

Ibn Wāṣil: An Ayyūbid Perspective on Frankish Lordships and Crusades

Konrad Hirschler

Ibn Wāṣil (604/1208–697/1298) was a relatively prominent scholar and administrator who had close links with the political and military elites of Ayyūbid- and early Mamlūk-period Egypt and Syria throughout his career.¹ Partly due to these relations he held a variety of posts, ranging from teaching appointments in Ayyūbid Jerusalem and early Mamlūk Cairo, via positions as *qāḍī* in Egypt and Ḥamā, to his role as Mamlūk ambassador to the court of the Hohenstaufen ruler Manfred (d. 1266) in southern Italy. In addition, he served as Ayyūbid ambassador to Baghdad and (probably as *kātib* [secretary]) at the provincial Ayyūbid courts of Ḥamā and Kerak.

Ibn Wāṣil was born into a middle-ranking family of scholars and administrators in the northern Syrian town of Ḥamā. Although his family was not the kind that was able to monopolise posts in the town over long periods in the same way that the Banu'l-Bārīzī did at the turn of the seventh/thirteenth and eighth/fourteenth centuries,² Ibn Wāṣil's father held various teaching posts in Ḥamā and its surrounding towns, as well as the position of chief *qāḍī* there. Ibn Wāṣil's maternal uncle Burhān al-Dīn Ismā'īl Ibn Abi'l-Damm was one of the notables of the town and, together with his cousin Shihāb al-Dīn Ibrāhīm Ibn Abi'l-Damm (d. 642/1244), was involved in the deposition of the town's ruler

- 1 On Ibn Wāṣil and the relevant primary and secondary sources see: K. Hirschler, *Medieval Arabic Historiography: Authors as Actors* (London, 2006), pp. 18–28; D.S. Richards, 'Ibn Wāṣil, Historian of the Ayyubids', in R. Hillenbrand and S. Auld (eds), *Ayyubid Jerusalem* (London, 2009), 456–59; K. Hirschler, 'Social Contexts of Medieval Arabic Historical Writing: Court Scholars Versus Ideal/Withdrawn Scholars—Ibn Wāṣil and Abū Šāma', in U. Vermeulen and J. Van Steenberghe (eds), *Egypt and Syria in the Fatimid, Ayyubid and Mamluk Eras IV* (Leuven, 2005), 311–31; K. Hirschler, 'Ibn Wāṣil', in *EMC*, vol. 1, p. 842.
- 2 Three members of the Bārīzī family held the position of chief *qāḍī* in Ḥamā for some sixty years in the period after 652/1254–55: Ibrāhīm b. al-Musallam b. Hibat Allāh (652/1254–55 to 669/1270–71; cf. al-Dhahabī, *Ta'riḫ al-Islām wa-wafayāt al-mashāhīr wa'l-a'lām*, ed. 'U. Tadmurī, 55 vols [Beirut, 1987–2000], vol. LII, p. 276), 'Abd al-Raḥīm b. Ibrāhīm b. Hibat Allāh (669/1270–71 to 670/1271–72; cf. al-Šafadī, *al-Wāfi bi'l-wafayāt*, ed. H. Ritter et al., 27 vols [Istanbul, 1931–97], vol. XVIII, pp. 317–19), and Hibat Allāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥīm b. Ibrāhīm b. Hibat Allāh (699/1271–72 to mid-730s/1330s; cf. Abu'l-Fidā', *al-Mukhtaṣar fī akhbār al-baṣhar*, s.n., 4 vols [Cairo, 1907], vol. IV, p. 124).

al-Malik al-Nāṣir in 626/1229. Shihāb al-Dīn was also the chief *qāḍī* of Ḥamā for twenty years from 622/1225.³ To cite a final example, a paternal cousin of Ibn Wāṣil, Sa'd Allāh b. Wāṣil (d. 673/1275), served as a physician at the court of Ḥamā.⁴

Although Ibn Wāṣil was trained in the religious sciences and held positions as *mudarris* and *qāḍī*, his scholarly fame rested on his learning in fields such as logic, in which 'he rose like the sun'.⁵ In contrast, his biographers scarcely noted his activities in religious disciplines. An isolated reference to *fiqh*,⁶ some references to hadith, and his activities as a *Mufti* pale in comparison with the constant references to logic. Ibn Wāṣil pursued his interest in the rational sciences mainly in Kerak and Ḥamā, the two places renowned for these disciplines in Syria and Egypt during his lifetime. For instance, Ibn Wāṣil spent several years in Kerak during the late 620s-early 630s/first half of 1230s, during which time he studied the 'theoretical sciences' with scholars such as 'Abd al-Ḥamīd b. 'Alī al-Khusrūshāhī (d. 652/1254).⁷ When Ibn Wāṣil subsequently moved back to his home town he continued these studies and in 641/1243–44 he assisted the astronomer and mathematician 'Alam al-Dīn Qayṣar (d. 649/1251) to construct an astrolabe for the ruler of Ḥamā.⁸

Owing to his interest in the rational sciences, Ibn Wāṣil composed a total of four works on logic—a number only equalled by his historical works. Two of these were commentaries on treatises by his teacher al-Khūnajī (d. 646/1248), who was the most outstanding scholar of the rational sciences in Egypt during his lifetime.⁹ His commentary on al-Khūnajī's *al-Jumal fi'l-mantiq* ('The Sum of Logic') seems to have been Ibn Wāṣil's most popular work in the field, with four copies surviving—of which three were produced either during his lifetime or

3 On Shihāb al-Dīn Ibn Abī'l-Damm, see Abu'l-Fidā', *Mukhtaṣar*, vol. III, p. 173; al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rikh*, vol. L, p. 112; al-Ṣafadī, *Wāfi*, vol. VI, pp. 33–34; R.S. Humphreys, *From Saladin to the Mongols. The Ayyubids of Damascus, 1193–1260* (Albany NY, 1977), p. 262.

4 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrīj al-kurūb fi akhbār Banī Ayyūb*, eds J. al-Shayyāl, Ḥ. al-Rabī' and S. 'Ashūr, vols 1–5 (Cairo 1953–77); ed. M. Rahim, vol. 6, as *Die Chronik des ibn Wasil. Kritische Edition des letzten Teils (646/1248–659/1261) mit Kommentar. Untergang der Ayyubiden und Beginn der Mamlukenherrschaft* (Wiesbaden, 2010) (the edition of the 6th part by 'U. Tadmurī [Sidon, 2004] is inferior), vol. v, p. 227; al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rikh*, vol. LIII, p. 130.

5 Al-Ṣafadī, *A'yān al-'aṣr wa-a'wān al-naṣr*, ed. F. Bakkūr, 4 vols (Beirut, 1998), vol. IV, p. 1660: '*bara'a fi'l-'ulūm al-shar'iyya wa-tala'a ka'l-shams fi'l-'ulūm al-'aqliyya*'.

6 Abu'l-Fidā', *Mukhtaṣar*, vol. IV, p. 38.

7 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrīj*, vol. v, p. 35: '*al-'ulūm al-naẓariyya*'.

8 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrīj*, vol. v, pp. 342–44.

9 Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ṭabaqāt al-shāfi'iyya*, ed. 'A. Khān, 4 vols (Beirut, 1987), vol. II, p. 125: '*bālagha fi 'ulūm al-awā'il ḥattā tafarrada bi-rī'āsāt dhālika fi zamānihī*'.

in the following fifty years.¹⁰ Ibn Wāṣil's only other surviving work on logic is the treatise *al-Risāla al-anbrūrīyya* ('The Imperial Treatise'), which he originally wrote for Manfred, ruler of southern Italy, and which he later reworked under the title *Nukhbat al-fikar fi'l-mantiq* ('The Pick of Reflection on Logic').¹¹

Although Ibn Wāṣil's contributions to the field were not particularly significant,¹² they earned him the hostility of later writers; Ibn Taymiyya, for example, described him in his treatise against logic as a 'leading philosopher'.¹³ Ibn Wāṣil stood in the tradition of the Western school of logic, as it had developed in the preceding century.¹⁴ The leading figure in the development of this school had been Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209) who had himself taught several of Ibn Wāṣil's teachers, most importantly al-Khūnājī, al-Khusrūshāhī and the Egyptian chief physician Ibn al-Nafīs (d. 687/1288). The indirect influence of al-Rāzī on Ibn Wāṣil was not limited to the field of logic. Ibn Wāṣil's only work close to the field of the religious sciences was a summary of a theological work by al-Rāzī: *Mukhtaṣar al-arba'īn fi uṣūl al-dīn* ('The Summary of [the] Forty [Questions] on the Bases of Religion').¹⁵ The summary was not widely popular, and no manuscript of it has apparently survived. However, it is significant that Ibn Wāṣil's only work dealing with problems related to religious questions in a narrow sense dealt with issues of speculative theology (*kalām*).

Finally, Ibn Wāṣil held a degree of fame for his work in the field of poetry. He summarized the fourth/tenth-century work *Kitāb al-aghānī*, which contained songs performed at various rulers' courts. In the preface to his summary, entitled *Tajrīd al-Aghānī*, he stated that he had undertaken the work at the request of the ruler of Ḥamā, al-Malik al-Manṣūr, and it enjoyed limited local success.¹⁶ His second study on poetry was a commentary on a work on

10 Cf. Hirschler, *Medieval Arabic Historiography*, p. 60. The three dated manuscripts were copied around 680/1281, in 738/1337–38 and in 746/1345.

11 The only manuscript is in the Reinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University, no. 1406 with the title *Nukhbat al-fikar fi tathqīf al-nazar*; copied in 680/1281 by one Yūsuf b. Ghanā'im al-Sāmīrī in Ḥamā from an autograph draft manuscript (f. 133r/v).

12 N. Rescher, *The Development of Arabic Logic* (Pittsburgh, 1964), p. 199.

13 Ibn Taymiyya, *Jahd al-qāhira fi tajrīd al-naṣiḥa* (translation of al-Suyūṭī's abridgement: W.B. Hallaq, *Ibn Taymīya against the Greek Logicians* [Oxford, 1993], p. 59).

14 Cf. Rescher, *Development*, pp. 64–67, on the development of the Western and Eastern schools.

15 Ibn Wāṣil's student Ibn al-Akfānī (d. 749/1348) cited it as *Lubāb al-arba'īn* (*Gist of the Forty*); see Ibn al-Akfānī, *Kitāb irshād al-qāṣid ilā asnā al-maqāṣid*, ed. J.J. Witkam (Leiden, 1989), pp. 43–44.

16 Three manuscripts of this work have been preserved (cf. C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*, supplement vols I–III [Leiden, 1937–42], rev. ed. vols I and II

metrics by his teacher Ibn al-Ḥājjib: it was the first of a series of commentaries and summaries which were produced in the following century.¹⁷ Ibn Wāṣil's remaining writings on astronomy and medicine were also not very popular, and no extant manuscripts of them are known.¹⁸

Building on his education and family network Ibn Wāṣil succeeded in forging a remarkable transregional career, moving with ease between positions in the administration, judiciary and education posts in Cairo and Syrian cities. His father and, especially, Shihāb al-Dīn, who had lived in Cairo, Damascus and Aleppo, were key figures in introducing Ibn Wāṣil to important members of the scholarly, political and military elite of the Ayyūbid period. Ibn Wāṣil secured his first full teaching position, for instance, in a *madrasa* in Jerusalem in 624/1227 at the age of 20 (lunar years) by standing in as a replacement for his father who had left to go on the Hajj and for an extended stay in Mecca.¹⁹ In the following decades Ibn Wāṣil established himself as a prominent member of the section of the scholarly elite, the *ʿulamāʾ*, that maintained close ties with courts and who also often served in administrative positions, in a similar manner to his contemporary Ibn al-ʿAdīm.²⁰

Of particular importance in his network, and also as a source for his chronicle, was the *amīr* Ḥusām al-Dīn al-Hadhabānī (d. 658/1260), with whom Ibn Wāṣil had a particularly close friendship and client-patron relationship. Ḥusām al-Dīn had begun his career as an officer in Ibn Wāṣil's home town of Ḥamā, where the Hadhabānī family belonged to the military elite. Ḥusām al-Dīn later entered the service of the Egyptian Ayyūbid Sultan al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb (d. 647/1249), first becoming one of his advisors, after which he was tutor (*Atābeg*) to his young son al-Malik al-Muʿazzam Tūrānshāh (d. 648/1250) in Ḥiṣn Kayfa, then al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ's mayor of the palace (major-domo, *ustādh al-dār*), and finally viceroy of Egypt.²¹ On account of this close relationship

[Leiden, 1943–49], S. vol. 1, p. 226). MS London—BL. Add. 7339 was copied in early twelfth/late seventeenth-century Ḥamā by the Shaykh of the ʿUlwān Mosque.

17 Ḥajjī Khalīfa (Kātib Ḥelebī), *Kashf al-zunūn fī asāmī al-kutub wa'l-funūn*, ed. Ş. Yalçakaya and K.R. Bilge, 2 vols (Istanbul, 1941–43), vol. 1, p. 1134. Ibn Wāṣil's commentary has survived in two manuscripts: MS Paris—BNF arabe 4451 and MS Princeton—Garrett Collection, no. 503.

18 Medicine: Summary of *al-Mufrada* by his teacher Ibn Bayṭār; astronomy: *Nukhbat al-amlāk fī hayʾat al-aflāk*.

19 This was in the Shāfiʿī Nāṣiriyya Madrasa, also called al-Madrasa al-Ṣalāḥiyya. On this *madrasa* see al-Nuʿaymī, *al-Dāris fī taʾriḫ al-madāris*, ed. J. al-Ḥasanī, 2 vols (Damascus, 1948–51), vol. 1, pp. 331–33; Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. IV, p. 208.

20 For this historian, see above, pp. 109–35.

21 Humphreys, *From Saladin to the Mongols*, pp. 251 and 290.

with Ḥusām al-Dīn, Ibn Wāṣil stayed at the officer's house after he had moved from Syria to Egypt in 643/1245 and they performed the Hajj to Mecca together in 649/1252.²² However, Ibn Wāṣil had not put all his eggs into one basket and after Ḥusām al-Dīn's fall from power in the Ayyūbid-Mamlūk transition period in the early 650s/1250s he was able to use his close relationships with other leading commanders and administrators to retain a prominent position within the newly emerging early Mamlūk elites.

For example, when Ibn Wāṣil went on the pilgrimage with Ḥusām al-Dīn they were accompanied by a third individual, 'Izz al-Dīn al-Afram (d. 695/1295), who was a rising star in the emerging Mamlūk sultanate. He became governor (*wālī*) of the upper-Egyptian town of Qūṣ in the early 650s/1250s and received the command of the royal household guard (*amīr jāndār*) under al-Malik al-Zāhir Baybars; with only short interruptions, he kept this post until his death.²³ Another military commander who was instrumental for Ibn Wāṣil in the transition period was Jamāl al-Dīn Aydughdī (d. 664/1265).²⁴ This *amīr* played a very important role in the Mamlūk government, especially under Baybars, who made him one of his trusted men and gave him a considerable *iqṭā'*. The ruler relied on his advice, particularly with regard to religious affairs and the appointment of judges. He was, for example, seen to have been influential in the introduction of a chief judge to each legal school (*madhhab*) in the Mamlūk realms in 663/1265.²⁵ Ibn Wāṣil was linked to Jamāl al-Dīn Aydughdī by ties of friendship and was present when Aydughdī was briefly arrested in his camp in 653/1255–56 because of his presumed involvement in a conspiracy against the then ruler Aybak (r. 648/1250–655/1257).²⁶

In his various appointments Ibn Wāṣil was a close observer of, and sometimes participant in, the political events of his lifetime. During the Ayyūbid period and the first decade of Mamlūk rule he was often at the centre of events, which makes this the most valuable part of his chronicle in terms of factual information. His chronicle ends at the point when his political career ceased in Syrian and Egyptian lands, in the 660s/1260s, and he returned to his home town

22 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. v, p. 334, and vol. vi, p. 128.

23 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. vi, p. 128. On al-Afram see al-Ṣafadī, *Wāfi*, vol. ix, p. 478; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm al-zāhira fī mulūk Miṣr wa'l-Qāhira*, ed. F.M. Shaltūt et al., 16 vols (Cairo, 1929–72), vol. viii, pp. 80–81; J.-C. Garcin, 'Le Caire et la province: Constructions au Caire et à Qūs sous les Mameluks Bahrides', *Annales Islamologiques* 8 (1969), 47–62, pp. 48–51.

24 Al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rikh*, vol. lii, pp. 172–73.

25 J.H. Escovitz, *The Office of Qādī al-Quḍāt in Cairo under the Bahārī Mamlūks* (Berlin, 1984), pp. 20–28.

26 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. vi, p. 133.

of Ḥamā and became the Shāfiʿī *qāḍī* there.²⁷ He remained in the town until his death in 697/1298 and there are no indications that he ever left it again.

On account of his close involvement with the political and military elites during his transregional years we repeatedly find him in army camps or observing military campaigns. For example, in 626/1229 he was in Damascus where he witnessed the intra-Ayyūbid conflict over the city and its siege by Egyptian troops;²⁸ some ten years later he accompanied the troops of al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb when the latter was in the process of establishing his authority in Syrian;²⁹ in 641/1244 Ibn Wāṣil passed through the army camp of the same ruler just before the battle of Ḥarbiyya/La Forbie in which the Ayyūbid-Frankish coalition of Syrian lords was defeated;³⁰ in 647/1250, during the Crusade of Louis IX, Ibn Wāṣil again spent several days in the Ayyūbid army camp in the Nile Delta;³¹ and, as discussed above, in 653/1255–56, during one of the early intra-Mamlūk conflicts, Ibn Wāṣil was in the Mamlūk army camp with the high-ranking officer Jamāl al-Dīn Aydughdī when the latter was arrested.³²

In the same vein, Ibn Wāṣil maintained good relationships with crucial players within the Ayyūbid family such as his patron al-Malik al-Nāṣir Dāʿūd (d. 656/1258), at whose court in Kerak he served. After his subsequent patron al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb, the last grand Ayyūbid sultan of Egypt, died in 647/1249, Ibn Wāṣil was amongst those who greeted the late sultan's son and successor al-Malik al-Muʿazzam Tūrānshāh upon his arrival in Egypt. Taking advantage of his link with Ḥusām al-Dīn, then viceroy of Egypt, Ibn Wāṣil immediately secured a place in the new ruler's entourage.³³ When the Mongols invaded northern Syria and refugees were arriving in Cairo, Ibn Wāṣil also grasped the opportunity, in 658/1260, to build up a close relationship with his future patron al-Malik al-Manṣūr (d. 683/1284), the ruler of Ḥamā.³⁴

Due to his involvement in Syrian-Egyptian politics Ibn Wāṣil also closely witnessed events linked to the Frankish presence in Syria and newly arriving Crusades. His reports are of particular importance when they are based on his

27 Al-Dhahabī, *Taʾriḫ*, vol. LV, p. 337.

28 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. IV, pp. 253–57.

29 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. V, pp. 210 and 231.

30 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. V, pp. 333–34.

31 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. VI, p. 59; P. Jackson, *The Seventh Crusade, 1244–1254: Sources and Documents* (Aldershot, 2007), p. 145.

32 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. VI, p. 133.

33 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. VI, pp. 59 and 64; cf. also vol. V, p. 296; Jackson, *Seventh Crusade*, p. 145.

34 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. VI, p. 213.

direct observations of developments on the Ayyūbid side during the major Crusades of the first half of the seventh/thirteenth century. Ibn Wāṣil was a very well-placed observer for such reports, in contrast to two other important chroniclers of the period, Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī and Abū Shāma, who were both much less involved in the political scene of their time and who both tended to have a purely Damascene outlook. In addition to his reports on Muslim reactions to newly arriving Crusades, the main value of his chronicle is his detailed reports on Ayyūbid/Mamlūk-Frankish diplomatic relationships in which, again, he was personally involved.

His most famous diplomatic endeavour, his mission in 659/1261 as Mamlūk envoy to the court of Manfred, son of Frederick II, meant Ibn Wāṣil was also relatively well acquainted with Latin European politics. We do not know exactly how long he remained in southern Italy, but it was for a prolonged period in Apulia, near Lucera, where he met the ruler.³⁵ Ibn Wāṣil was arguably chosen for this task because he had previous experience undertaking diplomatic missions. Some two decades earlier, in 641/1243, he had accompanied his relative Shihāb al-Dīn on a mission from the ruler of Ḥamā to Baghdad, where they stayed for two months.³⁶ On their way they also held talks with the rulers of Aleppo, Mardin and Mosul. Furthermore, they also held talks—with the help of a translator—with the leader of a new outside force that had started to play a role in Syrian politics at this time, the Khwārazmians, who had recently arrived from the East. From the various positions he held at a number of courts, Ibn Wāṣil was also well acquainted with diplomatic ritual and negotiation; some two years after his mission to Baghdad, for instance, he was among the courtiers of al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb who welcomed the envoy from Baghdad bringing with him the caliphal insignia for the Egyptian ruler.³⁷

Ibn Wāṣil may also have been appointed to the diplomatic mission to southern Italy because he had been such a close observer of diplomatic contacts between the Ayyūbids and Mamlūks on the one hand and the Franks and Latin Europeans on the other. This stance is reflected throughout his chronicle, which displays much less of a 'jihadist' outlook towards the Franks of Syria

35 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. IV, pp. 234 and 248–51 (tr. F. Gabrieli, *Arab Historians of the Crusades*, tr. E.J. Costello [Berkeley/Los Angeles, 1969], pp. 268 and 277); Abu'l-Fidā', *Mukhtaṣar*, vol. IV, pp. 38–39 (tr. P.M. Holt as *The Memoirs of a Syrian Prince* [Wiesbaden, 1983], pp. 31–32). Ibn Wāṣil does not comment on the purpose of this mission, but it was arguably aimed at building up an anti-Īlkhānate coalition in the framework of the increasing Mamlūk-Īlkhānate conflicts from 1260 onwards.

36 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. V, pp. 323–26.

37 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. V, p. 352.

and the Hohenstaufen rulers of southern Italy than other scholars and chroniclers of his period, such as Abū Shāma. This non-jihadist outlook goes back to two main factors in Ibn Wāṣil's background. First of all, he was not only interested in exclusively Islamic fields of knowledge such as Islamic law, but he also pursued other disciplines such as logic and philosophy that facilitated communication across religious borders. It was certainly not by chance that his most important teacher, 'Alam al-Dīn, had been asked by the Egyptian sultan al-Malik al-Kāmil (d. 635/1238) to respond to Frederick II's questions on mathematics and natural sciences.³⁸ In the same vein Ibn Wāṣil dedicated his treatise on logic, *al-Risāla al-anbrūriyya* ('The Imperial Treatise'), to Manfred. Had Ibn Wāṣil focused more narrowly on the religious disciplines it is unlikely that he would have enjoyed the intellectual atmosphere of his stay in southern Italy so much.

The second main reason for Ibn Wāṣil's relatively neutral description of anything related to Latin Europeans and the Franks was that his years of active political involvement occurred during the period of Ayyūbid rule. In these years the idea of military jihad against the Franks took a back seat compared with the previous eras (under the Zengids and Saladin) and the following Mamlūk period. The Frankish lordships of Syria were to a large extent integrated into the highly pluralistic political landscape of the region and the conclusion of truces between Frankish and Muslim rulers was standard practice.³⁹ Ibn Wāṣil was consequently deeply influenced by the regionalised character of political rule that resulted from the division of Syria into a multitude of lordships ranging from Damascus and Aleppo through medium-sized entities such as Homs, Acre/Jerusalem, Ḥamā and Antioch, to minor lordships such as Baalbek, Tripoli, Boṣrā and Kerak.

Ibn Wāṣil had a particularly strong degree of understanding about such diplomatic relationships, as he had spent his formative years at the small courts of Ḥamā and Kerak.⁴⁰ Unlike the large cities, these lordships had to engage in a wider variety of diplomatic strategies to secure their survival in the ever-

38 For 'Alam al-Dīn Qayṣar b. Abī'l-Qāsim (d. 649/1251), see Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-a'yān wa-abnā' al-zamān*, ed. I. 'Abbās, 8 vols (Beirut, 1968–72), vol. v, pp. 315–16; al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rikh*, vol. I, pp. 429–30; al-Ṣafadī, *Wāfi*, vol. xxiv, p. 304.

39 M.A. Köhler, *Alliances and Treaties between Frankish and Muslim Rulers in the Middle East: Cross-Cultural Diplomacy in the Period of the Crusades*, tr. P.M. Holt; rev. ed., introduced K. Hirschler (Leiden, 2013), pp. 267–75, and L. Atrache, *Die Politik der Ayyūbiden. Die fränkisch-islamischen Beziehungen in der ersten Hälfte des 7./13. Jahrhunderts unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Feindbildes* (Münster, 1996).

40 Hirschler, *Medieval Arabic Historiography*, pp. 99–100.

shifting political landscape of Syria and northern Mesopotamia, and due to his close relationships with members of the military elite Ibn Wāṣil was an attentive observer of these strategies. For instance, in the late 630s/1240s Ḥamā found itself increasingly in conflict with its Ayyūbid neighbours, especially Homs, on account of its pro-Damascene policy. When troops from Ḥamā were required in Damascus in the year 637/1240 they had to be securely moved through the hostile territories of Homs. In an attempt to secure safe passage the rulers of Ḥamā set up an elaborate, but ultimately doomed, ruse: the leading commander of Ḥamā, a cousin of Ibn Wāṣil's friend and patron Ḥusām al-Dīn, feigned falling out with Ḥamā's ruler and left the town with his troops, among them Ḥusām al-Dīn's father, and many members of the civilian elite, including Ibn Wāṣil's cousin Sa'd Allāh. Troops from the County of Tripoli were closely involved in the build up of the ruse. In order to enhance the credibility of the friction within the town's elite, rumours were spread that the Ayyūbid ruler was to hand over the town to the ruler of Tripoli and a group of Latin knights was indeed garrisoned in the town's citadel.⁴¹

Just as Ibn Wāṣil was used to diplomatic relations with the Franks, the Nizārī ('Assassin') lords of Syrian castles appear in the same capacity. For instance, the Ḥamā ruse of 637/1240 ultimately failed as the ruler of Homs arrested the entire party of Ḥamāwī troops and incarcerated its members without hesitation. The better part of the Ḥamāwī elite, among them Ibn Wāṣil's cousin, had to be ransomed, but many perished in gaol. In the protracted negotiations for ransoming the prisoners, the Nizārī lord of the nearby castle of Maṣyāf was one of the third parties that played an important intermediary role.⁴² Ibn Wāṣil was able to include such detailed information because he was a friend of the spiritual leader of the Nizārīs in Syria during this period.⁴³

In many ways Ibn Wāṣil thus personifies the decentralized and pluralistic political landscape of Syria during the Ayyūbid period. Yet, shortly after the rise of the Mamlūk dynasty he ended his involvement in trans-regional politics and upon his return from his mission to Apulia withdrew to his hometown of Ḥamā. This move is highly significant as Ḥamā was the only Ayyūbid principality that survived the imposition of Mamlūk authority on Syria in the aftermath of the Battle of 'Ayn Jālūt in 658/1260. Although Ḥamā became part of the Mamlūk Empire it retained at least nominal independence under its Ayyūbid rulers. As the town's chief judge Ibn Wāṣil was closely involved in local politics, yet he was never again able or willing to take up a formal or informal position

41 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. v, pp. 222–27.

42 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. v, p. 227.

43 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. v, p. 251: 'wa-kānat baynanī wa-baynahu mawaddatun'.

anywhere else in Syria or Egypt. Just as he started his career in an Ayyūbid landscape, he chose to end it in the last Ayyūbid enclave.

Mufarrij al-kurūb: Ayyūbid Politics and Frankish-Ayyūbid Diplomacy

Ibn Wāṣil not only wrote a number of works in the fields of logic and literature, but also in history. For the study of the Crusades the most interesting and useful work is his *Mufarrij al-kurūb fī akhbār Banī Ayyūb* ('The Dissipater of Anxieties on the Reports of the Ayyūbids'), an annalistic chronicle that covers most of the sixth/twelfth and the first half of the seventh/thirteenth century.⁴⁴ His second chronicle, *al-Ta'rikh al-Ṣāliḥī* ('The Ṣāliḥī History') is a universal history from the creation of the world down to the year 636/1239 which he attempted to dedicate first to al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ and, after the latter's death, to al-Malik al-Mu'azzam Tūrānshāh. This chronicle ends in the year in which Ibn Wāṣil's future patron al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ arrived in Damascus and briefly took power. Much like the *Mufarrij*, it was a work in the tradition of earlier chronicles in that it contained hardly any obituary notices and focused on political events.⁴⁵ This chronicle is of some interest for the early crusading period, as it contains material not found in the *Mufarrij*. For instance, it is here that we find Ibn Wāṣil's report on the 1099 conquest of Jerusalem.⁴⁶ This report is of interest as it is one of the last texts that still emphasises the Frankish massacre of the town's Jewish inhabitants—an event that had featured prominently in early accounts, but was increasingly sidelined in subsequent Arabic historiography.⁴⁷ However, up to the point when he starts to draw on information unique to him, i.e. from the mid-620s/1220s onwards, Ibn Wāṣil relied as much on earlier sources as he did for the *Mufarrij* and there are few additional factual details. As the *Ta'rikh Ṣāliḥī* ends as early as 636/1239 its relevant parts thus only cover some ten years.

The *Ta'rikh Ṣāliḥī* is much more concise than the *Mufarrij* and excludes important features that make the latter such an interesting work. Most importantly, in the *Ta'rikh Ṣāliḥī* Ibn Wāṣil hardly makes any personal observations based on direct involvement in the politics of the day. For instance, while his

44 For editions of this, see above, n. 4.

45 Ibn Wāṣil, *Kitāb al-ta'rikh al-Ṣāliḥī*, ed. 'U. Tadmurī, 2 vols (Sidon/Beirut, 2010).

46 Ibn Wāṣil, *Ṣāliḥī*, vol. II, pp. 154–55.

47 K. Hirschler, 'The Jerusalem Conquest of 492/1099 in the Medieval Arabic Historiography of the Crusades: From Regional Plurality to Islamic Narrative', *Crusades* 13 (2014), pp. 37–76.

reports in the *Mufarrij* on the intra-Ayyūbid conflict around Damascus in 626/1229 are those of an eyewitness, the parallel report in the *Ta'rikh Ṣāliḥī* excludes such observations.⁴⁸ The importance of this chronicle is further curtailed by the fact that the author repeatedly leaves out entire years. Particularly in the early seventh/thirteenth century, there are a cluster of years that are not covered, such as the years 601/1204–5, 602/1205–6, 605/1208–9, 608/1211–12, 609/1212–13, 611/1214–15, 612/1215–16 and 614/1217–18. These omissions are particularly regrettable as this is one of the most interesting periods in the *Mufarrij* for Frankish-Muslim relations. As will be seen, Ibn Wāṣil has considerable detail on this period's northern Syrian alliance system between Aleppo, Antioch and the Rūm Seljūqs of Anatolia against the Ayyūbid Sultan of Egypt and the Armenian Kingdom. In the *Ta'rikh Ṣāliḥī*, however, one gets little sense of the political dynamics in northern Syria in the early seventh/thirteenth century. Ibn Wāṣil wrote a third chronicle which he refers to in the *Mufarrij* as *al-Ta'rikh al-kabīr* ('The Great History') in the course of the text.⁴⁹ Yet aside from this indirect evidence of its existence no manuscript has survived. To judge from references in the *Ta'rikh Ṣāliḥī* it was probably also a universal history focusing on political and military events.⁵⁰

Ibn Wāṣil wrote his main chronicle, the *Mufarrij*, after he had returned to Ḥamā in the 660s/1260s. The chronicle starts in the 520s/1120s during the Zengid period, with reports on the Ayyūbid dynasty's founder Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb, and ends in 659/1261.⁵¹ His main aim in writing this chronicle was to celebrate the Ayyūbid dynasty that was about to disappear; tellingly, the chronicle stops at the point when the Mamlūk dynasty established its authority in Syria. However, Ibn Wāṣil's narrative went further than just being a panegyric of the Ayyūbids, and he was also concerned to show that ideal rule was a constant reality irrespective of a specific dynasty, and though his work focused on the Ayyūbids it hardly ascribed an outstanding place to it in the longer course of Islamic history. This dynasty merely provided a further example that ideal rule had existed in the past, existed in the present and would exist in the

48 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. IV, pp. 253–57; Ibn Wāṣil, *Ṣāliḥī*, vol. II, pp. 294–95.

49 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. I, pp. 204 and 236.

50 Such large universal histories were typical for the period. To take just early seventh/thirteenth-century Ḥamā, we find two authors writing similar works: Ibn Wāṣil's maternal relative Shihāb al-Dīn Ibn Abī'l-Damm and the court official Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. al-Naẓīf (d. after 634/1236–37). Their grand universal histories have also been lost but, as with Ibn Wāṣil's *Ta'rikh Ṣāliḥī*, their shorter universal histories, which were dedicated to rulers, have survived.

51 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. VI, pp. XL–XLIII (intro. M. Rahim).

future. It is the ongoing existence of ideal rule—with slight variations—under a wide variety of different dynasties which forms the underlying message of his chronicle.⁵²

The major difference with works of other writers from the crusading period, such as Bahā' al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād, 'Imād al-Dīn al-Iṣfahānī and Abū Shāma, was that Ibn Wāṣil—like Ibn al-'Adīm—did not consider anti-Frankish military jihad to be a crucial element of ideal rule. Abū Shāma's concern, for instance, was to present the two reigns of Nūr al-Dīn and Saladin, including their jihad activities, in a revivalist light, as a brief re-enactment of the early Islamic period. With the end of Saladin's reign political life, according to Abū Shāma, reverted to the same *jāhili*-like period of darkness that had also existed up until the rule of Nūr al-Dīn. For this author the period before Nūr al-Dīn, as well as the post-Saladin period (i.e. Abū Shāma's present), were eras of deviation scarcely worthy of mention in his *Rawḍatayn*.⁵³ This difference in the role ascribed to the Franks also influenced how the chronicles presented the Latin East and the Crusades: while for some chroniclers the anti-Frankish jihad was key to ideal rule, for Ibn Wāṣil the Franks were to a large extent just another group of political actors among many in the pluralistic landscape of the period. An example of how this difference is evident in his text is the fact that he only very rarely used curses, such as 'May God forsake them' and 'May God curse them', after mentioning the Franks.⁵⁴ In this regard his chronicle clearly differs from Abū Shāma's work and other chronicles where the use of such curses regularly occur.

Since Ibn Wāṣil's work was first and foremost a chronicle of the Ayyūbids the Latin lordships do not play a central role in the narrative. At the start of each year, for instance, the author generally gives a summary of the main events. This consists mostly of an overview of the state of affairs within the Ayyūbid family confederation, in particular the name of the sultan in Egypt and of those who ruled the major Syrian and Mesopotamian cities, such as Aleppo and Damascus. The Franks only enter these summaries when major Crusades arrived in Syria or Egypt and threatened to destabilize the political status quo.

From the point of view of the history of the Crusades and the Latin East the *Mufarrij* must be divided into two parts. Up until the mid-620s/1220s the author

52 Hirschler, *Medieval Arabic Historiography*.

53 Hirschler, *Medieval Arabic Historiography*, pp. 63–114.

54 On the use of curses cf. N. Christie, 'The Origins of Suffixed Invocations of God's Curse on the Franks in Muslim Sources for the Crusades', *Arabica* 48 (2001), 254–66; *idem*, "Curses, Foiled Again!" Further Research on Early Use of the "Khadhalahum Allah" Invocation during the Crusading Period', *Arabica* 58 (2011), 561–70.

relied on the works of his predecessors and contemporaries, such as Bahā' al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād, 'Imād al-Dīn al-Iṣfahānī, Ibn al-Athīr and Abū Shāma. It is only in the following years that his chronicle becomes a truly independent work from a factual point of view; in its metanarrative on the continuity of ideal rule, by contrast, it is an original work right from the start. In the first part of his chronicle Ibn Wāṣil relied to a large extent on authors who had written their works in a more 'jihadist' mode. Consequently, we also see that his outlook on the Crusades and Frankish rulers of Syria is slightly different in this section. Though Ibn Wāṣil tones down the focus on anti-Frankish endeavours it is here that we find, for instance, curses brought against the Franks,⁵⁵ and it is evident that these are citations from previous works, especially quotes from epistles to Baghdad.⁵⁶ In the second part of his work, when Ibn Wāṣil increasingly relies on his own observations and hardly uses any other chronicles, the curses virtually disappear, except in reports of Louis IX's Crusade.⁵⁷ In the same vein, the characterisation of the Franks as unbelievers (*kuffār*) and thus as the perennial enemies of Islam is restricted to the first part of his chronicle.⁵⁸ In the second part the term, if used at all, refers to the Mongols rather than to the Franks.⁵⁹ It only appears with reference to the Franks in a poem referring

- 55 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. I, p. 93 (the Fall of Edessa); vol. I, p. 136 (the defeat of Nūr al-Dīn in 558/1163); vol. I, p. 160 (the Franks in Egypt fighting Shīrkūh); vol. II, p. 16 (the Frankish attack on Alexandria); vol. II, p. 101 (Reynald of Châtillon); vol. II, p. 188 (the battle of Ḥaṭṭīn); vol. II, p. 243 (quoting 'Imād al-Dīn on Saladin's post-Ḥaṭṭīn campaign); vol. II, pp. 284 and 302 (Saladin's post-Ḥaṭṭīn campaign).
- 56 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. II, p. 2 (epistle written by 'Imād al-Dīn on behalf of Saladin); vol. II, p. 65 (epistle by the *Qāḍī* al-Fāḍil on behalf of Saladin); vol. II, p. 353 (epistle by the *Qāḍī* al-Fāḍil on behalf of Saladin).
- 57 Jackson, *Seventh Crusade*, p. 141; Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. VI, p. 48 (quoting an epistle calling for jihad); vol. VI, p. 83 (Louis IX).
- 58 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. I, p. 150 (Shīrkūh in Egypt fighting Franks and Fāṭimids); vol. I, p. 175 (Saladin facing Fāṭimid rebels who had contacted the Franks); vol. I, p. 199 (the Frankish castle on Île de Graye); vol. I, p. 225 (Saladin writing to Nūr al-Dīn); vol. II, p. 18 (Saladin justifying his conquest of Damascus); vol. II, p. 102 (Reynald of Châtillon); vol. II, p. 111 (epistle written by 'Imād al-Dīn on behalf of Saladin); vol. II, p. 127 (Reynald of Châtillon); vol. II, p. 148 (Saladin fighting the Franks); vol. II, p. 207 (quoting 'Imād al-Dīn on Saladin's post-Ḥaṭṭīn campaign); vol. II, p. 208 (on Saladin's post-Ḥaṭṭīn campaign); vol. II, p. 254 (reference to the battle of Ḥaṭṭīn); vol. II, p. 329 (on Saladin's post-Ḥaṭṭīn campaign).
- 59 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. IV, pp. 46 and 216; vol. V, p. 285 (also referring to Khwārazmian troops).

back to Saladin's conquest of Jerusalem and in a verbal quote from the ruler of Ḥamā after the battle of Ḥarbiyya/La Forbie.⁶⁰

A further consequence of the work's profile is that in the second part we see not only that curses against Franks and their association with unbelief take a backseat, but also that Latin European rulers can be presented in a quite sympathetic manner. During his mission to southern Italy, Ibn Wāṣil was certainly impressed by Manfred, whom he describes as 'distinguished, inclined to the rational sciences and knows by heart ten chapters of Euclid's work on geometry'.⁶¹ At the ruler's request, Ibn Wāṣil composed his *Imperial Treatise* on logic during his stay at the court, upon which the ruler supposedly praised him with the words: 'O my judge! We did not ask you about the allowed and forbidden in your religion of which you are a judge. Rather we asked you about things which were only known to the ancient philosophers. You answered them although you had no books or other material with you which you could consult'.⁶² Furthermore, Ibn Wāṣil praised the ruler for his 'sympathy for the Muslims, for he dwelled, was born and raised in the Sicilian lands. He himself, his father and his grandfather had been kings there and the majority of the population of this island is Muslim'.⁶³ That the Muslims could openly practise their religion and that the majority of the ruler's close entourage was supposedly Muslim impressed him as much as the fact that the call for prayer (*adhān*) and the ritual prayer (*ṣalāt*) were performed in the army.⁶⁴

Ibn Wāṣil not only took a rather sympathetic approach towards Latin European rulers, but he was one of the few Arab chroniclers of his period who had an interest in Latin European politics. For instance, he gave in his chronicle the Arabic translation of the term emperor,⁶⁵ and described the office of the Pope as follows: 'According to them, the Pope in Rome is the successor [*khalīfa*] of the Messiah and the one acting in his place. He has the right to ban and to permit... He crowns the kings and nominates them. Nothing is done in their Holy Law [*sharī'a*] except with his consent. He has to be a priest'.⁶⁶ Due to his acquaintance with Latin Europe he was also aware that the category 'Frankish' was not entirely satisfactory and stressed that Frederick II had been 'from among the Germans and this is one of the Frankish groups

60 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. v, pp. 247 and 339.

61 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. iv, p. 248.

62 Al-Ṣafadī, *A'yān*, vol. iv, p. 1661.

63 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. iv, p. 234.

64 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. iv, p. 248.

65 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. iv, p. 234.

66 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. iv, p. 149.

(*ajnās*).⁶⁷ In the same vein, he stated when discussing the Crusade of Louis IX that ‘Afrans is one of the most important Frankish communities (*umma*), and the meaning of Raydafrans is King of Afrans. In their language, *rayd* means “king”’.⁶⁸ In the field of European politics, the conflict between the Papacy and the Hohenstaufen dynasty was of particular interest of him. One of the few instances in his texts where he reported an event that actually took place after the year in which his chronicle ended is a report on the Battle of Benevento between Charles of Anjou and Manfred in 1266 (which is misdated by one year to 663/1264–65).⁶⁹ Ibn Wāṣil was also the only medieval Arabic author who contributed his own anecdote on disputed elections in the Holy Roman Empire to the rich material that originated in Normandy, Byzantium, France and Germany.⁷⁰ The close interest in European politics is further evidenced by Ibn Wāṣil’s reference to an unknown Latin knight when reporting on the alleged correspondence between Frederick II and al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb during Louis IX’s Crusade⁷¹—a source that we would certainly not find in the works of authors such as ‘Imād al-Dīn al-Iṣfahānī, Bahā’ al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād or Abū Shāma.

The main interest of the *Mufarrij* in terms of factual information lies in its coverage of the Ayyūbid period and the Crusades of the first half of the thirteenth century, those of the Fifth Crusade to Egypt, the Crusade of Frederick II, and the Crusade of Louis IX to Egypt. Within this second part of his chronicle Ibn Wāṣil alternated how he depicted the Franks and the crusaders. In reports on Crusades arriving from Latin Europe his text could take a jihadist tone, although this disappears in his descriptions of Ayyūbid-Frankish relations within Syria. Though his depiction of the crusaders is not as hostile as that of other chroniclers, the Crusade led by Louis IX clearly discomfited him and he ended its description with the words: ‘The sultan’s standard entered Damietta . . . and was hoisted on the walls, and Islam was proclaimed there. . . . God cleansed Egypt of them . . . The good news of his [victory] was transmitted to the rest of the Islamic world, where there were displays of gladness and rejoicing’.⁷²

67 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. IV, p. 250.

68 Jackson, *Seventh Crusade*, p. 129; Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. VI, p. 9.

69 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. IV, p. 251.

70 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. IV, pp. 249–50. On this issue cf. B. Weiler ‘Tales of trickery and deceit: the election of Frederick Barbarossa (1152), historical memory and the culture of kingship in later Staufien Germany’, *Journal of Medieval History* 38 (2012), 295–317.

71 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. III, pp. 247–48; Jackson, *Seventh Crusade*, p. 47.

72 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. VI, pp. 82–83; Jackson, *Seventh Crusade*, p. 154.

By contrast, when it came to daily diplomatic life in Syria he used a decidedly different tone. Ibn Wāṣil did not deem truces between Ayyūbid and Frankish rulers to be scandalous or even problematic. For instance, he reported on al-Malik al-ʿĀdil's (d. 615/1218) policy towards the Latin lordships, which veered between defensive and complaisant, without passing any judgement. Throughout his rule al-Malik al-ʿĀdil struggled to impose his authority on the Syrian Ayyūbid lordships and showed little inclination to open up new theatres of conflict or change the status quo with the Frankish lordships. Agreements such as the three-year truce of 594/1198 with Amalric II of Jerusalem and that of 604/1207 with the County of Tripoli are described as matter-of-factly as that of 601/1204, which involved the surrender of Jaffa and the condominium (*munāṣafāt*) in Palestine around Ramla and Lydda to Amalric II.⁷³ After the 604/1207 truce had expired in 607/1210 there was some conflict between Damascus and forces from the Kingdom of Jerusalem, which Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī describes with his typical jihad fervour as having been driven on the Damascene side by popular will. According to this author, a sermon he delivered in the Umayyad Mosque, which praised the virtue of fighting the Franks, led to spontaneous armed action by the Damascene populace. Al-Malik al-ʿĀdil, in contrast to the principled stance by the Damascenes and the city's governor al-Malik al-Muʿazzam ʿĪsā, appears here in a rather dubious light as he quickly entered into a truce.⁷⁴ Ibn Wāṣil, by contrast, has nothing on popular military action and principled rulers, but focuses again rather on the diplomatic side: 'Al-Malik al-ʿĀdil moved out of Damascus [against the Franks]. Envoys went back and forth between them until a truce was concluded for a limited period'.⁷⁵

Ibn Wāṣil has a particular penchant for reporting the multitude of truces between Frankish lordships and the less important Muslim lords, especially those in central and northern Syria. His chronicle is of particular importance in understanding interactions between his hometown of Ḥamā, on the one hand, and the Hospitallers of Ḥiṣn al-Akrād/Crac des Chevaliers and the County of Tripoli on the other.⁷⁶ Again, such diplomatic relationships were only soberly

73 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. III, pp. 78 (594/1198), 173 and 175 (604/1207), and 162 (601/1204). On the use of condominium in Frankish-Muslim diplomacy cf. Köhler, *Alliances and Treaties*, pp. 312–19.

74 Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, *Mirʾāt al-zamān* (A.H. 495–654), facs. ed. J.R. Jewett (Chicago, 1907), pp. 355–56.

75 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. III, p. 201.

76 On the information in the *Mufarrij* regarding the Hospitallers of Ḥiṣn al-Akrād/Crac des Chevaliers cf. Balázs Major, 'Al-Malik al-Mujahid, Ruler of Homs, and the Hospitallers (The Evidence in the Chronicle of Ibn Wasil)', in Z. Hunyadi and J. Laszlovsky (eds), *The*

registered. When Ḥamā entered into a truce with the Hospitallers in 601/1204 after a series of attacks on the town Ibn Wāṣil wrote, using a similar refrain, ‘The envoys of al-Malik al-Manṣūr and the Franks travelled back and forth until the truce was confirmed between them for a limited period.’⁷⁷ Authors who did not share Ibn Wāṣil’s typically Ayyūbid perspective on the pluralistic Syrian political landscape, such as Ibn al-Athīr and Abū Shāma, reported the Hospitallers’ attacks on Ḥamā, but omitted the conclusion of the truce.⁷⁸

The relationship between the Hospitallers and Ḥamā is also a prime example of the level of detail that the *Mufarrij* includes on diplomatic matters. Two years before the 601/1204 truce, Ibn Wāṣil gives a long account of an aborted attempt by an envoy from the Templars to mediate a truce between the Hospitallers and Ḥamā at the Ḥamāwī court.⁷⁹ The details on diplomacy in the *Mufarrij* also allow us to establish that in the following year Ḥamā entered into a truce with the Hospitallers after troops from the town besieged the castle of Ba’rīn/Montferrand between Ḥiṣn al-Akrād/Crac des Chevaliers and Ḥamā: ‘Letters were exchanged between him [al-Malik al-Manṣūr] and the Franks concerning the truce. The end of the matter was that he concluded a truce with them.’⁸⁰ Particularly valuable is the information he offers when he digs even deeper into the politics of central Syria and discusses minuscule Ayyūbid proto-lordships. These lordships usually remain below the radar of the period’s chronicles, yet they often conducted their own diplomatic policy. For instance, al-Malik al-Muẓaffar of Ḥamā (r. 626/1229–642/1244) had granted the castle of Ba’rīn/Montferrand to his deposed brother al-Malik al-Nāṣir (r. 617/1221–626/1229) in the year 626/1229. According to Ibn Wāṣil, Ba’rīn/Montferrand had, by 630/1232–33, become a tributary of the Hospitallers of Ḥiṣn al-Akrād/Crac des Chevaliers and the Templars of Ṣāfītā/Chastel Blanc. In addition, al-Malik al-Nāṣir had entered into condominium-agreements over several villages with the neighbouring ‘Franks’.⁸¹

Crusades and the Military Orders: Expanding the Frontiers of Medieval Latin Christianity (Budapest, 2001), 61–75.

77 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. III, p. 164.

78 Abū Shāma, *al-Dhayl ‘alā’ l al-Rawḍatayn*, ed. M. al-Kawtharī as *Tarājim rijāl al-qarnayn al-sādis wa’l-sābi‘*, (Beirut, 1974), p. 51; Ibn al-Athīr, *Al-Kāmil fi’l-ta’rikh*, ed. C.J. Tornberg, 13 vols (Beirut, 1965–67), vol. XII, p. 195; tr. D.S. Richards, *The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr for the Crusading Period from al-Kāmil fi’l-ta’rikh. Part 3: The Years 589–629/1193–1231: The Ayyubids after Saladin and the Mongol Menace* (Aldershot, 2008), p. 79.

79 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. III, pp. 145–47.

80 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. III, p. 154.

81 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. V, p. 67.

The example of the conflict between Ḥamā on the one hand and the Hospitallers and the County of Tripoli on the other hand at the beginning of the seventh/thirteenth century also shows the *Mufarrij*'s worth for understanding the intra-Ayyūbid dynamics in conflicts with the Frankish lordships. The conflict had started to gain in intensity with al-Malik al-Manṣūr's 599/1203 attack on Ba'rin/Montferrand. In preparation for this attack he tried to build up a larger coalition that would involve, most crucially, the Egyptian Sultan al-Malik al-Ādil. While al-Malik al-Ādil verbally supported al-Malik al-Manṣūr's jihad he refrained from getting his troops or those of Damascus involved. For al-Malik al-Ādil this was a local conflict in central Syria that did not require his attention or resources. Instead, he urged the local Ayyūbid rulers of the area, in particular Baalbek and Homs, and to a lesser degree Aleppo, to support Ḥamā. Despite the verbal grandeur of al-Malik al-Ādil's messages the *Mufarrij* clearly shows that anti-Frankish warfare was too low on his agenda to form a large-scale Ayyūbid coalition including the two most significant contingents from Egypt and Damascus.⁸²

Beyond the conclusion of truces, Ibn Wāṣil is also the main Arabic source that we have for longer-lasting Frankish-Ayyūbid alliances. Though these occurred less frequently than during the early sixth/twelfth-century *lā maqām*-period,⁸³ the *Mufarrij* discusses in detail, for instance, the northern Syrian alliance between Aleppo and Antioch in the early seventh/thirteenth century. Aleppo under al-Malik al-Zāhir (d. 613/1216) was one of the centres of Syrian Ayyūbid resistance to the attempts of his uncle al-Malik al-Ādil in Egypt to impose his hegemony on the Syrian lands. The neighbouring lordships in northern Syria and Anatolia were drawn into this interminable conflict, and Aleppo thus entered into an increasingly close alliance with the Rūm Seljūqs of Anatolia and with Frankish Antioch which, for its part, was increasingly unable to rely on support from the Kingdom of Jerusalem. In addition, this alliance not only developed due to a shared enmity towards al-Malik al-Ādil, but also because a strengthened Armenian Kingdom in the north was seeking to gain a foothold in the region. The Armenian Kingdom in turn entered into an alliance with al-Malik al-Ādil to bolster its position against this north Syrian Frankish-Ayyūbid-Seljūq alliance. For details on the northern Syrian alliance

82 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. III, pp. 141–45.

83 Köhler, *Alliances and Treaties*, pp. 59–174. '*lā maqām*' is the doctrine shared among the various Frankish and Muslim lords of Syria that they would form a coalition against any outside intruder (such as the Great Seljūqs from the East). The underlying rationale was the fear that there would be 'no place' (*lā maqām*) left for any of these small lordships within a more centralised political landscape.

between Aleppo and Antioch (much less so for the Armenian-Egyptian and Seljūq sides of the story) Ibn Wāṣil is—in addition to Ibn al-ʿAdīm's *Zubda*—consistently the principle Arabic source.

It is the *Mufarrij* that best informs us of one of the earliest manifestations of this alliance. When the Armenian King Leon II besieged Antioch in 600/1203 the ruler of Aleppo, al-Malik al-Zāhir, immediately moved with his army to support Bohemond IV in Antioch and thus forced Leon to retreat. However, in a surprise move some three weeks later Leon was able to bring Antioch under his control. Bohemond's situation was so desperate that he declared his full submission to Aleppo and his men sent urgent calls for help by carrier pigeon. Al-Malik al-Zāhir again promptly moved towards Antioch to reinstall the balance of power in northern Syria and Leon was again obliged to withdraw.⁸⁴ The following year Leon raided Aleppan territory and al-Zāhir requested support from Antioch, in the framework of an increasingly tight alliance, for the counter raid. Antioch duly fulfilled its part and sent, according to Ibn Wāṣil, 10,000 men.⁸⁵ The importance of Ibn Wāṣil's report is evident through a comparison with other Arabic accounts. Ibn al-Athīr, for instance, deliberately silenced the Antiochene contribution in this counter raid and merely stated: '[al-Malik al-Zāhir] asked for assistance from other rulers'. Towards the end of the report Ibn al-Athīr even turned the northern Syrian conflict into a simple Muslim-Armenian clash where seemingly 'Muslims' and 'Armenians' fought.⁸⁶ Abū Shāma adopted the same strategy, writing Antioch out of the conflict and simplifying it as a binary Muslim-Armenian affair.⁸⁷

The *Mufarrij* is also an important source that supports Cahen's argument that the large Ayyūbid coalition army of 603/1207 under al-Malik al-ʿĀdil must be seen in the context of this northern Syrian alliance system.⁸⁸ In this year al-ʿĀdil succeeded in uniting virtually all Syrian Ayyūbid rulers to fight the Hospitallers and the County of Tripoli who were increasingly undertaking raids in central Syria. What seems at first glance to be a classical jihad endeavour appears to have been more problematic in Ibn Wāṣil's report. Al-Malik al-Zāhir of Aleppo only sent a detachment, but did not participate in person.

84 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. III, pp. 154–55. Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Zubdat al-ḥalab min taʾrīkh Ḥalab*, ed. S. Dahhān, 3 vols (Damascus, 1951–68), vol. III, pp. 140–41 mentions an earlier correspondence between Bohemond III and al-Zāhir in 594/1197.

85 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. III, pp. 170–71.

86 Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. XII, pp. 238–39; tr. Richards, 3, p. 111.

87 Abū Shāma, *Dhayl*, p. 53.

88 C. Cahen, *La Syrie du nord à l'époque des Croisades* (Paris, 1940), p. 614; Humphreys, *From Saladin to the Mongols*, p. 135.

Furthermore, Ibn Wāṣil reports that throughout the campaigns al-Malik al-ʿĀdil sent messages to al-Malik al-Zāhir scolding him for his absence and thus prompting the latter to fear an attack and to reinforce the defences of Aleppo. For Ibn Wāṣil, al-Malik al-ʿĀdil's move was thus not only in retaliation for Frankish raiding but also an attempt to embarrass al-Malik al-Zāhir who faced the dilemma of whether to enter into conflict with Antioch or stay out of the largest anti-Frankish campaign since the era of his father Saladin. In this light al-ʿĀdil's campaign was aimed as much at weakening Aleppo's ally Antioch, at this point in control of Tripoli, as at supporting al-Malik al-ʿĀdil's principal ally in the region, the Armenian Kingdom. The intra-Ayyūbid dynamics underlying this anti-Frankish jihad are conveniently glossed over by other chroniclers such as Ibn al-Athīr, who has nothing on al-Malik al-Zāhir's reluctance to participate nor the subsequent exchange of messages. In addition, according to Ibn Wāṣil, al-Malik al-ʿĀdil ended this campaign with yet another truce, while Ibn al-Athīr explicitly states that a truce was not concluded. As there were no military conflicts with Tripoli in the subsequent years and as Ibn Wāṣil is in general better informed of Ayyūbid diplomacy, his account is more probable.⁸⁹

A final reason why the *Mufarrīj* is essential when tracing the development of this northern Syrian alliance system is that it also provides in detail the developments that led to its breakdown. The political landscape started to change in 611/1214 when a Frankish coalition of troops from Cyprus, Tripoli, Acre and Antioch was joined by Leon. The presence of these forces close to Ḥiṣn al-Akrād/Crac des Chevaliers quite understandably worried the north Syrian rulers of nearby Ḥamā and Homs as well as the Niẓārīs. Al-Malik al-Zāhir's role as protector of Ḥamā in the early stages of this conflict did not constitute a break of the established patterns of cooperation between Aleppo and Antioch. Yet his subsequent protection and assistance for the Niẓārīs arguably was a considerable shift because the Frankish attack on the Niẓārī castle of al-Khawābī was meant as retaliation for the murder of Bohemond's son Raymond the previous year.⁹⁰

89 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrīj*, vol. III, pp. 172–74; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. XII, p. 274; tr. Richards, 3, p. 13; F.-J. Dahmann, *al-Malik al-ʿĀdil: Ägypten und der Vordere Orient in den Jahren 589/1193 bis 615/1218, ein Beitrag zur Ayyūbidischen Geschichte* (Giessen: Diss. University of Giessen, 1975), pp. 126–28.

90 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrīj*, vol. III, pp. 223–24. Cf. A.-M. Eddé, *La principauté ayyoubide d'Alep: (579/1183–658/1260)* (Stuttgart, 1999), p. 82, who argues that al-Zāhir's capacity to intervene shows that this event is rather a sign of the continuing relationship between Aleppo and Antioch.

It is also the *Mufarrij*, to cite a final example on the alliance system, that describes in great detail the final stage of the breakdown from the perspective of Aleppo. While Aleppan assistance to the Niẓārīs had arguably weakened the relationship between Aleppo and Antioch, Aleppo effectively exited the northern Syrian-Anatolian entente only when it broke with the Rūm Seljūqs in 613/1216. In that year the Rūm Seljūq Sultan ‘Izz al-Dīn Kay Kāwūs I (r. 608/1211–616/1220) requested Aleppo’s support for a pincer attack on the Armenian Kingdom. After a prolonged advance and retreat, al-Malik al-Zāhir refused to participate because his relationship with al-Malik al-‘Ādil in Egypt was improving and Aleppo was losing interest in its former Rūm Seljūq allies. According to Ibn Wāṣil, al-Malik al-Zāhir also focused on the issue of diplomatic relations with the Frankish lordships in the ensuing negotiations with al-Malik al-‘Ādil. He demanded that Aleppo and Egypt would no longer enter into separate truces with them, but act in unison.⁹¹ This must be seen against the background of Bohemond IV’s deposition in Antioch in the previous year 612/1216 when Leon was finally able to take control of the city, thus rendering the entire alliance system fundamentally altered.

How deeply the *Mufarrij* was embedded in Ayyūbid politics is also evident from reports on the intra-Ayyūbid conflict between the Egyptian sultan al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb and the Damascene ruler al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā‘īl. Ismā‘īl had come under increasing pressure from his Egypt-based nephew and desperately tried to build an anti-Egyptian Syrian coalition. When he failed in this Ismā‘īl turned in 638/1240 to the Kingdom of Jerusalem, which had a significant military force at its disposal due to the recent arrival of the Crusade led by Theobald of Champagne. In exchange for Frankish support against Ayyūb, Ismā‘īl surrendered his possessions in Galilee (it is unclear whether Jerusalem was surrendered as well) and further to the north.⁹² This in turn led to such sharp criticism in Damascus that Ismā‘īl decided to exile two vocal scholars, including the *khaṭīb* of the Umayyad Mosque ‘Izz al-Dīn al-Sulamī. Ibn Wāṣil was clearly not at ease with Ismā‘īl’s wide-ranging territorial concessions, probably because the resulting Frankish-Damascene coalition was directed against his patron Ayyūb: ‘These two castles [that had been surrendered to the Franks] became painful coals and the affliction of the Muslims strongly increased’.⁹³ However, he is also at pains to explain Ismā‘īl’s motives for his alliance with the Franks. He underlined Ayyūb’s previous dubious behaviour towards Ismā‘īl, including the incarceration of the latter’s son. In addition, he

91 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. III, pp. 234–37.

92 Humphreys, *From Saladin to the Mongols*, p. 266.

93 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. V, p. 302.

put al-Sulamī's criticisms into perspective somewhat by depicting him as a zealot who was also deposed as *khaṭīb* in Cairo shortly after his arrival because he again ran into trouble with the military elite.⁹⁴ Finally, Ibn Wāṣil excluded details of the surrender that might have set it into a too negative light, such as the execution of the Muslim commander of one of the castles who refused to hand it over to the Franks.⁹⁵

The *Mufarrīj* is also the text that expresses most clearly one of the rationales of the Ayyūbid rulers for their non-aggressive conduct towards the Frankish rulers of Syria. The painful and costly experience of the Third Crusade was a constant reminder for the Ayyūbids that a more aggressive stance towards the relatively weak Frankish lordships would lead to renewed crusading activity and thus the arrival of a more serious enemy. The fiscal and budgetary problems under Saladin had been a consequence of his campaigns of expansion and were something the later Ayyūbid rulers wanted to avoid. In addition, they were well aware that the long periods of military conflict had strained Saladin's relationship with his leading officers, who became increasingly reluctant to support him in his belligerent policies. These issues also arose towards the end of the Fifth Crusade when the Egyptian sultan al-Malik al-Kāmil faced the decision of whether to annihilate the remaining crusading troops or to settle for a negotiated withdrawal. The *Mufarrīj* quotes his reasoning for opting for the latter solution as: 'These who are here are not all the Franks. If we eliminate them, we could only take . . . Damietta after a fairly long time. The kings of the Franks overseas and the Pope will hear what has happened to the Franks and then they will send further reinforcements to Egypt'.⁹⁶

Finally, the *Mufarrīj* is unique in presenting the developments on the Ayyūbid side during the major Crusade campaigns. For the Fifth Crusade his text is of limited value; from the arrival of the main crusading troops in 614/1217 to the end of the Crusade in 618/1221 Ibn Wāṣil was not yet directly involved in the political life of the Ayyūbid lordships, and although his account certainly adds some valuable detail, such as the above-quoted statement by al-Malik al-Kāmil on the danger of new crusades, it does not fundamentally change the picture of earlier sources, most importantly the report by Ibn al-Athīr.⁹⁷

For the Crusade of Frederick II, however, Ibn Wāṣil's reports do become an important source for understanding intra-Ayyūbid dynamics in response to its arrival. A crucial point for understanding these dynamics is the occasion of

94 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrīj*, vol. v, p. 304.

95 Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, *Mir'āt al-zamān*, ed. Jewett, p. 493.

96 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrīj*, vol. iv, p. 97.

97 Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. xii, pp. 320–31; tr. Richards, 3, pp. 174–82.

the Egyptian sultan al-Malik al-Kāmil's move to Syria in 625/1228, ostensibly to confront Frederick II. The ruler of Damascus, al-Malik al-Nāṣir, had little faith in al-Malik al-Kāmil and, fearing for his lordship, called for help from al-Malik al-Ashraf (d. 635/1237), the only Ayyūbid ruler who could match al-Malik al-Kāmil's forces. Ibn al-Athīr gives a broad outline of the ensuing conflicts among the Ayyūbid rulers, but he clearly lacked deep insight into the developments.⁹⁸ Ibn Wāṣil, in contrast, goes into much more detail and lists, for instance, the names of two Ayyūbid princes who were in al-Malik al-Kāmil's company. These princes were not only fiercely loyal to him but they both had territorial ambitions in Syria—crucial information to understand the concerns of al-Malik al-Nāṣir and other Syrian rulers vis-à-vis the Egyptian 'support'.⁹⁹ Similarly, Ibn Wāṣil digs deep into Syrian local politics to explain why al-Malik al-'Azīz, al-Malik al-Kāmil's brother, performed a *volte-face* upon his brother's arrival and joined forces with him.¹⁰⁰ The originality of the account given by Ibn Wāṣil—who was in Damascus during this period—is also evident from the increasing number of cases where he explicitly uses his authorial voice in the long passages that he devoted to intra-Ayyūbid dynamics.¹⁰¹

The *Mufarrij*—like Ibn al-'Adīm's *Zubda*—describes the Crusade of Frederick II, which evidently did not endanger the Ayyūbid Syrian political landscape in any serious way, as a rather curious endeavour.¹⁰² Even the surrender of Jerusalem to Frederick II by the Egyptian sultan al-Malik al-Kāmil in 626/1229 could for him be easily justified. He first quotes his own father who was in Jerusalem at this point: 'When it was proclaimed that the Muslims were to leave Jerusalem as it had been handed over to the Franks, the population of Jerusalem started to wail and cry'.¹⁰³ However, Ibn Wāṣil immediately made sure that the handover was given a more positive spin underlining that al-Malik al-Kāmil knew that 'the Franks will not be able to defend Jerusalem as its wall has been destroyed. So whenever he wishes and the circumstances allow he will be able to purify it from the Franks and drive them away'.¹⁰⁴ It comes as little surprise that the *Mufarrij* is the best Arabic source for the negotiations that led to the handover of Jerusalem. It is his summary of the final treaty, for

98 Ibn al-Athīr *al-Kāmil*, vol. x11, pp. 479–80; tr. Richards, 3, pp. 292–93.

99 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. iv, pp. 226–27.

100 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. iv, pp. 226–27.

101 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. iv, pp. 225–31 and 236–40.

102 Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubda*, vol. III, p. 305.

103 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. iv, p. 243.

104 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. iv, pp. 243–45.

instance, that has the most detailed account of this document in all contemporary Arabic sources.¹⁰⁵

In contrast, Ibn Wāṣil's contemporary Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī reported the handover of Jerusalem not as a political manoeuvre within the Syrian/Egyptian political landscape, but rather as part of a major Frankish-Muslim confrontation: 'The news of the handover of Jerusalem to the Franks arrived and all hell broke loose in the lands of Islam'.¹⁰⁶ The difference between these two crucial chroniclers of the Ayyūbid period is also evident from Ibn Wāṣil's report on Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī's preaching activities in Damascus in the aftermath of the agreement between al-Malik al-Kāmil and Frederick. While Ibn Wāṣil was evidently impressed by Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī's oratory skills, he could not help but set the religious uproar against the handover within the *realpolitik* of his day. After describing how al-Malik al-Nāṣir of Damascus approached Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī and asked him to preach on 'this humiliation of the Muslims and the shame', Ibn Wāṣil continues '[Al-Malik al-Nāṣir's] aim with this was to arouse the people's aversion to his uncle [al-Malik al-Kāmil]'.¹⁰⁷

In what is another rather unusual move for the Arabic sources Ibn Wāṣil devoted a lengthy passage to Frederick's visit to Jerusalem. In his detailed account Ibn Wāṣil could rely directly on the Muslim judge whom al-Malik al-Kāmil had appointed to accompany the emperor. Though he reserved his most positive comments for Frederick's son Manfred he clearly liked Frederick as well. He focussed in his report again on the issue of the emperor's supposedly pro-Muslim tendencies, demonstrated by Frederick banning a priest from entering the Aqṣā Mosque with a testament in his hand, and longing to hear the Muslim call to prayer.¹⁰⁸ Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī was obviously of a different opinion and it is he who gave the famous description of the emperor as having 'red skin' and being 'bald and short-sighted'. In terms of religiosity he described him rather as a 'materialist' whose 'Christianity was simply a game to him'.¹⁰⁹

105 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. iv, pp. 243–44. The other main contemporary chronicle is Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī (see above, pp. 84–108). Further contemporary chronicles have only very brief comments that add no substantial information such as Abū Shāma, *Dhayl*, p. 154 and Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. xii, pp. 482–83; tr. Richards, 3, pp. 293–94.

106 Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, *Mir'āt al-zamān*, s.n., 2 vols numbered viii/1 and viii/2 (Hyderabad, 1951–52), vol. viii/2, p. 653; tr. C. Hillenbrand, *The Crusades. Islamic Perspectives* (Edinburgh, 1999), p. 221.

107 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. iv, p. 245; cf. S.A. Mourad & J.E. Lindsay, *The Intensification and Reorientation of Sunni Jihad Ideology in the Crusader Period* (Leiden, 2013), pp. 95–99.

108 Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, vol. iv, pp. 244–45.

109 Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, *Mir'āt al-zamān*, ed. Jewett, p. 433.

Ibn Wāṣil's chronicle is thus, for the first half of the seventh/thirteenth century, of central importance for understanding Frankish-Ayyūbid diplomatic relationships and the ways in which Ayyūbid rulers reacted to the arrival and presence of the Franks. This was understood by subsequent medieval chroniclers such as Abu'l-Fidā' (d. 732/1332), Ibn al-Furāt (d. 807/1405) and Ibn Khaldūn (d. 808/1406), who drew from him extensively for this period. Despite the outstanding importance of this chronicle it has so far not played a prominent role in modern European and American historiographies of the Crusades as it remains virtually untranslated.¹¹⁰ The only exceptions are the passages relating to the Crusade of Louis IX which Peter Jackson skilfully translated.¹¹¹ The importance of his translation lies in the fact that he not only translated those passages dealing directly with events involving the Franks, but also those that deal with the much more important issue of intra-Ayyūbid dynamics. In contrast, the second work that has substantial passages of Ibn Wāṣil in translation fails for a related reason; while Gabrieli took the right decision to rely mostly on Ibn Wāṣil for the Crusade of Frederick II, his choice of passages gives an entirely erroneous impression of the text's focus. He only translated those passages that directly deal with the Crusade and Frederick II, but the much more interesting sections on the Ayyūbid dynamics are left out.¹¹² From the perspective of the history of the Latin East and the Crusades a full translation of the *Mufarrij* thus remains an urgent desideratum.

110 Except for earlier translations such as those by J. Michaud, *Bibliothèque des croisades vol. 4* (Paris, 1829), s.v. 'Gemal-Eddin'.

111 Jackson, *Seventh Crusade*, pp. 128–54.

112 Gabrieli, *Arab Historians*, pp. 264–73, 276–80, 284–300 (Louis IX's Crusade); these sections are also included in J. Bird, E. Peters and J.M. Powell (eds.), *Crusade and Christendom. Annotated Documents in Translation from Innocent III to the Fall of Acre, 1187–1291* (Philadelphia, 2013).