Imagination Versus Reality:

Interactions between the Crusaders and Indigenous People

Since antiquity, winning favorable public opinion has been an essential condition for successfully starting a war.[[1]](#footnote-1) One crucial stage in this process is the demonization of the enemy, which contributes to the ideological justification of any military initiative.[[2]](#footnote-2) Undoubtedly, the medieval papacy was well­-prepared to begin its propaganda campaign for the Crusades; the results prove its unprecedented success. There were, however, some challenges to bear in mind. The Holy Land, and, more particularly, the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, the focus of the papal address at Clermont, were certainly part of the spiritual background of eleventh-century Christendom; not so its inhabitants, who remained mysterious to the average believer. No wonder, therefore, that the Apostolic See concentrated its propagandistic efforts on portraying Muslims, their customs, and their creed as satanic, violent, and vicious.

This paper contends that the demonization of Muslims in Europe and the Holy Land served two different yet complementary purposes. In Christendom, the primary goal of this effort was the massive mobilization of the faithful and their support for the Latin settlements in the Levant. In the Holy Land, in contrast, this same campaign was devoted to strengthening and clearly delineating the social boundaries between the Franks, as a colonial society, and their neighbors. Continuous dialogue between conqueror and conquered and mutual conversions – whatever their number – hint at the challenges inherent in safeguarding Catholic life *Outremer*.

Following the Byzantine defeat at the Battle of Manzikert (1071), Pope Gregory VII tried to mobilize Christendom to defend the Byzantine Empire. The *servus servorum Dei* therefore began demonizing the enemy, stereotypically painting them as agents of Satan. The pope referred to “*a race of pagans* [that] *has strongly prevailed against the Christian empire and with pitiable cruelty has already almost up to the walls of the city of Constantinople laid waste and with tyrannical violence has seized everything; it has slaughtered like cattle (*quasi pecudes*) many thousands of Christians”* (1 March 1074).[[3]](#footnote-3) The pope repeated his call in a letter written a few months later to Heinrich IV, in which he shared his expectations and goals with the emperor: “*I called to your attention that the Christians beyond the sea, a great part of whom are being destroyed by the heathen with unheard-of slaughter and are daily being slain like so many sheep.”* St. Peter’s heir further declared that urgent assistance was needed to ensure that “*the religion of Christ may not utterly perish in our time.”* In addition, more confidentially, Gregory recognized that, “*I am especially moved toward this undertaking because the Church of Constantinople, differing from us on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, is seeking the fellowship of the Apostolic See.*” (7 December 1074).[[4]](#footnote-4) The emperor’s participation in the forthcoming military enterprise would, therefore, not only save many Christian lives but also prevent the collapse of the Christian faith and end the painful schism in the Church. Gregory repeated his call to the faithful a few days later (16 December 1074), referring again to the Eastern Christians, “*whom the devil through his own person is striving to turn away from the Catholic faith and through his members does not cease from cruelly slaughtering them every day as if they were cattle,”* and promising eternal reward to those answering his call to defend the Byzantine Empire.[[5]](#footnote-5) According to the pope, the Christians were being slaughtered “like cattle” by a cruel enemy whom he described as pagans, heathens, or the incarnation of the devil.

Urban II’s sermon at Clermont confirmed his predecessor’s approach when, according to Fulcher of Chartres, he referred to “*the Turks, a Persian race,* [who] *have overrun the faithful up to the Mediterranean Sea…slaughtering and capturing many, destroying churches and laying waste the kingdom of God.*”[[6]](#footnote-6) Robert of Rheims claimed that the pope further laid bare the many threats inherent:

[A] *foreign race, a race absolutely alien to God*…[that] *had reduced the people with sword, rapine and flame, and has carried off some as captives to its own land, has cut down others by pitiable murder… These men have destroyed the altars polluted by their foul practices. They have circumcised the Christians, either spreading the blood from the circumcisions on the altars or pouring it into the baptismal fonts. And they cut open the navels of those whom they choose to torment with a loathsome death, tear out their most vital organs and tie them to a stake, drag them around and flog them, before killing them as they lie prone on the ground with all their entrails out.*[[7]](#footnote-7)

Both versions of Urban’s sermon allude to the severe damage caused by the Seljuk conquerors throughout the Byzantine Empire, not only to the Christians but also to the native population of Syria and Palestine.[[8]](#footnote-8) Although Fulcher of Chartres refrained from the terrifying portrayal of Robert of Rheims, both chroniclers emphasized the desecration of churches and the condemnation of the faithful to tragic, dreadful deaths. Of further note is the reluctance of the pope, and consequently the chroniclers, to refer to these Sunni Muslim Turko-Persian conquerors as such or to reveal their religious identification with Islam. Instead, the fearsome enemy was described as Saracens, Ishmaelites, Hagarenes, Moors, or Mohammedans. From a religious perspective, they were further identified as pagans, heathens, or, more commonly, infidels.[[9]](#footnote-9) At this early stage, the complete ignorance of and consequent disregard for the monotheistic nature of Islam could be attributed to the lack of information about the rising Seljuk Empire and the actual beliefs and practices of this new enemy.

Although this premise probably has validity in the case of the chroniclers, the question remains as to the information available to the eleventh-century papacy. It appears more likely that the portrayal of the Muslims as demonic was, in fact, a product of a carefully-designed propaganda campaign by the Holy See. Notable in this regard is that when dealing directly with Muslim rulers, medieval popes usually refrained from offending their sentiments in any way, while indirectly recognizing Islam as a monotheistic faith. Apostolic correspondence indeed hints at ever-growing intercultural compatibility in the sphere of diplomacy.[[10]](#footnote-10) Thus, the same Pope Gregory VII, who had called for a Holy War two years earlier, recognized in a letter to the Berber ruler an-Nãşir b. ‘Alennas (late 1076) that both Christians and Berbers believe in one God, albeit in different forms, and worship him as creator and ruler of this world. After thanking the emir for his goodwill toward his Christian subjects, Gregory declared:

*This good action was inspired in your heart by God, the creator of all things, without whom we can neither do nor think any good thing. He who lighteth every man that cometh into the world enlightened your mind in this purpose. For Almighty God, who desires that all men shall be saved and that none shall perish, approves nothing more highly in us than this: that a man love his fellow man next to his God and do nothing to him, which he would not to others than should do to himself. This affection we and you owe to each other in a more peculiar way than to people of other races because we worship and confess the same God though in diverse forms and daily praise and adore him as the creator and ruler of this world.*

After such a moving declaration of fraternal love, the pope ended his epistle wishing the emir, “*that God himself, after the long journey of this life, may lead you into the bosom of the most holy patriarch Abraham.”*[[11]](#footnote-11) The biblical precept of “love your neighbor” (Lev.19: 18; Mk.12: 29–31; Jn.13:34) was therefore further reinforced by the shared Abrahamic origins and the faith of the emir and the Bishop of Rome.

The conclusion is therefore unavoidable – the very pope demonizing the Turko-Persian Sunni Muslims was well aware of the disparity between the Berbers’ monotheistic faith and the pagan, demonic nature that he was ascribing to the enemy as a whole. Did this dual approach on the part of the papacy reflect a deep knowledge of early Christian influences in North Africa, as opposed to the steppe culture of the Seljuks, or should it be ascribed to the divergence between the imperatives of foreign diplomacy and those of the more general propaganda efforts? Indeed, tactful, sensitive gestures of this kind were reserved for the highest levels of international diplomacy but were completely absent from the papal campaign for the crusade.

Urban’s letters, written shortly after the Council of Clermont, continued the demonization of the Muslims and ratified the pope’s contempt toward those who, by their savage conquest, had contaminated the holiest places of the Christian faith. In the apostolic epistle to the faithful in Flanders (December 1095), the pope referred to the Muslims as “*barbarians*” who “*have invaded and ravaged the churches of God*.”[[12]](#footnote-12) A later letter to the religious of Vallombrosa (7 October 1096), summarized Urban’s solution to the savage threat proposed by the papacy: “…[*W*]*e were stimulating the minds of knights to go on this expedition, since they might be able to restrain the savagery of the Saracens by their arms and restore the Christians to their former freedom*.”[[13]](#footnote-13)

Papal rhetoric further ascribed all the attributes of a just war to the military pilgrimage *Outremer* to undo the damage done to the holiest shrines of the Christian faith and the faithful as a whole. In this context, it should be noted that, according to classical jurisprudence, justice is “*a steady and enduring will to render unto everyone his right.*” [[14]](#footnote-14) Urban was not satisfied with a just punishment alone; he went further and spoke of the critical blow that the Christian mission would inflict on the enemy’s pride, not only in the Holy Land but far and wide, in all Christian lands that, with God’s help, would be liberated from Muslim rule. Referring to the Christian attack on Tarragona, the pope argued: *“For you know what a great defense it would be for Christ’s people and what a terrible blow it would be to the Saracens if, by the goodness of God, the position of that famous city were restored*.”[[15]](#footnote-15)

The thirst of vengeance thus appears to have played a crucial role, representing an appealing component in the papal message that was especially attractive to medieval knights. Indeed, the Muslims’ acts of sacrilege, their despoliation and vandalism of ancestral Christian sites in the Holy Land –which, by that time, had become the *Patrimonium Christi*– imbued the crusades with all the power and connotations of a just Biblical war.[[16]](#footnote-16)

Contemporary reactions reflect the acceptance of the Holy See’s narrative beyond the direct sphere of influence of the Roman Bishop. After initially disapproving of the Crusades, the Byzantine princess Anna Comnena alluded to the Turks, Saracens, and Hagarenes as pagans who worshipped “Mahumet” (sic!) through mystic rites. She further refers to those “*barbarian Ishmaelites who were slaves to drunkenness, wine, and Dionysius,”* andscorned their practice of circumcision. According to her, the castration of their body did not prevent them from becoming slaves of sordid sexual passions.[[17]](#footnote-17) Nor did Fulcher of Chartres refrain from expressing his scorn of Islam, which he regarded as pure idolatry.[[18]](#footnote-18) Whether this assertion should be considered a reflection of Fulcher’s ignorance of the Muslim creed – common to many participants in the First Crusade – or of xenophobic sentiments is still an open question. Guibert of Nogent, on the other hand, provided his own version of Muslim history: *“After the pagan heresy had grown strong over a long time, and for many generations, the people…invaded Palestine, Jerusalem, and the Holy Sepulcher and captured Armenia, Syria, and the part of Greece that extends almost to the sea…”* The “historical approach,” however, did not encourage more tolerant attitudes. On the contrary, Guibert further argues that according to the testimony of the Byzantine Emperor:

*The churches which the pagans held had been turned into stables for horses, mules and other animals… they set up in them temples, which they called Mahomeries, and they carried out all kinds of filthy activity in them, so that they had become not cathedrals, but brothels and theaters… those who survived led lives wretchedly bound by the yoke of slavery, harsher, … than those who died endured. They took virgins and made them public prostitutes…mothers were violated in the presence of their daughters, raped over and again…*.[[19]](#footnote-19)

As time went by, notwithstanding improved knowledge of Muslim beliefs and practices, the papal dissemination of satanic stereotypes only intensified in their regard. While calling the faithful to the Second Crusade, Pope Eugene III referred to them as pagans and, as such, “*enemies of the cross of Christ*” *(Quantum predecessors,* 1 March 1146).[[20]](#footnote-20) The message promoted by the Apostolic See toward the Muslims was a far cry from the evangelical message of love for God and neighbor as expressed in Gregory VII’s letter.[[21]](#footnote-21) It represented a return, instead, to the German heritage of the cult of war and the warriors’ ethics.[[22]](#footnote-22) These values were further cemented toward the end of the eleventh century by the consolidation of knighthood as a well-defined social class.[[23]](#footnote-23) The question remains as to the degree to which these feelings of anger and the quest for vengeance, fostered and manipulated by the papacy, permeated contemporary society. To what degree, then, was the papal narrative accepted thus justifying the atrocities committed by the crusaders against those they encountered in their pilgrimage to earthly Jerusalem?

At an early stage, contemporary documentation amply confirms the success of the papal propaganda campaign. The leaders of the First Crusade –Bohemond, Raymond Count of St. Gilles, Godfrey Duke of Lorraine, Robert Count of Flanders, and Eustace Count of Boulogne– following the conquest of Antioch (11 September 1098), proudly reported to the *Vicarius Christi*,“*the capture and slaughter of the Turks who had heaped so many insults on our Lord Jesus.*”[[24]](#footnote-24) Fulcher of Chartres, participant in and eyewitness of the First Crusade, further remained completely insensitive regarding the suffering inflicted by his fellow crusaders on innocent Muslim women, children, and elderly people whom they met. A few examples illustrate his utter indifference: when Muslim women were captured in Kerbogha’s tents before Antioch (1098), Fulcher mentioned that the Franks “*did them no evil but drove lances into their bellies*,” without expressing any criticism of this action.[[25]](#footnote-25) Moreover, when describing the slaughter of Muslims at Caesarea (1101), he evidences no sense of pity when relating that their bodies were piled up and burned to recover the money they had swallowed;[[26]](#footnote-26) he also did not express any sign of compassion toward the slaughter of Muslims following the conquest of Jerusalem.[[27]](#footnote-27) William of Tyre refrained from calling the Muslims “pagans” and portrayed Nũr al-Din as a man who feared God, albeit “according to the superstitious traditions of that people.”[[28]](#footnote-28) Nevertheless, he did not hesitate to describe them as repugnant “dogs,” who had profaned the holy places where Jesus had walked and subjugated the people of God to their tyrannical rule.[[29]](#footnote-29)

Toward the end of the twelfth century, however, vague characterizations and gross stereotypes of Muslims and Islam gradually gave way to more detailed and accurate descriptions, especially by those who had sojourned in the Levant.[[30]](#footnote-30) The testimony of James of Vitry, Bishop of Acre between 1216–1228, illustrates the new approach among the more educated ecclesiastical elite. In his detailed letter to the Parisian masters (c. 1216–1217), James refers to the different Muslim sects:

*Some respect the law of Muhammad, others scornfully ignore his precepts drinking wine, eating pork, and unlike the others they do not practice circumcision. The Old Man of the Mountain is the abbot of the religions of the Brothers of the Knives or Assassins, who recognize only one religious precept, that they will find salvation through obeying to do whatever they are asked, whether it be killing Christians or Saracens. There are other Saracens called of the occult belief…they would rather be killed than divulge their secret beliefs to anyone…I found others who say that the soul dies with the body, and so they do exactly as they please like animals satisfying their worst instincts….*[[31]](#footnote-31)

Although James complains that he could not freely preach or baptize in Muslim lands, he expressed some satisfaction at his progress in this endeavor.[[32]](#footnote-32) On the other hand, Geoffrey of Donjon, Master of the Hospital, reported the miraculous conversion of a young Saracen of humble birth, who, after discovering the true faith, devoted his life to the Christian mission.[[33]](#footnote-33) Notwithstanding the lack of extensive evidence concerning conversions in either direction,[[34]](#footnote-34) there are some accounts of such occurrences. There are three well-known cases of Templars who joined Islam, whether willingly or after being captured on the battlefield and then forced to renounce Christianity.[[35]](#footnote-35) The Order dignitaries would respond with the utmost severity to apostasy and, whenever possible, the traitorous knights lost their habits and were condemned to life imprisonment.[[36]](#footnote-36)

Guibert of Nogent further provides one of the earliest testimonies of Eastern Christians’ conversion to Islam:

*According to popular opinion, there was a man, whose name, if I have it right, was Mathomus, who led them away from belief in the Son and in the Holy Spirit. He taught them to acknowledge only the person of the Father as the single, creating God, and he said that Jesus was entirely human. To sum up his teachings, having decreed circumcision, he gave them free rein for every kind of shameful behavior. I do not think that this profane man lived a very long time ago, since I find that none of the Church doctors has written against his licentiousness. Since I have learned nothing about his behavior and life from writings, no one should be surprised if I am willing to tell what I have heard told in public by some skillful speakers. To discuss whether these things are true or false is useless, since we are considering here only the nature of this new teacher, whose reputation for great crimes continues to spread. One may safely speak ill of a man whose malignity transcends and surpasses whatever evil can be said of him.* [[37]](#footnote-37)

The gradual rapprochement between Latins and Muslims did not go unreported and prompted criticism from certain contemporaries, especially those coming from Christendom. One of the participants in Frederick II’s crusade bemoaned that, “*there is no difference between a Christian and a pagan…. Young and elderly Christians speak the pagan languages, and they appreciate more an infidel than two or more people of their own race*.”[[38]](#footnote-38) Criticism of this kind justifies further analysis of the actual relationships between the inhabitants of the Holy Land, either Latins, Muslims, or Eastern Christians.

Writing in the early thirteenth century, Abbot Arnold of Lübeck referred to the Franks’ imitation of Muslim practices. He honestly recognized that, “*the Muslims who are in their generation wiser than the children of light* (Franks)*, contrive many things that our people did not know, unless they learned from them*,” and pointed at carrier pigeons as an example.[[39]](#footnote-39) Although Arnold’s writing could not be considered an eyewitness account, his testimony merits full consideration since on several occasions he avoided using stereotyped generalizations regarding Muslims.[[40]](#footnote-40) Moreover, he twice recorded the Abrahamic origins of Islam and ascribed Muslims with some readiness to recognize certain basic principles of Christian dogma.[[41]](#footnote-41)

One can further identify several points of congruence between Franks and Muslims in the Latin Levant. Ronnie Ellenblum presented one of the most illuminating studies in this field, illustrating the constant dialogue between both sides in terms of economy, trade, agriculture, and warfare. Concerning crusader castles, he rightly concludes that they “are the most evident expression of a cultural dialogue between east and west, not because one of the sides borrowed from the other but because they are the outcome of a lengthy, ongoing dialogue between two schools of military tactics and approaches.”[[42]](#footnote-42)

The cultural dialogue between crusaders and Muslims covered almost every facet of daily life. The use of paper in the Frankish Levant –although less developed than among the Muslims– is indicative of this process.[[43]](#footnote-43) The permanent employment of salaried physicians in the Hospital of Jerusalem reflects Oriental influence.[[44]](#footnote-44) Perhaps more clearly, the proliferation of bathhouses in the Frankish Levant proves direct Muslim influence on daily practices, as frequent bathing became a characteristic of the *Pullani*, i.e., the Franks. Ecclesiasts, who cared more about Christian moral principles than about hygiene, often held a dim view of this practice, which sometimes occurred in mixed-sex contexts.[[45]](#footnote-45) Although we still lack a comprehensive study in the field of art,[[46]](#footnote-46) there is clear evidence of Muslim influence on luxury goods, glass, textiles, and other merchandise destined for the social elite. As Eva Hoffman rightly claims, the constant traffic of people and goods throughout the Mediterranean, both through gifts at the court level and through trade among the merchant class, proved an effective recipe for maintaining a fragile co-existence and a delicate balance of power.”[[47]](#footnote-47) In contrast, there are no clear manifestations of Islamic influence in monumental Christian architecture comparable to the arabesque style commonly found on the Iberian Peninsula at the time.

However, , on the theoretical and ideological levels, the quotidian rapprochement did not encourage more tolerant attitudes to the other, whether Christian or Muslim. On the contrary, in an anonymous description of 1202, the Eastern Christians were still referred to by the dubious sobriquets of “schismatics” or, worse still, “heretics,” a designation first given to them by the participants in the First Crusade.[[48]](#footnote-48) Moreover, the crusader leaders took great pains to maintain the satanic image of the enemy. This policy was expected to both encourage the continuous, but, in fact, still reluctant, support of Christendom and reinforce the social barriers between the conquerors and the conquered*.* Faithful to this purpose, Amalric of Nesle, Patriarch of Jerusalem, and Bertrand of Blancfort, Master of the Temple, wrote to the King Louis VII of France: “*We find ourselves surrounded by a perverse, evil nation of tyrannical infidels,”* portraying the Muslims as “*persecutors of truth and faith”* and *“persecutors of the Church*.”[[49]](#footnote-49) The Christian setback at the Horns of Hattin[[50]](#footnote-50) only added to the satanic portrayal of the Muslims. [[51]](#footnote-51) Terricus, the Gran Preceptor of the Temple, depicted Saladin’s followers as “*a horde of pagans*,” intoxicated by Christian blood,[[52]](#footnote-52) while Heraclius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, claimed that:

*Our Christian brothers were slain by the sword of Mafumetus the Unbeliever and his evil worshipper Saladin… Indeed, the perfidious enemies of the Cross of Christ have turned our Churches into stables for the horses and they copulate with Christian women in front of the altars.”*[[53]](#footnote-53)

Such attitudes, which evolved in the Holy Land, were consistent with the papal message and consequently received full support from the Holy See. Thus, Gregory VIII further referred to: “*those savage barbarians thirsting after Christian blood and using all their force to profane the Holy Places and banish the worship of God from the land*.”[[54]](#footnote-54) In his call for the Fifth Crusade, Innocent III, found it necessary to teach the faithful the apostolic version of “holy history” (*Quia Maior,* 19–29 April 1213): “*The Christian peoples, in fact, held almost all the Saracen provinces up to the time of Blessed Gregory; but since then, a son of perdition has arisen, the false prophet Muhammad, who has seduced many men from the truth by worldly enticements and the pleasures of the flesh*.”

After such a compelling opening, the pope further referred to the latest news, mainly the building of the fortress in Mount Tabor by “*the same perfidious Saracens*” that was expected to facilitate their conquest of Crusader Acre.[[55]](#footnote-55)

No wonder, then, that the Muslims reciprocated the lack of respect for the “other.” John Sarrasin, Chamberlain of France and participant in the Fifth Crusade, reported to Nicholas Arrode that when the Christians approached Damietta, “*the Saracens had fled…telling each other that the* ***pigs*** *had arrived*” (23 June 1249).[[56]](#footnote-56) Perhaps the animal reference hints at the Christian diet as opposed to the Muslim prohibition of pork. Still, one cannot ignore the derogatory nature of such a description.

The Mongols’ advance in the mid-thirteenth century evoked similar reactions, as the Tartars easily fulfilled the stereotyped role of a much-hated demonic enemy. Robert, Patriarch of Jerusalem and papal legate, together with other prelates in the Holy Land, complained to their colleagues in France and England: *“From the realms of the East the cruel beast has come to invest the province of Jerusalem…They decapitated the priest* (of the Holy Sepulchre) *while they were in the act of officiating at the altars saying: ‘here we shed the blood of the Christian People where they have drunk wine in honour of their god who they say was suspended on the cross*…’” The prelatesfurther lamented that the Mongols: *“Profaned everywhere, the graves of the kings…their wickedness was greater than that of all Saracens who had always shown the utmost reverence for our holy cities during their numerous occupations of the land of the Christians*.”[[57]](#footnote-57)

Somewhat unexpectedly, the Mongol threat thus engendered a reassessment of the Muslims image, rendering them and their actions more human and less satanic.[[58]](#footnote-58) Descriptions of this kind were meant to arouse anger and provide the much-needed support to the beleaguered Latin States. It can sometimes be difficult, if not impossible, however, to differentiate between real situations and repeated literary *topoi*.

In conclusion, the stereotyping of the Muslims as agents of Satan was elaborated and promoted by the eleventh-century papacy as an essential tool for serving apostolic interests. The assistance to the Byzantine Empire and the crusades were just a part of the Holy See pursuit of *plena potestas* – the establishment of the papal monarchical rule in Christendom. The portrayal of the enemy as frightening and satanic was successfully manipulated to promote the Holy War against the Muslims. These invectives were then incorporated into the symbolic and linguistic repertoire of contemporary society and were given expression in both papal correspondence and the narrative sources. The apostolic initiative was further accepted and adapted, especially by the Latin leaders, to justify their atrocities against native populations and became a principal means of rousing support within Christendom. In parallel, it was expected to reinforce the social boundaries between the Frankish colonial society and the native inhabitants. Conversely, there was a continuous dialogue and mutual influence at the practical level between the two different societies that convened in the Levant. The very existence of such a dialogue – as much as it was criticized at the theoretical and ideological levels – could perhaps have significance today as well.
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