Islamicjerusalem:
A Model for Multiculturalism

Maher Abu-Munshar

Abstract

This paper examines the extent to which `Umar ibn al-Khattab and Salah al-Din adhered to the Islamic vision toward non-Muslims and determines whether they established a multicultural society in Islamicjerusalem after the city's first and second conquests. In addition, it provides a historical perspective to these two important events, focuses on their attitudes toward Islamicjerusalem's non-Muslims inhabitants, and investigates whether the Muslims' understanding of other religions is possible and whether it is an integral part of a pluralist, multicultural society.

Introduction

Islamicjerusalem (*Bayt al-Maqdis*) has a special place in the hearts of the three major monotheistic religions. During the course of its history, followers of these religions have made intensive efforts to conquer it. It has been argued that under Muslim rule, Islamicjerusalem allowed adherents of different religions to live together and could be considered a model for multiculturalism, as El-`Awaisi[2] concluded in his definition of Islamicjerusalem.[1] In his newly published monograph *Introducing Islamicjerusalem*, he articulated a challenge when he defined Islamicjerusalem as:

> … a new terminology for a new concept, which may be translated into the Arabic language as *Bayt al-Maqdis*. It can be fairly and eventually characterised and defined as a unique region laden with rich historical background, religious significances, cultural attachments, competing political and religious claims, international interests and various aspects that affect

Maher Abu-Munshar is a lecturer in Islamicjerusalem studies, Al-Maktoum Institute for Arabic and Islamic Studies, Dundee, United Kingdom.

the rest of the world in both historical and contemporary contexts. It has a central frame of reference and a vital nature with three principal intertwined elements: its geographical location (land and boundaries), its people (population), and its unique and creative inclusive vision, to administrate that land and its people, as a model for multiculturalism.[3]

In this paper, I examine the validity of his argument by focusing on the situation of the city's Jewish and Christian inhabitants under Muslim rule and how the Muslims treated them during the reigns of `Umar ibn al-Khattab (d. 24/645) and Salah al-Din (d. 589/1193). I chose these two periods because they are the most important examples of a multicultural society in Islamicjerusalem's history. In the first period, El-`Awaisi argues, the Muslim conquest liberated the native Christians from Byzantine domination and persecution and allowed the Jews to return after a nearly 500-year exile.[4] In the second period, the conquest liberated the Muslims, Eastern Christians, and Jews from the domination of the Latin Crusaders.[5]

During these two periods, Islamic rule enabled Muslims, Christians, and Jews to live together side by side peacefully. Nevertheless, during certain periods of Islamicjerusalem's history non-Muslims were mistreated by certain leaders – particularly the Fatimids,[6] due to their own agendas and violations of Islamic precepts.

As this raises a set of critical questions regarding Muslim attitudes toward others and Islamic tolerance, I examine and discuss how Muslim conquerors aspired to implement multicultural policies in Islamicjerusalem by addressing the following question: Did the Muslims provide a foundation for a multicultural Islamicjerusalem during these two periods? Furthermore, I respond to such Israeli scholars as Shlomo Goitein, who have portrayed the first Muslim conquest as an occupation similar to any other occupation of Jerusalem during its long history and one that placed the lives of its non-Muslims in complete disarray.[7]

After defining multiculturalism, I review and highlight historical examples by classifying them under the different criteria on which a multicultural society is based. I then focus on several of the themes related to the basis of a multicultural society in parallel with the theoretical framework. `Umar and Salah al-Din's rule of Islamicjerusalem provide a particularly illustrative case study of a multicultural society. In conclusion, I reflect on both rulers' treatment of the city's non-Muslims to offer a model for a multicultural society. Generally, I address such issues as how discourses of multiculturalism, diversity, and cultural sensitivity, when combined with the prevailing practices of

how Muslims treat non-Muslims, shape a multicultural society. This answers the major question of this article: Do multicultural societies ruled by Muslims protect cultural diversity for all group members, or do they accomplish this at the expense of some segments of the population?

Criteria for a Multicultural Society

In this paper, terms like *multiculturalism* and *diversity* are used in a descriptive way to highlight the presence of "the other." Multiculturalism can imply different things to different people and, as a result, many interpretations exist. To avoid any ambiguity, I ascertain, within the context of this paper, the criteria needed to establish a multicultural society. W. C. Watson notes that a multicultural society is "a society, state, a nation, a region, composed of people who belong to different cultures." He further argues that multiculturalism is not a new concept; rather, it has been used previously but with different terminology (i.e., plural society, multiethnic society). He adds that the word's continuing popularity is derived from the fact that it has "everything to do with the resonances of the word *culture* and the positive connotations it evokes."[8]

In line with Watson's understanding, Charles Taylor stipulates that to enjoy a good life, a multicultural society, which has more than one community, must have a policy of recognition based on equal dignity.[9] Multiculturalism is often used interchangeably with diversity and pluralism to refer to an environment in which differences among people and groups are recognized, respected, and valued; where differences are seen as positive and desirable, rather than negative or threatening. Multiculturalism also refers to the combination of values that reflects this philosophy.

Therefore, a multicultural society is expected to identify, accept, and accommodate the cultural needs of its diverse citizens, all of whom have various cultural identities. In line with these definitions, I argue that multiculturalism seeks to promote the values of different cultures co-existing peacefully within a single society, where the rights of all citizens are protected and cultural diversity is deliberately fostered. Multiculturalism represents a policy tool for managing significant diversity in order to benefit from its positive influence, as well as to minimize and control any potential tension and conflict.

After reviewing some of the relevant literature on multiculturalism,[10] I identified three common criteria that are fundamental and integral to a multicultural society. I use each criterion to illustrate certain historical incidents

as reflected in `Umar and Salah al-Din's perspectives and practices. These criteria are recognizing others, diversity and pluralism, and tolerance and mutual respect.

Islamicjerusalem under `Umar ibn al-Khattab

Recognizing Others

The first Muslim conquest of Aelia is considered a turning point in the region's history.[11] This event, which took place in 16/637[12] and caused a dramatic change in the structure of the region's population, resulted in the emergence of a multicultural society after centuries of being a closed and an insular region. Consequently, Islamicjerusalem became a part of the Muslim world and its people were considered as *ra`aya* (subjects) of the empire.

Karen Armstrong argues that `Umar adopted this inclusive vision in Aelia (Islamicjerusalem)[13]:

> When Caliph `Umar conquered Jerusalem from the Byzantines, he was faithful to the Islamic inclusive vision. Unlike Jews and Christians, Muslims did not attempt to exclude others from Jerusalem's holiness. Muslims were being taught to venerate them.[14]

Prior to the first Muslim conquest, Aelia was mainly a Christian region ruled by the Byzantines. Most of its inhabitants had converted to Christianity following the efforts of Emperor Constantine, who had converted in 312, to spread Christianity throughout the empire until it became the official religion in 324.[15] The pre-Christian Romans had forbidden the Jews to live there after 135[16] due to their revolts against the Roman occupation. Nevertheless, during that time they were allowed to stay in Aelia for short periods (i.e., at the time of the Persian occupation [614-28]).[17] The Jews were very keen to return to Aelia, as demonstrated by their eagerness for the Muslims to conquer it and liberate them, according to al-Tabari.[18] Furthermore, Khalil Sarkis (d. 1915) provides examples of the "cruel aggression and oppressions of the Byzantines" to which the Jews had been subjected for a long time. For instance, he states that Constantine oppressed the Jews and forced them to convert. As a result, some of them did so and others only pretended to do so, while those who refused to do so were killed.[19]

Moreover, Aelia's Christian population was divided into sects and groups, as these had different languages and cultures.[20] This resulted in an unstable religious life for the Christians prior to the first Muslim conquest,

for there were serious disagreements from the fifth century on between the Monophysites and the Byzantine emperor about how Christ's divine and human natures coexisted.[21]

In the seventh century, Emperor Heraclius (610-41) attempted to solve the Monophysite-Chalcedonian schism, which had existed since 451, by suggesting a compromise known as Monoenergism. This creed adopted the Chalcedonian belief that Christ had two natures, combined with the Monophysite view that Christ had one "will." The definition of the term *will* was left deliberately vague. Monoenergism was accepted by the patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria, as well as of the Armenians, but not by the Patriarch of Aelia or Pope Honorius I.[22] As a result, Aelia's mainly Monophysite Christians suffered from Emperor Herculius' religious persecution and violence as he tried to force his own beliefs upon them.[23]

Not surprisingly, they welcomed the Muslim conquest, for it promised them religious tolerance. In line with this, Steven Runciman maintains that Aelia's Christians warmly welcomed the Muslim conquerors, for they ended the Byzantine persecution. [24] He quotes the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch, Michael the Syrian, in the days of the Latin Kingdoms, who, reflecting upon his people's situation at that time, stated: "The God of vengeance, who alone is the Almighty … raised from the south the children of Ishmael [meaning the Muslims] to deliver us from the hands of the Romans."[25] Runciman adds that even the Greek Orthodox, "finding themselves spared the persecution that they have feared and paying taxes that, in spite of the *jizyah*[26] (tax) demanded from the Christians were far lower than in the Byzantine times, showed small inclination to question their destiny."[27]

Leone Caetani discusses the issue from a different angle: The promise of Muslim religious tolerance appeared more attractive than any connection with Byzantium and a Christian government, due to Emperor Herculius' policy of religious compulsion and a strong aversion toward Byzantium. He goes on to say that after the first terrors caused by the invading army's arrival, a profound turnaround in favor of the Muslim conquerors occurred.[28] As a result of the above, Armstrong concludes that it was not surprising for the Nestorian and Monophysite Christians to welcome the Muslims and prefer their rule to that of Byzantium.[29]

Runciman comments on the lack of tolerance among the Byzantine emperors, who wanted to impose their own doctrine on other Christians and use religion as a unifying factor to extend their control.[30] Though some might argue that the different reactions of various Christian groups reflected inter-Christian relationships, this can also be understood in the framework of the

relationship of the empire's religion with the "separatist" groups. However, upon his arrival in Islamicjerusalem, `Umar made the whole area inclusive.

Diversity and Pluralism

From the measures and steps taken by the Muslims immediately after the first Muslim conquest, I argue that the goal was to establish the solid basis needed for a multicultural society, for Jerusalem was a holy place for Islam as well as for Judaism and Christianity. This indicates that Muslims needed to provide an atmosphere in which people belonging to different cultures and religions could live side by side in peace.

The Jews were among those who benefited from this attitude, for they were allowed to return after being excluded for nearly 500 years. In her discussion of the first Muslim conquest, Armstrong points out that `Umar allowed seventy Jewish families from Tiberius to settle to the southwest of the al-Aqsa enclave[31] and let them build a synagogue. In line with this, El-`Awaisi mentions that, according to an eleventh-century Jewish manuscript preserved in Cairo, `Umar acted as an arbitrator or forceful mediator between Christians and Jews to resolve the issue of banning Jews from the city.[32] Runciman discusses how, during `Umar's rule, Christians, Zoroastrians, and Jews became *dhimmis*.[33] In other words, they were allowed the freedom of religion and worship in return for paying the *jizyah* tax. He adds that each sect was treated as a "semi-autonomous community" under its religious leader, who was responsible for its members' good behavior.[34] Armstrong states further that the Muslims established a system that enabled the Jews, Christians, and Muslims to live together in Islamicerusalem for the first time.[35] She added that this was due to the inclusive vision, developed by the Muslims, who did not deny the presence and devotion of others, but rather respected their rights and celebrated plurality and coexistence.[36]

Tolerance and Mutual Respect

One of Islam's aims is to provide a peaceful life based on mutual respect between Muslims and non-Muslims.[37] `Umar granted the people of Aelia safety for "their persons, their goods and churches." This assurance (this is not, in any case, the "Pact of `Umar"[38]) stands as an important reference text and contains the basic principles for a multicultural society that are applicable at all times and in all places. However, various versions of this document exist.[39] Al-Tabari's version,[40] the longest and the most explicit, is as follows:

In the name of Allah, the most Merciful, the most Compassionate. This is the assurance of safety (*aman*) which the worshipper of Allah (the second caliph) `Umar [ibn al-Khattab], the Commander of the Faithful, has granted to the people of Aelia. He has granted them an assurance of safety for their lives and possessions, their churches and crosses; the sick and the healthy (to everyone without exception); and for the rest of its religious communities. Their churches will not be inhabited (taken over) nor destroyed (by Muslims). Neither they, nor the land on which they stand, nor their cross, nor their possessions will be encroached upon or partly seized. The people will not be compelled (*yukrahūna*) in religion, nor any one of them be maltreated (*yadarrūna*). (No Jews should reside with them in Aelia). The people of Aelia must pay the *jizyah* tax like the Ahl al-Mada'in (the people of the [other] region/cities), they must expel the Byzantines and the robbers. As for those (the first Byzantine group) who will leave (Aelia), their lives and possessions shall be safeguarded until they reach their place of safety, and as for those (the second Byzantine group) who (choose to) remain, they will be safe. They will have to pay tax like the people of Aelia. Those people of Aelia who would like to leave with the Byzantines, take their possessions, and abandon their churches and crosses will be safe until they reach their place of safety.

Whosoever was in Aelia from the people of the land (*ahl al-ard*) (e.g., refugees from the villages who sought refuge in Aelia) before the murder of *fulan* (name of a person) may remain in Aelia if they wish, but they must pay tax like the people of Aelia. Those who wish may go with the Byzantines, and those who wish may return to their families. Nothing will be taken from them until their harvest has been reaped.

The contents of this assurance of safety are under the covenant of Allah, are the responsibilities of His Prophet, of the caliphs, and of the faithful if (the people of Aelia) pay the tax according to their obligations. The persons who attest to it are Khalid ibn al-Walid, `Amr ibn al-`As, `Abd al-Rahman ibn `Awf, and Mu`awiyah ibn Abi Sufyan. This assurance of safety was written and prepared in the year 15 (AH).[41]

This assurance reflects the spirit of tolerance toward non-Muslims in general and Christians in particular. It clearly emphasizes that the Christians' lives, properties, and religion will be safe from any kind of interference or molestation; that their churches will not be demolished; no injury will be done to them; and no encroachment will be made on the areas near these churches. Freedom of religion is assured by the stipulation that they will not be compelled to convert. It is obvious that the first paragraph of al-Tabari's

version (excluding the condition relating to the Jews) is similar to and matches the line of treaties that Muslims used to issue to conquered cities. In other words, such guarantees were the normal practice.[42]

The weaknesses in al-Tabari's version starts with a statement that the Jews should be banned from living with the Christians in Aelia. Note that this restriction was not supported or even mentioned in any earlier narration. It does not seem to have been implemented, especially as Muslim historical accounts do not mention that `Umar expelled the city's Jews or prevented them from staying there. Al-Quda argues that it is strange to have a condition in the assurance that is not to be implemented. He concludes that it is well-known that Muslims, in general, respect pacts and follow them accordingly.[43]

Al-Duri refutes this stipulation by asserting that the details related to for-bidding a certain population to live in conquered cities are unusual and never appear in the texts of similar pacts in al-Sham. The reference to Jews is apparently absent from all Muslim literature. He adds that it is believed that this information first appeared in Michael of Syria's chronicle.[44] Al-Himyari attributes this condition to a specific demand made by Aelia's Christian pop-ulation.[45] Ibn al-Jawzi does not even mention the Jews in regard to `Umar's assurance in his *Fada'il al-Quds*.[46]

El-`Awaisi states that such an exclusion during `Umar's reign has not been proven historically and that this condition would be unacceptable to Muslim law because it contradicts Islam's basic teachings.[47] He supports his argument by citing verses from the Qur'an (e.g., 60:8-9).[48] It was not Muslim policy to prevent non-Muslims from living in Islamicjerusalem, since all people were guaranteed equal rights of residence in the city.

El-`Awaisi also argues that such a condition would be an infringement or interpretation invented by a Muslim jurist, and adds that these were pro-duced to "please the rulers or match the general circumstances and socio-political developments that affected the position of the People of the Book during certain periods of history, especially in the `Abbasid State."[49] In addi-tion to what has been said, I argue that in later periods, when the Christians recognized that Islamicjerusalem was under Muslim rule and that the Jews were no longer prevented from residing there, they felt threatened and added such a condition to the assurance, as shown in al-Tabari's version.

Freedom of religion, as clearly spelled out in `Umar's assurance, is an essential pillar in a multicultural society and should be guaranteed. Goitein points to Aelia's vacant patriarchal seat after Sophronious' (the Patriarch of Jerusalem) death in 638, claiming that the Muslim conquest threw its Christian community into complete disarray and that the Christian commu-

nity remained a flock without a shepherd.[50] He tries to substantiate this by stating that the aged patriarch died shortly after the conquest and that no new patriarch was appointed until 706.[51] In other words, he accuses the Muslims, more or less, of interfering with Christian religious matters. I disagree. The Muslims did not interfere in Christian matters; rather, they were complying with the essential term in the assurance: freedom of religion.

Furthermore, Shafiq Jasir, whose book lists the names and duration of every patriarch in Aelia from 451 to 1106, confirms this almost seventy-year vacancy until John V was enthroned in 706.[52] Why was a new patriarch not appointed for such a long period? Under `Umar's assurance, Muslims were forbidden to interfere in the Christians' religious affairs. The right to appoint patriarchs belonged only to them. Thus, I suggest that this long vacancy could be evidence of the Muslims' non-interference, even though the post was politically important to the Muslim state. It is also certain that any attempt to force the Christians to appoint a new patriarch would have been recorded, and this is not the case.

`Athaminah argues that this long-term vacancy was due to the disagreement between Islamicjerusalem's Monophysite Christians and the Byzantine emperors. The latter tried to impose their beliefs on the Monophysites, who formed the majority of the region's Christians.[53] After the conquest, these native Christians tried to eliminate the Byzantine presence after expelling its representatives from Islamicjerusalem. It seems that each group held to their own opinions. `Athaminah adds that when this problem was solved, a new patriarch was appointed. He concludes that the Muslims played no role in the long delay in filling this post.[54]

Hamilton attributes this long vacancy to the ongoing war between the Muslims and the Byzantine Empire.[55] This statement merely points to the fact that Muslims had no role in this vacancy. Nevertheless, during this time, the Church of the Holy Sepulcher was supervised by several priests who had limited authority in their capacity of being representatives of the patriarch and not the patriarch himself.[56]

Contrary to what Goitein claims, I argue that when `Umar conquered Aelia, the Christians' status immediately changed for the better. One result of this event was that the non-Chalcedonian churches were able to establish themselves in Islamicjerusalem on terms of parity with the Orthodox church. The Armenians appointed a bishop there in 650, and the presence of a Jacobite (Syrian Orthodox) bishop has been attested to since 793.[57]

Moroever, Christian pilgrimages to Islamicjerusalem's holy places continued without any interruption. Tibawi argues that the flow of Christian pil-

grims that had been coming since the days of Constantine's mother St. Helena (d. c. 330) was not affected.[58] `Athaminah agrees with him. Nevertheless, the number of pilgrims decreased slightly as a result of hostile relations between the Muslims and the Byzantine Empire.[59] I argue that this drop was normal, since pilgrims would be nervous about traveling during a time of war. Jasir quotes Niqula Ziyadah on this matter: "The liberation of Jerusalem by the Muslims did not stop the Christian pilgrims from visiting the holy places in Jerusalem. They encouraged them to come and visit."[60]

`Athaminah goes even further, claiming that building and renovating the churches and monasteries did not cease; rather, the Christians continued such projects under Muslim rule.[61] Jasir quotes Father Yusuf al-Shammas al-Mukhallisi, a Lebanese Christian monk who wrote on how Muslims treated Christians at that time:

> Except in paying the *jizyah*, the Muslim conquerors have not interfered with anything; they kept everything as it was before. The new situation was that the Muslims gave Christian sects independence with great privileges to their heads and religious leaders. Therefore, it was natural that the Jacobites were closer to the Caliphs than the Malikanis, as the Jacobites were far from any reminder of the Byzantines. This tolerance continued until the end of the seventh century.[62]

This citation is also evidence for the previous argument about welcoming the conquest, which explains the behavior of the different Christian sects. `Umar's multicultural inclusive vision prevented him from forcing the city's Jews and the Christians to convert due to his understanding that Islam mandates freedom of religion, belief, conscience, and worship. Neither the Qur'an nor the Prophet's sayings have ever encouraged forced conversion: "Let there be no compulsion in religion. Truth stands out clear from error."[63] I argue that Muslims understand that for a faith to be genuine, it needs to be absolutely free and voluntary.

`Umar's assurance stands as an important reference text and contains basic principles for Muslim–non-Muslim relations that are applicable at all times and in all places. Anything to contrary would be a deviation from these principles. In addition, El-`Awaisi argues that `Umar's conquest was a fundamental landmark that reshaped relations between those people of diverse faiths and cultures who inhibited the region. He went further, stating that:

> `Umar successfully created, developed and managed a new multicultural environment in Islamicjerusalem where differences among its people were not only acknowledged and recognised but accepted, respected, valued, and

protected. Islamicjerusalem provides and promotes a climate of religious and cultural engagement and dialogue, tolerance and diversity, and social justice. It also encourages, supports, and contributes to fostering a multicultural ethos of mutual culture understanding and respect, and a common understanding between different communities and individuals at all levels.[64]

Islamicjerusalem at the Time of Salah al-Din

Recognizing the "Other"

Similarly, during the Crusades (1099-1187), Muslims, Jews, and native Christians were not allowed to reside in Islamicjerusalem. Moreover, Egyptian Orthodox Copts were banned from visiting the Holy City after the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem was established because, according to the Crusaders, they were heretics and atheists.[65] Nevertheless, under the rule Baldwin I (1110-18), the Crusaders allowed many native Christians to return, mainly to populate the city and to ensure that there were enough people to carry out the realm's necessary undertakings. Native Christians had to attend ceremonies in which the language and rituals were alien to them, as Runciman describes. He adds that native Christians (Orthodox), who were the majority, resented being under Crusader (Catholic) domination.[66] Therefore, the Crusaders knew that thousands of Orthodox Christians would actually welcome a Muslim conquest.[67] According to Runciman, Eastern Christians had always looked back with nostalgia to the days under Muslim rulers, when they had had the freedom to worship as they pleased.[68] T. W. Arnold describes the sense of security of religious life under Muslim rule:

> The Native Christian certainly preferred the rule of the Muhammadans [Muslims] to that of the Crusaders, and when Jerusalem fell finally and ever into the hands of the Muslims (A.D. 1244), the Christian population of Palestine seems to have welcomed the new masters and to have submitted quietly and contentedly to their rule.[69]

Unlike the Crusaders, Salah al-Din made Islamicjerusalem an open city for all Christian sects and allowed them full freedom to practice their own particular rituals as they wished.[70] He not only recognized Christians, but also Jews. In fact, he allowed the latter to share the city with others.

Another important example showing Muslim recognition of others is the correspondence between Salah al-Din and King Richard of England in their frequent negotiations during the Third Crusade, for it deals directly with the issues of Islamicjerusalem. King Richard made a proposition and

asked al-`Adil (Salah al-Din's brother) to write it down and send it to Salah al-Din. The letter states:

> …The Muslims and the Franks are reduced to the last extremity. 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 Jerusalem, the Holy Cross and these lands. Now 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.[71]

> Salah al-Din's famous reply was as follows:

> 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 occupation of it was an unexpected accident due to the weakness of the Muslims there at that time.[72]

The above exchange reveals how Jerusalem was important to both sides and how each had their reasons for claiming it. Moreover, both sides would do their best to keep it under their control. The message shows the drop in Richard's demands; he is now asking only about Jerusalem, whereas in previous letters he had asked about the whole region.[73] However, Richard still insists that Jerusalem be first and foremost for the Christians and not shared with the Muslims. Salah al-Din's reply, on the other hand, shows a totally different attitude: He refutes the claim that they are invaders, asserts their rights in Islamicjerusalem, and then acknowledges the Christians' claims to the city. Both of these emphasize his inclusive vision.

Diversity and Pluralism

Salah al-Din's vision for establishing a multicultural society allowed the Jews to return to Islamicjerusalem. He designated two new quarters for the Magharibah (Moroccans) and the Jews within Islamicjerusalem. The number of Jews gradually increased thereafter.[74]

It is important to state that Salah al-Din distinguished between two types of Christians: the invading Crusaders who were behind the horrific mas-

sacres in Islamicjerusalem, and the native Christians. Although he ordered the Crusader (Catholic) Christians to leave Islamicjerusalem, he later permitted them to visit various sites and perform pilgrimage according to the terms of the Ramla peace treaty concluded at the end of the Third Crusade (1189-92).[75] He also granted Bishop of Salisbury Hubert Walter's request to allow two Latin priests and Latin deacons to celebrate divine service at the Holy Sepulcher church. These priests were to have their needs met by the pilgrims' offerings.[76]

According to `Imad al-Din (Salah al-Din's secretary), after the Muslims' recovery of Islamicjerusalem the native Christians requested permission to stay in Islamicjerusalem. Salah al-Din granted this on the following conditions: After paying their ransom, they should pay the *jizyah*, be his subjects, and be treated as *dhimmis*. However, those members of the poorer classes who did not have money were exempted from paying this tax.[77] The Orthodox Christians and the Jacobites were allowed to live in Islamicjerusalem, to worship as they chose, and to work within his service and be employed in the government. `Imad al-Din mentioned this, but gave no examples. It seems that the Christians were satisfied with how Salah al-Din treated them.[78] Arnold agrees with `Imad al-Din and emphasizes that the Christians were pleased with their Muslim employers.[79]

Salah al-Din's treatment of the native Christians seems to have been the result of the good and warm relations between himself and Emperor Isaac Angelus of Byzantium. Runciman reports that Salah al-Din received a message from the emperor, just after liberating the city, congratulating him and the Muslims on their victory over the Crusaders and requesting him to return the local churches to the Orthodox sects. Moreover, he asked that Christian ceremonies be performed according to the Greek Orthodox Church. His requests were later granted, although the other sects' rights were protected.[80] Salah al-Din allowed the native Christians to pray freely in their churches and handed control of Christian affairs to the Byzantine patriarch. Consequently, the Orthodox Christians and their priests benefited greatly from the Crusaders' departure and had the opportunity to recover their sovereignty over the Christian holy places.[81]

Furthermore, Salah al-Din then returned all of the Coptic churches and monasteries to the Coptic priests. Sawirus reports that Salah al-Din granted the Copts a place in Islamicjerusalem, known as the Dayr al-Sultan (monastery of the Sultan),[82] and exempted them from paying fees to visit the Church of the Holy Sepulcher and other Christian religious places. The main reason for this treatment was that they were his subjects.[83]

Interestingly, Salah al-Din also treated the Abyssinian Christians gener-ously. This was shown especially when he ordered his employees to exempt them from paying fees when visiting the holy places in Islamicjerusalem.[84] Ashur adds that Salah al-Din respected their monasteries in Islamicjerusalem and treated the priest who was taking care of these places with mercy and kindness.[85] From all of this, it becomes clear that Salah al-Din enabled differ-ent religions and sects to live side by side in Islamicjerusalem.

Tolerance and Mutual Respect

Islamicjerusalem was to surrender unconditionally, and the Crusaders were to be granted safe conduct out of the region, provided that they paid a fixed ran-som.[86] The city surrendered on 27 Rajab 583/2 October 1187 and, according to `Imad al-Din al-Asfahani, it held more than 100,000 people, including Christian men, women and children.[87] Patriarch Heraclius and his priests each paid their ten dinars and left the walled city laden with gold and silver jew-ellery, relics by the cartload, and other artifacts from the Church of the Holy Sepulcher. In addition, the Crusaders stripped the churches of their orna-ments, carrying with them gold and silver vases, silk- and gold-embroidered curtains, as well as church treasures.[88]

Salah al-Din's brother al-Malik al-`Adil was so moved by this scene that he asked for 1,000 Crusader captives. Salah al-Din granted his request, and al-`Adil immediately freed them. Salah al-Din, in his turn, freed all of the aged[89] as a goodwill gesture and out of respect for the elderly. Another exam-ple of his magnanimity is that he sent his guard to proclaim throughout the city's streets that all old people who could not pay the ransom would be allowed to leave. They came from the Postern of St. Lazar, and their depar-ture lasted from sunrise until sunset.[90]

`Imad al-Din, Ibn al-Athir, and Abu Shama are among the historians who reported Salah al-Din's good conduct toward the many noble-women of Jerusalem, whom he allowed to leave without paying any ransom. For example, a Byzantine queen who had led a monastic life was not only allowed to leave thus, but was permitted to take all of her belongings and whatever else she wanted to take.[91] Another example was the wife of the cap-tured King Guy, who was allowed to leave the city unhindered with her ret-inue and associates. Salah al-Din even granted her safe conduct to visit her captive husband in Nablus.[92] Some of his commanders (e.g., the ruler of al-Bira) asked him to free 500 Armenians, as they were from their country. Muzaffar al-Din ibn `Ali Kuchuk requested the release of 1,000 captives,

claiming that they had come from al-Ruha (Edessa). Salah al-Din confirmed and granted his request.[93]

Runciman reports that some of the Crusader noble-women who had ransomed themselves came in tears to ask Salah al-Din what was going to happen to them, as their husbands or fathers had been killed or captured. He promised to free their husbands and gave money and gifts from his own treasury to the widows and orphans, according to their need.[94] Runciman comments that this was in stark contrast to the deeds of the Crusader conquerors of the First Crusade, who indulged themselves in killing, creating refugees, and destroying all in their path.[95]

As the Crusaders were leaving, Salah al-Din assigned to them officers whose job was to ensure their safe arrival in Christian-held territories.[96] Regan quotes one chronicler, without specifying his name, who gave Salah al-Din's officers credit for their humane treatment of the refugees. These officers, "who could not endure the suffering of the refugees, ordered their squires to dismount and set aged Christians upon their steeds. Some of them even carried Christian children in their arms."[97]

`Imad al- Din was amazed at the amount of treasure the departing Latins carried away. He reported to Salah al-Din that these treasures had a possible value of 200,000 dinars and reminded him that he had agreed to the Latins' request for safe conduct for themselves and their own property, but not for that of the churches. Thus, he advised that such treasures not be left in Crusader hands. However, Salah al-Din rejected his proposal:

> If we interpret the treaty [now] against their interest, they will accuse us
> of treachery. Let us deal with them according to the wording of the treaty
> so they may not accuse the believers of breaking the covenant. Instead,
> they will talk of the favors that we have bestowed upon them.[98]

In the words of John Esposito: "The Muslim army was as magnanimous in victory as it had been tenacious in battle. Civilians were spared; churches and shrines were generally left untouched ... Salah al-Din was faithful to his word and compassionate toward non-combatants."[99] Salah al-Din's magnanimity toward both Crusader and native Christians contrasted sharply with the attitude of the victorious Crusaders in 492/1099. The taking of Islamicjerusalem is in itself enough to reveal that Salah al-Din was a chivalric and fair-minded man. His behavior was recognized as such by both the Muslim and Christian worlds as being that of a man possessed of great generosity, remarkable magnanimity, and compassion toward his enemies. The behavior of the Muslims in Islamicjerusalem was impeccable.

Salah al-Din's first action toward the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, the holiest place in the Christian world, was to order its closure for three days[100] so that the situation could calm down and life could to return to the region, as suggested by al-`Arif.[101] It also seems that this action was intended to give him and the Muslims enough time to discuss the church's future, especially after a long and tiring war. Some of his advisers called for its destruction in the hope that this would end the Christians' interest in Islamicjerusalem as a site for visits and pilgrimage. `Imad al-Din states that:

> Salah al-Din discussed with his people the issue of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher. Among them were those who advised that its structures be demolished, its traces blotted out, the way to visiting it blinded, its statues removed, its candelabras extinguished, its gospels destroyed, its seductions removed, and its pronouncements exposed as lies…[102]

However, the majority rejected this, arguing that it was the site and not the building that mattered, and that Christians would still make pilgrimage there due to the site's spirit and sanctity. Moreover, they argued that `Umar had never taken any such action against the holy places, but rather had confirmed the Christians' right to the church.[103] Salah al-Din was persuaded by the majority's opinion. After three days of closure, he reopened the church and granted the Christians the freedom toworship there. However, Crusader pilgrims were only admitted after they paid a fee, as agreed to earlier.[104]

To sum up, when Salah al-Din conquered the city, he did not need to invent and issue a new assurance. To him, `Umar's assurance was the most valid and applicable practice, as emphasized in this section.

Analysis

Recognizing other religions, encouraging diversity and pluralism, and implementing Islamic tolerance and mutual respect will lead to peaceful co-existence, which is greatly needed in a multicultural society. Immediately after liberating Islamicjerusalem both times, Muslims implemented their vision toward its non-Muslims and etablished a multicultural society where, for the first time ever in the city's long and often bloody history, Muslims and non-Muslims lived alongside each other in co-operation and peace.

`Umar's assurance of safety defined the non-Muslim residents' rights and obligations, the most important of which was to pay the *jizyah* to the Muslim government and thereby enter into the *dhimmah* contract. It is, therefore, quite useful to explain what exactly is meant by the *jizyah* tax and

the *dhimmah* contract. The latter was a contract of protection[105] made with Christians, Jews, and all others judged to be among the People of the Book, in addition to any other non-Muslim,[106] after they agreed to be ruled by the Muslims and pay the *jizyah*. Consequently, all of the empire's people were to be treated justly, regardless of their different religions.

As for the *dhimmah* pacts, al-Buti, a leading contemporary Syrian jurist, argues that this contract could be no more than a *bay`ah* (a pledge of allegiance to obey the laws and pursue the public interest) that took place between the ruler and the ruled.[107] No one could be excluded from it, as they were regarded as inhabitants of the empire[108] or, as described by contemporary scholars, holders of Muslim state citizenship (*al-jinsiyah al-islamiyah*).[109] The only difference was that Muslims had to take this *bay`ah* as a religious duty,[110] whereas for non-Muslims it was a fulfillment of their treaty with Muslims to secure protection.

Al-Buti argues that the non-Muslims' *jizyah* is similar to the Muslims' zakah,[111] the only difference being that Muslims pay zakah to the treasury as part of their religious duty and worship while *dhimmis* pay *jizyah* to fulfill their pact with the Muslims. The non-Muslims pay lower amounts under the name of *jizyah*, which goes to the Muslim ruler to be spent on protecting the realm.[112] Moreover, if a non-Muslim participated in military service during a particular year, he was exempted from the *jizyah* for that year.[113] The state was also obligated to return the *jizyah* if it could not protect them, as `Umar ibn al-Khattab had to in at least one instance.

It can be argued that exempting non-Muslims from military service made sense, because it was illogical to ask them to fight for the sake of Islam. This would be like making them practice a system of worship without a basic belief. However, non-Muslims could decide to participate in military service for other reasons, such as defending the land in which they were living. The *dhimmah* contract signed with the people of Islamicjerusalem during those two periods was a recognition of the "others," a recognition that Muslims and *dhimmis* were to live alongside each other in peace. Clearly `Umar and Salah al-Din's treatment of the Jews and Christians reflected the Islamic vision of how to treat non-Muslims: "Allah forbids you not, with regard to those who fight you not for (your) faith nor drive you out of your homes, from dealing kindly and justly with them, for Allah loves those who are just" (Qur'an, 60:8).

The results of the first Muslim conquest contrast significantly with the destruction, killing, and displacement that had characterized the region's history until then.[114] The teachings of Islam, prevented Salah al-Din from com-

mitting barbaric actions similar to those carried out by the Crusaders. Briefly, the concept of "forgiveness with capability" (*al-`afū `ind al-maqdirah*) was in his mind at that time.

In general, the basis for the rules of how to treat non-Muslims under Muslim rule is sought in the Qur'an and in the Prophet's manner of dealing with certain non-Muslim communities, and that of his immediate successors. Guidelines in the Qur'an and the Sunnah speak of strengthening and cementing the relationship between Muslims and non-Muslims.

Conclusion

By using `Umar and Salah al-Din's treatment of Christians and Jews in Islamicjerusalem as case studies, I examined how they established a multicultural society. Their understanding of non-Muslims' rights and recognition of the two communities' needs engendered a flourishing multicultural society that provided an atmosphere for peaceful co-existence. Hence, this research supports El-`Awaisi's argument that Islamicjerusalem can be considered a model for a multicultural society. Multiculturalism, a vital and crucial element of a society, can become a convenient and indispensable mechanism for fostering diversity among different cultures and religions. This approach tends to perpetuate, rather than challenge, views about the differences of other religions. The Muslims' inclusive vision for Islamicjerusalem, which involved recognizing others, fostering diversity and pluralism, implementing Islamic tolerance and mutual respect, led to peaceful co-existence.

In light of the above analysis, I suggest that those who study this region should investigate this topic using different case studies in Islamicjerusalem throughout Muslim history. The underlying lesson from this research is that, in terms of multiculturalism, diversity, and cultural sensitivity, Islamicjerusalem gives us a model of a common space in which people from different religions, ethnic groups, and cultural and linguistic backgrounds can live together in peace, tolerance, and harmony. Both `Umar and Salah al-Din encouraged inclusivity and rejected the policies of exclusivity and bigotry that had dominated the region before their conquests.

Endnotes

1. In this research, I use *Islamicjerusalem* as one word. This is not accidental, but rather the result of serious academic debate that sees it as a developing concept that can help us understand the whole dynamics of this region in its historical, sociological, anthropological, theological, and political perspectives. There-

fore, I use this term to emphasize that Islamicjerusalem is a new terminology for a new concept; to distinguish between *Islamicjerusalem* and *Muslim Jerusalem* (the period when Muslims ruled Islamicjerusalem for several centuries should be called *Muslim Jerusalem* instead of *Islamicjerusalem*); and to clarify that Islamicjerusalem refers to a region and not to a city.

2. `Abd al-Fattah El-`Awaisi is principal and vice chancellor of Al-Maktoum Institute for Arabic and Islamic Studies, Scotland (UK); chair in Islamicjerusalem Studies; and director of the Centre for Islamicjerusalem Studies.

3. `Abd al-Fattah El-`Awaisi, *Introducing Islamicjerusalem* (Dundee: Al-Maktoum Institute Academic Press, 2005), 14. As regards Islamicjerusalem being "a unique region," Khalid El-`Awaisi argues that it includes the walled city of Islamicjerusalem, Ramla, `Ascalan, Kusayfa, Sougar, Ma'ab, Hebron, Nablus, Jericho and many others towns and cities. See Khalid El-`Awaisi, "Geographical Boundaries of Islamicjerusalem," *Journal of Islamicjerusalem Studies* 6, no. 1 (2005): 175-92.

4. El-`Awaisi, *Introducing Islamicjerusalem*, 105.

5. Maher Abu-Munshar, "A Historical Study of Muslim Treatment of Christians in Islamicjerusalem at the Time of `Umar Ibn al-Kha"āb and Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn with Special Reference to the Islamic Value of Justice" (Ph.D. thesis, Al-Maktoum Institute for Arabic and Islamic Studies, Univ. of Abertay Dundee, 2003), 268.

6. For example, Caliph al-Hakim al-Fatimi treated the Christians of Islamicjerusalem and elsewhere strictly. For example, he ordered them to wear certain colored clothes to distinguish themselves from Muslims and heavy wooden crosses around their necks, and prohibited them from celebrating some religious ceremonies. He also ordered most of the churches in Islamicjerusalem destroyed, including the Church of the Holy Sepulcher. See Ibn al-Jawzi, *Al-Muntazam fi Tārīkh al-Muluk wa al-Umam* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-`Ilmiyyah, 1995), 15:60-61.

7. Shlomo Goitein, "Jerusalem in the Arab Period (638-1099)," in *The Jerusalem Cathedra – Studies in the History, Archaeology, Geography, and Ethnography of the Land of Israel,* ed. Lee I. Levine (Jerusalem: YAD Izhak Ben-Zvi Institute, 1982), 174.

8. W. C. Watson, *Multiculturalism* (Buckingham, UK: Open University Press, 2000), 1-2.

9. Charles Taylor, "The Politics of Recognition," in *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition,* ed. A. Gutman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 38.

10. Suzanne Audrey, *Multiculturalism in Practice: Irish, Jews, Italian, and Pakistani Migration to Scotland* (Hants: Ashgate, 2000); Barnor Hesse, *Un/settled Multiculturalisms, Diasporas, Entanglements, Transruptions* (London: Zed Books, 2000); Gerd Baumann, *The Multicultural Riddle: Rethinking National, Ethnic, and Religious Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1999).

11. El-`Awaisi, *Introducing Islamicjerusalem*, 63.

12. Othman Al-Tel, *The First Islamic Conquest of Aelia (Islamicjerusalem): A Critical Analytical Study of the Early Islamic Historical Narratives and Sources* (Dundee, UK: Al-Maktoum Institute Academic Press, 2003),109-20.

13. The Roman emperor Hadrian changed the city's name to Aelia in 135 after suppressing the Jewish revolt of Bar Cochba. See John Wilkinson, "Jerusalem under Rome and Byzantium: 63 BC-637 AD," in *Jerusalem in History,* ed. K. J. Asali (New York: Olive Branch Press, 1990), 88.

14. Karen Armstrong, "Sacred Space: The Holiness of Islamicjerusalem," *Journal of Islamicjerusalem Studies* 1, no. 1 (1997): 14.

15. `Azmi Muhammad Abu`lyan, *Al-Quds bayn al-Ihtilal wa al-Tahrir `abr al-`Usūr al-Qadimah wa al-Wusta wa al-Hadithah, (3000 B.C.-1967 C.E.)* (Al-Zarqa', Jordan: Mu'asassat Bakir li al-Dirasat al-Thaqafiyyah, 1993), 134.

16. Wilkinson, *Jerusalem under Rome and Byzantium*, 88: `Arif al-`Arif, *Al-Mufassal fi Tarikh al-Quds* (Jerusalem: Matba`at al-Ma`arif, 1986), 68; Abu-`lyan, *Al-Quds*, 132-33.

17. Abu-`lyan, *Al-Quds*, 136-37.

18. Al-Tabari, *Tarikh al-Umam wa al-Mulūk* (Beirut: Manshurat Muhammad `Ali Baydun, Dar al-Kutub al-`Ilmiyyah,1997), 2:448.

19. Khalil Sarkis, *Tarikh al-Quds al-Ma`rūf bi Tarikh Urshalim* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Thaqafah al-Diniyyah, 2001), 101

20. Abu-`lyan, *Al-Quds*, 127-33.

21. Bernard Hamilton, *The Christian World of the Middle Ages* (Stroud-Gloucester: Sutton Pub., 2003), 103.

22. Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades: The First Crusade and the Foundation of the Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 1:12-13.

23. Ibid., 1:12.

24. Ibid., 1:20.

25. Ibid., 1:20-21.

26. In his translation of *Sahih Muslim*, Siddiqi defines *jizyah* as "a tax, a sort of compensation to the Muslim State on the part of the non-Muslims living under the protection of the Muslim State for not participating in military service and enjoying the pact of protection (*Dhimma*)." Muslim, *Sahih Muslim,* tr. A. Siddiqi (Delhi: Adam Publishers and Distributors, 1996), 3:163.

27. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 1:20-21.

28. Leone Caetani, *Annali Dell Islam* (Millan: Ulrico Hoeli, 1910), 3:813-14.

29. Karen Armstrong, *A History of Jerusalem: One City, Three Faiths* (London: Harper Collins, 1996), 232.

30. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 1:6.

31. Armstrong, *A History of Jerusalem*, 233.

32. El-`Awaisi, *Introducing Islamicjerusalem*, 86.

33. *Dhimmah* literally means "pledge and guarantee." Ibn Manzur, *Lisan al `Arab* (Beirut: Dar Ihya' al-Turath al-`Arabi,1999), 5:59. See also Al-Fayruzabadi, *Al-Qamūs al-Muhit* (Beirut: Dar Ihya' al-Turath al-`Arabi, 1991), 4:162.

34. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, l:21.

35. Armstrong, *A History of Jerusalem*, 246.

36. Armstrong, *Sacred Space*, 19.

37. "O humanity. We created you from a single (pair) of a male and a female, and made you into nations and tribes, that you may know each other (not that you may despise each other). Verily the most honoured of you in the sight of Allah is (the one who is) the most righteous of you. And Allah has full knowledge and is well acquainted (with all things)" (Qur'an 49:13).

38. `Umar's assurance of safety to the people of Aelia (*al-`Uhdah al-`Umariyah*) is more commonly translated as "The Pact of `Umar." But in my opinion, this is confusing because of a fabricated document translated with the same name (*al-Shurūt al-`Umariyah*). The so-called Pact of `Umar enumerated humiliating and discriminatory conditions for Christians, conditions that are utterly foreign to `Umar's mentality, thought, and practice. Based on his consultation of Arabic primary sources, T. Arnold showed, in his *The Preaching of Islam* (pp. 56-59), that the pact, as a specific document, is at least a partial fabrication from a later period, since it contradicts what al-Tabari, for example, reports about `Umar's magnanimous treatment of Christians in Jerusalem. For more details about the Pact of 'Umar, see Abu-Munshar, *A Historical Study*, 97-122.

39. After searching the literature, it is obvious that not all historians have reported the text of `Umar's Assurance. Clearly, such early historians as al-Waqidi (d. 207/822), al-Baladhuri (d. 279/892), Ibn al-Athir (d. 630/1233), and Abu al-Fida' (d. 732/1313) were confined to mentioning its significance rather than the actual text itself. Other historians, such as al-Ya`qubi (d. 284/897), Patriarch of Alexandria Eutychius (Ibn al-Batriq) (d. 328/940), al-Tabari (d. 310/922), al-Himyari (d. 900/1494), Mujir al-Din al-Hanbali (d. 928/1521), and Ibn al-Jawzi (d. 597/1200) reported its text either in an abridged version or in full.

40. It is important to mention that al-Tabari was born at the end of 224/839. He began writing his history after 290/902 and completed it in 303/915. The version he provided is quoted from Sayf ibn `Umar (d. 170/786).

41. Al-Tabari, *Tarikh al-Umam*, 2:449. The English translation is quoted from El-`Awaisi, *Introducing Islamicjerusalem*, 72-74.

42. For example, Khalid ibn al-Walid presented a peace treaty to the people of Damascus in 14 AH. See al-Baladhuri, *Futūh al-Buldan* (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Ma`arif, 1987), 166. Another example is the peace treaty that `Ayyad Ibn Ghanam presented to the people of al-Jazirah in 17 AH. See al-Qasim Ibn Sallam Abu `Ubayd, *Kitab al-Amwal* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-`Ilmiyyah, 1986), 220.

43. Zakariyyah al-Quda, "Mu`ahadat Fath Bayt al-Maqdis: Al-`Uhdah al-`Umariyah," in *Bilad al-Sham fi Sadr al-Islam,* eds. Muhammad al-Bakhit and Ihsan `Abbas (Jordan: University of Jordan and University of Yarmuk, 1987), 276.

44. `Abd al-`Aziz al-Duri, "Jerusalem in the Early Islamic Period: 7th-11th Centuries AD," in *Jerusalem in History,* ed. K. J. `Asali (New York: Olive Branch Press, 1990), 107.

45. Muhammad al-Himyari, *Al-Rawd al-Mi`tar fi Khayr al-Aqtar* (Beirut: Maktabat Lubnan, 1984), 69.
46. Ibn al-Jawzi, *Fada'il al-Quds* (Beirut: Dar al-Afaq al-Jadidah, 1979), 123-24.
47. El-`Awaisi, *Introducing Islamicjerusalem*, 119.
48. "Allah forbids you not, with regard to those who fight you not for (your) faith nor drive you out of your homes, from dealing kindly and justly with them, for Allah loves those who are just. Allah only forbids you, with regard to those who fight you for (your) faith, and drive you out of your homes, and support (others) in driving you out, from turning to them (for friendship and protection). It is such as turn to them (in these circumstances) that do wrong" (Qur'an, 60:8-9).
49. El-`Awaisi, *Introducing Islamicjerusalem*, 102.
50. Goitein, "Jerusalem in the Arab Period (638-1099)," 174.
51. Ibid., 174.
52. Shafiq Jasir, *Tarikh al-Quds wa al-`Alaqah bayn al-Muslimin wa al-Masihiyin hatta al-Hurūb al-Salibiyah* (Amman: Matabi` al-Iman, 1989), 59-62.
53. Khalil `Athaminah, *Filastin fi Khamsat Qurūn: Min al-Fath al-Islami hatta al-Ghazw al-Faranji (634-1099)* (Palestine in Five Centuries: From the Islamic Conquest to the Frankish Invasion [634-1099]) (Beirut: Mu'asassat al-Dirasat al-Filastiniyyah, 2000), 144.
54. Ibid., 144.
55. Hamilton, *The Christian World*, 216.
56. Jasir, *Tarikh al-Quds*, 61.
57. Hamilton, *The Christian World*, 216.
58. A. L. Tibawi, *Jerusalem: Its Place in Islam and Arab History* (Beirut: The Institute for Palestine Studies, 1969), 11.
59. `Athaminah, *Filastin fi Khamsat Qurūn*, 144.
60. Jasir, *Tarikh al-Quds*, 184.
61. `Athaminah, *Filastin fi Khamsat Qurūn*, 144-45.
62. Jasir, *Tarikh al-Quds*, 62-63.
63. See Qur'an, 2:256. This verse was revealed to deal with the case of a Madinan man (from the tribe of Salim Ibn-`Awf) whose two sons had become Christians before Prophet Muhammad began the call to Islam. The father insisted that they convert. They refused and he took the case to the Prophet. Then the revelation "There is to be no compulsion in religion" came.
64. El-`Awaisi, *Introducing Islamicjerusalem*, 148.
65. Sawirus Ibn al-Muqaffa', *Tarikh Batarikat al-Kanisah al-Misriyah, al-Ma`rūf bi Siyar al-Bay`ah al-Muqaddasah*, ed. Y. `Abd al-Masih and `A. Suriyal (Cairo: 1959), vol. 2, part. 2, p. 249.
66. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 2:464-65.
67. Sa`id `Abd al-Fattah `Ashur, *Al-Harakah al-Salibiyah: Safhah Musharifah fi Tarikh al-Jihad al-Islami fi al-`Usūr al-Wusta* (Cairo: Maktabt al-Anjlu al-Masriyyah, 1986), 2:645.

68. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 2:464-65.
69. T. W. Arnold, *The Preaching of Islam: A History of the Propagation of the Muslim Faith* (London: Constable and Co.,1986), 96.
70. Abu-Munshar, "A Historical Study," 236-39.
71. Baha' al-Din ibn Shaddad, *Al-Nawadir al-Sultaniyah wa al-Mahasin al-Yūsufiyah* (Cairo: Dar al-Manar, 2000), 151-52. See also D. S. Richards, *The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin* (or *Al-Nawadir al-Sultaniyah wa al-Mahasin al-Yūsufiyah*, tr. Ibn Shaddad, or *Al-Nawadir al-Sultaniyah wa al-Mahasin al-Yūsufiyah* [Hants: Ashgate, 2001], 185-86); `Abd al-Rahman ibn Isma'il Abu-Shama, *Kitab al-Rawdatayn fi Akhbar al-Dawlatayn al-Nūriyah wal al-Salahiyah* (Beirut: Mu'asassat al-Risalah, 1997), 4:285-86.
72. Ibn Shaddad, *Al-Nawadir*, 152. See also Richards, *The Rare and Excellent History*, 186; Abu Shama, *Kitab al-Rawdatayn*, vol. 4:286.
73. Abu Munshar, "A Historical Study," 245.
74. Mustafa Hiyari, "Crusader Jerusalem (1099-1187 A.D)," in *Jerusalem in History,* ed. K. J. `Asali (New York: Olive Branch Press, 1990), 170.
75. Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Kamil fi al-Tarikh* (Beirut: Manshurat Muhammad `Ali Baydun, Dar al-Kutub al-`Ilmiyyah, 1998), 10:218; Ibn Shaddad, *Al-Nawadir*, 191.
76. Hasan Habashi, *Al-Harb al-Salibiyah al-Thalithah* (Salah al-Din and Richard), tr. Willaim Stubbs, (Egypt: Al-Hay'ah al-Misriyyah al-`Ammah li al-Kitab, 2000), 1:274-77. (*Itinerarum Peregrinorum et gesta Regis Ricardi.*)
77. Al-Asfahani, *Kitab al-Fath al-Qussi fi al-Fath al-Qudsi* (Cairo: n.d.), 47-48; Abu-Shama, *Kitab al-Rawdatayn*, 3:158. Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Kamil*, 10:158; Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 2:467.
78. Al-Asfahani, *Kitab al-Fath al-Qussi*, 48.
79. Arnold, *The Preaching of Islam*, 91.
80. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 2:467-68.
81. Ashur, *Al-Harakah al-Salibiyah*, 2:649.
82. Sawirus ibn al-Muqaffa', *Tarikh Batarikat al-Kanisah al-Misriyah*, vol. 2, part 2, p. 249.
83. Shuhada Khuri and Niqula Khuri, *Khūlasat Tarikh Kanisat Urshalim al-Orthūthiksiyah* (Jerusalem: Matba`at Bayt al-Maqdis, 1925), 78-80.
84. Sa`id `Abd al-Fattah `Ashur, "Ba`d Adwa' Jadidah `ala al-`Alaqat bayn Misr wa al-Habashah fi al-`Usūr al-Wusta," *Al-Majallah al-Misriyah al-Tarikhiyah*, no. 14 (1968): 22.
85. Ibid.
86. Al-Asfahani, *Kitab al-Fath al-Qussi*, 43; Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Kamil,* 10:156; Ibn Shaddad, *Al-Nawadir*, 53; Ibn Kathir, *Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr, 1978), 12:323; Isma'il ibn `Ali Abu al-Fida', *Tarikh Abi al-Fida' al-Musamma Al-Mukhtasar fi Akhbar al-Bashar* (Beirut: Manshurat Muhammad `Ali Baydun, Dar al-Kutub al-`Ilmiyyah, 1997), 2:157; Grigurius al-Malti ibn al-`Ibri, *Tarikh Mukhtasar al-Dūwal* (Beirut: Dar al-Mashriq, 1992), 221.

87. Al-Asfahani, *Kitab al-Fath al-Qussi*, 43.
88. Ibid., 47.
89. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 2:466; Stanley Lane-Poole, *Saladin and the Fall of the Kingdom of Jerusalem* (London, Darf Pubs., 1985), 231-32.
90. Lane-Poole, *Saladin*, 232.
91. Al-Asfahani, *Kitab al-Fath al-Qussi*, 43, Abu Shama, *Kitab al-Rawdatayn*, 3:343, Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Kamil*, 10:157; Mujir al-Din al-Hanbali, *Al-Uns al-Jalil bi Tarikh al-Quds wa al-Khalil* (Hebron: Maktabat Dandis, 1999), 1:474.
92. Al-Asfahani, *Kitab al-Fath al-Qussi*, 43; Abu Shama, *Kitab al-Rawdatayn*, 3:343, Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Kamil*, 10:157; al-Hanbali, *Al-Uns al-Jalil*, 1:474.
93. Al-Asfahani, *Kitab al-Fath al-Qussi*, 44. See also M. Lyons and D. Jackson, *Saladin: The Politics of the Holy War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 257.
94. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 2:466.
95. Ibid.
96. Ibn Shaddad, *Al-Nawadir*, 53. See also Geoffrey Regan, *Saladin and the Fall of Jerusalem* (Kent: Croom Helm, 1987), 153.
97. Regan, *Saladin*, 153.
98. Al-Asfahani, *Kitab al-Fath al-Qussi*, 47. See also Ibn al-Athir, *Al-Kamil*, 10:157; Abu Shama, *Kitab al-Rawdatayn*, 3:401.
99. John. L. Esposito, *Islam: The Straight Path* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 59.
100. Al-Asfahani, *Kitab al-Fath al-Qussi*, 35; Abu-Shama, *Kitab al-Rawdatayn*, 3:402. See also Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 2:468.
101. Al-`Arif, *Al-Mufassal fi Tarikh al-Quds*, 176.
102. Al-Asfahani, *Kitab al-Fath al-Qussi*, 53-54.
103. Ibid.; Abu-Shama, *Kitab al-Rawdatayn*, 3:402; Ibn Kathir, *Al-Bidayah*, 12:327; al-Hanbali, *Al-Uns al-Jalil*, 1:485.
104. Al-Maqrizi, *Al-Sulūk li Ma`rifat Diwal al-Mulūk* (Beirut: Manshurat Muhammad Ali Baydun, Dar al-Kutub al-`Ilmiyyah, 1997), 1:210-11.
105. Al-Baladhuri reported the story where the Muslim armies were unable to provide protect some cities in al-Sham and had to withdraw from them after realizing that the Byzantines were preparing to attack. As a result, the Muslims returned the *jizyah* to the *dhimmis*. See al-Baladhuri, *Futūh al-Buldan*, 187.
106. Al-Sadiq al-Ghiryani, *Mudawanat al-Fiqh al-Maliki wa Adilatih* (Beirut: Mu'asassat al-Rayan, 2002), 2:454.
107. Muhammad Sa`id Ramadan al-Buti, "Mu`amalat al-Dawlah Islamiyah li Ghayr al-Muslimin: Al-Quds Namūthajan," *Journal of Islamicjerusalem Studies* 3, no.1, (1999):8.
108. Al-Sarkhasi, *Kitab al-Mabsūt* (Beirut: Manshurat Muhammad `Ali Baydun, Dar al-Kutub al-`Ilmiyyah, 2001), vol. 5, part 10, p. 87; `Ala' al-Din Abi Bakr Ibn Mas`ud al-Kasani, *Bada'i` al-Sani' fi Tartib al-Shara'i`* (Beirut: Manshurat Muhammad `Ali Baydun, Dar al-Kutub al-`Ilmiyyah, 1997), 9:427.

109. `Abd al-Qadir `Udah, *Al-Tashri` al-Jina'i al-Islami Muqaranan bi al-Qanūn al-Wad`i* (Cairo: Maktabat Dar al-Turath, n.d.), 1:338. See also 'Abd al-Karim Zaydan, *Ahkam al-Dhimmiyin wa al-Musta'minin fi Dar al-Islam* (Baghdad: Maktabat al-Quds, 1982), 63-64.

110. Prophet Muhammad said: "Whoever (referring to Muslims) dies without a pledge (*bay`ah*) dies as one belonging to the days of Jahiliyyah (ignorance)."

111. Al-Buti, *Mu`amalat al-Dawlah al-Islamiyah*, 8-9.

112. Ibid.

113. For example, al-Baladhuri says that one of the terms in the treaty between Maslamah ibn `Abd al-Malik (an army chief of al-Walid ibn `Abd al-Malik) and al-Jarajimah (a Christian tribe in al-Sham) was that the latter would be exempt from paying the *jizyah* and would have to participate in the Muslim war. See al-Baladhuri, *Futūh al-Buldan*, 220. It is worth mentioning that Imam al-Shafi`i permitted non-Muslims to fight on the side of Muslims based on some examples, such as when a number of the Banu Qaynaqa' tribe's Jews joined the Muslims in their war after Badr, and Safwan's (a non-Muslim) joining the Muslim at the battle of Hunayn. However, Abu Hanifah and Malik did not allow this practice. See al-Mawardi, *Al-Hawi al-Kabir* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr, 1994),18:144-45.

114. El-`Awaisi, *Introducing Islamicjerusalem*, 63.