**Papal Manipulation at the Service of the Holy War:**

**The Apostolic Approach to the Muslims**

Public support has always been essential for the successful launch of a war. The need for justification only grows when the warfare is perpetrated far away and the self-defense rationale is consequently weakened, if not invalidated. One decisive stage in galvanizing favorable public opinion is the demonization of the enemy, which can offer ideological justification for a military action. The crusades reflect in this regard the unprecedented success of the papacy, ideally equipped to develop a propaganda campaign in inauspicious circumstances. The Holy Land and, more particularly, the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem – which was commonly assumed as focus of the papal address at Clermont – were certainly part of the eleventh-century spiritual ethos of Christendom.[[1]](#footnote-1) This was not however the case with regard its inhabitants, who were rather mysterious or completely unknown to the average believer. To fuel an aspiration for a confrontational warfare overseas, the Apostolic See thus needed to conjure up a suitably menacing image of the enemy, casting it as a threat to the very existence of Christendom. [[2]](#footnote-2) Consequently, from the last quarter of the eleventh century, medieval popes concentrated their propaganda efforts on portraying the Muslims, their customs and creed not merely as pagan but also as satanic, cruel and vicious.

This paper contends that the demonization of the Muslims in both Europe and the Holy Land was the result of a well-premeditated papal propaganda campaign within the limitations dictated by the medieval communication framework.[[3]](#footnote-3) For the purposes of its propaganda campaign, the papacy could safely rely on the experience and efficacy of the apostolic curia and the ecclesiastical organization as a whole, which Thomas Hobbes had rightly classified as the true successor of the Roman Empire.[[4]](#footnote-4) The papal propaganda campaign was carefully planned at the service of the crusades, and was actually based on the stereotyped, denigrating description of the Muslims. As such, papal propaganda served two different, though complementary purposes: In Christendom, the primary aim of apostolic efforts was to encourage mass mobilization for the crusades and to provide the critical support on which relied the Latin settlements in the Levant. The same propaganda campaign in the Holy Land was devoted to clearly delineating and reinforcing the sociocultural and religious gap between the Franks as conquerors and their native subjects, the Muslims at their head. Over time, however, the decline of the crusades and the continuous dialogue between conqueror and conquered, reflect the limitations of the papal propaganda campaign and the regression of apostolic political leadership at the eve of the modern times.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Following the Byzantine defeat at the Battle of Manzikert (1071),[[5]](#footnote-5) Gregory VII strove to mobilize Christendom against the Seljuk Turks. The *servus servorum Dei* thus began demonizing the enemy, casting them as pagans and, worse still, Satan agents. The pope referred to

*A race of* ***pagans*** (emphasis mine)[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).[[6]](#footnote-6)

Gregory VII repeated his call a few months later in a letter to Henry IV, in which the pope shared his deep concern 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*** (emphasis mine) *with unheard-of slaughter and are daily being slain like so many sheep* (7 December 1074)*.*

St. Peter’s heir further declared that assistance was urgently needed to ensure that “*the religion of Christ may not utterly perish in our time.”* More confidentially, Gregory additionally confessed 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]](#footnote-7)

The purpose of Gregory’s plea for imperial involvement, therefore, was not only to protecting Christian lives but also to prevent the collapse of the true faith overseas thus repairing as much as possible the lamentable schism in the Church.[[8]](#footnote-8) Gregory repeated his call to the faithful a few days later, while referring to the Eastern Christians as those:

*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…* (16 December 1074).[[9]](#footnote-9)

The devil had then released a double salvo – he had deceived the Eastern Christians into leaving the true faith while delivering them to slaughter by a cruel enemy, whom Gregory VII described as pagans and heathens. No wonder, therefore, that the pope promised eternal reward to those answering his call and devote themselves to the defense of the Byzantine Empire against such dangerous, twofold threat: the Seljuk Turks outside and the ecclesiastical schism inside. Gregory VII further committed himself to lead the sacred enterprise, its ultimate goal being the liberation of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem.[[10]](#footnote-10)

Despite Gregory’s vehement rhetoric, the papal attempts to enlist Christendom in an apostolic holy war did not crystallize at this stage. In his letter to Count William VI of Poitou (10 September 1074), Gregory justified the provisional impasse, since “*by God’s mercy the Christians have far repelled the savagery of the pagans.*”[[11]](#footnote-11)

 At this early stage, the complete ignorance of and consequent disregard for the monotheistic nature of the Muslims’ monotheistic religion could be attributed to the lack of knowledge about the rising Seljuk Empire and its actual beliefs and practices. While this assumption may have been valid concerning the average believer, the question remains as to the eleventh-century papacy, and its knowledge of the approaching enemy. This question acquires much significance in light of the papal curia’s developed communication system, with regular messengers and/or legates covering the routes across Christendom and with the Byzantine Empire, as well.[[12]](#footnote-12) One should further note that most of the chroniclers who wrote about the crusades, if not all, were members of the Ecclesiastical Monastic Order and, as such, were more exposed to accessible information than the average believer.

It appears therefore reasonable that the widespread portrayal of the Seljuk Turks as demonic pagans while deliberately neglecting their monotheistic faith was in fact the product of the carefully designed apostolic campaign, founded on manipulation. Especially telling here is the gap between papal declarations in crusading propaganda vis-à-vis apostolic diplomacy, especially with Muslim leaders. Indeed, medieval popes usually refrained from offending Muslim rulers when addressing them directly, by alluding to Islam as a monotheistic faith, further suggesting an ever-growing intercultural compatibility.[[13]](#footnote-13) Even Pope Gregory VII, who had called for the Holy War against the pagans and heathens two years earlier, affirmed that both Christians and Berbers believe in one God, albeit in different forms, and worship Him as creator and ruler of this world. Writing to the Berber ruler, an-Nãşir b. ‘Alennas (late 1076), to thank the emir for his goodwill toward his Christian subjects, Gregory indeed avowed

*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.*

Following this moving declaration of fraternal love, the pope wished the emir “*that God himself, after the long journey of this life, may lead you into the bosom of the most holy patriarch Abraham.”*[[14]](#footnote-14) The biblical precept of “love your neighbor” (Leviticus19. 18; Mark12. 29–31; John13. 34) was thereby reinforced by shared Abrahamic roots and the elements of faith shared by both the Berber Emir and the Roman Bishop.

 The conclusion is therefore unavoidable – the very pope demonizing the Seljuk Turks for propagandistic, manipulative reasons, was well aware of the disparity between the Berbers’ monotheistic faith and the pagan, demonic nature that he was categorically ascribing to the Christian enemy as a whole. Did this contradictory approach reflect a deep knowledge of early Christian influences in North Africa, as opposed to the steppe culture of the Seljuks? Alternatively – what seems to us more probable -- should it be ascribed to the inevitable conflict between the imperatives of foreign diplomacy and of propaganda campaigns? No doubt, tactful, sensitive gestures were reserved for the highest levels of international diplomacy but were completely absent from papal crusading rhetoric. Moreover, in his letter to the kings and lay magnates of Spain (28 June 1077), Gregory VII again differentiated between Saracens and pagans while taking care to refer to them as distinct categories.[[15]](#footnote-15) Such differentiation between Saracens and pagans, however, was not maintained to the long range and does not characterize the apostolic approach either in the Iberian Peninsula and/or the Holy Land.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

The characterization of Muslims as pagans in the Crusade Period have attracted the attention of historians, since the pioneer studies of Benjamin Z. Kedar and Bernard Hamilton,[[16]](#footnote-16) and more recently, of Marcus Bull, John Tolan, and Yan Bourke.[[17]](#footnote-17) It is commonly assumed that notwithstanding available information, medieval sources gave freedom to their authors’ imagination, either because they were not sufficiently interested in the Muslims and Islam, or to justify the Crusade.[[18]](#footnote-18) R. W. Southern, indeed, characterized the pre-crusade period as the “age of ignorance’ with regard the Muslims and Islam.[[19]](#footnote-19) Brian Catlos remarks the Frankish indifference to Islamic religious practices, and the lack of a continuous, massive effort to convert Muslims or curb their worship.”[[20]](#footnote-20) The question remains, however, if this alleged ignorance indeed resulted from a lack of interest or, what seems us more plausible, from the well-premeditated papal manipulative campaign, the chroniclers and preachers being an inherent part of the apostolic target audience.

 The complexity inherent in the apostolic description of the Muslims as pagans and/or idolaters, thus deserves additional explanation. The Early Church applied the concept of paganism to the “other”, as one of the antitheses in the process of Christian self-definition and, as such, it was generally used in a derogatory sense.[[21]](#footnote-21) The Church Fathers further considered idolatry as the worst crime of the human race.[[22]](#footnote-22) During the Carolingian era, as well, the concept of paganism characterized the complete opposition between the true faith and the superstitious beliefs attributed to the pagans. Pepin III’s capitularies indeed ordered, “*Ut populus christianus paganismum non faciat.”*[[23]](#footnote-23) Christian thinkers further understood paganism as a worship of demons, which sometimes was used as a generic term applied to all non-Christians.[[24]](#footnote-24)

 As to the more specific equivalence between Muslims and paganism and/or idolatry, while the first encounters of Christendom with Islam date back to the eighth century, the earliest description of Saracen idolatry was made by the nun Hrotsvither of Gandersheim at the turn of the first millennium. The interest of Christian authors in Muhammad and Islam, however, grew throughout the centuries,[[25]](#footnote-25) while the equivalence between Saracens and pagans gradually permeated the *chansons de geste,* liturgical drama, and the stories of saints up to the sixteenth century.[[26]](#footnote-26) As late as in 1418 Pope Martin V still referred to the Muslims as idolaters.[[27]](#footnote-27)

 Pope Gregory’s acknowledgement of the Muslims’ monotheistic faith, however, is less surprising bearing in mind the early recognition of Christian theological treatises of both Muhammad’s closeness to Christian and Jewish sources, and the monotheistic essence of Islam. The expansion of Islam, indeed, brought about a wide interest on Muhammad and Islam from the eighth to the fifteenth century, with more than one hundred Latin texts mentioning the Prophet.[[28]](#footnote-28) On the other hand, Gregory’s concomitant hostility to the Seljuks paved the way for a new, more extreme and antagonistic approach, casting Muhammad as a god – whose statue supposedly stayed in the Temple of Solomon -- thus painting the Saracens as a whole as pagans. From the end of the eleventh century, the figure of Muhammad was therefore instrumentalized to condemn Islam and subsequently justify the crusade.[[29]](#footnote-29) Through the thirteenth-century, moreover, biased polemical biographies portrayed Muhammad as heresiarch, trickster, and magician.[[30]](#footnote-30) One should therefore conclude at this stage that Gregory VII’s recognition of the Berber Emir’s monotheistic faith, on the one hand, and his call to the Holy War against the pagan Seljuks, on the other, hints at the contradiction between historical facts and the apostolic manipulative propaganda campaign on behalf of the crusades.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

 Urban II confirmed the core of Gregory’s ideological message at the Council of Clermont (18–28 November 1095) [[31]](#footnote-31) when, according to Fulcher of Chartres, the pope 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.*[[32]](#footnote-32)

Robert of Reims further claimed that the pope had laid bare the many threats posed by this menacing situation:

[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.*[[33]](#footnote-33)

Both versions of Urban’s sermon thus allude to the depredations of the Seljuk conquerors throughout the Byzantine Empire, suffered not only by Christians but also by the native populations of Syria and Palestine.[[34]](#footnote-34) Both chroniclers further emphasized the desecration of churches and the condemnation of the faithful to dreadful deaths.[[35]](#footnote-35) One should note, however, the pope’s reluctance and consequently the chroniclers’, to identify the conquerors as Sunni Turko-Persians and, more important still, to reveal their Islamic monotheistic faith.[[36]](#footnote-36) Following the papal approach, indeed, contemporary sources described the fearsome enemy as Saracens, Ishmaelites, Hagarenes, Moors, or Mohammedans, while further depicting them as pagans, heathens or, more commonly, infidels.[[37]](#footnote-37) Thus, the very fact that the Seljuks had converted to Islam by 985, more than one hundred years before the Council of Clermont, was completely ignored.

 Urban’s letters, written shortly after the Council of Clermont, continued to demonize the Seljuks and confirmed the pope’s contempt toward those who had defiled the holiest Christian places with their savage conquest.[[38]](#footnote-38) God’s vicar on earth referred to them as “*barbarians”* who “*have invaded and ravaged the churches of God*,”[[39]](#footnote-39) thus justifying the apostolic plan “*to restrain the savagery of the Saracens … and restore the Christians to their former freedom”* (December 1095, October 1096).[[40]](#footnote-40) Papal rhetoric further ascribed all the attributes of a Just Holy War to the military pilgrimage *Outremer,* which aimed to repair the damage caused to the holiest Christian shrines and to the faithful as a whole.

One should note in this regard that a Holy War was considered to be authorized directly or indirectly by God (or Christ), and fought to reinforce His designs. Being the vicars of God and also, as Innocent IV claimed later on, the heirs of the Roman Emperors, the popes were responsible for its public proclamation.[[41]](#footnote-41) The apostolic claim of *plenitudo postestatis --* whichmatured with the Gregorian Reform and the revival of Roman Law and reached its zenith during the pontificates of Innocent III, Innocent IV, and Boniface VIII – further justified papal crusader policy.[[42]](#footnote-42) According to the opening line of Justinian’s Institutes, indeed, justice is a steady and enduring will to render unto everyone his rights.[[43]](#footnote-43) Urban II was not satisfied with a just punishment of the Muslim forces alone; he went further and detailed the critical blow that the crusade would inflict on the enemy’s pride, not only in the Holy Land but throughout Christendom, which, with God’s help, would be liberated from Muslim oppression.[[44]](#footnote-44)

The thirst for vengeance appeared to have played a crucial role in driving the crusades and becoming a compelling element in the papal manipulative campaign, which was especially appealing to medieval knights.[[45]](#footnote-45) Indeed, the Muslims’ acts of sacrilege, their despoliation of ancestral Christian shrines in the Holy Land – which had become by then the *Patrimonium Christi* – imbued the crusades with all the power and meaning of a Just Biblical War *(bellum justum)*.[[46]](#footnote-46) When calling the faithful to the Second Crusade, Pope Eugene III as well referred to the Muslims as pagans, and worse still, “*enemies of the cross of Christ” (Quantum predecessores,* 1 March 1146),[[47]](#footnote-47) thus justifying the prolongation of the Christian enterprise overseas. The Apostolic See approach regarding the Muslims thus diverged vastly from the Gospel message of love for God and your neighbor, as expressed in Gregory VII’s letter.[[48]](#footnote-48) It presents, instead, a return to the German heritage of the cult of war and the warrior ethos.[[49]](#footnote-49) These were further cemented toward the end of the eleventh century by the consolidation of knighthood in Christendom,[[50]](#footnote-50) and the following emergence of the Military Orders in the Holy Land.[[51]](#footnote-51)

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

The degree to which anger and the thirst for vengeance, fostered and manipulated by the papacy, permeated contemporary society justifies additional research on the degree of reception of papal narrative. As a whole, contemporary sources reflect the acceptance of the apostolic manipulative approach across the Mediterranean, even beyond the direct sphere of influence of the Roman Bishop. As claimed by Colin Morris, “the preaching of the crusades was a spectacularly successful example of propaganda, and one of the major reasons for its success was the fact that it was not completely controlled and regulated by a central authority. Crusading propaganda was in one sense a dramatic expression of the international standing of the papacy. Viewed from another angle, it was a demonstration of that spirit of initiative and ‘do it yourself’ which is characteristic of twelfth century lay society.”[[52]](#footnote-52) The complexity of crusading propaganda and its reception by different social strata does not however neutralize the tremendous apostolic influence in the injurious, pejorative depiction of Muslims as pagans, idolaters, and/or Satan envoys.

After initially disapproving of the crusades, the Byzantine Princess Anna Komnene alluded to the Turks, Saracens, and Hagarenes as pagans who worshipped “Mahumet’ through mystic rites. She additionally refers to those “*barbarian Ishmaelites who were slaves to drunkenness, wine, and Dionysius,”* andscorned their practice of circumcision. Anna further claims that the Muslims’ mutilation of their body did not prevent them from becoming slaves to their sordid sexual passions.[[53]](#footnote-53) Clearly, the princess was either unaware of the Islam’s strict prohibition against alcohol or chose to ignore it.[[54]](#footnote-54) On the other hand, she was probably influenced by the Muslim descriptions of earthly pleasures in paradise, which had been popularized and manipulated by Christian treatises since the eighth century.[[55]](#footnote-55)

The expressions of scorn and contempt toward the Muslims and Islam only increased among crusader circles. Fulcher of Chartres, a participant and eyewitness of the First Crusade, did not refrain from expressing his disdain for Islam, considering it as pure idolatry.[[56]](#footnote-56) Whether Fulcher’s conviction reflected his ignorance of the Muslim creed – common among many participants in the First Crusade – or his xenophobic sentiments, is still an open question. Fulcher, nevertheless, was completely insensitive to the suffering of innocent Muslim women, children, and elderly the crusaders had inflicted through their path. When Muslim women were captured in Kerbogha’s tents before the attack on Antioch (1098), Fulcher simply reported that the Franks “*did them no evil but drove lances into their bellies.”*[[57]](#footnote-57) Moreover, he expressed no sense of pity while describing the slaughter of Muslims at Caesarea (1101), while commenting that their bodies were piled up and burned to recover the coins they had swallowed.[[58]](#footnote-58) Neither did he demonstrate any sign of compassion toward the slaughter of Muslims following the conquest of Jerusalem.[[59]](#footnote-59) Many chroniclers of the First Crusade, furthermore, made malicious caricatures of the Moslems and Islam, while refraining from calling them by their authentic name and presenting them, instead, as pagans. In sharp contrast, the crusaders were depicted as the new apostles while their enemy represented the old but familiar typecast of the Roman pagan tormentors.[[60]](#footnote-60)

The political leadership, as well, entered the fray by denigrating the Muslims, their religion and practices, although for different, more specifically, because their political and economic interests. Following the conquest of Antioch (11 September 1098), 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 – proudly reported to the Bishop of Rome“*the capture and slaughter of the Turks, who had heaped so many insults on our Lord Jesus.”*[[61]](#footnote-61) Similarly, letters written in the Latin East often refer to the Muslims as hordes of pagans and hint at the existence of a perpetual agreement between the Saracens and the devil.[[62]](#footnote-62) The Templar Master, Bertrand of Blancfort, further claimed that the Muslims’ final goal was “*to wipe the memory of us from the region and, God forbid, to crush the Church of the faithful by the weight of their number.”*[[63]](#footnote-63)

There do exist, however, less tendentious sources that went beyond the Muslims’ stereotypical portrayal. Guibert of Nogent, writing from distant Christendom[[64]](#footnote-64) but in close contact with former crusaders, provided an original version of Muslim history, while enriching his readers with stories about Muhammad and the origins of Islam. Guibert was well aware of the lack of apostolic and patristic sources, a deficiency that had actually forced him to depend on less reliable information: [[65]](#footnote-65)

*According to popular opinion, there was a man, whose name, if I have it right, was Mathomus* (sic!)*, 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...* [[66]](#footnote-66)

Notwithstanding his strong criticism of Muhammad and his deeds, or perhaps as a consequence, Guibert recognized that the Saracens do not consider “Mathomus’ as god, as some people believed, but only as a just man through whom divine law was transmitted.[[67]](#footnote-67) This approach hints at some acknowledgment of the Muslims’ monotheism, in complete contrast to the widespread belief on their paganism, common among the chroniclers of the First Crusade.[[68]](#footnote-68) Guibert further reports the expansion of Islam in the Levant, while emphasizing their conquest of Palestine, Jerusalem, and the Holy Sepulcher. On the other hand, the testimony of the Byzantine Emperor Alexios I Komnenos caused Guibert to depict the Muslims as a whole in a most disgraceful light, referring to them as pagans, notwithstanding his previous acknowledgment of the Muslims’ faith in one Almighty God:

*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…*.[[69]](#footnote-69)

Crusader leaders, as well, took great pains to maintain the satanic image of the enemy, an approach they hoped would encourage the continuous but still reluctant support of Christendom and further reinforce the social barriers between them and their subjects*.* Faithful to this purpose, Amalric of Nesle, Patriarch of Jerusalem, and Bertrand of Blancfort, Master of the Temple, wrote to King Louis VII, “*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*.”[[70]](#footnote-70)

Not surprisingly, the Christian setback at the Horns of Hattin[[71]](#footnote-71) only intensified the Muslims’ satanic portrayal.[[72]](#footnote-72) Terricus, the Grand Preceptor of the Temple, depicted Saladin’s followers as “*a horde of pagans”* intoxicated with Christian blood (July–August 1187),[[73]](#footnote-73) while Eraclius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, claimed:

*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* (September 1187).[[74]](#footnote-74)

Reports of this kind, written in the Holy Land, were consistent with papal rhetoric and consequently received the full support of the Holy See. Thus, Pope Gregory VIII 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”* (October-November 1187).[[75]](#footnote-75) Papal rhetoric encountered a fructiferous reception among contemporary preachers, who refer to the insult committed by sacrilegious Muslim hands against Christ and the holy city of Jerusalem, while Mohammed’s name is being exalted and glorified.[[76]](#footnote-76)

 In his call to the Fifth Crusade, Innocent III found it necessary to teach the faithful his own version of Muslim history, accusing Muhammad of being a false prophet and the Muslims as a whole of usurping Christian ancestral rights in the Holy Land (*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*.

Following this compelling opening, the pope referred to the latest appalling news – the building of the fortress on Mount Tabor by “*the same perfidious Saracens”* that was expected to facilitate their conquest of Crusader Acre.[[77]](#footnote-77) No wonder, therefore, that papal manipulation of the Muslims’ atrocities influenced contemporary preachers, who alluded to the enslavement of the Christians *Outremer*, living as they were in a continuous danger of life.[[78]](#footnote-78)

 The Muslims, in turn, reciprocated the Christian defaming approach and did not refrain from denigrating them. 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”* (emphasis mine) (23 June 1249).[[79]](#footnote-79) Ibn Jubayr, as well, referred to Baldwin IV and Agnes of Courtenay with this pejorative portrayal.[[80]](#footnote-80) Perhaps this animal reference hints at the Christian consumption of pork, a practice forbidden in Islam and still, one cannot ignore the derogatory nature of such description.[[81]](#footnote-81)

 Paradoxically, the Khwarizmian Turks’ advance in the mid-thirteenth century improved the former Muslims’ labelled image. Robert, Patriarch of Jerusalem and papal legate, together with other prelates in the Holy Land reported to his colleagues in France and England that the allies of the Egyptian Ayyubids:

*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*.[[82]](#footnote-82)

Somewhat unexpectedly, the new threat thus prompted a reassessment of the Muslims, rendering them a more human shape, their actions becoming less satanic.[[83]](#footnote-83)

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

The need to survive in the same space, however, gradually paved the way for coexistence between conquerors and conquered, thus transcending the constraints of the apostolic manipulative campaign.[[84]](#footnote-84) After the early ethnic cleansing, when all non-Christians were terrorized into flight, the Latins adopted by the second half of the twelfth century the Muslim *dhimma* system,[[85]](#footnote-85) therefore recognizing the autonomous existence of Muslim communities. This policy enabled non-Christians to enjoy the legal status of protected minorities,[[86]](#footnote-86) while contributing to the growth and development of the Latin settlements, especially but not only in farming.[[87]](#footnote-87) An unexpected source confirms the possibility of nonviolent and sometimes cordial coexistence between members of the two conflicting faiths. The Valencian traveler Ibn Jubayr, who constantly prayed for God's help in destroying the Christian dominion in the Latin East, described in a rather positive manner the Franks’ good treatment of Muslim farmers.[[88]](#footnote-88) Whether the appreciation he expressed was part of a hidden political agenda, the main goal of which was to improve the Muslim landowners’ treatment of their tenants, remains uncertain.[[89]](#footnote-89) It seems, however, that after the first brutal, atrocious stages of the conquest, the Latins allowed their Muslim tenants to retain their institutions and practice their traditions, while Muslims as other minorities were treated relatively fairly in crusader courts.[[90]](#footnote-90) The fundamentalism of the early crusaders forbidding all contact between Christians and Muslims, moreover, was gradually rescinded with the exemption of interreligious marriages.[[91]](#footnote-91)

The improving state of affairs intensified the adoption of common intercultural gestures, reflected also in the literary sources.[[92]](#footnote-92) Thus, William of Tyrerefrained 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.”*[[93]](#footnote-93) Moreover, he did not hesitate to describe the Muslims as repugnant “dogs”, who had profaned the holy places where Jesus had walked while subjugating the people of God to their tyrannical rule.[[94]](#footnote-94) Nonetheless, toward the end of the twelfth century, the stereotyped characterizations of Muslims and Islam gradually yielded to more accurate and detailed descriptions, especially by those who had sojourned in the Levant.[[95]](#footnote-95) Oliver of Paderborn, who participated in the Fifth Crusade, for example, offers a rather impartial description of the Muslim creed:

…*For as they had written in the Qur’an, the book of their law, they believe that Jesus Christ Our Lord was conceived and born of the Virgin Mary and they protest that he lived without sin as a prophet and more than a prophet. They firmly assert that he gave sight to the blind, cleansed lepers, and raised the dead; they do not deny the word and the spirit of God, and that he ascended alive into heaven. But they do deny his passion and death, and also that the divine nature is united to the human nature in Christ. They likewise deny the Trinity of Persons. Therefore, they ought to be called heretics rather than Saracens, but the use of the false name prevails.*[[96]](#footnote-96)

James of Vitry, bishop of Acre (1216–1228), additionally provides an interesting insight on 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….*[[97]](#footnote-97)

Although James bemoaned not being able to freely preach or baptize in Muslim lands, he did express some satisfaction following his progress in the pursuit of conversion.[[98]](#footnote-98) Indeed, James took it upon himself to baptize Muslim children who had fallen captive during the Fifth Crusade and placed them in the care of Acre nuns to receive a Christian education.[[99]](#footnote-99) The Master of the Hospital, Geoffrey of Donjon, as well, reported c. 1201 the miraculous conversion of a young Saracen of humble birth, who went on to devote his life to the Christian mission after discovering “the true faith.” He further claims that some two thousand pagans followed his example and converted to Christianity.[[100]](#footnote-100) Although this number may be greatly exaggerated and is otherwise unconfirmed by other sources, it still reflects the possibility of Muslim conversion to Christianity either by compulsion or by other reasons.[[101]](#footnote-101) Following the Franciscan example, there were indeed some efforts to convert the Muslims through mission, and James of Vitry personified such approach. Conversely, there remain three well-known cases of Templars joining Islam either willingly or after being captured on the battlefield and forced to renounce their faith.[[102]](#footnote-102) The Order’s dignitaries responded to apostasy with the utmost severity, and whenever possible, the traitorous knights were stripped of their habits and condemned to life imprisonment.[[103]](#footnote-103)

 One should note in this regard that crusade preachers did not promote the coercive conversion of Muslims, which contradicted the Church principles.[[104]](#footnote-104) Eudes de Châteauroux, moreover, claimed that the Saracens preferred to live in their cave of sins, and the missionary preaching felt on deaf ears.[[105]](#footnote-105) By the fourteenth century, indeed, very few still believed on the possibility that Christianity can prove its superiority to Islam by logical reasons, since the Muslims were still portrayed as illogical, invariably hostile enemies.[[106]](#footnote-106) Humbert of Romans, as well, opposed the Christian mission among the Muslims, advocating most radical solutions:

*…As long as they remain in the world, they will multiply without measure unless they are destroyed by some Christian or barbarian power…It is clear that it is pleasing to God and to the saints that the Christian faithful purify countries from the Saracens through warfare. For formerly, God similarly wanted the sons of Israel to expel the gentiles from the Promised Land through warfare, so that where previously dreadful things hateful to God were done, the worship of God might be established.*[[107]](#footnote-107)

Humbert de Romans further attributed to the crusades the highest status among all pilgrimages, which were limited in both time and purpose. While common pilgrimages were devoted to some saint during a limited period of time, the pilgrimage to the Holy Land was devoted to Christ and involved the danger of life.[[108]](#footnote-108) He additionally argued that by killing Muslims, the crusaders actually assisted them, by providing them a fast death instead of a continuous sinful existence.[[109]](#footnote-109)

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Although the extreme trend championed by the Dominican Master was at the heart of the crusades, quotidian life encouraged a more peaceful and rewarding interaction between Latins and Muslims. There is the well-known account of Ousamah Ibn Munkidh, a Syrian prince and diplomat who traveled extensively in Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, and visited Jerusalem several times during 1140-1143.[[110]](#footnote-110) His writings reflect, indeed, the mutual respect and collaboration between members of both religions:

*…When I went into the mosque al-Aqsa, which was occupied by the Templars,* ***who were my friends***(emphasis mine) *they assigned me this little mosque in which to say my prayers. One day I went into it and glorified Allah. I was engrossed in my praying when one of the Franks rushed at me, seized me, and turned my face to the east, saying, “That is how to pray!’ A party of Templars made for him, seized his person, and ejected him. I returned to my prayers. The same man, escaping attention, made for me again and turned my face round to the east, repeating, “That is how to pray!’ The Templars again made for him and ejected him` then they apologized to me and said to me, “He is a stranger who has only recently arrived from Frankish lands. He has never seen anyone praying without turning to the east.’ I answered, “I have prayed sufficiently for today. “…Among the Franks, we notice those who have come to dwell in our midst and who have become accustomed to the society of* [Muslims]. *They are greatly superior to those who have more recently joined them in the country, which they occupy. They form, in fact, an exception, which must not be made into a rule.*[[111]](#footnote-111)

Beyond his patronizing approach to the Latin newcomers, Ousamah Ibn Munkidh undoubtedly reflected the sociocultural coexistence between conquerors and conquered, even in the most sensitive sacred sites in Jerusalem. Still, one may ask to what degree did Ousamah reflect wide, current mutual perceptions, or, as claimed by Caroline Hillenbrand, he spoke on behalf of a narrow, intellectual elite.[[112]](#footnote-112) On the other hand, the gradual rapprochement between Latins and Muslims did not go unreported and prompted some criticism, especially among those coming from the West. One participant in Frederick II’s crusade thus lamented:

*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*.[[113]](#footnote-113)

Not all reactions, however, were negative. Writing in the early thirteenth century, Abbot Arnold of Lübeck referred to the Franks’ imitation of Muslim practices while conceding 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 further pointed to carrier pigeons as an example.[[114]](#footnote-114) Although Arnold could not be considered an eyewitness, his testimony merits full consideration since he avoided using stereotyped generalizations regarding the Muslims.[[115]](#footnote-115) Moreover, he twice recorded the Abrahamic origins of Islam, and ascribed to the Muslims certain readiness to recognize some basic principles of the Christian dogma.[[116]](#footnote-116)

A constant interaction between Franks and Muslims in the areas of economy, trade, agriculture, and warfare is also discernable.[[117]](#footnote-117) Crusader castles, for example, are considered “the outcome of a lengthy, ongoing dialogue between two schools of military tactics and approaches.’[[118]](#footnote-118) The cultural dialogue between crusaders and Muslims involved almost every aspect of daily life. The use of paper in the Frankish Levant – although less developed than among the Muslims – is representative of this process.[[119]](#footnote-119) The permanent employment of salaried physicians in the Hospital of Jerusalem further reflects Oriental influence.[[120]](#footnote-120) In addition, the proliferation of bathhouses reflects a direct Muslim impact on daily practices, as frequent bathing became a characteristic of the *Pullani*, i.e., the Franks living in the Holy Land. Some members of the clergy, who cared more about Christian moral principles than about hygiene, often held a hostile, disapproving view of this practice, perhaps because it occurred sometimes in mixed-sex contexts.[[121]](#footnote-121) Although we still lack a comprehensive study of mutual influences in the field of art,[[122]](#footnote-122) there is clear evidence of a Muslim impact on the design of luxury goods, glass, textiles, and other merchandise destined for the elite. The constant traffic of people and goods throughout the Mediterranean, both through gifts at the court level and trade among the merchant class, further helped to maintain a fragile coexistence and a delicate balance of power.[[123]](#footnote-123)

The expansion of Christian rule, indeed, extended the contacts between the Latins and the natives. Daily coexistence fomented the mutual interest in each other, while the Dominicans, converted Jews, and/or learned monks bridged over linguistic and cultural gaps. Bernard Hamilton claims in this regard that “Western Christians who lived in frontier societies like Spain, Sicily and the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, came to know Muslims as human beings, and to feel affection and respect for some of them.”[[124]](#footnote-124) It seems, however, that this is a rather too categorical conclusion, that calls for further analysis.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

In conclusion, the eleventh-century papacy elaborated and promoted the stereotyping of the Muslims as pagans and/or agents of Satan, as an essential propagandistic tool in the service of the crusades. As claimed by Jonathan Riley Smith, the stereotyped, satanic image of the Muslims and Islam was at the very core of papal crusader propaganda. Thus, the *imago inimici* as an incorrigible and militant enemy of the Christian religion, the very forefather of the Antichrist, was consistently present in papal crusade propaganda. It further created the symbolism of *Satani gesta per Sarracenos* as a suitable, convincing antithesis to the *gesta Dei per Francos*.[[125]](#footnote-125) The portrayal of the enemy as frightening and satanic was successfully manipulated to promote the Holy War overseas and was incorporated into the symbolic and linguistic repertoire of Christendom. This is not to claim that the papacy was the only factor responsible of the crusades, which were actually continuously dependent on the close cooperation of all social strata in Western Christendom.[[126]](#footnote-126) Still, St. Peter’s heirs were indeed responsible for the elaboration of the Muslims’ pagan stereotype, thus completely and unreservedly ignoring their monotheistic faith.

It would not be redundant to emphasize here the grave consequences of the papal propaganda campaign. The demonization of the enemy in the most ruthless terms, whether on the religious and human levels, while neglecting the atrocities committed by the crusaders, left its mark on modern propaganda campaigns. As in many other aspects of state-building, indeed, the papacy provided an original, unprecedented model. Unfortunately, in this case, it was the manipulation of truth for political interests, helping to justify erroneous information and eventually, the extermination of minorities. The Latin leaders ultimately accepted and adapted the apostolic approach, to justify their atrocities against the native populations; it further became a major means of rousing the much-needed Christendom support. In parallel, it was expected to reinforce the social boundaries between the Franks and the native population. Conversely, at the quotidian level, there was a continuous dialogue and mutual influence between the two 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 also have significance today.
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