemporary City" in J. Goudeau, M. Verhoeven & W. Weijers (eds.), *The Imagined and Real Jerusalem in Art and Architecture* (Leiden 2014), 114-135 q.v. 124.
[119] Boas, *Jerusalem in the Time of the Crusades,* 112-113.
[120] Ibidem.
[121] Ibidem.
[122] B. Pixner, *Paths of the Messiah and Sites of the Early Church from Galilee to Jerusalem: Jesus and Jewish Christianity in Light of Archaeological Discoveries* (San Francisco 2010), 353-354.
[123] Ibidem, 349.
[124] D. Pringle, *The Churches of the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: A Corpus, Vol. 3, The City of Jerusalem* (New York & Cambridge 2007), 262.
[125] Boas, *Jerusalem in the Time of the Crusades*, 111.

celebrated or remembered in this location, such as Last Supper, the Christ's washing of the feet on Maundy Thursday, the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the disciples, the burial of St Stephen who was the first Christian martyr and even the death of St Mary.[126] The site is also reported to have housed a mosaic displaying the episode of the Last Supper created or commissioned by the Latin settlers, though it is now also lost.[127] Such a visible reminder of the scene on the location it was supposed to have occurred would have been a striking reminder of the biblical history of the location. A history which was easily recognisable to all Latins, who heavily identified themselves with their Christian faith and thus with the biblical episode. Through appropriating this history the Latins might have enabled themselves to experience a shared history together, one based on religion yet excluded to the Latin community through a physical barrier.

That the specific site of the Cenacle on Mount Zion became a part of Latin identity may be further evidenced by the existence of other reported sites which were claimed to have housed the Last Supper. The Syriac Orthodox Christian Monastery of Saint Mark served as the greatest "rival" to the claim of the site of the Last Supper. This monastery was founded as early as 73 A.D., was held to be the location of the biblical episode in the tradition of the Levantine Syriac church, as noted on Syriac inscription in the convent.[128] Its ancient origins may even grant it a more legitimate claim than the Cenacle. Though the Syriac description was likely added at a later date, perhaps as late as the 15th century, archaeological evidence does suggest the convent has an ancient origin, and may have become a religious site in the first century exactly because of its reported use by Christ and the apostles.[129] The Cenacle, meanwhile, may have only usurped the St Mark as the "traditional" site of these events due to the importance of by Byzantine church built there.[130] Little attention seems to have been paid to the Saint Mark by the Latin settlers however. Latin writers such as Rorgo Fretellus (1119-1154) and Theoderich, referred to in the previous chapter, wrote of their visits to the Cenacle, seemingly convinced of its authenticity, even citing the preservation of the original table on which Christ and the Apostles were supposed to have dined.[131] The claim of the St Mark seems to have been dismissed, or at least ignored by the Latins. The Syriac church, and probably the other Levantine Christian communities as well, seem to have been largely excluded from the memory of the

[126] Verhoeven, "Jerusalem as Palimpsest", 125.
[127] Boas, *Jerusalem in the Time of the Crusades*, 194.
[128] A. Palmer & G.J. van Gelder, "Syriac and Arabic Inscriptions at the Monastery of St. Mark's in Jerusalem", *Oriens Christianus*, vol. 78 (1994): 33–63, q.v. 33-34.
[129] Ibidem, 34-37.
[130] Boas, *Jerusalem in the Time of the Crusades*, 111.
[131] Ibidem.

biblical history constructed by the Latins in the Cenacle. This may in part have been a result of the wilful ignorance of the Latin settlers towards the local Christian denominations which MacEvitt suggested in his Rough Tolerance theory.[132] It also shows that the "Eastern Christianity" and "Eastern Church" described in the letters of chapter 2 indeed remained distinctively Latin in practice.

Even the name of the crusader church hints at a biblical past, while also being an example of the appropriation of this past by the crusaders. As mentioned, Mount Zion was remembered for more than just the Last Supper and its name was meant to evoke another memory; the death of St Mary, who held a special place in Latin Christianity especially.[133] The name was familiar and recognisable with the Latin population and by attaching their own name to the location they could associate it with their own Latin identity. This naming tactic was not unique to the St Mary of Zion, and was employed more frequently by the settlers, the Dome of the Rock was similarly renamed by the Latins. The Dome of the Rock is perhaps the most important Islamic religious site in Jerusalem, regarded as the location where the prophet Mohammed ascended to heaven during a journey in the night. When the Latins took control over the city they renamed it to the *Templum Domini* (Temple of the Lord). Though the crusaders likely were well aware they were not the same building as the similarly referred to Temple of the Old testament, it was clearly meant to draw a parallel between both buildings.[134] Islamic imagery on the inside and outside of the building were predictably replaced with Christian symbolism, such as the Holy Cross which was displayed on top of the dome. Through this process the Muslim origin of the location could be erased, and could instead be transformed into one that referred to an ancient, proto-Christian past.[135] The Latins thus appropriated not only the Islamic religious site, but could also claim even the history of the old testament through renaming the building after the Temple. This process seems to have been similar in the case of the renaming of the Hagia Sion to the St Mary of Mount Zion. The change was much less drastic for the St Mary however, as it is unknown how much the site was still used before the arrival of the crusaders. The erasure of the Islamic past of the Dome of the Rock was also further enhanced by the physical expulsion of Muslims from the city. The initial conquest of Jerusalem infamously saw the local population massacred and the survivors expulsed, after which the Kingdom of Jerusalem forbade its Islamic population from living inside the city walls where the mosque was located.[136] Despite

[132] MacEvitt, *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East*, 105-106.
[133] Pringle, *The Churches*, 261-262.
[134] Verhoeven, "Jerusalem as Palimpsest", 130.
[135] Ibidem, 131-132.
[136] Kedar, B.Z., "The Subjected Muslims", 143-145 & 150.

the difference in scale, both sites were renamed to replace the local history with a Latin one, which appropriated the location and the biblical history that inspired the new name. The use of a biblical name could have allowed the settlers to imply a continuity with the early Christian and even pre-Christian pasts of the city.

The importance placed on the location of these sites of Cultural Memory by the Latins seems reminiscent of how diasporas often retain and shape their identity. In Robin Cohen's generally accepted definition of the word, the crusaders could be considered to have become a diaspora once they settled the Levant. He defines the broadest definition of a diaspora as any community living outside of their native land.[137] While the crusaders fit this definition it might be disingenuous to consider the Latin population of the Levant as a 'true' diaspora, however. Cohen also notes the term carries the implication of a forceful expulsion or migration, while the crusades were almost entirely a voluntary expedition, and many of the crusaders did take the opportunity to return home afterwards.[138] Crusader settlers also do not perfectly fit the common definition of a diaspora, as it often implies the diaspora as part of a marginalised and oppressed minority group under a more powerful majority.[139] Some aspects of a diaspora may still be applicable to the Latin settlers however. Though they were themselves conquerors they still found themselves contrasted to the norms of their new "host country", which found a core of their cohesion in the maintenance of their religious identity and the development of local community structures and temples, and were spatially scattered within the cities of the Levant. All of these aspects are considered in various theoretical definitions of a diaspora.[140] According to Martin Baumann, it is a common "tactic" of diasporas to centre their communal cohesion in the maintenance of their religious identity.[141] Communal temples, especially those carrying a cultural connection to their native land, often become the cornerstones of such communities, becoming a common meeting place in which the minority population can easily find each other.[142] The Latins meanwhile found themselves into the exact opposite position, as conquerors of the kingdom they were the dominant force inside the new society they found themselves in despite their low number. Though they employed similar tactics to a commonly defined

[137] R. Cohen, "The diaspora of a diaspora: the case of the Caribbean." *Social Science Information*, 31.1 (1992) 159–169, q.v. 159-160.
[138] Ibidem.
[139] Ibidem, 160-161.
[140] D. Haller, "Let it flow: Economy, spirituality and gender in the Sindhi Network" in W. Kokot, . Tololyan and C. Alfonso (eds.), *Diaspora, Identity and Religion: New Directions in Theory and Research* (New York 2004) 189-204 q.v. 191-192.
[141] M. Baumann, "Conceptualizing Diaspora. The Preservation of Religious Identity in Foreign Parts, Exemplified by Hindu Communities Outside India." *Temenos - Nordic Journal of Comparative Religion*, Vol. 31. (1995), 19-35 q.v. 30-35.
[142] Ibidem.

diaspora, they held the power to claim and appropriate these relevant sites and adapt them to suit their own needs and frame of reference. The use of the Cenacle and the Dome of the Rock by the crusaders are an example of this; they were transformed into something that matched the settlers' perception of the city, which seems to have been defined by its biblical past. These locations then became important sites for the community, becoming an important part of the image of crusader Jerusalem. The Dome of the Rock, in the form of the *Templum Domini*, featured heavily on the coinage of the Latin kingdom for example, sometimes even being paired with the image of a knight on horseback more commonly associated with the crusades.[143] Such use shows us that the location had been adopted into the self-image of the settlers who minted those coins and was considered something by which they identified the city.

The second major expression of Cultural Memory in the 12th century Kingdom of Jerusalem was the remembrance of the First Crusade itself. The need to remember the First Crusade seems to have been felt almost immediately after the event occurred. It is one of the most recorded events in medieval history, with an unusually large amount of primary sources written on the subject.[144] Some other early sources on the matter include Peter Tudebode's *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere* (presumably written shortly after the siege of Antioch 1097-1098), the *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem* by Raymond of Aguiler (d. 1105) and the *Gesta Francorum* written by an anonymous presumably Norman soldier (not to be confused with Fulcher's work), written at least before 1108.[145] Such a diverse array of sources being written so shortly after the event shows us the cultural impact it must have had for its observers. This impact seems to have continued playing an important role, as different histories continued to be written about the event within the Kingdom of Jerusalem throughout the 12th century. Even Fulcher of Chartres's *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem Peregrinantium*. already discussed at length in this research, was only finished in 1128; 29 years after the capture of Jerusalem. Other writings also continued until the very end of the 1099-1187 period of the Crusader State. William of Tyre, the Archbishop of Tyre who was himself born in crusader Jerusalem, still believed it relevant to include a history of the First Crusade in his *Historia Rerum in Partibus Transmarinis Gestarum* (History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea), written between 1170-1184.[146] Beyond these literary sources, the First Crusade also remained an important source of

[143] J. Burgtorf, *The Central Convent of Hospitallers and Templars: History, Organization, and Personnel 1099/1120-1310* (Leiden & Boston 2008) 545–546.
[144] E. Lapina, *Warfare and the Miraculous in the Chronicles of the First Crusade* (Penn State University Press 2015) 8-9.
[145] Ibidem.
[146] Edbury, P.W. & Rowe, J.G., *William of Tyre: Historian of the Latin East* (Cambridge 1988), 25-26.

inspiration for songs and poems which were written, commissioned and distributed throughout the crusader states.[147] These songs and poems commemorated the events of the crusade and the deeds of its leaders. Unlike the literary sources these songs and poems would have been more accessible to a wider illiterate audience, as they were performed publicly. The memory of the first crusade would have then remained integrated in multiple layers of the society of the kingdom.

The First Crusade may have remained relevant within the memory of the Crusader State because it could fulfil the role of an origin myth. Benedict Anderson states that an important part of creating an identity in an imagined community is for the community to have a 'birth-day'; a starting point in the "biography" of the community (in Anderson's case, the nation).[148] The First Crusade was a perfect representation of the 'birth-day' of the Latin community in Jerusalem. It was a starting point in the history of the kingdom, and was an event that the settlers and their descendants all shared in common. There may have also been a sense of superiority among the participants of the First Crusade and their descendants towards those that arrived in later periods. Conor Kostick noticed a trend in which courage and cowardice played an important role in the framing of the First Crusade. Those who remained stalwart in their conviction and continued the journey, i.e. the ancestors to the settlers, were of course praised for their courage and faith while those who abandoned the crusade were shamed and vilified for their cowardice.[149] This stigma seems to have been hard to overcome. Even Stephen of Blois, himself a major leader of the First Crusade until he abandoned it during the Siege of Antioch, was not forgiven for this cowardice, even when he was recognised to have eventually died an honourable death in battle against the Arabs in 1101.[150] As mentioned in the first chapter, the Crusade of 1101 and its participants were especially scorned by the settlers of the Crusader States due to it being made up mostly of those who, like Stephen, had abandoned the original crusade.

Because those who abandoned the crusade had failed where those who had remained during the First crusade succeeded, failure during a crusade became attached to the sin, pride and cowardice of its participants.[151] This meant that the success of the First Crusade would in turn be associated with the strong character and piety of those who kept their vows and finished the

[147] Buck, "Settlement, Identity, and Memory in the Latin East", 282-285.
[148] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 204-205.
[149] C. Kostick, "Courage and Cowardice on the First Crusade 1096-1099", *War in History* vol. 20.1 (2003) 32-49, q.v. 35-36.
[150] Ibidem, 39.
[151] Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade*, 134.

journey. As time went on, and new histories were written, the first crusaders became increasingly more mythologised and more emphasis was placed on their courage and piety.[152] The First Crusade itself became essentially detached from those who had abandoned it, as the memory of the event at large focussed solely on the faithful crusaders. It is not surprising then that the event continued to be remembered within the Kingdom of Jerusalem, being a representation of its greatest success, and thus becoming a source of pride and identity for the descendants. This memory was also an active one, kept alive through active remembrance practices. An example is the annual commemoration of the capture of Jerusalem that was celebrated every 15th of July.[153] This was a procession meant to celebrate the so called "liberation" of the city, and remember the deaths of those who died in the attempt.

Additionally, the First Crusade was kept alive in the society of Latin Jerusalem through the memory of its heroes. In Jerusalem the most prominent hero to feature in this remembrance was Godfrey of Bouillon. Godfrey played a pre-eminent role in the capture of Jerusalem and became the first ruler of the state, rejecting the title of king in favour of naming himself "Advocate of the Holy Sepulchre".[154] The memory of Godfrey seems to have been widespread among the settlers. Fulcher, writing 28 years after Godfreys death, referred to him as "Prince of the Fatherland", chosen by "all the people of the Lord's army".[155] Fulcher's description of Godfrey seems to have embodied a collective memory, explaining his praise was seemingly recognised by "all the people" who were present during the choosing of Jerusalem's first ruler. This portrayal is overwhelmingly positive, praising Godfrey for "the nobility of his character, military skill, patient conduct" and "his elegance of manners".[156] Already we can see the memory of Godfrey was meant to be a resolutely positive and heroic one. As a sort of founding father of the kingdom his description embodied the pious, noble and courageous characteristics that would become increasingly attested to the First Crusade as a whole. This memory, like that of the First Crusade as a whole, remained relevant throughout the 12th century. William of Tyre states "that many splendid deeds, well worthy of admiration, were done by him, works which even today are still told as familiar stories".[157] He tells us that the memory of Godfrey of Bouillon were still frequently recounted in Jerusalem in his own time, near the end of the Latin

[152] Kostick, "Courage and Cowardice", 46-47.
[153] S.A. John, "The Feast of the Liberation of Jerusalem: Remembering and Reconstructing the First Crusade in the Holy City, 1099–1187", *Journal of Medieval History* Vol. 41.4 (2015) 409–431, q.v. 410-413.
[154] A. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: A Dynastic History 1099–1125* (Oxford 2000), 75-77.
[155] Fulcher of Chartres, *Gesta Francorum*, Book I.XXX, 124.
[156] Ibidem.
[157] William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (tl. E.A. Babcock & A.C. Krey, New York 1943), 386.

occupation of Jerusalem. These stories around Godfrey increasingly mythologised in these later accounts, with emphasis being placed on his virtues. Especially his refusal to crown himself a king was remembered in a positive light. It was framed as an example of his strong character an piety, refusing it because he supposedly believed that Christ was the only king of Jerusalem.[158] This telling ignored the political motivations behind the decision, as Count Raymond of Toulouse and some of the clergy present heavily objected to Godfrey's election as king, with the title of Prince or Advocate of the Holy Sepulchre being a compromise.[159]

The heavily idealised image of Godfrey fit perfectly with the mythologised memory of the First Crusade. The image of such heroes seems to have played an important role in the formation of identity for the Latin settlers. Many of them had either been followers of heroes like Godfrey themselves, or were descended from such followers, meaning they owed a lot of their current position to such figures.[160] The remembrance of Godfrey was yet another active form of memory. After his death a commemoration of his life, exploits and death became a part of the annual "liberation" feast, and an extra day of commemoration was added to the feast in his honour on either the 16th or 18th of July (the latter being the day of his death).[161] Godfreys memory was not wholly uniting however. Godfreys memory was disputed between the French-speaking settlers who seem to have adopted this new "Eastern" identity, and the German-speaking settlers who (as mentioned in the second chapter) remained more staunch in preserving their German heritage.[162] Smith notes that German-speaking settlers and pilgrims felt slighted by their perceived dominance of the French-speaking settlers exactly because they desired more recognition of the role of Germans in the First Crusade.[163] Godfreys status as a German hero, rather than a French one, was thus an important part of the identity to the German-speaking population, and the question to whom Godfrey "belonged" seems to have been a point of some friction. It is unknown how much this friction was felt by the French-speaking population, however. As noted in the second chapter, this conflict seems to have been felt more heavily by the German-speaking settlers, as many French-speaking writers had little issue with grouping all Latin settlers together, and placed less emphasis on their ethnical homelands.

No matter how severe this friction was, it does not take away from the importance placed on a shared hero like Godfrey. Even the German speaking population shared in their

[158] John, S.A., *Godfrey of Bouillon: Duke of Lower Lotharingia, Ruler of Latin Jerusalem c. 1060-1100* (London & New York 2018) 232-233.
[159] Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem*, 76-77.
[160] Riley-Smith, "The Motives of the Earliest Crusaders", 734-736.
[161] John, S.A. "The Feast of the Liberation", 419-420.
[162] Smith, "Scribal Crusading", 145-147.
[163] Ibidem.

commemoration of these heroes. These heroes became embodiments of the virtues associated with the memory of the First Crusade. Such memories seem to have played an important role in the identity of the Latin settlers of Jerusalem. They could create a shared history with which various differing ethnic groups from all over Western Europe could identify. This shared history was mostly based on two important pieces of the past that were familiar to all crusaders. The ancient biblical history further served the purposes of appropriating and adapting the city to the Latin Christian frame of reference of its new inhabitants as well as creating a sense of continuity to an ancient past. The First Crusade served as a type of founding myth, legitimising the existence of their identity and remaining central in their minds through active remembrance and ceremonies.

Conclusions

This research has attempted to answer the question of how a new united identity was formed among the diverse Latin populations of the crusader state of Jerusalem, between its creation in 1099 and Saladin's conquest of the city in 1187. This identity is visible in various primary sources on the crusader state, which has given us insights in how it came to be. The crusaders found themselves in a unique position within their new kingdom. They were isolated from their homelands and the people they had initially identified with. This context seems to have led to this new identity taking shape. This lead to a perceived feeling of "Easternness", in which the Latins of the Levant started to identify not as "Occidentals" but as "Orientals", as Fulcher put it. The formation of this identity is therefore inherently connected to a number of aspects of the social and political landscape of the Crusader State.

One of these aspects, which would have been significantly different from the European mainland, was the interaction with the local population of the Levant. The Latins were but a small minority in their own kingdom and were vastly outnumbered by the Eastern Christian denominations (such as the Syriac or Armenian churches) and the Islamic population of the kingdom. Sources differ on exactly how important this interaction was, but all seem to recognise certain changes as a result of it. Fulcher of Chartres believed it fundamentally changed the character of the settlers, while Islamic 'outsider' sources like Usama also recognised the settled Latins as more tolerant and less 'difficult' to interact with than their European brethren. European visitors like James of Vitry seem to have been less extreme than Fulcher, but his letters still show us examples of Levantine customs adopted by the Latins, much to his own dismay. Letters sent from the Latins back to Europe also shows us the other side of the relationship with the population of the Levant. Conflict with the Islamic states of the region

played a perhaps unsurprising part in the identity of the settlers, who frequently portrayed their struggle against Islamic powers to the people of Europe. While the exact nature of this interaction remains disputed among historians, it is undeniable that the settlers themselves recognised the effect of living with these other cultures had on them, and that it in some form or another it set them apart from the Europeans.

Another aspect that seems to have led to the creation of this shared identity is the presence of a shared religion. While back in Europe this religion had already been dominant, in the Levant they were isolated from the rest of Latin Christendom. Religion was already a primary motivator of the crusaders. Surrounded by people of differing faith this same religion was one of the primary aspects of their previous identity, which could bind the various settlers together. It offered them a shared frame of reference with which to understand their new kingdom. The region played an important role in medieval Latin Christendom as the stage of biblical history, especially the land where Jesus Christ was born and performed his miracles. The city of Jerusalem itself could serve a constant reminder of this biblical history which all settlers, regardless of their ethnicity, recognised and identified with. The settlers could all experience the history of the city as their own, and had the power to adapt the city to fit this image. This religion would inherently serve as a physical point of connection too, as it would have been focussed on physical locations, such as churches, in which the settlers came together and worshipped or celebrated the same things. This lead to the settlers experiencing a feeling of union in their self-perceived "Eastern" church. Their shared religion thus served to highlight the similarities which the settlers already shared, rather than their differences, while also forging a deep connection to their new shared homeland.

Feelings of a shared history were further enhanced by the commemoration and celebration of the First Crusade. The memory of this event was long kept alive in the Crusader State. Chroniclers kept recording the history of this event all throughout the 1099-1187 period in manuscripts, numerous songs and poems were written, and frequently recited, about the subject while an annual feast was celebrated the event in Jerusalem. This constant remembrance shows us how important of a Cultural Memory the First Crusade was to the settlers. It served as a foundation of the identity, a shared origin for all the Latins of the kingdom. Heroes such as Godfrey of Bouillon were central to this memory, as they became embodiments of the ideas of virtue and piety associated with the memory of the First Crusade.

It is this isolation, the complex interactions with the local population and the emphasis on a shared faith and history which allowed a new identity to emerge among the Latin settlers. This identity seems to have formed in a way reminiscent of the imagined community of

Anderson. Allowing the Latins to experience a feeling of unity with all their fellow settlers, despite the fact that many of the crusaders, let alone their descendants, could never have personally known one another, therefore being both *imagined* yet still a perceived *community*. This identity became *limited* to the settlers in the Levant, with their cousins back in Europe becoming increasingly excluded from this identity. However, this identity was not all-encompassing in the kingdom itself either, as even the German-speaking community seems to have felt themselves excluded as well.

The subject of identity in the Crusader States still leaves room for much additional research to be done. This research has limited itself to the Kingdom of Jerusalem with no investigation being made into the status or formation of a similar identity in the other Crusader States of the Levant (Edessa, Antioch and Tripoli) or a shared identity between these states. The role of a primarily urban life among the Latins of the Levant on the formation of identity (rather than a rural one more common in Europe) could also be a relevant subject to be looked further into. Finally it opens the question of how much change and continuity this Latin identity went through in the period following this research's timeframe.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

Amalric, king of Jerusalem, 'Amalric, king of Jerusalem to Louis VII, King of France (8 April 1163). Jerusalem,' in Barber, M. & Bate, K. (tl.), *Letters from the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12th-13th Centuries* (Farnham 2010).

Amalric, king of Jerusalem, 'Amalric, king of Jerusalem to Louis VII, King of France (September 1163). Jerusalem', in Barber, M. & Bate, K. (tl.), *Letters from the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12th-13th Centuries* (Farnham 2010).

Amalric, king of Jerusalem, 'Amalric, king of Jerusalem to Louis VII, King of France (1164). Jerusalem', in Barber, M. & Bate, K. (tl.), *Letters from the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12th-13th Centuries* (Farnham 2010).

Amalric, patriarch of Jerusalem, 'Amalric, Patriarch of Jerusalem, to Louis VII, King of France (between 1161-1164). Jerusalem', in Barber, M. & Bate, K. (tl.), *Letters from the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12th-13th Centuries* (Farnham 2010).

Anselm of Ribemont, 'Anselm of Ribemont to Manasses, Archbishop of Reims (1097)' in Barber, M. & Bate, K. (tl.), *Letters from the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12th-13th Centuries* (Farnham 2010).

Ansell, 'Ansell, Cantor of the Holy Sepulchre, to Gerbert, Bishop of Paris and Stephen, Archbishop of Paris (1120 & 1121). Jerusalem', in Barber, M. & Bate, K. (tl.), *Letters from the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12th-13th Centuries* (Farnham 2010).

Bertrand of Blancfort, 'Bertrand of Blancfort, Master of the Temple, to Louis VII, King of France (September-October 1163). Jerusalem', in Barber, M. & Bate, K. (tl.), *Letters from the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12th-13th Centuries* (Farnham 2010).

Bertrand of Blancfort, Master of the Temple, to Louis VII, King of France (november 1164), in Barber, M. & Bate, K. (tl.), *Letters from the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12th-13th Centuries* (Farnham 2010).

Fulcher of Chartes, *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem peregrinantium,* (tl. Ryan, F.R. Knoxville 1969).

Stephen of Blois, 'Stephen, Count of Blois, to his wife, Adela (1097). Antioch. in Barber, M. & Bate, K. (tl.), *Letters from the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12th-13th Centuries* (Farnham 2010).

Stephen of Blois, ‘Stephen, Count of Blois, to his wife, Adela (1098). Antioch’, in Barber, M. & Bate, K. (tl.), *Letters from the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12th-13th Centuries* (Farnham 2010).

Usama ibn-Munqidh, *The Book of Contemplation* (tl. Cobb, P.M. 2008).

William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, (tl. Babcock, E.A. & Krey A.C. 1943).

Secondary Literature:

Alba, R. & Nee, V., "Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration". *International Migration Review* vol. 31.4 (1997), 826-874.

Anderson, B., *Imagined communities: Reflection on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London & New York 2006).

Assmann, A., ‘Canon and Archive’, in: Erll A,m and Nünning A., (eds.), *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook* (Berlin 2008), 97-107

Barber, M., *The Crusader States* (Yale 2012).

Baumann, M., “Conceptualizing Diaspora. The Preservation of Religious Identity in Foreign Parts, Exemplified by Hindu Communities Outside India.” *Temenos - Nordic Journal of Comparative Religion*, Vol. 31. (1995), 19-35.

Bedos-Rezak, B. “French Medieval Regions: A Concept in History.” *Historical Reflections / Réflexions Historiques* 19, no. 2 (1993) 151-166.

Boas, A.J., *Jerusalem in the Time of the Crusades: Society, Landscape and Art in the Holy City under Frankish Rule*, (London 2001) 102, 156.

Bödeker, H.A. “Letters as historical sources – some concluding reflections” in Schulte, R. & Tippelskirch, X. (eds.), *Reading, Interpreting and Historicizing Letters as Historical Sources* (Florence 2004) 199-202.

Böhme, E. “Legitimising the Conquest of Egypt: The Frankish Campaign of 1163 Revisited*”*, in Srodecki, P. & Kersken N. (eds.), *The Expension of the Faith* (Turnhout 2022) 269-280.

Buck, A.D., “Settlement, Identity, and Memory in the Latin East: An Examination of the Term ‘Crusader States’”, *The English Historical Review* Vol. 135 (2020) 271–302.

Burgtorf, J., *The Central Convent of Hospitallers and Templars: History, Organization, and Personnel 1099/1120-1310* (Leiden & Boston 2008).

Coakley, J., "Thomas of Cantimpré and Female Sanctity" in R. Fulton & B.W. Holsinger (eds.), *History in the Comic Mode: Medieval Communities & the Matter of Person* (New York 2007), 49-62.

Cassidy-Welch M. & Lester, A.E., "Memory and interpretation: new approaches to the study of the crusades", *Journal of Medieval History* vol. 40.3 (2014) 225-236.

Cobb, P.M., *Usama ibn Munqidh: Warrior-Poet of the Age of Crusades* (Oxford 2005).

Cohen, R.. "The diaspora of a diaspora: the case of the Caribbean." *Social Science Information,* 31.1 (1992) 159–169.

Doxey, G.B. "Norwegian Crusaders and the Balearic Islands." *Scandinavian Studies* 68, no. 2 (1996): 139–160.

Edbury, P.W. & Rowe, J.G., *William of Tyre: Historian of the Latin East* (Cambridge 1988).

Ellenblum, R., *Frankish Rural Settlement in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Cambridge, 1998).

Friedman, Y., "The Templars as Peacemongers", in Shagrir I., Kedar, B.Z. & Balard, M. (eds.), *Communicating the Middle Ages* (London & New York 2018) 15-23

Halbwachs, M., *On Collective Memory* (tl. L.A. Coser, Chicago & London 1992).

Haller, D. "Let it flow: Economy, spirituality and gender in the Sindhi Network" in Kokot, W., Tololyan, K. and Alfonso, C. (eds.), *Diaspora, Identity and Religion: New Directions in Theory and Research* (New York 2004) 189-204.

Harris, Z.S. "Discourse Analysis" *Language* vol. 28.1 (1952) 1–30.

Hazard, H.W., "Preface" in ed. Hazard, H., *A History of the Crusades Volume IV: The Art and Architecture of the Crusader States* (Madison 1977).

Holmes, U.T., 'Life among the Europeans in Palestine and Syria in the Twelfth and Thirtheenth Century', in H.W. Hazard, *A History of the Crusades Vol IV: The Art and Architecture of the Crusader States (*Madison 1977).

Hunt, L. "Art and Colonialism: The Mosaics of the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem (1169) and the Problem of 'Crusader' Art", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers,* vol. 45 (1991) 69–85 q.v. 69-70.

John, S.A. "The Feast of the Liberation of Jerusalem: Remembering and Reconstructing the First Crusade in the Holy City, 1099–1187", *Journal of Medieval History* Vol. 41.4 (2015) 409–431.

John, S.A., *Godfrey of Bouillon: Duke of Lower Lotharingia, Ruler of Latin Jerusalem c. 1060-1100* (London & New York 2018).

Jotischky, A., 'Franks and the Natives in the Crusader States: The State of the Question', Third Symposium of *The Norman Edge: Identity and State Formation on the Frontiers of Europe* (2009).

Kedar, B.Z., 'The Subjected Muslims of the Frankish Levant', in: Powel J.M. ed., *Muslims Under Latin Rule* (Princeton 1990), 135-174.

Kedar, B.Z., 'Frankish Bathhouses: Balneum and furnus - a functional dyad?' in: Shagrir, I. ed., *Communicating the Middle Ages Essays in Honour of Sophia Menache* (Oxon & New York 2018), 121-141.

König, D.G., *Arabic-Islamic views of the Latin West: Tracing the Emergence of Medieval Europe* (Oxford, 2015), 211-215.

Kostick, C., "Courage and Cowardice on the First Crusade 1096-1099", *War in History* vol. 20.1 (2003) 32-49.

Lapina, E., *Warfare and the Miraculous in the Chronicles of the First Crusade* (Penn State University Press 2015).

MacEvitt, C., *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East: Rough Tolerance* (Philadelphia 2009).

MacEvitt, C. 'What was Crusader about the Crusader States?', *Al-Masāq*, (vol. 30 2018), 317–330.

Murray, A.V., *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: A Dynastic History 1099–1125* (Oxford 2000).

Murray, A.V."National Identity, Language and Conflict in the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1096–1192," in *The Crusades and the Near East: Cultural Histories*, ed. C. Kostick (Abingdon 2011), 107–130.

Murray, A.V. "Ethnic Identity in the Crusader States: The Frankish Race and the Settlement of Outremer" in J. Muldoon & F. Fernández-Armestro (eds.), *The Expansion of Latin Europe, 1000-1500: The Eastern Mediterranean Frontier of Latin Christendom* (London 2014), 339-350.

Palmer, A & Gelder, G.J. van, "Syriac and Arabic Inscriptions at the Monastery of St. Mark's in Jerusalem", *Oriens Christianus*, vol. 78 (1994): 33–63.

Paul, N., "The Emergence of a Francophone Culture in the East: An Overview," from The French of Outremer, *Fordham University* accessed 09 Febuary 2023, https://frenchofoutremer.ace.fordham.edu/thematic-essays/the-emergence-of-a-francophone-culture-in-the-east-an-overview/.

Peters, E., The *First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and Other Source Material* (Philadelphia 1971).

Pixner, B., *Paths of the Messiah and Sites of the Early Church from Galilee to Jerusalem: Jesus and Jewish Christianity in Light of Archaeological Discoveries* (San Francisco 2010).

Pringle, D. *The Churches of the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: A Corpus, Vol. 3, The City of Jerusalem* (New York & Cambridge 2007).

Riley-Smith, J., "The Motives of the Earliest Crusaders and the Settlement of Latin Palestine, 1095—1100" *The English Historical Review,* vol. 98, no. 389 (1983), 721-736.

Riley-Smith, J., *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, (London & New York, 1993).

Schulte, R. & Tippelskirch, X., "Introduction" in Schulte, R. & Tippelskirch, X. (eds.), *Reading, Interpreting and Historicizing: Letters as Historical Sources* (Florence 2004).

Smith, T.W., "Scribal Crusading: Three New Manuscript Witnesses to the Regional Reception and Transmission of First Crusade Letters ", *Traditio* (2017), vol.72, 133-169.

Snijders, T., *Peer-to-Peer Knowledge Transfer in Religious Communities* (Amsterdam 2019).

Verhoeven, M., "Jerusalem as Palimpsest: The Architectural Footprint of the Crusaders in the Contemporary City" in Goudeau J., Verhoeven M. & Weijers, W. (eds.), *The Imagined and Real Jerusalem in Art and Architecture* (Leiden 2014), 114-135.