

The Position of Islamic Jerusalem in the Negotiations Between Sultān Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn and King Richard I 'the Lion-Heart'

Maher Y. Abu-Munshar

Al-Maktoum Institute for Arabic and Islamic Studies

Introduction

For Muslims and Christians Islamic Jerusalem has occupied a very distinctive and important place in their hearts and minds. Islamic Jerusalem was presented by Abd al-Fattah El-Awaisi, the founder of the new field of inquiry of Islamic Jerusalem Studies, as a unique region¹ promoting co-existence between its inhabitants and followers of other religions based on mutual respect. Moreover, El-Awaisi did not only present Islamic Jerusalem as a model for multiculturalism but also as a model for conflict resolution. He argued that "one good example which represent Islamic Jerusalem as a model for conflict resolution was the negotiations between Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn and the King Richard I 'the Lion Heart' of England during the third Crusade (1189-1193)"². Indeed, Islamic Jerusalem's inclusive vision encouraged Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn to negotiate with his enemy for an inclusive solution to resolve their dispute.

This clearly manifested during the long peace negotiations between the most known sole leaders during the third Crusade: Sultān Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn (died. 589AH /1193 CE) and the King Richard I 'The Lion-Heart' of England (died. 1199 CE). In this article, an attempt is made to verify the accounts of

the communication between Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn and the Crusaders and analytically discusses the peace negotiations between Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn and Richard I. The article covers, also, the outcomes of these negotiations and how the vision of inclusivity was adopted in IslamicJerusalem. The article concludes with how at the end of the third Crusade, that lasted nearly five years, Richard and Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, the two of the greatest warriors and statesmen of the medieval age, parted on good terms.

The fall of IslamicJerusalem on Friday, 27 *Rajab*, 583 AH /2 October 1187 CE³ to the Muslims under the leadership of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn was followed by several campaigns and another major Crusades effort to regain it. The third Crusade (1189-1193 CE) was led by three of medieval Europe's most famous monarchs: Emperor Frederick Barbarossa of Germany, King Philip II Augustus of France, and King Richard I 'the Lion-Heart' of England. This was a strong start, but the crusades quickly weakened. Frederick Barbarossa accidentally drowned while he was marching towards IslamicJerusalem,⁴ and this halted his army's momentum. As a result, most of the army trudged back to their German homes. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn attributed this death to the will of Allah, for he had feared the strength of Frederick's army. Philip II Augustus was taken ill during the siege of Acre, and only partially recovered, or so he said. He was probably tired of fighting the Muslims and disagreeing with Richard and the other Crusaders and therefore, decided to go back home. Although Richard enjoyed much military success and won back a considerable portion of the Holy land, he failed to take IslamicJerusalem.

Far from being a thorough study of the third Crusade, this article will focus only on the relationships between the King of England, Richard the Lion-Heart and Muslim Sultan, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn. This is due to the fact that both led the process of negotiations between Muslims and Crusaders during the third Crusade. However, it maybe be noted that Frederick Barbarossa wrote a letter while in Germany to Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn threatening the latter to hand over IslamicJerusalem and the holy lands, otherwise, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn would face dire consequences. It seems that this was the only communication between the two leaders.⁵

First Episode of the Negotiations

As soon the Crusades had moved their forces to Acre, they led a siege against the Walled City of IslamicJerusalem for almost two years, during which thousands on both sides died. At this stage, channels of communication between the Muslim and Crusaders sides, represented by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn and Richard, were established. According to Ibn Shaddād, although the fighting was very fierce and violent, the Muslims were very patient and remained as steadfast as noble heroes. When the Crusaders saw this, they were surprised; so Richard sent a messenger first to al-‘Adil, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn’s brother, asking for a meeting with Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn in order to discuss some matters. However, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn answered immediately:

‘Kings do not meet unless an agreement has been reached.

It is not good for them to fight after meeting and eating together. If he wants this, an agreement must be settled before it can happen.

We must have an interpreter whom we can trust to act between us,

and who can make each of us understand what the other says. Let the envoy be our mutual interpreter. If we come to an agreement, the meeting can happen later, God willing.⁶

Richard agreed about the interpreter and sent another messenger asking to set a time to meet on the plain with their troops surrounding the two of them. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn accepted the invitation, but the meeting did not take place on account of Richard's was being suddenly become ill. In addition to that, the Crusaders' princes had met with Richard and expressed their disapproval of his actions as they were endangering Christianity. Richard sent a messenger to Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn explaining the reason for his absence.⁷

After a period of time, when it became clear to the defenders of Acre, the Muslim inhabitants of the Walled City, that there was no hope of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's army reaching the Walled City to aid them, they asked the Crusaders for surrender terms.⁸ When these were agreed upon they surrendered the Walled City. To ensure that the terms were fulfilled, 3000 Muslim prisoners were taken as hostages. The conditions, agreed upon by the inhabitants of the Walled City and the Crusaders were, as Ibn Shaddād states:

‘That they would give up the city and all the engines, equipment and ships it contained and hand over 200000 *dinārs*, 1500 prisoners of common, unremarkable background and 100 prisoners to be specified by the Franks, whom they would select, and additionally the Holy Cross that was taken by the Muslims. These would be granted, provided that the Muslims could leave in safety, taking with them their personal wealth and goods and their children and womenfolk. They guaranteed to the marquis (for he had been reconciled and had returned) 10,000 *dinārs* because he

was the intermediary, and 4000 *dinārs* to his men. On that basis an agreement was concluded between them and the Crusaders'.⁹

Therefore, under this agreement, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn was supposed to hand in the agreed amount of money, Christian prisoners to be exchanged for the Muslim hostages, and the True Holy Cross to be restored to them. However, progress was slow because Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn had doubts that if the Crusaders received the money, the cross and the prisoners, while still having the Muslim hostages, they would act treacherously and then the loss for the Muslims would be too great to be repaired.¹⁰ Richard lost his patience and massacred some 2700 Muslims in the sight of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's army;¹¹ according to Ibn al-'Adīm, Richard killed 2200 and saved the rest.¹² Elizabeth Hallam criticise this incident by saying that later chronicles contrasted this incident with Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's more chivalrous treatment of Crusaders prisoners.¹³ Lane-Poole states that there was 'no imaginable excuse or palliation for the cruel and cowardly massacre that followed'.¹⁴ He quotes a chronicle describing this horrible scene:

'Orders were then given to cut off the heads of the hostages with the exception of a few of the nobler prisoners, who perhaps might yet be relieved or exchanged for captive Christians. King Richard, always eager to destroy the Muslims, to confound the law of Muhammad utterly, and vindicate that of Christ, on the Friday after the Assumption bade 2700 Muslim hostages led out of the city and beheaded. Nor was there any delay. The king's followers leapt forward eager to fulfil the commands, and thankful to the Divine Grace that permitted them to take such vengeance for those Christians whom these very (captives) had slain with bolts and arrows'.¹⁵

The Issue of Islamic Jerusalem in the Negotiations

After the Crusaders had captured Acre they marched along the coast with Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn was not far behind. King Richard asked for al-‘Ādil, who came up to the advanced guard, for a meeting; this was granted. However, the meeting did not go well. King Richard started talking about peace; according to Ibn Shaddād al-‘Ādil said to him:

‘You desire peace but you do not mention your demands that I might mediate your differences with the sultan’. The King of England replied, ‘the basic condition is that you should restore all the lands to us and return to your countries’. Al-‘Ādil gave a harsh answer and a quarrel followed which led to the enemy’s departure after the two of them had separated.¹⁶

From Richard’s reply, it can be seen that he saw the Muslims as invaders and had no rights, not only in Islamic Jerusalem but also in the whole area. Richard also believed that the Crusaders were the real owner of those lands and the Muslims should leave the area. As a result, negotiations were unsuccessful and a battle was fought near *Arsūf* on 14 *Sha‘bān* 581 AH/ 7 September 1191 CE. King Richard achieved a victory over the Muslims at *Arsūf*. The Crusaders then headed to Jaffa (*Yāfā*) and won that land as well. It seems that King Richard had remembered his last meeting with al-‘Ādil, and discovered that it had not been a proper basis for a peace treaty. Therefore, on the 26 *Ramaḍān* 581 AH /18 October 1191 CE, Richard met al-‘Ādil at *Yāzūr*; they talked for a long time and discussed the matter of peace. King Richard made a proposition and asked al-‘Ādil to write it and send it to Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn. This

letter, seen as the most important correspondence between Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn and Richard as it deals directly with the issue of Islamic Jerusalem, states:

'You will greet him and say, 'The Muslims and the Franks are done for. The land is ruined, ruined utterly at the hands of both sides. Property and lives on both sides are destroyed. The matter has received its due. All we have to talk about is Islamic Jerusalem, the Holy Cross and these lands. Now Islamic Jerusalem is the centre of our worship, which we shall never renounce, even if there was only one of us left. As for these lands, let there be restored to us what is this side of Jordan River. The Holy Cross is a piece of wood that has no value for you, but it is important for us. Let the sultan bestow it upon us. Then we can make peace and have rest from this constant hardship.'¹⁷

Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn read the message and then summoned the leading men of his council and consulted them about what to reply. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's famous reply was as follows:

'Islamic Jerusalem is ours as much as it is yours. Indeed, for us it is greater than it is for you, for it is where our Prophet came on his Night Journey and the gathering place of the angels. Let not the king imagine that we shall give it up, for we are unable to breathe a word of that amongst the Muslims. As for the land, it is also ours originally. Your conquest of it was an unexpected accident due to the weakness of the Muslims there at that time. While the war continues Allah will not enable you to build up one stone there. From the lands in our hands we, thanks be to Allah, feed on the produce and draw our benefit. The destruction of the Holy Cross would in our eyes be a great offering to Allah, but the only reason we are not permitted to go that far is that some more useful benefit might accrue to Islam'.¹⁸

From this it can be seen how Islamic Jerusalem was important to both sides and how each had their reasons for

wanting it. Moreover, both sides would make the utmost effort to keep the IslamicJerusalem under his control. Richard was obviously very exhausted of war as shown in his attempt to persuade Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn to arrange for peace. The message shows the drop in Richard's demands; he is now asking only about IslamicJerusalem, where in the previous letters he was asking about the whole region. However, Richard is still insisting that Jerusalem is for the Christians only and cannot be shared with the Muslims. In contrast to Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's reply which shows a totally different attitude. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's reply demonstrated the Muslim inclusive vision toward IslamicJerusalem and the possibility for both Muslims and Christians to live in peace and harmony together and to share the holiness of IslamicJerusalem. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn acknowledges the Christians' rights in IslamicJerusalem; he asserts the rights of the Muslims in controlling the area; and refutes his claim that the Muslims are invaders.

New Development in the Negotiations

King Richard was trying his best to establish a peace agreement with Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn. On 29 *Ramaḍān* 581 AH /21 October 1191CE he offered peace on these terms: al-'Ādil was to marry his sister Joan (the widowed Queen of Sicily); then the couple to live in IslamicJerusalem; and Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn should give to al-'Ādil all the coastal lands he held and make him king of the Littoral. In addition to the lands and fief (*Iqtā'āt*) that were in Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn hands, both al-'Ādil and Joan should together rule the land; the holy cross was to be returned to the Crusaders;

prisoners from both sides were to be freed; and the Templars and Hospitallers were to be given villages. It was proposed that this should be the basis for a peace settlement, and if this was settled, Richard would return to England.¹⁹ When Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn received these terms, he immediately expressed approval of these terms, while at the same time taking them as a joke on Richard's part. He believed that Richard would not agree to any of them and that they were meant to mock and deceive him. Indeed, what Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn expected came true; after hearing the approval of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn to the marriage conditions, Richard apologised by saying that his sister had utterly rejected the idea and swore by her religion that she would never marry a Muslim. Richard then proposed that if al-'Ādil became a Christian he would fulfill the marriage condition.²⁰

King Richard's demands

Since his approaches to Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn with peace treaties had been unsuccessful, Richard decided to take drastic measures and marched towards IslamicJerusalem, in the hope of recovering the city and finishing the job that he had come to do. On the 27 *Jumādā al-Thānī* 588 AH /6 June 1192 CE the Crusaders under the leadership of Richard arrived at the village of *Bayt Nūba*, west of the Walled City of IslamicJerusalem, and chose it as the base for capturing IslamicJerusalem. He examined the situation carefully in terms of the military situation, the forces available on both sides, and the outcome of such a military campaign. Richard realised that the situation was very difficult and it soon became clear to him that the game was

not worth it. He might spend years besieging Islamic Jerusalem before victory and then find it virtually impossible to hold. He had enough forces and power to hold a siege in the Walled City of Islamic Jerusalem, but he could not keep up a supply of food and water for a long period of time. He had a meeting with the leaders of his army within his camp and told them that he would never desert them; he would proceed to the Walled City of Islamic Jerusalem as a comrade but not as a commander or leader. He then asked if anyone would volunteer to be leader. They all realised that if Richard was unable to be leader, then neither any of them.²¹ Therefore Richard started re-insisting on a peace treaty.

In fact from reading several sources, the researcher is inclined to argue that the reason behind Richard's insistence, for a peace treaty with Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, can be summarised in three main points. Firstly, his health appeared to be deteriorating shortly after the capture of Acre, and it seemed that the climate in Palestine did not help. During the summer of 588 AH /1192 CE, when they were in *Bayt Nūba*, King Richard's health deteriorated more. Secondly, his assessment of the power of the Muslim army showed him that it was more than he had expected. He had thought, since he had a large army from several European countries, he would easily defeat Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's army. However, he now saw the strength and power of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's armies. The third point was regarding the deteriorating situation in England; his brother John was planning to overthrow him and takeover his throne.

Richard and his armies failed to recover Islamic Jerusalem. This resulted in disagreement between the Crusaders themselves about whether to march up to walled city of Islamic Jerusalem or go back to their own territory.²² The French were in favour of marching towards the walled city, saying: 'the only reason we came was Jerusalem and we shall not return without it'.²³ However, Richard argued about the way they were going to get water to drink as the water in the wells around the walled city of Islamic Jerusalem had been poisoned by the order of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn.²⁴ A meeting was held and a decision was reached for the departure. In the early morning of 21 *Jumādā al-Thānī* 588 AH / 4 July 1192 CE they set out in the direction of *Ramla*, retreating the way they had come.²⁵

On Thursday 26 *Jumādā al-Thānī* 588 AH / 9 July 1192 CE the Crusaders' messenger returned with the *al-Hājeb* Yūsuf with a message from Richard to Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn; this, according to Ibn Shaddād, was as follows:

'The king of England desires your love and friendship. He does not wish to be a Pharaoh ruling the earth and he does not think that of you. 'It is not right' he says, 'for you to ruin all the Muslims, nor for me to ruin all the Franks. Here is my nephew, Count Henry, whom I have made ruler of these lands. I hand him and his troops over to your authority. If you were to summon them for execution they would hear and obey. Many monks and men of religion have asked you for churches and you have not grudged them what they asked. Now I ask you for a church. Those matters which annoyed you in the negotiations with al-Ādil I have declared that I give them up. I have renounced them. Were you to give me a very small village, I would accept it'.²⁶

Ibn Shaddād then states that:

When the Ṣultān had heard this message, he gathered his advisers and counsellors and asked them what the reply to this message should be. There was no one who did not advise conciliation and a concluding of peace because of the fatigue, exhaustion and burden of debts from which the Muslims suffered. It was agreed to make this response: **‘if you make this sort of overture to us, goodwill cannot be met with other than goodwill. Your nephew will be to me like one of my sons. You shall hear how I shall treat him. I shall bestow on him the greatest of churches, the Holy Sepulchre, and the rest of the land’s upland castles that are in our hands shall remain ours. What is between the two regions shall be considered condominium. ‘Asqalān and what is beyond shall be left in ruins, neither yours nor ours. If you want its villages, let them be yours’.** ²⁷

From studying Richard’s letter, it shows how desperate he was to finish the job he came to do, by any means and with any results. His letter, from top to bottom, indicates a need for an arrangement in a friendly and conciliatory spirit. Furthermore, it shows how far Richard’s concession had gone, in that he was willing to accept even a small village, in contrast to the early stages when he had asked Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn’s army to return to their countries and leave Islamicjerusalem and the area to him. King Richard went further to confirm the sovereignty of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn over all when he recommended his own nephew to Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn’s good grace. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn’s reply was for peace. He promised him, first, that he would treat his nephew as a son; second, he would hand him the most important Church in Islamicjerusalem for the Christians; and finally, he would divide the country between the Muslims and Christians.

A day later, on 29 *Jumādā al-Thānī* 588 AH /12 July 1192 CE, another messenger was sent by Richard to see Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, to convey his thanks, and with a new request:

‘What I request from you is that we should have twenty persons in the citadel of IslamicJerusalem and that the local Christians and Franks who live in the city should not be harassed. As for the rest of the land, we have the coastal plain and the lowlands and you have the hill country’.²⁸

This time the messenger of Richard on his own initiative exposed an important issue, which was that the gaining of IslamicJerusalem was no longer Richard’s intention; he had given up all talk about IslamicJerusalem apart from being allowed to make pilgrimage there. King Richard wished to reach a peaceful agreement and then return home. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn discussed the issue with his advisers and his answer to the messenger was ‘you will not have anything at all to do with IslamicJerusalem, apart from making pilgrimage visit’. The messenger replied, ‘but the pilgrims would have nothing to pay’. From these words it was understood that he agreed with the terms.²⁹

It is important to mention here that these negotiations occurred while the fighting was still going on at different locations. During the fight in *Yāfā*, Richard asked to meet Chamberlain (*al-Hājeb*) Abū Bakr. At the meeting, Richard, according to Ibn Shaddād, said:

‘This Sultān of yours is a great man. Islam has no greater or mightier prince on earth than him... By God, he is great... Greet the Ṣultān for me and say for God’s sake grant me what I ask for to make peace. This is a matter that must have an end.

My lands over the sea have been ruined. For this to go on is no good for us nor for you'.³⁰

While negotiations were still going on between Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn and King Richard, the latter's health deteriorated; he had a burning fever. He craved for fruit and ice, and had a yearning for pears and plums. In a gesture of goodwill, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn supplied these fruits with refreshing snow from the mountain.³¹ It appears that there were two reasons for this: Firstly, Richard's sickness seems to have softened the heart of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn towards Richard;³² and secondly, to gain intelligence access by the coming and going of the messengers.³³ Meanwhile, Richard had a meeting with Chamberlain Abū Bakr al-‘Ādilī and told him to thank Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn for the fruit and the ice. He also asked al-‘Ādil how he could influence Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn to make peace and asked him to beg Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn to give Richard *‘Asqalān*. In return, Richard would agree to leave but he would leave behind him his little band, so that Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn would be able to take the land from them. All he aimed for, upon his departure, was to strengthen his reputation amongst the Crusaders. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn admitted that if they agreed to give up *‘Asqalān*, then a peace treaty would be concluded with them as his army was very tired of fighting and constant campaigning and their resources were exhausted.³⁴ Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn wanted to rest his army for a while so that they could recover and gain strength. Furthermore, he wanted to make the land productive again, and be capable of supplying Islamic Jerusalem with more weapons to strengthen and support his defences.³⁵

Outcomes

Finally *Al-Ramla* peace treaty was carefully negotiated and signed on 23 *Sha‘bān* 588 AH /2 September 1192 CE,³⁶ stipulating a period of three years and eight months; according to Ibn al-‘Adīm (died 660 AH /1262 CE) it was for a period of three years and five months,³⁷ and for three years and three months according to Abū al-Fidā’ (died 732 AH /1332 CE) and al-Maqrīzī (died 845 AH /1442 CE).³⁸ The conditions of the treaty included that *‘Asqalān* was to be destroyed and was not to be rebuilt by anyone for three years. The starting date of the peace treaty was 22 *Rabī‘ al-Awwal* 589 AH /28 March 1193 CE). After the three years, whoever was stronger would get *‘Asqalān*. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn would give them Joppa, its vicinity and the sea-coast and the mountains. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn was to keep Islamic Jerusalem, provided that he allows free passage, without tribute, and the freedom of selling objects to any land exercising free commerce. Both sides signed the treaty.³⁹

Immediately after signing, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn ordered the herald to make a loud proclamation in the encampments and in the markets:

‘Listen all! Peace has been arranged. Any person from their lands who wishes to enter ours may do so and any person from our lands who wishes to enter theirs may also do so’. The sultan announced that the pilgrim route from al-sham was now open.⁴⁰

Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn adhered to the terms of the peace treaty, which contained freedom of religion that included allowing Christians to visit various sites in Islamic Jerusalem and perform their pilgrimage. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn even gave them assistance and

would send escorts with them to protect them until they were taken back to *Yāfā* (Jaffa).⁴¹ The main reason for this assistance was to ensure that they had done their pilgrim duty and had then returned to their own lands happy and gracious. Furthermore, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn offered them food, and treated them kindly and spoke to them in a friendly way. However, Richard was unhappy and annoyed at seeing a very large number of Crusader's pilgrims visiting Islamicjerusalem. Therefore, he sent a letter to Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn asking him not to allow Christians to visit Islamicjerusalem unless they had written permission from him.⁴² Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, for his part, refused Richard's request, justifying his refusal by saying that, if people were travelling a very long distance to get to Islamicjerusalem, it would be unacceptable to prevent them from entering and visiting the holy site.⁴³ It seems that Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn was aware that if he prevented these people from attending, they would go back and tell their people how they had been banned from visiting Islamicjerusalem. As a result, people would feel outraged and start preparing for a new Crusade. One might assume that Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn would take Richard's request as a great opportunity to keep Islamicjerusalem away from the Crusaders. However, the Ṣultan's refusal would prevent King Richard from having any control of Islamicjerusalem even if this were spiritual domination. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn informed those visiting of the dissatisfaction of Richard, and told them that they could still perform their pilgrimages as he had refused his proposal.

Once again, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn adhered to the terms in the peace treaty with regard to Islamicjerusalem. It is worthwhile

mentioning the incident that took place between Hubert Walter, the Bishop of Salisbury, and Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, during the former's visit to Islamic Jerusalem when he brought with him the pilgrim caravans to the holy places. When they arrived, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn welcomed them warmly. A meeting took place between the two men, where they discussed among several issues the character and morals of King Richard. After a friendly and warm meeting, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn asked him what present would he really like as he wanted to grant it to him. The Bishop thanked Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn warmly and asked him to give him until the next day to think carefully about this present. The next day, the Bishop told Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn that he wanted two Latin priests and Latin deacons to be permitted to celebrate divine service with the Syrians at the Lord's Sepulchre. These priests were to be maintained out of the offerings of the pilgrims. He also requested the same for Bethlehem and Nazareth. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn granted his request.⁴⁴

The third Crusade, that lasted nearly five years, ended with Richard and Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn parting on good terms. Each had generally shown respect for the other, at times exchanging generous gifts, even in the heat of battle. King Richard sailed out of Acre, in October 1192 CE, well aware that he was not leaving all his enemies behind, as more would be waiting to trap him during his journey home. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn returned from *al-Ramla* to Islamic Jerusalem to prepare the material to restore it and to look after its welfare. On being assured that King Richard has left the country,⁴⁵ Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn started making plans to go for *Hajj* (pilgrimage at Makkah),⁴⁶ a visit to which he was looking forward to. His plan was to go and inspect the coastal

areas in Palestine and make sure that everything was in good order,⁴⁷ then to go to Damascus and stay there for a few days. Afterwards he would return to IslamicJerusalem on his way to Egypt to examine its affairs, establish its government, and consider what would further its prosperity.⁴⁸ Şalāḥ al-Dīn left IslamicJerusalem on 6 *Shawwāl* 588 AH /15 October 1192CE. Shortly after his visit to Damascus, Şalāḥ al-Dīn fell ill and had a very bad fever for nearly ten days. He died on 27 *Şafar* 589 AH /4 March 1193CE, six months after the end of the third Crusade.⁴⁹

Conclusion

Non-Muslim as well as Muslim writers describe Şalāḥ al-Dīn as a man of justice and tolerance. Lane-Poole points out that ‘the secret of Şalāḥ al-Dīn’s power lay in the love of his subjects. What others sought to attain by fear, severity, and majesty, he accomplished by kindness’.⁵⁰ The legacy and legend of Şalāḥ al-Dīn only grew after his death. Respected by those who fought against him as well as those who surrendered to his mercy, he found a lasting place in the hearts of the Muslim people and achieved a fame rarely given in Western society to a non-Christian enemy. It was Şalāḥ al-Dīn’s adherence to the chivalric ideals of justice and magnanimity, as well as his combat expertise, that has given him a unique place amongst chivalric heroes.

The researcher argues that Şalāḥ al-Dīn is a model of chivalry; he was generous toward defeated enemies, kind toward the Crusaders’ wives and women, and humane with captured

prisoners. Once he regained IslamicJerusalem he left it open to pilgrims of all faiths. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn was a determined fighter and a good strategist. With regards to IslamicJerusalem, it can be concluded that the attitude of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn toward the Christians was totally different from that of the Crusaders toward the Muslims. Although he had the power to do so, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn did not kill tens of thousands, unlike the Crusaders when they first entered IslamicJerusalem. His treatment of Christians and non-Muslims in IslamicJerusalem was characterised by tolerance, respect and generosity.

From the above discussion one can conclude that the episodes of the third Crusade have clarified several issues such as the actual reason for the Crusade which is for some a purely a religious matter, in addition for being a mechanism to liberate IslamicJerusalem from the hands of the Muslims who were allegedly prosecuting the Christians there. This claim has been refuted by the actions of Richard as he was easily able to drop his demands on IslamicJerusalem, and finally abandon it completely. The discussion elaborated the position of IslamicJerusalem in the peace negotiations between the two parties and how it is important to the followers of the two religions, Christianity and Islam. In addition, the discussion emphasised the vision on IslamicJerusalem as an inclusive region which means that Muslims accepted to share this region with the followers of other religions. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's encouraged inclusivity and rejected the policy of exclusivity. Finally, the discussion also highlighted the significance of the dialogue and

understanding others for solving out complicated issues such as the issue of Islamicjerusalem.

- ¹ El-Awaisi, Abd al-Fattah *Islamicjerusalem: A New Concept and Definations*, the 7 the International academic Conference on Islamicjerusalem Studies, (Islamicjerusalem: Definations and Approaches), held at Al-Maktoum Institute for Arabic and Islamic Studies, 6 June 2005, pp. 1-9.
- ² El-Awaisi, Abd al-Fattah, *Introducing Islamicjerusalem*, Unpublished book, chapter title “Islamicjerusalem as a model for Conflict resolution”.
- ³ Ibn Shaddād, Bahā’ al-Dīn, *Al-Nawādir al-Sultāniyya wa’al-Maḥāsin al-Yūsufiyya*. Dār al-Manār, (Cairo 1421 AH/ 2000 CE), 1st Edition, p.53, (Hereinafter cited as: Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir*), See also Ibn Shaddād, Bahā’ al-Dīn, *The Rare and Excellent History Of Saladin or Al-Nawādir al-Sultāniyya wa’l Maḥāsin al-Yūsufiyya*, Translated by Richards. D.S, Ashgate (Hants-U.K 2001), p. 77. (Hereinafter cited as: Ibn Shaddād, *The Rare and Excellent*),
- ⁴ ‘Imād al-Dīn al-Aṣfahānī, Abū ‘Abd Allah Muḥammad, *Kitāb al-Faḥ al-Qussī fī al-Faḥ al-Qudsī*, p. 192, n.p, n.d, (Hereinafter cited as: ‘Imād al-Dīn al-Aṣfahānī, *Kitāb al-Faḥ al-Qussī*); Abū Shāma, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Ismā‘īl, *Kitāb al-Rawḍatayn fī Akhbār al-Dawlatayn al-Nūriyya wal al-Salāhiyya*. Edited and commented on by al-Zaībaq. A. Mū’asaset al-Risālah. (Beirut 1418 A.H /1997 CE), 1ST Edition, Vol.4, pp. 129-130, (Hereinafter cited as: Abū Shāma, *Kitāb al-Rawḍatayn*), Ibn al-‘Adīm, Kamāl al-Dīn Abī al-Qāsem, *Zubdat al- Ḥalab min Tārīkh Halab*, Annotated by al-Mansūr K. Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, (Beirut 1417 AH 1996 CE), 1ST Edition, p.421, (Hereinafter cited as: Ibn al-‘Adīm, *Zubdat al-Ḥalab*), Al-Ḥanbalī, Muḥr al-Dīn, *al-Uns Al-Jalīl bi Tārīkh al-Quds wa al-Khalīl*, Edited and Edited by Abū Tabāna A. Maktabat Dandīs (Hebron-Palestine 1420 A.H /1999 CE), 1ST Edition., Vol. 1, pp. 510-511. (Hereinafter cited as: Al-Ḥanbalī, *al-Uns Al-Jalīl*).
- ⁵ Stubbs, Willaim. *Itinerarum Peregrinorum et gesta Regis Ricardi*, Translated into Arabic under the name *al- Ḥarb al- Ṣalībīyā al-Thālitha (Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn and Richard)*, By Ḥabashi, Ḥasan, al-Hay’a al-Miṣrīa al-‘Āma lil Kitāb. (Egypt 2000 CE). Vol.1, pp. 57-63. (Hereinafter cited as: Stubbs, *Itinerarum Peregrinorum*)

- 6 Ibn Shaddād, *al-Nawādir, op. cit.*, pp. 122-124, See also Ibn Shaddād, *The Rare and Excellent, op. cit.*, pp. 152-153), 'Imād al-Dīn al-Aṣfahānī, *Kitāb al-Faḥ al-Qussī, op. cit.*, p. 253.
- 7 Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir, op. cit.*, pp. 125-126. See also Ibn Shaddād, *The Rare and Excellent op. cit.*, p. 155, 'Imād al-Dīn al-Aṣfahānī, *Kitāb al-Faḥ al-Qussī, op. cit.*, p. 253.
- 8 Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir, op. cit.*, pp. 128-129. See also Ibn Shaddād, *The Rare and Excellent, op. cit.*, pp. 158-160, 'Imād al-Dīn al-Aṣfahānī, *Kitāb al-Faḥ al-Qussī, op. cit.*, p. 259.
- 9 Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir, op. cit.* p. 131. See also Ibn Shaddād, *The Rare and Excellent, op. cit.*, p.161, 'Imād al-Dīn al-Aṣfahānī, *Kitāb al-Faḥ al-Qussī, op. cit.*, p. 259.
- 10 Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir, op. cit.* p.134. See also Ibn Shaddād, *The Rare and Excellent, op. cit.*, p.164, 'Imād al-Dīn al-Aṣfahānī, *Kitāb al-Faḥ al-Qussī, op. cit.*, pp. 268-269.
- 11 'Imād al-Dīn al-Aṣfahānī, *Kitāb al-Faḥ al-Qussī, op. cit.*, p. 269, See also Al-Dhahabī, Shams al-Dīn Abī 'Abd Allah, *Duwal al-Islām*, Edited by Muzwa H.I. presented by al-Aṣmā'ūt M. Dār Ṣader (Beirut 1999 CE), 1ST Edition, Vol.2, pp. 95-96, (Hereinafter cited as: Al-Dhahabī, *Duwal al-Islām*), Abū al-Fidā', Ismā'īl Ibn 'Alī, *Tārīkh Abī al-Fidā' al-Musammā Al-Mukhtaṣr fī Akhbār al-Basher*, Edited and annotated by Dyūb M, Manshūrāt Muḥammad 'Alī Bayḍūn Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmīya, (Beirut 1417 AH/1997 CE), 1ST Edition, Vol.2. p.165, (Hereinafter cited as: Abū al-Fidā', *Al-Mukhtaṣr*). Al-Ḥanbalī, *al-Uns Al-Jalīl, op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 524. .
- 12 Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubdat al-Ḥalab, op. cit.*, p. 425.
- 13 Hallam, Elizabeth, *Chronicles of the crusades: eye witness accounts of the wars between Christianity and Islam*, Guild Publishing. (London 1989 CE), p.153.
- 14 Lane-Poole, Stanley, *Saladin and the fall of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*, Darf publishers limited, (London, 1985 CE), p. 306 (Hereinafter cited as: Lane-Poole, *Saladin*).
- 15 Ibid., p. 306.
- 16 Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir, op. cit.*, pp. 141-142, See also Ibn Shaddād, *The Rare and Excellent, op. cit.*, p. 174.

- ¹⁷ Ibn Wāṣil Jamāl al-Dīn Ibn Muḥammad, *Mufarij al-Kurūb fī Akhbār Banī Ayūb*, Edited by al-Shayyāl. J., n.p (Egypt 1957 CE), Vol. 2, pp. 372-373 (Hereinafter cited as: Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarij al-Kurūb*). Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir*, *op. cit.*, p. 151-152, See also Ibn Shaddād, *The Rare and Excellent*, *op. cit.*, pp. 185-6, Abū Shāma, *Kitāb al-Rawḍatayn*, *op. cit.*, Vol.4, pp. 285-286. See also

"أنك تسلم عليه وتقول له إن المسلمين والإفريج قد هلكوا وخربت البلاد وخرجت من يد الفريقين بالكلية، وقد تلفت الأموال والأرواح من الطائفتين، وقد أخذ هذا الأمر حقه، وليس هناك حديث سوى القدس والصليب والبلاد، والقدس متعبدا ما نزل عنه ولو لم يبق منا إلا واحداً. واما البلاد فيعاد إلينا ما هو قاطع الأردن. وأما الصليب فهو خشبية عندكم لا مقدار له وهو عندنا عظيم فيمن به السلطان علينا ونصطليح ونستريح من هذا التعب".

- ¹⁸ Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir*, *op. cit.*, p.152. See also Ibn Shaddād, *The Rare and Excellent*, *op. cit.*, p. 186, Abū Shāma, *Kitāb al-Rawḍatayn*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 4, p. 286. Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarij al-Kurūb*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 373

"القدس لنا كما هو لكم وهو عندنا أعظم مما هو عندكم، فإنه مسرى نبينا ومجتمع الملائكة، فلا تتصور أن نزل عنه ولا نقدر على التفريط بذلك بين المسلمين، وأما البلاد فهي أيضاً لنا في الأصل، واستيلاؤكم عليها كان طارئاً عليها لضعف من كان فيها من المسلمين في ذلك الوقت، وما يقدركم الله على عمارة حجر منها ما دام الحرب قائماً، وما في أيدينا منها نأكل بحمد الله مغلة ونتنعف به. واما الصليب فهلاكه عندنا قرية عظيمة لا يجوز لنا أن نفرط فيها إلا لمصلحة راجعة إلى الإسلام".

- ¹⁹ Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir*, *op. cit.*, pp. 153-154, See also Ibn Shaddād, *The Rare and Excellent* *op. cit.*, pp.187-1888, 'Imād al-Dīn al-Aṣḥānī, *Kitāb al-Fath al-Qussī*, *op. cit.*, pp. 284-285, Abū Shāma, *Kitāb al-Rawḍatayn*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 4, pp. 283-284. Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarij al-Kurūb*, *op. cit.*, Vol.2, p. 372.

- ²⁰ Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir*, *op. cit.*, pp. 153-154, Ibn Shaddād, *The Rare and Excellent*, *op. cit.*, pp. 187-188, 'Imād al-Dīn al-Aṣḥānī, *Kitāb al-*

Fatḥ al-Qussī, op. cit., pp. 284-285, Abū Shāma, *Kitāb al-Rawḍatayn, op. cit.*, Vol. 4, p. 284.

- 21 Geoffrey de Vinsauf. *Itinerary of Richard I and others to the Holy Land*, 'Translated as 'conjoint labour of a classical scholar and a gentlemen well read in medieval history' Henry G. Bohm, (London 1948 CE), p. 301.
- 22 Abū Shāma, *Kitāb al-Rawḍatayn, op. cit.*, Vol. 4, p. 310. See also Ibn Wāsil, *Mufarij al-Kurūb, op. cit.*, Vol.2, p. 389.
- 23 Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir, op. cit.*, p. 174, Abū Shāma, *Kitāb al-Rawḍatayn, op. cit.*, Vol. 4, p. 310. Ibn Wāsil, *Mufarij al-Kurūb, op. cit.*, Vol.2, pp. 389-390.
- 24 Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir, op. cit.*, pp. 168-175, Ibn Shaddād, *The Rare and Excellent, op. cit.*, pp. 209-212, Abū Shāma, *Kitāb al-Rawḍatayn, op. cit.*, Vol. 4, p. 306. Ibn Wāsil, *Mufarij al-Kurūb, op. cit.*, Vol.2, p.390.
- 25 Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir, op. cit.*, p. 175, Abū Shāma, *Kitāb al-Rawḍatayn, op. cit.*, Vol. 4, p. 311.
- 26 Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir, op. cit.*, p. 176, Ibn Shaddād, *The Rare and Excellent, op. cit.*, pp. 213-214. Ibn Wāsil, *Mufarij al-Kurūb, op. cit.*, Vol.2, p. 390.

"إن الملك الإنكثار يقول إني راغب في مودتك وصدقتك وأنه لا يريد أن يكون فرعون
ملك الأرض ولا يظن ذلك فيك، ولا يجوز لك أن تملك المسلمين كلهم ولا يجوز لي أن
أهلك الإفرنج كلهم، وهذا ابن أخي الكندھري قد ملكته هذه الديار وسلمته إليك
ليكون هو وعسكره تحت حكمك ولو استدعيتهم إلى الشق سمعوا وأطاعوا، ويقول إن
جماعة من الرهبان النقطعين قد طلبوا منك كنائس فما مجلت عليهم وأنا أطلب منك كنيسة
وتلك الأمور التي كانت تضيق صدرك مما كان يجري في المراسلة مع الملك العادل تركتها
وأعرضت عنها ولو أعطيتني مفرعة أو خربة قبلتها".

- 27 Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir, op. cit.*, p.176, Ibn Shaddād, *The Rare and Excellent, op. cit.*, p. 214. Ibn Wāsil, *Mufarij al-Kurūb, op. cit.*, Vol.2, p. 391.

"فلما سمع السلطان هذه الرسالة جمع أرباب الرأي وأصحاب مشورته وسأهم عن ما يكون الجواب لهذه الرسالة، فما منهم إلا من أشار بالمخاسنة وعقد الصلح لما كان قد أخذ المسلمين من الضجر والتعب وعلاهم من الديون. واستقر الحال على هذا الجواب. إذا دخلت معنا هذا الدخول فما جزاء الإحسان إلا الإحسان، إن ابن أختك يكون عندي كبعض أولادي وسيلفك ما أفعل معه وأنا أعطيك أكبر الكنائس وهي القمامة، وأما بقية البلاد فنقسمها، فالساحلية التي بيدك تكون بيدك، والذي بأيدينا من القلاع الجبلية يكون لنا، وما بين العمليين يكون مناصفة، وعسقلان وما وراءها يكون خراباً لا لنا ولا لكم، وإن أردتم قراها كانت".

²⁸ Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir*, op. cit., p.177.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 177. see also Ibn Wāsil, *Mufarij al-Kurūb*, op. cit., p.392.

³⁰ Ibid., pp. 184-185. See also Ibn Wāsil, *Mufarij al-Kurūb*, op. cit., pp.398-399.

"هذا السلطان عظيم، وما في هذه الأرض للإسلام أكبر ولا أعظم منه، كيف رحل عن المكان بمجرد وصولي، والله ما ليست لأمة الحرب ولا تأهبت لأمر وليس في رجلي إلا رذول البحر، فكيف تأخر، ثم قال: والله العظيم الكريم ما ظننت أن يأخذ يافا في شهرين فكيف أخذها في يومين. ثم قال لأبي بكر: سلم على السلطان وقل له بالله عليك أجب سؤالي في الصلح فهذا الأمر لا بد له من آخر، وقد هلكت بلادتي وراء البحر وما في دوام هذا مصلحة لا لنا ولا لكم".

³¹ Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir*, op. cit., p. 188.

³² Lane-Poole, *Saladin*, op. cit., p. 357.

³³ Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir*, op. cit., p. 188, Ibn Shaddād, *The Rare and Excellent*, op. cit., pp. 227-228.

³⁴ Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir*, op. cit., p. 189.

³⁵ Ibid., p.192.

- 36 Ibn al-Athīr, Abū al-Ḥasan Alī al-Shaībānī, *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh*, Reviewed and Corrected by al-Daqāq M.Y. Manshūrāt Muḥammad ‘Alī Bayḍūn, Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmīya, (Beirut 1418 AH/ 1998 CE), 3RD Edition, Vol.10, p. 218, Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir*, *op. cit.*, p.191.
- 37 Ibn al-‘Adīm, *Zubdat al-Ḥalab*, *op. cit.*, p. 426.
- 38 Abū al-Fidā’, *Al-Mukhtaṣr*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 169, See also Al-Maqrīzī, Abū al-‘Abāss Aḥmad Ibn ‘Alī, *Kitāb al-Mawā’iz bi Dhikr al-Khīṭaṭ wa al-Āthār*, Annotated by al-Mansūr K. Manshūrāt Muḥammad ‘Alī Bayḍūn, Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmīya, (Beirut. 1418 AH/1998 CE), 1ST Edition, Vol. 3, p.409, (Hereinafter cited as: Al-Maqrīzī, *Kitāb al-Mawā’iz*).
- 39 Al-Qalqashandī, Aḥmad Ibn ‘Alī, *Subḥ al-A’shā fī Sinā’at al-Inshā*, Edited by Shams al-Dīn M. Manshūrāt Muḥammad ‘Alī Bayḍūn. Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmīya, (Beirut), n.d, 1ST Edition, Vol. 4, pp. 183-184, Ibn Kathīr, Abū al-Fidā’ Ismā‘īl, *Al-Bidāya wa al-Nihāya*, Dār al-Fikr (Beirut 1398 AH/ 1978 CE), Vol. 12, p.350 (Hereinafter cited as: Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*). Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarij al-Kurūb*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p.403.
- 40 Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir*, *op. cit.*, p.192. Ibn Shaddād, *The Rare and Excellent*, *op. cit.*, p. 231, Al-Ḥanbalī, *al-Uns Al-Jalīl*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p.536. Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarij al-Kurūb*, *op. cit.*, Vol.2, p. 408.
- 41 Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir*, *op. cit.*, p.193. Ibn Shaddād, *The Rare and Excellent*, *op. cit.*, p.232.
- 42 Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir*, *op. cit.*, p.193, ‘Imād al-Dīn al-Aṣfahānī, *Kitāb al-Faṭḥ al-Qussī*, *op. cit.*, p.317, Abū Shāma, *Kitāb al-Rawḍatayn*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 4, p. 330, Al-Ḥanbalī, *al-Uns Al-Jalīl*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p 537 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarij al-Kurūb*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p.409.
- 43 Abū Shāma, *Kitāb al-Rawḍatayn*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 4, pp. 330-331. See also Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarij al-Kurūb*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p.409
- 44 Stubbs, *Itinerarum Peregrinorum*, *op.cit.*, Vol.1, pp. 274-277.
- 45 Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir*, *op. cit.*, p.196, See also ‘Imād al-Dīn al-Aṣfahānī, *Kitāb al-Faṭḥ al-Qussī*, *op. cit.*, p. 317,
- 46 Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir*, *op. cit.*, p.196, ‘Imād al-Dīn al-Aṣfahānī, *Kitāb al-Faṭḥ al-Qussī*, *op. cit.*, p.317, Al-Ḥanbalī, *al-Uns Al-Jalīl*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 537.
- 47 Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir*, *op. cit.*, p.196.
- 48 Ibid., p.196.

-
- ⁴⁹ Ibn Shaddād, *Al-Nawādir*, *op. cit.*, pp.197-203, See also ‘Imād al-Dīn al-Aṣfahānī, *Kitāb al-Faḥ al-Qussī*, *op. cit.*, pp.325-327, Al-Ḥanbalī, *al-Uns Al-Jalīl*, *op. cit.*, pp. 538-539.
- ⁵⁰ Lane-Poole, *Saladin*, *op. cit.*, p. 367.

