INTRODUCTION

Frankish Jerusalem – Revisiting an Urban Landscape That Was Both a Symbol and an Anomaly

On 15 July 1099, after besieging the walls of Jerusalem for weeks, Crusader troops stormed the Holy City. A three-year journey culminated in the capture of Jerusalem and, most importantly, its holiest Christian shrine, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The conquest of Jerusalem marked the zenith of the Latin campaign in the East and the achievement of its main objective.[1]

Despite the vigour and profound religious motivations that had driven the entire campaign, and particularly the conquest of the Holy City, the Crusading troops do not seem to have formed their plans for the day when Jerusalem would be captured. When Heavenly Jerusalem finally materialised in its earthly counterpart, Crusaders faced the challenge of bridging the gap between ideal and reality.[2] More importantly, they were now compelled to devise a course of action that would suit their status as the new rulers of the Holy Land.

This challenge eventually yielded an urban landscape whose traces still dominate the Old City of Jerusalem today. Churches such as the Holy Sepulchre, St Mary of the Valley of Jehoshaphat and St Anne, as well as ample Crusader remains on the Temple Mount, and many other monuments, attest to this short but significant chapter in the history of the Holy City. Yet architectural remains tell only a fraction of a much bigger story, one that encompasses the complex process that shaped the cityscape during the twelfth century. It entailed a profound demographic, social, institutional and cultural transformation, after almost four

---

[1] On Jerusalem as the proclaimed goal of the Crusade, see S. Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City: Crusader Jerusalem and the Catholic West* (Aldershot and Burlington, 2005), pp. 9–20; N. Housley, 'Jerusalem and the Development of the Crusade Idea, 1099–1128', in B. Z. Kedar (ed.), *The Horns of Hattin* (Jerusalem, 1992), pp. 27–40; P. Frankopan, *The First Crusade: The Call from the East* (Cambridge, MA, 2012), pp. 90–116.

[2] J. Rubenstein, *Armies of Heaven: The First Crusade and the Quest for Apocalypse* (New York, 2011), p. 293.

Introduction: Frankish Jerusalem – Symbol and Anomaly

centuries of Muslim rule. The landscape that was shaped in this process reflected myriad encounters: between Latin newcomers and local populations; between the urban fabric shaped by centuries of Roman, Byzantine and Muslim rule, and the values, beliefs and interests of the Frankish inhabitants and institutions; and finally, between symbolic and physical landscapes.

From a modern perspective, the Frankish period seems like a brief interlude in a long continuum of Muslim rule, starting with the Umayyad period (seventh–eighth centuries CE), and ending with Ottoman rule (sixteenth–twentieth centuries CE). Yet the brevity of Crusader rule belies the remarkable impact it had on the city in terms of architecture, institutions, population and urban landscape. The Frankish period offers a remarkable wealth of extant documentation. As such, this period has long been considered a distinct historical and historiographical unit, both in the eyes of contemporaries and in modern historiography. Thus, scholarship has tended to regard the city as an urban centre whose transformation under Frankish rule took place more or less at one fell swoop, remaining in a rather stable form throughout the period.

This book sets out to challenge this perception by tracking interlaced spatial and socio-economic aspects of urban development in the twelfth century. It aims to investigate the urban transformation of Frankish Jerusalem as a multifaceted and dynamic process that was shaped by a complex mosaic of religious aspirations as well as social, institutional and economic mechanisms that developed in the city after the Crusader conquest. The study examines the formation of these mechanisms and their correspondence with broader processes that were shaping socio-economic structures in the Latin East at the time, but also looks at how these processes corresponded with concomitant trends in medieval urbanisation. This analysis relies primarily on the extant corpus of Frankish documents, supplemented by pilgrimage accounts, chronicles and archaeological evidence. Building on methodologies widely applied in the study of medieval urban environments, this study attempts to tease out of the corpus patterns that reflect socio-economic interactions and their spatial manifestations in the city and its hinterland. Moreover, this synchronous reading of the evidence sheds new light on individual documents, thus providing a glimpse into everyday life in the city through property disputes, neighbourly interactions and the formation of social bonds in an immigrant population. In doing so, this book sets out to address some of the key questions concerning a cityscape that epitomises and symbolises the medieval encounter between western European perceptions and Middle Eastern realities.

a A Pilgrim's Birds' Eye View

Before embarking on this analysis, some introductory remarks that provide a basic acquaintance with the topography of Jerusalem, its main shrines and conditions at the time of the Crusader conquest are in order.

a 'the jerusalem the crusaders captured': a pilgrim's birds' eye view at the beginning of the twelfth century

Situated amid the Judean hills, separating the Judean desert in the east from the coastal plain on the west that stretches to the shores of the Mediterranean, the city of Jerusalem stands at the meeting-point of varied climatic, topographic and geologic micro-regions.[3] The landscape in and around Jerusalem is mountainous, and the walled area of the city is dominated by two ridges, one in the west, its peak forming Mount Zion, and another in the east, featuring the plateau of the Temple Mount (see Map I.1). Stretching between these ridges on a north–south axis is the narrow Tyropoeon valley, which connects the Hinnom valley in the south-west to the Kidron valley in the east. To the east of the Kidron valley rises the Mount of Olives, beyond which stretch the hills of the Judean desert.[4]

In the twelfth century, the city was accessed through four main gates: St Stephen's (present-day Damascus Gate) from the north, Jehoshaphat (present-day Lions' Gate) from the east, Mount Zion from the south and David's Gate (present-day Jaffa Gate) from the west. An additional gate at the eastern edge of the Temple Mount was used only once a year, for liturgical purposes during Palm Sunday celebrations.[5] The four main gates connected the city to a network of roads, some dating back to the Roman period, which linked Jerusalem, the local religious and governmental centre with other shrines, holy sites and cities in the region.[6] Thus, the road extending south-west from David's Gate led

---

[3] The title of this section echoes the title of an article by Joshua Prawer, 'The Jerusalem the Crusaders Captured: A Contribution to the Medieval Topography of the City', in P. Edbury (ed.), *Crusade and Settlement* (Cardiff, 1985), pp. 1–16. For a more recent survey, see, D. Pringle, 'Jerusalem 1099. From Muslim to Christian City', *Medievalista*, 32 (2022), https://doi.org/10.4000/medievalista.5625. On micro-regions as a key concept in the history of the Mediterranean, see P. Horden and N. Purcell, *The Corrupting Sea: A Study of Mediterranean History* (Oxford and Malden, MA, 2000), pp. 58–90.

[4] For detailed topographic descriptions, see H. Vincent, *Jérusalem: recherches de topographie, d'archéologie et d'histoire – Jérusalem antique* (Paris, 1912), pp. 43–53; R. Rubin, 'Jerusalem and Its Environs: The Impact of Geographical and Physical Conditions on the Development of Jerusalem', in S. Ahituv and A. Mazar (eds.), *The History of Jerusalem: The Biblical Period* (Jerusalem, 2000), pp. 1–12.

[5] I. Shagrir, 'Adventus in Jerusalem: The Palm Sunday Celebration in Latin Jerusalem', *Journal of Medieval History*, 41 (2015), 8.

[6] On the roads to Jerusalem, see R. Ellenblum, 'The Crusader Road to Jerusalem', in Y. Ben-Arieh, Y. Ben Artzi and H. Goren (eds.), *Historical Geographical Studies in the Settlement of Eretz-Israel* (Jerusalem, 1987), pp. 203–19; M. Ehrlich, 'The Route of the First Crusade and the Frankish Roads to Jerusalem during the Twelfth Century', *Revue Biblique*, 113 (2006), 263–83.

Introduction: Frankish Jerusalem – Symbol and Anomaly

Map I.1   Topography of Jerusalem and its environs.

to Bethlehem and Hebron; the road entering St Stephen's Gate led north, connecting the city with Neapolis (Nablus), and the Gate of Jehoshaphat connected the city to the churches of the Kidron valley and the Mount of Olives, such as St Mary of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, Gethsemane and the Church of the Ascension. It also led farther east to Bethany, Bethphage, the Jordan River, the Dead Sea and Jericho.

   People arriving in Jerusalem in the first half of the twelfth century would enter the city through David's Gate, which was adjacent to the

4

a A Pilgrim's Birds' Eye View

Tower of David, a massive citadel that was part of the fortifications erected by Herod in the first century BCE.[7] This imposing structure was extensively described in accounts of the First Crusade, mostly due to its strategic importance.[8] In later decades, pilgrims noted the biblical traditions associated with the Tower, namely those connecting it to King David, an association that gained currency during the twelfth century as part of the developing imagery of the Frankish monarchy, which wished to link itself to the royal Davidic lineage. This symbolic link was strengthened after the transfer of the royal residence, initially located in the Al–Aqsa Mosque, to the Tower of David sometime after 1119.[9] Immediately to the east of the citadel, pilgrims would encounter the Greek Orthodox Jerusalemite branch of the Laura of St Sabas, and slightly to the south, the Church of St James, the main church of Jerusalem's Armenian community.

Below the citadel, stretching from west to east, lay one of the city's main arteries, presumably on the same route as the Roman *decumanus*, which connected the citadel and the western entrance to the walled area of the Temple Mount.[10] Its intersection with the north–south main axis, roughly corresponding with the Roman Cardo, marked the centre of the city and the location of its main commercial areas. Turning north–east shortly before reaching this intersection would lead visitors and inhabitants to the Holy Sepulchre.

The appearance of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in the beginning of the twelfth century was considerably different from its appearance by the end of the period of Frankish rule in Jerusalem. Visitors who arrived shortly after the Crusader conquest would have found the sepulchre of Christ in the rotunda, and the site of Golgotha in the courtyard to its east. These would later be incorporated into a single roofed complex as part of the Crusader renovation of the church, which was rededicated in 1149.[11]

---

[7] A. Kloner, 'The Contribution of Walls and Fortifications to Shaping the Urban Plan and Layout of the City', in I. Gafni, R. Reich and J. Schwartz (eds.), *The History of Jerusalem: The Second Temple Period 332 BCE–70 CE* (Jerusalem, 2020), vol. 2, pp. 416–17.

[8] See, for example, *FC*, book 1, chapter 26, pp. 284–85.

[9] A. Gutgarts, 'Royal Sovereignty in Frankish Jerusalem: Davidic Legacy and the Transformation of Jerusalem's Cityscape in the Twelfth Century', in R. Milstein, T. Ornan and A. David (eds.), *Picturing Royal Charisma* (Oxford, 2023), pp. 114–27.

[10] Y. Tsafrir, 'The Topography and Archaeology of Aelia Capitolina', in Y. Tsafrir and S. Safrai (eds.), *The History of Jerusalem: The Roman and Byzantine Periods (70–638 CE)* (Jerusalem, 1999), p. 120. As Tsafrir notes, the modern route deviates slightly to the south after the intersection with the Cardo.

[11] On the appearance of the church before the Frankish renovation, see R. Ousterhout, 'Rebuilding the Temple: Constantine Monomachus and the Holy Sepulchre', *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 48 (1989), 66–78. On the renovation and consecration in 1149,

Introduction: Frankish Jerusalem – Symbol and Anomaly

Also included in the (Latin) pilgrimage circuit in this part of the city was the Church of St Mary Latin, to the south of the Holy Sepulchre. This church was presumably part of the complex of churches and hospices that were supported by a group of merchants from Amalfi who had settled in Jerusalem in the second half of the eleventh century.[12] This area of the city, too, would later undergo significant changes, as it became the headquarters of the Hospitaller order, which received papal affirmation in 1113.[13] Additional non-Latin churches dotted this area of the city, where, as we shall see, most of the Christian population was settled prior to the Crusader conquest.[14]

After visiting the Church of St Mary Latin, pilgrims usually proceeded to the Temple Mount, entering the walled compound through an eastern gate identified in some sources as the *porta speciosa*, and also depicted on some of the round maps of Jerusalem from the twelfth century.[15] On the Temple Mount, they encountered the monumental structure of the Dome of the Rock, dubbed *Templum Domini* by the Franks, and at the southern edge of the Temple precinct they would see the Al–Aqsa Mosque, which under Latin rule became known as the *Templum* (or *Palatium*) *Salomonis*. The former was transformed into a Christian shrine, served by a community of Augustinian canons.[16] The latter served initially as the seat of the Frankish monarchs, but twenty years after the conquest it became the headquarters of the newly established Templar order.[17]

Exiting the walled area of the Temple Mount through one of the gates on its northern wall, pilgrims would have then visited the church of St Anne, probably constructed shortly after the conquest, and later significantly expanded into a monastic compound.[18] Not far from St Anne was the central church of the city's Jacobite community, St Mary Magdalene. From there, heading further east, pilgrims exited the city's

see K. Blair Moore, *The Architecture of the Christian Holy Land: Reception from Late Antiquity through the Renaissance* (Cambridge, 2017), pp. 72–75.

[12] D. Pringle, *Churches of the Crusader Kingdom* (Cambridge, 2007), vol. 3, *The City of Jerusalem*, pp. 236–37.

[13] On the early history of the order and its foundation, see J. Riley-Smith, *The Knights Hospitaller in the Levant, c. 1070–1309* (New York, 2012), pp. 16–20.

[14] See, for example, map 2 in Pringle, *The Churches*, vol. 3, p. 478.

[15] For example, *Saewulf*, 68; M. Levy-Rubin, 'Medieval Maps of Jerusalem', in J. Prawer and H. Ben-Shammai (eds.), *The History of Jerusalem: Crusaders and Ayyubids (1099–1250)* (Jerusalem, 1991), pp. 434–66.

[16] On the early stages of the establishment of Augustinian canons in the Templum Domini, see W. Zöller, *Regularkanoniker im Heiligen Land: Studien zur Kirchen-, Ordens- und Frommigkeitsgeschichte der Kreuzfahrerstaaten* (Berlin, 2018), pp. 108–22.

[17] A. Luttrell, 'The Earliest Templars', in M. Balard (ed.), *Autour de la Première Croisade* (Paris, 1995), pp. 193–202.

[18] Pringle, *The Churches*, vol. 3, pp. 142–43.

a A Pilgrim's Birds' Eye View

walls through Jehoshaphat Gate, descended to the Kidron valley and
headed towards St Mary of the Valley of Jehoshaphat and Gethsemane.
The pilgrimage circuit around this side of the walls passed through addi-
tional sites such as the pool of Siloam and Akeldama, and included an
ascent to the Mount of Olives and a visit to the Church of the Ascension
and the Church of the Lord's Prayer. On the south-western corner of
the city, pilgrims would have found the Church of St Mary of Mount
Sion. Off this circuit, which became increasingly standardised during
the twelfth century, lay additional pilgrimage sites such as the Monastery
of the Holy Cross, about 2.5 km to the south-west of the city, and the
desert, mostly Greek Orthodox, monasteries to the east of the city.[19]

Yet pilgrims' accounts provide only a limited look at the cityscape, not
only because they emphasise (mostly Latin) places of worship, but also
because in the first decades of the twelfth century such accounts almost never
touch on daily life or describe urban infrastructure such as streets, water and
sewage facilities, markets and public spaces.[20] A description, the so-called *La
Citez* (incorporated in the chronicle of Ernoul from c. 1231), depicting the
city at the end of the twelfth or beginning of the thirteenth century, some-
what compensates for this lacuna.[21] Unlike many of the earlier accounts, it
describes not only religious shrines but also streets and markets. Even more
importantly, it departs from earlier descriptions in that it provides glimpses
into daily life in the city, as well as practical travelling advice.[22] In this sense,
the gap between *La Citez* and most of the other pilgrimage accounts from
this period captures the city's most significant transformation, from a sym-
bolic space defined by the sum of its holy shrines to a lived cityscape.

By the time it was written, presumably after the loss of Jerusalem
to Saladin, Frankish architectural, administrative and socio-economic
activity had already significantly transformed the appearance of the
city. Thus, although some urban features, such as the basic street

---

[19] A. Jotischky, 'Greek Orthodox and Latin Monasticism around Mar Saba under Crusader Rule',
in J. Patrich (ed.), *The Sabaite Heritage in the Orthodox Church from the Fifth Century to the Present*
(Leuven, 2001), pp. 85–87.

[20] B. H. Qureshi, 'A Hierophany Emergent: The Discursive Reconquest of the Urban Landscape
of Jerusalem in Latin Pilgrimage Accounts from the Twelfth Century', *The Historian*, 76 (2014),
726–49; on non-Latin churches in Jerusalem, see B. Hamilton and A. Jotischky, *Latin and Greek
Monasticism in the Crusader States* (Cambridge, 2020), pp. 300–8.

[21] *La Citez* is a later title, which is often used to denote this textual unit. For a recent edition of the
text, see P. Edbury and M. Gaggero (eds.), *The Chronique d'Ernoul and the Colbert-Fontainebleau
Continuation of William of Tyre*, vol. 1 (Leiden and Boston, 2023), pp. 251–71. On the textual
tradition of the chronicle, see P. Edbury, 'Ernoul, Eracles and the Fifth Crusade', in E. J. Mylod,
G. Perry, T. W. Smith and J. Vandeburie (eds.), *The Fifth Crusade in Context* (London and New
York, 2017), pp. 163–68. On the passage describing Jerusalem, see D. Pringle, *Pilgrimage to
Jerusalem and the Holy Land, 1187–1291* (Farnham and Burlington, 2012), pp. 29–34.

[22] A. J. Boas, *Jerusalem in the Time of the Crusades: Society, Landscape and Art in the Holy City under
Frankish Rule* (New York, 2001), pp. 140–55.

7

outline or main commercial areas, are attested in earlier sources, the cityscape depicted in *La Citez* captures only the end point of an almost century-long development. Moreover, its panoramic scope, typical of pilgrimage accounts, obscures the underlying mechanisms of urban development and city life. It focuses our attention on the physical shape of the city and its main monuments at the expense of the social structures and daily interactions that shaped the cityscape over decades of Frankish rule.

If *La Citez* provides a bird's-eye view of the twilight of Frankish Jerusalem, then, to better grasp the scope and significance of the transformation that the city underwent until the time of its composition, it is necessary to examine its point of departure. Urban change in the twelfth century should be assessed against the backdrop of the challenges that faced Frankish settlers who came to Jerusalem shortly after its conquest in 1099. These challenges derived, in large part, from the tumultuous events of the eleventh century.

b jerusalem under muslim rule

Despite its strategically important topographic conditions, two main factors limited the growth of Jerusalem over the centuries. First, the city was not situated on the major historical routes that connected different regions of the eastern Mediterranean. This was particularly notable in the period of Frankish rule, when Jerusalem's economy depended largely on the influx of pilgrims and on regional production, especially compared to the coastal cities of the Latin East, which became major maritime trade hubs. Second, soil and climate conditions, and a natural elevation that demanded solutions for water supply, restricted the agricultural output in its surroundings.

Nevertheless, since about the tenth century BCE, Jerusalem has intermittently functioned as a political centre, and later continuously maintained its symbolic importance among the three Abrahamic religions.[23] It is due to this unique status that the history of Jerusalem is circumscribed by a tumultuous and often violent past. The many ebbs and flows of the cityscape are associated with different conquering polities which left their mark on the urban layout, reflecting the cultural, religious, social and economic preferences of changing rulers.

---

[23] On the role of Jerusalem as the capital of the kingdom of Judea in biblical archaeology, see F. Čapek, 'United Monarchy as Theological Construct in Light of Contemporary Archaeological Research on Iron Age IIA', in M. Oeming and P. Sláma (eds.), *A King Like All the Nations? Kingdoms of Israel and Judah in the Bible and History* (Zürich, 2015), pp. 11–16.

b Jerusalem under Muslim Rule

Until recently, the Muslim conquest of Jerusalem in 638 has been seen as a crisis that triggered a long period of decline, stemming mainly from political tensions between different Muslim polities and rulers. Coupled with such factors as Jerusalem's economic and political marginality compared to other cities in Palestine, such as Ramla, this resulted in a dwindling of the city's population and urban fabric, a decline that was part of a broader regional process of deterioration.[24] As we shall see, drawing on this narrative, historians of the Crusades have argued that Jerusalem's recovery under Latin rule resulted from the religious piety of its new Christian rulers, which led them to invest in the transformation of the cityscape. According to this line of thinking, the city's condition was mostly a matter of political resolution, socio-religious preferences and patronage.

Recent historical studies and archaeological evidence, however, challenge the nexus between cultural–religious partialities and Jerusalem's urban growth or decline between the seventh and twelfth centuries. These data show continuity, in terms of demography and physical landscape, between the Byzantine and early Muslim periods. During that time Jerusalem maintained its status as a rather prosperous urban settlement, which benefited from the significant investment of both Muslim rulers and Christian benefactors, who were motivated by the city's religious significance and by other, more mundane, reasons.[25] Matters started taking a turn for the worse only towards the eleventh century.

This transition is associated with regional geopolitical changes, namely the rise of the Seljuks, and the decline of Byzantium and the Fatimid Caliphate. The ensuing shift in the balance of power in the Levant dovetailed with a climate crisis that affected the entire eastern Mediterranean, prompting droughts, famines, social unrest and the abandonment or significant contraction of settlements.[26]

These phenomena can be traced in historical and archaeological evidence pertaining to Jerusalem and its surroundings in the eleventh

[24] M. Gil, 'The Political History of Jerusalem during the Early Muslim Period', in J. Prawer (ed.), *The History of Jerusalem: The Early Islamic Period (638–1099)* (Jerusalem, 1987), pp. 1–37.
[25] On Jerusalem's importance as a Muslim centre of worship during this period, see S. A. Mourad, 'Jerusalem in Early Islam: The Making of the Muslims' Holy City', in S. A. Mourad, N. Koltun-Fromm and B. Der Matossian (eds.), *Routledge Handbook on Jerusalem* (Abingdon and New York, 2019), pp. 77–89.
[26] R. Ellenblum, *The Collapse of the Eastern Mediterranean: Climate Change and the Decline of the East, 950–1072* (Cambridge, 2012), especially pp. 172–95 on Jerusalem; J. Preiser-Kapeller, 'A Collapse of the Eastern Mediterranean: New Results and Theories on the Interplay between Climate and Societies in Byzantium and the Near East, ca. 1000–1200 AD', *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*, 65 (2015), 195–242. For a revision of the hitherto prevalent narrative on the impact of the Muslim conquest, see G. Avni, *The Byzantine-Islamic Transition in Palestine* (Oxford, 2014), especially pp. 35–39.

Introduction: Frankish Jerusalem – Symbol and Anomaly

century, when the city suffered the consequences of regional turmoil and political unrest. The general instability and food shortages in the Fatimid Caliphate, already noted in contemporary sources from the end of the tenth century, triggered the persecution of religious minorities. Thus, in 1009, the Caliph al-Ḥākim ordered the burning of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, as well as other churches in his dominion.[27] Later, increasing attacks on the city by nomadic Bedouin tribes led Fatimid authorities to compensate for their losses by imposing harsh taxation on the Jewish community of Jerusalem, a move that prompted many Jewish residents to leave the city.[28]

Disasters continued to befall the city during the following decades, including a devastating earthquake in 1033. It was previously thought that the destruction caused by the earthquake prompted the Fatimid rulers to initiate the reconstruction of the city walls, yet recently scholars have suggested that the construction started even earlier, as a response to the demographic decline and subsequent contraction of the inhabited areas of the city.

The walls that were in place by the end of the eleventh century left out the southern edge of the city.[29] The contraction of the fortified area of the city and the destruction of the southern section of its walls in the beginning of the eleventh century prompted further shifts in settlement patterns in the city and its surroundings.[30] The rebuilding of the walls had additional implications, such as the dismantling of churches in the outskirts of Jerusalem, in order to supply building materials for the new walls, as recorded by the Melkite chronicler Yahya of Antioch. Decades later, pilgrims who travelled to Jerusalem shortly after the Crusader conquest also described the dilapidated churches around Jerusalem.[31]

---

[27] Ellenblum, *The Collapse*, 174–75. The church was restored by the Byzantine Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos in 1042–48. On the restoration, see Ousterhout, 'Rebuilding the Temple', 66–78.

[28] On the conditions in Jerusalem and their implications for the Jewish community, see M. Gil, *Palestine during the First Muslim Period (634–1099)* (Tel Aviv, 1983), Part 1, *Studies*, pp. 229–30; For evidence from the Cairo Geniza see S. D. Goitein, *Palestinian Jewry in Early Islamic and Crusader Times*, ed. Joseph Hacker (Jerusalem, 1980), pp. 115–22, 191–92; S. Simonsohn, *A Documentary History of the Jews in Italy* (Leiden, 1997), vol. 13, pp. 48–52, 360–65; Frankopan, *The First Crusade*, 90–93.

[29] Ellenblum, *The Collapse*, 176–78; on continuity and change in Jerusalem and its environs between the seventh and eleventh centuries, see Avni, *The Byzantine-Islamic Transition*, 109–59.

[30] *WT*, book 9, chapter 17, pp. 442–43; On the relocation of the Jewish population, which populated the area that remained outside the walls, to another area in the city, see J. Prawer, *Crusader Institutions* (London, 1980), pp. 86–89; J. Prawer, *The History of the Jews in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Jerusalem, 2000), pp. 38–40; Boas, *Jerusalem in the Time of the Crusades*, 43–44, 88.

[31] Cited in L.-H. Vincent and F.-M. Abel, *Jérusalem: Recherches de topographie, d'archéologie et d'histoire. II – Jérusalem nouvelle* (Paris, 1914–26), p. 942. For pilgrimage accounts after the conquest, see for