

# FRANKS AND SARACENS

reality and fantasy  
in the crusades



AVNER FALK

**KARNAC**

# FRANKS AND SARACENS



# FRANKS AND SARACENS

Reality and Fantasy  
in the Crusades

*Avner Falk*

KARNAC

First published in 2010 by  
Karnac Books Ltd  
118 Finchley Road, London NW3 5HT

Copyright © 2010 Avner Falk.

The right of Avner Falk to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted in accordance with §§ 77 and 78 of the Copyright Design and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A C.I.P. for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978 1 85575 733 2

Edited, designed and produced by The Studio Publishing Services Ltd  
[www.publishingservicesuk.co.uk](http://www.publishingservicesuk.co.uk)  
e-mail: [studio@publishingservicesuk.co.uk](mailto:studio@publishingservicesuk.co.uk)

Printed in Great Britain

[www.karnacbooks.com](http://www.karnacbooks.com)

## *CONTENTS*

<i>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</i>	vii
<i>ABOUT THE AUTHOR</i>	ix
<i>PREFACE</i>	xi
CHAPTER ONE Us and them	1
CHAPTER TWO Romans, Germans, and Berbers	29
CHAPTER THREE Frankish myths of origin	39
CHAPTER FOUR From Franks to Crusaders	45
CHAPTER FIVE The fantasy of the “Holy Roman Empire”	53
CHAPTER SIX A short history of the “Saracens”	65

CHAPTER SEVEN	
The First Crusade: a “pilgrimage” to rescue the “Holy Land”	73
CHAPTER EIGHT	
The fantastic “Kingdom of Jerusalem”	99
CHAPTER NINE	
The Second Crusade: persisting fantasies	121
CHAPTER TEN	
Templars and Hospitallers: monkish knights	133
CHAPTER ELEVEN	
The “Saracens” look at the “Franks”	137
CHAPTER TWELVE	
The Third Crusade: a “lion-hearted” king in search of a “holy land”	149
CHAPTER THIRTEEN	
The Fourth Crusade: Christians massacre Christians	155
CHAPTER FOURTEEN	
The Fifth Crusade: a fantastic invasion of Egypt	167
CHAPTER FIFTEEN	
The Sixth Crusade: winning Jerusalem peacefully	177
CHAPTER SIXTEEN	
The Seventh Crusade: the unhappy war of “Saint Louis”	183
CHAPTER SEVENTEEN	
The Eighth Crusade: “Saint Louis” fails again and dies	189
CHAPTER EIGHTEEN	
The Ninth Crusade: the last fantasy	191
CHAPTER NINETEEN	
Aftermath: the end of a two-century fantasy	195
EPILOGUE	
“The new Crusaders”	199
REFERENCES	201
BIBLIOGRAPHY	211
INDEX	219

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Professor Reuven Amitai of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem for inviting me to speak at an international conference on the subject of this book that he organized in Jerusalem in 2008. The interdisciplinary approach is still rarely accepted among Israeli historians, especially when it involves psychoanalysis. I am also grateful to my publisher, Oliver Rathbone, and his staff at Karnac Books, and to the copy-editor and the team at The Studio Publishing Services for their helpful corrections, advice, and encouragement. The responsibility for any errors is, of course, mine alone.

Avner Falk  
Jerusalem, Israel, June 2010





## *ABOUT THE AUTHOR*

Dr Avner Falk is an internationally-known Israeli scholar in the interdisciplinary fields of psychohistory and political psychology. In addition to a long career in clinical psychology and psychotherapy, he has published dozens of articles and ten books in these fields, as well as in psychobiography, psychogeography, the psychoanalysis of literature, and other areas of applied psychoanalysis. His most recent book is a psychobiography of Barack Obama, being published by Praeger this summer.



## *PREFACE*

The mediæval crusades have not only fascinated novelists like Walter Scott and their readers, or film makers like Ridley Scott and their viewers, they have also preoccupied numerous historians, political scientists, geographers, economists, and other scholars. There are thousands of books and tens of thousands of articles about the crusades, most of them by “Western” scholars, others by Arab or Muslim ones. There is a Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East, and other groups for which the crusades are their primary interest. There are scholarly journals devoted to the study of the crusades, multi-volume histories of the crusades, multi-volume editions of original documents and primary sources of the crusades, and international conferences on the crusades. There are books aiming to acquaint “Western” readers with the Arabic and Muslim writings on the crusades, such as the monumental work of Carole Hillenbrand (1999). Geographers like Ronnie Ellenblum (1998, 2007) have studied crusader castles, cities, and villages in Israel to unravel their history.

One crucial aspect of the crusades, however, has been largely neglected by scholars: the unconscious motivations of the crusaders and of the Muslims who fought them. The Scottish psychiatrist

William Ireland published a two-part article on the psychology of the crusades over a century ago, in which he pointed out the “enormous credulity of the Dark Ages” and the “paranoid” nature of *some* of the crusaders, yet argued that “the pilgrims cannot be said to have acted illogically” (Ireland, 1906–1907, vol. 53, p. 322). The fact that one of the crusades was a “Latin” Christian war on Christian “Greek” Byzantium, and that the Spanish Basques were called “Saracens” in the mediæval *Chanson de Roland* and that later crusades were waged against the pagan “Saracens” in the Baltic lands has not seemed odd enough to scholars to warrant a psychological investigation. The use of the ancient Roman term “Saracens” to designate all Arabs, Turks, Muslims, Mamluks, Persians, and even European “heathens”, is only one example of the irrational aspect of the crusades. The Muslim notion of the crusaders as inferior “Franks” was equally irrational. This book sets out to fill the void in the psychological study of the crusades, to investigate the unconscious meanings of the Holy Land, Holy City, and Holy Sepulchre to the crusaders, and the mutual projections of the warring parties. It is a psychoanalytic study of the irrational aspects of religious wars.

## CHAPTER ONE

# Us and them

### *Human warfare, ethnocentrism, and the naming of nations*

**H**uman evolution scholars, anthropologists, and historians have many theories about how ethnic groups, races, tribes, and nations came about, but recorded human history is often the story of the wars that they fought. Organized human warfare has existed for the past ten thousand to fifteen thousand years—a short period of time relative to the hundreds of thousands of years it took for our species to evolve from its African origins. One of the earliest warring civilizations was that of Egypt. The ancient Egyptian pharaohs made war on their neighbours to enlarge their kingdoms, yet the earliest archaeological evidence for large-scale organized warfare dates from around 3500 BCE, and a unified Egyptian kingdom was only founded around 3150 BCE by the pharaoh Menes, giving rise to a series of dynasties that ruled Egypt for the next three millennia and, “naturally”, made war on their neighbouring peoples to subjugate them (Keegan, 1993).

However, organized human warfare has been with us ever since recorded history and “prehistory”, and among its psychological accompaniments have been *ethnocentrism* and racism. Deriving

from the Greek word *ethnos*, meaning tribe or people (hence “ethnic group” and “ethnic cleansing”), ethnocentrism is the perception of a human “race”, tribe, or nation of itself as the centre of the world, and racism is its perception of itself as superior to all other “races”. The Italian psychoanalyst Franco Fornari thought that another, deeper cause of human warfare was the collective inability of large human groups to mourn their losses. Those who cannot mourn their losses unconsciously project their guilt feelings on their “enemies”, and make war on them (Fornari, 1974). We shall look into this crucial issue below, when discussing the origins of the mediæval Crusades.

The American social psychologist James Waller cited psychological experiments, ethnological field studies, and evolutionary theory to argue that human beings are *genetically predisposed* to divide into groups, to value their in-group over other human groups, and to treat those within the group better and more “ethically” than those outside the group (Waller, 2002). This predisposition has caused or encouraged racism, ethnocentrism, xenophobia, bigotry, hatred, war, ethnic cleansing and genocide. Our biological heritage also influences our response to authority and our desire to exert authority over others.

Genocide, the killing of entire ethnic groups by other human groups, has also been with us for millennia (Charny, 1999). Waller thought that there are also “social forces” that help prepare “ordinary people” to commit genocide. One such “force” is cultural beliefs, like nationalism, racism, or “manifest destiny”. Another evil-disposing psychological “social force” is disengaging morality from conduct by displacing responsibility, using euphemisms, seeking moral justification, looking for advantageous comparisons, minimizing, distorting, dehumanizing the other, distancing ourselves from the consequences of our actions (such as not broadcasting the disturbing images of war, concentration camps, or mass killing; calling torture “abuse”, and calling the destruction of a village “liberation”). Waller believed that the more highly regarded one’s self-interest becomes, the easier it is to justify evil done to others (Waller, 2002).

*Ethnonyms* (Greek for people’s names) are the names that human groups have given themselves and other groups. They are divided into *endonyms* and *exonyms*, and they are psychologically

significant and fascinating. An *endonym*, or *autonym*, or self-appellation, is the name that the people call themselves. An *exonym* is a name for a people or place that is not used within that place by the local inhabitants (neither in the official language of the state nor in local languages), or a name for a people or language that is not used by the people or language to which it refers. For example, the ancient Greeks called themselves *Hellenes*, while the Romans called them *Graeci* and the Hebrews called them *Ionim* (Ionians), which was later corrupted into *Yevanim*. *Deutschland* is the German endonym for Germany, while *Germany* is the English exonym for that same country and *l'Allemagne* is the French exonym for it. *Spanish* is the English exonym for the language whose speakers call it *español* or *castellano*. In the Spanish language, *inglés* is the exonym for either an English male person or the English language.

Endonyms and exonyms are part of human group psychology. Human groups, such as families, clans, tribes, peoples, and nations, have tended to place themselves in the centre of the world and to see other groups as inferior, or even inhuman. We call this tendency ethnocentrism or racism. The warring indigenous tribes of North America, who may have come there from Central Asia through *Beringia* (the then land-covered Bering Straits) some twelve thousand years ago, often called their own tribe "the human beings" and all other tribes, their enemies, non-human. The ethnic group's perception of the other, the stranger, the enemy has always been distorted and unrealistic, and it was always given derogatory names. The endonym of the North American "Apache" is *indeh*, meaning the people, or the human beings, and their exonym for other tribes is *indah*, meaning the non-humans or non-people (Ball, 1970; Ball, Henn, & Sánchez, 1980; Haley, 1981).

Similarly, we Jews have perceived ourselves as the Chosen People, and our exonym for non-Jews is *goyim* (gentiles), while some ultra-orthodox Jews also call them *shkotsim* (abominations). We also call non-Jews "idolaters", or "worshippers of stars and astrological signs". Our *Talmud*, the record of rabbinic discussions pertaining to Jewish law, ethics, customs, and history which is second only to the Hebrew Bible in importance, has verses saying that we are human (*adam*) while pagan people are not human: "And ye, my flock, the sheep of my pastures, ye are called *adam*; ye are called *adam*, but the idolaters are not called *adam*" (Epstein,



1935–1948, Tractate *Yebamoth*, Chapter VI, Folio 61a, and Order *Nezikin*, Chapter IX, Tractate *Baba Mezi'a*, Folio 114b) [the English rendering of the Hebrew word *adam* as “men” in this work is erroneous].

The Hebrew word *mashiakh*, rendered in English as *Messiah*, means “anointed”. It referred to the ancient kings of Judah and Israel, who were crowned by being anointed with the “oil of anointment”. The Greek word for “anointed” is *christos*, and in the Greek-language Septuagint version of the Old Testament, made by seventy Alexandrian Jews in the third century BCE, *mashiakh* was always rendered as *christos*. Nonetheless, the Talmudic Hebrew name (as well as the modern Hebrew name) for Christians is not *meshikhiyim* (messianic) but *notsrim* (people from Nazareth), referring to the fact that Jesus came from Nazareth. The term was designed to derogate the Christians and to deny or mask the fact that Christians believe that Jesus was their Christ or Messiah.

Just as the ancient Greeks called all those who could not speak Greek *barbaroi*, the Russians still call the Germans *Niemtsi*, meaning “mute people”, because they cannot speak Russian. The ancient Persians called themselves *arya*, meaning noble people, and the name Iran comes from the ancient Avesta Persian name *Arya-nam*, meaning “land of the noble people”. One of the etymological and historical theories of the origins of the word “Aryan”, the so-called “Aryan invasion theory”, is that following an “Aryan” invasion of northwest India (now Pakistan) from Persia (now Iran) in the second millennium BCE, the Avesta Persian word *arya* entered the Indian Sanskrit language to denote the light-skinned people of the north, as opposed to the dark-skinned *dravida* from the south. The so-called Indo-Aryans derived from an earlier proto-Indo-Iranian stage, usually identified with the Bronze Age Andronovo or Sintashta-Petrovka culture at the Caspian Sea. Their migration to and within Northern India is consequently presumed to have taken place in the Middle to Late Bronze Age, contemporary to the Late Harappan phase in India (1700 to 1300 BCE).

According to this theory, from the Sanskrit language of India, the word *Aryan* passed to the “Indo-European”, or “Indo-Aryan”, languages, including Greek and Latin. In the twentieth century, Adolf Hitler’s German Nazis imagined themselves *Arier* (Aryans), *Indogermanen* (Indo-Germans), and a *Herrenvolk* (master people or

master race), and other people *Untermenschen* (subhuman). They were convinced that “white Aryans” had reached Persia and India from Northern Europe, and, ironically, the Nazi *Hakenkreuz* or swastika, symbol of war, murder, massacre, and genocide, was a mirror image of an ancient Hindu religious symbol of peace and harmony.

Fervently believing in their superiority fantasies, the German Nazis outlawed marriage between “Aryans” and “non-Aryans”. They murdered not only six million “subhuman” Jews, but also millions of “gypsies” (Roma and Sinti), communists, Catholics, homosexuals, retarded people, mentally ill people, *all those people whom they considered “subhuman” and who unconsciously represented painful aspects of their own self to them*. The fantasy about the “gypsies” was that they had come from Egypt (hence their exonym), whereas they had actually migrated from India to Europe in the Middle Ages. A young English writer has published a novel describing, in the first person singular, the mass murder of the Jews from the point of view of one of their murderers, an SS officer who also has a variety of sexual perversions (Littell, 2006). This novel has won two prestigious French literary prizes for its “insight into the mind of mass murderers”.

Why are such groups as tribes and nations—and why were the German Nazis, in particular—so susceptible to viewing the “enemy” as threatening and inhuman, to dehumanizing and demonizing him, and then to exterminate him? I have tried to answer some of these questions in my recent book on anti-Semitism (Falk, 2008a). The American psychoanalyst David Terman believed that both ancient pagan and later Christian anti-Semitism were an unconscious psychological defence mechanism employed by the majority group which feels that its *collective ideology* is threatened:

The fury which may then be unleashed is proportional to so dire a threat. The narcissistic rage of the group, like that the individual, by definition precludes empathy: the offender appears not as an individual or group with needs, motivations, and goals which arise from quite separate or different concerns, but only as a malevolent force whose sole purpose is to destroy one’s most precious asset [the majority group’s ideology], so the proper response is the obliteration of the danger. All manner of evil is then perceived in the dissenter [the Jew]. Such a phenomenon has often been explained

as the projection by the offended party of its own disavowed evil, but in this framework that would be a *secondary* rather than a primary cause. More pertinently, the malevolence attributed to the dissenter has to do with the [collective] narcissistic injury to the group. [Terman, 1984, p. 20; cf. Falk, 2008a, p. 92]

At first sight, this explanation seems stunning: did the German Nazis murder six million Jews only because their racist ideology was threatened by the “different” Jews, whom they had dehumanized, and whose image they had totally distorted out of all proportion to reality? Or did they develop their racist ideology in response to some other, inner threat that had nothing to do with the Jews themselves? The Nazis hated the Catholic Christians, too, replacing God and Jesus Christ with Adolf Hitler and the old Germanic god Wotan as their new gods. Many Roman Catholics were persecuted and murdered by the Nazis, and the SS chief Heinrich Himmler built great temples to the old Teutonic gods. Hitler’s hatred of the Jews was part of the tragedy of his own life and that of his nation (Waite, 1977).

The Japanese, too, have a “national superiority complex”. Their name for their own country, *Nihon*, or *Nippon*, means “source of the Sun”, and Japan’s byname is “Land of the Rising Sun”. This name supposedly originated in the letters of the Japanese emperor to his Chinese counterpart during the reign of the Sui dynasty in China (581–618) and it had to do with Japan lying east of China. However, in the third century of the Christian era, the Japanese had already called their country *Yamato-jidai* or *Hinomoto* (the Source of the Sun), and the Japanese sun goddess *Amaterasu* was the most important goddess in their Shinto pantheon. Her Japanese name means “she who illuminates Heaven”.

The Japanese superiority complex (De Mente, 2003) includes an ancient myth that Japan was created by *kami* and *omikami* (gods and goddesses) and that the Japanese themselves were descendants of these superior creatures. The Emperor of Japan was considered divine until the twentieth century. During the Second World War, when the Japanese were allied in an “axis” with the Germans and Italians, they called their suicide bomber pilots *kamikaze* (divine wind), the name they had given to a typhoon that saved them from the Mongol invasions of Japan in 1271 and again in 1284 by blow-

ing away the invading Mongol ships. As the myth of the Biblical hero Samson (whose name derives from that of the Semitic sun god) has him kill himself along with his Philistine enemies, a British psychologist has studied the “Samson Syndrome” of kamikaze pilots and other suicide bombers (Canter, 2006).

Some scholars believed that the Japanese “superiority complex” was an unconscious defence against an underlying “inferiority complex”. The American journalist Boye Lafayette De Mente (born 1928) thought that this complex began with Japan’s inferior relationship to Korea and China around the third century (exactly the time when the Japanese began to call their country “source of the sun”). De Mente writes,

at the start of this period, Japan was divided into numerous competing clans, with primitive life-styles, while China was at the height of one of its greatest dynasties and Korea had long been the cultural beneficiary of its huge neighbor. The impact this cultural disparity had on the Japanese mind is still very much in evidence. The big difference between Japan’s relationship with China well over a thousand years ago and with the West today is that the Japanese could at least identify with the Chinese radically and emotionally, thus lessening the trauma resulting from their inferior position. [De Mente, 2003, p. 108]

The *Mongols*, who tried to invade Japan (as well as most of the rest of Asia and much of Europe) in the thirteenth century, and who were originally nomadic tribes from Central Asia, are another example of incredible ethnocentrism and racism. Who were these Mongols? The name *Mongol* appeared first in the eighth-century Chinese records of the Tang dynasty, but only resurfaced in the eleventh century during the rule of the Khitan. At first, it was applied to some small and insignificant nomadic tribes in the area of the Onon River. In the thirteenth century, however, the name Mongol grew into an umbrella term for a large group of Mongolic and Turkic tribes united under the rule of Genghis Khan. It is not clear what the Mongols called themselves in their own languages. In fact, the specific origin of the Mongolic languages is unclear. Some linguists have proposed a link to languages like Tungusic and Turkic, which are often included alongside Mongolic in a hypothetical language group called “Altaic languages”, but the evidence for this is rather weak.

Since ancient times, Mongolia was inhabited by nomads who occasionally formed unions, whose leaders were called *Khans*. The first of these, the *Xiongnu*, were united by Modu Shanyu Mete Khan in 209 BCE. Mongolia being China's northern neighbour, they soon emerged as the greatest threat of the Qin Dynasty of China (221–206 BCE), forcing it to construct the Great Wall of China, guarded by up to 300,000 soldiers during Marshal Meng Tian's tenure, as a mean of defence against the destructive Xiongnu raids. After the decline of the Xiongnu, the *Rouran*, *Ruanruan*, or *Tantan*, who were close relatives of the Mongols, came to power in Mongolia and ruled from the late fourth to the late sixth century CE before being defeated by the Turkic *Göktürk*, *Göktürkler*, or *Köktürkler*, who dominated Mongolia for some time.

During the seventh and eighth centuries, the *Göktürk* were displaced by *Uyghurs*, and then by the *Khitans* and *Jurchens* as rulers of Mongolia. Each of these tribes had its own *khan*. During the tenth and eleventh centuries, Mongolia was divided into numerous warring tribes linked through transient alliances and involved in the old patterns of internal strife. In the late twelfth century, a Mongol tribal ruler named Temüjin Khan (1162–1227), after prolonged warfare, succeeded in uniting the Mongol and Turkic tribes and renamed himself Genghis Khan. After founding the Mongol Empire, he began the Mongol invasions of East and Central Asia. The Mongols were fierce and effective warriors. During Genghis Khan's lifetime, the Mongol Empire occupied most of Asia.

Genghis Khan died in 1227 after defeating the Tanguts. He was buried in an unmarked grave somewhere in his native Mongolia. Genghis Khan's descendants went on to stretch the Mongol Empire across most of Asia and Eastern Europe, overrunning the Great Wall of China, and conquering all of China, as well as substantial portions of modern Russia, southern Asia, Eastern Europe, and the Middle East. By 1294, Genghis Khan's successors expanded their kingdom greatly by invasions in all directions, until they made it into the largest contiguous empire in human history, covering most of Asia and much of Europe. The Mongols also invaded Kievan Rus and annexed large parts of it. The Russians called the invaders *Tatari*, a name that had designated eight centuries earlier the nomadic Turkic tribes in northeast Mongolia, around Lake Baikal, whom the Chinese called Dada, Dadan, Tatan, or Tantan. The

Western Europeans, however, believing that the “Tatars” came from Tartarus (the Greco-Roman name for the underworld), called them “Tartars”.

Under Genghis Khan’s successor, Ögedei Khan, the Mongol expansion reached its peak. In the late 1230s, the Mongols under Batu Khan invaded Russia and Volga Bulgaria (where they were called *Tatari*), reducing most of its principalities to vassalage, and pressed on into Europe. In 1241 the Mongols were ready to invade Western Europe as well, having defeated the last Polish–German and Hungarian armies at the Battle of Legnica and the Battle of Mohi. The tide turned after Ögedei Khan’s death, which may have saved Western Europe, as Batu Khan had to deal with the election of the next Mongol *Khagan* or *Qaghan* (Great Khan or emperor).

During the 1250s, Genghis Khan’s grandson, Hülegü Khan, operating from the Mongol base in Persia, destroyed the Abbasid Caliphate in Baghdad and destroyed the Nizari Isma’ili cult of the “Assassins”, moving into Palestine towards Egypt, which had just been taken over by the Mamluks. The Great Möngke Khan having died, however, Hülegü Khan hastened to return for the election, and the force that remained in Palestine was destroyed by the Mamluks under Saif ad-Din Qutuz in 1261 at Ayn Jalut. Mongol armies pushed into Persia, finished off the Xia and the remnants of the Khwarezmid, and fought the Song Dynasty of China, which then, like now, constituted the majority of the world’s economic production, and which they finally conquered in 1279.

The Mongols were greatly feared in Europe and the Middle East for their reputed savagery and brutality, and during the thirteenth century they sacked Baghdad. The Crusader leaders and Muslim sultans alike tried to ally themselves with the Mongols against their enemies. We shall return to this theme when we discuss the last crusades. The “Mughal” Empire of India, even though it was created by Turkic tribes, was named after the Mongols.

*The Mongols had no hesitation in thinking that they were the centre of the world, that they were superior to other peoples, and that they had the right to conquer the world.* After Genghis Khan’s death in 1227, the Mongol empire was administratively divided into four Khanates, which, however, split up after Möngke Khan’s death in 1259. One of the khanates, the so-called “Great Khanate”, consisting of the Mongol homeland and China, became the Mongol Yuan Dynasty of

China under Kublai Khan, a grandson of Genghis Khan. He set up his capital in what is now Beijing. After over a century of power, in 1386, the Yuan Dynasty was replaced by the Chinese Ming Dynasty, with the Mongol court fleeing north into Mongolia. As the Ming armies pursued the Mongols into their homeland, they sacked and destroyed the Mongol capital, Karakorum or Kharkhorin, wiping out the cultural progress that was achieved during the imperial period and throwing Mongolia back into anarchy. Mongolia's modern capital is Ulan Bator, or Ulaanbaatar, but modern Mongolia is nowhere near the power it once was. Part of it, called Inner Mongolia, is now the "Mongol autonomous region" of China, although the majority of its population is Han Chinese, just as Tibet is the "Tibetan autonomous region" of China.

### *Middle Eastern people's names*

The Biblical name *Canaan* is very old. Archaeological excavations in Mesopotamia, the land between the Euphrates and the Tigris rivers (now Syria and Iraq) have found it time and again in various documents. Some scholars see the oldest reference to the Canaanites in the ethnic name *ganana* that appears in the *Ebla* tablets, dated to the twenty-fourth century BCE. The Hebrew name Canaan, or the Akkadian Ca-na-na-um or *kinahhu*, is also mentioned in a document from the eighteenth century BCE, found in the ruins of *Mari*, a former Sumerian outpost on the middle Euphrates river. Canaan, at that time, was a loose confederation of city-states. A letter from that time complains about certain "thieves and *kinahhu*" causing trouble in the town of Rahisum. Tablets found at *Nuzi* use the term *kinahhu* as a synonym for the red or purple dye, produced from murex mollusc shells on the Mediterranean coast, which was a renowned Canaanite export commodity. Dyes were named after their place of origin. The Greco-Latin name *Phoenicia* for Canaan is related to the Greek word *phoini* (purple), referring to the same dye. The purple cloth of Tyre (now in Lebanon) was well known far and wide and long associated with royalty.

A reference to the "land of Canaan" is found on the statue of King Idrimi of *Alalakh* (now in Syria) in the fifteenth century BCE. After a popular uprising against his rule, Idrimi was forced into

exile with his mother's relatives to seek refuge in "the land of Canaan", where he prepared an eventual attack to recover his city. References to the Canaanites are also found throughout the letters of the Egyptian pharaoh Amenhotep IV (Ikhnaton or Akhenaten), written around 1350 BCE. Alphabetical cuneiform clay tablets from *Ugarit* (now the Syrian town of Ras Shamra), dating from the second millennium BCE, refer to an individual Canaanite, suggesting that the people of Ugarit, contrary to much modern scholarly opinion, may *not* have considered themselves Canaanites, even though their language was akin to Hebrew (Killebrew, 2003, 2005; Tubb, 1998).

With warfare and conquest being a matter of course, the mighty empires of Egypt and Mesopotamia (including Sumer, Assyria, and Babylonia) surrounded the smaller Canaanites and often invaded and subjugated them. Archaeological excavations of several sites later identified as Canaanite show that the prosperity of Canaan reached its peak during the Middle Bronze Age under the leadership of the city-state of *Hazor*, which paid tribute to Egypt for much of the period, into the Late Bronze Age (Killebrew, 2005). In the north, the cities of Yamkhad (an ancient Amorite kingdom centred at what is now Aleppo, Syria) and Qatna (another Amorite kingdom, northeast of Homs, Syria) led important Canaanite confederacies, and the Biblical Hazor led another important coalition in the south.

In the early Late Bronze Age, Canaanite confederacies were centred on the cities of Megiddo and Kadesh, before being annexed to the Egyptian empire. The Hebrew language of the Hebrews, Israelites, and Jews was originally that of the Canaanites. The early Canaanite Hebrew language was written in alphabetic cuneiform, as in Ugarit, which later developed into the early Canaanite cursive Hebrew alphabet, and later still into the square Hebrew–Aramaic script. The authors of the Hebrew Bible, whose early parts were written in Canaanite Hebrew, called the various tribes of their land, such as the Moabites, Edomites, and Ammonites, by the collective name of Canaanites (Genesis 10: 15–19). The Biblical land of Canaan covered parts of present-day Israel, the Palestinian Authority, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon. Its borders shifted continually with each battle between the tribes.

The Canaanites living on the eastern coast of what they called the Great Sea (the Mediterranean) were seafaring people. Their



greatest city was Tyre (now in Lebanon). During the first millennium BCE they settled in many places around the Mediterranean basin, including parts of present-day Greece, Sicily, and Tunisia, and gave them Canaanite Hebrew names that were later corrupted by the Greeks and Romans. The Greeks called the seafaring Canaanites *phoiniki*, or Phoenicians, a name that derived either from the Greek word *phoini* for the famous purple dye, or from the Greek word *phoinix* (phoenix), which meant palm tree, zither, red dye, and the phoenix bird. Some scholars think that this Greek name, which later became the Roman *Phoeni* and *Puni*, originally derived from the Egyptian name *fnkhw* for the Canaanites and Syrians. It was these seafaring Canaanite “Phoenicians” who founded *Qart Khadat* (New City) in the ninth century BCE, a North African city-empire (now in Tunisia), which the Romans corrupted into *Carthago*, and which was later anglicized into Carthage. The chief god of Qart Khadat was *Melqart* (King of the City), the god of Tyre.

The Romans called the Canaanite “Phoenicians” *Puni*, or *Punici* (plural of *Punicus*), from which comes the English word *Punic*. To the Romans, who fought the Puni, the exonym *punicus* was synonymous with barbarian, treacherous, and perfidious. They fought the Puni relentlessly, and the three “Punic” wars between Rome and Carthage lasted 118 years (264–146 BCE). During the Second Punic War (218–216 BCE), the brilliant chief of Carthaginian military, Hannibal (247–183 BCE) led a mighty army composed of elite archers, horsemen, and elephant riders from all over North Africa into the Roman empire. The capable Hannibal managed to move his army through Spain and Gaul, cross the Alps, enter Italy, and, even though he had lost half his army, defeat the Roman armies in three major battles at Trebia, Lake Trasimene, and Cannae.

The formerly “unbeatable” Romans, however, avoided further battle with Hannibal, waging a war of attrition against him. Hannibal maintained an army in Italy for more than a decade, never losing a major engagement with the Romans, but he could not force the Romans to accept his terms for peace, nor to fight him. He did not attempt to move on the city of Rome itself, which was very well defended, and where he would have lost his battle.

In 203 BCE, a Roman counter-invasion of North Africa forced Hannibal to return to Carthage, where, in 202 BCE, he was defeated in the Battle of Zama. The Romans could not abide the existence of

two empires. The Roman senator Marcus Porcius Cato (234–149 BCE), also known as Cato Censorius, Cato Sapiens, Cato Priscus, Cato Major, and Cato the Elder, ended every speech in the Senate with the phrase *Praeterea censeo Carthaginem esse delendam*, meaning, “I also declare that Carthage must be destroyed.” After twenty more years of fighting Rome, Hannibal finally committed suicide at Libyssa, on the eastern shore of the Sea of Marmara, by taking poison, which, it was said, he had long carried about with him in a ring. If, as the Roman historian Titus Livius (Livy, 59 BCE–17 CE) seems to imply, this happened in 183 BCE, Hannibal died in the same year as his Roman nemesis, Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus Major (236–183 BCE), at the age of sixty-four.

The Carthaginians had threatened not only Rome’s military power, but also its group identity. The Roman response was furious and ruthless. Cato’s death in 149 BCE signalled the beginning of the Third Punic War. The Punic Wars brought the end of Carthaginian power and the complete destruction of the city of Carthage by the Roman general Scipio Aemilianus (185–129 BCE). In 146 BCE, the Romans pulled the Phoenician warships out into the harbour and burned them before the city, and then went from house to house, capturing and enslaving the Carthaginians. Fifty thousand Carthaginians were sold into slavery. The city of Carthage was set ablaze, and was razed to the ground, with only ruins and rubble left. The same thing would happen to Jewish Jerusalem in 70 CE.

After the fall of Carthage, Rome annexed most of the Carthaginian colonies, including North African cities like Volubilis, Lixus, Chellah, and Mogador, and made Carthage’s former North African empire into the Roman province of *Africa pronsensularis*, which covered present-day Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libya, and Egypt, or most of North Africa.

### *The mystery of Sepharad and al-Andalus*

Many linguists believe that the ancient Sanskrit and Avesta languages of India and Iran were related to the ancient Greek and Latin of southern Europe, and that all of them had developed from a “proto Indo-European” language. The Lydian language of Western Anatolia was an ancient Indo-European language with consonants and vowels. The old Canaanite Hebrew language, on

the other hand, was a Semitic language, with consonants only. The older texts of the Hebrew Bible were written in Canaanite Hebrew, and the Hebrew text of the Old Testament was not vocalized when it was sealed around 100 CE. It was not vocalized until the tenth century, under Arabic influence, by Aharon ben Moshe ben Asher and Moshe ben Naphtali, the leading Jewish *Masoretes*, or Tradition Bearers, in Tiberias. The name *Israel* was an epithet and a byname of the Canaanite father-god El, and it meant “El shall reign”. The apocryphal etymology in Genesis 3: 27–28 was meant to make the name Jewish, as it had become the name of the Jewish people.

The old Hebrew name *sfrd*, now the Hebrew name for Spain, appears only once in the Hebrew Bible (Obadiah, 20). The original name was pronounced *Sfard*, the Lydians’ own name for their capital, known in Greek as Sardis. The vocalization of *Sepharad* for *sfrd* was introduced by the tradition-bearers, or *Masoretic* vocalizers, of Tiberias, Moshe Ben-Asher, his son Aharon ben Moshe Ben-Asher, and Moshe Ben-Naphtali, in the ninth and tenth centuries CE, under Islamic Arab rule and the great influence of the Arabic language. But how did the Biblical name *Sepharad*, which had nothing to do with Spain, come to designate Spain among the Jews?

Ironically, the English name “Spain” comes from the Roman name *Hispania*, itself a corruption of the “Phoenician” Canaanite-Hebrew name *i-shfania*, meaning “island of hyraxes”, or “island of hares”, which the Carthaginians had given to their colony on the southern Iberian coast, which flourished from the eighth to the third centuries BCE. During the early Middle Ages, the Jews identified the Biblical *Sepharad* with *Hispania*, and this was alluded to by the great eleventh-century Jewish sage Rabbi Shlomo ben Yitzhak, or Yitzhaki (Rashi, 1040–1105) in his commentary on Obadiah 20. The Jews, however, ironically also called *Hispania* by its Aramaic name, *Espamia* or *Aspamia* (Epstein, 1935–1948, Order *Thoroth*, Tractate *Nidah*, Folio 30b, translates this name as “Spain”).

Some Jewish scholars believed that the Jews of Spain called their country *Sepharad* for two reasons: First, Obadiah 20 refers to “the exile of Jerusalem which is in Sepharad”, so that the Jews of “Sepharad” were of the prestigious tribe of Judah, and second, because the exile of the Jews to “Sepharad” preceded Christianity, the Jews of Sepharad were not in Jerusalem at the time of Jesus Christ and could not be accused by the Christians of Christ’s

“deicide”. Such “explanations”, however, are apocryphal and unconvincing. The same was true of the Jews calling France by the Biblical name of *Zarephath* (a Canaanite Phoenician town now in Lebanon) and Germany *Ashkenaz* (a great-grandson of Noah). Both names had nothing to do with France or Germany. The American-Jewish historian Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi believed that this was a psychological symptom of life in the past “for even the most terrible events are somehow less terrifying when viewed within old patterns” (Yerushalmi, 1988, p. 36). I believe that it indicated the inability to mourn one’s historical losses collectively (Falk, 1996).

While the Hebrew-speaking Jews called Spain *Sepharad*, the Arabic-speaking Muslims, who conquered Spain in 710–712, called it *al-Andalus*. Coming out of Arabia, they had conquered all of the Middle East and North Africa during a few decades and force-converted their populations to Islam. There are several theories about the origin of the name *al-Andalus*. The best-known one says that it is an Arabic corruption of *Vandalicia*, the Latin name for the country of the *Vandali*, one of the East Germanic tribes that destroyed Rome in the fifth century and that passed through Spain on its way to North Africa (Esposito, 2003, entry on *al-Andalus*; Houtsma, Arnold, Basset, & Hartmann, 1954–2007, vol. 1, p. 486). Another theory is that *al-Andalus* was the Arabic name for *Atlantis*, the mythical lost continent (Vallvé Bernejo, 1986). This theory, however, has no evidence to support it.

During the Middle Ages, there were several Muslim caliphates, the best known of which were the Abbasid in Baghdad, the Umayyad in Damascus and later in Córdoba, and the Fatimid in Cairo. Some of the Arabic chroniclers of the Umayyad caliphate’s conquest of the Iberian peninsula, written centuries later, mention an “island of *al-Andalus*” on which landed the first Muslim invaders of Iberia, and which was later renamed *Tarifa* after their “Berber” leader, Tarif Abu-Zora (flourished 700), whose fellow conqueror, Tariq ibn Ziyad (died 720), gave his name to Gibraltar (a corruption of *jebel al-Tariq*). As with the Carthaginians, the name of an island had become the name of the whole country. Another theory is that the name *Al-Andalus* has a Gothic origin, that it comes from the Gothic *Lanahlauts*, the name given to Spain by the Visigoths, who ruled it during the early Middle Ages, from which the Latin name *Gothica sors* also came (Halm, 1989).

None of these theories, however, is convincing. It is unlikely that even the Arabic language, which changed *Alexandria* into *al-Iskanderiya*, would corrupt names like *Atlantis* or *Landahlauts* into *al-Andalus*. The German scholar Georg Bossong believed that the name *al-Andalus* predated the Roman occupation of Spain. He pointed out that the name *Andaluz* exists in several mountainous places of the Spanish region of Castile. The village of *Andaluz* lies at the foot of the Andaluz Mountain on the Duero River in the province of Soria, and nearby are the villages of *Torre-Andaluz* and *Centenera de Andaluz*. A brook named *Andaluz* flows in the province of Guadalajara out of the cave of La Hoz. The prefix *And-* is common in Spanish place names, and the suffix *-luz* (meaning “light” in Spanish, from the Latin *lux*) also occurs in several place names across Spain (Bossong, 2002). This does not explain, however, why the Muslim “Moors” gave the name of *al-Andalus* to the whole country, nor is it quite certain that those names predated the Muslim conquest. To me, the name *al-Andalus* seems imaginary, a psychogeographical fantasy, just like the names Paradise Island or El Dorado (Stein & Niederland, 1989).

### *The Romans and the Germans*

Like the ancient Greeks, the ancient Romans considered the Germanic tribes north of the Danube River “barbarians”, and in 9 CE they fought a major battle against these “savage” tribes. The Teutoburg forest, now in the German states of Lower Saxony and North-Rhine-Westphalia, was the site of that battle between the Roman Empire and an alliance of Germanic tribes. The location of the battle was given by the Roman historian Gaius Cornelius Tacitus (56–117 CE) as *saltus Teutoburgiensis* (Teutoburg forest valley), a northern extension of the central European uplands, extending eastward towards the Weser River, southward from the town of Osnabrück, and southeastwards to Paderborn, Charlemagne’s future capital. The battle was therefore called the Battle of the Teutoburg Forest. Recent archaeological excavations suggest that the final stages of the battle took place farther north, at Kalkriese, north of Osnabrück.

At this battle, Hermann of the *Cherusci* (18 BCE–21 CE), the leader of the Germanic tribes during the battle, who had lived in Rome in

his youth as a hostage, and whom the Romans called Arminius, defeated the legions of the Roman general Quintilius Varus and became a legend for his victory. Hermann followed it up with a clean sweep of the Roman forts, garrisons and cities—of which there were at least two—east of the River Rhine. The remaining two Roman legions, commanded by Varus's nephew, Lucius Nonius Asprenas, held the river. The Roman fort of Aliso fended off the Germanic tribes for weeks, perhaps months, before its garrison, which included survivors of the Teutoburg Forest battle, broke out from the siege under commander, Lucius Caeditius, and reached the Rhine.

The Roman historian Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus wrote that the Roman emperor, Gaius Julius Caesar Octavianus Augustus (63 BCE–14 CE), showed signs of near-insanity at the news, banging his head against the walls of his palace and repeatedly shouting *Quintili Vare, legiones redde!* (Quintilius Varus, give back my legions!) (Suetonius, 2003). This was the first major defeat of Roman forces by the “barbarian” tribes who would eventually take over their empire.

During the third century, the Roman Empire began to divide. In 285, Emperor Diocletianus declared Maximianus, a military colleague from Illyricum, his co-emperor. Each emperor had his own court, his own military and administrative faculties, and each would rule with a separate praetorian guard and its own prefect as chief lieutenant. Maximian ruled in the West, from his capitals at Mediolanum (now Milan, Italy) or Augusta Treverorum (now Trier, Germany), while Diocletian ruled in the East, from his capital of Nicomedia (now İzmit, Turkey). This division was supposedly for practical purposes: the Roman Empire was still called “indivisible” in official panegyric and both emperors could move freely throughout the Empire.

In 288, Emperor Maximianus appointed Constantius his praetorian prefect in *Gallia* (Gaul). Constantius then abandoned his wife or concubine Helena, the mother of his sixteen-year-old son Flavius Valerius Aurelius Constantinus (the future emperor Constantine the Great, 272–337), whom he had hardly seen, to marry Maximian's stepdaughter Theodora, which would secure his political power. In 293, however, Emperor Diocletianus divided the Roman Empire again, appointing two Caesars to rule over further subdivisions of

East and West. During the fourth century, Emperor Constantine the Great began the process that would bring about the division of the Roman empire into two rival and enemy empires: the Latin-speaking “Western” and Greek-speaking “Eastern” Roman empires. This process was accelerated by the success of Christianity.

For many centuries, the people whom the Romans saw as “barbarian” Germanic tribes had repeatedly moved south towards Rome, raiding the villages and towns along their way. At other times, the Romans moved north to fight and subdue them. Their Roman exonyms were corruptions of the endonyms that the Germanic tribes called themselves. For instance, the name *Chamavus* may have been a Roman corruption of the Old German word *Hamm* (settlement), *Heim* (home), or *Haimaz* (homeland; modern German *Heimat*). The Roman name *Salius* may have been a corruption of the Dutch name of the IJssel river in the Netherlands, then called *Isala* or *Sal*, signalling the people’s movement and residence in that area of Roman Gaul. This Dutch area was called *Salland*. The name *Salius* may also come from *salus* (salt) because to the Romans the *Salii* were sea-dwelling people and, hence, “salty”.

Just as the North American Apache called themselves *indeh* (the people), the Germanic tribe whom the Romans called *Teutones* called themselves *teutsch*, meaning “the people”. There are other theories about the etymology of the German words *teutsch* and *deutsch*. Some scholars think that they may have derived from *teuta*, a proto-Indo-European word for “people”. Other scholars think that they came from the Dutch word *duyts* (German), which derived either from the Dutch *de oudst* (the oldest) or from the Dutch *duidelijk* (clear), or that *teutsch* came from the Latin *theodiscus*, which became the Old German word *theodisk*, which referred to a West Germanic tribe and language, and that the word *theodisk* turned into the mediæval German words *diüdesch*, *tütsch*, *teutsch*, and *deutsch* (whence the English word *Dutch*). In any event, to the German “Teutons” themselves, the word *teutsch* meant “the people”.

During the late second century BCE, the Germanic *Teutones* and *Cimbri* were recorded by Roman historians as passing west through Roman-occupied Celtic Gaul and attacking Roman Italy. Passing through Celtic Gaul, the Teutons adopted as their god *Teutates*, *Toutatis*, or *Tuisto*, one of the three major Celtic gods. Probably originating in the Danish area of Jutland during the second century BCE,

many Teutones and Cimbri migrated south and west to the Danube River valley, where they faced the armies of the expanding Roman Republic.

The Cimbri, under their king Boiorix, and the Teutons, under the king Theudobod, won the opening battles of this war, defeating the Gallic or Celtic tribes allied with the Romans and destroying a huge Roman army at the Battle of Arausio in 105 BCE. In 104 BCE the Cimbri left the Rhône valley to raid Spain, while the Teutons remained in Gaul, still strong, but not powerful enough to march on Rome on their own. This gave the Romans time to rebuild their army, and the invading Cimbri and Teutones were defeated in 102 BCE by the Roman general Gaius Marius (156–86 BCE) at Aquae Sextiae (near present-day Aix-en-Provence in France). The Germanic King, Theudobod, was taken in irons to Rome. As Greek legend had it about the women of Troy, German myth has the captured Germanic women kill their own children and commit mass suicide rather than be raped by the victorious Romans. This myth passed into Roman legends of Germanic heroism and was noted by Saint Jerome (347–420), the translator of the Hebrew Bible into the Latin *Vulgata*. One of the fascinating aspects of the name *Teutones* is that *Teuton* and *Teutonic* have been used in reference to all of the Germanic peoples, and that the old Germanic word *teutsch* (people) became *deutsch*, the modern German word for “German”.

The Celts were an ancient people in central Europe around 1000 BCE who, by 400 BCE, had migrated all the way to Ireland, Iberia, and Anatolia. In Roman *Gallia* (Gaul) they became known as *Galli* (Gauls). The origin of the various names used since classical times for the people known today as the Celts is obscure and has been controversial. In particular, there are at least nineteen records of the term “Picts” being used in connection with the inhabitants of Ireland and Britain prior to the eighteenth century. According to a famous text by Julius Caesar (100–44 BCE), the Latin name *Celtus* (plural *Celti* or *Celtae*), which came from the Greek *Keltes* or *Keltos* (plural *Keltai* or *Keltoi*), was based on a native Celtic ethnic name: “All *Gallia* is divided into three parts, in one of which the *Belgae* live, another in which the *Aquitani* live, and the third are those who in their own tongue are called *Celtae*, in our language *Galli*” (Julius Caesar, *Commentarii de Bello Gallico*, 1.1).



The first literary reference to the Celts, as *Keltoi*, is by the Greek historian Hecataeus of Miletus in 517 BCE. He wrote that the Greek town of Massalia (now the French city of Marseille) was near “the place of the Celts” and also mentioned a Celtic town named Nyrex. The Greek historian Herodotus located the *Keltoi* at the source of the Danube River, or in Iberia, but this passage in his writings is unclear. The Greeks seem to have confused the Celts with the Germans, just as the Romans later confused the Goths with the Getae. The name of the Germanic god Teutates, Toutatis, or Tuisto, who was also one of the three major Celtic gods, may also have come from the proto-Indo-European word *teuta* (the people), so that his name meant “the god of the people”.

The Danube River, which flows from west to east, and the River Rhine, which flows from south to north, were the natural frontiers in Europe. The Greco-Roman world knew little about the people who lived north of the Danube River before the second century BCE. The Roman exonym for the land of the “savage” tribes north of the Danube River was *Germania*, while the German endonym for it was *Deutsch-Land* (the land of the people). *Germania* was inhabited by many different tribes, the majority of them Germanic but also including some Celtic, Baltic, Scythian, and proto-Slavic. The tribal and ethnic makeup of *Germania* changed over the centuries as a result of assimilation and, most importantly, great migrations. The Germanic people spoke many dialects, which some linguists think may have developed from a proto-Indo-Germanic language.

Until the fourth century BCE, the Greeks and the Romans probably confused the Germans with the Celts. Around 320 BCE, the Greek sailor Pytheas of Massalia (ca. 380–310 BCE) sailed from Massalia (now Marseille) around Britain and along the northern coast of Europe. What he found on his journeys was so strange to the Greeks that later writers refused to believe his stories. Pytheas may have been the first Mediterranean sailor to distinguish the Germans from the Celts. The Roman emperor Julius Caesar thought that the *Galli*, though quite warlike, could also be civilized, while the Germanic tribesmen were far more savage, were a big threat to Roman *Gallia*, and, therefore, had to be conquered. His accounts of the “barbaric” northern tribes expressed the feeling of superiority of the Romans, including the Gauls, over the Germans, but also expressed the Roman fear of the savage Germanic tribes. Those

fears were realized five centuries later, when the Germanic tribes raided Italy and destroyed the weakened Roman empire.

The most complete account of *Germania* from ancient times was that of the Roman historian Cornelius Tacitus (ca. 56–117). At the end of the first century of the Christian Era, Tacitus wrote about the origins of the name *Germania*:

The Germans themselves I should regard as aboriginal, and not mixed at all with other races through immigration or intercourse. For, in former times it was not by land but on shipboard that those who sought to emigrate would arrive; and the boundless and, so to speak, hostile ocean beyond us, is seldom entered by a sail from our world. And, beside the perils of rough and unknown seas, who would leave Asia, or Africa, or Italy for Germany, with its wild country, its inclement skies, its sullen manners and aspect, unless indeed it were his home? [Tacitus, 1999, i]

Tacitus went on to describe the Germans with a mixture of fear, contempt, superiority, and disdain that betrayed his ambivalence about them:

In their ancient songs, their only way of remembering or recording the past they celebrate an earth-born god Tuisco, and his son Mannus, as the origin of their race, as their founders. To Mannus they assign three sons, from whose names, they say, the coast tribes are called Ingaevones; those of the interior, Herminones; all the rest, Istaevones. Some, with the freedom of conjecture permitted by antiquity, assert that the god had several descendants, and the nation several appellations, as *Marsi*, *Gambrivii*, *Suevi*, *Vandalii*, and that these are nine old names. The name *Germania*, on the other hand, they say is modern and newly introduced, from the fact that the tribes which first crossed the Rhine and drove out the *Galli*, and are now called *Tungri*, were then called *Germani*. Thus what was the name of a tribe, and not of a race [nation], gradually prevailed, till all [of them] called themselves by this self-invented name of *Germani*, which the conquerors had first employed to inspire terror. [*ibid.*]

Actually, the Germans did not call themselves by that name: their endonym was *deutsch*. We can see how the exonyms given by the Romans to the German tribes betray their feelings about the “strange” people whom they feared and hated.

Christianity was introduced into Roman *Hispania* in the first century CE and it became popular in the Iberian cities in the second century. The first Germanic tribes to invade Roman *Hispania* arrived in the third century, when the once-mighty Roman empire began to decline both politically and militarily. Some historians believe that these Germanic tribes adopted the Roman exonym for themselves, *Franci*, as their endonym, while others believe that these tribes had other, Germanic, endonyms for themselves. By the seventh century, German historians writing in Latin were referring to their own people as *Franci*. We shall discuss the *Franci* in greater detail below, as their name was borne by the non-Germanic Crusaders.

During the first three centuries of the Christian era, Christianity had gradually spread to other Roman provinces than Spain, then to Rome itself. Byzantium was an ancient Greek city, founded by Greek colonists from Megara in 667 BCE and named after their king Byzas, or Byzantas. The Romans Latinized the Greek name into Byzantium. In the fourth century of the Christian era, the Roman emperor Constantinus (Constantine the Great) adopted Christianity as the religion of his empire and moved his capital from Rome to Byzantium (Nova Roma), whose language was Greek rather than Latin. This was a revolutionary move. He is known in the Greek Orthodox Church as “Saint Constantine”, and his mother, Helena, as “Saint Helena”. They are usually pictured together as the great saints of Greek Orthodoxy.

Constantine was the Roman Emperor from 306 CE (though he was challenged for his throne), and the undisputed Emperor from 324 to his death. He rebuilt the old city of Byzantium, renamed it *Nova Roma* (New Rome), moved his capital there, and issued special commemorative coins in 330 CE to honour the event. He provided *Nova Roma* with a Senate and civic offices similar to those of old Rome. After his death in 337, *Nova Roma* was renamed *Constantinopolis* (anglicized as Constantinople), and by the end of the century the Roman empire was partitioned into two parts: the “Latin” Roman empire of the West, whose capital was Rome, and the “Greek” Roman empire of the East, whose capital was Constantinople (now Istanbul, a Turkish corruption of the Greek words *eis tin polin*, meaning within the city).

The Western Roman Empire was weakened, its emperor was a figurehead after 395, and in the fifth century it was invaded by

Germanic tribes. The pope of the Christian Church had his seat in Rome, which was called the Holy See, or the throne of Saint Peter, but neither he nor the emperor had political or military power. The First Council of Constantinople (381) suggested strongly that Roman primacy was already asserted; however, it should be noted that, because of the controversy over this claim, the pope did not personally attend this ecumenical council, which was held in the capital of the eastern Roman empire rather than at Rome. It was not until 440 that Pope Leo I more clearly articulated the extension of papal authority as doctrine, promulgating in edicts and in councils his right to exercise “the full range of apostolic powers that Jesus had first bestowed on the apostle Peter”. It was at the ecumenical Council of Chalcedon (now Kadıköy) in 451 that Pope Leo (through his emissaries) stated that he was “speaking with the voice of Peter”. At this same council, the Bishop of Constantinople was given a primacy of honour equal to that of the Bishop of Rome, because “Constantinople is the New Rome”.

The Eastern Roman Empire, whose people were mostly Greek, and whose language was Greek, was later called the Byzantine Empire by historians, but it was not so called by its own emperors. The seventh century was disastrous for the Eastern Roman Christians: they were invaded by the newly Muslim Arabs, Persians, and Slavs, and lost some of their territories in Asia Minor and in the Middle East, including the “Holy Land”. The appellation of “Holy Land” for Palestine, which, in that century, was conquered from the Byzantines by the invading Muslims, was a fantasy. It was based on the religious belief that the land in which Jesus Christ was born and crucified was holy. This belief unconsciously came from a longing for a Great Good Mother who was holy and unblemished, like the Virgin Mary.

Like many peoples who are unable to mourn their collective losses, the Byzantine Greeks seem to have immersed themselves in their past and sought to recover their losses. The writings of Theophylaktos Simokattes, a seventh-century Byzantine chronicler, “the last historian of Antiquity”, and the *Chronographia* of Theophanes the Confessor (born 758 or 760, died 817 or 818) attest to this phenomenon (Theophanes the Confessor 1982, 1997; Theophylaktos Simokattes, 1986). As the American historian David Olster astutely observed,

Seventh-century [Byzantine] literature reveals the Christian preoccupation with the collapse of the imperial world-order in the wake of the Arab, Persian, and Slav invasions. But their preoccupation with defeat did not find primary expression through the historical genres. Classical biography disappears entirely. Theophylact Simocatta is not only the sole extant historian from the seventh century, but the sole known historian, and he chose to narrate the victories that closed the sixth century, not the defeats that opened the seventh. From the Paschal Chronicle at the end of the 620s to Theophanes' *Chronicle* at the beginning of the ninth century, there is no extant chronicle, and Theophanes' narrative poverty testifies to the Christians' reluctance to face defeat. *Christians may have been preoccupied with defeat, but they had no interest in recording it. They had far less interest in what had happened than in how the past would be restored.* [Olster, 1994, p. 180, italics added]

During recorded human history (and prehistory), there were many great migrations of entire ethnic groups in quest of land, food, power, or territory. These migrations almost always involved wars, conquest, pillage, and bloodbaths. For the ancient Romans, the Germanic *Gothi*, who made great migrations in the fifth century, were divided into the *Thervingi* (forest people), the *Greuthungi* (steppe dwellers or people of the pebbly coasts), and the *Vesi*, *Wesi*, or *Wisi* (good or noble people), who were later called Visigoths. The name *Visigothi* was an invention of the Roman writer Cassiodorus, who combined *Visi* and *Gothi* intending it to mean "West Goths" because they ruled Spain. This is another fascinating case of the changing meaning of peoples' names. The word *Wisi* may have come from the Gothic word *iusiza*, meaning "better". The British historian William Henry Stevenson thought that *Wesi* was the Germanic version of the Indo-European *wesus* meaning "good", like the Sanskrit *vásus*, and the Gallic *vesu* (Stevenson, 1899).

Incredibly, the Romans confused the Germanic *Gothi* with the Thracian *Getae*, the Greek name for several tribes that occupied the regions south of the Lower Danube River (now in Bulgaria), and north of the Lower Danube, in the Muntenian plain (now in Romania). The *Getae* lived in the hinterland of Greek colonies on the Black Sea coast, bringing them into contact with the ancient Greeks from an early date. At the end of the fourth century, however, the Roman poet Claudianus, in the court of the Roman

emperor Honorius and the patrician Stilicho, used the exonym *Getae* for the Visigoths. During the fifth and sixth centuries, several Roman and Greek writers, including Marcellinus Comes, Orosius, Johannes Lydus, Isidore of Seville, Procopius of Caesarea, and Jordanes, used the same exonym, *Getae*, as a collective name for the “barbarian” populations invading the Eastern Roman Empire (Goths, Gepids, Kutrigurs, and Slavs).

The sixth-century Byzantine Greek historian Procopius of Caesarea wrote,

There were many *Gothic* nations in earlier times, just as also at the present, but the greatest and most important of all are the Goths, Vandals, Visigoths, and Gepaedes. In ancient times, however, they were named Sauromatae and Melanchlaeni; and there were some too who called these nations *Getic*. [Procopius of Caesarea, 1653; cf. Boia, 2001, p. 14]

The *Getae* were called the ancestors of the Goths by the sixth-century Roman historian Jordanes, who was of Germanic Alan origin (his father’s name was Alanoviiamuth) in his Latin work *De origine actibusque Getarum* (The Origin and Deeds of the *Getae*). Jordanes also wrote that a river gave its name to the *Vesi*, but this is a legend, like his similar story about the *Greuthung* name. Jordanes assumed the earlier testimony of Orosius.

The Germanic Goths (not the Thracian *Getae*) had begun to attack Rome in the third century. The Gothic Thervingi made one of the first major “barbarian” invasions of the Roman Empire from 262 to 267. A year later, however, they suffered a devastating defeat at the Battle of Naissus and were driven back across the Danube River by 271. The Goths continued their migrations and raids into the Roman empire during and after its division in the fourth century. By the fifth century, the “Roman empire of the West” had been invaded by marauding Germanic tribes—Visigoths, Swabians, Vandals, and Alans—whom the Romans often called *Franci*, and who arrived in Roman *Hispania* by crossing the Pyrenees from *Gallia*. From 407 to 409 the Vandals, with the allied tribes of the Alans and Suevi, swept into the Roman Iberian peninsula.

In response to this invasion of Hispania, the Roman emperor of the West, Honorius (384–423), enlisted the aid of the Visigoths, who entered Hispania in 415, and in 418 Emperor Honorius made them

*foederati*, or allies, of Rome. In Gaul and Spain, the East Germanic Vandals were attacked by *Galli* allied to the Romans. They crossed the Pillars of Hercules (now the straits of Gibraltar), settled in the North African highlands west of the Roman city of Carthage (now in Tunisia and Algeria), established a sizable kingdom in North Africa, and finally “sacked” Rome in 455. The word “vandal” has become synonymous with “barbarian”, “violent”, and “uncivilized”. The “Pagan” Visigoths remained in Spain. After their conversion to Roman Catholicism in 589, and after conquering the Swabian territories in the northwest and the Byzantine territories in the southeast, the Visigothic kingdom of Spain comprised a great part of the Iberian Peninsula.

### *Unconscious psychological processes: splitting and projection*

The derogatory exonyms that each ethnic group gives other groups, especially its “enemies”, are not accidental. Psychologically, each human group needs an enemy, a foreign group, against which it can define its own identity and maintain its internal cohesion. In this classical *Us and Them* paradigm, we are the good guys and they are the bad guys. On the individual level, *consciously* seeing oneself as all-good and others as all-bad is the product of two *unconscious* defensive processes that operate in each of us from a very early age: *splitting*, by which the infant defends itself from unbearable ambivalence and anxiety by splitting its world (its mother) into all-good and all-bad parts, and *projection*, by which one’s painful feelings are attributed to the other. These processes are supplemented by *externalization* and *internalization*, in which painful aspects of ourselves and our painful relationships are blamed on other people, while the early object of our feelings (usually the early mother) is internalized. Some object-relations psychoanalysts think that externalization and internalization do not bear on aspects of the object (of our painful feelings), but, rather, on the relationships and conflicts that are inherent in the object and that it maintains with other objects (Mijolla, 2005).

These unconscious defensive processes begin in our infancy, because of the total dependence of the baby on its mother, who has no way of being good, nourishing, and care-taking twenty-four

hours a day, seven days a week. Even the best mother is at times tired, sleeping, depressed, worried, or not totally attentive to her baby. The baby wants absolute attention and endless supplies. It cannot integrate its perception of its mother as a “good object” that supplies all its needs and as a “bad object” that frustrates them. Therefore, it splits up its image of its mother into two, one all-good, the other all-bad, one a fairy, the other a witch, as if it had two different and separate mothers. This theme is abundant in legends, myths, and fairy tales. In addition, the infant also unconsciously splits its own image of itself into two, so that it harbours a good self-image and a bad self-image at the same time, but the two are not integrated, as in the classic story *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, by the Scottish novelist Robert Louis Balfour Stevenson (1850–1894), who died of a cerebral haemorrhage on his Samoan estate at the age of forty-four. Through splitting, projection, and externalization we attribute to the other, the foreigner, the enemy all the painful aspects of our own self.

Unconscious splitting and projection were active on a large scale in the seventh century of the Christian era, when Islam came into being as major religion in Arabia. In great waves of marauding “holy” warriors, seeing themselves as righteous and non-Muslims as “the infidel”, the Muslims conquered most of the Middle East and North Africa, and, in the early eighth century, most of Iberia, which led to almost eight centuries of continual warfare with Christian Europe. The Europeans called the invading Muslims “Moors”, “Saracens”, and “Barbarians”, while the Arabic-speaking Muslims called the Europeans *frangi* (Franks). Let us look at these dramatic events, which, a few centuries later, led to the Crusades, and at the incredible fantasies that they involved.





## CHAPTER TWO

# Romans, Germans, and Berbers

### *European ethnocentrism and the Arabs*

As we have seen, *ethnocentrism* is an age-old and universal phenomenon. In a kind of collective group narcissism, each ethnic group prides itself on being superior to all the others, on being elected by its gods or God, and on being good; others are bad. The indigenous North Africans, whom we call *Berbers*, *Kabyles*, or *Chaoui*, call themselves *Imazighen* (singular *Ama-zigh*), meaning “free men” (presumably, to them, other men are slaves). The ancient Greeks called everyone who did not speak their language *barbaros*, meaning “foreign, strange, ignorant”, an onomatopoeic word in which the “bar-bar” represented the impression of random “hubbub” the Greeks had from hearing a language they could not understand, similar to “blah blah”, or “babble” in modern English. The English word “barbarian” derives from the Latin *Barbarus*, the Latin form of the Greek *barbaros*, and from the Latin name *Barbaria*, meaning “foreign country.” Similarly, the name “Berber” was the derogatory name given by the Spaniards to the nomadic Imazighen of North Africa and sub-Saharan Africa who invaded their country as Muslims in the eighth century.

The River Rhine, one of Europe's longest and most important rivers along with the Danube, begins in Switzerland, runs north between France and Germany, then runs further north through Germany and turns west in the Netherlands, where it flows into the North Sea. The exonym *Berber* that was given to the Muslim *Imazighen* by the Europeans was a corruption of the Latin word *Barbarus*, which had been given by the Romans to their northern hostile Germanic neighbours from the land they called *Germania*, the Latin exonym for a geographical area east of the Rhine, as well as an area under Roman control on the west bank of the Rhine. The name *Germanus* came into use after Julius Caesar adopted it from a Gallic term for the peoples east of the River Rhine, and it may have meant "neighbour". The Roman name *Barbaria* at first designated the land of the Germanic "Barbarians", but was later applied to the pirate-ridden North African Mediterranean coast, inhabited by the "Berbers". The term first appeared in writing in the fourth century, during the schism in the Roman Catholic church between the North-African bishop Saint Augustine of Hippo (354–430) and the "heretical Donatists", the followers of the "Berber" Christian "heretic" Donatus Magnus (ca. 311–355), and the allies of the "Barbarians".

White-skinned Europeans felt themselves superior to the dark-skinned "Barbarians" from African and Asia who came to Europe. When the dark-skinned Arabic-speaking "Berber" Muslim conquerors of Spain arrived from Morocco in 710–712, the Christian Spaniards called these invaders *Moros*, meaning "swarthy ones" or "black ones". The Spanish word *moro* derived from the Roman word *mauro*, which came from the Greek *mauros*, and which had the same meaning, as does the Spanish word *moreno*. The English called these Muslims *Moors*. Ironically, in modern Morocco, Algeria, and Mauritania (the ancient Mauretania), it is the *light-skinned* people who are called (in French) *Maures* and *Berbères*. The dominant political group in Mauritania is called *les Maures blancs* (the white Moors). In modern Spanish, the word *Moros* denotes all Muslims, not only those from North Africa but also those in faraway lands such as the Philippines and Granada.

Among the major Turkic tribes of Central Asia were the Oghuz Turks. They are considered the ancestors of the Azerbaijanis, the Turks, the Turkish Cypriots, the Balkan Turks, the Turkmens, the Qashqai, the Khorasani, the Gagauz, and the Salar. During the

Turkic mass-migrations of the ninth through the twelfth century, the Oghuz Turks were among the indigenous tribes of Central Asia who migrated towards western Asia and eastern Europe via Transoxiana (now in Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and south west Kazakhstan). From the fifth century onward, the Oghuz Turks were the founders and rulers of several important Turkic empires, such as those of the Seljuk Turks and the Ottoman Turks. In later centuries, they adapted and applied their own traditions and institutions to the ends of the Islamic world and emerged as empire-builders with a constructive sense of statecraft.

Just as the Crusaders called all Muslims, Persians, Turks, Mamluks, Arabs, and other Near Easterners “Saracens”, the Muslim Arabs and “Berbers” lumped their European Christian enemies into the name *al-franj*, *ifranj*, or *franji*, the Arabic versions of the Latin name *Franci*. The Arabic word *Rum* referred to the Byzantines or “Eastern Romans”, rather than to the Romans of Rome, but *ar-Rumi* later acquired the wider meaning of “Christian” or “European”. When the Seljuk Turks, a branch of the Oghuz Turks who around 960–985 adopted Islam as their religion, created a sultanate in Anatolia, it was called the “Sultanate of Rum”. To this day, the Arabic word *franji* denotes all Western Europeans, and even all Europeans and all Westerners.

By the end of the ninth century, the Frankish kingdom no longer existed. The kingdom of France was still called *Francia* in Latin, but it was called *France* in the *langue d’oïl*, from which the modern French language developed. The twelfth-century French poet Jean Bodel, author of the *Chanson de Saisnes*, wrote, “Ne sont que trois matières à nul homme atendant / de France et de Bretaigne, et de Rome la grant”. (There are but three Matters which no one must ignore / of France, and of Britain, and of great Rome.) The Crusaders who fought the Muslims called themselves, in their own spoken language, *François* (Frenchmen) and *Normands* (Normans), yet they wrote in Latin, and, in their Latin-language documents, such as the letter of Estienne de Blois to his wife Adele from the siege of Antioch in 1098, and the *Gesta Francorum* (Deeds of the Franks), these Crusaders called themselves *Franci* (Franks). This was a fantasy that was acted out in reality.

In the European languages, the word *Moor*, *Maure*, or *Moro* denoted swarthy skin as late as the fifteenth century. The Milanese

duke Ludovico Sforza (1452–1508) was called *Ludovico il Moro* because of his dark complexion. The “Moorish” Muslims, who had conquered Spain in 711–712 and called it *Al-Andalus*, had met the Franks at “the battle of Tours-Poitiers” in southwest France in 732, where they were forced back into *Al-Andalus* by Charles Martel (688–741). That battle actually took place some twenty kilometers north of Poitiers, near the border between *Francia* and *Aquitania*. The Frankish and Burgundian armies were led by Charles Martel, while the “Saracen” armies were commanded by Abd ar-Rahman al-Ghafiqi. Charles Martel won, without using cavalry, while Abd ar-Rahman was killed. The surviving Muslims escaped southward during the night, crossed the Pyrenees, and returned to *Al-Andalus*.

After the battle of 732, *Francia* expanded to southwest France (Aquitania), and Muslim expansion in Europe halted. Modern historians are still arguing about the significance of the battle of Tours-Poitiers, which some see as a mere skirmish. The name *Martellus* (the Hammer) was given to Charles by ninth-century European Christian historians, who thought that he had delivered to the “Saracens” or “Moors” a divine blow that stopped Islam and saved Christianity, the true religion. The most detailed account of that battle was written in 754 in a Latin book (called in Spanish *Crónica Mozárabe*), written by an anonymous “Mozarab” (from the Arabic word *musta’arib*, meaning Arabized), an Arabic-speaking Christian Spaniard who lived under Muslim rule in Spain (López Pereira, 1980) Muslim Arab historians called the battle *marrakat balat ash-shuhada* (the battle of the court of martyrs). As always, all is in the eye of the beholder.

### *Romans, Germans, and Franks*

Every European schoolchild, when taught the history of its continent, learns that from the third to the ninth centuries the Germanic tribes known as “Franks” gradually conquered the Roman empire and built the largest empire that had ever existed in Europe, covering most of present-day central and western Europe, and that it was called *Francia* in Latin (probably pronounced *Frankia*). The name “Frank” remains in such German place names as *Frankfurt*, *Franken* (Franconia) and *Frankreich* (France). Mediæval France at first also

called itself *Francia*, but in the twelfth century it was already called France. Along with the Louis d'Or, the *franc* was the official currency of France for centuries: only in the twenty-first century did it give way to the Euro. The European Christian "Crusaders" who invaded the "Holy Land" in the late eleventh century did not call themselves Crusaders: they wrote of themselves as *Franci* and *Latini*, even though the Frankish kingdom had disappeared in the mid-ninth century, being replaced by France and Germany, and the "Frankish" Crusaders were mostly Frenchmen and Normans, with some Germans and others among them.

The old Latin name *francus*, as did the Old English word *franca*, may have derived from the Old German word *frankon*, meaning a lance or javelin. In Latin, however, the word *francus* meant "a free man", just as the word *sclavus* meant "a slave". The Franks, as the conquering class, had the status of freemen in ancient Rome, while the Slavs were slaves. The Romans gave the name of *Franci* to many of the Germanic tribes that entered Roman history around 260 CE, after crossing the Rhine and the Danube southward into the Roman Empire. Over the next century, other Frankish tribes appeared in Roman records. The major sources are the *Panegyrici Latini*, a collection of twelve ancient Roman orations, and the chronicles of Ammianus Marcellinus, Claudian, Zosimus, Sidonius Apollinaris, and Gregorius de Turones (Gregory of Tours).

Most historians like to divide history neatly into periods, such as Classical Antiquity, the Middle Ages, and Modern times. In reality, historical developments are much more complicated. The "Migration Period", or the "Barbarian Invasions", is a name given by historians to the great wave of human migration which lasted about four centuries, from about 300 CE to 700 CE, and even later, to 1000 CE, in Europe, marking the transition from Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages. During that time, especially in the fifth century, after being divided into a Western and Eastern part, the Western Roman Empire was destroyed by marauding tribes. The migration included the Huns, Goths, Vandals, Swabians, Franks, and other Turkic, Germanic, and Slavic tribes. The Huns were a confederation of Central Asian equestrian nomads or semi-nomads (like the Mongols), with a Turkic aristocratic core. The migration of the Germanic tribes may have been triggered by the incursions of the Huns, which were connected to the Turkic migrations in Central

Asia. Eight centuries later, in the thirteenth century, the Mongols made the vast “migration” which led them to conquer most of Asia and large parts of eastern Europe.

The migrations of the “savage” tribes continued well beyond 1000 CE, with successive waves of Slavs, Alans, Avars, Bulgars, Magyars, Pechenegs, Cumans, Turks, and Mongols radically changing the ethnic makeup of Eastern Europe, much more than the Muslims and Arabs of our own time have changed it. Western European historians, however, tend to emphasize the migrations that were most relevant to Western Europe. Most scholars of the Migration Period agree that the Franks emerged in the third century out of smaller Germanic groups, including the “savage” or “barbarian” tribes whom the Romans called *Salii*, *Ripuari*, *Sicambri*, *Chamavi*, *Bructeri*, *Chatti*, and *Chattuarii*, and who inhabited the northwestern coasts of Europe, the lower Rhine valley, and the lands immediately to its east. These names were later rendered into English as “Salian Franks”, “Sicambrian Franks”, “Chamavian Franks”, and so on.

The exonyms that the Romans gave the various Germanic tribes were corruptions of German names. For example, the *Salii*, whom we call the “Salian Franks”, were a subgroup of the early *Franci* who originally had been living north of the *limes*, the boundary of the Roman empire, in the coastal areas above the River Rhine in the Netherlands, which had a region called “Salland” (located west and north of the present Dutch province of Overijssel). The “Merovingian” Frankish kings who conquered Gaul from the Romans were of Salian stock. From the third century on, the *Salii* appear in Roman historical records as warlike Germanic pirates, and as *Laeti* —“barbarians” permitted to settle on imperial Roman territory on condition that they provide recruits for the Roman military.

The *Salii* were the first Germanic tribe from beyond the Roman *limes* that settled permanently on Roman land. Later, the *Salii* were absorbed into the *Franci* and ceased to appear by their original name, especially from the fifth century, when they became the dominant *Ripuari*. The *Salii* were mentioned by the Romans long before the *Ripuari*. The *Lex Salica*, or Salic law, was an important body of traditional law codified for governing the Salian Franks in the early Middle Ages during the reign of the Merovingian Frankish King Clovis I in the sixth century. Although the Salic Law

reflects ancient usage and practices, the *Lex Salica* was probably enacted between 507 and 511. The *Lex Ripuaria* originated over a century later, about 630, around Cologne, and was a later development of the Frankish laws known from the *Lex Salica*.

As we have seen, the Romans used the exonyms *Franci* (probably pronounced Franki) and *gens Francorum* (Frankish people) for the “savage” Germanic tribes that lived in the Lower Rhine valley and east of it, who later crossed the Rhine and the Danube into their empire, defeated the Celts or Gauls, fought the Romans, and were first mentioned in Roman writings during the third century. The Romans called their land *Francia*. Historians of human migrations think that the “Frankish” ethnic identity began to coalesce after 250 CE through the amalgamation of smaller Germanic tribes, just as the Teutonic identity encompassed several “savage” Germanic tribes worshipping several gods.

One of the ancient Germanic tribes mentioned by the Romans were the *Alamanni*, *Allemanni*, or *Alemanni* (unlike our obsessional “correct spelling”, ancient spellings often varied). Their name in Old German (as in modern German, *alle Männer*) meant “all men”, but the Romans probably had no idea of this. The *Allemanni* may have called themselves “all men” because they were originally an alliance of West Germanic tribes located around the upper Main River, one of the largest tributaries of the River Rhine, on land that is today part of Germany. One of the earliest references to the *Alamanni* is the title or *cognomen* of *Alamannicus* assumed by the Roman emperor Marcus Aurelius Septimius Bassianus Antoninus Augustus Caracalla (186–217), who ruled the Roman Empire from 211–217 and by that title claimed to be the defeater of the *Alamanni*. Eventually, these *Alamanni* merged with the Germanic tribes that the Romans called *Franci*.

In 241 the future Roman emperor Aurelian, then a military tribune, defeated the *Franci* in the neighbourhood of Mainz and marched on against Persia. His troops sang, *Mille Sarmatas, mille Francos, semel et semel occidimus; mille Persas, quaerimus*. (We kill a thousand Sarmatians, a thousand Franks, once and for all; we want a thousand Persians.) The first document to mention the *Franci* was a third-century Roman map now known as the *Tabula Peutingeriana*. Its thirteenth-century copy is the only surviving copy of the *cursus publicus*, the road map of the Roman Empire. The original third-



century map was revised in the fourth or fifth century. It covers Europe, parts of Asia (Persia and India) and North Africa. The map is a parchment scroll, 34 cm high and 6.75 m long, assembled from eleven horizontal sections. It is named after Konrad Peutinger (1465–1547), the German humanist, diplomat, politician, economist, and antiquarian who brought it to the world's attention. The map was discovered by the German humanist scholar Konrad Celtes (1459–1508), who handed it over to Peutinger for his antiquities collection. It was first published in 1591 by the Antwerp-based publishing house of Johannes Moretus.

The *Tabula Peutingeriana* called the Franks *Chamavi qui et Pranci* (the *Chamavi* who are *Pranci*), but the word *Pranci* may have been a typo for *Franci*, or the writer may have meant to write *Phranci*. During the fourth century, the *Franci* appear in Roman manuscripts such as the *Panegyrici Latini*, a collection of twelve ancient Roman panegyric orations from ca. 100–389. The *Franci* were also mentioned in the writings of the Roman historians Ammianus, Marcellinus, Claudianus, Zosimus, Sidonis Appollinaris, and Gregorius de Turones (Gregory of Tours).

The Germans whom the Romans called *Franci* were alternately Rome's enemies and allies. Around 350 a group of "savage" Germanic tribes whom the Romans called *Franci* invaded a weakened Roman empire in Gaul and went as far as Tarragona in *Hispania*. They bothered the Romans until ca. 260 before the Romans succeeded in expelling them. From around 290 the *Franci* ruled the area around the River Scheldt (now in the Netherlands and Belgium) and raided the "English Channel" between Gaul and Britain to foil Roman shipping there. The Romans managed to get control of the area, but they did not expel the *Franci*, who continued their pirate raids on the coast until 358, when the Roman emperor Julian the Apostate invited the *Salii*, or "Salian Franks", to settle in his empire as *foederati*, or allies, of Rome. Later, other Franks did the same.

Gradually, the Germanic tribes assumed a collective identity of "Franks" as they conquered the Roman empire from the Romans. They later believed, in fact, that they were the Romans' successors, and even called themselves Romans. The King of the Franks, later the King of the Germans, held the title of *Rex Romanorum* (King of the Romans) and later even *Imperator Romanorum* (Emperor of the

Romans). The Franks developed myths of origin showing their descent all the way back to the mythical Trojans in early antiquity (fourteenth, thirteenth, or twelfth century BCE). The myth of Dido and Aeneas (the queen of Carthage and the prince of Troy) was created by the Roman poet Publius Vergilius Maro (70 BCE–19 BCE), better known as Virgil, even though Carthage was only founded in the ninth century BCE and Troy had been destroyed centuries earlier. Let us look at the collective psychology and identity of the Franks as it developed over the centuries.



## Frankish myths of origin

Every human ethnic group, clan, tribe, nation, or people has myths about its origins, and the Germanic Franks were no exception. The “Merovingian” Franks were a royal Salian Frankish dynasty who believed that they were descended from a legendary king named *Mariwig*. His name, which meant “famed fight” in Old German, was Latinized into *Merovech* and *Meroveus*, hence *Merovingi*. After conquering the Roman empire, the Merovingians created a Germanic “Frankish” empire that ruled Roman *Gallia* and adjacent lands from the fifth to the eighth century. As usual, due to the psychologically complicated and, at times, even dangerous human family structure and sibling rivalry, there was continual strife and civil war between different branches of their dynasty. The Merovingian kings were referred to by their Roman contemporaries as *reges criniti*, or “long-haired kings”, for their long, unshorn hair: the tribal leader of the Germanic Franks wore his hair long, unlike the haircuts of the Romans and the tonsured clergy. During the final century of Merovingian rule, ending in 751, their dynasty was pushed into a ceremonial role by their rivals, the “Carolingians”, who were their *major domus*, or “Mayors of the Palace”.

As part of their myths of origin, some peoples believe that they are descended from the gods, some that they are chosen by God. We Jews have our myth of election as God's chosen people. While the Germanic "Franks" spoke various Germanic dialects, they imitated the "higher" Roman civilization, and wrote their documents, books, and histories in the Latin language of their former allies, the Romans, whom they gradually conquered, merged with, and displaced. The Latin word "vulgaris" meant "of or pertaining to the common people", from *vulgus*, meaning "the common people, multitude, crowd, or throng". Vulgar Latin differed from classical, written Latin. The Latin brought by the Roman soldiers to the provinces was not identical to the Latin of Cicero, and differed from it in vocabulary, and later in syntax and grammar as well. Some time in the mid-seventh century, during Merovingian Frankish rule, the history of the *Franci* in *Gallia* from 584 to 641 was written in a seventh-century Latin-language manuscript entitled *Fredegarii chronicon* (the Chronicle of Fredegarius or Fredegar) whose authorship is uncertain. It is written in "Vulgar Latin", the popular spoken dialects of the Latin language in the Roman empire, which diverged from each other in the early Middle Ages, evolving into the Romance languages by the ninth century.

The intriguing question of who wrote the *Fredegarii chronicon* has been hotly debated by scholars. Fredegar is an unusual Frankish name. The "Vulgar Latin" language in which this work is written is pre-French, suggesting that it was written in Gallia (Gaul). There are several theories about the authorship of this work: that this chronicle was written by one person, Fredegar (suggested mainly by French historians), that this chronicle was written by *three authors* (a theory embraced by several prominent historians), and that this chronicle was the work of *two authors* (Fredegar et al., 1960). Fredegar himself is presumed to have been a Burgundian from the region of Avenches (now in the Swiss canton of Vaud) because he knew the alternative German name of Wifflisburg for this locality, a name just coming into usage. He also had access to the annals of many Burgundian churches and to court documents, and interviewed Lombard, Visigoth, and Slavic ambassadors. His awareness of events in the Byzantine world is also usually explained by the proximity of Burgundy to Byzantine Italy. Even though Fredegar was alive around 660, he did not continue the chronicle past the year 642.

The fascinating *psychological* aspect of the *Fredegarii chronicon*, however, is its myth of origin. Fredegar's chronicle seriously related that the Franks were descended from the ancient Trojans, and that their name *Franzi* derived from a mythical ancient Trojan king named "Francio". In its "continuations", in 727 a Latin Frankish book entitled *Liber Historiae Francorum* (Book of the History of the Franks) claimed that after the fall of Troy (some two thousand years earlier) twelve thousand Trojans, led by their king Priam and their sage Antenor, migrated to the Tanais River (now the Don River) and settled in Pannonia (in what are now Hungary, Austria, Croatia, Slovenia, and Bosnia), near the Sea of Azov (the northern part of the Black Sea), where they founded a town named *Sicambria*, whence came the tribe the Romans called *Sicambri* . . .

Why did the Franks need to imagine themselves as descendants of the ancient Trojans? The Trojan prince Aeneas, according to Virgil's myth, went to Carthage and thence to Italy, to found Rome. If Rome was created by Aeneas, could the Franks have wished to see themselves as greater than Rome? If they had been founded by his father, Priam, they had preceded the Romans, and the Roman empire was their by right of ancestry, not only conquest. As the Franks became the major European power in the seventh and eighth centuries, they needed myths of origin to match their greatness. This was part of their ethnocentrism and group narcissism. On the other hand, they may have felt inferior to the Romans, whose language and culture they eagerly adopted.

The Merovingian Franks expanded from central Europe in all directions. In the eighth century, the Frankish empire, or *Francia*, comprised *Neustria* in the northwest, *Aquitania* in the southwest, *Austrasia* in the northeast, *Burgundia* in the south, *Lombardia* in northern Italy, and several other kingdoms. *Francia* comprised large parts of the territory of present-day Italy, France, Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands.

The original Frankish capital was Metz in Austrasia (now the capital of the French region of Lorraine). The *major domus* (superior of the house or "Mayor of the Palace") was an early mediæval office, also called *majordomo*. It was used in the Frankish kingdoms in the seventh and eighth centuries. The *major domus* was the most powerful courtier after the king. As we have seen, in 732 the Franks, under Charles Martel, won a battle over the invading "Saracens" or

"Moors" from Spain between Tours and Poitiers in Aquitaine. The "Saracens", who were Arabized "Berbers", called it in Arabic *ma'arakat bala ash-Shuhada* (Battle of Court of The Martyrs). The battle of 732 was fought between Poitiers and Tours, near the village of Moussais-la-Bataille (modern Vouneuil-sur-Vienne), north of Poitiers. The location of the battle was close to the border between Francia and the "independent" Aquitaine, which had not effectively resisted the "Moors" (another exonym for the "Saracens").

The Muslims who invaded Europe were formally ruled from Damascus by their Umayyad Caliph, Al-Walid ibn al-Malik (668–715). The word "caliph" is an anglicized form of the Arabic word *khalifah*, which means the successor or representative of the Prophet Muhammad (died 632). The word "caliphate" is the anglicized form of the Arabic word *khilafah*, meaning the realm and reign of the *khalifah*, and it is the Islamic conception of government representing the political unity and religious leadership of the Muslim world. Muhammad was called *Rasul Allah* (Messenger of Allah), and the early caliphs of "the Muslim nation" following his death were called *Khalifat Rasul Allah*, meaning the Successors to the Messenger of Allah. Not that the Muslim *ummah* (nation), a word that comes from *umm* (mother), was ever unified. There were several contemporaneous rival caliphates in Muslim history, which we shall discuss below. However, the Muslims took their caliphs and caliphates very seriously, and those living in a given caliphate saw their caliph as their supreme lord, leader, king, and master, above all the *emirs* (princes) and *sultans* (rulers).

As we have seen, the battle of Tours–Poitiers in 732 pitted Frankish and Burgundian forces, under the Austrasian *major domus* Charles, against the army of the Umayyad caliphate, led by Abdul Rahman al-Ghafiqi, the governor-general of *al-Andalus*. The Franks won, Abdul Rahman al-Ghafiqi was killed, and Charles extended his authority into Aquitaine in the south. Ninth-century chroniclers, who interpreted the outcome of the battle as a divine judgment in his favour, gave Carolus the nickname of *Martellus* (The Hammer), recalling Judas Maccabeus (The Hammer) of the Maccabean Jewish revolt against the Syrian Greeks in the second century BCE. Details of the battle, including its exact location and the exact number of combatants, cannot be determined from accounts that have

survived; although the Frankish troops seem to have won the battle without cavalry.

The Merovingian Frankish leader Charles Martel, or Charles the Hammer, was a brilliant military leader. He helped found the Carolingian Frankish empire, which succeeded the Merovingian one. In fact, Merovingian rule ended in 751 with a palace coup by Pepin the Short (714–768), the *major domus* of the Merovingian king Childeric III (died 753). Pepin deposed his king and took his place, beginning a new dynasty that later became known as the Carolingian Frankish monarchy, after Charles Martel. Its most famous king was Charlemagne, who became “Roman emperor” in 800. Indeed, the newly constituted “Franks” gradually took over the Roman empire. In fact, despite the fact that they spoke German dialects, they adopted Latin as their official language and considered themselves the successors of the Roman empire, in what later, in 962, after the German king Otto was crowned *Imperator Romanorum*, became known as the *translatio imperii*, or transfer of the empire. This was a fascinating notion, based on the fantasy that the Roman empire was “translated” or “transferred” from the Romans to the Franks.

The most famous king of the Franks was Charlemagne (died 814), whose Latin name (*Carolus Magnus*) and German name (*Karl der Grosse*) both meant Charles the Great, and who was King of the Franks with his younger brother Carloman (751–771) from 768 to his death. Later Frankish historians “continued” Fredegar’s Chronicle to the coronation of Charlemagne (and of his brother Carloman) as *rex Francorum* (Kings of the Franks). Later, the German kings were elected and crowned *Rex Romanorum* (King of the Romans) rather than *Rex Germanorum* (King of the Germans), and even *Imperator Romanorum* (Emperor of the Romans). This was based on the fantasy that the Franks and later the Germans were the direct successors to the Romans. In the late Middle Ages, this fantasy led to the notion of the “Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation”. The title of *Rex Romanorum* meant that its holder was not only King of Germany, but also of Italy and of all the other “Holy Roman” territories. Even though Charlemagne suffered some defeats, such as at the one at Roncevaux (Roncesvalles) Pass in 778, he called himself on his coinage *Karolus Imperator Augustus*.

The Byzantine Empire often encroached on Rome’s eastern territories. The eighth and ninth centuries of Christianity were



dominated by the religious controversy over *Iconoclasm* (the breaking of religious icons). Icons of saints had been banned by the Byzantine emperors Leo III and Constantine V, leading to revolts by the “iconodules” throughout the empire. The efforts of Empress Irene Serantapechaina (died 803) led to the Second Council of Nicaea in 787, which affirmed that icons could be *venerated* but not *worshipped as idols or gods*. Empress Irene endeavoured to negotiate a marriage between herself and Charlemagne, but, according to Theophanes the Confessor, the scheme was frustrated by Aetios, one of her favourites (Theophanes the Confessor, 1982, 1997).

In 800, after protracted negotiations, Charlemagne was crowned *Imperator Augustus* in Rome by Pope Leo III, who wanted the German king as his ally against his rival, the Byzantine emperor. In 962, Pope John XII similarly crowned the German king Otto the Great “Holy Roman Emperor” and a new political entity called *Sanctum Romanum Imperium* (Holy Roman Empire) was born, a fantastic psychogeographical entity that later became known as the “Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation”. As the great French writer Voltaire (François-Marie Arouet, 1694–1778) wittily observed, it was neither holy, nor Roman, nor an empire, and not even German. Nonetheless, it was considered a real political entity, with its own coats of arms.

The Frankish empire, which became the “Holy Roman Empire”, had begun with small Germanic tribes. As we have seen, during the fifth century the Germanic people whom the Romans called *Salii* and whom we now call the “Salian Franks” had crossed the Rhine into Roman Gaul and Spain. They later extended their hold on the Roman empire to northwestern Europe, including the Low Countries south of the River Rhine, Belgium, and northern France, absorbing other “Frankish” tribes, such as the Salians of Lorraine, the Ripuarians of Franconia, the Saxons, the Bavarians, and the Swabians. The German name *Franken* refers to the geographical region of Franconia, as well as to a mediæval duchy, one of the five German “tribal duchies”, or “young duchies”, that arose within the “Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation” during the late ninth and early tenth centuries (Saxony, Franconia, Bavaria, Swabia, and Lorraine), and which comprised the “Frankish” territories east of the River Rhine, in what is now Germany.

## From Franks to Crusaders

As we have seen, the Romanized Germanic tribes that gradually migrated and conquered most of Western Europe from the Romans adopted the Roman exonym *Franci* for themselves, and developed a steadily growing kingdom which later became the Frankish empire. As was common in mediæval Europe, kingdoms were ruled by dynasties, which were often established amid much bloodshed and later divided amid fratricidal wars among the successors. The “Merovingian” Frankish dynasty was named after the mythical *Meroveus*, and the “Carolingian” after the actual *Carolus*, the Latinized name of Charles Martel, the hero of the battle of Tours–Poitiers against the invading Muslims in 732. Some scholars, however, believe that the mediæval Latin name *carolingi* for this dynasty was an altered form of an Old High German name, *karling* or *kerling*, meaning “descendant of Charles”, similar to the Middle High German *kerlinc*.

With the fall of the Roman empire in the fifth century, the Germanic “Merovingian Franks” set up their kingdom in Italy in its place. In 493 the first “Merovingian” Frankish king, Clovis (466–511), who united the Germanic “Frankish” tribes, married a Burgundian Christian queen named Clotilde (475–545). The name

*Clovis* was a Latinized form of the German name *Chlodovech*, which became the Latin *Chlodovechus*, from which came the Latin name *Ludovicus*, which evolved into the Latin *Clovis* and also into the French name *Louis*. By that time, the Roman language, Latin, was evolving as the common language of literate Europe. The “Franks” adopted it as their own. Centuries later, the “Vulgar Latin” dialects that were spoken in various parts of the Roman empire evolved into different languages, such as Portuguese, Spanish, Catalan, Provençal, French, Italian, and Romanian. Church Latin was the Latin language as used in documents of the Roman Catholic Church and in its Latin liturgies. Though its pronunciation differed somewhat from that of Classical Roman Latin, Church Latin was not a distinct language or dialect, but, rather, Latin used for ecclesiastical purposes: the same language was also used for many other purposes.

In the early fifth century, the *Vulgata* Latin version of the Hebrew Bible was largely the work of Eusebius Sophronius Hieronymus (347–420), also known as Hieronymus Stridonensis, but better known as “Saint” Jerome, a Confessor and Doctor of the Church who was commissioned by Pope Damasus I (died 384) to make a revision of older Latin translations. The *Vulgata* accelerated the spread of Christianity, which Emperor Constantine had made into the religion of the Roman empire. In 496, after marrying the twenty-one-year-old Queen Clotilde of Burgundy, the thirty-year-old King Clovis of *Francia* became a Christian, as did his “Frankish” subjects. Myth has it that this dramatic act followed his victory in battle over the *Alamanni* at Tolbiacum, between Aachen and Bonn (now the German town of Zülpich), but in fact this battle occurred in 506, ten years after the conversion of Clovis. It is more likely that Clovis was following the Roman empire in his conversion.

The Frankish kingdom that Clovis created gradually expanded, but, with each generation, the king needed to divide it among his rival sons, and he also feared *coups d'état* by the *major domus*, or Mayor of the Palace. With many splits, divisions, and battles, the Merovingian empire lasted some three centuries, with several kings named Clovis. At the same time, the “Carolingian” Franks slowly gained the ascendancy. Charles Martel defeated the Muslims at Tours–Poitiers in 732, forcing them back into Iberia. The Carolingian Frankish empire, which supplanted the Merovingian one in

751, lasted two centuries. During the eighth century, it covered much of Western Europe, including most of present-day France and Germany. In the ninth, it disintegrated into several kingdoms. Nonetheless, the name *Francia* remained as that of France until at least the twelfth century.

### *The “Moorish” conquest of “Al-Andalus”*

At the beginning of the eighth century, after the Muslim conquests of the Middle East and North Africa, the Muslim *emir* Musa bin Nusair (640–716) governed the province of *Ifriqiya* (now Tunisia and eastern Algeria) for the sixth Umayyad caliph, Al-Walid ibn al-Malik (668–715), who ruled from Damascus. Musa’s father Nusair was an Arab from Syria or Iraq who had been captured during the first Muslim expansion and enslaved. After regaining his freedom, he returned to his home town, where Musa was born. In 711 Musa sent the “Berber” Muslim conqueror Tariq ibn Ziyad (died 720) to the place now called Gibraltar (from the Arabic *jebel al-Tariq*, or Mount Tariq), where the Muslim expedition discovered that a large Gothic army was marching nearby. The seventeenth-century Muslim historian Abu-l-Abbas Ahmad ibn Mohammed al-Maqqari, who was born in the North African town of Tlemcen (now in Algeria), wrote that Tariq ibn Ziyad burned his own ships and told his men that they had no choice but to fight, and that they would be glorious. On July 19, 711 Tariq ibn Ziyad won the Battle of Guadalete River and the Gothic king Roderic was lost or killed. The name *Guadalete* comes from the Arabic phrase meaning “river of forgetfulness”.

Envious of his subordinate Tariq, Musa bin Nusair decided to land his army in *Al-Andalus* to lead the Muslim army instead of Tariq, and he was apparently successful in his battles against the *franj*. After taking Iberia in 712, he crossed the Pyrenees into France, but then, according to some Muslim historians (see below), he was summoned to his caliph in Damascus. According to an anonymous mediaeval Muslim Arab historian, the caliph asked Musa, “Now tell me, who are these *franj* and what is their nature?” Musa answered, “They are a great people, brave and tempestuous in attack, but cowardly when defeated.” The caliph then asked Musa, “How did

the battle turn out between you and them? For you or the reverse?" Musa answered, "The reverse? No, by Allah and His Prophet! Not a company of my army was defeated in battle. Never did the Muslims hesitate to follow me when I led them, even though they were half the number of the *franj*."

Musa bin Nusair had not fought the "Franks". He was probably speaking about his battles against the Goths in Spain, but to the Muslims, all European Christians were "*franj*". In contrast to Musa's poor opinion of the *franj*, the twelfth-century Kurdish Muslim *sultan* of Egypt and Syria, Salah ed-din Yusuf ibn Ayyub (1138–1193), the founder of the Ayyubi dynasty of Syria and Egypt, whom the Franks called "Saladin", and who defeated the "Franks" at the Battle of Hattin in 1187 and took Jerusalem from them, was said to have told his troops: "See the *franj*! See with what tenacity they fight for their religion, while we, the Muslims, show no zest for holy war!" Saladin was probably trying to exhort his men to fight more tenaciously.

There are many legends about Musa bin Nusair. According to some Muslim historians of the time, such as Al-Hakim, Musa bin Nusair had been sailing in the "Dark Sea", where he came upon cage-like bottles floating and a great voice screaming "No Prophet of God, Not again!" Musa brought one of these bottles on deck and, to his surprise, a man (or genie) appeared on the ship, who took him for Suleyman (Solomon), and said in astonishment "By God, you are them!! If it wasn't for a favour you (meaning Solomon) have done to me, I would have drowned your ships!" Then the man or genie disappeared. The report continues to state that Musa said to his crew that the man was a *jinn* (demon) who had been enslaved by King Suleyman (a prophet in Islam) and was given a favour-release by Solomon. The report continues to state that since Musa's campaign was so extraordinarily successful, the *jinn* of Solomon might have hand in it.

In 712, Musa bin Nusair joined his army to that of Tariq ibn Ziyad to conquer Iberia, then led the Muslim armies into Septimania, in southern Francia, where he annexed some land. Musa, however, cast his rival Tariq ibn Ziyad into prison, and was planning an invasion of the rest of Europe, when he was recalled to Damascus by his Umayyad caliph, Al-Walid: Tariq had smuggled a letter out of his prison informing the caliph of what had

happened, and Al-Walid was displeased by Musa's behavior. Both leaders were, therefore, summoned by the caliph to Damascus. Tariq arrived first. Al-Walid took ill, however, and his brother, Suleyman ibn Abd al-Malik, asked Musa, who arrived in great pomp with a cavalcade of soldiers and war spoils, to delay his entry into the city until Al-Walid had died and Suleyman became the new caliph.

Tragically for himself, however, Musa dismissed Suleyman's request, entered Damascus triumphantly, and brought his case before the ailing Caliph Al-Walid. After hearing from both Musa and Tariq, the caliph concluded that Musa, as *emir*, had wronged his subordinate general, Tariq, by taking all the credit for the victory. Al-Walid died a few days later, and was succeeded by his brother Suleyman, who demanded that Musa deliver all his spoils to him. When Musa complained, Suleyman stripped him of his rank and confiscated all the booty, including a table that reputedly once belonged to King Solomon. He ordered Musa (a very old man by then) to stand in the sun all day long as a punishment, and Musa reportedly said, "O, Caliph, I deserve a better rewarding than this." He was seen begging at a mosque door in the last days of his life.

Regardless of the personal fortunes of Musa and Tariq, the Muslims had conquered southern Spain, which they called *Al-Andalus*. The battle of Tours-Poitiers in 732 was a turning point, their first defeat after their succession of victories in the Middle East, North Africa, and Spain. Henceforth, the Muslims remained in *Al-Andalus*, their imaginary name for Iberia, and no longer ventured into *Francia*. They did not know the Europeans well, and were not interested in the political, social, or cultural changes in Europe. Keeping a fixed mental image of the *franj*, they did not seem to know that Francia had split up in the ninth century, and that new kingdoms such as Germany, France, and Normandy had come into being. If the Crusaders themselves called themselves *Franci*, no wonder the Muslims called them *frangi* as well. Perhaps they did not want to know too much about the *franj*. They preferred to live in a fantasy world, divided into *Dar al-Islam* and *Dar al-Harb*. The modern Moroccan Muslim Arab scholar Abdallah Laroui argued that the Arabs live in a society that ignored history, that they lived in a kind of ahistorical bubble, just as the Jews had done for almost fifteen centuries (Falk, 1996; Laroui, 1976; Patai, 1973, 1976; Yerushalmi, 1982).

### *The disintegration of Francia*

In the ninth century, the Carolingian Frankish empire fell apart. The Frankish king Carolus Magnus (Charlemagne) was crowned emperor by the pope in Rome in 800 and died in 814. Following bloody fratricidal wars among his sons, the Treaty of Verdun in 843 divided the Frankish empire into three kingdoms: *Francia occidentalis* (West Francia), *Francia media*, and *Francia orientalis* (East Francia). Middle Francia, the kingdom of Lothar, or Lothair, soon disappeared politically. The realm of Lothar, which included the kingdom of Italy, Burgundy, Provence, and the west of Austrasia, was an unnatural creation, with no historical or ethnic identity to bind its varied peoples. The kingdom was split on Lothair's death into those of Lotharingia (Lorraine), Provence (with Burgundy divided between it and Lotharingia as Lower Burgundy and Upper Burgundy), and Italy.

Count Welf, or Hwelf, or Guelph, of Metz was the son of the ninth-century Frankish count Rothard of Metz. In historical chronicles, Welf is mentioned on the occasion of the wedding of his daughter Judith with Emperor Louis the Pious in 819. Welf began the Elder House of Welf, a dynasty of European rulers from the ninth through the eleventh centuries. It consisted of a Burgundian group and a Swabian group. Historians disagree on whether the two groups formed one dynasty or whether they only shared the same name.

In 869, the Western Roman Emperor Louis II allied himself with the eastern Roman Emperor Basil I against the "Saracens", while Charles the Bald of West Francia tried to take *Francia media* after the death of Lothair II, but was resisted by Louis the German. The middle Frankish kingdom was once again divided into Lorraine, Burgundy, and northern Italy. East Francia, which was essentially Germany and Austria, was divided into four "young" duchies: Alamannia, Franconia, Saxony, and Bavaria, which, at that time, included Moravia and Carinthia. The dukes elected their king, who was the King of the Germans. Henceforth, there was no more Frankish Empire. West Francia became France, East Francia became Germany, and the Normans set up a large kingdom in Italy as well. Yet, when the French and Norman Christians left on their First Crusade in 1096, they called themselves, and wrote of themselves in Latin as, *Franci*. We shall try to explain this fantasy below.

By 884, the West Frankish king Charles *le gros* (Charles the Fat, 839–888) had briefly reunited all the Frankish kingdoms under his rule. This fat king was deposed in 887 and died in 888. Odo, or Eudes, the count of Paris, was elected King of West Francia, and he assumed the crown upon the death of Charles the Fat. The Frankish empire split up again. The nobles and leading clergy of Upper Burgundy assembled at Saint Maurice (now in the Swiss canton of Valais) and elected Rudolph, count of Auxerre, from the Elder House of Welf, as King of the Franks. Rudolph of Burgundy tried to reunite Burgundy with *Francia media*, but opposition by Arnulf of Carinthia (850–899), the Slovenian King of East Francia (and the future “Holy Roman Emperor”), forced him to focus on Burgundy. Eventually, *Francia media* split up, and the other two parts (East and West Francia) vied for the title of “Francia”. The rulers of *Francia orientalis*, or Germany, who claimed the Roman imperial title and wanted to reunify the Frankish Empire under their rule, renamed their kingdom the “Holy Roman Empire”.

The kings of *Francia occidentalis*, however, successfully opposed the German claim, and managed to preserve their country as an independent kingdom, distinct from the Holy Roman Empire, called France. Its capital was Paris, the former Neustrian capital. From 888 to 1180, *Francia occidentalis* grew steadily and became the kingdom of France, one of the largest and most powerful in Europe. The short-lived Middle Francia included parts of northern Italy, Burgundy, Provence, and Austrasia, the northeastern portion of the Frankish kingdom, comprising parts of present-day France, Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands. These parts were gradually divided among the various kingdoms, chiefly France, Burgundy, and Germany. *Francia media* disappeared from the pages of history.





## The fantasy of the “Holy Roman Empire”

One of the fascinating things about mediæval Europe is how *Francia orientalis*, the eastern part of the formerly Frankish empire, gradually “revived” the defunct Roman empire and became its successor. This psychohistorical and psychogeographical fantasy was maintained for centuries. The “Holy Roman Empire”, or (as it was called by the Germans from the fifteenth century) “the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation”, came into being after King Otto “the Great” of Germany (912–973) was crowned *imperator Romanorum* by Pope Johannes XII in 962. The pope needed Otto to protect him militarily from an Italian nobleman named Berengar of Ivrea (died 966), who had declared himself king of Italy and occupied the Papal States. Ten days after the coronation, the pope and emperor ratified the *Diploma Ottonianum*, under which the “holy Roman” emperor became the guarantor of the independence and integrity of all the papal states in Italy, which were the territorial possession of the pope and a symbol of his temporal power.

*The "translation of the empire"*

Like beauty, history is the eye of the beholder. In contemporary and later Latin writings, the crowning of the German king Otto I by Pope Johannes XII in 962 was referred to as the *translatio imperii*, or the transfer of the empire. Mediæval historians, however, interpreted this *translatio imperii* in different fantastic ways, depending on their nationality and loyalty. For example, the twelfth-century *German* historian Otto von Freising saw the *translatio imperii* as the transfer of the empire by stages, from Rome to Byzantium to the Franks to the Lombards to the Germans. His *French* contemporary, Chrestien de Troyes, saw it as the transfer of the empire by stages from Greece to Rome to France, and the fourteenth-century *English* historian Richard de Bury saw it as the transfer of the empire from Athens to Rome to Paris to England . . .

Christianity took centuries to take hold in "pagan" or polytheistic Europe. After King Clovis of the Merovingian Franks had married Queen Clotilde of Burgundy and adopted Christianity in 496, the "Salian Franks" had spread Christianity in Europe. Just as the Frankish empire had split up in the ninth century, the Roman Catholic Christian Church split up in the eleventh, in what became known as the Great Schism of 1054. This East–West Schism divided mediæval Christendom into the Western or "Latin" part in Rome, and the Eastern or "Greek" part in Constantinople, which later became the Roman Catholic Church and the Eastern or Greek Orthodox Church.

The causes of the Great Schism were personal, political, theological, linguistic, and, above all, psychological. *One wonders how secure people are in their religious belief when they try to impose it on others.* Pope Leo IX of Rome and Patriarch Michaelis Cerularius of Constantinople heightened the conflict by suppressing the Greek and Latin languages in their respective domains. In 1054, Roman legates travelled to Constantinople to deny Cerularius the title of Ecumenical Patriarch and to insist that he recognize Rome's claim to be the head and mother of the church. Cerularius refused. The leader of the Roman legation angrily excommunicated Cerularius, while he furiously excommunicated the Roman legates.

By the eleventh century, the Frankish empire had long ceased to exist as a political, geographical, or ethnic entity. The kingdoms that

replaced it, such as France and Germany, continued to expand and flourish. In a striking psychohistorical fantasy, the German kings were called *Imperator*, after the Roman Caesars, and thought of themselves as direct successors of the old Roman emperors. Despite being Kings of Germany, they bore titles such as *Rex romanorum* and *Imperator Augustus*. While the Germans spoke different German dialects, the official language of the mediæval German kingdom, like that of the Frankish one, was Latin, and its documents and histories were written in Latin.

Unlike France, which was an absolute and hereditary monarchy, Germany, which became the "Holy Roman Empire", consisted of duchies or principalities, which were ruled by *Fürsten* (princes). The most powerful of these were called *Curfürsten* (elector princes, or simply Electors). These *Curfürsten* elected the German king, and were very powerful. The dignity of *Curfürst* was extremely prestigious and second only to the King or Emperor, exceeding such titles as count, duke, and archduke. Formally, however, they elected a *Rex Romanorum* or "King of the Romans", who was crowned German king in Aachen but only became "Holy Roman Emperor" after being crowned by the pope in Rome, which, at times, took many years, due to the perennial rivalry and power struggles between the older pope and the younger "Holy Roman Emperor".

The Ottonian dynasty (919–1024) was a dynasty of Germanic kings, named after its first emperor, Otto, but also known as the Saxon dynasty after the family's origin in Saxony. Under the reign of the Ottonian emperors, the German duchies of Lorraine, Saxony, Franconia, Swabia, Thuringia, and Bavaria were consolidated, and the German king Otto was crowned Emperor of these regions in 962. In the eleventh century, the German kings formally assumed the title of *Imperator Romanorum*, or Roman Emperor. Why had they not also done so earlier? Some historians believe that they may have tried to avoid conflict with the Eastern Roman Emperor in Constantinople, which by now was no longer a threat to them. The term *Imperator Romanorum* first became official when the last Ottonian German king, Conrad II (990–1039), who was elected King of Germany in 1024, was crowned *Imperator Romanorum* by Pope Johannes XIX (died 1032) in 1027. Under the reign of the Salian emperors (1024–1125), the "Holy Roman Empire" absorbed northern Italy and Burgundy.

In the meantime, France had become an absolute monarchy, where the King was not elected by the dukes, as in Germany, but rather inherited his throne from his father. The Carolingian Franks ruled France for a while, but lost it when Hugues Capet (938–996), Duke of France and Count of Paris, was crowned King of France in 987, succeeding the last Carolingian king, Louis *le fainéant* (Louis the idle), who died that year at about the age of twenty, either accidentally or of poisoning by his mother, the widow of Lothair, who had married a descendant of Otto. Hugues Capet was the son of *Hugues le Grand*, Duke of France, and a grandson of the German king *Heinrich der Finkler* (876–936), also known as *Heinrich der Vogler*, in Latin *Henricius Auceps*, or, in English, Henry the Fowler. The descendants of Hugues Capet, known as the “Capetians”, progressively unified France through a series of wars and dynastic inheritance.

By the eleventh century, West Francia, or France, was a powerful kingdom, separate from the now-defunct Frankish empire. Its language, which scholars call “Old French”, was the “Vulgar Latin” dialect spoken in territories that span roughly the northern half of modern France and parts of modern Belgium and Switzerland. It was known as the *langue d’oïl*, to distinguish it from the *langue d’oc* (also called Occitan or Provençal), spoken south of the *langue d’oïl*. In the *langue d’oïl*, the word for yes was *oïl*, while in the *langue d’oc* it was *oc*. In modern French, both are *oui*. The *langue d’oc* gave its name to the whole southern region of France, called Languedoc. The name of the country, in the *langue d’oïl*, was *France*, not *Francia*, and its inhabitants were called *François*. Nevertheless, when the Crusades began at the end of the eleventh century, the Frenchmen and Normans who led them did not call themselves Crusaders: they wrote Latin letters and documents calling themselves *Franci*. The Arabs and Muslims, for their part, called *everyone* who came from Europe *al-franj*, the Arabic name for the Franks.

Burgundy and Normandy, which later became parts of France, were not so in the eleventh century. They were, rather, separate kingdoms which often warred with France or joined her allies. Burgundy had a complex history. It became a kingdom after the dissolution of the Frankish Empire in the ninth century. After the dynastic succession was settled in the 880s, there were actually four different geographical regions called *Burgundia*: the Kingdom of

Upper Burgundy around Lake Geneva, the Kingdom of Lower Burgundy in Provence, the Duchy of Burgundy west of the Saône River, and the County of Burgundy east of the Saône. In 937, the two kingdoms of Upper and Lower Burgundy were united, while Magdeburg (now the capital of the German state of Saxony-Anhalt) became the capital of the "Holy Roman Empire" after a Diet held by Otto I, "Holy Roman Emperor". In 1032, the Kingdom of Burgundy was absorbed into the "Holy Roman Empire" under Emperor Conrad II as the "Kingdom of Arles", which, however, existed more *de jure* than *de facto*, its territory slowly dwindling, until its remnants finally passed to France. The duchy and county of Burgundy, however, remained separate from France.

Normandy, as its name implies, was a kingdom created by the Normans, or "Norsemen", the invaders from Northern Europe who settled in northwestern France, on the English Channel. From there, however, the Normans spread far and wide, attacking Paris and other parts of France and taking lands as far south as Naples and Sicily. Normandy had a long history. In Roman times, Normandy had been Romanized by building Roman roads and by a policy of urbanization. The Belgian Celts, known to the Romans as *Galli* (Gauls), invaded Normandy in successive waves in the fourth and third centuries BCE. When Julius Caesar invaded *Gallia* there were nine different Gallic tribes in Normandy. Classicists have found many Gallo-Roman villas in Normandy. In the late third century, "Barbarian" raids devastated Normandy. Coastal settlements risked raids by Saxon pirates. Christianity began to enter the area during this period. In 406, Germanic tribes began invading from the West, while the Saxons subjugated the Norman coast. The Roman Emperor withdrew from most of Normandy.

By 486, the area between the Somme and the Loire rivers had come under the control of the Frankish lord Clovis. It remained under "Frankish" rule, but from the eighth to the eleventh century, Roman Normandy was invaded by the Scandinavian "Norsemen". Under the mediæval feudal system, the "fiefdom" of Normandy was created in 911 for the Norseman leader Rollo or Roluo (860–932), who later became Robert of Normandy, his baptismal name. The name "Rollo" was probably a Frankish Latin version of the Scandinavian name Hrólf, as we may gather from the Latinization of the name Hrólf Kraki into Roluo in the *Gesta Danorum*

(Deeds of the Danes) by the twelfth century Danish historian Saxo Grammaticus.

### *Frenchmen and Normans*

The city of Paris, first the capital of Frankish Neustria and then the capital of *Francia occidentalis*, was a frequent target of attacks by the Normans. As we have seen, in 887 the young Odo, or Eudes (860–898), Count of Paris, was elected “King of the Franks” in place of the older incumbent, Charles the Fat (839–888), thanks to the fame that Odo had gained in his defence of Paris during the long Viking siege of Paris in 885–886. The young Norseman Rollo, Roull, or Hrólfr had been one of the lesser leaders of the Viking fleet that besieged Paris, but he became the major leader of the Normans. In 911, in the Treaty of Saint-Clair-sur-Epte, Rollo became a vassal to the king of the West Franks, Charles the Simple (879–929), was baptized, and took the name of *Robert de Normandie*. In exchange for his homage and fealty, Rollo legally gained the territory that he and his Viking allies had previously conquered. The descendants of Rollo and his followers adopted the local Gallo-Roman language, intermarried with the area’s inhabitants, and the Normans became a mixture of Scandinavians, Hiberno-Norse, Orcadians, Anglo-Danish, Franks, and Gauls.

The Normans adopted a dialect of the French language. Rollo’s descendant *Guillaume le conquérant* (William the Conqueror, 1027–1087), the Duke of Normandy, conquered England in 1066 at the Battle of Hastings, while retaining the fiefdom of Normandy for himself and his descendants. The Normans were warlike, and they raided and invaded far and wide. Normandy became a great power, with territories in England, Wales, Italy, Byzantium, and elsewhere. After conquering England, the Norman language entered Old English, and vice versa. The Normans spoke an “Anglo-French” or “Anglo-Norman” language, a beautiful example of which can be found in the famous *Estoire de la Guerre Sainte*, by the Norman historian–poet Ambroise, written after the end of the Third Crusade, around 1195 (Ambroise, 1897, 1941, 2003).

By the eleventh century, the mediæval Christian kingdoms of Normandy, France, Spain (west of the Rhine), and Germany, or the

"Holy Roman Empire" (east of the Rhine) were firmly established. It is fascinating to note that the Germans still call France by the name of *Frankreich*, but when they refer to the empire of *Karl der Grosse* (Charlemagne), they call it *Frankenreich*. Did this exonym mean that the Germans, who regarded themselves as the successors to the Roman Empire, had ceded the succession of their Frankish empire to the French? After *Francia orientalis* became the "Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation", its name disappeared, and *Francia occidentalis* became simply *Francia*, from which the word *France* is derived. It is still called *Francia* in Spanish, Italian, and other Romance languages.

*No nation is a "pure race".* All nations are mixtures of tribes and peoples of different origins. The Franks had been a mixture of Germanic tribes, and the "French" were not Franks but a mixture of Gallic tribes with West Frankish Germanic tribes and Celtic tribes (Braudel, 1989–1990). When French children are taught to say "*nos ancêtres les Gaulois*" (our ancestors the Gauls) they are being taught a *myth of origin*. The phrase even sounds funny when it is pronounced by French people from Martinique, Vietnam, or Mali.

While the *françois* spoke a language derived from Vulgar Latin, the Germanic "East Franks" spoke various Germanic languages and dialects and called themselves *teutsch*, meaning "the people", whence the modern word *deutsch*. The Germans of the former East Francia, which later became the "Holy Roman Empire", did not easily give up their Frankish identity. They called their old country *Frankenland* and one of their major duchies was called *Franken*. They could not, as a group, mourn their loss of the eastern part of their empire, and wanted it back. In fact, the first German kings tried to recreate the Frankish empire by conquering and annexing the kingdom of France. It was not until the thirteenth century that they were forced to give up that wish at the Battle of Bouvines (1214), in which King Philippe Auguste of France defeated King Otto IV of Germany and Count Ferrand of Flanders so decisively that Otto was deposed and replaced by Friedrich II Hohenstaufen. Ferrand was captured and imprisoned.

While the Germans call the French *Franzosen*, and not *Franken*, they called the new French kingdom *Frankreich* (empire of the Frank) though not *Frankenreich* (empire of the Franks). The French,



for their part, in their new *langue d'oïl*, called themselves *françois*, but they called the Germans *allemands*, after the *Allemanni*, or *Alamanni*, one of the old Germanic tribes that the Romans had known. As this tribe had fused with the Franks and with the Germans, and no longer had any separate existence, this appellation is fascinating. As we have seen, the name *Alamanni* was a Latinized corruption of an old German name which meant "all men", as in the phrase *Alle Männer* in modern German. Why did the French call the Germans *allemands* after a single ancient tribe that did not exist? Did they by such means wish to deny the Germans' Frankish identity and make it their own (Braudel, 1989–1990)?

The Latin phrase *lingua franca* means "the language of the Franks", but much later, in the seventeenth century, this phrase came to mean a *common language* spoken in many Mediterranean ports that consisted of Italian mixed with French, Spanish, Greek, and Arabic (Maltese is a hybrid language of that kind). Today, *lingua franca* simply means common language. Classical Latin was the *lingua franca* of the Mediæval European Christian world. Between the fifth and tenth centuries, the *dialects* of spoken "Vulgar Latin" diverged in various parts of their domain, becoming distinct *languages*, while the literary language, Mediæval Latin, remained close to Classical Latin. The official language of the Franks had been Classical Latin, and their spoken languages were Germanic, but the new languages of the eleventh and twelfth centuries in Western Europe were French, Spanish, Italian, Provençal, Catalan, Portuguese, and Anglo-Norman.

During the tenth and eleventh centuries, some local spoken "Vulgar Latin" vernaculars developed a written form and began to supplant formal Classical Latin in many of its roles in Italy, Spain, France, Portugal, and other Latin-speaking countries. In Portugal, which was then a county of the Spanish Christian kingdom of Leon and Castile, the transition from Latin to Portuguese was expedited by law, whereas in Italy, many poets and writers used the Italian vernacular of their own accord. By the time of the first Crusade at the end of the eleventh century, many of the new "Romance languages" were being written, including the *Langue d'oïl*, the basis of modern French, the *langue d'oc* (also called Occitan or Provençal), and the "Anglo-Norman" French vernacular. Nevertheless, at the end of the eleventh century, when the Crusaders, who called

themselves *Franci* (Franks), wrote letters or documents, they wrote them in Classical Latin. Later, during or after the Third Crusade, the Norman poet Ambroise wrote the famous *Estoire de la Guerre Sainte* in his Anglo-Norman French language. Why did the Frenchmen and Normans call themselves "Franks" when the Franks had ceased to exist for at least two centuries (Braudel, 1989–1990)?

One of the psychological causes of the Crusades was the need of people who have doubts about their own faith to lessen their anxiety by forcing others to accept their faith. And one of the reasons for the crusading Frenchmen and Normans, let alone the Germans, English, and other peoples who came on the later crusades, calling themselves *Franci* and setting up a "Kingdom of Jerusalem" was *their inability to mourn their historical losses*, to let go of the past, and to live in the present. If we accept Franco Fornari's theory of war as the "paranoid elaboration of mourning", than that same inability was also the cause of their waging so many wars, through an unconscious projection of their own failings on the "Saracens". The breakup of the Frankish empire, or *Francia*, in the ninth century into several entities was a historical loss. It led to the creation of *West Francia*, which later became France, and *East Francia*, which later became Germany. *Francia occidentalis* eventually dropped the whole second part of its name, calling itself simply *Francia*, and later *France*. Its inhabitants, however, as we have seen, were not Franks. They were a mixture of Gauls, Celts, Franks, Basques, Normans, and many other peoples and tribes.

The disintegration of *Francia* in the ninth century was not the only loss of the European Christian "Franks". The European Christians had never accepted their loss of Spain to the "Saracens" or "Moors", their exonyms for the Arabs and Muslims. For almost eight centuries, the Spaniards waged a war of *reconquista* to capture "their" land back from the "Saracens". In 778, the young Frankish king Charlemagne invaded Spain, but his plans to conquer it failed, and he had to retreat and head back home, suffering a humiliating defeat by the Basques at the battle of Roncevaux Pass. Centuries later, the *Chanson de Roland* celebrated this defeat as a great heroic battle for the Franks, calling the Basques "Saracens". The pain of the loss and defeat was too great. Unable to mourn their losses, they waged war to recover them. In the Middle Ages, Christians were preoccupied with Sin, the Devil, and Hell. They externalized the

badness they felt within them on to the “evil Moors”. During the crusades, most of Iberia was still under “Saracen” rule. Indeed, the Christian Spaniards spent almost eight centuries, including those of the Crusades, in their endless *reconquista*, fighting the “Moors” until they drove them out of Spain (along with the Jews) in 1492.

The Muslims of Spain could not accept their own defeat in 732 at Tours–Poitiers, and they still wanted to defeat the “Franks”. But they kept themselves within Iberia, and to them the Spanish Christians were the “Franks”. Spain was *Al-Andalus*, and for centuries thereafter the “Franks” remained *al-franj*, even though they had in the meantime disappeared as a people, nation, and empire. When the French and Norman Crusaders arrived in the “Holy Land” in 1099, they were still *al-franj* to the Muslims, the more so as they called themselves *Franci*. Neither group could mourn its historical losses, and each group waged a “holy war” against the other (Cole, 2002; Hindley, 2003; Partner, 1997).

The inability to mourn historical losses collectively is a universal phenomenon which characterizes large human groups (Mitscherlich & Mitscherlich, 1975). The Jews were unable to mourn their great collective losses of the first century, those of the Second Temple, their holy city of Jerusalem, their land and their language, and they did not write their own chronological history for fifteen centuries, living in an ahistorical bubble (Falk, 1996; Patai, 1976, Yerushalmi, 1982). As we have seen, the Jews gave Biblical Hebrew names to European countries like Spain, France, and Germany that had nothing to do with those countries. Jewish historians of the First Crusade, writing in the twelfth century, called the River Rhine “the Jordan River” and the massacre of the Jews by Crusader mobs “the binding of Isaac”. The Jewish Zionists, rather than mourn their losses, turned back the clock of history and recreated a Jewish state in “the Land of Israel” (Palestine). This was achieved at the expense of enduring Arab hostility, which has caused tens of thousands of Israeli lives, let alone Arab lives.

The Serbs are unable to mourn their loss of Kosovo, which they consider a sacred Serbian place, even though they lost their battle of Kosovo against the Ottoman Turks there in 1389, even though it was under Ottoman rule for nearly five centuries, and even though it is formally a separate country ruled by Albanians and named Kosova in their language. Serbian leaders are still waging an

international political war to regain Kosovo and withhold recognition from it.

This inability to mourn may have been one of the psychological causes of the Crusades. We shall examine it along with the Crusader notion of the "Saracens".



## A short history of the “Saracens”

**T**he Latin word *saraceni* has a very interesting history, for it gradually referred not only to Arabs or Muslims, but also to all non-Christian or non-European “foreigners.” The Arabs are an old people, originally nomadic, which are mentioned in the Hebrew Bible, without any connection to Abraham’s son Ishmael (Ezekiel, 27:21, II Chronicles, 9:14, Jeremiah, 25:24, Isaiah, 21:13, Nehemiah, 4:1). Their life and culture were far removed from those of Europe, and, like all people of antiquity, they were polytheistic. The ancient Greeks and Romans called them *Saraceni*. In fact, the ancient Romans called all the “savage” and “barbarian” tribes that lived east of the limes of their empire *Saraceni*. The Arabist scholar Bernard Lewis, in the introduction to his book *The Arabs in History* (1950), pointed out that the Greek word *sarakenos* had already appeared in old Greek inscriptions. It was the exonym that the Greeks gave to a desert tribe in the northern Sinai. Some scholars have thought the Greek name *Sarakenos* to be derived from the Arabic word *sharqiyyin*, meaning “easterners”, but this etymology may be unfounded.

The *Talmud* is the Hebrew-Aramaic record of rabbinic discussions pertaining to Jewish law, ethics, customs, and history, which

is second only to the Hebrew Bible in importance. In old Greek, Latin, and Talmudic literature, the word *Saraceni* came to designate Arabs and nomads in general. The Byzantines used it to denote all Arabs and Muslims, including Turks and Persians. As Bernard Lewis pointed out, in the early centuries of the Roman Empire, the *Saracens* were a nomadic tribe from the Sinai Peninsula, but later the name acquired a much broader meaning, and the Greek-speaking subjects of the Byzantine Empire applied it to all Arabs. After the rise of Islam, and especially at the time of the Crusades, its usage was extended to refer to all Muslims, including non-Arab Muslims, particularly those in Sicily and southern Italy, and even to the Basques and to non-Muslim "heathen" like the "pagan" tribes around the Baltic Sea.

### *The Arabs as "Ishmaelites"*

Just as the Hebrew Bible has fantastic genealogies purporting to explain the origins of the various tribes and peoples of its time (cf. Genesis, 10), so has the Arabic *Qur'an*. Mediæval Arab genealogists divided the Arabs into three different ethnic groups: (1) the "Ancient Arabs", tribes that had vanished or been destroyed, such as the Ad and the Thamud, mentioned in the *Qur'an* as examples of Allah's power to destroy wicked peoples; (2) the "Pure Arabs" of South Arabia, descending from Qahtan, the al-Aribah, or the Semites who inhabited Yemen. The Qahtanites are said to have migrated to the land of Yemen following the destruction of the Ma'rib Dam; (3) the "Ishmaleite Arabs", or "Arabized Arabs", of centre and North Arabia, descending from the Biblical Isma'il (Ishmael), son of Ibrahim (Abraham). However, despite the fact that some of the people called "Ishamelites" in the Hebrew Bible (Genesis, 25:13–15) may have been Arab, the Hebrew Bible itself says nothing about any connection between the Arabs and the "Ishmaelites."

The connection between the Arabs and Ishmael dates back to the *Book of Jubilees*, also called the *Lesser Genesis* or *Leptogenesis*, an ancient Jewish religious work in Greek, considered part of the *Pseudepigrapha* by Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Eastern Orthodox Christians. It was originally written in Hebrew, but its

original Hebrew manuscript has not been found. The lost Hebrew original is thought to have used an otherwise unrecorded text for Genesis and the early chapters of Exodus, one that was independent of either the *Masoretic* text or the earlier Hebrew text that was the basis for the *Septuagint* Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible. Keturah was the Ethiopian woman whom Abraham married after the death of his first wife Sarah. Among other things, the *Book of Jubilees* claimed that the sons of Ishmael had intermingled with the six sons of Keturah by Abraham and were called both Arabs and Ishmaelites:

And Ishmael and his sons, and the sons of Keturah and their sons, went together and dwelt from Paran to the entering in of Babylon in all the land which is towards the East facing the desert. And these mingled with each other, and their name was called Arabs, and Ishmaelites. [Jubilees, 20:13]

This "myth of origin" of the Arabs as descendants of the Biblical Ishmael took hold both among Jews and among Muslims, entered the *Qur'an*, and is accepted as truth by believers of both faiths. As the Biblical Ishmael was the son of Abraham's young concubine Hagar, while his half-brother Isaac was Abraham's son by his wife Sarah, one fascinating interpretation of the name "Saracen" occurred in European Christian writing, where the word came to mean "empty of Sarah" or "not from Sarah". In this incredibly fantastic interpretation, the Arabs were called both "Ishmaelites" and "Hagarenes". The "Church fathers" Dionysius and Eusebius, who wrote in Greek, called all non-Greek-speaking "Barbarians" by the name of Saracens. As we know, the word "Barbarians" was a derogatory Greek name for all those who could not speak Greek, just as the mediæval Jews called the Christians *Notsrim*, or "Nazarenes", to derogate them and deny their key belief that Jesus of Nazareth had been the Messiah or Christ.

The Fathers of the Church were the early and influential theologians of the Christian Church, particularly those of the first five centuries of Christianity, most of whom wrote in Greek. The term is used of writers and teachers of the church, not necessarily saints. It is generally not meant to include the New Testament authors, though in the early Christian Church some writing of Church



Fathers were considered canonical. Saint Hippolytus, another Church Father who lived in the second and third centuries, used the word "Saracens" to denote a nomadic desert tribe in Arabia. Gradually, after the emergence of Islam in Arabia in the seventh century, and after the great Muslim conquests of the Middle East, North Africa, and Iberia, the term "Saracen" lumped together all Muslims, Arabs, Turks, Persians, and all other "strange" or "exotic" non-Europeans and non-Christians. By the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the term "Saracen" had spread into Western Europe through the Byzantines and the Crusaders. The "Saracens" were the Muslim enemy of Christian Europe. The "Moors" of Spain were identified as "Saracens". By the early Middle Ages, European Christians equated "Saracen" with Arab, Muslim, Turk, Persian, and all their other enemies. The word "Saracen" included all the "savage" tribes in the East that the Romans had fought against.

As they still do, the unconscious processes of splitting and externalization operated on a large scale. The European Christians, who themselves had committed massacres of Jews and other "children of the Devil", thought of the "Saracens" as evil, violent, savage people who attacked monasteries and churches and murdered people. In the early eighth century, Damascus was still the capital of the Umayyad caliphate. After the "Saracens" had taken Spain, the Christian Arab Greek-language theologian Johannes Damaskenos (John of Damascus, died 749), whom some call "the last father of the church", wrote that the "Saracens" were "Ishmaelites" or "Hagarenes", that they worshipped the morning star and the goddess Aphrodite, whom they called "Akbar" (the greatest), and that after the arrival of the "false prophet Muhammad", the "Saracens" had become Muslims. By "Aphrodite", Johannes Damaskenos may have meant Alat, one of Allah's three daughters, worshipped in Mecca before Muhammad (John of Damascus, 1958).

The "false prophet" Muhammad had almost single-handedly created Islam in the seventh century of the Christian era, uniting the tribes of Arabia into a single Muslim Arab entity, and the rapid expansion of the Muslims through the Middle East, North Africa, and Iberia posed a grave new threat to Christian Europe. The Muslims, for their part, believed that all history prior to Islam was ignorance and darkness (*al-jahiliyya*) and divided their world in their own imagination into *Dar al-Islam* or *Dar as-Salaam* (the abode

of peace), where they lived in peace and freedom, and *Dar al-Harb* (the abode of war), where they had to fight the "infidel". In addition, they imagined a *Dar al-Kufr* (abode of the infidel), *Dar al-Hudna* (abode of the truce), *Dar al-Ahad* or *Dar al-Sulh* (abode of reconciliation), *Dar al-Dawa* (abode of the invitation) and *Dar al-Aman* (abode of security). *Dar al-Islam* had many different caliphates: the Abbasids in Baghdad, the Umayyads in Damascus, the Fatimids in Cairo, and later the Umayyads in Córdoba, the capital of *al-Andalus*. These caliphates fought among themselves over territories, power and wealth. After 1031 there were also small Muslim states in *al-Andalus* called *taifas*. A *taifa*, in the history of Iberia, was an independent Muslim-ruled state, principality, emirate, or petty kingdom, of which a number formed in *al-Andalus* after the final collapse of the Umayyad Caliphate of Córdoba in 1031.

In the eighth century, the Abbasids drove the Umayyads, who had conquered Spain, from Damascus. In 750 (eighteen years after the battle of Tours–Poitiers) the Abbasids set up their caliphate in Harran, then in northwestern Iraq, now in southeastern Turkey. They then conquered Damascus from the Umayyads, massacring the entire Umayyad clan, except for Abd ar-Rahman, who escaped to Córdoba in Spain and became its *emir*. The Arabic title of *emir* meant "commander", "general", or "prince". It was a high title of nobility or office, used in the Arab nations of the Middle East and North Africa, and, historically, in some Turkic states. The Umayyad emirate of Córdoba lasted until 929, when it became the new Umayyad caliphate, which ruled most of Iberia until it broke down itself in 1031. The last Caliph of Córdoba was Hisham III (1027–1031). At his death, the territories he controlled, which had shrunk to possessions on the Iberian Peninsula, fractured into small independent *taifas*. The Umayyad caliphate had ended.

In 762–764 the second Abbasid caliph, Abu-Ja'afar Muhammad Abdallah al-Mansur (the Victor) moved his caliphate from Harran to Baghdad, an old Persian city on the Tigris River, in what the Greeks called "Mesopotamia" (Between the Rivers) and the Arabs Iraq. Baghdad's Persian name means "gift of God" or "garden of God". Al-Mansur renamed it *Madinat as-Salaam* (city of peace), an Arabic term for paradise. Al-Mansur believed that Baghdad was the perfect city to be the capital of the Islamic empire or caliphate under the Abbasids (though this "empire" did not include the entire

Muslim world). Al-Mansur loved the site so much he reportedly said, "This is indeed the city that I am to found, where I am to live, and where my descendants will reign afterward."

The choice of Baghdad as the capital of the Abbasid caliphate gave it security and facilitated its development as a political and economic capital, because its location gave it control over strategic and commercial routes. It was on a trade route where caravans met and traded. During the reign of the illustrious caliph Harun al-Rashid (763–809), Baghdad's streets were paved and monthly trade fairs were held in this area. Baghdad also provided an excellent location for the capital, due to the abundance of water and its healthy climate. Water existed on both north and south ends of the city gates, allowing all Baghdad households to have a plentiful supply of water, which was very uncommon during this time.

The Western Roman Empire had disintegrated two centuries before Islam. The Arabs considered the "Eastern Roman Empire" of Byzantium as Rome, so they called it *Rum* (Rome). A few centuries later, the Islamized Seljuk Turks, who had conquered eastern Anatolia from the Byzantine, called their realm the "Sultanate of Rum". The Abbasid caliphate ruled from Baghdad for five centuries, with the support of Arabs, Persians, Turks, and other non-Arab Muslims, until it was destroyed by marauding Mongols in 1258. Meanwhile, the Umayyads ruled in Córdoba, the Fatimids in Cairo. The latter were preceded by the Persian Ikhshidid dynasty of Egypt, which ruled briefly from 935 to 969. The Ikhshidids were founded by Muhammad bin Tughj al-Ikhshid (882–946), who began as governor of Egypt, and was later given the Persian title of Ikhshid or Prince by the Caliph of Baghdad. In 935 he founded his own caliphate, but after the reign of five caliphs it came to an end when the Fatimid army conquered Cairo in 969.

The Fatimids had their origins in what the Arabs called *Ifriqiya* (now Tunisia and eastern Algeria). Their dynasty was founded in 909 by Abdullah al-Mahdi Billah, who claimed descent from the Prophet Muhammad by way of his daughter Fatima az-Zahra and her husband Ali ibn Abi-Talib, the first Shi'ite Imam, hence the name "Fatimid". Unlike the Sunni Abbasid and Umayyad caliphates, the Fatimids were *Shi'ite* Muslims, and their caliphate was founded in 969 by the *emir* Gawhar as-Siqilli (the Sicilian) also called Jauhar ar-Rumi (the Byzantine), a Sicilian Mamluk of Greek

origin who displaced the last Ikhshidid caliph, Abu el-Fawaris Ahmed ibn Ali ibn al-Ikhshid.

The Fatimids entered Egypt in the 900s, defeating the short-lived Ikhshidid dynasty from Persia and founding a new capital at *al-Qāhira* (Cairo) in 969. This Arabic name referred to the planet Mars, "the subduer", or "the victorious", which was reportedly prominent in the sky at the moment that city construction started. Cairo was intended as a royal enclosure for the Fatimid caliph and his army, though the administrative and economic capital of Egypt was in cities such as Fustat. From 970 onward, the Fatimids continued to conquer the surrounding areas until they ruled the whole area from Tunisia to Syria, including Palestine, and even crossed over into Sicily and southern Italy. The Umayyads ruled *al-Andalus*, which included much of Iberia, from Córdoba, whence they threatened the southwestern parts of "Francia".

For the European Christians, however, there was no difference between Umayyads, Fatimids, and Abbasids, Arabs and Muslims, Shi'ites and Sunnis, Persians and Turks. All were lumped under the name "Saracens", which enabled the Christians to unconsciously split their world into black and white. They thought of themselves as good people of the true faith, and of the "Saracens" or "Moors" as the evil race or bad people of the false faith. By the time the Crusades began, in the late eleventh century, in the minds of European Christians the "Saracens" were the embodiment of Evil (Strickland, 2003), while for the Arabs and Muslims, all European Christians were the "infidel" *franj*. The Muslims' military encounters with *al-franj* began when they conquered Iberia in 711–712, through their defeat at Tours–Poitiers in 732, and continued in Iberia for centuries, where the Christian Spaniards and Portuguese attempted to "reconquer" their country from the "Moors".

The Kurdish Muslim historian Abu al-Hassan Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Muhammad, also known as Ali 'izz ad-Din ibn al-Athir al-Jazari (1160–1233), or simply Ibn al-Athir, often referred to the *franj* in his works. He distinguished between the Greek Orthodox and Roman Catholic, or "Latin", Christians as "those from *ar-Rum* (Byzantium) and those from *al-Franj* (Francia)". The word *al-franj* entered the Arabic language in the eighth century, at first meaning Franks, later, Frenchmen, and later, Europeans in general. In Arabic, the verb *tafarnaja* means to become Europeanized, the adjective

*mutafarnij* means Europeanized, *al-ifranj* means the Europeans, *Firanja* and *bilad al-Firanj* (country of the Franks) mean Europe.

With both the European Christians and the Asian and African Muslims splitting their worlds into good and bad parts, each seeing themselves as the good people and the other as the evil ones, the stage was set for a great conflict between them, should they ever encounter one another on the battlefield. While the fighting in Spain or *al-Andalus* never ceased, the Middle East, including the "Holy Land", was free of such conflict from the seventh to the eleventh century, being under Muslim rule.

The name "Seljuk" was that of the mythical or eponymous hero of the Oghuz Turkish tribe. He was the son of Dukak Timuryaligh (of the iron bow) and was either the chief or an eminent member of a tribe of Oghuz Turks. In the eleventh century, the Seljuk Turks, who came from central Asia, conquered parts of western Asia, and established the "Great Seljuk Empire", a mediæval Sunni Muslim empire established by the Seljuk branch of the Oghuz Turks. At its zenith, it controlled a vast area stretching from the Hindu Kush to eastern Anatolia, and from Central Asia to the Persian Gulf. From their homelands near the Aral Sea, the Seljuks advanced first into Khorasan and then into mainland Persia, before conquering eastern Anatolia. The Seljuks set up sultanates in Hamadan and Kerman (Persia), Syria, and "Rum" (Anatolia). Their advance marked the beginning of Turkic power in the Middle East and later led to the Ottoman Turkish empire and to modern Turkey. The Seljuks, however, were Muslim. The great conflict between Christians and Muslims began in the late eleventh century. Let us examine how the great conflict came about.

## The First Crusade: a “pilgrimage” to rescue the “Holy Land”

**L**ogic or rationality do not play a great part in religious belief. Christians believe that the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem houses the tomb of Jesus Christ, even though no evidence exists to support that: in fact, no direct historical evidence proves the existence of Jesus himself as described in the New Testament gospels. There are contradictions among the gospels themselves, and, other than his baptism by John the Baptist and his crucifixion by Pilate, all else about Jesus may be myths that developed after his crucifixion (Fredriksen, 1988). This, however, did not prevent the European Christians from fervently believing in his divinity. Being Christians, they also believed he was the Christ, the Messiah, the Redeemer, and the Saviour.

Mediaeval Christian religious fervour was powerful. The myths of the Virgin Mary, God the Father, the Holy Spirit, the immaculate conception, and Jesus Christ as God the Son involved all the deepest emotions in the human family: the wish of the son for his mother not to be “violated” sexually by his father, the Oedipal struggle of the son against the father, the infantile longing for the Great Good Mother in the person of Mary. Believing that Jesus Christ bore all the sins of the world was a great relief to people who

believed in Sin, the Devil, and Hell as matters of course. The “Holy Land”, the “Holy City” of Jerusalem, Jesus Christ and his Holy Sepulchre stood for the idealized images of the parents that every infant and child has and that are carried over into adulthood.

In the Catholic Mass, Jesus Christ is said to be in Heaven, seated on the right of God the Father (*qui sedes ad dexteram Patris*), yet he was believed to be buried in the “Holy Sepulchre” in Jerusalem. It is also fascinating to note that the people whom we call the first “Crusaders” and who set out for the “Holy Land” in 1096–1097 to “liberate the Holy Sepulchre from the evil Saracens” did not call themselves “Crusaders” at all: they called themselves *Franci* (Franks), even though the Frankish empire had ceased to exist for over two centuries, and the people of the kingdoms that replaced it, France and Germany, were not “Franks”. These Crusaders also called themselves *fideles Sancti Petri* (the faithful of Saint Peter) and *milites Christi* (soldiers of Christ), their Messiah and God being Jesus Christ. They saw themselves as carrying out an *iter* (voyage) or a *peregrinatio* (pilgrimage), not a holy war, yet they carried arms, despite the fact that Christian *pilgrims* were not allowed to do so. All in all, the beliefs of the Crusaders were fraught with contradictions.

The Latin-language book *Gesta Francorum* was written around 1100–1101, right after the capture of Jerusalem by the Crusaders. It told “the Deeds of the Franks” in what we call the First Crusade without ever mentioning the word “crusade”. Every “Frank” who went on the crusade took a vow to reach Jerusalem and received a fabric cross which he sewed on to his garment. This act was called “taking the cross”. In Latin the word for the cross was *crux*, and in the new French language, *croix*. Much later, the French word *croisés* designated the pilgrims. In 1174, in a *langue-d’oïl* biography of “Saint Thomas the Martyr” (Thomas à Becket, 1118–1170), Guernes de Pont de Saint-Maxence, a twelfth-century Anglo-Norman historian, used the expression *soi cruisier* (in modern French *se croiser*), to make the sign of the cross. The Spanish word *cruzada* first appeared in 1212, and the French word *croisade* first appeared only in 1460, in the *Chroniques de Chastellain* by the Burgundian historian Georges Chastellain (died 1475).

There are many theories on the religious, political, economic, social, and other causes of the First Crusade. Some scholars still

think that it originated in the events that happened at the beginning of the eleventh century under the "mad" Fatimid caliph Abu-Ali al-Mansur al-Hakim bi-Amr Allah (985–1021). This caliph ascended the throne in 996, at age eleven. He reportedly ordered all the dogs in his realm killed because he could not stand their barking. He began to persecute the Christians, whom the Arabs called "the people of the book", along with the Jews, in his lands, and in 1009 he destroyed the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, which was under his rule. This "mad" caliph reportedly forced the Jews and the Christians to wear black hats, and then he forced the Christians to wear a wooden cross some 20 by 20 inches in size, and the Jews to wear a wooden calf, to remind them of their sin of the Golden Calf as depicted in their Bible (Exodus, 32:4). However, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was repaired by al-Hakim's successor, with the help of the Byzantines, and most modern scholars discount his "crimes" against the Christians as a real original cause of the Crusades.

The migrations of Muslim tribes from Central Asia into west Asia and Europe, especially the Seljuk Turkish migrations, in the second half of the eleventh century, and their conquests of eastern Anatolia, posed a big threat to the Byzantine Empire, the "Roman Empire of the East" and the major Christian power in the "Orient" (meaning the Middle East), whose capital was Constantinople. As we have seen, the Seljuk Turks were named after their mythical or eponymous leader, Seljuk or Selçuk, son of Dukak Timuryaligh, an eminent member of a major tribe of Oghuz Turks. The Seljuks split off from the bulk of the Tokuz-Oghuz group, a confederacy of clans between the Aral and Caspian Seas, and set up camp on the right bank of the lower Syr Darya River, in the direction of Jend, near Kyzylorda in present day Kazakhstan, where they were converted to Islam.

The city of Baghdad, the capital of the Abbasid caliphate, had undergone stagnation and invasions. By the tenth century, Baghdad's population was several hundred thousand souls. Baghdad's meteoric growth, however, had slowed due to troubles within the Caliphate, including the temporary losses of Baghdad to the Egyptian Fatimids, the relocations of the capital to Samarra (808–819 and 836–892), the loss of the western and easternmost provinces, and periods of political domination by the Persian Buyids or Buwayhids



(945–1055), and by the Seljuk Turks (1055–1135). The latter first became allies of the Abbasids and then dominated them.

Mediaeval Khorasan was a large Asian region that included parts of what are now Afghanistan, Iran, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan. The *Ghaznavid Empire* was a Turkic–Persian Muslim state in Khorasan, founded by a Turkic Mamluk dynasty. It lasted from 975 to 1187. It was named after its capital of Ghazni (now in Afghanistan), and ruled much of Persia, Transoxania, and northern India. Due to the linguistic, political, and cultural influence of their Persian predecessors (the Iranian Samani dynasty), the Turkic Ghaznavids were Persianized. The Ghaznavid dynasty was founded by Sebuktigin upon his succession to the rule of the territories around the city of Ghazni from his father-in-law, Alp Tigin, a former general of the Persian Samanis. Sebuktigin's son, Mahmoud Shah, expanded the Ghaznavid empire to India, from the Oxus river to the Indus Valley and the Indian Ocean, and in the west to the Persian cities of Ray (Rhagae) and Hamadan.

The European Christians knew little about what was happening in Asia, except when migrations of “savage” tribes or “Saracens” threatened their lives. In the eleventh century, under the reign of Mas'ud Shah, the Ghaznavids suffered great territorial losses. The founder of the Seljuk Turks died around 1038, but, under his sons, the Seljuks raided into the Ghaznavid province of Khorasan. In 1040, the Ghaznavids' attempts to stop the Seljuks from raiding the local Muslim populace led to the Battle of Dandanaqan, which they lost to the fierce Seljuks. The defeated Ghaznavids were left with Afghanistan, Baluchistan, and the Punjab. In 1151, the Ghaznavid sultan Bahram Shah lost his capital of Ghazni to Ala'uddin Hussain of Ghor, and the Ghaznavid capital was moved to Lahore, until its subsequent capture by the Ghurids in 1186.

The Seljuk Turks would soon threaten Byzantium. Having defeated the Ghaznavids in 1140, the victorious Seljuks became masters of Khorasan, expanding their power into Transoxiana (now in Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Kazakhstan) and across all of Persia. In the previous century, the Seljuk Turkish chief Toğrül had also expanded his control all the way to Baghdad, allying himself with the Abbasid caliph of Baghdad, Al-Qa'im (died 1075), who was fighting the Fatimids of Cairo. By 1054, the year of the Great Schism in the Christian Church, Toğrül's Seljuk forces had been fighting the

Byzantines in Anatolia. In 1055, Toğrül had been commissioned by Caliph Al-Qa'im to recapture Baghdad from the Fatimids. This began a Seljuk rule in Baghdad. A revolt by Toğrül's foster brother in 1058 had enabled the Fatimids to recapture Baghdad, but, in 1060, a furious and determined Toğrül had crushed the rebellion, personally strangled his foster brother with his bowstring, and entered Baghdad again. He then married the daughter of the Abbasid Caliph, who honoured him with the title of *sultan*, yet Toğrül died childless in Ray in 1063.

In 1071, the Seljuk Turks, led by Arp-Arslan (1029–1072), had fought a battle with the Byzantines at Manzikert in eastern Anatolia (now Malazgirt in eastern Turkey), defeating the "Eastern Roman Emperor" Romanos Diogenes, whom they captured, blinded, and exiled to an island in the Sea of Marmara, where he soon died. This battle was an important milestone in the Turkish settlement of Asia Minor. The warlike Seljuks went on to capture Egypt and Syria, including Palestine, which the Christians called the "Holy Land". Some historians consider the Battle of Manzikert a major cause or origin of the Crusades. A few years later, the Seljuks created their "Sultanate of Rum", the sultanate that ruled Anatolia in direct lineage from 1077 to 1307, with capitals at Iznik and Konya, and, at times, at Kayseri and Sivas. At its height, the sultanate of Rum stretched across central Turkey from the Mediterranean coast to the Black Sea. In the east, the sultanate absorbed other Turkish states and reached to Lake Van. Its westernmost limit was near Denizli and the gates of the Aegean basin.

### *Prelude to the Crusades: Pope vs. Emperor*

The crusades were born out of the internal struggles among the European Christians, and out of their unconscious externalization of this struggle on to the "Saracens". After the battle of Manzikert in 1071, the new "Roman Emperor of the East" in Constantinople was Alexius Komnenos (1048–1118), who had served with distinction in the battles against the Seljuk Turks. Alexius had to defend his Byzantine empire against constant incursions by the Normans from Italy and by the Seljuks from the east. The Byzantines, who were pushed westward by the Seljuks, called them "Saracens".

Emperor Alexius would play an indirect role in the first crusade, when he sent an appeal for military help to Pope Urban II in 1095.

In Rome itself, or, rather, in the “Holy Roman Empire”, there were two key powers: one was the pope, the other the “Holy Roman Emperor”, who was also the king of Germany. Both were elected: the pope by the college of cardinals, the German king by his elector princes. The German king only became Roman Emperor after being crowned by the pope. Some historians tell us that already in 1072, after he became Emperor, Alexius Komnenos of Byzantium asked the “Holy Roman Emperor” for military assistance. By some theories, it was this appeal for help by Alexius that brought about the first crusade. In fact, it took another twenty-four years before that crusade was called, and there was no “Holy Roman Emperor” in 1072: the German king Heinrich IV (1050–1106), known in English as Henry IV, had not been crowned by the pope, Alexander II (died 1073), and would not be crowned by his successor, Gregory VII (died 1085), who was his sworn rival and who excommunicated Heinrich—twice. Heinrich was only crowned by Anti-Pope Clement III in 1084.

Heinrich IV was crowned German king at the age of six (1056) and took this office when he was aged sixteen (1066, the year the Normans conquered England). Perhaps due to his early battles with his mother, Agnes de Poitou (died 1077), Heinrich IV of Germany was strong-willed and impetuous. In 1066, he married Bertha of Maurienne, a daughter of Count Otto of Savoy, to whom he had been betrothed since the age of five. In the same year, at the request of Pope Alexander II, he assembled an army to fight the Normans of southern Italy. Heinrich’s troops had reached the Bavarian city of Augsburg when he received word that his ally Godfrey of Tuscany (died 1076), husband of the powerful Great Countess, or Marchioness, Matilda of Tuscany (1046–1115), had already attacked the Normans. Heinrich halted the expedition. In 1068, in love with another woman, Heinrich attempted to divorce Bertha, an act that contravened the rules of the Roman Catholic Church. His speech on this subject at a church council in Mainz was rejected by the papal legate, Pier Damiani, who threatened that any further attempt at divorce would lead the pope to deny his coronation. Heinrich obeyed, and his wife returned to Court, but from now on he was convinced that the papal opposition aimed at

overthrowing lay power within the Holy Roman Empire and creating an ecclesiastical hierarchy.

In 1073, Gregory VII took over the Seat of Saint Peter, and soon a bitter power struggle erupted between the young king and the old pope. The issue for the pope was his supremacy over the emperor. The ostensible issue was that of *investiture*: which of them had the power to invest bishops, archbishops, cardinals, and other major officials of the Roman Catholic Church. The pope-emperor struggle took on the character of a life-and-death, father-son conflict. Pope Gregory VII issued a *Dictatus Papae*, by which he alone held "the divine right" of investiture. Gregory's "papal dictate" was a radical departure from the previous balance of power between pope and emperor, because it eliminated the "divinely-appointed" king's right to invest a prelate with the symbols of power, both secular and spiritual. A furious Heinrich reacted to this "paternal dictate" in early 1076 by sending Gregory a very aggressive and humiliating letter in which he rescinded his imperial support of Gregory as pope. The letter was headed "Henry, king not through usurpation but through the holy ordination of God, to Hildebrand, at present not pope but false monk". It called for the resignation of the pope and for the election of a new pope. His letter ended: "I, Henry, king by the grace of God, with all of my Bishops, say to you, come down, come down, and be damned throughout the ages."

This unprecedented letter of Oedipal fury was written amid a revolt of the German princes against their young king, Heinrich IV, which became known as "The Great Saxon Revolt". It was actually a civil war in Germany that began either with Gregory VII's accession in 1073 or with the princes' revolt in 1077, and ended in 1088. The revolt was led by a group of opportunistic Saxon, Bavarian, and Carinthian German *Fürsten* who elected as their "anti-king" Rudolf von Rheinfelden, Duke of Swabia, a brother-in-law of the young King Heinrich. In 1057, Rudolf had kidnapped and married Matilda, Heinrich's sister, who died three years later. In 1075, Gregory had excommunicated some members of Heinrich's Imperial Court, and threatened to do the same with Heinrich himself. In a church synod held in February of that year, Gregory clearly established the supreme power of the Catholic Church, with the Empire subjected to it. Heinrich replied with a counter-synod of his own.

The beginning of the Investiture Controversy can be traced to Christmas 1075, when Gregory was kidnapped and imprisoned by Cencio Frangipane, a Roman nobleman, while officiating at the Roman church of Santa Maria Maggiore. Later, freed by the Roman people, Gregory accused Heinrich of having been behind the attempt. Having defeated a rebellion of Saxons in the First Battle of Langensalza, Heinrich felt free to accept the pope's challenge. At Worms, on 24 January 1076, a synod of German bishops and princes summoned by Heinrich formally declared Gregory VII deposed. Heinrich IV installed his own chaplain as Bishop of Milan, although another candidate had already been chosen by Pope Gregory VII in Rome. Heinrich then sent his "be damned" letter to Gregory. On 22 February, a furious Gregory replied by excommunicating the emperor and all the bishops named by him as "anathema", formally removing him from the church and deposing him as German king.

This was the first time since the fourth century that a king of this stature had been deposed. The pope and the king each claimed to have removed the other from office. However, in early 1077, to gain time to be able to put down "The Great Saxon Revolt", Heinrich pretended to "come to his senses. He asked the old pope to forgive him for his "folly", accepted all his demands, and travelled to the castle of the Great Countess Matilda of Tuscany, an ally of Pope Gregory VII, in Canossa, Emilia-Romagna, in northern Italy, where the pope was staying. Heinrich wore a hair shirt, knelt in the snow, and did penance before Gregory. The phrase "going to Canossa" became synonymous with capitulation and humiliation. Within less than a decade, however, Heinrich would take vengeance on "Hildebrand" for thus humiliating him.

As for the pope's ally, Matilda of Tuscany, both her mother and husband had died in 1076, leaving her the sole ruler of her great Italian patrimony, as well as some lands in Lorraine. In 1080, Heinrich was excommunicated again by Pope Gregory. Heinrich beat his enemies near Leipzig, killing the "anti-king" Rudolf, then crossed the Alps, aiming to get the pope to lift the excommunication and crown him emperor, or to depose the pope. Matilda controlled the western passages over the Apennines, forcing Heinrich to approach Rome via Ravenna. Even with this route open, he had trouble besieging Rome with a hostile territory at his

back. Some of his allies defeated Matilda at the battle of Volta Mantovana, and the citizens of Lucca, then the capital of Tuscany, had revolted and driven out her ally, Bishop Anselm. Matilda took the Ponte della Maddalena, north of Lucca. In 1081, Matilda suffered further losses, and Heinrich formally deposed her as Countess of Tuscany. Matilda remained Pope Gregory's intermediary for communication with northern Europe when he lost Rome to Heinrich and took refuge in the Vatican's Castel Sant'Angelo. After Heinrich had obtained the Anti-Pope's seal in 1084, Matilda wrote to supporters in Germany telling them only to trust papal messages that came through her. She later manipulated Heinrich's son, Conrad (1074–1101), to rebel against his father and declare himself King of Germany.

After Heinrich did penance at Canossa, Pope Gregory VII lifted his excommunication, but the German lords of the "Great Saxon Revolt" continued their insurrection. Heinrich's mother, Agnes de Poitou, had died in late 1077. Rather than mourn his loss, Heinrich continued to make war on Pope Gregory and on his rebellious princes. In 1080, Guibert, or Wibert, the Archbishop of Ravenna (died 1100), an ally of Heinrich, was elected "Anti-Pope" Clement III by his fellow cardinals. An anti-pope was a person who made a widely-accepted claim to be the lawful pope, in opposition to the pope recognized by the Roman Catholic Church. Anti-popes were supported by a fairly significant faction of the cardinals.

As a sworn rival and enemy of King Heinrich IV of Germany, Pope Gregory VII supported the "Great Saxon Revolt" against Heinrich and repeatedly excommunicated Heinrich. This humiliation resolved the angry Heinrich to take revenge on Gregory. Heinrich had captured and killed Rudolf von Rheinfelden at the Battle of the *Weisse Elster* River (now in the Czech Republic and Germany). After that, Heinrich was the sole king of Germany, and he now planned an expedition to Italy to consolidate his power as "Holy Roman Emperor", remove Gregory, install a new pope, and get himself crowned by him.

From about 1070 to 1085, the Norman rulers of southern Italy, led by Robert Guiscard of Apulia, had a long-running feud with the Byzantines, who had conquered parts of their lands. Guiscard was successful. Bari was reduced in 1071 and the Byzantine forces were ousted from southern Italy. The territory of Salerno was already

Guiscard's. In 1076, he took the city, expelling its Lombard prince, Gisulf, whose sister Sichelgaita he had married. The Norman attacks on the papal fief of Benevento greatly upset Pope Gregory VII, but, pressed hard by the German emperor, Heinrich IV, he turned again to the Normans, and in 1080, at Ceprano, reinvested Guiscard, securing him also in the southern Abruzzi, but reserving Salerno for himself. From 1080 to 1085, when Guiscard died, the Normans of southern Italy raided the southern parts of the Byzantine empire.

From 1080 to 1084, Heinrich IV of Germany led several attacks on his enemies in Italy, including the Lombards, the Normans, Rome, and Matilda of Tuscany, who had supported Pope Gregory against him. His new ally was Emperor Alexius Komnenos of Byzantium. Alexius enhanced his ability to strike back at the Normans and Seljuks by bribing Heinrich with 360,000 gold pieces to attack the Normans in southern Italy, which forced the Normans to concentrate on their defences at home. Alexius sought to thwart the Normans' aims against his empire, as the Italian Normans often attempted to invade Byzantine territories. Heinrich left Rome, which he already taken, and marched south against the Normans. The Romans abrogated their allegiance to the pope. Recalled to Rome, Heinrich entered Rome in March 1084, after which Gregory was declared deposed and the anti-pope Clement III was recognized by the Romans as their new pope.

On 31 March 1084, Heinrich was crowned emperor by Clement, and received the patrician authority. His next step was to attack the fortresses of Castel Sant'Angelo, which was still in the hands of Gregory. The pope was saved by the Norman lord Robert Guiscard of Apulia, who left the siege of Durazzo and marched towards Rome. Unwilling to fight the fierce Normans, Heinrich left the city and Gregory was freed. The Normans sacked Rome, however. With friends like these, you did not need enemies. The citizens of Rome rose up against Gregory, and he was forced to flee south to Salerno with the Normans, where he died in 1085 (so did Guiscard). His last act was to write a letter exhorting the whole of Christianity to fight their emperor. In 1089, Matilda of Tuscany married Welf II of Bavaria, but she secretly gave her lands to the church. Heinrich continued as "German king and Holy Roman Emperor" to his death in 1106, after the First Crusade.

*Did we "invent" the Crusades?*

In 1086, Pope Gregory VII was succeeded by Victor III (died 1087), who was succeeded by Urban II (died 1099), who preached the First Crusade. The Investiture Controversy continued for decades: each succeeding pope tried to regain the investiture powers by stirring up revolt in Germany. The "Great Saxon Revolt" ended in 1088, but the civil unrest and war went on. At issue was not only who would be king of Germany, but whether the pope or the emperor was supreme. These struggles were in full force when the First Crusade erupted in 1095.

The power struggle between Pope Gregory VII and the German king and "Holy Roman Emperor" Heinrich IV, which ended with the pope's removal in 1084, may have been a psychological prelude to the papal call for the crusades by Gregory's successor Urban II. In fact, as we have seen, while the crusades as we know them took place, they were not known by that name for a long time, and those who wrote their early histories did not call them that. Do we perceive the crusades as the Crusaders themselves saw them? Do we romanticize the crusades, do we distort their meaning? Can we have an accurate perception of their complex history?

The British mediæval historian Christopher Tyerman believed that modern historians "invented the crusades" to fit their view of current conflicts between the West and Islam (Tyerman, 1998, 2004, 2005a, 2006). Tyerman thought that modern historians view the crusades anachronistically, through their own perspective, rather than through that of the Middle Ages. In order to truly understand the crusades, Tyerman thought, we need to grasp the mediæval mind. Our most egregious mistake is to see the Crusades as a mediæval precursor of modern conflicts in the Near East. Tyerman thought that our prevalent myth that the Crusades were a barbaric assault on a superior, sophisticated, and peaceful Islamic civilization was "nonsense", but that the idea that Islam was a superior, beneficent force for good, wrecked by these evil Westerners, was also "nonsense" (Tyerman, 2005b). Tyerman thought that, far from being the homogenous "movement" that many modern historians have assumed it to be, "crusading" was never a movement at all, in our modern sense, with all of the self-sustaining features now implied by the term. Carole Hillenbrand, however, has shown that



the Muslims clearly considered themselves superior to the “Franj” in every way (Hillenbrand, 1999).

By examining how participants, observers, and historians imposed their own attitudes, aspirations, and interpretations on this particular form of Christian “holy war”, Tyerman challenged modern historians’ commonly-held assumptions about the nature and coherence of the crusades. In his studies of the ideas, language, practice, and reception of crusading, and its historiography, he suggested that the Crusades *reflected* the religious and political habits and ambitions of their time, rather than *moulding* them. Crusading was a malleable phenomenon within mediæval western society even since 1095, provoking widely divergent views among its participants, witnesses, and commentators. Tyerman believed that crusade literature and historiography often say more about the authors themselves than about what they claim to have seen. The British historian Elizabeth Siberry examined the British historiography of the Crusades in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and reached similar conclusions (Siberry, 2000).

In an online interview with the US National Public Radio in 2005, Tyerman stated his views:

There was no strategic reason for Western knights and soldiers to be laboring about in the Judean hills in the 11th, 12th and 13th centuries. They were there for essentially ideological religious reasons. The Holy Land and Jerusalem were regarded as part of Christendom, as a relic, and the Crusaders went there, in a sense, to establish a protective garrison to restore, as they saw it, their holy city to Christian control. But the prime motive of crusading in the Holy Land, unlike crusading in Spain or in [the] Baltic, was not initially that of settlement. If you wanted to make a profit, you did not go on Crusade. Crusaders habitually made thumping losses. [Tyerman, 2005b]

Tyerman believed that the chief motive for the crusades was religious: the idea of “holy war”.

In a similar vein, conventional historical wisdom about the Crusades was challenged by the Israeli geographer Ronnie Ellenblum in his books on the Crusades (Ellenblum, 1998, 2007). In his first book, Ellenblum studied the spatial distribution of the “Frankish” *rural* settlement in the “Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem” at the

time of the Crusades, and based it on an unprecedented field study of more than two hundred "Frankish" rural sites in Israel, and on a close re-examination of the historical documentary sources (Ellenblum, 1998). Ellenblum re-examined the basic assumptions of historical scholarship, and advocated a new model of the nature of Frankish settlement as a society of European Christian migrants who settled in the Levant, had close relations with Eastern Christians, and were almost completely shut off from the Muslim society that lived elsewhere in the country.

Like Tyerman, the ambitious Ellenblum, who is writing a third book on the Crusades, sought to revise the entire historiography of the Crusades. In his second book, Ellenblum studied the economic, cultural, geographical, architectural, and even family ties between the "Franks" and the "Saracens" in the Crusader castles. Ellenblum studied the location of Crusader castles in Israel and found that there were "architectural" relations between the "Franks" and the local Christians, as well as among them and the local Arabs, Muslims, and Turks, and that dialogue and mutual influences always existed. He argued that during the past 150 years Crusader historiography had been unduly influenced by the national and colonial discourse, both in Europe and in the Middle East, which tended to introduce an anachronistic reading of nationalism and colonialism into the Crusades. This was why many historians have described the crusades as a black-and-white, "Franks"-versus-"Saracens" story. By studying the location and distribution of the Crusader castles, the tactics of the siege, and the strategies of their defence, Ellenblum found connections between Crusader settlement choices and "Saracen" surroundings, and a mutual intercultural influence. Crusader fortifications were built for economic and geographic reasons more than for strategic ones or to defend imaginary frontiers. Crusader castles are, thus, live evidence of an "East-West dialogue".

In my view, the crusades were the acting out on a mass scale of a psychogeographical fantasy. They fulfilled several psychological needs at the same time. After all, the European Christians could have gone on a crusade to liberate the "Holy Land" centuries earlier. The religious fervour which took hold of Christian Europe in 1095 to wage a "holy war" against the "evil Saracens" was a way of resolving its inner conflicts, as well as a fantasy of rescuing the

Good Mother in the shape of the “Holy Land” from the Evil Father in the shape of the “Saracens.” Through unconscious splitting and projection, the Christians could imagine themselves as the good people and the “Saracens” as the evil ones. By “liberating the Holy Sepulchre” they could undo the deicidal and filicidal crucifixion of their Christ, the son of God. They also imagined themselves absolved of all their sins, avoiding the Devil and Hell.

In March 1095, during the civil war in the “Holy Roman Empire” of Germany, the French-born Pope Urban II (Otho de Lagery, 1042–1099), who also opposed Emperor Heinrich IV, held a church council at Placentia (now Piacenza), in northern Italy. He received ambassadors from the Byzantine “Roman Emperor of the East”, Alexius Komnenos, asking for help in his war against the “Saracens”, who were “destroying the Roman Empire”. As the head of a Greek Orthodox empire, the Byzantine emperor was a rival of the pope. Nonetheless, the pope heeded his call. The Council of Piacenza was attended by tens of thousands of European Christian princes, cardinals, and bishops from Italy, France, and Burgundy, so many that it had to be held in the open air. In November 1095, the French-born pope Urban II held another church council in an abbey in the French town of Cluny (now in the French département of Saône-et-Loire), which is known as the Council of Clermont, and where he “preached the first crusade”. The word “crusade” was never used in his sermon. Here is part of what the pope’s sermon said:

I [the Pope], or rather the Lord [God], beseech you as Christ’s heralds to publish this everywhere and to persuade all people of whatever rank, foot-soldiers and knights, poor and rich, to carry aid promptly to those Christians [in Byzantium] and to destroy that vile race [the Saracens] from the lands of our friends. I say this to those who are present, it is meant also for those who are absent. Moreover, Christ commands it . . . [Halsall, 2006]

Significantly, the sixty-year-old pope exhorted his listeners to set out for the “Holy Land” by citing the internal wars and problems of Christian Europe. He dangled before his people the prospects of new land, as well as the remission of their sins:

This land which you inhabit, shut in on all sides by the seas and surrounded by the mountain peaks, is too narrow for your large

population; nor does it abound in wealth; and it furnishes scarcely food enough for its cultivators. Hence it is that you murder one another, that you wage war, and that frequently you perish by mutual wounds. Let therefore hatred depart from among you, let your quarrels end, let wars cease, and let all dissensions and controversies slumber. Enter upon the road to the Holy Sepulcher; wrest that land from the wicked race [the "Saracens"], and subject it to yourselves . . . God has conferred upon you above all nations great glory in arms. Accordingly undertake this journey for the remission of your sins, with the assurance of the imperishable glory of the kingdom of heaven. [Halsall, 2006]

Pope Urban promised every Christian going on the crusade that he would receive an "indulgence" (the formal Church forgiveness of sins), which meant that "taking the cross" and going to Jerusalem would constitute a full repentance for his sins, and that his home would be protected by the Mother Church, so that he would get it back upon his return. The battle cry of the crusading Christians would be *Deus vult* (God wills it). Urban also gave away fabric crosses to the masses.

"Indulgences", for mediæval Christians, who believed in Sin, the Devil, and punishment in Hell, were a very serious matter. An indulgence, in the Roman Catholic Church, was the full or partial remission of punishment for sins that had already been forgiven. The indulgence was granted by the church after the sinner had confessed and received absolution. Mediæval Christians believed that indulgences drew on the storehouse of merit acquired by Jesus' sacrifice of himself on the Cross, and the virtues and penances of their saints. The indulgences were granted for specific good works and prayers. Indulgences replaced the severe penances of the early church, or shortened those penances at the intercession of those imprisoned and those awaiting martyrdom for the faith. Indulgences, and the abuses that accompanied them, including their selling, would become a major bone of contention when Martin Luther initiated the Protestant Reformation in 1517.

"Holy Roman Emperor" Heinrich IV of Germany ignored the pope's call for a crusade. He was too busy with his internal problems in Germany and in Italy. In 1090 Heinrich had launched his third punitive expedition against his enemies in Italy, Matilda of Tuscany, the Lombards, and the Normans. After some initial

successes against the Great Countess Matilda of Canossa, his defeat in 1092 had caused the rebellion of the Lombards. The revolt grew after Matilda had managed to turn Heinrich's elder son, Conrad (1074–1101), against him. Conrad joined the Papal opposition and was crowned King of Italy at Monza in 1093. Heinrich now found himself cut off from his kingdom in Germany. He returned there only in 1097: in Germany, his power was still at its height. The Great Countess Matilda of Tuscany had secretly transferred her property to the church in 1089, before her marriage to Welf II of Bavaria (1072–1120). In 1095, when he found this out, a furious Welf left her and, together with his father, switched his allegiance to Heinrich IV, possibly in exchange for a promise of succeeding his father as duke of Bavaria. Heinrich reacted by deposing his son Conrad at the diet of Mainz in April 1098, and designating his younger son Heinrich (the future Heinrich V) as his successor, under the oath sworn that he would never follow his brother's example.

The princes, counts, and barons who led the first crusade were Frenchmen and Normans, not "Franks". Yet, they thought and wrote of themselves as "Franks". We can see that from the letter that Count Estienne de Blois (1045–1102) wrote to his wife Adele in 1098 from the Crusader siege of Antioch, as well as from the *Gesta Francorum* and other documents. Each of them had temporal ambitions for territories, titles, and wealth, as well as religious fervour. The Normans of southern Italy had been raiding the Byzantine empire for a long time. The French-born Pope Urban II appointed a French bishop, Adhemar de Monteil (died 1098), also known as Adhemar du Puy (he had been the bishop of Le Puy-en-Velay), as his personal legate and as the spiritual leader of the "pilgrimage". The word "Crusade" was never used. There were several military leaders of the "pilgrimage". Notable among them was Count Raymond de Saint-Gilles of Toulouse, the first nobleman who "took the cross".

Other European Christians joined the "pilgrimage" for many different reasons, religious, social, economic, familial, personal, and psychological. The stated aim of the crusade was to liberate the Holy Sepulchre from the grip of "that vile race", the "Saracens", but also to strengthen the Byzantine Christian "Eastern Roman Empire" against those "Saracens" and to win lands, titles, and wealth, to change their whole lives. Why did the Crusaders write in Church

Latin, rather than in their "Vulgar" vernaculars, and why did they call themselves *Franci*? Did they see themselves as the heirs of Charlemagne's Franks? There were other words, in the *langue d'oïl* and in Anglo-Norman, by that time, that they could have used for themselves, such as *françois* and *normands*. The story of the battle of Tours–Poitiers in 732, where the Franks had defeated the "Saracens", was known to every European Christian from his childhood: it was the victory of the "good race of the Franks" over the "vile race of the Saracens". In their fantasy, the "pilgrims" also wanted to repeat the victory of Charles Martel: to defeat the "Saracens" and drive them out of the "Holy Land", where Jesus Christ, their Messiah and God, was crucified and buried.

Conventional historians attribute the wide popular response to Pope Urban's call for the crusade in 1095 to a variety of rational reasons: the feudal system of mediæval Europe, the increase of the population and the economic growth of western Europe, the strengthening of religious fervour among Christians, hopes for territorial expansion and wealth among noblemen, hopes for freedom among vassals and serfs, the colonial ambitions of the Normans in the "Saracen" lands and in Byzantium, the wish of the Italian cities to expand their trade with the cities of the East, and a general attraction of voyages and adventures. Beyond all these rational causes, however, there were also irrational, conscious, and unconscious psychological reasons. Among the conscious ones were the fear of Sin, the Devil, and Hell: mediæval Christians believed in Satan no less than in God, and feared that their sins would take them to Hell after their death, where they would suffer infernally and eternally. Taking the cross and going to the "Holy Land" could save them from this horrible fate.

### *Holy War and Sacred Space*

"Sacred space" is a geographical or physical location which religious people hold to be sacred, such as holy sepulchres, holy shrines, or holy cities. It is a psychogeographical fantasy that often leads to "holy wars" (Cole, 2002; Spicer & Hamilton, 2005). In the unconscious mind of the Crusaders, the "holy city" of Jerusalem and the "Holy Land" of Palestine, where their Christ was born and

crucified, may have symbolized the Great Good Mother of their infancy, captured by the “evil Saracens”, like a good wife and mother abused by her cruel husband, whose son wants to save her from him and make her his (Falk, 1987). The Virgin Mary, mother of Jesus Christ, also unconsciously symbolized the Great Good Mother, as she does in many places. According to the Roman Catholic catechism, the Virgin Mary, “having completed the course of her earthly life, was assumed body and soul into heavenly glory”. Mary was transported into Heaven with her body and soul united. If a “pilgrim” came to Jerusalem and supplicated Mary, she would give him grace and pardon all his sins. The Holy Sepulchre itself also had a symbolic meaning, as the Crusaders believed that it bore the body of Jesus Christ, Son of God the Father, and it was violated by the “Saracens”.

The First Crusade—as it much later came to be called—began in 1096 with riots and massacres by lower-class “pilgrims” throughout Europe. A murderous mob of “pilgrims” massacred thousands of Jews, especially in towns along the River Rhine. The mediæval term “pauper” indicated a man’s status as impoverished, or as a mendicant ward of the church. Most paupers were sick or disturbed people, as they would otherwise have been able to make a living. The Crusader mob consisted of bands of poor and desperate peasants and “paupers” from both sides of the Rhine, led by disturbed, charismatic, and violent “cult leader” types like Gaultier sans-avoir (Walter the Penniless, died 1096) and Pierre l’hermite (Peter the Hermit, died 1115).

### *The Crusaders fight the Kingdom of Hungary*

In early 1096, Gaultier sans-avoir and Pierre l’hermite led their pilgrims and paupers in the so-called People’s Crusade. Full of religious frenzy, they left with their “people’s army” well before the main army of nobles, knights, and their followers could organize their expedition, and without adequate preparation. Gaultier and Pierre led their band of paupers through the “Holy Roman Empire” of Germany and Italy, massacring the Jews along the River Rhine, then through Hungary, where the new king, Könyves Kálmán (Coloman the Book Lover, died 1116), had tough choices to make.

In May 1096, he let the armies led by Gaultier sans-avoir pass peacefully through Hungary, but the next hordes, led by Pierre l'hermite, occupied the Hungarian fortress of Zimony and withdrew only when Kálmán's armies were approaching them.

In the summer of 1096, the troops of a German knight called Folkmar pillaged the territories of the Hungarian County of Nyitra, while the hordes of a German priest named Gottschalk ravaged the Transdanubian region of the kingdom. The able Kálmán managed to rout both of these armies and denied the entrance of new armies led by the German nobleman Emich von Leiningen and the Frenchman Guillaume de Melun. The audacious Crusaders laid siege to Kálmán's fortress of Moson (Wieselburg) in northwestern Hungary. It took Kálmán six weeks to break the siege and defeat the frenzied Crusaders. On 20 September 1096, Kálmán made an agreement with Godefroy V of Lower Lorraine, better known as Godefroy de Bouillon, the leader of the next Crusader army. Under their agreement, Kálmán took hostages and mustered his own army to guard the progress, and the Crusader armies passed through the kingdom peacefully.

After their battles in Hungary, the surviving pilgrims and paupers of the "People's Crusade" reached the Bulgarian province of the Christian "Eastern Roman Empire". Bulgaria had been an empire itself, but, at the end of the tenth century, it had been conquered by the Byzantines. Gaultier sans-avoir's hungry and desperate followers plundered the Belgrade area, drawing the wrath of the Serbs. They continued to Constantinople under Byzantine escort, meant more to watch over them than to protect them. Gaultier sans-avoir and Pierre l'hermite joined their forces at Constantinople, where Emperor Alexius Komnenos provided them sea transport across the Bosphorus to Anatolia, where the "people's army" finally engaged the "Saracens" (the Seljuk Turks)—and were massacred by them. Gaultier died with his followers in late 1096.

Pierre l'hermite was the other leader of what later came to be known as the People's Crusade, as opposed to those of the noblemen. He was one of the preachers of the crusade in France, and soon became famous as a charismatic emotional preacher who carried the masses. Most historians agree that thousands of peasants and "paupers" eagerly took the cross at his bidding, *including women*. Like a charismatic cult leader of our own time, Pierre l'hermite told



the “paupers” that they were “spiritually purified and holy” pilgrims who would be protected by the Heavenly Host, the army of angels in Heaven (Luke, 2:13; Revelation, 19:19). They believed him, and followed him to their destruction. Pierre l’hermite led part of the People’s Crusade from 1096 to 1099, all the way to the destination of their pilgrimage, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. The German city of Cologne, on the Rhine was an important Christian town. The Archbishop of Cologne was one of the seven prince-electors who elected the King of Germany and one of the three ecclesiastical electors. The archbishop also ruled large temporal domains. Pierre l’hermite, therefore, chose Cologne as his point of departure for the Crusade.

Pierre l’hermite started out from Cologne in April 1096 with some forty thousand men and women, travelled with them for three months, lost ten thousand on the way, and arrived with some thirty thousand men and women at Constantinople in July, after massacring the Jews along the Rhine. Most of the paupers did not make it out of Europe’s Roman Catholic jurisdiction. The majority could not be provided for by the various temporal lordships and church dioceses along the way. They either starved to death, returned home, or were put into servitude, which was almost like slavery, while a substantial number were captured and sold into slavery by Slavic robber barons in the Balkans. Western Europeans viewed the Balkan Slavs as evil, unredeemed robbers and villains. The “Eastern Roman Emperor” Alexius Komnenos was unhappy with the arrival of 30,000 pilgrims at his doorstep: as head of the Eastern Orthodox Church, and as the sovereign who had requested aid against the “Saracens” from the pope, he was required to provide for the care and sustenance of the vast host of pilgrims and paupers for the remainder of their journey.

The “people’s crusade”, or paupers’ crusade, was just the beginning of the psychohistorical fantasy that we know as the Crusades. It was followed by the “Princes’ Crusade”, or “Barons’ Crusade”, which was led by some of the great noblemen of Europe, most of them Frenchmen or Normans. By late 1096 and early 1097, four major Crusader armies had reached “the Roman Empire of the East”, the name given by the western Europeans to Byzantium. The first one was French, the army of Hugues de Vermandois (died 1102), a brother of King Philippe the First of France. He bore the

Papal Banner and was called Hugues le Grand, even though he was not a great leader or soldier. King Philippe himself could not take part in the campaign, as he had been excommunicated by the pope for repudiating his wife and taking another woman.

Hugues de Vermandois' army was joined by three Anglo-Norman armies—those of the three sons of the Norman nobleman Eustache II of Boulogne: Baudouin de Boulogne (Baldwin of Boulogne), Godefroy de Bouillon (Godfrey of Bouillon), and Eustache de Boulogne (Eustace III of Boulogne)—as well as the army of one of their cousins. The other "Frankish" armies were led by Count Raymond de Saint-Gilles of Toulouse (1041–1105), who represented the knights of Provence, and who was accompanied by the papal legate, Adhemar du Puy; the Norman Prince Bohemond of Taranto (1058–1111), a son of Robert Guiscard of Apulia (who had died in 1085), representing the Normans of southern Italy, with his nephew Tancred (1072–1112), who would play a major role in the First Crusade; and the "Northern French" armies, led by Count Robert II of Flanders (died 1111), Robert Courtheuse, or Robert of Normandy (Robert Curthose, died 1134), the eldest son of William the Conqueror and brother of King William II of England, and Estienne, Count of Blois. The combined Crusader armies consisted of about 35,000 "Franks", including 5,000 cavalry. Raymond de Saint-Gilles of Toulouse had the largest contingent.

Unlike the "people's crusade", these princely French and Norman armies crossed the Kingdom of Hungary without being challenged by its king, Kálmán, and reached Constantinople in April 1097, numbering some 4,000 cavalrymen and 25,000 infantry. The "Eastern Roman Emperor" Alexius Komnenos, who had requested military assistance from the pope, was apprehensive: the Normans had already raided his empire, and the "Frankish" princes could try to take his kingdom from him. In 1080–1085 Prince Bohemond had served under his father Guiscard in the great Norman attack on the Byzantine Empire, and he commanded the Normans during Guiscard's absence, penetrating into the Greek province of Thessaly as far as Larissa, but had been repulsed by the Byzantine armies. This time Bohemond publicly paid homage to Alexius. He may have eyed the principality at Antioch (now the Turkish town of Antakya), a major Byzantine city occupied since 1084 by the "Saracens" (the Seljuk Turks). From Constantinople to Antioch,

across Anatolia, Bohemond of Taranto led the First Crusade. Thanks to his leadership, the First Crusade succeeded in crossing Asia Minor despite the "Saracens", which the following crusades failed to do.

Before letting the "Franks" cross the Strait of Bosphorus and leave Constantinople for Antioch and the Holy Land, however, the "Roman Emperor of the East", Alexius Komnenos, who regarded the whole of Anatolia, Syria, and the "Holy Land" as his territory, demanded that the Crusader princes swear allegiance to him and vow to return to him every piece of land they would take from the "Saracens" in his empire. All but two of them, Raymond de Saint-Gilles of Toulouse and the young Tancred of Taranto, who had other ambitions, did so. But even those princes who did take the oath had no intention of keeping it: they wanted to set up their own kingdoms, principalities, or counties in the "East".

In October 1097 the "Frankish" princes reached Antioch, which was occupied by the Seljuk Turks. They laid siege to it with great determination. Since 1088, Antioch's Seljuk governor had been the *emir* Yaghi-Siyan (died 1098). Yaghi-Siyan was well aware of the Crusader army as it marched through Anatolia in 1097, and he appealed for help from neighbouring Muslim states, but to no avail. To prepare for their arrival, he imprisoned the Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, John VII the Oxite, and exiled the Greek and Armenian Orthodox Christian population from Antioch, although the Syrian Orthodox citizens were permitted to stay.

The Siege of Antioch by the "Franks" lasted eight months (October 1097 to June 1098), during which both the besieged and the besiegers endured terrible suffering. Antioch contained a large Christian population, and it might have withstood the siege, but it was betrayed by the Islamic allies of Bohemond of Taranto. When the city fell on 28 June, 1098, the *emir* Yaghi-Siyan fled with his bodyguard, while his son stayed behind to defend the citadel. During his escape, however, Yaghi-Siyan fell from his horse and was injured. His guards found it impossible to bring the injured governor with them. They left him on the ground and rode away without him. He was found by an Armenian, perhaps one whom Yaghi-Siyan had exiled, who happily cut off his head and sent it as a gift to Prince Bohemond. Antioch remained the capital of the "Latin Principality of Antioch" for nearly two centuries.

In July 1098, Bohemond of Taranto became Prince of Antioch, and on 1 August the papal legate, Adhemar du Puy, died at Antioch. At the Council of Clermont in 1095, Adhemar had shown great zeal for the crusade, perhaps at Pope Urban's prior urging, and had been named the apostolic legate and appointed to lead the crusade. He had accompanied Raymond de Saint-Gilles of Toulouse to the "East". While Raymond and the other leaders constantly quarrelled with each other over the military leadership of the crusade, Adhemar was always recognized as its spiritual leader. On behalf of Pope Urban, Adhemar had negotiated with "Roman Emperor of the East" Alexius Komnenos at Constantinople, re-established discipline among the Crusaders, played a crucial role at the Battle of Dorylaeum, and sustained morale during the siege of Antioch through various religious rites, including fasting and special observances of holy days.

Religious belief is often beyond belief. During the siege of Antioch, the "sacred lance" with which Jesus Christ's side was pierced on the Cross, according to Christian belief, was "discovered" following a dream or vision of the Provençal priest Pierre Barthelemy. This "discovery" was fervently espoused by Raymond d'Aguilers, a chronicler and canon of Le Puy-en-Velay, who accompanied Count Raymond de Saint-Gilles of Toulouse on the First Crusade as chaplain to Adhemar, the Bishop of Le Puy and the legate of Pope Urban II. Adhemar himself was sceptical of the "holy lance". With Pons de Balazuc, Raymond d'Aguilers undertook to write a history of the expedition, but, Pons having been killed, he had to carry out this undertaking alone.

At a courage-plucking sortie of the Crusaders during the siege, Raymond d'Aguilers went before the column, bearing in his hands the "Sacred Lance" which had been "discovered" by Pierre Barthelemy. He later took part in the entry into Jerusalem, accompanied the Count of Toulouse on his pilgrimage to the Jordan, and was at the battle of Ascalon (Ashkelon). His major work was the *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Hierusalem*, eyewitness accounts of most of the events of the First Crusade. The narrative is largely devoted to the visions of Pierre Barthelemy, and to the authenticity of the "Holy Lance" he had found. Modern historians do not take his work seriously. The French historian Auguste Molinier (1851–1904) wrote that Raymond d'Aguilers is partial, credulous,

ignorant, and prejudiced. "He may be utilized, but on condition of close criticism" (Molinier & Polain, 1901–1906).

After the capture of Antioch by the "Franks" in June 1098, and its subsequent siege by the Seljuk leader Kerbogha, the *atabeg* or "father prince" of Mosul, which scared the "Franks" to death, the papal legate Adhemar had organized a procession through the streets of Antioch, and had the gates of the city locked so that the Crusaders, many of whom had begun to panic, could not flee the city. He was sceptical of Pierre Barthelemy's "discovery" of the "Holy Lance", especially as he knew that such a relic existed in Constantinople, but he was willing to let the Crusader army believe that it was real if it raised their morale.

When Kerbogha was defeated, and the "Saracen" siege of Antioch was lifted, Adhemar organized a council in an attempt to settle the disputes among the Crusader princes, but he died on 1 August 1098, probably of typhus. The territorial and power disputes among the higher nobles remained unresolved, and the march to Jerusalem was delayed for months. However, the lower-class foot soldiers continued to think of the dead Adhemar as their leader; some of them even claimed to have been visited by his ghost during the siege of Jerusalem, and reported that Adhemar instructed them to hold another procession around its walls.

There were great personal rivalries among the "Frankish" princes. In 1097, Raymond de Saint-Gilles of Toulouse had sent his army ahead to occupy Antioch, offending Bohemond of Taranto, who wanted the city for himself. The city was, however, still occupied by the "Saracens", and was taken by the Crusaders only after a nine-month difficult siege in 1098. Raymond took the *Palatium Cassiani* (the Latin name for the palace of the *emir*, Yaghi-Siyan) and the tower over the Bridge Gate. With typhoid fever and other diseases rampant, Raymond was ill during the siege of Antioch by the "Saracen" *atabeg* Kerbogha, which culminated in the "discovery of the Holy Lance" by Pierre Barthelemy.

The "miracle of the Holy Lance" raised the morale of the Crusaders, and, to their own surprise, they were able to rout Kerbogha's Seljuks outside Antioch. The Lance itself became a "holy relic" among Raymond's followers, despite the grave doubts of the papal legate Adhemar and Bohemond's occasional mockery. Raymond refused to relinquish his control of Antioch to Bohemond,

reminding Bohemond that he was obligated to return Antioch to Emperor Alexius, as he had sworn. A struggle arose between Raymond's supporters and the supporters of Bohemond, including his nephew Tancred, partly over the genuineness of the Lance, but mostly over the possession of the new Principality of Antioch.

Another important territory captured by the "Franks" from the "Saracens" and made into a Crusader state was the County of Edessa, a landlocked state northeast of Antioch, which straddled the Euphrates River and became the property of Baudouin de Boulogne (1058–1118), a future king of Jerusalem. Edessa was surrounded by Seljuk Turks. In 1098, the Roman Catholic Baudouin de Boulogne left the main Crusading army, which was travelling southeastward towards Antioch and Jerusalem, and went into Cilicia, east of Edessa, where he convinced its Greek Orthodox Christian lord, Thoros or Theodoros, to adopt him as a son and heir. Thoros was disliked by his Armenian Orthodox subjects. In March 1098 he was assassinated; it is unknown if Baudouin had any hand in this murder. In any event, Baudouin succeeded Thoros in Cilicia, taking the title of Count of Edessa (having also been Count of Verdun as a vassal of his brother in Europe).

### *From Antioch to Jerusalem*

The Seljuk Turks had taken Jerusalem from the Egyptian Fatimids in 1073, but, in the summer of 1098, at about the same time as the Crusader capture of Antioch, the Fatimids took Jerusalem back from the Seljuks. Al-Malik Al-Afdal ibn Badr al-Jamali Shahanshah (1066–1121), the Fatimid general, expelled its Seljuk Turkish governor, Najm ad-Din Ilghazi ibn Artuq (died 1122), and placed a Fatimid governor, Iftikhar ad-Dawla, in his place. To the Crusaders, however, it made no difference: the Seljuks and Fatimids were all "Saracens". When the "Franks" arrived in their caliphate in 1099, the bewildered Fatimids attempted to make peace with the *Franj*, on the condition that they not continue towards Jerusalem, but this demand was ignored by the "Franks", as Jerusalem was the real goal of the Crusaders.

The Fatimid governor of Jerusalem, Iftikhar ad-Dawla, had no idea who the Crusaders were, what they were doing in his country,

or what they wanted. The “Franks”, led by Raymond de Saint Gilles of Toulouse and Godefroy de Bouillon, laid siege to “Saracen” Jerusalem. Tancred had left Raymond and was now with Godefroy. The siege of Jerusalem by the “Franks” lasted almost six weeks, from 7 June to 15 July 1099. The Crusaders had some 1500 knights and 12,000 infantry—a small part of those who had left Europe—while the Fatimid garrison only had some 1000 soldiers. The “Franks” fought with great zeal, being certain that they were doing God’s bidding, and liberating the Holy Sepulchre, in addition to the lucrative territories and titles that awaited them. The besieging Crusaders themselves suffered greatly, due to the lack of food and water around Jerusalem. The city was well prepared for the siege, and the Fatimid governor, Iftikhar ad-Dawla, had expelled most of the Christians from the city.

Soon after the first assault, a number of Christian ships sailed into the port at Jaffa, and the besieging Crusaders were able to re-supply themselves for a short time. They also began to gather wood from Samaria in order to build siege engines. They were short on food and water, and by the end of June there was the bad news that a “Saracen” army was marching north from Egypt on Jerusalem. But the “Franks” were encouraged when a Catholic priest named Peter Desiderius claimed to have a divine vision in which the ghost of Adhemar, the papal legate who had died in 1098, instructed them to fast for three days and then march in a barefoot procession around the city walls, after which the city would fall in nine days, following the Biblical example of Joshua at the siege of Jericho. Although they were already starving, they fasted, and on 8 July they made the procession, with the clergy blowing trumpets and singing psalms, being mocked by the defenders of Jerusalem all the while. The procession stopped on the Mount of Olives and sermons were delivered by monks such as Pierre l’hermite, Arnulf of Chocques, and Raymond d’Aguilers.

## The fantastic “Kingdom of Jerusalem”

On 15 July 1099, the frenzied and furious “Franks” finally managed to breach the walls of Jerusalem and take the “Holy City”. According to Guillaume de Tyr (William of Tyre, died 1185), the French archbishop of Tyre and a chronicler of the Crusades, there followed a horrible bloodbath (William of Tyre, 1893, 1943, 1986). To the “Franks”, as to their pope, the “Saracens” were “a vile race” that had to be eradicated. They split up their world into good and bad, white and black: they were the good “race”, the “Saracens” were the devil. Almost every “Saracen” inhabitant of Jerusalem was killed over the course of that afternoon, that evening, and next morning. Muslims, Jews, and even a few Christians who looked to the Crusaders like “Saracens”, were massacred with indiscriminate violence. Some 40,000 people lost their lives that day. Raymond d’Aguilers, a chronicler of the crusade, and the *Gesta Francorum* reported Crusaders wading in rivers of blood.

The young Tancred d’Hauteville, along with Gaston of Béarn, claimed to be the first “Frank” to enter Jerusalem. However, the first Crusaders to enter Jerusalem were actually Ludolf of Tournai and his brother Englebert. When the city fell, Tancred gave his banner to



a group of citizens who had fled to the roof of what they believed to be the Temple of Solomon. This should have assured their safety, but they too were massacred along with the others during the sack of the city. The author of the *Gesta Francorum* reported that when Tancred realized this, he was “greatly angered”. When the Kingdom of Jerusalem was established, Tancred became Prince of Galilee.

Some historians believe that the local Sunni Muslims had been suffering under the yoke of the Shi’ite Fatimids, and actually saw the “Franks” as liberators. The Crusader princes, for their part, set up a new kingdom along the European model, which was called *Regnum Hierosolymitanum* in Latin and *Roiaume de Jherusalem* in their mediæval French. Modern scholars use the term “Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem”, but that was not what the first Crusaders called it. In fact, this kingdom included not only Jerusalem, but most of the Holy Land. Why did the Crusaders not call it *Regnum Terrae Sanctae* (Kingdom of the Holy Land)?

The Kingdom of Jerusalem was sandwiched between the Seljuk Sultanate of “Rum” (the Arabic name for Byzantium), the Seljuk Emirate of Damascus, and the Fatimid Caliphate of Cairo. At first, the new kingdom was little more than a loose collection of “Palestinian” towns and cities captured during the crusade. It developed like the monarchies of Europe, with which it had close connections, both politically and through the family relationships of its rulers. It was, however, a minor kingdom in comparison, and often lacked financial and military support from Europe. The kingdom had closer ties to the neighbouring Christian Kingdom of Armenia and the Byzantine Empire, which had an Orientalizing influence on the western Crusaders.

Some of the crusading “Franks” at times distinguished between “Saracens” and Arabs or Seljuk Turks. Most of them, however, continued to use the word “Saracens” as a single appellation for all Muslims, Persians, Arabs, Turks, and Mamluks throughout the Crusades (which ended with the expulsion of the Crusaders from Acre by the Mamluks in 1291). Even in the sixteenth century, the great Italian poet Torquato Tasso, in his famous poem *La Gerusalemme liberata*, used the name *Saraceni* for the Muslims. Tasso imagined a terrible fight to the death between Tancredi, the prince of the Galilee, and his “Saracen” lover Clorinda (hardly an Arabic name), a princess disguised as a “Saracen” warrior. After a bloody duel, Tancredi kills

Clorinda, not knowing that she is his lover or even a woman. Before she dies, however, Tancredi recognizes his lover, who asks him to baptize her a Christian. In 1624, the great composer Claudio Monteverdi wrote a wonderful dramatic musical work entitled *Il Combattimento di Tancredi e Clorinda*, using Tasso's poem, in which, at the moment of recognition, the narrator sings Tasso's words, "*Ahi, vista! ahi, conoscenza!*" (O sight! O recognition!). This tragedy may be symbolic or emblematic for the entire Crusades.

The "Frankish" princes divided the spoils of war among them. Tancred became Prince of the Galilee, the hero of many future works of fiction, such as the *Gerusalemme Liberata* of Torquato Tasso, the *Combattimento di Tancredi e Clorinda* of Claudio Monteverdi, and the *Tancred* of Benjamin Disraeli. In reality, he was an ambitious prince who had refused to swear loyalty to the "Roman Emperor of the East", Alexius Komnenos, and, with his uncle Bohemond, continued to make war on the Byzantines, and even on Baudouin de Boulogne, who had become the Count of Edessa (now Urfa or Şanlıurfa in southeastern Turkey), and later King of Jerusalem. Tancred's life was recorded in the *Gesta Tancredi*, written in Latin by Raoul de Caen (1080–1120), a Norman chronicler who joined the First Crusade and served under Tancred and Bohemond.

Raymond de Saint-Gilles of Toulouse, the leader of the most important army to capture Jerusalem, was offered the crown of "King of Jerusalem" by his fellow princes. He refused to accept it, however, saying that he would not rule over the city where Jesus Christ had been tortured and crucified. He said that he shuddered to think of being called "King of Jerusalem" because that should be the title of Jesus Christ himself and not of an earthly king. It is also likely that Raymond wished to continue the siege of Tripoli (now in Lebanon) rather than remain in Jerusalem. Raymond may have hoped that none of his rivals would accept the crown, and that he would still take it eventually.

In the Middle Ages, Bouillon was a lordship within the Duchy of Lower Lorraine and the seat of the "Frankish" Ardennes-Bouillon dynasty. In the eleventh century, they dominated the area, and held the ducal title along with many other titles in the region. Bouillon was the location of the ducal mint and the dominant urban area in the dukes' possession. On 22 July 1099, the rule of Jerusalem was given to the younger prince Godfrey de Bouillon (1060–1100),

who was more popular than Raymond, and who was named Defender of the Holy Sepulchre. Godefroy did not use the title of King of Jerusalem, however, and he died the following year, almost a year to the day from the taking of Jerusalem. Godefroy de Bouillon had been born around 1060, either in Boulogne-sur-Mer, in France, or in Baisy, in the region of Brabant (now in Belgium).

Godefroy's chief rival, Raymond de Saint Gilles of Toulouse, was reluctant to give up the "Tower of David" in Jerusalem—a minaret which has nothing to do with King David—that he had taken after the fall of the city, and it was only with difficulty that Godefroy de Bouillon was able to take it from him. After Godefroy de Bouillon became king of Jerusalem, he and Robert de Flandres led their army to Ascalon (now the Israeli city of Ashkelon) to face the Fatimid "Saracens" from Egypt. Raymond of Toulouse and Robert of Normandy stayed behind, either due to a quarrel with Godefroy, or because they preferred to have better information about the Egyptian army from their own scouts. When the Egyptian presence was confirmed, they marched out as well the next day. Near Ramla, they met Tancred and Godefroy's brother Eustace, who had left to capture Nablus earlier in the month. At the head of the army, the monk Arnulf Malecorne of Chocques (died 1118) carried the relic of the Cross, while Raymond d'Aguilers carried the relic of the Holy Lance that had been discovered at Antioch the previous year.

The word *mamluk* is an Arabic word meaning "owned", which is also transliterated as *mameluk*, *mameluke*, *mameluq*, *mamaluke*, and *mamluke*. During the European Middle Ages, a mamluk was a slave soldier who converted to Islam and served the Fatimid caliphs of Egypt and later the Ayyubid sultans of Syria and Egypt. Some of the mamluks were Christian children kidnapped by the Egyptian Muslims in Europe, force-converted to Islam, trained as warriors, and made high-ranking soldiers in Egypt. Over time, the mamluks became a powerful military caste, and, on more than one occasion, they seized power for themselves. During the Crusades, in 1250, they took power from their Ayyubid masters and ruled Egypt until 1517, when the Ottoman Turks conquered it. Their dynasty was established in 1250 by Baibars (al-Malik az-Zahir Rukn al-Din Baybars al-Bunduqdari, 1223–1277), a Kipchak Turk mamluk who took power from his Ayyubid masters.

On 12 August 1099, the "Franks" roundly defeated the army of the Fatimid "Saracens", led by the thirty-three-year-old al-Malik al-Afdal ibn Badr al-Jamali Shahanshah, at Ascalon. Shahanshah is a Persian title meaning "King of Kings", and Al-Afdal was a powerful man, the regent and chief of the army of the Fatimid caliphs, who had made a puppet of his child-caliph. He had been born in Acre, Palestine (now Acco, Israel), then part of the Fatimid caliphate, the son of Badr al-Jamali, an Armenian mamluk vizier of the Fatimid caliphate. Badr al-Jamali was the grand vizier for the Fatimid caliphs in Cairo from 1074 until his death in 1094, when his son al-Afdal succeeded him. The Fatimid caliph Ma'ad al-Mustansir Billah (1029–1094) died soon afterwards. Al-Afdal, who was Regent, appointed as caliph al-Musta'li (died 1101), a child, instead of al-Mustali's older brother, Abu Mansur al-Nizar, who was surnamed al-Mustafa ad-din-illah, meaning "the chosen for Allah's religion"). This enabled Al-Afdal to control the caliph.

A furious al-Nizar revolted against his younger brother and was defeated by al-Afdal in 1095; his supporters, led by Hassan-i-Sabah, fled to Alamut (the castle of death), a mountain fortress located in the central Elburz mountains, south of the Caspian Sea, where Hassan established the Nizari Ismaili community, also known as the Hashshashin, or Assassins. Fatimid power in Palestine had been eroded by the arrival of the Seljuk Turks. In 1097, al-Afdal captured Tyre from the Seljuks, and, in 1098, as we have seen, he also took Jerusalem, expelling its Seljuk governor, Najm ad-Din Ilghazi ibn Artuq (died 1122) and placing a Fatimid governor, Iftikhar ad-Dawla, in his place. Al-Afdal temporarily restored most of Palestine to Fatimid control. Al-Afdal, however, had misperceived the "Franks" as Byzantine mercenaries, and this misperception had caused him to conclude that the Crusaders would be his natural allies, as both of them were enemies of the Seljuk Turks: the Fatimids had just taken Jerusalem from the Seljuks. Fatimid overtures for an alliance with the Crusaders had been rebuffed, however, and the Crusaders had continued southward from Antioch to capture Jerusalem from the Fatimids.

When it became apparent to Al-Afdal that the "Franks" would not rest until they took Jerusalem, Al-Afdal marched from Cairo towards them, but was too late to rescue Jerusalem, which had fallen on 15 July 1099. As we have seen, on 12 August the Crusaders

under Godefroy of Bouillon surprised al-Afdal at the Battle of Ascalon and routed him. Al-Afdal, however, did not give up. He would re-harass the "Franks" and re-assert Fatimid control of Ascalon, as the Crusaders did not attempt to retain it, and he would utilize it as a staging ground for later attacks on the Crusader states.

Al-Afdal marched out every year from Cairo to attack the Kingdom of Jerusalem, and, in 1105, he attempted to ally with Damascus against them, but was defeated at the Battle of Ramla. Al-Afdal and his army enjoyed success only so long as no European fleet interfered, but they gradually lost control of their coastal strongholds. In 1109, Tripoli (now in Lebanon) was lost to the "Franks", despite the fleet and supplies sent by al-Afdal, and the city became the centre of an important Crusader county. In 1110, the governor of Ascalon, Shams al-Khilafa ("Sun of the Caliphate"), rebelled against al-Afdal with the intent of handing over the city to the Kingdom of Jerusalem (for a large price). However, Al-Khilafa's Berber troops assassinated him and sent his head to al-Afdal. The Crusaders later took Tyre (now in Lebanon) and Acre (now the Israeli city of Acco) as well, and remained in Jerusalem until the arrival of Saladin in 1187.

Al-Afdal Shahanshah was murdered in 1121 during the *eid ul-adha* (the Feast of the Sacrifice of Isma'il to Allah by Ibrahim). According to the Muslim chronicler Hamza ibn Asad abu Ya'la ibn al-Qalanisi (1070–1160), "it was asserted that the Batinis (the Isma'ili Naziris or Hashshashin) were responsible for his assassination, but this statement is not true. On the contrary it is an empty pretence and an insubstantial calumny". The real cause of the murder was the growing boldness of the young caliph, al-Amir bi-Ahkamillah (1096–1130), who had succeeded his father al-Musta'li in 1101, and his resentment of al-Afdal's control of him. Ibn al-Qalanisi states that "all eyes wept and all hearts sorrowed for [al-Afdal]; time did not produce his like after him, and after his loss the government fell into disrepute". He was succeeded as vizier by Al-Ma'mun. The "Franks" called al-Afdal "Lavendalius", or "Elaf-dalio".

Their victories over the "Saracens", however, did not end the deep and bitter rivalry between the "Frankish" princes, which was no less emotional than the deepest sibling rivalry or father-son struggle in any family. The chief rivalry was between the forty-year-

old Godefroy de Bouillon, the ruler of Jerusalem, and the sixty-year-old Count Raymond de Saint Gilles of Toulouse. It ended in July 1110 with the death of the former. The "Saracen" chronicler Hamza ibn Asad abu-Ya'la ibn al-Qalanisi wrote that Godefroy was killed by a Muslim arrow during the siege of Acre, but the German historians Albert of Aachen (flourished 1100), author of *Historia Hierosolymitanae expeditionis*, or *Chronicon Hierosolymitanum de bello sacro*, and Ekkehard of Aura (died 1126), a participant in the Crusade of 1110, reported that Godefroy had contracted an illness in Caesarea in June 1100. It was later believed that the Muslim emir of Caesarea had poisoned him, but there seems to be no basis for this rumour. Guillaume de Tyr (William of Tyre, 1130–1185), the Jerusalem-born archbishop of Tyre and the chronicler of the crusades, did not mention it. It is also said that Godefroy died after eating a poisoned apple. He died in Jerusalem after suffering from a prolonged illness.

Raymond de Saint Gilles of Toulouse survived his younger rival Godefroy by five years. He continued to fight the "Saracens" until 1105. When Raymond went north, in the winter of 1099–1100, his first act was one of aggression against Bohemond, capturing Laodicea from him (Bohemond himself had recently taken it from Alexius Komnenos of Byzantium). From Laodicea, Raymond went to Constantinople, where he allied himself with Alexius, Bohemond's most powerful enemy. Bohemond was at the time attempting to expand his Principality of Antioch into Byzantine territory, and blatantly refused to fulfil his oath to the Byzantine Empire. Tancred, the Prince of the Galilee, was Bohemond's nephew and natural ally.

By 1100, the Byzantine town of Malatia, which guarded one of the Cilician Gates through the Taurus Mountains, had been captured by Gabriel of Melitene, an Armenian soldier of fortune. Reports were received that the "Saracen" Malik Ghazi Danishmend, or Danishmend emir, Ghazi Gümüştekin of Sivas, was preparing an expedition to capture Malatia, and the Armenians sought help from Bohemond of Antioch. Afraid to weaken his forces at Antioch, trying to use the chance to extend his domain, Bohemond marched north with only 300 knights and a small force of infantry. Having failed to send scouting parties to find out the location of the Seljuks, they were ambushed by the Turks, and completely encircled at the Battle of Melitene (1101). Bohemond managed to send a soldier to

seek help from Count Baudouin of Edessa (Baldwin of Boulogne, who would become King of Jerusalem later that year), but was captured by the Seljuks and imprisoned in Neo-Caesarea (now the Turkish town of Niskar). He languished in prison for two years.

Hearing of Bohemond's capture, Emperor Alexius of Byzantium, incensed that Bohemond had broken his sacred oath made in Constantinople and kept the Principality of Antioch for himself, offered to ransom Bohemond for 260,000 dinars, if the Seljuk ruler, Emir Ghazi Gümüştekin, handed the prisoner over to him. When Kilij Arslan, the Seljuk Sultan of Rum and overlord of the Emir, heard of the proposed payment, he demanded half of it for himself, or he would attack Byzantium. Bohemond himself then proposed a ransom of 130,000 dinars paid just to the Emir. The bargain was concluded, and Ghazi Gümüştekin and Prince Bohemond exchanged oaths of friendship. Ransomed by Count Baudouin of Edessa, who had become King of Jerusalem, Bohemond returned in triumph to Antioch in August 1103, where his nephew Tancred had been ruling in his place for two years.

In 1101, Raymond de Saint Gilles of Toulouse had joined the "Crusade of 1101", a minor crusade of three separate movements, organized in 1100 and 1101 in the successful aftermath of the First Crusade. It is called the "Crusade of the Faint-Hearted", due to the many participants who joined this crusade after having turned back from the First Crusade. The three groups of "Franks", who were Lombards, Nivernois (Frenchmen from Nevers), and Bavarians, fought the Seljuk Turks in the Seljuk Sultanate of Rum, in mid-Anatolia. The Lombards were originally the Langobards (long beards), a Germanic tribe that had settled in northern Italy, around Mediolanum (Milan) and became Romanized and Italianized. The Crusaders were roundly defeated. Guillaume de Nevers escaped to Tarsus and joined the rest of the survivors there, as did Raymond de Saint Gilles of Toulouse.

Under Raymond's command, the "Franks" captured "Tortosa" (the Syrian town of Tartous), with help from a Genoese fleet. But by now the crusade of 1101 was more of a pilgrimage than a war. The survivors arrived at Antioch at the end of 1101, and at Easter 1102 arrived in Jerusalem. Afterwards, many of them simply went home, their vow of pilgrimage having been fulfilled, although some remained behind to help King Baudouin defend the Kingdom of

Jerusalem against an Egyptian invasion at Ramla. Estienne de Blois was killed in this battle, as was Hugues de Lusignan, the ancestor of the future Lusignan dynasty of Jerusalem and Cyprus. Joscelin de Courtenay also stayed behind and survived to become Count of Edessa in 1118.

The Seljuk defeat of the Crusaders in 1101–1102 allowed the Seljuk sultan Kilij Arslan to establish his capital at Konya, push the Byzantines to Europe, and prove to the Muslim world that the Crusaders were not invincible, as they had appeared to be during the First Crusade. The Crusaders and the Byzantines each blamed the other for the defeat, but neither of them could ensure a safe route to Jerusalem through Anatolia now that Kilij Arslan had strengthened his position. The only open route to the Holy Land was the sea route, which benefited the Italian cities. The lack of a safe land route from Constantinople to Jerusalem also benefited the Principality of Antioch, where Prince Tancred, ruling for his captive uncle Bohemond, was able to consolidate his power without Byzantine interference.

Raymond de Saint Gilles of Toulouse, who had tragically joined the Crusade of 1101, was defeated by the Seljuk Turks at Mersivan in Anatolia. He escaped the Seljuks and returned to Constantinople, where he joined his ally Alexius Komnenos. In 1102, Raymond traveled by sea from Constantinople to Antioch, where he was imprisoned by Tancred, Bohemond's nephew and the Regent of Antioch during the captivity of Bohemond, and was only freed after promising not to attempt any more conquests in the country between Antioch and Acre. He immediately broke his promise, however, attacking and capturing Tartous, and began to build a castle on the Mons Peregrinus, a Crusader castle near Tripoli, which would help in his siege of Tripoli (now in Lebanon). He was aided by Emperor Alexius I, who preferred to create a friendly state in Tripoli to balance the hostile state in Antioch.

Raymond de Saint Gilles of Toulouse had an incestuous streak. He was married three times, and was twice excommunicated for marrying within forbidden degrees of consanguinity. His first wife was his cousin and the mother of his son, Bertrand. His second wife was Matilda, or Mafalda, the daughter of King Roger of Sicily. Raymond's third wife was Elvira, the illegitimate daughter of King Alfonso of Castile, the Spanish king who also campaigned against



the “Moors”, just as Raymond fought the “Saracens”. Raymond died in 1105 during the siege of Tripoli, before it was captured from the “Saracens”. He was succeeded by his nephew Guillaume-Jourdain, who, in 1109, with the aid of King Baudouin of Jerusalem, finally captured Tripoli. They created the Christian County of Tripoli (1109–1289), the last Crusader state founded in the “Levant” (now in Lebanon). Guillaume, however, was deposed that year by Raymond’s son Bertrand, and Tripoli remained in the possession of the counts of Toulouse throughout the twelfth century. The online *Wikipedia* article says that

Raymond of Toulouse seems to have been driven both by religious and material motives. On the one hand he accepted the discovery of the Holy Lance and rejected the kingship of Jerusalem, but on the other hand he could not resist the temptation of a new territory. Raymond of Aguilers, a clerk in Raymond’s army, wrote an account of the crusade from Raymond’s point of view.

In fact, as is often the case, the emotional motives may have been more powerful. The “account” of Raymond d’Aguilers was a Latin book entitled *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem* (the spelling *Iherusalem* for Jerusalem may have had to do with its Greek name, *Hierosolyma*). However, Raymond’s greed for territory may have masked a deeper, unconscious infantile greed, such as the greed for his mother’s milk, her body, and her love.

During the twelfth century, the French literary works switched from Latin to Old French. The first period of the Kingdom of Jerusalem lasted until 1187. The Oxford manuscript of the *Chanson de Roland*, an epic poem about an eighth-century battle of Charlemagne, was written between 1140 and 1170, when the “Franks” ruled Jerusalem. This was the first French (or, rather, Anglo-Norman) literary text. Its earliest extant text is the Oxford manuscript, which holds some 4,000 lines. The *Chanson de Roland*, written by an unknown French troubadour of the eleventh century, is a *chanson de geste*, a literary genre that flourished in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and which told the story of some legendary hero of battles and wars.

The battle celebrated in the *Chanson de Roland* is the battle of Roncevaux Pass, which had taken place in 778, and in which the Basques attacked the Franks. At the battle of Roncevaux Pass, the

Basques of Spain had ambushed and defeated the Frankish army under Hruodland (Roland), the chief paladin of Charlemagne and his ruler of the March of Bretagne (the border region of Brittany), on his way home from Spain, in a small Pyrenees mountain pass named Roncevaux in French, Roncesvalles in Spanish, and Orreaga in Basque. Three centuries later, in the eleventh century, this Roland became the central figure not only in the *Chanson de Roland*, but in the so-called *matière de France*, a literary cycle of French epic poems. The name "matière" for that poem cycle was bestowed on it by the twelfth-century French poet Jean Bodel, the author of the *Chanson de Saisnes*, another *chanson de geste* (about the war of Charlemagne with the Saxon leader Widukind, whom Bodel called "Guiteclin"). In that poem, Bodel wrote, "*Ne sont que trois matières à nul homme atendant, de France et de Bretagne, et de Rome la grant*" (There are but three matters that no man can ignore, of France, and of Britain, and of Rome the great).

Most of the *Chanson de Roland* was not about Roland, the Lord of the March of Brittany, who was killed in the battle at Roncevaux along with some other prominent Franks, but rather about the victories of Charlemagne over the "Saracens". Those "Saracens" are described as mean and cruel. How did the Basques of Roncevaux Pass become "Saracens"? Were they not Christians? There are two different theories about when the polytheistic Basques were Christianized. One says that Christianity arrived in the Basque Country during the fourth and fifth centuries, the other that the Basques were not Christian until the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Early traces of Christianity can be found in the major urban Basque areas from the fourth century onwards, a bishopric from 589 in Pamplona, and three Basque hermit cave concentrations were in use from the sixth century onwards.

Did the authors of the *Chanson de Roland* use the word "Saracen" to mean anyone who was not both Frankish and Christian, or anyone who fought the Franks? If so, then the fantastic term "Saracen" was not only reserved for Muslims, Arabs, Turks, and Persians, but for all enemies of the Franks. The Germanic Teutonic Knights, a chivalric order that was formed at the end of the twelfth century in Acre, the new capital of the "Kingdom of Jerusalem", conducted the "Baltic Crusade" of 1199–1266 against the Livs, Letts, Prussians, and other "pagan" peoples in northeastern Germany,

Christianizing them by the sword. The Teutonic Knights also called these “pagan” tribes “Saracens”. We shall discuss this striking phenomenon below.

The only truly historical account of the battle of Roncevaux Pass was written by Einhard (775–840), a Frankish courtier, biographer and servant of Charlemagne. His biography of his king is entitled *Vita Karoli Magni*. Here is the relevant passage from Einhard’s chronicle about the battle of Roncevaux:

While he was vigorously pursuing the Saxon war, almost without a break, and after he had placed garrisons at selected points along the border, [Charlemagne] marched into Spain [in 778] with as large a force as he could mount. His army passed through the Pyrenees and he received the surrender of all the towns and fortified places he encountered. He was returning [to Francia] with his army safe and intact, but high in the Pyrenees [at Roncevaux] on that return trip he briefly experienced the Basques. That place is so thoroughly covered with thick forest that it is the perfect spot for an ambush. [Charlemagne’s] army was forced by the narrow terrain to proceed in a long line and [it was at that spot], high on the mountain, that the Basques set their ambush . . . The Basques had the advantage in this skirmish because of the lightness of their weapons and the nature of the terrain, whereas the Franks were disadvantaged by the heaviness of their arms and the unevenness of the land. Eggihard, the overseer of the king’s table, Anselm, the count of the palace, and Roland, the lord of the Breton March [border region], along with many others died in that skirmish. But this deed could not be avenged at that time, because the enemy had so dispersed after the attack that there was no indication as to where they could be found. [Einhard, 1998, pp. 21–22]

The fascinating psychological question is, how could the Christian Basques be called “Saracens” in the *Chanson de Roland*, when that was the Frankish name for Arabs and Muslims? The author of the *Wikipedia* article on the *Chanson de Roland* thinks that the centuries of oral tradition about the Basque ambush of the Franks at Roncevaux that had passed from the battle itself to the *chanson* had turned reality into fantasy:

Roland becomes, in the poem, the nephew of Charlemagne, the Christian Basques become Muslim Saracens, and Charlemagne, rather than marching north to subdue the Saxons, returns to Spain

and avenges the deaths of his knights. The *Song of Roland* marks a nascent French identity and sense of collective history traced back to the legendary Charlemagne.

Psychologically, that was what had happened to the Crusaders: they, too, had thought of themselves as "Franks", tracing their identity back to Charlemagne, even though they were Normans and Frenchmen. Like the twelfth-century Anglo-Norman epic poem, *Estoire de la guerre sainte*, by Ambroise, which described the crusade of Richard *Coeur-de-Lion* (1157–1199), the king of England and of what later came to be called the "Angevin Empire", the *Chanson de Roland* was written in an Anglo-Norman French dialect, which suggests a common origin in northern France, even though some critics believe that the origin of the Oxford manuscript of the epic was much farther south, in Provence. The authors of the *Chanson de Roland* seem to have thought of themselves as *françois* rather than *franci*, a subtle but important difference.

Human historiography and memory change the reality of events and create legends around them. Those legends depend on who is doing the writing and the remembering. After 778, over the years, the battle of Roncevaux Pass was romanticized by oral tradition into a major conflict between Christians and Muslims, when in fact it was a minor battle in which both sides were Christian (the Franks and the Basques). Charlemagne had fought the "Saracens" in Iberia, not in the Pyrenees. In the oral tradition, however, the Basques were replaced by a force of 400,000 "Saracens". The *Chanson de Roland*, which commemorates this battle, is the earliest surviving of the *chansons de geste*, or epic poems, of mediæval France in the northern French dialect, or *langue d'oïl*, of what later became the French language. There is even a tombstone near the Roncevaux Pass commemorating the place where it is traditionally held that Roland died.

The French legend of the battle of Roncevaux Pass, as told in the *Chanson de Roland*, has a Spanish counterpart in the Iberian legends about *Bernardo del Carpio*, a mediæval Spanish hero from the Kingdom of León in northwest Spain, whom these legends make the vanquisher of Roland at Roncevaux. Bernardo del Carpio is the son of Sancho, Count of Saldana and brother of King Alfonso II of Asturias (759–842), and of Doña Ximena, Alfonso's sister. Unhappy with the marriage of his sister to Sancho, Alfonso has his

brother-in-law Sancho blinded and thrown into a dungeon, and takes Bernardo into his court as his own son. No one must tell the young Bernardo who his real father is. Some of these legends have Bernardo striving against Alfonso to release his father from prison. Others have him as the rival and slayer of “Rolando” at Roncesvalles. The legends have Alfonso invite Charlemagne into Iberia to defeat the Moors, promising to name him as his heir, but Bernardo’s victory at Roncevaux ends that plan. Bernardo joins the “Moors” or “Saracens”, hoping to force Alfonso into action, but Alfonso secretly has Sancho killed in his prison cell. From a psychoanalytic viewpoint, this legend has a very clear Oedipal theme to it.

Drawing on their own oral traditions, some mediaeval Muslim historians glorified “their” victory at the battle of Roncevaux Pass. Writing four centuries after the battle, the mediaeval Muslim historian Abu al-Hassan Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Muhammad (1160–1233), also known as Ali ‘izz ad-Din ibn al-Athir al-Jazari, or al-Athir, claimed that the young Frankish king Charlemagne had come to Spain in 778 at the invitation of the Muslim rulers of Zaragoza, Barcelona, and Huesca, who asked him to aid them in their revolt against Abd ar-Rahman, the *emir* of Córdoba. Seeing an opportunity to extend his empire and his religion into Iberia, Charlemagne led his armies across the Pyrenees, subdued the Basques at Pamplona, and proceeded south. Arriving at Zaragoza, however, he found that its ruler, Husayn, would not surrender the city to him, and that Sulayman al-Arabi of Barcelona had also changed his mind. Charlemagne besieged Zaragoza for some time, then decided not to risk defeat, turned around, took Sulayman al-Arabi prisoner, and headed home to Paderborn. At Roncevaux Pass, al-Arabi’s sons collaborated with the Basques to ambush Charlemagne’s troops, avenge their defeat, and rescue their father.

However, this Muslim story hardly explains the incredible transformation of the Basques into “Saracens” in the *Chanson de Roland*. This was pure psychohistorical fantasy. The authors of the epic poem needed to identify the “evil race” of people who had attacked Charlemagne as “Saracens” because these were the “evil race” of eleventh-century Europe (Strickland, 2003). In the same way, the first Crusaders needed to see all Muslims, Turks, Persians,

and other non-Christian non-Europeans in the "East" as "Saracens". They even killed the Christians in Jerusalem in 1099 because they were dressed like "Saracens" and appeared to them like the "evil race".

### *The "Latin" Kingdom of Jerusalem*

After the capture of Jerusalem by the "Franks" in 1099, and the creation of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, headed by Godefroy de Bouillon, a "Latin" Christian religious hierarchy was established in the kingdom under a "Latin Patriarch" named Dagobert of Pisa. The Greek word patriarchos means "father ruler". Before that time, all the Christians in the Holy Land were under the authority and care of the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem. During the existence of the "Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem", the Latin Patriarchate of Jerusalem was divided into four archdioceses—those of Tyre (now in Lebanon), Caesarea, Nazareth (now in Israel), and Petra (now in Jordan), and a number of "suffragan" dioceses. The "Latin" Patriarch controlled the "Latin quarter" of the city of Jerusalem (the Holy Sepulchre and its immediate surroundings), and had as his direct "suffragans" the bishops of Lydda-Ramla, Bethlehem, Hebron, and Gaza, and the abbots of the Temple, Mount Zion, and Mount of Olives. After the last vestiges of the "Latin kingdom of Jerusalem", including its capital of "Saint-Jean d'Acre", were conquered by the mamluks in 1291, the "Latin" hierarchy was eliminated in the Middle East. However, confusing fantasy with reality, for centuries the Roman Catholic Church continued to appoint a "Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem", who, however, was based in Rome after 1374.

The first person to formally call himself "king of Jerusalem", Baudouin de Boulogne (Baldwin of Boulogne, 1058–1118), Count of Edessa, actually called himself "King of the Latins of Jerusalem". The Crusaders were no more "Latin" than they were "Franks": they were only Latin in the sense of being Roman Catholics and writing in Latin, and not being Greeks. Yet, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Dagobert of Pisa, was called the "Latin" patriarch. Baudouin may have wanted to assert his authority over the "Latins" and reduce that of Dagobert. The Crusader kingdom, which was later called the

"Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem" (Prawer, 1972, 1980), was no more "Latin", or even a kingdom, than the "Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation" was holy, Roman, German, or even an empire. The King of Jerusalem did not have absolute authority over the feudal lords and princes of his kingdom, such as those of Acre, or Ascalon, or the Galilee, who had their own fiefs. The "kingdom" was a loose federation of towns captured by the Crusaders. It was separate from the Crusader counties and principalities of Edessa, Tripoli, and Antioch (now in Turkey, Lebanon, and Syria).

In 1100, upon the death of Godefroy de Bouillon, his brother Baudouin de Boulogne, the Count of Edessa, claimed the title of "King of the Latins of Jerusalem". Baudouin was opposed by his old enemy Tancred, the Prince of the Galilee and nephew of Prince Bohemond of Antioch, as well as by the "Latin" patriarch, Dagobert of Pisa, who wished to set up a theocratic state in Jerusalem. As soon as he arrived in Jerusalem, however, Baudouin set out on an expedition against the "Saracen" Egyptian Fatimids to the south and did not return until the end of December. The showdown with Dagobert was postponed.

On Christmas Day, 1100, Baudouin de Boulogne, Count of Edessa, was crowned King of Jerusalem by Patriarch Dagobert, who had given up his opposition to Baudouin, although he refused to crown Baudouin in Jerusalem. The coronation took place in Bethlehem, the place Christians believe to be the birthplace of their Messiah and God, Jesus Christ. The struggle between church and state in Jerusalem continued into 1101, when Baudouin had Dagobert suspended by a papal legate. Later that year, the two disagreed on the question of the contribution to be made by the patriarch towards the defence of the Holy Land. The struggle ended in the removal of Dagobert by Baudouin in 1102. Dagobert died in 1107. Their Oedipal struggle was similar to that of King Heinrich against Pope Gregory in the famous investiture controversy.

Baudouin expanded his kingdom northward into what is now Lebanon. He captured the port cities of Acre (1104), Beirut (1110), and Sidon (1111), while also exerting his suzerainty over other Crusader states to the north—the County of Edessa (which he had founded), the Principality of Antioch, and, after 1109, the County of Tripoli. He successfully defended his kingdom against "Saracen" invasions from the Fatimids of Egypt at the numerous battles at

Ramla and elsewhere in the southwest of the kingdom, and from the Seljuks of Damascus and Mosul in the northeast in 1113. The reportedly-homosexual Baudouin brought with him an Armenian wife, whom he had married to gain political support from the Armenian population in Edessa, but whom he set aside when he found that he did not really need the Armenian support in Jerusalem. He married Adelaide del Vasto, regent of Sicily, in 1113, but divorced her as well in 1117. Adelaide's son from her first marriage, Roger II of Sicily (1095–1154), never forgave Baudouin, and for decades withheld his much-needed naval support from the Crusaders.

Baudouin died without heirs in 1118, during a campaign against the "Saracens" of Egypt, and the "Latin" kingdom of Jerusalem was offered to his brother Eustache (Count Eustace III of Boulogne), who rejected it. It was then given to Baudouin du Bourg, a former Count of Edessa, who became "King Baudouin II of Jerusalem". Baudouin II was an able ruler who successfully defended his kingdom against the "Saracen" invasions. The Principality of Antioch was severely weakened in 1119 by the battle that the "Franks", or "Latins", called the battle of *Ager Sanguinis* (Field of Blood). In that battle, also known as the Battle of Sarmada and the Battle of Balat, the Crusader army of the Principality of Antioch, led by Prince Roger of Salerno (died 1119), was annihilated by the "Saracen" army of Najm ad-Din Ilghazi ibn Artuq (died 1122), or Ilghazi of Mardin, the Seljuk ruler of Aleppo. Roger himself was killed. Baudouin was held captive by the emir of Aleppo from 1122–1124, when he was finally ransomed and returned to his throne. In 1125 Baudouin led the Crusader states to victory over the "Saracens" at the Battle of Azaz.

What kind of relations developed between the "Franks" who lived in the Holy Land and the "Saracens" that they were fighting? The Israeli historian Benjamin Kedar believed that there was a "cross-fertilization" between the two communities. He believed that the Crusaders saw themselves as Christian missionaries (Kedar, 1984). Before 970, the European Christians were not particularly interested in Muslims, except as "evil Saracens". Later, they sought to convert them to Christianity. Islam, however, forbids the "infidel" from attacking it, considers itself the only true religion, and imposes the death penalty on renegades who abandon it. After



the conquest of the "Holy Land" by the Crusaders, there were conversions of Muslims to Christianity, but Kedar thought they came from economic and social motives, not religious conviction.

Jewish converts to Christianity often became "more Catholic than the pope", embracing their new religion with fanatical zeal. One of them, the Spaniard Petrus Alfonsi (1062–1110), was the most important historical source about Islam in Christian Europe in the eleventh century. Alfonsi was physician to King Alfonso VI of Castile. His original Hebrew name is not known. He was born at Huesca, Aragon, and was forty-four years old when he embraced Christianity and was baptized at Huesca on St Peter's Day in 1106. He took the baptismal Latin name of Petrus Alfonsi (Peter of Alfonso, his king). Like all the Jewish "apostates" of his time, he sought to show his zeal for his new faith by attacking Judaism and defending the truths of the Christian faith.

Petrus Alfonsi composed twelve diatribes against the Jews, which were praised by Raymund Martin in his *Pugio Fidei*, and by others equally biased against the Jews, but are little known today. The works of Petru Alfonsi came to light in the sixteenth century. A fifteenth-century manuscript attributed to him is entitled *De conversione Petrus Alfonsi quondam judaei et libro ejus in Judaeos et Saracenos*. In that manuscript, much material about the "Saracens" can be found. Kedar concluded from it that the Crusader "Latins" or "Franks" were no less missionary in propagating their Christian religion than the Muslim "Saracens", who imposed conversion or death on all those whom they conquered.

We have several documents written in Latin by the "Franks" of the First Crusade: two letters of Count Anselme de Ribemont to Archbishop Manasses II of Reims in France, dated 1098; a letter by Estienne Henry, Count of Blois and of Chartres, to his wife Adele; a letter of the "Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem" Arnulf Malecorne to the Church of the West; a letter by the people of Lucca in Italy to all faithful Christians; and a letter by the princes Godefroy, Raymond, and Daimbert to the pope. Anselme of Ribemont, the count of Ostrevant and Valenciennes, was one of the most brilliant figures in the first crusade; his "glorious" death before Archis in April 1099 was recorded by all the eye-witnesses of the expedition. He wrote two letters to the archbishop of Reims, Manasses II. In the first letter of Anselme de Ribemont, written in 1098 during the siege of the

Antioch by the Crusaders, he repeatedly mentioned the "Turks" rather than the "Saracens".

We moved our camp from Nicaea on the fourth day before the Calends of July and proceeded on our journey for three days. On the fourth day the Turks, having collected their forces from all sides, again attacked the smaller portion of our army, killed many of our men and drove all the remainder back to their camps. Bohemond, count of the Romans, count Stephen, and the count of Flanders commanded this section. When these were thus terrified by fear, the standards of the larger army suddenly appeared. Hugh the Great and the duke of Lorraine were riding at the head, the count of St. Gilles and the venerable bishop of Puy followed. For they had heard of the battle and were hastening to our aid. The number of the Turks was estimated at 260,000. All of our army attacked them, killed many and routed the rest. On that day I returned from the emperor, to whom the princes had sent me on public business. [Robinson & Robinson, 1894, vol. 1, no. 4, p. 4]

We do not know whether Count Estienne of Blois had placed that mythical chastity belt on his wife before embarking on the First Crusade in 1096. In his letter to her from the siege of Antioch in 1098, we have the following paragraph:

We found the city of Antioch very extensive, fortified with incredible strength and almost impregnable. In addition, more than 5,000 bold Turkish soldiers had entered the city, not counting the Saracens, Publicans, Arabs, Tulitans, Syrians, Armenians and other different races of whom an infinite multitude had gathered together there. In fighting against these enemies of God and of our own we have, by God's grace, endured many sufferings and innumerable evils up to the present time. Many also have already exhausted all their resources in this very holy passion. Very many of our Franks, indeed, would have met a temporal death from starvation, if the clemency of God and our money had not saved them. Before the above-mentioned city of Antioch indeed, throughout the whole winter we suffered for our Lord Christ from excessive cold and enormous torrents of rain. What some say about the impossibility of bearing the heat of the sun throughout Syria is untrue, for the winter there is very similar to our winter in the west. [*ibid.*, pp. 6-7]

This letter is fascinating, because, contrary to the tendency of the European Christians to put all Muslims, Turks, Arabs, Persians, and other “Easterners” into one bag called “Saracens”, Estienne of Blois seemed to think that “Publicans, Arabs, Tulitans, Syrians” were not Saracens. By “Arabs” he may have meant the desert Beduin. On the other hand, he obviously called the French and Norman Crusaders “Franks”, just as the Muslims called them all *al-Franj*. In another paragraph of the same letter, Count Estienne de Blois wrote to his wife Adele about the “Saracen princes”, who were really Seljuk Turkish emirs. As the Europeans always did, every Arabic or Turkish named was Latinized:

When truly Caspian [Bagi Seian], the emir of Antioch—that is, prince and lord—perceived that he was hard pressed by us, he sent his son Sensodolo [Chems Eddaulah] by name, to the prince who holds Jerusalem, and to the prince of Calep, Rodoam [Rodoanus], and to Docap [Deccacus Iba Toutousch], prince of Damascus. He also sent into Arabia to Bolianuth and to Carathania to Hamelnuth. These five emirs with 12,000 picked Turkish horsemen suddenly came to aid the inhabitants of Antioch. We, indeed, ignorant of all this, had sent many of our soldiers away to the cities and fortresses. For there are one hundred and sixty-five cities and fortresses throughout Syria which are in our power. But a little before they reached the city, we attacked them at three leagues’ distance with 700 soldiers, on a certain plain near the “Iron Bridge.” God, however, fought for us, His faithful, against them. For on that day, fighting in the strength that God gives, we conquered them and killed an innumerable multitude—God continually fighting for us—and we also carried back to the army more than two hundred of their heads, in order that the people might rejoice on that account. The emperor of Babylon also sent Saracen messengers to our army with letters and through these he established peace and concord with us [*ibid.*, p. 7]

The letter of the “Frankish” princes Daimbert, Godefroy, and Raymond to Pope Paschal was sent from Laodicaea (now the Syrian port city of Latakia) in September 1099, some two months after the bloody capture of Jerusalem, and it mentioned not the “Saracens” and the Turks. It seems, however, that the two names were used as synonyms:

Multiply your supplications and prayers in the sight of God with joy and thanksgiving, since God has manifested His mercy in fulfilling by our hands what He had promised in ancient times. For after the capture of Nicaea, the whole army, made up of more than three hundred thousand soldiers, departed thence. And, although this army was great that it could have in a single day covered all Romania, and drunk up all the rivers and eaten up all the growing things, yet the Lord conducted them amid so great abundance that a ram was sold for a penny and an ox for twelve pennies or less. Moreover, although the princes and kings of the Saracens rose up against us, yet, by God's will, they were easily conquered and overcome. Because, indeed, some were puffed up by these successes, God opposed to us Antioch, impregnable to human strength. And there He detained us for nine months and so humbled us in the siege that there were scarcely a hundred good horses in our whole army. God opened to us the abundance of His blessing and mercy and led us into the city, and delivered the Turks and all of their possessions into our power. [*ibid.*, p. 9]

The letter of the "Frankish" princes seems to imply that they identified the name "Saracens" with all Arabs, Turks, Persians, and Muslims. They may have distinguished among some groups, such as Bedouin Arabs, Turks, and Muslims in general, but the general tendency was to label them all "Saracens" and treat them as the evil enemies of God.



## The Second Crusade: persisting fantasies

**T**he Turkish title of *atabeg* (also *atabek* or *atabey*), meaning “father prince”, was a hereditary title of the Turkish nobility. It was used by the Seljuk Turks and by other Turkish, Turkic, and Turkoman tribes from central Asia that invaded western Asia in the Middle Ages. The Frankish “Latin” Christian County of Edessa had been sandwiched between the Seljuk Turkish sultanate of “Rum” that surrounded most of it, the “Dominion of the Atabegs” that ruled parts of Syria and Iraq, the Christian kingdom of Armenia and the principality of Antioch.

In 1144, the landlocked County of Edessa, northeast of the Principality of Tripoli, was taken by the “Saracens” (the Seljuk Turks). The loss of Edessa was a major defeat for the Christians, as Edessa was the first county they had taken and ruled in the First Crusade, and one of the only four states of *Outre-mer* (the others were the principality of Antioch, the county of Tripoli, and the kingdom Jerusalem). It provoked the Second Crusade. Edessa, which had a centuries-long Christian history, was the first of the Crusader states to have been founded during the First Crusade, and it was the first to fall to the “Saracens”. Its fall was no light matter for the Roman Catholic Church.

The Second Crusade was preached in 1145 by the new Pope, Eugene III (Bernardo dei Paganelli di Montemagno, who was Pope from 1145 until his death in 1153). It lasted four years, until 1149. The Pope chose as his legate the French abbot Bernard de Clairvaux (1090–1153) to lead the second crusade. The new Pope granted the same indulgences for the Second Crusade that his predecessor, Urban II, had accorded to the First Crusade. In 1146, a *parlement* was convoked at Vezelay in Burgundy, and Bernard preached before the assembly. King Louis VII of France, his wife, Eleanor of Aquitaine, and all the princes and lords present prostrated themselves at the feet of Bernard to receive the pilgrims' cross. Bernard then crossed the Rhine into Germany, and the reported miracles that multiplied at his every step undoubtedly contributed to the success of his mission. King Conrad III of Germany and his nephew Friedrich Barbarossa received the cross from the hands of Bernard. Pope Eugene came in person to France to encourage the enterprise.

Bernard of Clairvaux was the primary builder of the Cistercian order of monks. After the loss of his mother, which was a great blow to him, Bernard went into the Cistercian order. The Church, or *Mater Ecclesia*, became his new psychological mother. Three years later, he was sent to found a new house that Bernard named *Claire Vallée* (hence Clairvaux), in 1115. Bernard preached an immediate faith, in which the intercessor was the Virgin Mary (another mother figure). In 1128, Bernard attended the Council of Troyes, at which he outlined of the Rule of the Knights Templar, who became the ideal of Christian nobility. On the death of Pope Honorius II in 1130, another schism broke out in the Roman Catholic Church. Gregorio Cardinal Papareschi (died 1143) was hastily elected Pope Innocent II by most of his fellow cardinals. In protest, the other cardinals elected Pietro Cardinal Pierleoni (died 1138) as "Anti-pope" Anacletus II. In response, King Louis VI of France (*Louis le gros*, 1081–1137) convened a national council of the French bishops at Estampes, and chose Bernard de Clairvaux to adjudicate between the rival popes (both father figures) and end the schism.

Portugal, then a region in southwestern Iberia, had been a county and fief of the Kingdom of Léon and Castilla. In 868, during the *Reconquista*, the centuries-long process through which the Iberian Christians reconquered the Iberian peninsula from the Muslims, the First County of Portugal was formed. The Christian

rulers of Léon and Castile repeatedly proclaimed that they were reconquering Christian territory that had been lost to the “Moors”, thus insuring that reinforcements would continue to arrive from other Christian realms, especially because the Papacy continued to support such efforts. Galicia, in northwest Spain, was the “march”, or border land, of the Kingdom of Léon and Castile.

At the end of the eleventh century, when the First Crusade set out for the “Holy Land” to fight the “Saracens” there, crusading knights also came from every part of Europe to Iberia to aid the kings of Léon, Castile, and Aragon in combating the “Moors”. Among them was Henry of Burgundy, who, in 1095, married Theresa de Léon, a daughter of King Alfonso VI of Léon. The County of Portugal was included in Theresa’s dowry. Count Henry ruled Portugal as a vassal of Alfonso VI, securing his Galician march against Moorish raids. In 1109, Alfonso VI died, bequeathing all his territories to his legitimate daughter, Urraca of Léon and Castile. Count Henry of Portugal at once invaded Léon, hoping to add to his own dominions at the expense of his suzerain.

In 1112, after three years of war against Urraca and other rival claimants to the throne of Léon, Count Henry of Portugal died, leaving his widow, Theresa, to govern Portugal north of the Mondego River during the minority of her infant son, Afonso Henriques (1109–1185), the future King Afonso I of Portugal. South of the Mondego River, the “Moors” were still supreme. Afonso became Count of Portugal, and in 1139 his victory over the “Saracens” at Ourique, in the Alentejo region of southern Portugal, made Afonso king and transformed Portugal from a county of Léon and Castile into an independent kingdom. Portugal still fought the “Moors” until the thirteenth century, and also had its own internal wars. The Portuguese language developed from one of the dialects of “Vulgar Latin”, akin to the Gallego language of Galicia in northwestern Spain.

Bernard de Clairvaux devoted himself to the composition of the works which would win for him the title of “Doctor of the Church”. In 1139, he attended the Second Lateran Council called by the pope. Bernard denounced the teachings of his rival Pierre Abelard to Pope Innocent, who called a council at Sens in 1141 to settle the matter. Bernard’s disciple, Bernard of Pisa, was elected Pope Eugene III. Having previously helped end the schism within the church,



Bernard was now called upon to combat heresy. In June 1145, Bernard travelled in Southern France, and his preaching there helped strengthen support against heresy. Now he preached the Second Crusade.

For all his religious zeal, Bernard de Clairvaux was neither a bigot nor a persecutor. Yet, as in the First Crusade, his preaching of the Second Crusade led to mob attacks on the Jews; and, as in the First Crusade Pierre l'hermite and Gaultier sans avoir had led murderous gangs of Crusaders on a rampage through Jewish towns on the Rhine, a fanatical French monk named Rodolphe inspired the massacres of the Jews in the Rhenish cities of Cologne, Mainz, Worms, and Speyer, claiming that the Jews were not contributing financially to the rescue of the Holy Land. Bernard of Clairvaux, the Archbishop of Cologne, and the Archbishop of Mainz were vehemently opposed to these attacks, and Bernard travelled from Flanders to Germany to deal with the problem and calm the mobs. Bernard then found Rodolphe in Mainz and was able to silence him and return him to his monastery.

The Second Crusade was the first of the crusades to be led by European Christian kings—Louis VII of France (*Louis le jeune*, roy des François, 1120–1180) and Conrad III of Germany (1093–1152)—with help from some other important European nobles. While Louis was the undisputed king of France, Conrad was never crowned “Holy Roman Emperor” by the pope. He continued to style himself *Rex Romanorum* until his death. The armies of these two unfortunate kings marched separately across Europe towards Constantinople, and were alternately and ambivalently helped and hindered by the Byzantine emperor, Manuel Komnenos, who feared their taking his territories.

One of the leaders of the Second Crusade was Joscelin II, Count of Edessa (died 1159). The young Joscelin had been taken prisoner by the Seljuk Turkish “Saracens” at the Battle of Azaz in 1125, but was ransomed by Baudouin II, King of Jerusalem. In 1131, Joscelin’s father, Joscelin de Courtenay, was seriously injured in battle with the Danishmends, the Turkoman dynasty that ruled north-central and eastern Anatolia in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and Edessa passed to his son. Joscelin II feared to march the small Edessan army out to meet the powerful Danishmends, so his father, in his last act, did so, and forced the Danishmends to retreat, dying

soon after. Joscelin's landlocked Edessa was the weakest and most isolated of the Crusader states.

In 1138, Joscelin II of Edessa allied himself with the Prince of Antioch and with the Byzantine emperor Johannes II Komnenos to attack the atabeg of Mosul and Aleppo, Imad ad-Din Zengi al-Malik al-Mansur (the Victorious King, 1085–1146), who ruled under the Abbasid caliphs. The atabeg was subordinate to the *sultan* and charged with raising the crown prince. The title first appeared among the early Seljuk Turks, and was later used by the Armenians. Zengi defeated the "Franks" and drove them back. In the "Frankish" principality of Antioch, popular sentiment against the Byzantine Empire, which Johannes Komnenos was trying to extend into the northern "Latin" Crusader states of Edessa, Tripoli, and Antioch, led to a riot, engineered by Joscelin. The Byzantine emperor was forced to return home.

In 1143, both Emperor Johannes Komnenos of Byzantium and King Foulques (Fulk) of Jerusalem died, leaving Joscelin with no powerful allies to help him defend Edessa against the "Saracens". In 1144, Atabeg Zengi of Aleppo and Mosul invaded and captured Edessa. Joscelin fled to Turbessel (now Tilbeşar in southeastern Turkey), where he held the remnants of the county west of the Euphrates River. In 1146, following the murder of Atabeg Zengi by his own Frankish slave, Yarankash, Joscelin attempted to take Edessa back from the Seljuk Turks. The murder was described by the Muslim historian Ibn al-Qalanisi of Damascus:

... one of [Zengi's] attendants, for whom he had a special affection, and in whose company he delighted ... who nursed a secret grudge against him on account of some injury previously done to him by the *Atabeg*, had, on finding an opportunity when he was off his guard in his drunkenness, and with the connivance and assistance of certain of his comrades amongst the attendants, assassinated him in his sleep on the eve of Sunday, 6th Second Rabi [the night of Saturday 14th September]. [Ibn al-Qalanisi, 1932]

According to Ibn al-Qalanisi, Yarankash stabbed the atabeg numerous times, killed him, then fled to the fortress of Dawsar, and then to Damascus, "in the confident belief that he would be secure there, openly putting forward his action as a claim to consideration, and imagining that he would be made welcome." The governor of

Damascus, Mu'in ad-Din Unur, instead had Yarankash arrested and sent him to Zengi's son, Nur ad-Din, in Aleppo. Nur ad-Din sent him on to his brother, Saif ad-Din Ghazi, in Mosul, who had Yarankash beheaded. Zengi's son and successor, al-Malik al-Adil Nur ad-Din Abu al-Qasim Mahmud Ibn Imad ad-Din Zengi (1118–1174), defeated Prince Joscelin in 1150. Joscelin languished in the "Saracen" prison and died in the Citadel of Aleppo in 1159. His daughter, Agnes de Courtenay (circa 1138–1184), was engaged to the Crusader nobleman Hugues d'Ibeline (Hugh of Ibelin). Instead, she briefly married Amalric (1136–1174), Count of Jaffa and of Ascalon.

In 1162, King Baudouin III of Jerusalem (1130–1162) died, and the "Latin" kingdom passed to Amalric. Although there was some opposition among the nobility to Agnes, they were willing to accept the marriage in 1157, when Baudouin III was still capable of siring an heir, but now the *Haute Cour*, or High Court, refused to endorse Amalric as king unless his marriage to Agnes was annulled. The nobles' hostility to Agnes may have been exaggerated by Guillaume de Tyr (William of Tyre), whom she prevented from becoming the "Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem" decades later, as well as by Guillaume's "continuator", like Ernoul, the author of a chronicle of the late twelfth century dealing with the fall of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, who hints at a slight on her moral character: "*car telle n'est que roïne doie iestre di si haute cite comme de Jherusalem*" (for there should not be such a queen for so high a city as Jerusalem).

Consanguinity, which meant incest, had led to the nobles' opposition to Amalric's marriage with Agnes. Amalric then agreed to annul his marriage to Agnes and ascended the throne of Jerusalem single. Agnes continued to hold the title Countess of Jaffa and Ascalon, and received a pension from that fief's income. She married Hugues d'Ibeline, to whom she had been engaged before her marriage to Amalric. The Church ruled that Amalric's and Agnes's children were legitimate and preserved their place in the order of succession. Through her children, Agnes exerted much influence in Jerusalem for almost two decades. After her divorce from Amalric, she held the lands and incomes of the County of Jaffa, while Joscelin's son, Joscelin III, held the title Count of Edessa, being in reality the lord of a small seigneurie near Acre.

Joscelin's grandchildren, Sibylla (circa 1160–1190) and her brother Baudouin IV (1161–1181), the Leper King, both of them

children of Amalric and Agnes, were monarchs of Jerusalem. So was Joscelin's great-grandson, Baudouin V, who led a "crusade in the East". In early 1147, the French Crusaders met at Estampes in southwestern France to discuss their route. The Germans had already decided to travel overland through Hungary, as King Roger II of Sicily was an enemy of Conrad, and the sea route was politically impractical. Many of the French nobles distrusted the land route, which would take them through the Byzantine Empire, whose reputation still suffered from the accounts of the First Crusaders. Nevertheless, it was decided to follow Conrad, and to set out on 15 June 1147.

Roger II was offended and refused to participate in the crusade any longer. In France, Abbot Suger and Count Guillaume II of Nevers were elected as regents while the king would be on crusade. In Germany, further preaching was done by Adam of Ebrach, and Otto of Freising also took the cross. On 13 March 1147, at Frankfurt, Conrad's son Friedrich was elected king by the Reichstag, under the regency of Henry, Archbishop of Mainz. The Germans planned to set out at Easter, but did not leave until May.

### *Baltic "Saracens"*

One of the fascinating things about the Crusades was their fantastic use of the word "Saracens" for any enemy of the "Franks", as well as their turning away from their initial goal of rescuing the "Holy Sepulchre", the "Holy City", and the "Holy Land" from the "evil Saracens" and waging a "holy war" against "pagan idolaters" in Europe itself. By the twelfth century, the peoples inhabiting the Baltic lands (now Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania) formed a "pagan" wedge between increasingly powerful Christian states, Greek Orthodox to their east and Roman Catholic to their west. The conflict and difference in creeds between the Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox churches was one of the reasons they had not been Christianized. During a period of about 150 years leading up to the arrival of the German "Crusaders" in the region, Estonia was attacked thirteen times by Russian Orthodox principalities, and by Denmark and Sweden as well. The Estonians, for their part, raided Denmark and Sweden. There were some peaceful attempts by the western Christians to convert the Estonians, starting with missions

dispatched by Adalbert, Archbishop of Bremen from 1045 to 1072. However, these peaceful efforts had very limited success.

In 1147, with new religious fervour, Pope Eugene III, who, along with Bernard of Clairvaux, had preached the Second Crusade, authorized the “Wendish Crusade” (*Wendenkreuzzug*), a campaign of German Crusaders against the Polabian Slavs or “Wends” in north-eastern Germany (as well as an Iberian crusade against the “Moors” of Spain). In the case of the Wendish Crusade, the “Saracen” enemy was no longer Muslim, but, rather, “pagan”. The Christians saw it as a “holy war” for Jesus Christ. The “Wendish Crusade” began in the twelfth century, but it went on irregularly for four centuries, not ending until the sixteenth century and the Reformation. As always, internal conflicts within the Christian world led to “holy wars” on non-Christians.

In 1180, in the wake of German merchants who followed the old trading routes of the Vikings, a German monk named Meinhard landed at the mouth of the Daugava River (now in Latvia) and was made Bishop of Ikškile in 1186. In 1193, Pope Celestine III proclaimed a crusade against the Baltic “heathen”. A crusading expedition led by Meinhard’s successor, Bishop Berthold, landed in “Livonia” (part of present-day Latvia surrounding the Gulf of Riga) in 1198. Although the Crusaders won their first battle, Bishop Berthold was mortally wounded and the Crusaders were repulsed by the “Saracens”. The first Baltic Crusade (1199–1266), which had been called by Pope Celestine III six years earlier, was directed against the Balts, Livs, Letts, Prussians, and other “pagans”—who were, incredibly, called “Saracens” by the German knights, who converted them by the sword. The Arabs and Muslims were forgotten. The “Saracens” were now the Baltic peoples.

One of the Baltic Crusades, the “Livonian Crusade”, was the German and Danish conquest and colonization of Livonia (now in Latvia and Estonia). The lands on the eastern shores of the Baltic Sea were the last corners of Europe to be Christianized. During the Livonian Crusade, ancient Livonia was colonized by the “Livonian Brothers of the Sword”, later called the Livonian Knights, and the name Livonia came to designate a larger territory: the Livonian Confederation on the eastern coasts of the Baltic Sea. Its frontiers were the Gulf of Riga and the Gulf of Finland in the northwest, Lake Peipus and Russia to the east, and Lithuania to the south.

Before they were united in 1237, the Livonian Knights and the Teutonic Knights, both Germanic monastic orders, vied for the Christianization of the Baltic tribes. The Baltic Crusades lasted several centuries, and paralleled the "Holy Land" crusades. The Teutonic Knights, who had been formed in the "Holy Land" capital of Acre around 1192, and the Livonian Knights sought to Christianize many "heathen" tribes: the Polabian Slavs and Sorbs (Christianized by the Saxons, Danes, and Poles, beginning with the Wendish Crusade), the Finns (Christianized by the Swedes), the Estonians, Latgalians, and "Livonians" (Christianized by the Germans and Danes), the Lithuanians (Christianized by the Germans, unsuccessfully, in 1316), the Curonians and Semigallians, the Old Prussians, the Polabian Wends and Obotrites (between the Elbe and Oder rivers).

Meanwhile, the only success of the Second Crusade was not in the "Holy Land" but in Europe, outside of the Mediterranean, where Flemish, Frisian, Norman, English, Scottish, and German Crusaders, on the way by ship to the Holy Land, fortuitously stopped and helped the Portuguese in the capture of Lisbon from the "Saracens". Some of them, who had departed earlier, helped capture Santarém earlier in the same year. Later, they also helped conquer Sintra, Almada, Palmela, and Setúbal, and were allowed to stay in the conquered lands, where they had offspring. After crossing Byzantine territory from Constantinople into Anatolia, both armies were defeated in 1148 by the Seljuk Turks. Louis of France and Conrad of Germany and the surviving remnants of their armies did reach Jerusalem and, in 1148, participated in another ill-advised attack on Damascus, which also failed. The Second Crusade was a great failure for the Crusaders and a great victory for the Muslims. It would ultimately lead to the fall of Jerusalem in 1187 and to the Third Crusade that followed, at the end of the twelfth century.

Meanwhile, in northeastern Europe, the first Baltic Crusade (1199–1266) began, with the intent of converting the "pagan" Baltic tribes to Christianity. The official beginning of the Northern Crusades was Pope Celestine III's call in 1193 to Christianize the "heathen" peoples of the Baltic, but the already Christian kingdoms of Scandinavia and the "Holy Roman Empire" of Germany and Italy had started to subjugate their "pagan" neighbours earlier. These "crusades" would last four centuries, but they had nothing to do

with the crusades in the Holy Land. These “Northern Crusades” were undertaken by the Catholic kings of Denmark and Sweden, the German Livonian and Teutonic military orders, and their allies against the pagan peoples of Northern Europe around the southern and eastern shores of the Baltic Sea (including the Prussi, Letts, Finns, Livs, and Eesti). Some of these wars were called “crusades” during the Middle Ages; others, including most of the Swedish ones, were first dubbed “crusades” by nineteenth-century romantic historians. The eastern Baltic was transformed by military conquest: first the Livs, Letts, and Estonians, then the Prussians and the Finns underwent defeat, baptism, military occupation, and sometimes extermination by groups of Germans, Danes, and Swedes.

The Latin documents of the Baltic Crusade of 1199–1266 give us a flavour of the fantastic quality of the Crusader ideas about the “Saracens” whom they were fighting to Christianize and of what went through their minds as they set out on their “crusade”. For example, in 1211, Pope Innocent III signed an agreement with the Livonian Knights, or Brothers of the Sword, in which nothing was said about the people to be force-converted, but very much was said about lands, property, wealth, and titles.

As for lands which the Brothers acquire with the help of God outside Livonia or Lettia, they will not answer to the Bishop of Riga for these, nor will he trouble them in any way over them. But they will obey what the Apostolic See tells them. The Brothers will obey the rule of the Knighthood of the Temple, but will have a different symbol on their habit, to show that they are not subject to them. [Migne, 1844–1855, vol. 1, no. 141; vol. 216, col. 325–326, translation by Helen Nicholson]

In 1266, at the end of the first Baltic Crusade, the thirteenth-century English Franciscan monk Roger Bacon (1214–1294), also known as *Doctor Mirabilis* (Wonderful Teacher), one of the most famous Franciscan friars of his time, wrote his *Opus Maius*, in which he described the Baltic crusade and referred to the “heathen” convertees as “Saracens”. Bacon discussed the importance of learning foreign languages, arguing that the third reason for needing to learn languages is to be able to convert the infidel by speaking to them in their own tongue: “And so an infinite number of Jews perish among us, because no one knows how to preach to them, nor

to interpret the scripture in their language, nor to confer with them nor dispute" (Bacon, 1877–1900, vol. 3, pp. 121–122, translation by Helen Nicholson).

A learned man, Roger Bacon argued that the Christian religion came from the Jewish one, that the Jews were from the seed of the patriarchs and prophets, that Jesus Christ Our Lord was a Jew, as were the Virgin Mary and the apostles and innumerable saints. Also, he wrote, the Greeks and the Russians and many other "schismatics" (Greek Orthodox Christians who call themselves Christian but do not acknowledge papal authority) remain in error because there is no one to preach the truth to them in their own language. Similarly with the "Saracens" and pagans and Tatars and other infidels throughout the whole world (*ibid.*, translation by Helen Nicholson).

Bacon believed that war could not solve the problem of Christianization either:

Nor is war against them any use, since sometimes the Church loses out in Christians' wars, as often happens Overseas [i.e. in the Holy Land] and especially in the last expedition, i.e. the lord King of France's, as the whole world knows [the Seventh Crusade, or Louis IX's first crusade]; and even if the Christians conquer, there is no one who defends the occupied lands. Nor are the infidels converted thus but killed and sent to hell. But as for the rest [of the infidels] who survive after the battle, their sons are stirred up more and more against the Christian faith because of those wars, and move an infinite distance away from the faith of Christ, and are inflamed to do every evil which they can against the Christians. [*ibid.*, translation by Helen Nicholson]

Bacon denounced the violence of the Teutonic Knights while using the term "Saracens" to refer to all "infidels", including the Baltic ones:

So the Saracens, because of this, become impossible to convert in many parts of the world, and especially Overseas and in Prussia and the lands bordering Germany, because the Templars and Hospitallers and the brothers of the Teutonic order much disturb the conversion of infidels because of the wars which they are always starting, and because of the fact that they wish to dominate them absolutely. For there is no doubt that all the infidel nations



beyond Germany would have been converted long ago, if it was not for the violence of the brothers of the Teutonic order. The pagan race has many times been ready to receive the faith in peace after preaching, but those of the Teutonic order do not wish to allow this, because they wish to subjugate them and reduce them to slavery. By subtle persuasions they have already deceived the Roman Church for many years . . . Besides, faith does not come into this world through weapons but by simple preaching, as I have shown. And we have many times heard and we are certain that many, however imperfectly they know languages and have poor interpreters have nevertheless done much useful work by preaching, and converted many to the Christian faith. [*ibid.*, translation by Helen Nicholson]

Thus did the word “Saracens” come to designate anyone who was not European and Christian, and even Christians like the Basques who had fought against the “Franks”.

## Templars and Hospitallers: monkish knights

**K**ing Baudouin's reign in Jerusalem, which lasted from 1118 to 1131, saw the establishment of the Crusader military orders, the Knights Hospitaller and the Knights Templar. These extraordinary Christian orders combined knighthood with monasticism in a way that had not been known in Europe: there you were either a monk or a knight. The *Ordre des Hospitaliers* was also known as "the Sovereign Military Hospitaller Order of St John of Jerusalem", and later became the Order of St John, the Knights of Rhodes, and the Knights of Malta. This unique Christian organization began as an Amalfitan hospital founded in Jerusalem in 1080, under "Saracen" rule, to care for poor, sick, or injured Christian pilgrims to the Holy Land. After the Christian conquest of Jerusalem in 1099, it became a religious-military order under its own charter, and was charged with the care and defence of the Holy Land. How could those monkish knights, whose job was to take care of sick people, defend the Holy Land against the "Saracens"?

The headquarters of the *Hospitaliers* in the "Holy Land" during the Crusades was a mighty fortress called *Le Krak des Chevaliers* in Syria. The word *Krak* came from the old Syriac word *karak*, meaning fortress. It was also called in French *Le Crac des Chevaliers*, and the

Arabs called it *Qala'at al-Hisn*. The nearby *Qala'at Salah ed-Din* (The fortress of Saladin) was in the Principality of Antioch, but was taken from the "Franks" by the "Saracens" in 1188. *Le Krak des Chevaliers* was expanded between 1150 and 1250 and housed a garrison of 2,000 Knights Hospitaller. The inner curtain wall was up to 100 feet thick at the base on the south side, with seven guard towers 30 feet in diameter. King Edward I of England, while on the Ninth Crusade in 1272, saw the fortress and used it as an example for his own castles in England and Wales.

The *Ordre des Templiers* was founded in 1119 by the French knight Hugues de Payens and his relative, Godefroy de Saint-Omer. They proposed the creation of a monastic order for the protection of the pilgrims. King Baudouin accepted their proposal. The order was formally called *Pauperes commilitones Christi Templique Solomonici* (The Poor Fellow-Soldiers of Christ and of the Temple of Solomon). Its original purpose was to ensure the safety of the many European Christians who made the pilgrimage to Jerusalem after its conquest. The Crusaders called the site of the Dome of the Rock *Templum Solomonis*. Around 1129, the Templars were officially endorsed by the Roman Catholic Church. Their order became a favoured charity across Europe and grew rapidly in membership and power. Templar knights, in their distinctive white mantles with a large red cross on it, were among the most skilled fighting units of the Crusades, and the most warlike. Non-combatant members of the order managed a large economic infrastructure throughout Christendom, innovating financial techniques that were an early form of banking, and building many fortifications across Europe and the Holy Land.

The Hospitaller order was founded by the monk Gerard Thom (1040–1120), also known as Tom, Tum, Tune, and Tenque. This French monk was either born at Amalfi, or at Martigues in Provence, or in the Chateau d'Avesnes in Hainaut. He went to Jerusalem in 1097, either as a soldier or a merchant, where the hospice of St John had existed since 1080 for the convenience of those who wished to visit the Christian holy places. Gerard Thom became the provost of this institution around 1100, and he organized that religious order of St John which received papal recognition from Pope Paschal II in 1113, by the papal bull entitled *Geraudo institutori ac praeposito Hirosolimitani Xenodochii*. It was renewed and

confirmed by Pope Calixtus II shortly before the death of Gerard in 1120.

The first Grand Master of the *Templiers* was Hugues de Payens (1070–1136), the French knight from the Champagne region, and the co-founder with his relative, Godefroy de Saint-Omer, of the Order of the Knights Templar. With Saint Bernard of Clairvaux, he created the Latin Rule, the code of behaviour for the Order. The Templars being the foremost Crusader fighters, their fortunes were tied closely to those of the crusades. At first victorious, the Second Crusade brought them losses and trouble. In 1187, they lost a major battle at Hattin to the “Saracens” under Saladin, who went on to take Jerusalem from “*al-Franj*”. In 1291, the last Crusaders were forced out of the “Holy Land” after the capture and destruction of their capital, “Saint-Jean d’Acre”, by the mamluks, and the “Kingdom of Jerusalem” was no more. After that, support for the Order waned. False rumours about “un-Christian” acts at the Templars’ secret initiation ceremony created mistrust, and King Philippe le Bel of France, who was deeply in debt to the Order, pressured Pope Clement V to take action.

In 1307, using the false pretext of the “heretical” initiation ceremonies, King Philippe le Bel had many of the Order’s members in France arrested, tortured into giving false confessions, and burned at the stake, including their last Grand Master, Jacques de Molay. In 1312, Pope Clement, under continuing pressure from King Philip, disbanded the Order. The abrupt disappearance of a major part of the European infrastructure of the *Templiers* gave rise to much speculation and legends about the Templars’ subsequent fortunes, which have kept the “Templar” name alive into the modern day. The freemasons believe they, too, were Templars. Since the 1700s, the York Rite of Freemasonry has incorporated some Templar symbols and rituals, and it has a modern degree called “the Order of the Temple”. The Sovereign Military Order of the Temple of Jerusalem, founded in 1804, has achieved United Nations NGO status as a charitable organization. There is no clear historical link, however, between the Knights Templar, which were dismantled in the 1300s, and any of these newer organizations, of which the earliest emerged in the 1700s.

In 1854, Christoph Hoffmann, a Lutheran clergyman, started the paper *Süddeutsche Warte*, an “organ for the gathering of the children

of God in Jerusalem". In 1861, the Tempel-Gesellschaft, also called *Deutscher Tempel* or *Jerusalemsfreunde* (Friends of Jerusalem), was organized by Christoph Hoffmann at a meeting of the Friends of Jerusalem at Ludwigsburg, near Stuttgart, in Germany. The new movement was rooted in Württemberg Pietism. Gottlieb Hoffmann, the father of Christoph Hoffmann, had founded the separatist settlement of Korntal near Stuttgart. Another religious fanatic named Philipp Hahn influenced Christoph Hoffmann regarding the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth and called all true believers "out of Babel", later adding the notion of gathering them in Palestine in order to be enabled to "build the temple of God". Around 1870, a group of German Mennonites called themselves "Templars" and set out to the Holy Land. They established colonies in Jerusalem, Haifa, Jaffa, "Wilhelma", and other places. During both World Wars the "Templars" were interned as German citizens. During the Second World War, their German Nazi descendants were deported to Australia by the British mandatory government of Palestine.

The earliest surviving laws of the Kingdom of Jerusalem were compiled at the Council of Neapolis (Nablus or Shechem) in 1120, and its first commercial treaty with Venice, the *Pactum Warmundi*, was written in 1124; the increase of naval and military support from Venice led to the capture of Tyre from the "Saracens" that year. The influence of the Kingdom of Jerusalem was also further extended over the county of Edessa and the principality of Antioch, where Baudouin II acted as regent when their rulers were killed in battle, although there were regency governments in Jerusalem as well during Baudouin's captivity. Baudouin was married to the Armenian princess Morphia of Melitene, and had four daughters by her: Hodierna and Alice, who married into the noble families of the Count of Tripoli and Prince of Antioch; Ioveta, who became an influential abbess; and the eldest, Melisende, who was Baudouin's heir, and succeeded him upon his death in 1131, with her husband, Foulques V of Jerusalem, the former Count Foulques of Anjou, as her king-consort. Foulques died in 1143. Their son, the future Baudouin III, was also named co-heir by his grandfather.

## The “Saracens” look at the “Franks”

A few scholars, both Western and Muslim, have collected and translated the Arabic and Muslim sources about the crusades into European languages. This should give us an understanding of how the Muslim “Saracens” saw themselves and their “Frankish” enemies. An Italian scholar, Francesco Gabrieli, translated the Muslim historians of the crusades from the Arabic into Italian and his book was translated into English (Gabrieli, 1969). Amin Maalouf (born 1949), a Lebanese Arab journalist and writer, and a former editor of *An-Nahar*, the leading Arabic-language daily in Lebanon, published a book in which he brought together various Arabic sources on the crusades (Maalouf, 1983). Some scholars, however, see this book as an inaccurate historical novel.

Carole Hillenbrand, an Islamic Studies scholar at the University of Edinburgh in Scotland, has published an extraordinary collection of Muslim writings on the Crusades, as well as Muslim pictorial images of the Crusaders (Hillenbrand, 1999). Her study is very important for the understanding of the Muslim tenacity in the Crusader wars. Hillenbrand pointed out that mediæval Muslims considered their civilization, with its medicine, mathematics, art,

and religion, superior to that of the “Franks”, and felt that they had little to learn from the Europeans:

Western Europe held few attractions to the medieval Muslims; from their perspective their own culture was so obviously more sophisticated and advanced. The medieval Muslim felt superiority and condescension toward Christians. For him it was indisputable that Christianity, an incomplete and imperfect revelation, had been superseded and perfected by Islam, the final Revelation, and that the Prophet Muhammad was the seal of the prophets. [Hillenbrand, 1999, p. 267]

Unlike Westerners, Arabs and Muslims use the time frame of the *Hijra*, the year of the migration of the Prophet Muhammad and his followers to the city of Medina (622), marking it the first year of the Islamic calendar. One of the first mediæval Muslim historians to write about the crusades was the Damascus scholar Hamza ibn Asad abu-Ya’la ibn al-Qalanisi (1070–1160), who saw the “Frankish” armies entering his country when he was in his twenties. His chronicle, *Dhail Ta’rikh Dimashq* (Continuation of the Chronicle of Damascus), was an extension of the chronicle of his predecessor Hilal bin al-Muhassin al-Sabi (died 1055), covering the years 363 to 555 of the *Hijrah*, to Ibn al-Qalanisi’s death in 1160 (Ibn al-Qalanisi, 1932). His chronicle is one of the few contemporary accounts of the First Crusade and its immediate aftermath from the Muslim perspective. It is an invaluable source for modern historians, and was also an important source for later Muslim chroniclers, including the Kurdish Muslim chronicler Abu al-Hassan Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Muhammad, also known as Ali ‘izz al-Din ibn al-Athir al-Jazari (1160–1233) or, for short, Ibn al-Athir. In addition to chronicling the crusades, Ibn al-Qalanisi wrote about the rivalries and wars among the petty Arab princes, the terrible, murderous, and burning hatred between Radwan and Duqaq in Syria, and the helplessness of the Abbasid caliphate in Baghdad, which also ruled Damascus, in the face of the “Franks.”

We learn from Ibn al-Qalanisi that in the summer of the year 492 of the *Hijra* (August 1099), after the fall of Jerusalem to the “Franks”, al-Harawi, the chief *qadi* or Muslim religious leader of Damascus in Syria, preached a sermon in the Great Mosque of Baghdad, crying, “Your brethren in Syria have no home other than

the saddles of their camels or the entrails of vultures". Al-Harawi was surrounded by a throng of Syrian and Palestinian refugees who wept as he spoke, and their weeping made others weep in turn. Al-Harawi was preaching about the need to fight the "Frankish" armies of the First Crusade, which had arrived in Syria in 1097 and had later occupied Antioch, Edessa, and, finally, in 1099, Jerusalem. Muslims from there and other places had fled to the larger Muslim cities of the hinterland, in particular to Damascus and Aleppo in Syria. At the end of the eleventh century, Syria and Palestine were, theoretically at least, part of the Seljuk Turkish sultanate, and, as such, subject to the authority of the Abbasid caliph in Baghdad and of the Seljuk sultan in Isfahan.

Al-Harawi's mission in Baghdad was to put pressure on the Abbasid Caliph, al-Mustadhir Billah (1078–1136), to send an army to help the Muslims against the Crusaders. However, Baghdad was a long way from Jerusalem and, moreover, al-Mustadhir had no troops to speak of. In fact, as we have seen, the Fatimids of Egypt had taken Jerusalem from the Seljuks before being defeated by the "Franks". Muslim preachers travelled throughout the Abbasid caliphate proclaiming the tragedy and rousing men to recover from infidel hands the Al-Aqsa Mosque, which they believed to be the scene of the Prophet's heavenly flight. But whatever the success elsewhere, the mission failed in the eastern provinces, which were preoccupied with their own troubles, and moreover cared little for the Holy Land, dominated as it then was by the Fatimid Shi'ites. Crowds of Muslim exiles, seeking refuge in Baghdad, joined there with the populace in crying out for war against the "Franks". For two Fridays in 1111 the insurgents, incited by Abu'l Fadl Ibn al-Khashshab, the *qadi* of Aleppo, stormed the Great Mosque, broke the pulpit and throne of the Caliph in pieces, and shouted down the service, but neither the Sultan nor the Caliph were interested in sending an army to the "west".

One of the most important Arab historians of the crusades was Usamah ibn Munqidh (1095–1188), a Muslim *emir* and counsellor of the statesman and general Imad ad-Din Zengi al-Malik al-Mansur (the Victorious King, 1085–1146), the *atabeg* of Mosul and Aleppo (Cobb, 2005; Irwin, 1998). Zengi himself ruled under the Seljuk Turkish sultan before being murdered by his Frankish slave, Yarankash. Ibn Munqidh wrote a memoir entitled *Kitab al-i'tibar*



(the book of learning by example) which was published in English by Philip Khuri Hitti (1886–1978), a Lebanese-born Arab-American scholar (Ibn Munqidh, 1929). This book tells us a great deal about the Muslim attitude toward the “Franks” in the twelfth century. The Muslims compared the “Frankish” culture to their own and found it inferior (Hillenbrand, 1999, pp. 267–268).

Hitti thought that the Franks’ apparent lack of jealousy in sexual matters shocked the conservative Muslims, for whom female sexual honour, or *’ird*, was paramount. Indeed, in Muslim and Arab society *’ird* was more important than *sharaf* (honour). *’Ird* translates roughly into English as “chastity”, or “purity”. *’Ird* was the honour of women, depending on their chastity and faithfulness. Its value could only decrease. Exemplary sexual and moral behaviour could not increase a woman’s *’ird*, but sexual misconduct reduced or killed it. The honour of the Arab family, clan, or tribe, the respect accorded to it by others, can be gravely damaged when one of its women’s *’ird* is violated. If an Arab woman became pregnant out of wedlock, she would almost always be killed in an “honour killing” by her own father or brother, to save the family’s honour (Feldner, 2000; Patai, 1973, pp. 120–125).

The Franks had no such notion, and the Muslims did not understand them at all. Like other Muslims, Ibn Munqidh was amazed by Frankish customs. When his Frankish friend, a knight in the army of King Foulques of Jerusalem (1089/1092–1143), the former Count of Anjou, offered to take his son away to the “Frankish” lands, Ibn Munqidh thought him foolish:

In the army of King Foulques, son of Foulques, was a Frankish reverend knight who had just arrived from their land in order to make the holy pilgrimage and then return home. He was of my intimate fellowship and kept such constant company with me that he began to call me “my brother.” Between us were mutual bonds of amity and friendship. When he resolved to return by sea to his homeland, he said to me: “My brother, I am leaving for my country and I want you to send with me thy son (my son, who was then fourteen years old, was at that time in my company) to our country, where he can see the knights and learn wisdom and chivalry. When he returns, he will be like a wise man.” Thus there fell upon my ears words which would never come out of the head of a sensible man; for even if my son were to be taken captive, his captivity

could not bring him a worse misfortune than carrying him into the lands of the Franks. [Ibn Munqidh, 1929, p. 161]

Ibn Munqidh also relates that the Muslims mocked the Frankish justice system. When a dispute arose among two Franks, they fought a duel to settle it. To test the veracity of a man's statements in a trial, they tried to drown him in a cask of water. Here is a typical passage from *Kitab al-'itibar*:

I once went in the company of *al-Amir* Mu'in-al-Din (may Allah's mercy rest upon his soul!) to Jerusalem. We stopped at Nablus. There a blind man, a Muslim, who was still young and was well dressed, presented himself before the *amir* carrying fruits for him and asked permission to be admitted into his service in Damascus. The *amir* consented. I inquired about this man and was informed that his mother had been married to a Frank whom she had killed. Her son used to practice ruses against the Frankish pilgrims and cooperate with his mother in assassinating them. They [the Franks] finally brought charges against him and tried his case according to the Frankish way of [legal] procedure. They installed a huge cask and filled it with water. Across it they set a board of wood. They then bound the arms of the man charged with the act, tied a rope around his shoulders and dropped him into the cask, their idea being that in case he was innocent, he would sink in the water and they would then lift him up with the rope so that he might not die in the water; and in case he was guilty, he would not sink in the water. This man did his best to sink when they dropped him into the water, but he could not do it. So he had to submit to their sentence against him—may Allah's curse be upon them! They pierced his eyeballs with red-hot awls. [*ibid.*, p. 168]

To the Muslims of the twelfth century, their own system of justice, based on *Shari'a* law, was much more fair and advanced. Ibn Munqidh saw the "Frankish" culture as far inferior to his own. Their medicine was hopelessly primitive, ignorant, and cruel. There were "Frankish" patients whom Ibn Munqidh personally and successfully treated with simple, natural means, and whom the Frankish physicians then killed with their ignorant, superstitious, and brutal treatments. On the other hand, Ibn Munqidh cited a case in which the Frankish physicians knew how to cure their patients:

The king of the Franks had for treasurer a knight named Bernard, who (may Allah's curse be upon him!) was one of the most accursed and wicked among the Franks. A horse kicked him in the leg, which was subsequently infected and which opened in fourteen different places. Every time one of these cuts would close in one place, another would open in another place. All this happened while I was praying for his perdition. Then came to him a Frankish physician and removed from the leg all the ointments which were on it and began to wash it with very strong vinegar. By this treatment all the cuts were healed and the man became well again. He was up again like a devil. [Ibn Munqidh, 1929, p. 163]

There was yet another case of a patient in which Ibn Munqidh admitted that he had learnt medicine from his Frankish colleagues:

Another case illustrating their curious medicine is the following: In Shayzar we had an artisan named Abu-al-Fath, who had a boy whose neck was afflicted with scrofula [swellings of the lymph nodes]. Every time a part of it would close, another part would open. This man happened to go to Antioch on business of his, accompanied by his son. A Frank noticed the boy and asked his father about him. Abu-al-Fath replied, "This is my son." The Frank said to him, "Wilt thou swear by thy religion that if I prescribe to you a medicine which will cure thy boy, thou wilt charge nobody fees for prescribing it thyself? In that case, I shall prescribe to you a medicine which will cure the boy." The man took the oath and the Frank said: "Take uncrushed leaves of glasswort, burn them, then soak the ashes in olive oil and sharp vinegar. Treat the scrofula with them until the spot on which it is growing is eaten up. Then take burnt lead, soak it in ghee butter and treat him with it. That will cure him." The father treated the boy accordingly, and the boy was cured. The sores closed and the boy returned to his normal condition of health. I have myself treated with this medicine many who were afflicted with such disease, and the treatment was successful in removing the cause of the complaint. [*ibid.*]

Nonetheless, the unconscious process of dehumanization was operating in full force. Ibn Munqidh often saw the *Franks* as animals. They had the qualities of courage and fighting, but no other. Just as the early Crusaders thought of the Muslims as "that evil race", the Muslims looked down on the *frank* and thought them foolish. The

Muslims were willing to co-operate with the *Franj* when it served their interests. Some Muslim rulers allied themselves with Crusader states against their rival Muslims. They also treated newly-arrived "Franks", who were still full of fanatical hatred for the "Saracens", differently from those who had been in their country for years, and who had got used to Muslim ways. Here is a significant passage:

Among the Franks are those who have become acclimatized and have associated long with the Muslims. These are much better than the recent comers from the Frankish lands. But they constitute the exception and cannot be treated as a rule. Here is an illustration. I dispatched one of my men to Antioch on business. There was in Antioch at that time *al-Ra'is* [the head ruler] Theodoros Sophianos, to whom I was bound by mutual ties of amity. His influence in Antioch was supreme. One day he said to my man, "I am invited by a friend of mine who is a Frank. Thou shouldst come with me so that thou mayest see their fashions." My man related the story in the following words: "I went along with him and we came to the home of a knight who belonged to the old category of knights who came with the early expeditions of the Franks. He had been by that time stricken off the register and exempted from service, and possessed in Antioch an estate on the income of which he lived. The knight presented an excellent table, with food extraordinarily clean and delicious. Seeing me abstaining from food, he said, 'Eat, be of good cheer!' I never eat Frankish dishes, but I have Egyptian women cooks and never eat except their cooking. Besides, pork never enters my home. I ate, but guardedly, and after that we departed. As I was passing in the market place, a Frankish woman all of a sudden hung to my clothes and began to mutter words in their language, and I could not understand what she was saying. This made me immediately the center of a big crowd of Franks. I was convinced that death was at hand. But all of a sudden that same knight approached. On seeing me, he came and said to that woman, 'What is the matter between you and this Muslim?' She replied, 'This is he who has killed my brother Hurso.' This Hurso was a knight in Afiimiyah who was killed by someone of the army of Hamah. The Christian knight shouted at her, saying, 'This is a bourgeois (i.e., a merchant) who neither fights nor attends a fight.' He also yelled at the people who had assembled, and they all dispersed. Then he took me by the hand and went away. Thus the effect of that meal was my deliverance from certain death." [*ibid.*, pp. 169–170]

Ibn Munqidh's memoir *kitab al i'tibar* is a very important source for our understanding of how the Muslims perceived the "Franks" who had invaded their lands (which they had taken from the Byzantines in the seventh century).

Ibn Munqidh was not the only "Saracen" chronicler of the Crusades. Other important Muslim and Arab chroniclers of the crusades were Imad ad-Din Muhammad ibn Muhammad al-Katib al-Isfahani (1125–1201), who wrote the exploits of Sultan Salah ed-Din (Saladin), Baha ad-Din ibn Shaddad (1145–1234), whose honorific title *Baha ad-Din* means "splendour of the faith", a Muslim jurist and scholar who wrote a biography of Saladin, whom he knew well (Ibn Shaddad, 2001), and Muhyi ad-Din ibn Abd az-Zahir (1223–1292), one of the historians of mamluk Egypt, who served under two early mamluk sultans. The Lebanese Arab writer Amin Maalouf claimed that mediæval Arab historians enjoyed a high social and political standing in their society.

The Muslim historian Imad ad-Din Muhammad ibn Muhammad al-Katib al-Isfahani, who wrote the exploits of Sultan Salah ed-Din (Saladin), described in gory detail how, in 1187, Saladin personally beheaded the "Frankish" leader Reynauld de Chastillon (1125–1187), who had been raiding "Saracen" caravans in the "Holy Land". Reynauld de Chastillon was a violent Knight Templar who had served in the Second Crusade from 1145 and remained in the "Holy Land" after its defeat. He had ruled as Prince of Antioch from 1153 to 1160 and through his second marriage became Lord of Oultre-Jordain. He was a controversial character in his own lifetime and beyond, being violent and unruly and inciting to war.

Reynauld de Chastillon had served as King Baudouin IV of Jerusalem's envoy to Emperor Manuel Komnenos of Byzantium. As his wife Constance had died in 1163, he was rewarded with marriage to another wealthy widow, Stephanie, the widow of Humphrey III of Le Toron (now Latrun) and of Miles of Plancy, and the heiress of Oultre-Jordain (Trans-Jordan), including the castles of Kerak (*Crac des Moabites*) and Montréal (Mount Royal) in the hills of Moab southeast of the Dead Sea. These fortresses controlled the trade routes between Egypt and Damascus and gave Reynauld access to the Red Sea. He became notorious for his violence and cruelty at Kerak, often having his enemies and hostages flung from its castle walls to be dashed to pieces on the rocks below.

One of the characters of the Kingdom of Jerusalem was Balian of Ibeline (died 1193), around whose figure the historical film *Kingdom of Heaven* was made. In Latin, his name appears variously as Balian, Barisan, Barisanus, Balianus, Balisan, and Balisanus, and the Arabic sources call him Balian ibn Barzan. The site of Ibeline had been occupied since ancient times; the Romans called it Iamnia, the Jews Yavneh, or Jabneh. The Crusader castle was built in 1141 between Jaffa and Ascalon (Ashkelon), near Montgisard and Ramla (now the Israeli town of Yavneh). At that time Ascalon was still controlled by Fatimid Egypt, and the Egyptian armies marched out every year from Ascalon to attack the Crusader kingdom. The Castle of Ibeline was constructed in order to contain these attacks. The original castle, built by King Foulques of Jerusalem, had four towers.

In 1186, Reynauld de Chastillon allied himself with Queen Sibylla of Jerusalem, the surviving sister of the leprous King Baudouin IV of Jerusalem (1161–1185), and with her husband, Guy de Lusignan, against Count Raymond III of Tripoli, for the throne of Jerusalem. Reynauld's influence and power contributed to the recognition of Guy as King of Jerusalem, although Raymond and the Ibelines had been attempting to advance the claim to the throne of Princess Isabella, the wife of Raymond's stepson Humphrey, who remained loyal to his stepfather and Guy. Reynauld attacked a "Saracen" caravan travelling between Cairo and Damascus, breaking the truce between Sultan Saladin of Damascus and King Baudouin. In March 1187, Saladin sent troops to protect another caravan, in which his own sister was returning from a pilgrimage to Mecca. The caravans became a major issue which led directly to the great battle of Hattin of 1187 and to Reynauld's execution by Saladin.

Later European writers, such as Ernoul, the "continuator" of Guillaume de Tyr (William of Tyre), and the presumed author of a late twelfth-century chronicle of the fall of the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem, seem to have mixed up the two caravan stories. The so-called "Chronicle of Ernoul" is several separate but similar manuscripts, supposedly stemming from an original source that does not survive, but was assumed to have been written by Ernoul. The basis for assuming the existence of these manuscripts is a thirteenth-century Old French translation of the twelfth-century Latin chronicle of Guillaume de Tyr, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis*

*gestarum*, written in the Kingdom of Jerusalem in the twelfth century. This French translation came to be known as *Estoire d'Eracles* or History of Heraclius, because Guillaume de Tyr began his chronicle with the reign of Byzantine emperor Heraclius.

One of the more important manuscripts of the *Continuation de Guillaume de Tyr* by Ernoul is known as the *Eracles de Lyon* and is the basis of its modern editions (Ernoul, 1973, 1982). This manuscript continues the history until 1248, and the section containing the years 1184–1197, which covers the great battle of 1187, is not found in any other manuscript. The nineteenth-century *Recueil des historiens des croisades*, a collection of Crusader texts compiled by the *Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*, used a different version of the *Eracles*, known as the Colbert-Fontainebleau *Eracles*. There is also a shorter manuscript known as the *abrégé*, and a Florentine *Eracles* from the Laurentian Library in Florence, which has a unique section from 1191 to 1197 and continues until 1277.

As we have seen, the thirteenth-century Old French and Latin chroniclers who “continued” the *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum* by Guillaume de Tyr, conflated the two caravan incidents, claiming erroneously that Saladin’s sister, aunt, or even mother, had been taken prisoner by Reynauld de Chastillon. This is contradicted by Arabic sources, such as Imad al-Din, Abu Shama and Ibn al-Athir, who say that she made it home safely to Damascus. King Guy de Lusignan of Jerusalem publicly chastised Reynauld de Chastillon, in an attempt to appease Saladin, but a haughty Reynauld replied that he was the lord of his own lands and that he had made no peace with Saladin. A furious Saladin swore that Reynauld would be executed if he was ever taken prisoner. In 1187, Saladin invaded the Kingdom of Jerusalem from Damascus, defeating the Crusaders at the Battle of Hattin, which took place near Tiberias in what is now Israel. The battlefield, near the town of Hittin, had as its chief geographic feature a double hill named *Karney Hittin* (Hebrew for Horns of Hattin) beside a pass through the northern hills between Tiberias and the road from Acre to the west. That road, built by the Romans, served as the main east–west passage between the Jordan fords, the Sea of Galilee, and the Mediterranean coast.

The battle of Hattin left Saladin with many “Frankish” prisoners. Most prominent among these prisoners were Reynauld, de

Chastillon and King Guy de Lusignan, both of whom Saladin ordered brought to his tent. The "Saracen" chronicler Imad ad-Din al-Isfahani, who was present at the scene, related it as follows:

Saladin invited the king [Guy de Lusignan] to sit beside him, and when Arnat [Reynauld de Chastillon] entered in his turn, he seated him next to his king and reminded him of his misdeeds. "How many times have you sworn an oath and violated it? How many times have you signed agreements you have never respected?" Reynauld answered through a translator: "Kings have always acted thus. I did nothing more." During this time King Guy was gasping with thirst, his head dangling as though drunk, his face betraying great fright. Saladin spoke reassuring words to him, had cold water brought, and offered it to him. The king drank, then handed what remained to Reynauld, who slaked his thirst in turn. The sultan then said to Guy: "You did not ask permission before giving him water. I am therefore not obliged to grant him mercy." After pronouncing these words, the sultan smiled, mounted his horse, and rode off, leaving the captives in terror. He supervised the return of the troops, and then came back to his tent. He ordered Reynauld brought there, then advanced before him, sword in hand, and struck him between the neck and the shoulder-blade. When Reynauld fell, he cut off his head and dragged the body by its feet to the king, who began to tremble. Seeing him thus upset, Saladin said to him in a reassuring tone: "This man was killed only because of his maleficence and perfidy". [El-Isfahani, 1888]

*Outre-mer* was the fantastic name given by the "Franks" to the four Crusader states they had established in the First Crusade: the County of Edessa, the Principality of Antioch, the County of Tripoli, and the Kingdom of Jerusalem. The name was also used as an equivalent to the Levant, Syria, or Palestine, and incorporated areas that are today part of Israel, Jordan, Syria, Turkey, and Lebanon. But the term *outre-mer* was also used for any other French land that was "overseas". Louis IV of France was called "Louis d'outre-mer" as he was raised in England. The modern term *outre-mer* means overseas, and is notably used for the *départements d'outre-mer et territoires d'outre-mer*, known by their acronym DOM-TOM.

Saladin spared the life of King Guy de Lusignan of Jerusalem. He was taken to Damascus for a time, then allowed to go free. To some Christians of his time, Reynauld de Chastillon, was considered a



martyr killed at the hands of the "evil Saracens". However, documentary evidence tends to give an impression of Reynauld as a free-booter and pirate who had little concern for the welfare of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. Some scholars think that the successes of the "Latin" Kingdom of Jerusalem were undone in large measure by Reynauld's recklessness, which needlessly provoked the Muslim states surrounding *Outre-mer*. Saladin, however, had acted in accordance with his own interests. He killed Reynauld, his bitter enemy, and spared the life of Guy, knowing that to kill him was to end the factional struggle in the remnants of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. He kept him in Damascus until he was sure that he would not be able to destroy all of the Kingdom outright. The factional struggle later greatly diminished the potency of the Third Crusade, which followed the loss of Jerusalem to the "Saracens" in 1187.

## The Third Crusade: a “lion-hearted” king in search of a “holy land”

After their defeat at Hattin in 1187, the Crusaders lost not only their capital of Jerusalem but also their seaport of Acre, though Saladin allowed its Christian inhabitants to move north to Tyre. The Crusaders did not give up on Acre, however, as it was their major seaport access to the “Holy Land”. In 1189, they began their efforts to take it back. In 1191, during the Third Crusade, Richard *Coeur-de-Lion*, the French king of England and of the “Angevin Empire”, besieged Acre and took it back from the “Saracens”. Jerusalem, however, remained in the hands of the “Saracens”, and Richard was unable to take it back from Saladin. He had to settle for Acre, the Crusader seaport, as his capital.

When the Crusades began, the island of Cyprus was part of the Byzantine empire. In 1185, the last Byzantine governor of Cyprus, Isaac Komnenos of Cyprus, from a minor line of the Imperial house of Constantinople, rose in rebellion against his emperor and attempted to seize the throne. His attempted coup was unsuccessful, but Komnenos was able to retain control of the island. Byzantine actions against Komnenos failed because he enjoyed the support of King William II of Sicily. The Emperor of Byzantium had agreed with the sultan of Egypt to close Cypriot

harbours to the Crusaders. That, however, did not deter Richard *Coeur-de-Lion*.

During the Third Crusade, the Crusaders founded the Kingdom of Cyprus. Richard *Coeur-de-Lion* of England conquered Cyprus from the Byzantines on his way to Holy Land. The island was made into a kingdom and, after the Crusader defeat at Hattin in 1187, it was given to the displaced "King of Jerusalem", Guy of Lusignan, in 1192. He proclaimed Acre the new capital of the "Kingdom of Jerusalem" and Richard left the Holy Land to pursue his wars in Europe. Henceforth, the "Kings of Jerusalem", who ruled in Acre, were also the kings of Cyprus. The island was later awarded to the Knights Hospitallers. Acre was a major city in the thirteenth-century Christian world. In 1229, it was placed under the control of the Knights Hospitaller of Saint John (whence came its French name, *Saint-Jean d'Acre*). It finally fell to the Egyptian Mamluks in 1291.

The Third Crusade in 1189, just two years after the fall of Jerusalem to Saladin. In October 1187, the new old Pope, Gregory VIII (Alberto di Morra), who only ruled for less than two months before his death later that year, proclaimed that the capture of Jerusalem by the "Saracens" was punishment for the sins of the Christians across Europe. The cry went up for a new crusade to the Holy Land. King Henry II of England and King Philippe II of France ended their war with each other, and both imposed a "Saladin tithe" on their citizens to finance the great venture. In Britain, Baldwin of Exeter, the Archbishop of Canterbury, made a tour through Wales, convincing 3,000 men-at-arms to take up the cross, as recorded in the *Itinerarium Cambriae* of Giraldus Cambrensis or Gerald of Wales (1146–1223).

The first European Christian king to respond to Pope Gregory's call for a Third Crusade was neither Richard of England nor Philippe of France, but the German king and "Holy Roman Emperor" Friedrich Barbarossa (Frederick Red Beard, 1122–1190), who led a massive army across Anatolia into the "Saracen" lands, but drowned in the Saleph river before reaching the Holy Land. Many of his discouraged troops went home. Others were killed by the Turks, deserted, or committed suicide. The same Barbarossa had undertaken several expeditions to Lombardy in Italy, where he had been repeatedly defeated. Nonetheless, the Germans created a

national legend around Barbarossa, that of the sleeping hero, much like the older British Celtic legends of King Arthur, or Bran the Blessed. The German legend has Barbarossa asleep with his knights in a cave in the Kyffhäuser mountain in Thuringia, or in Mount Untersberg in Bavaria, and when the ravens cease to fly around the mountain, he will awake and restore Germany to its ancient glory. According to the story, his red beard has grown through the table at which he sits. His eyes are half closed in sleep, but now and then he raises his hand and sends a boy out to see if the ravens have stopped flying. Adolf Hitler named his ill-fated invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941, which ultimately led to his defeat and suicide, Operation Barbarossa.

Richard *Coeur-de-Lion* of England came from the royal House of Plantagenet, also known as the House of Anjou, later called the "Angevins" after their capital of Angers. The Plantagenets were a noble family of counts from western France that ruled Anjou, a county around the city of Angers in the lower Loire Valley of western France (now in the French *département* of Maine-et-Loire). Later, the Angevins ruled the Duchy of Normandy (1144–1204 and 1415–1450), the Kingdom of England (1154–1485), the Kingdom of Jerusalem (1131–1205), the Duchy of Aquitaine (1153–1453), and the Lordship of Ireland (1171–1485). Much later, their European lands were called the "Angevin Empire", but were not an empire in any modern sense, nor were they called that at the time.

Richard's crusade followed the failure of the Second Crusade, after which Zengi's dynasty controlled a unified Syria and constantly fought the Fatimid rulers of Egypt, which ultimately resulted in the unification of Egyptian and Syrian forces under the command of the Sultan Saladin, who employed them to reduce the Christian states and to recapture Jerusalem in 1187. The Third Crusade began in 1189 and ended in 1192. Even though the Second Crusade had been led by the kings of France and of Germany, the Third Crusade was known as the Kings' Crusade. It was an attempt by European Christian leaders to reconquer the Holy Land from Saladin and his "Saracens." Spurred by Christian religious zeal, King Henry II of England (1133–1189) and King Philippe II of France (1165–1223) ended their conflict to lead a new Crusade.

Henry II of England died in 1189, and his English contingent of the Third Crusade came under the command of his son and heir,

Richard *Coeur-de-Lion* (1157–1199), who had been a great military leader from a very young age. At the age of sixteen, Richard had had his own command, putting down rebellions in Poitou against his father. Richard was not only the king of England, which he rarely saw, but also the king of what was later called the “Angevin Empire”, the collection of French states ruled by the Plantagenet dynasty of Anjou. That “empire” stretched from the Pyrenees to Ireland during the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. It was roughly half of mediæval France, as well as all of England and Ireland.

With the failure of Barbarossa’s crusade, the Third Crusade had begun inauspiciously. The Crusaders began to besiege Acre, which was occupied by the “Saracens”. Barbarossa’s successor as German king and “Holy Roman Emperor” was his son Heinrich VI (1165–1197), who did not wish to leave on a crusade and suffer his father’s fate. Instead, with Swabia and Austria being part of his empire, Heinrich sent as his representatives to the Third Crusade Duke Friedrich VI of Swabia (1167–1191) and Duke Leopold V of Austria (1157–1194). Friedrich was killed at the siege of Acre in 1191. Leopold also arrived to take part in the siege of Acre by the Crusaders in 1191, having sailed from Zadar on the Adriatic coast (now in Croatia).

In early 1192, Duke Leopold of Austria took over command of what remained of the Holy Roman Imperial forces after the death of Duke Friedrich VI of Swabia. After an initial military success, the Christian leaders soon fought among themselves. After Acre surrendered to the “Franks”, the banners of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, King Richard I of England, King Philippe II of France and Duke Leopold V of Austria were raised in Acre by Leopold’s cousin, Corrado del Montferrato (King Conrad of Jerusalem, died 1192), a Piedmontese nobleman. However, an angry Richard removed Leopold’s flag. Richard may also have instigated the murder of Conrad of Monferrat shortly after his election as “King of Jerusalem” in April 1192.

Frustrated with Richard *Coeur-de-Lion*, Duke Leopold of Austria and King Philippe of France left the Holy Land and sailed back to Europe. Richard kept fighting Sultan Saladin of Syria over the “Holy Land” for a few more months, but failed to take Jerusalem from the “Saracens”. Finally, Richard and Saladin signed a peace

treaty by which Jerusalem would remain under Muslim control, but unarmed Christian pilgrims would be allowed to visit the city. Richard sailed home from Acre on 9 October 1192. This was the sad end of the Third Crusade.

On his journey back to Europe that winter, the thirty-five-year-old King Richard of England, travelling in disguise, stopped in Vienna, was recognized by his signet ring, and was arrested by Duke Leopold in Vienna's Erdberg district (now the Landstrasse). For some time, Richard of England was imprisoned in Dürnstein castle, after which he was brought for trial before the German king and Holy Roman Emperor Heinrich VI and accused of King Conrad's murder in the Holy Land. The emperor found Richard guilty of the murder and imposed an enormous ransom on him—six thousand buckets of silver. This immense ransom became the foundation for the Viennese mint and was used to build new city walls for Vienna as well as to build the *Wiener Neustadt* (new city of Vienna). However, Duke Leopold of Austria was excommunicated by Pope Celestine III (died 1198) for having taken a fellow Crusader prince prisoner.

The Third Crusade, while an act of war in reality, was also the collective unconscious acting out of yet another psychogeographical fantasy. Seeking to "liberate" the "Holy Land", the "Holy City", and the "Holy Sepulchre" from the "evil Saracens", it had failed in all its goals. The Kingdom of Jerusalem had become the *de facto* Kingdom of Acre. Like the previous crusades, the Third Crusade produced many fantasies in the form of legends and literary works on the greatness of Saladin, Richard *Coeur-de-Lion*, and other heroes. In reality, like most other "holy wars", it led to great sufferings and the tragic loss of many human lives. The failure of the Third Crusade would lead to the papal call for a Fourth Crusade six years later, in 1198, and that crusade would begin in 1202.

How did the Third Crusaders view the Muslims? Around 1195 the Norman poet Ambroise, who had accompanied Richard *Coeur-de-Lion* on his crusade, wrote his famous *Estoire de la Guerre Sainte* (Ambroise, 1897, 1941, 2003). This was an epic poem written in the Anglo-Norman dialect of French, and holding some twelve thousand lines. Being Richard's court poet, Ambroise denounced the "evil Saracens", but also Richard's Christian enemies. Ambroise described the horrors of the war, including famine, and its great

pain and suffering. From his poem, we can learn how the Third Crusaders viewed the Arabs, Muslims, and other "Saracens" they were fighting. For the most part, they spoke ill of the "Saracens", depicting them as cruel, vile, and ruthless. The occasions on which the "Franks" spoke well of the "Saracens" were few and far between. The "Saracens" were the psychological repository on which the "Franks" could unconsciously project, externalize, and displace all their own unacceptable qualities and actions, including their massacres of innocent civilians, women, and children.

## The Fourth Crusade: Christians massacre Christians

**T**he Fourth Crusade, which lasted from 1202 to 1204, was a fantastic, incredible, and tragic event. It was originally designed to conquer “Saracen” Jerusalem by means of an invasion of European Christian forces through Egypt. Instead, in 1204, the “Latin” Crusaders of Western Europe invaded, conquered, and sacked the Byzantine and Eastern Orthodox Christian capital of Constantinople, the eastern rival of the Roman Catholic Church and of the “Holy Roman Empire”. Some historians think that this was one of the final acts in the Great Schism between the Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox churches, which had begun in 1054 and led to the creation of the Greek-speaking Eastern Orthodox Church in Constantinople. The Crusade historian Jonathan Phillips has described it as one of the most profitable and disgraceful sacks of a city in all of human history (Phillips, 2004, p. xiii).

Germany, whose king was elected by its powerful *Curfürsten*, or Electors, was often divided by the death of its king, which at times led to civil war. After the death of the German king and “Holy Roman Emperor” Heinrich VI in 1197, two rival groups of German *Curfürsten* elected two rival kings: Philipp von Schwaben (died 1208), of the Hohenstaufen family, and Otto von Braunschweig



(died 1218), of the Welf or Guelph, family. Like Duke Leopold of Austria, Philipp of Swabia had been excommunicated by Pope Celestine III, and had not been crowned in Aachen as the German kings were. In 1198, Lotario Cardinal de' Conti di Segni (1161–1216) was elected Pope Innocent III. In 1201, the new Pope openly supported Otto of Brunswick; he threatened all those who refused to acknowledge Otto as King with excommunication.

In 1202, Innocent III issued his papal bull, entitled *Per Venerabilem*, which made clear to the German princes his view of the relationship between the empire and the papacy: that as God's vicar, the pope was above the emperor (this bull was afterwards embodied in the *Corpus Juris Canonici*). The bull asserted the papal rights to decide whether a German king is worthy of the Roman imperial crown, and to arbitrate in favour of one of the claimants in case of a double election, which was the current situation in the Empire. The pope argued in his bull that the *translatio imperii*—the transition of the ancient Roman Empire to the Holy Roman Emperor—had taken place only under papal blessing, and, therefore, all blessing, coronation, and investiture of the emperor depended upon the pope.

The Fourth Crusade was the ambition of Pope Innocent III. The new crusade became the main goal of his pontificate. He issued his call for the Fourth Crusade soon after his accession to the Throne of Saint Peter. The Pope directed his call to the knights and nobles of Christian Europe rather than to its kings, as he wished that neither Richard I of England nor Philippe II of France, who were still engaged in war, nor especially his German enemies, should participate in the crusade. Indeed, his call was largely ignored by the European monarchs. There were two German kings struggling for the office of Holy Roman Emperor, while England and France were warring against each other. However, due to the fiery preaching of Foulques de Neuilly (died 1201), the priest of Neuilly-sur-Marne in France, in 1199 a crusading army had been organized by the nobles and knights at a tournament held by Count Thibault III de Champagne (1179–1201).

Thibault was elected the leader of the crusade, and was going to go on the crusade with his brother-in-law, Count Baudouin de Flandre, and with his cousin, Count Louis de Blois, a son of Queen Alix of France. Thibault, however, died in 1201, and was replaced by an Italian count, Bonifacio del Montferrato (1150–1207).

Bonifacio was an experienced soldier, and it was an opportunity for him to restore his dynasty's reputation after several military defeats at home in Italy. Bonifacio's family was well-known in the "East": his brother Corrado (Conrad, died 1192) and their nephew Baudouin (Baldwin V, 1177–1186) had both been Kings of Jerusalem, and his niece, Maria del Montferrato (1192–1212), who would marry Jean de Brienne in 1210, was the heiress of the kingdom of Jerusalem. But the nine-year-old Baudouin had either died of leprosy or been murdered, and Corrado had been murdered as well. Bonifacio was either courageous or foolhardy.

Bonifacio del Montefrrato and the other leaders of the Fourth Crusade sent envoys to Venice, Genoa, and to other port cities to negotiate a contract for the sea transport of the Crusaders to Egypt, the object of their crusade, where they planned to attack and defeat the "Saracens" and take the Holy Land. One of the chief envoys was Geoffroy de Villehardouin (died 1213), a soldier and historian, the future *seneschal de Champagne*, who had joined the Crusade in 1199 during the tournament held by Count Thibault of Champagne (Morris, 1968). Thibault named Geoffroy one of his ambassadors to Venice to procure ships for the voyage, and Geoffroy helped to elect Bonifacio del Montferrato as the new leader of the Crusade when Thibault died. Geoffroy supported the diversion of the Crusade first to Dalmatia and then to Constantinople. While at Constantinople, he also served as an ambassador to the Byzantine emperor, Isaakios II Angelos, and he was in the embassy that demanded that Isaakios appoint Alexius IV Angelos his co-emperor in 1203.

The Republic of Genoa refused to join the Crusade, but in 1201 Bonifacio del Montferrato and his fellow leaders negotiated fruitfully with Enrico Dandolo (died 1205), the *doge* of the Republic of Venice, a great maritime and naval power, which agreed to build numerous ships to transport 33,500 Crusaders to Egypt, a very ambitious number for that time. Venice was to be paid a high amount of money for its services: 85,000 silver marks. This agreement required a full year of preparation on the part of the Venetians to build the ships and train the sailors who would man them, all the while curtailing the city's commercial activities.

The crusading army was expected to comprise 4,500 knights (with their 4,500 horses), 9,000 squires (two for each knight), and 20,000 foot-soldiers. It was ready by the fall of 1202, but it did not

sail for Egypt. The majority of the crusading army that set out from Venice in October 1202 had originated from France. It included men from Blois, Champagne, Amiens, Saint-Pol, the Isle-de-France, and Burgundy. Several other European regions, such as Flanders and Montferrat, sent substantial military contingents as well. Other Fourth Crusader groups came from the "Holy Roman Empire" of Germany, including groups led by Bishop Martin of the Alsatian monastery of Pairis and by Bishop Conrad von Krosigk of Halberstadt (Andrea, 1987), and a group of Venetian soldiers and sailors led by Enrico Dandolo, the old and blind *doge* of the Republic of Venice.

The Fourth Crusade was to sail directly from Venice via Alexandria to "Saracen" Fatimid Cairo, which the Europeans took to be the centre of the "Saracen" world. Its leaders were ready to sail on 24 June 1202. Their agreement with Venice was ratified by Pope Innocent III, but with a solemn ban on attacks on Christian states, which had often happened in the previous crusades (Hughes, 1948, p. 370). This ban, however, was broken by the Crusader leaders, who not only attacked the Christian Dalmatian city of Zara (now Zadar in Croatia), but also sacked Constantinople itself. The Pope sent a personal legate to the Fourth Crusade, Pietro Cardinal di Capuano (died 1214), who, however, was more indulgent about attacking Christian states than was his boss in Rome.

One of the first blunders of the Fourth Crusade leaders was not to require all their men to sail from Venice. Being far from Venice, many Crusaders chose to sail for Egypt from other European ports, such as Antwerp, Marseille, or Genoa. By 1201, the Crusader army had gathered at Venice, but with far fewer troops than expected: only 12,000 men out of the 33,500 that had been anticipated. Venice had fulfilled its part of the bargain: it had made numerous war galleys, large transports, and horse transports, enough for three times the assembled army. The Venetians, under their old and blind *doge*, Enrico Dandolo, would not let the Crusaders leave Venice without first paying the full amount agreed to, 85,000 silver marks. The Crusader leaders could only pay 51,000 silver marks, and even that only by reducing themselves to poverty. This was disastrous to the Venetians, who had halted their commerce for a great length of time to prepare this expedition.

In addition to this catastrophe for Venice, 20,000 to 30,000 men (out of Venice's total population of 60,000 people) were needed to man the Crusader fleet, placing a further strain on the Venetian economy (Phillips, 2004, p. 57). But the *doge* Enrico Dandolo and his Venetians succeeded in turning the crusade to their own purposes as a form of repayment. Following riots and massacres of "Latin foreigners" in Greek Orthodox Constantinople in 1182, the Venetian merchant population had been expelled by the ruling Byzantine Angelos dynasty, with the support of the Greek population. These events made the Venetians hostile to Byzantium. Enrico Dandolo, who joined the crusade in a public ceremony in Venice's *Chiesa di San Marco*, proposed that the Crusaders pay their debts by attacking the port of "Zara" in Dalmatia.

"Zara", now the Croatian city of Zadar, then the capital of the Duchy of Dalmatia, was called *Jadera* in Latin documents and *Jadres* by the French Crusaders. The Venetian name *Zara* was a later derivation of the contemporary vernacular name *Zadra*. "Zara" had been dominated by Venice throughout the twelfth century, but it had rebelled against Venice in 1181 and allied itself with the kingdom of Hungary and Croatia. Its king at that time was Béla III (died 1196), King of Hungary and Croatia and former Duke of Croatia and Dalmatia. Béla's son Imre (Emeric, or Imrich, 1174–1204), was crowned in 1182, in his father's lifetime, and became King of Hungary and Croatia (1182–1204), and Duke of Croatia and Dalmatia (1194–1196). Subsequent Venetian attacks on "Zara" were repulsed by Béla and Imre, and by 1202 the city was economically independent, under the protection of the King of Hungary and Croatia (Phillips, 2004, pp. 110–111).

The Hungarian and Croatian king was Catholic and had agreed to join this Fourth Crusade, though this was mostly for political reasons, and he had made no actual preparations to leave for Egypt or the Holy Land. In view of Pope Innocent III's ban on attacking Christian lands, many Crusaders were opposed to attacking "Zara". Some, including the French nobleman Simon de Montfort (1160–1218), Seigneur de Montfort-l'Amaury (who was also the 5th Earl of Leicester), refused to participate and returned home. While the Papal legate to the Crusade, Pietro Cardinal di Capuano (died 1214), endorsed the move on "Zara" as necessary to prevent the crusade's failure, Pope Innocent III himself was alarmed at this

development. He wrote a letter to the Crusading leadership expressing his alarm (Hughes, 1948, p. 371).

In his letter of 1202 to the Fourth Crusade leaders, Pope Innocent III “forbade” the Crusaders of Western Christendom from committing any atrocious acts on their Christian neighbours, despite his wanting to secure his authority over Byzantium (Hindley, 2003, pp. 143, 152). This letter, however, was concealed from the bulk of the Crusader army, and the attack on “Zara” proceeded. The citizens of “Zara” demonstrated their Christianity by hanging banners marked with crosses from their windows and the walls of the city, but, nevertheless, the city fell to the Crusaders after a brief siege. Both the Venetians and the Crusaders were threatened with excommunication for this by an angry Pope Innocent III. Nonetheless, they proceeded from Zara to the Greek island of Corfu (now Kerkyra) to attack the Byzantine capital of Constantinople.

Bonifacio del Montferrato, the leader of the Fourth Crusade, had left the fleet before it sailed from Venice to visit his cousin Philipp of Swabia, the rival of the pope’s favourite for “German king and Holy Roman Emperor”, Otto of Brunswick. The reasons for his visit are still a matter of debate; Bonifacio may have realized the Venetians’ plans and left the expedition to avoid excommunication, or he may have wanted to meet with the Byzantine prince, Alexius IV Angelos, Philipp’s brother-in-law and the son of the recently deposed Byzantine emperor Isaakios II Angelos. Alexius had fled to Philipp when his father was overthrown and jailed in 1195, but it is unknown whether or not Bonifacio knew that he was at Philipp’s court. In Swabia, Alexius IV offered Bonifacio 200,000 silver marks, 10,000 men to help the Crusaders, the maintenance of 500 knights in the Holy Land, the service of the Byzantine navy to transport the Crusader Army to Egypt, and the placement of the Greek Orthodox Church under the Roman Catholic Church—if they sailed to Byzantium and toppled the reigning emperor, Alexius III (died 1211). It was a very tempting offer for an enterprise that was short on funds and that still owed some 35,000 silver marks to Venice.

Relations between the “Latins” of Western Europe and the “Greeks” of Byzantium were strained for at least two decades. The “Latins” of the First, Second, and Third Crusade had fought Constantinople on their way to the Holy Land, whereas the Greeks of Byzantium had been accused by the Latins of betraying the

Crusaders to the “Saracens”. Many Venetian merchants had been attacked and deported during the anti-Latin riots in Constantinople in 1182. The Byzantine prince’s proposal to the Crusader leader involved his restoration to the throne, not the sack of his capital city. Bonifacio accepted the proposal. Alexius IV returned with Bonifacio to rejoin the fleet at Corfu after it had sailed from Zara. Some of the other Crusader leaders eventually accepted the plan as well. There were many other leaders, however, of the rank and file, who wanted nothing to do with the proposal, and many deserted.

The fleet of sixty galleys, 100 horse ships, and fifty large transports (the entire fleet was manned by 8,000 Venetian oarsmen and marines) arrived at Constantinople in late June 1203. In addition, 300 siege engines were brought along on board the fleet. When the Fourth Crusade arrived at Constantinople, the city had a population of 150,000 people, a garrison of 30,000 men (including 5,000 Varangians), and a fleet of twenty galleys. The “Latins” laid siege to the city, which lasted some ten months. In July 1203, the Crusaders restored to the Byzantine throne Emperor Isaakios II (1156–1204), who had already been Emperor from 1185 to 1195, but who had been deposed and imprisoned for eight years by his brother, Alexius III, and by his son, Alexius IV. Isaakios had been traumatized by his confinement, and the Crusaders placed his son Alexius IV Angelos with him on the throne as the effective monarch. It was Alexius IV who had promised the Crusaders his complete support in money, men, and ships.

The Byzantine emperor Alexius V Doukas Mourzouphlos (died 1205) reigned for only two months (5 February to 12 April 1204) at the end of the siege of Constantinople by the “Latin Franks”. He was a rival of the Angelos dynasty. His Greek nickname, *Mourzouphlos*, either denoted his overhanging eyebrows or his sullen character (the Greek term *mourzouphlos* means being crestfallen, depressed, despondent, downcast, gloomy, sullen, frowning, or scowling). A Byzantine nobleman, Alexius had risen to the court position of *protovestarios* by the time the Fourth Crusade arrived in Byzantium in 1203. He had been married twice, but was now the lover of Eudokia Angelina, a daughter of Emperor Alexius III Angelos.

Byzantine politics were, well, Byzantine. In 1200, the courtier Alexius Doukas had participated in an attempted usurpation of the throne of Emperor Alexius III Angelos by Johannes Komnenos, a

member of the rival Komnenos dynasty. Alexius III had himself deposed his brother Isaakios II five years earlier. Alexius Doukas was imprisoned, until the accession to the throne of Isaakios II Angelos and of his son Alexius IV Angelos in 1203. Fearing imprisonment and execution for his treatment of his brother Isaakios eight years earlier, Alexius III fled Constantinople with some 10,000 pounds of gold and some priceless jewels, leaving the imperial treasury short on funds. Being heavily beholden to the Crusaders for his throne, Alexius IV could not meet his obligations to them, and his vacillation caused him to lose the support of both his Latin Crusader allies and his Greek subjects.

By the beginning of 1204, the incompetent emperors Isaakios II and his son Alexius IV had inspired little confidence among the Greeks of Constantinople in their failed efforts to defend the city from the besieging Latins and Venetians. The Byzantine Greeks became restless and rioted when the money and aid promised by Alexius IV was not forthcoming. Using the riots, Alexius Doukas emerged as a leader of the anti-Latin movement. He personally led some skirmishes against the Crusaders outside the city walls. When the Greek populace rose up against its emperors in late January 1204, the two emperors barricaded themselves in their palace and entrusted Alexius Doukas with a mission to seek help from the Crusaders. Instead, Alexius Doukas took advantage of the Greek riots in the capital to imprison Alexius IV and to seize the throne as Emperor Alexius V. He at once set about eliminating his enemies and fighting the "Latins".

Alexius V Doukas was crowned Emperor of Byzantium in early February 1204. He began to strengthen the defences of Constantinople and stopped the negotiations with the invading Latins. After the incompetent acts of his two predecessors, however, it was too late for the new emperor to save Constantinople. The young emperor Alexius IV was murdered in prison, while his old father, Isaakios II, died, a victim of his physical and emotional trauma, or, as was said, dying of fright, sorrow, or foul play.

On 8–9 April 1204, there were some very dramatic events in Constantinople. The besieging Crusaders and Venetians, incensed at the murder of their supposed patron, demanded that Alexius V Doukas honour the contract which Alexius IV had promised. When the Byzantine emperor refused, the Crusaders assaulted the city

once again. Alexius V's army put up a strong resistance, however, which did much to discourage the Crusaders. It was said that the Greeks were so elated at their victory that they mooned the Crusaders by baring their buttocks at them. The Greeks pushed enormous projectiles on to the Latin enemy siege engines, shattering many of them. A serious hindrance to the Crusaders was bad weather conditions. Wind blew from the shore and prevented most of the ships from drawing close enough to the walls to launch an assault. Only five of the Greek towers were actually engaged and none of these could be secured; by mid-afternoon it was evident that the Crusader attack had failed.

The Latin clergy of the Crusaders discussed the situation among themselves and settled upon the message they wished to spread through the demoralized army. They had to convince the men that the events were not God's judgement on a sinful enterprise: the campaign, they argued, was righteous and, with proper belief, it would succeed. The idea of God testing the determination of the Crusaders through temporary setbacks was a familiar means for the clergy to explain failure in the course of a campaign. Alexius V Doukas was not invincible. An attempted surprise attack on the Crusaders failed, despite the emperor's personal leadership. During the ensuing fight, he defended the city with courage and tenacity, beating back the Crusader assault of 9 April. But the Crusaders' attack on 12 April proved too strong to repel, and during the night Alexius V fled to Thrakia (Thrace), accompanied by his lover Eudokia Angelina and her mother Euphrosyne Doukaina Kamatera. Constantinople was under "Latin" control on 13 April.

Emperor Alexius V Doukas and his retinue from Constantinople reached the Thracian city of Messinopolis (now the Bulgarian city of Messinopol), to join the deposed emperor Alexius III Angelos, who had fled Constantinople. They were initially well received, and Alexius V married Eudokia Angelina, the daughter of Alexius III. Later, however, a scheming and vengeful Alexius III arranged for his son-in-law Alexius Doukas to be ambushed, captured, and blinded, making him ineligible for the imperial throne. Abandoned by his supporters and enemies alike, Alexius V Doukas was captured near Mosynopolis by the advancing Latins under Thierry de Loos in November 1204. Brought back to Constantinople, Alexius V was tried and condemned to death for his treason against



his predecessor, Alexius IV. He was hurled down to his death from the top of the Column of Theodosius. Alexius V Doukas was the last Byzantine emperor to reign in Constantinople before the establishment of the Latin Empire, which controlled the city for the next fifty-seven years (1204–1261).

The sack of Constantinople in 1204 was no less bloody than that of Jerusalem in 1099, even though the Byzantines were “good” Christians, not “evil Saracens”. The Greek historian Speros Vryonis gave us a vivid account of the sack of Constantinople by the Frankish and Venetian Crusaders:

The Latin soldiery subjected the greatest city in Europe to an indescribable sack. For three days they murdered, raped, looted and destroyed on a scale which even the ancient Vandals and Goths would have found unbelievable. Constantinople had become a veritable museum of ancient and Byzantine art, an emporium of such incredible wealth that the Latins were astounded at the riches they found. Though the Venetians had an appreciation for the art which they discovered (they were themselves semi-Byzantines) and saved much of it, the French and others destroyed indiscriminately, halting to refresh themselves with wine, violation of nuns, and murder of Orthodox clerics. The Crusaders vented their hatred for the Greeks most spectacularly in the desecration of the greatest Church in Christendom. They smashed the silver iconostasis, the icons and the holy books of Hagia Sophia, and seated upon the patriarchal throne a whore who sang coarse songs as they drank wine from the Church’s holy vessels. The estrangement of East and West, which had proceeded over the centuries, culminated in the horrible massacre that accompanied the conquest of Constantinople. The Greeks were convinced that even the Turks, had they taken the city, would not have been as cruel as the Latin Christians. The defeat of Byzantium, already in a state of decline, accelerated political degeneration so that the Byzantines eventually became an easy prey to the Turks. The Crusading movement thus resulted, ultimately, in the victory of Islam, a result which was of course the exact opposite of its original intention. [Vryonis, 1967, p. 152]

In other words, not only did the Fourth Crusade fail to reach the Holy Land, or even Egypt, and to “liberate” Jerusalem and the Holy Sepulchre, it also weakened the Christian world in its prolonged struggle with the “Saracens”.

We have three eyewitness accounts of the Fourth Crusade. One is by Geoffroy de Villehardouin, the French soldier and writer, another by Robert de Clari, a French Crusader knight, and the third by the Byzantine chronicler Niketas Choniates. All three were present in Constantinople during the brief reign of Alexius V Doukas in 1204, before the city's capture by the Crusaders. Niketas, who did not like Alexius, related his usurpation of the throne of Byzantium from his two predecessors, while the two "Franks" related in detail the Crusader siege of Constantinople and its fall. In fact, however, Alexius V Doukas was an able ruler, but he was not supported by all the Greeks. The mediæval historian Peter Noble believed that Alexius "almost achieved the impossible, and [that] much of his failure can be attributed to the incompetence of his predecessors" (Noble, 2002, p. 178).

From 681 to 1018 the Slavic Bulgars had maintained an empire, which was finally conquered by the Byzantines. In 1185, the Bulgarians had thrown off Byzantine rule and set up their second Empire. After the conquest of the Byzantine Empire by the "Latins" in 1204, the Fourth Crusade was over. Geoffroy de Villehardouin continued to serve as a military leader. In April 1205, he fought at the Battle of Adrianopolis (Adrianople) between the Bulgarians, under Tsar Kaloyan "the Greekslayer" (died 1207), and the Crusaders, under Emperor Baudouin I (1172–1205), the first Latin emperor of Constantinople, the former Baudouin IX of Flanders and Baudouin VI of Hainaut, one of the most prominent leaders of the Fourth Crusade. That battle was won by the Bulgarians. Around 300 "Latin" knights were killed, including Louis de Blois, the Duke of Nicaea. Emperor Baudouin of Byzantium was captured, blinded, and later died in Bulgarian captivity. The Bulgarians overran much of Thrace and Macedonia and annexed them to their country. Geoffroy de Villehardouin led the retreat of the "Latins" from the Battle of Adrianople in April 1205, after their Emperor Baudouin I of Byzantium was captured. In recognition of his services, Bonifacio del Montferrato, the leader of the Fourth Crusade, gave Geoffrey the Thracian city of Messinopolis.

On 20 August 1205, Emperor Baudouin of Byzantium was succeeded on the throne of Constantinople by his younger brother, Henry de Flandre. In 1204, Henry had married Agnes de Montferrat, daughter of Bonifacio del Montferrato, the Crusade

leader, but she had died before her father's death in 1207. Henry's reign as Emperor of Byzantium was passed in successful battles with Tsar Kaloyan of Bulgaria, and with his Byzantine Greek rival, Theodore I Lascaris, the emperor of Nicaea. After the death of Tsar Kaloyan in 1207, Henry briefly fought his successor, Tsar Boril (died 1218), defeating him at the Battle of Plovdiv in 1208. Some contemporary chroniclers wrote that Henry made a peace with the Bulgarians after the death of Tsar Kaloyan, and that Pope Innocent III ordered that he should marry Kaloyan's only child, his daughter Maria. Henry's only child by his first wife, Agnes, apparently died in childbirth with his mother, and this second marriage also left no heirs. In 1216 Henry died, poisoned, it was said, by his Bulgarian wife, Maria.

In 1207, after the death of Tsar Kaloyan of Bulgaria and the peace between Byzantium and Bulgaria, Villehardouin began to write his chronicle of the Fourth Crusade, *Sur la conquête de Constantinople* (Villehardouin, 1891, 1915). It was written in French rather than in Latin, making it one of the earliest works of French prose. Villehardouin's account is read alongside that of Robert de Clari, a lowly French knight, that of Niketas Choniates, a high-ranking Byzantine official and historian, who gives an eyewitness account, and that of Günther von Pairis, an Alsatian Cistercian monk who tells the story from the perspective of his abbot, Martin of Pairis. Whatever the viewpoint, however, the Fourth Crusade was a disaster for Christian Europe.

## The Fifth Crusade: a fantastic invasion of Egypt

**G**eoffroy de Villehardouin, the chief chronicler of the Fourth Crusade, died in 1212 or 1213. His nephew (also named Geoffroy) had become the Prince of Achaea in Morea (the mediæval name for the Greek Peloponesus) in 1209. The incredible and tragic Fourth Crusade was over, but Christian Europe did not give up. Within a few years, the Fifth Crusade had begun.

Like its predecessors, the Fifth Crusade (1217–1221) was another fantastic attempt by the European Roman Catholic Christians, who called themselves “Franks” and “Latins”, to take back Jerusalem and the rest of the “Holy Land” from the “Saracens” by first defeating and conquering the powerful Ayyubid state in Egypt. Set up by Saladin, the Ayyubid dynasty was a Kurdish Muslim dynasty that ruled a large empire, including Egypt, Syria, most of Yemen, Diyar Bakr (now Diyarbakır in southeastern Turkey), Mecca, the Hejaz (now in Saudi Arabia), and northern Iraq in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Unable to mourn their losses, the “Latins” and “Franks” made war on the Ayyubids to regain them (Fornari, 1974).

The history of the Fifth Crusade can be told in a nutshell, and it can also be told in great detail. Perhaps because the Fourth Crusade had ended in 1204 with the capture of Christian Constantinople,

against his own wishes, it was not until 1213 that the old Pope Innocent III issued a new papal bull entitled *Quia maior*, calling all of Christendom to join a new crusade. As usual, the kings and emperors of Europe were busy fighting each other. Moreover, Pope Innocent III did not really want their help, because the previous crusades led by kings had failed, and because kings were prone to seek conquest in Christian lands as well as in "Saracen" ones. The Pope ordered processions, prayers, and preachings to help organize the crusade, as these would involve the general population, the lower nobles, and the knights. No crusade, however, came about in his own lifetime.

Pope Innocent III, who had called the Fourth and Fifth Crusades, died in 1216. By Catholic Church custom, the cardinals who were present at his death assembled at Perugia and elected their colleague Cencio Savelli (1148–1227) as Pope Honorius III. Honorius soon organized crusading armies, led by Duke Leopold VI of Austria (1176–1230) and King András II of Hungary (died 1235), but their attempt to take Jerusalem left the city in "Saracen" hands. Neither Leopold nor András could achieve any major military success. András was obliged to issue the Golden Bull confirming the privileges of the noblemen of Hungary and later he was also obliged to confirm the special privileges of the clergy. During his long reign, he had several quarrels with his sons.

In 1218, a German Crusader army led by Oliver of Cologne and a mixed Crusader army of Dutch, Flemish, and Frisian soldiers led by Willem I, Count of Holland (died 1222), arrived. Holland was then a County in the Low Countries, or Netherlands. In order to attack the port of Damietta in Egypt, they allied themselves with the Seljuk Sultanate of "Rum" in Anatolia, who attacked the Ayyubids in Syria in an attempt to free the Crusaders from fighting on two fronts. After occupying the Egyptian port of Damietta in 1221, the Crusaders marched south on Cairo, but were turned back after their dwindling supplies led to a forced retreat. A night-time attack by Sultan Al-Kamil resulted in a great number of Crusader losses and, eventually, in the surrender of the army. Al-Kamil agreed to an eight-year peace agreement with the "Franks".

The same history, however, can also be told in detail, revealing its psychological paradoxes, fantasies, and tragedies. Here is the longer version. The main European countries involved in the Fifth

Crusade were France, Germany, the Low Countries (now Belgium and the Netherlands), and Hungary (which included Slovakia and Croatia). In France, the message of the crusade was preached by Robert de Courçon (died 1218), a French-speaking Anglo-Norman cardinal. Unlike the previous crusades, where the French were the largest and most important contingent, not many French knights joined the Fifth Crusade, as many of them were fighting the "Albigensian Crusade" against the "heretical" Cathar sect in southern France, at the pope's behest.

The "Albigensian Crusade" or "Cathar Crusade" (1209–1229), which overlapped with the Fifth and Sixth Crusades, was a twenty-year military campaign initiated by the Roman Catholic Church to eliminate the "Cathar heresy" in Languedoc. That "heresy" consisted of a Christian religious sect with Manichaean, dualistic and gnostic elements that rose in the Languedoc region of southern France in the eleventh century and flourished in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. "Catharism" had "Paulician" and "Bogomile" roots. They saw the world as a struggle between Good and Bad, Light and Darkness. The Cathars were numerous in what is now southwestern France, which was then part of the Kingdom of Aragon. They were called Albigensians, either because of the movement's presence in and around Albi, northeast of Toulouse, or because of the Church Council held near Albi, which declared the Cathar doctrine heretical.

Political power in Languedoc had been divided among the local lords and town councils. Before the Albigensian crusade, there was little fighting in the area, and a fairly sophisticated and calm polity. After the crusade was initiated by Pope Innocent III in 1209, however, it was prosecuted by the French king Louis VIII (Louis le Lion, 1187–1226), and promptly became a political power struggle, resulting in not only a significant reduction in the number of Cathars, but also in a political realignment of southern France, bringing it into the sphere of the French crown and diminishing its distinct regional culture and language and its high level of foreign influence. By the end of the Cathar Crusade, many of the people of southwest France had become refugees in neighbouring countries. King Louis the Lion died of an epidemic that hit his army during his siege of Avignon. While on his way back to Paris, he fell ill with dysentery himself, and died on 8 November, 1226 in the château de Montpensier, in Auvergne.

In 1215, the year before his death, Pope Innocent III called the Fourth Lateran Council, where, along with the “Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem”, Raoul de Merencourt (died 1225), and with many of his suffragan bishops, he discussed the recovery of the Holy Land. Pope Innocent wanted this crusade to be under the full control of the papacy, as the First Crusade was supposed to have been, in order to avoid the mistakes of the Fourth Crusade, which had been hijacked by the Venetians and diverted to Constantinople. Pope Innocent planned for the Crusaders to meet at the southern Italian port of Brindisi in 1216, and prohibited trade with the “Saracens” to ensure that the Crusaders would have ships and weapons. Each Crusader would receive a free indulgence from the pope, including those who only helped pay the expenses of a Crusader but did not go on the crusade themselves. This was a great enticement, as mediæval Christians feared the Devil and believed that their sins would lead them to hell, and that an indulgence from the pope would absolve them from their sins.

Germany and Hungary were different from France. Oliver of Cologne had preached the crusade in Germany, and the German king Friedrich II Hohenstaufen (1194–1250) half-heartedly attempted to join it in 1215, the year he became King of Germany. Friedrich, however, was not the king whom Pope Innocent wanted to join the Crusade: in the perennial power struggle between the pope and the “Holy Roman Emperor”, he had challenged the Papacy. Friedrich had claimed the title of *Rex Romanorum* from 1212 and held that title from 1215. As such, he was King of Germany, of Italy, and of Burgundy, and also King of Sicily from his mother’s inheritance. But he could not become “Holy Roman Emperor” before being crowned by the pope in Rome, which took another five years.

Pope Innocent III wanted the Duke of Austria and the King of Hungary to take up the leadership of the Crusade. Innocent, however, died in 1216. He was succeeded by Pope Honorius III, who at first barred the “rebellious” Friedrich from participating in the Crusade, and instead organized crusading armies led by Leopold VI of Austria and András II of Hungary. However, the new pope soon realized that King Friedrich of Germany was crucial to his undertaking. In 1217, the pope crowned Pierre de Courtenay (died 1219) “Latin Emperor of Constantinople”. Before the new emperor could reach his empire, however, he was captured on his

eastward journey by Theodore Komnenos Doukas, the despot of Epiros, and, after an imprisonment of two years, died in prison. Pope Honorius III finally became aware that there was only one man in Europe who could bring about the recovery of the "Holy Land", and that man was his former pupil and rival, King Friedrich II of Germany. Like many other European Christian rulers, Friedrich had taken an oath to embark for the "Holy Land" in 1217. But he procrastinated, and Honorius repeatedly put off the date for the beginning of the expedition.

The Crusaders, led by Duke Leopold of Austria and King András of Hungary, left Brindisi by sea for Acre in 1217, where they joined Jean de Brienne (died 1237), the "King of Jerusalem", who, of course, did not really rule Jerusalem, which was in "Saracen" hands, but was considered the most valorous knight of his time. They were also joined by Hugues de Lusignan (died 1218), the King of Cyprus, and by Prince Bohemond IV of Antioch (died 1233). All these kings and princes had come to fight against the "Saracen" Ayyubids in Syria. In the city of Jerusalem, however, the "Saracens" had demolished the walls and fortifications of the city, to prevent the Christians from being able to defend the city from their assault, if they should ever reach it and take it. Fearing the "Franks", the Muslims fled the city, afraid of a bloodbath like that of the First Crusade in 1099. The Ayyubids, however, tried to avoid fighting. The battles were inconclusive. Nothing came of this campaign, and András, Bohemond, and Hugues returned home in 1218, leaving behind King Jean of Jerusalem, Duke Leopold of Austria, and some of the Fifth Crusaders. Later, in 1218, Oliver of Cologne arrived in Acre with a new German army, and Willem of Holland arrived with an army consisting of Dutch, Flemish, and Frisian soldiers.

Willem of Holland, also known as "William the Crazy", was an interesting character. Born around 1167, he had been raised in Scotland, had risen up against his brother, Dirk VII, and became Count in Friesland after a fraternal reconciliation. But the Counts of Holland considered Friesland part of their county. Willem's niece, Ada, married Count Louis of Holland and inherited Holland in 1203, but Willem wanted both Friesland and Holland for himself. The civil war that ensued lasted several years. Louis and Ada were supported by the bishops of Liège and of Utrecht and by the Count of Flanders. Willem was supported by the Duke of Brabant and by



the majority of the Hollanders. Willem finally won the civil war, and "Holy Roman Emperor" Otto IV of Germany recognized Willem as the Count of Holland in 1203, because he supported Otto's Welf (Guelph) dynasty in Germany.

In 1214 took place the Battle of Bouvines, a town between Lille and Tournai, then in the County of Flanders. The military alliances of that battle were orchestrated by Pope Innocent III. In the battle, King Philippe Auguste of France defeated "Holy Roman Emperor" Otto IV of Germany and Count Ferrand of Flanders. Otto was deposed and replaced as German king by Friedrich II Hohenstaufen. Ferrand was captured and imprisoned. Their ally, King John of England, was forced by his discontented barons to return to England and to sign the Magna Carta. Philippe Auguste took undisputed control of the territories of Anjou, Brittany, Maine, Normandy, and the Touraine, which he had recently seized from Otto's kinsman and ally, John of England.

After the battle of Bouvines, Count Willem of Holland and many other noblemen switched their allegiance to King Friedrich II of Germany. Willem also took part in a French expedition against King John of England. The pope excommunicated Willem for this. Excommunication was a grave matter for a mediaeval Christian. It meant life in hell after death. Possibly to have his excommunication lifted, Willem became a fervent Crusader. He campaigned in Prussia with the "Baltic Crusades" and joined in the conquest of Lisbon. In Europe, he came to be called "William the Crazy" for his reckless behaviour in battle.

Count Willem of Holland discussed the attack on Egypt with Duke Leopold of Austria, King Jean of Jerusalem, and Oliver of Cologne. They allied themselves with the Seljuk Turkish leader Izzeddin Keykavus (died 1220), the Sultan of "Rum" in Anatolia. Now the "Saracens" were fighting one another. As the Ayyubids ruled both Syria and Egypt (and several other territories), the Seljuk Turkish "Rumians" attacked the Ayyubids in Syria, seeking to free the Crusaders from one of their two fronts. This left the Crusaders free to sail for Egypt and try to take Damietta from the Ayyubids. In June 1218, the Crusaders began their siege of Damietta, and, despite resistance from the unprepared Ayyubid sultan, al-Malik al-Adil Sayf al-Din Abu-Bakr ibn Ayyub (1145–1218), the tower outside the city was taken on 25 August. The Crusaders could not

gain Damietta itself, however, and in the ensuing months rampant diseases killed many of them, including Robert de Courçon, who had preached the crusade in France. Sultan Al-Adil also died, and was succeeded by Sultan al-Malik al-Kamil Naser al-Din Abu al-Ma'ali Muhammed (1180–1238).

In 1219, Pope Honorius III sent Pelagius of Albano or Pelagio Galvani (died 1240), a Portuguese-born Benedictine monk, cardinal, and canon lawyer, as his papal legate to lead the Fifth Crusade. Sultan Al-Kamil of Egypt tried to negotiate peace with the Crusaders. He offered to trade Damietta for Jerusalem, but Pelagius turned him down, confident that the Crusaders could take Egypt. After hearing this, Count Willem of Holland left the crusade and sailed home. In August or September, Francesco d'Assisi, a future saint of the Roman Catholic Church, arrived in the Crusader camp and crossed over to the Egyptian side to preach to Sultan Al-Kamil. By November, the Crusaders had worn out the sultan's forces, and were finally able to occupy the port of Damietta.

As soon as they had occupied Damietta, the papal and secular powers fought for control of the town. Jean de Brienne, "King of Jerusalem", claimed it for himself. Cardinal Pelagius would not hear of it, and an angry Jean de Brienne returned to his capital of Acre later that year. Cardinal Pelagius had hoped that the German king Friedrich II would arrive from Germany with a fresh army, so that the Crusaders could take all of Egypt, but Friedrich never did, as part of his struggle with Pope Honorius III. In April 1220, after a five-year wait, Friedrich II was finally elected *Imperator Romanorum* or "Roman Emperor" and in November was crowned "Holy Roman Emperor" in Rome by Pope Honorius III. Yet, despite the insistence of the pope, Friedrich delayed sending his army to Egypt, and the Egyptian campaign failed miserably.

After a year of inactivity in Syria and Egypt, Jean de Brienne, the nominal "King of Jerusalem", returned from Acre to Damietta, and the Crusaders marched south towards Cairo in July 1221. By now Sultan Al-Kamil of Egypt was able to ally with his fellow Ayyubids in Syria, who had defeated the Seljuk Turkish leader Izzeddin Keykavus in 1220. The Crusader march to Cairo was disastrous; the River Nile flooded ahead of them, stopping the Crusader advance. A dry canal that was previously crossed by the Crusaders also flooded, blocking the Crusader army's retreat. With

supplies dwindling, a forced retreat began, culminating in a night-time attack by Al-Kamil, which resulted in a great number of Crusader casualties and, eventually, in the surrender of the army under Pelagius. The terms of this surrender were relinquishing Damietta to Al-Kamil in exchange for the release of the Crusader prisoners. Al-Kamil agreed to an eight-year peace agreement with the *franj* and to return a piece of the true cross of Jesus Christ, which, in reality, he did not possess.

The failure of the Fifth Crusade, and the machinations of Pope Innocent III and Pope Honorius III that preceded and accompanied it, were a disaster for the pope. It caused an outpouring of anti-papal sentiment from many Western European Christians, including the Provençal poet Guilhem Figueira, a southern French *jongleur* and *troubadour* from Toulouse, who was active at the court of the German king and "Holy Roman Emperor" Friedrich II, the pope's rival, in the 1230s, after the Sixth Crusade. Figueira was a close associate of Aimery de Péguhan and Guillem Augier Novella. Figueira was popular with the lower classes.

Figueira was the son of a Toulouse tailor and himself also a tailor by trade. As a result of the Albigensian Crusade, he was exiled from his homeland and took refuge in Lombardy, whence he eventually made his way to Friedrich's court in Germany. In Italy, he and his fellow exile Aimery de Péguhan, who were bitter about their exile, helped found a *troubadour* tradition of lamentation for the "good old days" of pre-crusade Languedoc. Their Lombard successors continued to employ the Provençal language, and it was not until the time of Dante Alighieri in the fourteenth century that the Italian language got a significant vernacular literature of its own.

In 1228, Guilhem Figueira publicly denied the efficacy of the indulgences given by the pope to the Crusaders, and blamed the death of the "good" King Louis VIII of France, who died of dysentery at the siege of Avignon, on the false indulgence that had drawn him out of the safety of Paris. His most famous work, *D'un sirventes far*, or the *Sirventes contra Roma*, was a powerful denunciation of the papacy. Its violence had to do with the circumstances of its composition: Guilhem wrote it while he was in Toulouse, besieged by the Crusaders in 1229. It was set to the tune of a famous hymn about the Virgin Mary, and was thus easily sung by the masses. Figueira's *D'un sirventes far* was a venomous diatribe against Rome:

Treacherous Rome, avarice ensnares you, So that you shear, too much wool from your sheep; May the Holy Ghost, who takes on human flesh, Hear my prayers, And break your beaks, O Rome! You will never have truce with me, Because you are false and perfidious, With us and with the Greeks! . . . Rome, to the Saracens, you do little damage, But to the Greeks and Latins, massacre and carnage; In the bottom of the abyss, Rome, you have your seat, In hell. [Throop, 1938]

The pro-papal Occitan poetess Gormonda de Monpeslier (flourished 1226–1229) was a *trobairitz*, or *troubadrese*, from Montpellier in Languedoc. Her only surviving work, *A sirventes*, while written in the Provençal dialect, has been called “the first French political poem by a woman”. Gormonda de Monpeslier responded to Figueira’s attack on the pope in *D’un sirventes far* with a poem of her own, *Greu m’es a durar*. Instead of blaming Pelagius or the papacy, she laid the blame on the “foolishness of the wicked”.

The tragedy of the Fifth Crusade, however, was neither the “wickedness of the pope” nor the “foolishness of the wicked”. It was the denial of reality, the inability to mourn, and a life in fantasy. Most of those who left on it were either killed, defeated, or returned home empty-handed. The religious fanaticism and political ambition that drove it were based on pure fantasy. “Holy wars”, whether in the name of Yahweh, God or Allah, are always disastrous.



## The Sixth Crusade: winning Jerusalem peacefully

**T**he Sixth Crusade was unique among the nine crusades, as well as among the crusades in Europe such as the Baltic and Cathar crusades, in that it was the only one whose goal was won peacefully. The “Holy City” of Jerusalem was bought peacefully from the “Saracens”, even though they also considered it a holy place and called it *Al-Quds* (the holy one). Its chief protagonist was the German king and “Holy Roman Emperor” Friedrich II (1194–1250), of the Hohesntaufen dynasty, who had refused to play a serious military role in the Fifth Crusade, and was excommunicated by Pope Honorius III for it. It was Friedrich who negotiated with the “Saracens” for Jerusalem, and it was he who crowned himself King of Jerusalem in 1229.

The old Pope Honorius III, who had played a major role in the Fifth Crusade, died in 1227. He was succeeded by Gregory IX (died 1241), the former Ugolino Cardinal di Conti. In 1228, seven years after the failure of the Fifth Crusade, the European Christians were already getting into another crusading frenzy. Once again, the crusade was born out of Europe’s internal conflicts, above all the perennial power struggle between the pope and the “Holy Roman Emperor”. This struggle had all the earmarks of an Oedipal battle:

the pope was an old man and was called *Papa* (father), whereas the emperor, who was also the king of Germany, was a younger man. For example, in 1228, Pope Gregory IX, who was born in 1145 (according to the Catholic Encyclopedia) or around 1170 (according to the *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexicon*), was anywhere from fifty-eight to eighty-three years old, while Emperor Friedrich was only thirty-two years old.

Despite the opposition of Pope Innocent III and the reluctance of Pope Honorius III, the German king and *Rex Romanorum* Friedrich II, who had been crowned "Holy Roman Emperor" by the pope, had partially involved himself in the Fifth Crusade, sending troops from Germany, but he had not accompanied the army personally, and had failed to send it to Egypt, where it was badly needed, despite the encouragement of Honorius III and, later, Gregory IX, as he needed to consolidate his position in Germany and Italy before embarking on a crusade. Friedrich promised to go on a crusade after his coronation as emperor in 1220 by Pope Honorius III, but did not leave for Egypt, and the Fifth Crusade failed miserably in 1221.

In 1210, Jean de Brienne, "King of Jerusalem", had married Maria del Monferrato, daughter of Isabella and Conrad of Montferrat, assuming the title of "King of Jerusalem" in right of his wife. In 1211, he concluded a six years' truce with Sultan Malik-el-Adil of Egypt, but in 1212 he lost his beloved wife, Maria del Monferrato (1192–1212), who had given him a daughter, Yolande (also known as Isabelle), but Maria died shortly thereafter, probably from puerperal fever. Jean de Brienne became Regent of Jerusalem for his daughter Yolande, now the baby Queen of Jerusalem. Soon afterwards Jean married Princess Stephanie, a daughter of King Leo II of Armenia. But Jean de Brienne had trouble mourning his loss of his first wife. He was a prominent figure during the Fifth Crusade, but the papal legate Pelagius claimed the command; insisting on the advance from Damietta to Cairo, in spite of Jean's warnings, he refused to accept the favourable terms of the sultan of Egypt, as Jean de Brienne advised, until it was too late.

After the failure of the Fifth Crusade in 1221, Jean de Brienne, "King of Jerusalem", who actually ruled in Acre, came to Europe to obtain help for his kingdom. He now became a tragic victim of the ambitions of "Holy Roman Emperor" Friedrich II. In 1223, Jean met

Pope Honorius III and Emperor Friedrich II at Ferentino, southeast of Rome, where, in order to have closer ties to the “Holy Land”, against Jean’s wishes, the *twenty-nine-year-old* Friedrich was betrothed to Jean’s *eleven-year-old* orphaned daughter Isabelle Yolande (1212–1228), the heiress of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. A disconsolate Jean de Brienne then went to France and England, then to Santiago de Compostela, a place of pilgrimage in northwest Spain, where King Alfonso IX of León offered him the hand of one of his daughters and the promise of his kingdom. Jean de Brienne passed over Alfonso’s eldest daughter and heiress in favour of a younger daughter, Berenguela de León.

In 1225, the *thirty-one-year-old* “Holy Roman Emperor” Friedrich of Germany married Jean de Brienne’s daughter, the *thirteen-year-old* Yolande Isabelle, who was known as “Queen Isabella of Jerusalem”. Friedrich now had a claim to the truncated “Kingdom of Jerusalem”, and a reason to attempt to restore it to Christian rule. Since the wedding of Friedrich and Yolande, she was kept in seclusion by her husband in his harem in Sicily. In November 1226, the fourteen-year-old Yolande gave birth to her first child, a daughter (Marguerite or Margareta), but this baby girl died in August 1227. Friedrich II and his army had set sail from Brindisi for Acre, but an epidemic at Otranto had forced him to turn back. Gregory took this opportunity to excommunicate Friedrich for breaking his crusading vow, though this was a pretext. Friedrich had for years been trying to consolidate his imperial power in Italy at the expense of the papacy.

Meanwhile, in 1225, after a visit to Germany, Jean de Brienne, “King of Jerusalem”, had returned to Rome, where he received a demand from his son-in-law Emperor Friedrich II that Jean should abandon his title and dignity of king, which, so Friedrich claimed, had passed to himself along with his wife, the heiress of the kingdom, Jean’s daughter Yolande Isabelle. This was “an offer that could not be refused”, and the “King of Jerusalem” abdicated in favour of his daughter—and, in effect, in favour of Friedrich. Jean de Brienne, “the most valorous knight of his time”, avenged himself on Friedrich three years later, *after his daughter’s death*, by commanding the papal troops that attacked Friedrich’s domains in southern Italy during the emperor’s absence on the Sixth Crusade (1228–1229). Once again we can see here a confirmation of Franco



Fornari's theory that those who cannot mourn their losses must make war (Fornari, 1974).

Pope Gregory IX had stated in 1227 that the reason for the excommunication of Emperor Friedrich II of Germany was Friedrich's failure to honour his crusading oath, dating back to the Fifth Crusade. As we have seen, for Gregory the crusade was a pretext to excommunicate the emperor, whose Italian ambitions he feared, just as his predecessors had feared their own "Holy Roman Emperors". Friedrich attempted to negotiate with the stubborn old pope, but eventually decided to ignore him, and, on 8 September 1227, Friedrich II of Germany sailed from Brindisi for Jerusalem. However, as we have seen, he fell ill at Otranto, where the young Landgrave Ludwig IV of Thuringia (1200–1227), who had joined the Sixth Crusade, had been put ashore, and Friedrich postponed his journey while he and Ludwig tried to recover. Ludwig had fallen ill of the fever after reaching Brindisi and Otranto. He received "Extreme Unction" from the Patriarch of Jerusalem and the Bishop of Santa Croce and died in Otranto. A few days after his death, his daughter Gertrud was born. Ludwig's remains were buried in Germany in 1228. Emperor Friedrich's sixteen-year-old wife Yolande Isabelle died on 25 April 1228 in Andria, near Bari, Italy, after giving birth to her second child, a son, Corrado (Conrad). She was buried in the Cathedral of Bari.

Some contemporary Christian chroniclers, who were sympathetic to the pope, doubted the sincerity of Friedrich's illness, stating that he had deliberately delayed sailing for selfish reasons, using his "illness" as a pretext. Roger of Wendover (died 1236), an English chronicler, wrote,

he went to the Mediterranean sea, and embarked with a small retinue; but after pretending to make for the holy land for three days, he said that he was seized with a sudden illness . . . this conduct of the emperor redounded much to his disgrace, and to the injury of the whole business of the crusade. [Peters, 1971]

In fact, Emperor Friedrich was forced to return home after an epidemic broke out in his camp before departing for Acre, and took the life of Ludwig of Thuringia. The Grand Master of the Teutonic Knights, Hermann von Salza (1179–1239), who had come on the

crusade with his Knights, recommended that Friedrich return to the mainland to recuperate. Hermann von Salza was the fourth Grand Master of the Teutonic Knights, serving from 1209.

A skilled diplomat with ties to both the "Holy Roman Emperor" and the pope, Hermann von Salza oversaw the expansion of his Teutonic order into Prussia. He was also a chief figure in the Baltic Crusades. Hermann was a friend and councillor of Emperor Friedrich II, whom he represented as a mediator in the Papal Curia from 1222 onwards. Pope Honorius III recognized Hermann's capabilities, and granted the Teutonic Knights an equal status with the Knights Hospitaller and the Knights Templar, after the latter had gone into decline under previous Grand Masters. This was a major coup for Hermann. His order became important, and in 1291 it defended Acre, where it had been created around 1192, along with the older orders.

Hermann von Salza's visits to the pope and the emperor brought new privileges and donations to the Teutonic Knights. In 1237, he obtained the incorporation of the Livonian Knights, or Brothers of the Sword, into the Teutonic Order. The importance of Hermann's role as mediator between Pope Gregory IX and Emperor Friedrich II can be seen by the fact that all communication between the two broke off with Hermann's death. Yet, within his own Teutonic Order, the knights began to grow dissatisfied at the absence of their Grand Master, like children with an absent father. They recalled him, and he had to withdraw from his political life. Being less successful as a religious leader, he retired to the papal estate at Salerno in 1238, where he died in 1239.

After recuperating from his illness, in 1228, the thirty-four-year-old "Holy Roman Emperor" Friedrich II of Germany embarked again for Jerusalem, arriving at Acre in September. This was looked upon by Pope Gregory IX as another provocation, since the church had no part in the honour of the crusade. Gregory once more excommunicated Friedrich. By this time, the army of the Sixth Crusade had dwindled. Knowing that he could not take Jerusalem by force of arms, Friedrich negotiated with the Ayyubid ruler for peace, along the lines of a previous agreement he had intended to broker with the Egyptian Ayyubid sultan, Al-Kamil. The Ayyubid ruler of the region, who feared a possible war with his relatives in Syria and Iraq, wished to avoid trouble from the Christians, at least

until his domestic rivals were subdued. The treaty he signed with Friedrich resulted in the peaceful restitution of Jerusalem, Nazareth, and Bethlehem to the "Kingdom of Jerusalem", for the first time since 1187, though historians disagree as to the exact territory returned.

The Sixth Crusade ended in a truce and in Friedrich's coronation by himself as King of Jerusalem, in the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem itself, on 18 March 1229. In the meantime, the sixteen-year-old Queen Yolande Isabelle of Jerusalem, had died (in 1228), and Pope Honorius III and Jean de Brienne used Friedrich's absence to attack Friedrich's territories in southern Italy (1228–1229). This, however, was technically impossible, as Friedrich's wife, Yolande, the true heiress of the throne of Jerusalem from her father Jean de Brienne, had died, leaving their infant son Corrado (Conrad) as the rightful heir to the kingdom. Friedrich ruled Jerusalem as regent on behalf of his son, Conrad, and signing a truce with the "Saracens". *This was the first and last time that Jerusalem was taken peacefully by the Crusaders from the Muslims.*

Nor did Jerusalem remain in Christian hands for a long time. In 1244, the "Saracens" once more took Jerusalem from the Crusaders. This time the "Saracens" were the Khwarezmians, recently displaced by the advance of the Mongols from Central Asia westward. They took Jerusalem on their way to ally with the Egyptian mamluks. They had come from the Khwarezm, a series of states centred on the Amu Darya river delta of the former Aral Sea, in Greater Iran (now in Uzbekistan), extending across the Ust-Urt plateau and possibly as far west as the eastern shores of the northern Caspian Sea. Soon, the mamluks would be the masters of Jerusalem.

## The Seventh Crusade: the unhappy war of “Saint Louis”

**T**he Seventh Crusade (1248–1254) followed the recapture of Jerusalem by the “Saracens”, and was led by King Louis IX of France (1214–1270). This king, who ruled France from the age of twelve until his death at the age of fifty-six, was pious, ascetic, deeply religious, and hostile to the “usurious” Jews. Indeed, from a Jewish viewpoint, this French king, whom the Christians later canonized and called “Saint Louis”, was not a saint. In fact, he persecuted the Jews. As money lending was one of the few professions allowed the Jews in France, and as high rates of interest were their only insurance against the very high rate of non-repayment of debts by Christians to Jews, the Jewish money lenders were considered greedy and usurious. In order to finance his crusade, Louis ordered the expulsion from France of all the Jews engaged in usury. This action enabled Louis to confiscate the property of the expelled Jews for use in his crusade (Joinville, 1617).

Louis IX did not eliminate the debts incurred by Christians to Jews, however. One-third of the debt was forgiven, but the other two-thirds were to be remitted to his royal treasury. Louis also ordered, at the urging of Pope Gregory IX, the burning of some 12,000 handwritten copies of the Jewish *Talmud* in Paris in 1243, on

the grounds that they contained anti-Christian material. Legislation against the Talmud, which was not uncommon in the history of European Christendom, was due to mediæval courts' concerns that its production and circulation might weaken the faith of Christian individuals and threaten the Christian basis of society, the protection of which was the duty of any Christian monarch (*ibid.*).

In 1249, the army of the Seventh Crusade under King Louis IX of France, numbering tens of thousands of men, landed in Egypt and took the port city of Damietta from the "Saracens". The Egyptian troops retreated inland. According to the Muslim historian Taqi al-Din Ahmad ibn 'Ali ibn 'Abd al-Qadir ibn Muhammad al-Maqrizi (1364–1442), King Louis sent a haughty letter to the Egyptian sultan, threatening him with destruction:

As you know that I am the ruler of the Christian nation I do know you are the ruler of the Muhammadan nation. The people of Andalusia give me money and gifts while we drive them like cattle. We kill their men and we make their women widows. We take the boys and the girls as prisoners and we make houses empty. I have told you enough and I have advised you to the end, so now if you make the strongest oath to me and if you go to Christian priests and monks and if you carry kindles before my eyes as a sign of obeying the cross, all these will not persuade me from reaching you and killing you at your dearest spot on earth. If the land will be mine then it is a gift to me. If the land will be yours and you defeat me then you will have the upper hand. I have told you and I have warned you about my soldiers who obey me. They can fill open fields and mountains, their number like pebbles. They will be sent to you with swords of destruction. [Al-Maqrizi, 1969, p. 436]

The Egyptian Ayyubid sultan, as-Salih Ayyub, died soon after receiving Louis's letter, and power passed to Sultan as-Salih's son, Turanshah (died 1250), and to Sultan as-Salih's widow, Shajar al-Durr, or Shajarat-ul-Durr (died 1257), who took control of Egypt with mamluk support and launched a counterattack on the invading "Franks". But the widow did not announce the death of her husband for some time.

The news of the death of Sultan as-Salih Ayyub reached the Crusaders in Damietta, however. Encouraged by the news of the death of the Sultan, and by the arrival of reinforcements led by

Alphonse de Poitiers, a brother of King Louis IX, the French Crusaders decided to march on Cairo. A Crusader force led by Louis IX's other brother, Robert d'Artois, crossed the canal of Ashmum (now the Albahr Alsaghir) and attacked the Egyptian camp in Gideila, near Al Mansurah. The Egyptian emir Fakhr ad-Din was killed during the sudden attack, and the Crusader force advanced toward Al Mansurah, where Robert d'Artois was killed, and the Crusader force was annihilated by an Egyptian military force led by the mamluk leaders who were about to establish the state which would dominate the entire southern Mediterranean: Izz ad-Din Aybak (died 1257), Saif ad-Din Qutuz (died 1260), Baibars al-Bunduqdari (died 1277), and Qalawun al-Alfi (died 1290).

The year 1250 was a dramatic one in Egypt. In February, Al-Muazzam Turanshah, the dead Sultan's son, arrived in Egypt and was enthroned Sultan of Egypt at as-Salihiya, as he had no time to go to Cairo, due to the war with the *Franj*. Feeling relieved by the arrival of the new Sultan, the widow Shajar al-Durr finally announced the death of her husband, Sultan as-Salih Ayyub. Turanshah went to Al Mansurah to fight the Crusaders. The Egyptian "Saracens" began to turn back the Frenchmen. An overconfident King Louis IX, however, delayed his retreat in Egypt. He had 15,000 to 25,000 men, but the "Saracen" troops of Turanshah, along with those of the mamluk commanders Baibars, Qutuz, Aybak, and Qalawun, defeated the French troops.

In March 1250, the rigid and self-righteous King Louis IX finally realized his hopeless military position and tried to return to the port of Damietta, but on 6 April he was defeated and taken captive at the Battle of Fariskur, where his army was annihilated. Sultan Turanshah himself was killed in Fariskur by the mamluks, who felt he was discriminating against them. King Louis fell ill with dysentery, and was cured by an Arab physician, but the "Saracens" demanded 50,000 gold bezants (400,000 French *livres*, the entire annual revenue of France) as his ransom. In May, Louis IX was indeed ransomed for the 400,000 *livres*, but 150,000 *livres* of this ransom were never paid. He was set free, and immediately left Egypt for Acre, the capital of the "Kingdom of Jerusalem" and one of few remaining Crusader possessions in the "Holy Land".

After Turanshah's murder in 1250, political pressure for a male Sultan in Egypt made the widow Shajar al-Durr marry the mamluk

commander of her army, Izz ad-Din Aybak, but he was murdered in 1257. In the power struggle that ensued, the vice-regent, Saif ad-Din Qutuz, became Sultan. In 1260 the mamluks defeated a Mongol army at Ain Jalut (now in northern Israel) and forced the Mongols to retreat to what is now Iraq. The defeat of the Mongols by the mamluks enhanced their position in the southern Mediterranean basin. Baibars, one of the mamluk leaders at the battle, became Sultan after the assassination of Qutuz on the way home to Cairo. Baibars was the fifth mamluk sultan of the "Bahri dynasty", named after its *Bahriya* or River Island regiment, which was based in al-Manial Island in the River Nile. This regiment consisted mainly of Kipchak Turks.

After the mamluks had killed Turanshah, toppled the Ayyubids, and created the mamluk Bahri dynasty, Louis of France made an alliance with the mamluks, and from his new base in Acre began to rebuild the other Crusader cities in the "Holy Land". Although the Kingdom of Cyprus claimed authority in the "Holy Land", King Louis IX was the *de facto* ruler. The legends of Prester John (also called Presbyter John), which were popular in Europe from the twelfth century, told of a Christian patriarch and king said to rule over a Christian nation lost amid the Muslims and pagans in the "Orient". The superstitious Louis negotiated with the Mongols, who had begun to appear in the "Orient" (the Middle East), and whom the Christians, encouraged by legends of a Nestorian kingdom among them, hoped would help them fight the "Saracens" and restore the Crusader States.

Ironically, both the Christians and the Muslims, who were also negotiating with the Mongols against the Christians, failed to realize that the Mongols were not interested in helping either side, and that they would eventually prove disastrous for both. In 1248, two envoys from the Mongols, whom the Crusaders named David and Marc, had visited Louis of France in Cyprus (Joinville, 1617). "David and Marc" were two Eastern Christians who were sent as ambassadors to the French king Louis IX by the Mongols. David is also known by his Arabic name, Saif al-Din Muzaffar Dawoud. David and Marc were first met by André de Longjumeau in 1245 in Tabriz (now in Iran), during his mission to the Mongols. In response, Louis sent an embassy by André de Longjumeau, and later by William of Rubruck, to the Mongol *khan* (Ruler). But the

*khan* rejected Louis's invitation to convert to Christianity, and instead suggested that Louis submit to him.

By 1254, the proud Louis's money had run out, and his presence was badly needed in France, where his mother and regent, Blanche de Castille (1188–1252), had died. Louis IX returned to Paris. The crusade of "Saint Louis" was a failure, but he was, nonetheless, considered a saint by many, and his fame gave him an even greater authority in Europe than the "Holy Roman Emperor". The history of the Seventh Crusade was written by Jehan de Joinville, a friend of Louis who was also a participant, by Mathieu de Paris, and by many Muslim historians. Joinville labelled all Muslims *Sarrasins*, the French form of "Saracens", and described them as evil, mean, and murderous. The European Christians saw the "Saracens" (and the Jews) as children of the Devil, and this was also expressed in their art, which depicted them as such (Strickland, 2003).





## The Eighth Crusade: “Saint Louis” fails again and dies

Unable to accept his humiliating defeat in Egypt, in 1270 the proud Louis IX of France attempted yet another crusade. By now Louis was in his mid-fifties, a considerable age for that time. Louis was disturbed by events in Syria, where the mamluk sultan Baibars (died 1277) had been attacking the remnants of the Crusader states. Baibars had seized the opportunity of a war between the republics of Venice and Genoa in 1256–1260, which had exhausted the Syrian ports that these two cities controlled. By 1265, Baibars had captured Nazareth, Haifa, Le Toron (Latrun), and Arsuf. King Hugues III of Cyprus, the nominal king of Jerusalem, landed in Acre to defend that city, while Baibars marched as far north as Armenia, which was at that time under Mongol control. In 1266, Charles d’Anjou, a son of Louis VIII, conquered Sicily and made himself its king.

These events led King Louis IX of France to call for a new crusade in 1267, although there was little support for a crusade this time. Jehan de Joinville, the chronicler who accompanied Louis on the Seventh Crusade, refused to go on the Eighth. Louis was convinced by his brother, Charles d’Anjou, to attack Tunis in North Africa, which would give them a strong base for attacking Egypt,

the focus of Louis' previous crusade. Charles d'Anjou, who was King of Sicily, had his own interests in this area of the Mediterranean. The Caliph of Tunis, Muhammad al-Mustansir (died 1277), had good connections with Christian Spain and was considered a good candidate for conversion. Louis landed on the North African coast in July 1270, a bad season for an invasion. Much of the army became sick due to the poor drinking water, and, on 25 August, Louis himself died from a "flux in the stomach", a day after the arrival of his brother Charles. According to Joinville, his last word was "Jerusalem".

Charles d'Anjou proclaimed Louis IX's son, Philippe, the new king of France, Philippe III, but, due to his youth, Charles became the regent and the actual leader of the crusade. Due to further diseases, the siege of Tunis was abandoned on 30 October 1270, by an agreement with the sultan. In this peace treaty, the Christians gained free trade with "Saracen" Tunis, and residence for monks and priests in the city was guaranteed, so the crusade could be regarded as a partial success. Not so for "Saint Louis", whose crusading zeal and narcissism had led him to his death.

## The Ninth Crusade: the last fantasy

Charles d'Anjou, who had conquered Sicily in 1266, allied himself with Prince Edward of England, who had arrived in Tunis in 1270. When Charles d'Anjou called off the attack on Tunis, Edward went on to Acre, the last Crusader outpost in Syria, in an attempt to restore the "Kingdom of Jerusalem". His time spent there (1271–1272) is called the Ninth Crusade. This crusade is considered to be the last major mediæval Crusade to the Holy Land. The Ninth Crusade failed largely because the crusading spirit was nearly extinct in Europe, and because of the growing power of the mamluks in Egypt. It also foreshadowed the imminent collapse of the last remaining Crusader strongholds along the Mediterranean coast.

Edward of England and Charles d'Anjou of Sicily decided that they would take their forces onward to Acre, capital of the remnant of the "Kingdom of Jerusalem" and the final objective of Baibars' military campaign. The armies of Edward and Charles arrived in Acre in 1271, just as the able and cruel Baibars was besieging the city of Tripoli, which, as the last remaining Christian area of the County of Tripoli, had tens of thousands of Christian refugees. From their bases in Cyprus and Acre, Edward and Charles managed to attack

Baibars' interior lines and break the siege of Tripoli. This was the first Crusader victory in many years.

As soon as Edward of England arrived in Acre, he tried to ally himself with the Mongols, sending an embassy to the Mongol ruler of Persia, Abaqa Khan (1234–1282), an enemy of the Muslims. The Mongols had sacked Muslim Baghdad in 1258, and Edward believed that they would ally themselves with the Christians. The embassy to the Mongols was led by Reginald Rossel, Godefroy de Waus, and John of Parker. In an answer dated 4 September 1271, Abaqa Khan agreed to co-operation and asked at what date the concerted attack on the mamluks should take place.

The arrival of the forces of King Hugues III of Cyprus, the nominal king of Jerusalem, in Acre emboldened Edward, who raided the "Saracen" town of Qaqun, near Nablus. At the end of October 1271, a small force of Mongols arrived in Syria and ravaged the land from Aleppo southward. However, Abaqa Khan, occupied by other conflicts in Turkestan, could only send 10,000 Mongol horsemen under General Samagar from the occupation army in Seljuk Turkish Anatolia, with some auxiliary Seljuk troops. Despite the relatively small force, their arrival triggered an exodus of Muslim populations (who remembered the previous campaigns of Kitbuqa) as far south as Cairo. The fierce and ruthless Mongols were deeply feared. But the Mongols did not stay, and when the mamluk leader Baibars mounted a counter-offensive on the Mongols from Egypt on 12 November, the Mongols had already retreated beyond the Euphrates into Persia.

Baibars suspected that there would be a combined land-sea attack on Egypt by the *Franj*. Feeling his position threatened, he endeavoured to head off such a manoeuvre by building a large fleet. Having finished construction of the fleet, rather than attack the Crusader army directly, Baibars attempted to land on Cyprus in 1271, hoping to draw King Hugues III of Cyprus (the nominal King of Jerusalem) and his fleet out of Acre, with the objective of conquering the island and leaving Edward and the Crusader army isolated in the "Holy Land". However, in the ensuing naval campaign, the Egyptian fleet was destroyed and Baibars' armies were routed and forced back.

Following this temporary victory over the "Saracens", Edward of England realized that it was necessary to end the internal rivalry

within the Crusader state. He mediated between Hugues and his unenthusiastic knights from the Ibeline family of Cyprus. After the mediation, Prince Edward of England began negotiating an eleven-year truce with Sultan Baibars of Egypt, although, according to some sources, this negotiation almost ended when Baibars attempted to assassinate Edward by sending men pretending to seek baptism as Christians. Edward and his knights personally killed the assassins and at once began preparations for a direct attack on Jerusalem. However, when news arrived that Edward's father, Henry III, had died in England, a peace treaty was signed with Sultan Baibars, allowing Edward to return home to be crowned King of England in 1272. The Ninth Crusade thus ended without any of its goals, above all the capture of Jerusalem, being realized.



## Aftermath: the end of a two-century fantasy

**A**fter the Ninth Crusade (1271–1272), the mamluks, who now ruled in Egypt, repeatedly tried to take Acre from the “Franks”. Edward of England had been accompanied on his crusade by Theobaldo Cardinal Visconti, who, in 1271, became Pope Gregory X. Gregory called for a new crusade at the Council of Lyons in 1274, but nothing came of this. Europe’s crusading spirit had died. New fissures arose within the Christian states in the “East” when Charles d’Anjou of Sicily took advantage of a dispute between Hugues III of Cyprus (the “King of Jerusalem”), the Knights Templar, and Venice in order to bring the remaining Crusader state under his control. Having bought Princess Mary of Antioch’s claims to the Kingdom of Jerusalem, Charles attacked Hugues III, causing a civil war within the rump kingdom. In 1277, Hugo of San Severino captured Acre for Charles. In that year, Sultan Baibars of Egypt died, as did the Caliph of Tunis, Muhammad al-Mustansir.

Although the civil war within the Crusader ranks had weakened them badly, it also gave the opportunity for a single commander to take control of the crusade: Charles d’Anjou, King of Sicily. However, this hope, too, was dashed when Venice again suggested



that a crusade be called, not against the "Saracens", but against the Greeks of Constantinople, where, in 1261, Michaelis VIII Palalelogos (1223–1282) had toppled the "Latin Kingdom of Constantinople", re-established the Byzantine Greek Empire, and driven out the Venetians as well. Pope Gregory X would not have supported an attack by Christians on Christians, but, in 1281, his successor, Pope Martin IV, did. This led in 1282 to the "War of the Sicilian Vespers" (1282–1302). The war began as a popular Sicilian uprising against King Charles d'Anjou, who had conquered Sicily in 1266, and was instigated by Emperor Michaelis VIII of Byzantium. Charles d'Anjou was driven from Sicily, and the French and Norman population of Sicily was massacred.

The Ninth Crusade was the last Crusader expedition launched either against the Byzantines in Europe or the Muslims in the Holy Land. During the remaining nine years (1282–1291), the mamluks demanded ever increasing tribute from the "Franks", and also persecuted the Christian pilgrims to Jerusalem, in contravention of their truce with Edward of England. In 1289, the mamluk sultan Qalawun al-Alfi of Egypt gathered a large army and attacked the remnants of the Christian County of Tripoli, laying siege to its capital of Tripoli, and finally taking it after a bloody assault. Their attack on Tripoli was terrible for the mamluks themselves, however, as the desperate and frenzied Christian resistance to the siege reached fanatical proportions. Qalawun lost his eldest and ablest son in the Tripoli campaign. He waited another two years to gather his strength. Qalawun died in 1290, but, in 1291, the mamluks, under his son Khalil (al-Malik al-Ashraf Salah ad-Din Khalil ibn Qalawun, 1262–1293), took Acre from the Crusaders.

The fall of Acre was tragic and bloody. Following the fall of Tripoli to the mamluks in 1289, King Henry of Cyprus desperately sent his seneschal Jean de Grailly to Europe to warn the European monarchs about the critical situation in the "Levant". In Rome, Jean de Grailly met Pope Nicholas IV (Girolamo Masci, 1227–1292), who promptly wrote to the European princes urging them to do something about the "Holy Land". Most of them, however, were too preoccupied by the "War of the Sicilian Vespers" to organize a crusade, and King Edward of England was entangled in his own troubles at home. Only a small army of Italian peasants and unemployed Italians from Tuscany and Lombardy could be raised. They

were transported in twenty Venetian galleys, led by Nicolò Tiepolo, son of the *Doge* of Venice, who was assisted by Jean de Grailly. As they sailed eastward, the fleet was joined by five Spanish galleys from King James of Aragon, who wished to help despite his conflict with the pope and Venice.

The fall of Acre and the final fall of the “Kingdom of Jerusalem” was preceded by a tragic massacre of Muslims by Christians. In August 1290, the inexperienced and poorly controlled peasants from Italy killed Muslim merchants and peasants in and around Acre without the permission of Acre’s Christian rulers. These killings gave the mamluk Sultan Qalawun a pretext to attack Acre. Although a ten-year truce had been signed between the mamluks and the Crusaders in 1289, Qalawun deemed the truce null and void following the killings. Qalawun first asked the Crusaders for the men guilty of the massacre to be handed over to him so that he could execute them. Guillaume de Beaujeu, the Grand Master of the Knights Templar, proposed handing over the Christian criminals from Acre’s jails, but the Council of Acre finally refused to hand over anybody to Qalawun, and instead tried to argue that the killed Muslims had died because of their own fault. At one point during the siege, Guillaume de Beaujeu dropped his sword and walked away from the walls. When his Templar knights remonstrated, Beaujeu reportedly replied: “*Je ne m’enfuis pas; je suis mort. Voici le coup.*” (I am not running away; I am dead. Here is the blow.) He raised his arm to show the mortal wound he had received (Barber, 2001, Crawford, 2003).

After the Council of Acre refused to hand over the culprits for the massacre of the “Saracens”, Sultan Qalawun ordered a general mobilization of the mamluk armies of Egypt. Though he died in November 1290, he was succeeded by his son Khalil, who soon led the forces attacking Acre. The island of Cyprus at that time was the base of operations for the three major Crusader orders: the Knights Templar, the Teutonic Knights, and the Knights Hospitaller. These orders sent their knights to Acre, which was well fortified, and now had these three groups of defenders. The population of Acre at the time was some 40,000 souls, its troops numbering around 15,000, and an additional 2,000 troops arrived on 6 May 1291, with King Henry II from Cyprus. There are no reliable figures for the mamluk army, though it was certainly larger than the

Crusader troops, with most of the force being volunteer siege workers. The siege lasted six weeks, beginning on 6 April 1291 and ending with the fall of the city on 18 May. According to a nineteenth-century painting by the French painter Dominique-Louis Papéty (1815–1849), the *Grand maître hospitalier*, Guillaume de Villiers, and the *maréchal des Hospitaliers*, Mathieu de Clermont, were among the leaders and last defenders of Acre. This is by no means certain, however, as the Knights Templar held out in their fortified headquarters in Acre until 28 May.

After the mamluks took Acre, they utterly destroyed it, so as to prevent the “Franks” from ever taking it again and re-establishing their kingdom. Within months, the remaining Crusader-held cities in the “Holy Land” fell easily, including Sidon (14 July 1291), Haifa (30 July), Beirut (31 July), Tartus (3 August), and Atlit (14 August). Only the small Mediterranean island of Arados or Arwad, off the Syrian coast, held out until 1302 or 1303. For the European Christians, this was the tragic end of the “Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem”, which had been based on psychohistorical and psychogeographical fantasies from its very outset. The Baltic Crusades, however, continued well into the fifteenth and even the sixteenth century. Paying no heed to Roger Bacon, the thirteenth-century *Doctor Mirabilis*, the Franciscan monk who wrote that religion can only be acquired by preaching, not imposed by war, the European Christians continued to try to impose their religion on the “heathen Saracens” of the Baltic region by the sword. Those who cannot mourn their losses, those who are unsure of their own faith, tragically try to force others to believe as they do.

## “The new Crusaders”

**D**uring the twentieth-century Arab–Jewish conflict in Palestine, which led to the creation of Israel in 1948, and has been going on for over a century (Falk, 2004), the Arabs came to regard the Jews as “the new Crusaders”. This was formally expressed by Abd ar-Rahman al-Azam, the secretary-general of the Arab League, which was founded in Cairo in 1945. In September 1947, al-Azam met with Abba Eban and David Horowitz, the representatives of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, and told them that the Jews of Palestine were “not a fact” but only a temporary phenomenon, like the mediæval Crusaders. The Arabs had not accepted the Crusaders as a fact, and had driven them away from Palestine after two centuries of war. In the same way, they would drive away the Jews. Many Arabs and Muslims still think of Israel as a colonial European outpost, like the Crusader kingdom of Jerusalem, that will not last any longer than did that kingdom.

This is a denial of reality by the Arabs and Muslims, which, not accidentally, is also shared by the Iranian mullahs, whose president repeatedly threatens Israel with annihilation. The Israeli Jews are powerful militarily, and they also have weapons of mass destruction, nuclear bombs, which their leaders intend to use if they are

convinced that Israel's very existence is threatened. It is dangerous to see the present with the eyes of the past. The Arabs and Muslims have lived in the past for a long time, just as the Jews did for fifteen centuries, after their loss of their sovereignty, country, holy city, and temple in 70 CE (Falk, 1996; Yerushalmi, 1982). To live in the present, one must mourn one's losses and come to terms with them. The mediæval Crusaders' failure to mourn their losses cost them many thousands of lives and untold tragedy. If the Israeli Jews and the Palestinian Arabs can mourn their own losses, perhaps the Arabs will no longer confuse the Israelis with the Crusaders, nor will the Israelis confuse the Arabs with their ancient enemies, like Amalek. Then, perhaps, peace can be achieved between these two hostile groups, which have been locked in an intractable conflict for so long.

## REFERENCES

- Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres (1841). *Recueil des historiens des croisades*. Fifteen volumes. Paris: Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres [abridged edition. Farnborough: Gregg, 1967] [French].
- Alfonsi, P. (2006). *Dialogue Against the Jews*, I. M. Resnick (Trans.). Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press.
- Alighieri, D. (1996). *Dante Alighieri's Divine Comedy*, M. Musa (Ed. & Trans.). Vol. 1. *Inferno*. Bloomington, IA: Indiana University Press.
- Al-Maqrizi, Taqi al-Din Ahmad ibn 'Ali ibn 'Abd al-Qadir ibn Muhammad (1969). The road to knowledge of the return of kings. In: H. G. Bohn (Ed.), *Chronicles of the Crusades*. New York: AMS Press.
- Ambroise (1897). *L'Estoire de la Guerre sainte: histoire en vers de la troisième croisade (1190–1192). par Ambroise; publiée et traduite d'après le manuscrit unique du Vatican [c. 1195] et accompagnée d'une introduction, d'un glossaire et d'une table des noms propres par Gaston Paris ...* Paris: Imprimerie Nationale [French].
- Ambroise (1941). *The Crusade of Richard Lion-Heart*, M. J. Hubert (Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ambroise (2003). *The History of the Holy War*, M. Ailes (Trans.). New York: Boydell Press.

- Andrea, A. J. (1987). Conrad von Krosigk, Bishop of Halberstadt, Crusader, and Monk of Sittichenbach: His Ecclesiastical Career, 1184–1225. *Analecta Cisterciensia*, 43: 11–91.
- Bacon, R. (1877–1900). *The Opus Majus of Roger Bacon*, Three volumes, J. H. Bridges (Ed.). Oxford: PNU [reprinted Frankfurt: PNU (Latin), 1964].
- Ball, E. (1970). *In the Days of Victorio: Recollections of a Warm Springs Apache*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Ball, E., Henn, N., & Sánchez, L. A. (1980). *Indeh: An Apache Odyssey*. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press [new edition, Oklahoma City, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988].
- Barber, M. (2001). *The Trial of the Templars* (2nd edn). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boia, L. (2001). *History and Myth in Romanian Consciousness*. Budapest: Central European University Press.
- Bossong, G. (2002). Der Name *Al-Andalus*: Neue Überlegungen zu einem alten Problem. In: D. Restle, & D. Zaefferer (Eds.), *Sounds and Systems: Studies in Structure and Change* (pp. 149–164). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter [German].
- Braudel, F. (1989–1990). *The Identity of France* (two volumes), S. Reynolds (Trans.). London: Fontana Press.
- Canter, D. (2006). The Samson syndrome: is there a kamikaze psychology? *Twenty-First Century Society*, 1(2): 107–127.
- Charny, I. W. (Ed.) (1999). *Encyclopedia of Genocide*. Forewords by Desmond M. Tutu and S. Wiesenthal. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Cobb, P. M. (2005). *Usama ibn Munqidh: Warrior-Poet in the Age of Crusades*. Oxford: Oneworld.
- Cole, R. J. (2002). *Sacred Space and Holy War: The Politics, Culture and History of Shi'ite Islam*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Crawford, P. (Ed.) (2003). *Templar of Tyre: Part III The Deeds of the Cypriots*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- De Mente, B. L. (2003). Ichiban to Biri: feeling superior and inferior. In: *Japanese Etiquette & Ethics in Business*. Lincolnwood, IL: Contemporary Publishing.
- Einhard (1998). *Charlemagne's Courtier: The Complete Einhard*, P. E. Dutton (Ed. & Trans.). Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press.
- El-Isfahani, Imad ed-din el-Katib (1888). *Conquête de la Syrie et de la Palestine par Salah ed-din*, publié par le comte Carlo de Landberg. Leyden: E. J. Brill [new edition, 1972] [French].

- Ellenblum, R. (1998). *Frankish Rural Settlement in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellenblum, R. (2007). *Crusader Castles and Modern Histories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Epstein, I. (Ed.) (1935–1948). *The Babylonian Talmud . . . Translated into English with Notes, Glossary, and Indices under the editorship of I. Epstein*. London: Soncino Press.
- Ernoul (1973). *The Chronicle of Ernoul and the Continuations of William of Tyre*, M. R. Morgan (Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ernoul (1982). *La Continuation de Guillaume de Tyr (1184–1192)*, M. R. Morgan (Ed.). Paris: L'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres [French].
- Esposito, J. L. (Ed.) (2003). *The Oxford Dictionary of Islam*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Falk, A. (1987). The meaning of Jerusalem: a psychohistorical inquiry. *The Psychohistory Review*, 16(1): 99–113 [expanded version in H. F. Stein, & Niederland, W. G (Eds.) *Maps from the Mind: Readings in Psychogeography*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1989].
- Falk, A. (1996). *A Psychoanalytic History of the Jews*. Madison: NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Falk, A. (2004). *Fratricide in the Holy Land: A Psychoanalytic View of the Arab–Israeli Conflict*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Falk, A. (2008a). *Anti-Semitism: The History and Psychoanalysis of Contemporary Hatred*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Falk, A. (2008b). *Islamic Terror: Unconscious and Unconscious Motives*. Westport, CT: Praeger Security International.
- Feldner, Y. (2000). “Honor” murders—why the perps get off easy. *Middle East Quarterly*, 7(4): 41–50.
- Fornari, F. (1974). *The Psychoanalysis of War*. New York: Doubleday.
- Fredegar et al. (1960). *The Fourth Book of the Chronicle of Fredegar; With Its Continuations*. J. M. Wallace-Hadrill (Ed. & Trans.). London: Nelson [new edition, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1981].
- Fredriksen, P. (1988). *From Jesus to Christ: The Origins of the New Testament Images of Jesus*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press [2nd edition, 2000].
- Gabrieli, F. (Ed.) (1969). *Arab Historians of the Crusades*. Selected and translated from the Arabic sources into Italian by Francesco Gabrieli, E. J. Costello (Trans.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Haley, J. L. (1981). *Apaches: A History and Culture Portrait*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.



- Halm, H. (1989). Al-Andalus und Gothica Sors. *Der Islam*, 66: 252–263 [German].
- Halsall, P. (Ed.) (2006). *Internet Medieval Sourcebook*. Online version at <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/sbook.html>
- Hillenbrand, C. (1999). *The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hindley, G. (2003). *The Crusades: A History of Armed Pilgrimage and Holy War*. New York: Carroll & Graf [new edition, *The Crusades: Islam and Christianity in the Struggle for World Supremacy*, 2004].
- Houtsma, M. T., Arnold, T. W., Basset, R., & Hartmann, R. (Eds.) (1954–2007). *The Encyclopaedia of Islam: A Dictionary of the Geography, Ethnography and Biography of the Muhammadan Peoples, prepared by a number of leading orientalists. Published under the patronage of the International association of the academies* [Second edition, twelve volumes, P. J. Bearman et al. (Eds.). Leiden: E. J. Brill] [English and French editions].
- Hughes, P. (1934). *A History of the Church: An Introductory Study*. New York: Sheed & Ward [new edition, three volumes, New York: Sheed & Ward, 1935–1947].
- Hughes, P. (1948). *A History of the Church*. New York: Sheed & Ward [new edition, *A History of the Church: To the Eve of the Reformation*. London: Sheed & Ward, 1976].
- Ibn al-Qalanisi, Abu Ya'ala Hamzah ibn Asad (1932). *The Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades*, extracted and translated from the chronicle of Ibn al-Qalanisi by H. A. R. Gibb. London: Luzac [new edition, New York: AMS Press, 1980. New edition, Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 1992].
- Ibn Munqidh, U. (1929). *An Arab-Syrian Gentleman and Warrior in the Period of the Crusades; Memoirs of Usamah ibn-Munqidh (Kitab al i'tibar)*. Arabic text edited from the unique manuscript in the Escorial Library, Spain, by Philip K. Hitti. New York: Columbia University Press [reprinted as *Usamah's Memoirs, Entitled Kitab al-i'tibar*, by Usamah ibn Munqidh. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1930. New edition, with a new Foreword by R. W. Bulliet, New York: Columbia University Press, 2000].
- Ibn Shaddad, Baha al-Din Yusuf ibn Rafi' (2001). *The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin, or al-Nawadir al-Sultaniyya wa'l-Mahasin al-Yusufiyya*, D. S. Richards (Trans.). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Ireland, W. W. (1906–1907). On the psychology of the Crusades. *Journal of Mental Science*, 52: 745–755 & 53: 322–341.

- Irwin, R. (1998). Usama ibn Munqidh: *An Arab-syrian Gentleman at the Time of the Crusades* reconsidered. In: J. France & W. G. Zajac (Eds.), *The Crusades and Their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton* (pp. 71–87). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- John of Damascus (1958). *Writings*, F. H. Chase, Jr (Trans.). New York: Fathers of the Church [reprinted Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1970, new edition, 1999].
- Joinville, J. de (1617). *Histoire de S. Loys IX. du nom, roy de France, Par messire Jean, sire de Joinville, seneschal de Champagne, nouvellement mise en lumiere, suivant l'original ancien de l'autheur, avec diverses pieces du mesme temps non encorr imprimees, & quelques Observations historiques. Par Me. Claude Menard . . . Sancti Ludovici vita, conversatio et miracula, per F. Gaufridum de Belloloco, confessorem, et F. Guillelum Carnotensem, capellanum ejus. Item Bonifacii, papae VIII, sermones duo in canonizatione . . .* Paris: En la boutique de Nivelles, Chez Sebastien Cramoisy [new edition, Paris: Club des Libraires de France, 1960] [French].
- Kedar, B. Z. (1984). *Crusade and Mission: European Approaches toward the Muslims*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Keegan, J. (1993). *A History of Warfare*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Killebrew, A. E. (2003). Biblical Jerusalem: an archaeological assessment. In: A. G. Vaughn & A. E. Killebrew (Eds.), *Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeology: The First Temple Period*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Killebrew, A. E. (2005). *Biblical Peoples and Ethnicity: An Archaeological Study of Egyptians, Canaanites, Philistines, and early Israel, 1300–1100 B.C.E.* Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Laroui, A. (1976). *The Crisis of the Arab Intellectual: Traditionalism or Historicism?* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Lewis, B. (1950). *The Arabs in History*. London: Hutchinson's University Library [4th edition, London: Hutchinson, 1966; 6th edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993].
- Littell, J. (2006). *Les Bienveillantes: roman*. Paris: Gallimard [French].
- López Pereira, J. E. (Ed. & Tr.) (1980). *Epitoma imperatorum: Crónica mozárabe de 754*. Zaragoza: Anubar [Spanish & Latin].
- Maalouf, A. (1983). *The Crusades Through Arab Eyes*, J. Rothschild (Trans.). New York: Schocken Books [reprinted London: Al Saqui Books, 1984; reprinted New York: Schocken Books, 1985].
- Migne, J.-P. (Ed.) (1844–1855). *Patrologiae cursus completus, sive bibliotheca universalis, integra, uniformis, commoda, oeconomica, omnium SS. Patrum, doctorum scriptorumque ecclesiasticorum qui ab aeo apostolico ad usque Innocentii III tempora floruerunt . . .* [Series Latina, in qua

- prodeunt Patres, doctores scriptoresque Ecclesiae Latinae, a Tertulliano ad Innocentium III]* Accurante J.-P. Migne. Three volumes. Paris: Lutetiae Parisiorum [Latin].
- Migne, J.-P. (Ed.) (1862–1865). *Index alphabeticus omnium doctorum, patrum, scriptorumque ecclesiasticorum quorum opera scriptaque vel minima in Patrologia Latina reperiuntur*. J. B. Pearson: *Conspectus auctorum quorum nomina indicibus Patrologiae Graeco-Latinae a J. P. Migne editae continentur*. Three volumes. Paris: PU [reprinted, Ridgewood, NJ: Gregg Press, 1965 (Latin)].
- Mijolla, A. de (Ed.) (2005). *International Dictionary of Psychoanalysis*. Three volumes. Detroit, IL: Macmillan Reference USA.
- Mitscherlich, A., & Mitscherlich, M. (1975). *The Inability to Mourn: Principles of Collective Behavior*. B. R. Placzek (Trans.). New York: Grove Press.
- Molinier, A., & Polain, M.-L. (1901–1906). *Sources de l'histoire de France des origines aux guerres d'Italie (1494)*. Six volumes. Paris: Picard et fils [French].
- Morris, C. (1968). Geoffroy de Villehardouin and the Conquest of Constantinople. *History*, 53(177): 24–34.
- Noble, P. S. (2002). Eyewitnesses of the Fourth Crusade: the reign of Alexius V. In: E. Kooper, (Ed.) *The Mediæval Chronicle II: Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on the Mediæval Chronicle Driebergen/Utrecht 16–21 July 1999* (pp. 178–189). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Olster, D. M. (1994). *Roman Defeat, Christian Response and the Literary Construction of the Jew*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Partner, P. (1997). *God of Battles: Holy Wars of Christianity and Islam*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Patai, R. (1973). *The Arab Mind*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Patai, R. (1976). Ethnohistory and Inner History. *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, 67: 1–15 [reprinted in *The Jewish Mind* (pp. 28–37). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1977].
- Peters, E. (Ed.) (1971). *Christian Society and the Crusades: 1198–1229*. Sources in translation, including *The Capture of Damietta* by Oliver of Paderborn, translated with notes by John J. Gavigan. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Phillips, J. P. (2002). *The Crusades, 1095–1197*. London: Pearson Education.
- Phillips, J. P. (2004). *The Fourth Crusade and the Sack of Constantinople*. London: Jonathan Cape [reprinted London: Pimlico, 2005].

- Prawer, J. (1972). *The Crusaders' Kingdom; European Colonialism in the Middle Ages*. New York: Praeger [new edition London: Phoenix, 2001].
- Prawer, J. (1980). *Crusader Institutions*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Procopius of Caesarea (1653). *The History of the Warres of the Emperour Justinian . . .*, H. Holcroft (Trans.). London: Henry Moseley.
- Raoul de Caen (2005). *Gesta Tancredi*. The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen: a history of the Normans on the First Crusade, B. S. Bachrach & D. S. Bachrach (Tr.). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Raymond d'Aguilers (1611). *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem*. In: J. Bongars (Ed.), *Gesta Dei per Francos, siue Orientaliom expeditionum, et regni Francorum hierosolimitani historia a variis, sed illius æui scriptoribus, litteris commendata: nunc primum aut editis, aut ad libros veteres emendatis. Auctores præfatio ad lectorem exhibet. Orientalis historiae tomus primus [et secundus]*, vol. I (pp. 139–183). Hanoviæ: typis Wechelianis, apud heredes I. Aubrii [Latin].
- Robinson, G. R., & Robinson, J. H. (Eds.) (1894). *Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Department of History [new editions, Philadelphia, PA, 1895–1907, 1898–1912 (six volumes); reprinted New York: Longman Green, 1902].
- Siberry, E. (2000). *The New Crusaders: Images of the Crusades in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Spicer, A., & Hamilton, S. (Eds.) (2005). *Defining the Holy: Sacred Space in Mediæval and Early Modern Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Stein, H. F., & Niederland, W. G. (Eds.) (1989). *Maps for the Mind: Readings in Psychogeography*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Stevenson, W. H. (1899). The beginnings of Wessex. *The English Historical Review*, 14(53): 32–46.
- Strickland, D. H. (2003). *Saracens, Demons & Jews: Making Monsters in Mediæval Art*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Suetonius, Gaius Tranquillus (2003). *The Twelve Caesars*, M. Grant (Ed.), R. Graves (Trans.). New York: Penguin [new edition, *The Twelve Caesars: The Lives of the Roman Emperors*, J. C. Rolfe (Trans.). St. Petersburg, FL: Red and Black Publications, 2008].
- Tacitus, Cornelius (1999). *Germania*, J. B. Rives (Trans.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Terman, D. (1984). Anti-semitism: a study in group vulnerability and the vicissitudes of group ideals. *The Psychohistory Review*, 12(4): 18–24.

- Theophanes the Confessor (1982). *The Chronicle of Theophanes: an English Translation of Anni Mundi 6095–6305 (AD 602–813)*, H. Turtledove (Ed.). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Theophanes the Confessor (1997). *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History, AD 284–813*, C. Mango & R. Scott (Eds. & Trans.), with the assistance of G. Greatrex. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Theophylaktos Simokattes (1986). *The History of Theophylact Simocatta: An English Translation with Introduction*, M. Whitby & M. Whitby (Trans.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Throop, P. A. (1938). Criticism of Papal Crusade Policy in Old French and Provençal. *Speculum*, 13(4): 379–412.
- Tubb, J. N. (1998). *Canaanites. Peoples of the Past*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Tyerman, C. (1998). *The Invention of the Crusades*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Tyerman, C. (2004). *Fighting for Christendom: Holy War and the Crusades*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tyerman, C. (2005a). *The Crusades: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tyerman, C. (2005b). Interview with Sheila Kast on National Public Radio, February 27. NPR.org website.
- Tyerman, C. (2006). *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Vallvé Bernejo, J. (1986). *The Territorial Divisions of Muslim Spain*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Villehardouin, G. de (1891). *La conquête de Constantinople*. Texte et traduction nouvelle, avec notice, notes et glossaire par Emile Bouchet. Paris: A. Lemerre [French].
- Villehardouin, G. de (1915). *Memoirs of the Crusades*. London: J. M. Dent.
- Vryonis, S. (1967). *Byzantium and Europe*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Waite, R. G. L. (1977). *The Psychopathic God: Adolf Hitler*. New York: Basic Books [reprinted New York: Da Capo Press, 1993].
- Waller, J. (2002). *Becoming Evil: How Ordinary People Commit Genocide and Mass Killing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- William of Tyre (1893). *Godeffroy of Bolyne; or, The Siege and Conquest of Jerusalem, by William, Archbishop of Tyre*, M. N. Colvin (Ed.), W. Caxton (Trans.). London: published for the Early English Text Society by K. Paul, Trench, Trübner [reprinted Millwood, New York: Kraus Reprints, 1987].

- William of Tyre (1943). *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, by William, Archbishop of Tyre, E. A. Babcock & A. C. Krey (Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press [reprinted New York: Octagon Books, 1976].
- William of Tyre (1986). *The Conquest of Jerusalem and the Third Crusade: Sources in Translation*, P. W. Edbury (Ed. & Trans.). Brookfield, VT: Scolar Press.
- Yerushalmi, Y. H. (1982). *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abels, R. P., & Bachrach, B. S. (Eds.) (2001). *The Normans and Their Adversaries at War*. Woodbridge and Rochester, New York: Boydell Press.
- Amitai, R. (2007). *The Mongols in the Islamic Lands: Studies in the History of the Ilkhanate*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Andrea, A. J. (Ed.) (2000). *Contemporary Sources for the Fourth Crusade*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Angold, M. (2003). *The Fourth Crusade: Event and Context*. Harlow: Longman.
- Bachrach, B. S. (Ed.) (1971). *The Mediæval Church: Success or Failure?* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bachrach, B. S. (2002). *Warfare and Military Organization in Pre-crusade Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Barber, M. (1994). *The New Knighthood: A History of the Order of the Temple*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bartlett, W. B. (2000). *An Ungodly War: The Sack of Constantinople and the Fourth Crusade*. Stroud: Sutton.
- Bédier, J. (Ed. & Tr.) (1988). *La Chanson de Roland*. Publié et traduit d'après le manuscrit d'Oxford. Paris: Union générale d'éditions [French].



- Bohn, H. G. (Ed.) (1848). *Chronicles of the Crusades, Being Contemporary Narratives of the Crusade of Richard Coeur de Lion / by Richard of Devizes and Geoffrey de Vinsauf ; and of the crusade of St. Louis, by Lord John de Joinville . . .* H. G. Bohn (Ed.). London: Henry George Bohn. New edition, London and New York: G. Bell & Sons, 1892 [reprinted New York: AMS Press, 1969].
- Bradford, A. S. (2001). *With Arrow, Sword, and Spear: A History of Warfare in the Ancient World*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Brand, C. M. (1968). *Byzantium Confronts the West, 1180–1204*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brett, M., & Fentress, E. W. B. (1996). *The Berbers*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Brundage, J. A. (Ed. & Tr.) (1962). *The Crusades: A Documentary Survey*. Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press [Latin and English].
- Comfort, W. W. (1940). The literary role of the Saracens in the French Epic. *PMLA*, 55(3): 628–659.
- Comnena, A. (2003). *The Alexiad of the Princess Anna Comnena: Being the History of the Reign of her Father, Alexius I, Emperor of the Romans, 1081–1118 A.D.* E. A. S. Dawes (Trans.). New York: Kegan Paul.
- David, C. W. (Ed. & Tr.) (2000). *De expugnatione Lyxbonensi*. [On the conquest of Lisbon.] With a foreword and bibliography by Jonathan Philipps. New York: Columbia University Press [English & Latin].
- Dawkins, C. R. (2006). *The God Delusion*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Duby, G. (1984). *Guillaume le Maréchal, ou, Le meilleur chevalier du monde*. Paris: Fayard [French].
- Duby, G. (1985). *William Marshal: The Flower of Chivalry*, R. Howard (Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Edbury, P. W. (1996). *The Conquest of Jerusalem and the Third Crusade: Sources in Translation*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Falk, A. (2001). Osama Bin Laden and America: a psychobiographical study. *Mind and Human Interaction*, 12(3): 161–172.
- Flori, J. (1999). *Richard Coeur de lion: le roi-chevalier*. Paris: Editions Payot.
- Flori, J. (2001a). *La guerre sainte: la formation de l'idée de croisade dans l'Occident chrétien*. Paris: Editions Aubier-Flammarion [French].
- Flori, J. (2001b). *Les croisades*. Paris: Editions Gisserot [French].
- Flori, J. (2002). *Guerre sainte, jihad, croisade: violence et religion dans le christianisme et l'islam*. Paris: Editions du Seuil [French].
- Flori, J. (2006). *Pierre l'Ermite et la première croisade*. Paris: Editions Fayard.
- Flori, J. (2007a). *L'Islam et la fin des temps: l'interprétation prophétique des invasions musulmanes dans la chrétienté médiévale*. Paris: Editions du Seuil [French].

- Flori, J. (2007b). *Bohémond d'Antioche: chevalier d'aventure*. Paris: Editions Payot [French].
- Flori, J. (2008). *La fin du monde au Moyen Age*. Paris: Editions Gisserot [French].
- France, J., & Zajac, W. G. (Eds.) (1998). *The Crusades and Their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Geary, P. J. (Ed.) (2003). *Readings in Mediæval History* (3rd edn). Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press.
- Gibb, H. A. R., & Kramers, J. H. (Eds.) (2001). *Concise Encyclopedia of Islam*. Edited on behalf of the Royal Netherlands Academy. Leiden: Brill Academic.
- Godfrey, J. (1980). *1204: The Unholy Crusade*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goitein, S. D. (Ed.) (1974). *Religion in a Religious Age*. Cambridge, MA: Association for Jewish Studies.
- Graves, R., & Patai, R. (1964). *Hebrew Myths: The Book of Genesis*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday [new edition, New York: Greenwich House, 1983].
- Gregory IX (1896–1955). *Les registres Grégoire IX*. Four volumes, L. Auvray (Ed.). Paris: PNU [Latin and French].
- Hagenmeyer, H (Ed.) (1892). [Originally written around 1100]. *De Gesta francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum*. Ten Books. Heidelberg: Verlag Carl Winter. New edition with an Italian translation, Ed. Luigi Rosso, Alessandria, Piemonte, Italy: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2003 [Latin].
- Harris, J. (2003). *Byzantium and the Crusades*. London: Hambledon & London.
- Heer, F. (1968). *The Holy Roman Empire*, J. Sondheimer (Trans.). London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Hirschfeld, A. (2008). Armida: a review of Haydn's opera directed by Nicolaus Harnoncourt. *Ha'aretz Weekly Supplement*, June 20.
- Holder-Egger, O., & von Simson, B. (Eds.) (1916). *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*. In: *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica: Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in Usum Scholarum*. Hanover: [1st caret] rerum Germanicarum; [2nd caret] Hahnsche Buchhandlung [Latin and German].
- Holt, A., & Muldoon, J. (2008). *Competing Voices from the Crusades: Fighting Words*. Westport, CT: Greenwood World.
- Houtsma, M. T., Arnold, T. W., & Basset, R. (Eds.) (1913–1936). *The Encyclopaedia of Islam: A Dictionary of the Geography, Ethnography and Biography of the Muhammadan Peoples, prepared by a number of leading*

- orientalists. Published under the patronage of the International association of the academies [English, German, and French editions].
- Huillard-Bréholles, J.-L. A (Ed.) (1852–1861). *Historia diplomatica Fridericii secundi*. Six volumes in eleven. Paris: Plon [Latin].
- Jacques de Vitry (1997). *Histoire occidentale ' Historia occidentalis: tableau de l'Occident au XIIIe siècle*. J. Longère (Ed.), G. Duchet-Suchaux (Trans.). Paris: Editions du Cerf [French].
- Kazdhan, A. (2001). Latins and Franks in Byzantium. In Laiou, Angeliki E. & Mottahedeh, Roy Parviz (Eds.) *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks.
- Kedar, B. Z., Mayer, H. E., & Small, R. C. (Eds.) (1982). *Outremer: Studies in the History of the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem presented to Joshua Prawer*. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi Institute.
- Kehew, R. (Ed.) (2005). *Lark in the Morning: the Verses of the Troubadours*, E. Pound, W. D. Snodgrass, & R. Kehew (Trans.), bilingual edition. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kolbaba, T. M. (2001) Byzantine perceptions of Latin religious “errors”: themes and changes from 850 to 1350. In: A. E. Laiou & R. P. Mottahedeh (Eds.), *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks.
- Krämer, U. (1996). *Translatio imperii et studii: zum Geschichts- und Kulturverständnis in der französischen Literatur des Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit*. Bonn: Romanistischer [German].
- Lilie, R.-J. (1988) *Byzantium and the Crusader States, 1096–1204*, J. C. Morris & J. E. Ridings (Trans.). Oxford: Clarendon Press [revised edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993].
- Madden, T. F. (2003). *Enrico Dandolo and the Rise of Venice*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Madden, T. F., & Queller, D. E. (1997). *The Fourth Crusade: The Conquest of Constantinople*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Maqsood, R. W. (2001). *A Basic Dictionary of Islam*. New Delhi: Good Word Books.
- Marin, S. (2000). A Humanist vision regarding the Fourth Crusade and the state of the Assenides. The Chronicle of Paul Ramusio (Paulus Rhamnusius). *Annuario del Istituto Romano di Cultura e Ricerca Umanistica*, 2: 51–57.
- Martin, S. (2004). *The Knights Templar: The History & Myths of the Legendary Military Order*. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press.
- Martini, R. (1968). *Pugio fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos*. Farnborough: Gregg [Latin].

- McNeal, E., & Wolf, R. L. (1962). The Fourth Crusade. In: K. M. Setton (General Ed.), R. L. Wolff & H. W. Hazard (Eds.), *A History of the Crusades* (volume 2). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Michaud, J.-F. (1853). *The History of the Crusades*. Three volumes, W. Robson (Trans.). G. Doré (Illustr.). New York: Redfield [new edition, New York: AMS Press, 1973].
- Muir, W. (1883). *Annals of the Early Caliphate, from Original Sources, by Sir William Muir*. London: Smith, Elder [new edition, *Annals of the Early Caliphate from the Death of Mahomet to the Omeyyad and Abbaside Dynasties A.H. XI–LXI (A.D. 632–680) from Original Sources*. Amsterdam: Oriental Press, 1968].
- Munro, D. C. (Trans.) (1902). Letters of the Crusaders written from the Holy Land. In: G. R. Robinson & J. H. Robinson (Eds.), *Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History, Volume 1*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Murray, A. V. (Ed.) (2006). *The Crusades: An Encyclopedia*. Four volumes. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Nahon, G. (1996). *Adversus Judaeus: sources hébraïques et latines sur la Première Croisade*. In: A. Dierkens (Ed.), *Le penseur, la violence, la religion* (pp. 83–95). Bruxelles: Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles [French].
- Nicholson, H. J. (2005). *God's Warriors: Knights Templar, Saracens and the Battle for Jerusalem*. Oxford: Osprey.
- Nicol, D. (1993). *The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261–1453*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nicol, D. M. (1988). *Byzantium and Venice: A Study in Diplomatic and Cultural Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Noble, P. S. (1999). Eyewitnesses of the Fourth Crusade: the war against Alexius III. *Reading Mediæval Studies: Annual Proceedings of the Graduate Centre for Mediæval Studies in the University of Reading, Volume 25*. Reading: University of Reading.
- Önal, A. (2008). *Honour Killing: Stories of Men Who Killed*. London: Saqi.
- Philippi, R. (Ed.) (1882–1886). *Preussisches Urkundenbuch*. Six volumes. Königsberg: Aalen und Marburg [German].
- Pryor, J. H. (Ed.) (2006). *Logistics of Warfare in the Age of the Crusades: Proceedings of a Workshop held at the Centre for Mediæval Studies, University of Sydney, 30 September to 4 October 2002*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Queller, D. E. (1971). *The Latin Conquest of Constantinople*. New York: John Wiley.

- Queller, D. E. (1977). *The Fourth Crusade: The Conquest of Constantinople, 1201–1204*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press [reprinted Leicester: University of Leicester Press, 1978; revised edition: D. E. Queller & T. F. Madden, *The Fourth Crusade: The Conquest of Constantinople*, with an essay on primary sources by Alfred J. Andrea. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press].
- Queller, D. E., & Stratton, S. J. (1969). A century of controversy on the Fourth Crusade. *Studies in Mediæval and Renaissance History*, 6: 237–277 [reprinted in Queller, D. E., *Mediæval Diplomacy and the Fourth Crusade*. London: Variorum Reprints, 1980].
- Raymond d'Aguilers (1824). *Histoire des Francs qui prirent Jérusalem*. In: F. Guizot (Ed. & Tr.), *Collection de mémoires relatif à l'histoire de France*, vol. XXI (pp. 227–397). Paris: J.-L.-J. Brière [French].
- Raymond d'Aguilers (1968). *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem . . .* J. H. Hill & L. L. Hill (Eds. & Trans.). Philadelphia, PA: American Philosophical Society [Latin and English].
- Reiter, Y. (2008). *Jerusalem and Its Role in Islamic Solidarity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Reston, J., Jr (2001). *Warriors of God*. New York: Doubleday.
- Ricardus, Canonicus Sanctae Trinitatis Londoniensis [Richard, Canon of Saint Trinity Church, London] (1997). *Chronicle of the Third Crusade. A Translation of the Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*, H. J. Nicholson (Trans.). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Richard of Devizes et al. (1892). *Chronicles of The Crusades: Contemporary Narratives of the Crusade of Richard Coeur de Lion, by Richard of Devizes and Geoffery de Vinsauf; and of the Crusade of Saint Louis, by Lord John de Joinville*. With illustrative notes and an index. London: G. Bell.
- Riley-Smith, J. S. C. (1973). *The Feudal Nobility and the Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1174–1277*. London: Macmillan.
- Riley-Smith, J. S. C. (1977). *What were the Crusades?* Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield [3rd edition, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2002].
- Riley-Smith, J. S. C. (1986). *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Riley-Smith, J. S. C. (1987). *The Crusades: A Short History*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Riley-Smith, J. S. C. (1991). *The Atlas of the Crusades*. New York: Facts on File.

- Riley-Smith, J. S. C. (Ed.) (1995). *The Oxford Illustrated History of the Crusades*. New York: Oxford University Press [new edition, 1997].
- Riley-Smith, J. S. C. (1997). *The First Crusaders, 1095–1131*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Riley-Smith, J. S. C. (1999). *Hospitallers: The History of the Order of St. John*. London: Hambledon Press.
- Riley-Smith, J. S. C. (2005). *The Crusades: A History* (2nd edn). London: Continuum.
- Riley-Smith, J. S. C. (2008). *The Crusades, Christianity, and Islam*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Riley-Smith, L., & Riley-Smith, J. S. C. (1981). *The Crusades: Idea and Reality, 1095–1274*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Runciman, S. (1951–1955). *A History of the Crusades*. Three volumes. Vol. 1. *The First Crusade and the Foundation of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*. Vol. 2. *The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100–1187*. Vol. 3. *The Kingdom of Acre, and the later Crusades*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Setton, K. M. (General Ed.) (1955–1962). *A History of the Crusades*. Two volumes. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press [2nd edition (1969–1989). Six volumes. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press].
- Shagrir, I., Ellenblum, R., & Riley-Smith, J. S. C. (Eds.) (2007). *In Laudem Hierosolymitani: Studies in Crusades and Mediæval Culture in Honour of Benjamin Z. Kedar*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Siberry, E. (1985). *Criticism of Crusading: 1095–1274*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Stein, S. M. (Ed.) (1999). *Beyond Belief: Psychotherapy and Religion*. London: Karnac.
- Strehlke, E. (Ed.) (1975). *Tabulae ordinis Theutonici ex tabularii regii Berolinensis codice potissimum*. Toronto: Prelum Academicum Universitas Torontonensis [Latin].
- Tolan, J. V. (Ed.) (1996). *Medieval Christian Perceptions of Islam: A Book of Essays*. New York: Garland.
- Tolan, J. V. (2002). *Saracens: Islam in the Mediæval European Imagination*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Tolan, J. V. (2008). *Sons of Ishmael: Muslims through European eyes in the Middle Ages*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
- Villehardouin, G. de, & Joinville, J. de (1983) *Memoirs of the Crusades*, Sir Frank Marzials (Trans.). Westport: Greenwood Press [new edition,

*Chronicles of the Crusades*. Mineola, New York: Dover Publications, 2007].

Walker, M. (1981). *Johann Jakob Moser and the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Wheatcroft, A. (2004). *Infidels: A History of the Conflict Between Christendom and Islam*. New York: Random House.

Wilkinson, T. J., Miller, N. F., Reichel, C. D., & Whitcomb, D. (2004). *On the Margin of the Euphrates: Settlement and Land Use at Tell Es-Sweyhat and in the Upper Lake Assad Area, Syria*. Chicago, IL: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

# INDEX

- Abbasid(s), 9, 15, 69–71, 75–77, 125, 138–139  
 Academie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, 146, 201  
 Adhemar du Puy, 88, 93, 95–96, 98, 117  
 Al-Afdal, 97, 103–104  
*al-Andalus*, 13, 15–16, 32, 42, 47, 49, 62, 69, 71–72  
 Alexius Komnenos, 77–78, 82, 86, 91–95, 97, 101, 105–107  
 Alexius III Angelos, 160–163  
 Alexius IV Angelos, 157, 160–162, 164  
 Alexius V Doukas Mourzouphlos, 161–165  
 Alfonsi, P., 116, 201  
 Al-Harawi, 138–139  
 Alighieri, D. (Dante), 174, 201  
 Al-Maqrizi, Taqi al-Din Ahmad ibn ‘Ali ibn ‘Abd al-Qadir ibn Muhammad, 184, 201  
 Al-Walid ibn al-Malik, 42, 47–49  
 Amalric, 126–127  
 Ambroise, 58, 61, 111, 153, 201  
 Ammianus, 33, 36  
 Andrea, A. J., 158, 202  
 András II, 168, 170–171  
 Antioch, 31, 88, 93–97, 102–103, 105–107, 114–115, 117–119, 121, 125, 134, 136, 139, 142–144, 147  
 Arnold, T. W., 15, 204  
 Arouet, F.-M. (Voltaire), 44  
 Aryan, 4–5  
 Bacon, R., 130–132, 198, 202  
 Baghdad, 9, 15, 69–70, 75–77, 138–139, 192 *see also*: Iraq  
 Ball, E., 3, 202  
 barbarian(s), 12, 16–18, 25–27, 29–30, 33–34, 57, 65, 67  
 Barber, M., 197, 202  
 Barthelemy, P., 95–96  
 Basques, 61, 66, 108–112, 132  
 Basset, R., 15, 204  
 Baudouin de Boulogne (of Edessa, of Jerusalem), 93, 97, 101, 106, 108, 113–115



- Baudouin II, 115, 124, 133–134, 136  
 Baudouin III, 126, 136  
 Baudouin IV (Leper King), 126, 144–145  
 Baudouin V, 127, 157  
 berber(s), 15, 29–31, 42, 47, 104  
 Bernard de Clairvaux, 122–124, 128, 135  
 Bible, 3, 11, 14, 19, 46, 65–67, 75  
 Bodel, J., 31, 109  
 Bohemond of Taranto (of Antioch), 93–97, 101, 105–107, 114, 117  
 Boia, L., 25, 202  
 Bonifacio del Montferrato, 156–157, 160–161, 165  
 Bossong, G., 16, 202  
 Braudel, F., 59–61, 202  
 Byzantine Empire/Byzantium, xii, 22–23, 26, 31, 40, 43, 54, 58, 66, 70–71, 75–78, 82, 86, 88–89, 92–93, 100–101, 105–107, 125, 127, 129, 149, 155, 159–162, 164–166, 196  
 Canaan(ite), 10–15  
 Canter, D., 7, 202  
 Carthage, 12–13, 26, 37, 41  
 Celt(s), 18–20, 35, 57, 59, 61, 151  
*Chanson de Roland*, 61, 108–112  
 Charlemagne (Carolus Magnus), 16, 43–44, 50, 59, 61, 89, 108–112  
 Charles d'Anjou, 189–191, 195–196  
 Charles the Fat, 51, 58  
 Charles the Hammer (Charles Martel), 32, 41–43, 45–46, 89  
 Charny, I. W., 2, 202  
 China, 6–10  
 Cimbri, 18–19  
 Claudianus, 24, 33, 36  
 Clotilde of Burgundy, 45–46, 54  
 Clovis I, 34, 45–46, 54, 57  
 Cole, R. J., 62, 89, 202  
 Conrad (king of Jerusalem), 152–153, 157, 178  
 Conrad II (Holy Roman Emperor), 55, 57  
 Conrad II (king of Germany and Italy), 81, 88  
 Conrad III (king of Germany), 122, 124, 127, 129  
 Constantine V, 44  
 Constantine the Great (Flavius Valerius Aurelius Constantinus), 17–18, 22, 46  
 Constantinople (*Nova Roma*), 22–23, 54–55, 75, 77, 91–96, 105–107, 124, 129, 149, 155, 157–165, 167, 170, 196  
 Crawford, P., 197, 202  
 Crusade(s)  
   Albigensian/Cathar, 169, 174, 177  
   Baltic, 109, 128–130, 172, 181, 198  
   Barons' / Princes', 92  
   Fifth, 167–169, 171, 173–175, 177–178, 180  
   First, 50, 60, 62, 74, 78, 82–83, 86, 88, 90, 93–95, 99–101, 106–107, 112, 116–117, 121–124, 127, 138–139, 147, 160, 170–171  
   Fourth, 153, 155–161, 164–168, 170  
   Ninth, 134, 191, 193, 195–196  
   Northern, 129–130  
   paupers' / people's, 90–93  
   Second, 121–122, 124, 128–129, 135, 144, 151, 160  
   Seventh, 131, 183–184, 187, 189  
   Sixth, 169, 174, 177, 179–182  
   Third, 58, 61, 129, 148–154, 160  
   Wendish, 128–129  
 Cyprus, 107, 149–150, 171, 186, 191–193, 197  
 Dagobert of Pisa, 113–114  
 Dante *see*: Alighieri, D.  
 Danube river, 16, 19–20, 24–25, 30, 33, 35  
 De Mente, B. L., 6–7, 202  
*Doctor Mirabilis see*: Bacon, R.

- Edessa, 97, 101, 107, 113–115, 121,  
 124–126, 136, 139, 147  
 Edward I, 134, 191–193, 195–196  
 Egypt, 1, 5, 9, 11–13, 48, 70–71, 75,  
 77, 97–98, 102, 107, 114–115,  
 139, 143–145, 149–151, 155,  
 157–160, 164, 167–168, 172–173,  
 178, 181–182, 184–185, 189,  
 191–193, 195–197  
 Einhard, 110, 202  
 El-Isfahani, Imad ed-din el-Katib,  
 147, 202  
 Ellenblum, R., xi, 84–85, 203  
 Enrico Dandolo, 157–159  
 Epstein, I., 3–4, 14, 203  
 Ernoul, 126, 145–146, 203  
 Esposito, J. L., 15, 203  
 Estienne de Blois, 31, 88, 107, 118  
 ethnocentrism, 1–3, 7, 29, 41  
 Euphrates, 10, 97, 125, 192  
 Eustache de Boulogne, 93, 115  
 externalization, 26–27, 61, 68, 77,  
 154  
 Falk, A., 5–6, 15, 49, 62, 90, 199–200,  
 203  
 Fatimids, 69–71, 75–77, 97, 100, 103,  
 114, 139  
 Feldner, Y., 140, 203  
 Ferrand of Flanders, 59, 172  
 Figueira, G., 174–175  
 Fornari, F., 2, 61, 167, 180, 203  
 France, 15, 19, 30–33, 41, 44, 47,  
 49–51, 54–62, 74, 86, 91, 102,  
 109, 111, 116, 122, 124, 127, 135,  
 151–152, 156, 158, 169–170, 173,  
 179, 183, 185, 187  
*Franci / Francia*, 22, 25, 31–36, 40–42,  
 45–51, 53, 56, 58–59, 61–62, 71,  
 74, 89, 110–111  
 Franks  
 Carolingian, 39, 43, 45–47, 50, 56  
 Merovingian, 34, 39–41, 43, 45–47,  
 54  
 Fredegar, 40–41, 43, 203  
 Fredriksen, P., 73, 203  
 Friedrich Barbarossa, 122, 150–152  
 Friedrich II, 59, 170–174, 177–181  
 Gabrieli, F., 137, 203  
 Gaul(s) (*Gallia*), 12, 17–20, 25–26,  
 34–36, 39–40, 44, 57–59, 61  
 Gaultier sans-avoir, 90–91  
 Genghis Khan, 7–10  
 Germans, 4, 6, 16, 20–21, 32–33, 36,  
 43, 50, 53–55, 59–61, 127,  
 129–130, 150  
 Germany, 3, 15, 17, 21, 30, 33, 35, 41,  
 44, 47, 49–51, 55–56, 58, 61–62,  
 74, 79, 81, 83, 86–88, 90, 109,  
 122, 124, 127–129, 131–132, 136,  
 151, 155, 158, 169–170, 172–174,  
 178–180  
 Getae, 20, 24–25  
 Ghaznavid(s), 76  
 Godefroy de Bouillon, 91, 93, 98,  
 101–102, 105, 113–114  
 Godefroy de Saint-Omer, 134–135  
 Goths, 20, 24–25, 33, 48, 164  
 Great Saxon Revolt, 79–81, 83  
 Greeks, 3–4, 12, 16, 20, 23–24, 29, 42,  
 65, 69, 113, 131, 160, 162–165,  
 175, 196  
 Gregorius de Turones (Gregory of  
 Tours), 33, 36  
 Guiscard of Apulia, 81–82, 93  
 Guy de Lusignan, 145–147  
 Haley, J. L., 3, 203  
 Halm, H., 15, 204  
 Halsall, P., 86–87, 204  
 Hamilton, S., 89, 207  
 Hannibal, 12–13  
 Hartmann, R., 15, 204  
 Heinrich IV, 78–83, 86–88, 114  
 Heinrich VI, 152–153, 155  
 Henn, N., 3, 202  
 Hermann of the *Cherusi*, 16–17  
 Hermann von Salza, 180–181  
 Hillenbrand, C., xi, 83–84, 137–138,  
 204  
 Hindley, G., 62, 160, 204

- Hispania*, 14, 22, 25, 36  
 Hitler, A., 4, 6, 151  
 Holy  
   City *see*: Jerusalem  
   Ghost/Spirit, 73, 175  
   Lance, 95–96, 102, 108  
   Land, xii, 23, 33, 62, 72, 74, 77, 84–86, 89, 94, 100, 107, 113–116, 123–124, 127, 129–131, 133–136, 139, 144, 149–153, 157, 159–160, 164, 167, 170–171, 179–180, 185–186, 191–192, 196, 198  
   Sepulchre, xii, 73–75, 86–90, 92, 98, 102, 113, 127, 153, 164, 182  
   war, 27, 48, 62, 74, 84–85, 89, 127–128, 153, 175  
 Holy Roman Emperor, 44, 51, 53, 55, 57, 78, 81–83, 87, 124, 150, 152, 153, 155–156, 160, 170, 172–174, 177–181, 187  
 Holy Roman Empire, 43–44, 51, 53, 55, 57, 59, 78–79, 86, 90, 114, 129, 155, 158  
 Honorius (emperor), 24–25  
 House of Welf, 50–51, 82, 88, 156, 172  
 Houtsma, M. T., 15, 204  
 Hughes, P., 158, 160, 204  
 Hugues de Vermandois, 92–93  
 Hugues III, 189, 192–193, 195  
  
 Ibn al-Qalanisi, Abu Ya'ala Hamzah ibn Asad, 104–105, 125, 138, 204  
 Ibn Munqidh, U., 139, 140–144, 204  
 Ibn Shaddad, Baha al-Din Yusuf ibn Rafi', 144, 205  
 Iftikhar ad-Dawla, 97–98, 103  
 indulgences, 87, 122, 170, 174  
 Iran *see*: Persia  
 Iraq, 10, 47, 69, 121, 167, 181, 186  
   *see also*: Baghdad  
 Ireland, 19, 151–152  
 Ireland, W. W., xi–xii, 204  
 Irwin, R., 139, 205  
 Isaakios II Angelos, 157, 160–162  
 Ishmael(ites), 65–68  
 Islam, 14–15, 27, 31–32, 42, 48, 66, 68–70, 75, 83, 94, 102, 115–116, 137–138, 164 *see also*: Muslim(s)  
 Israel, xi, 11, 14, 62, 85, 102–104, 113, 145–147, 186, 199–200  
   *see also*: Judah  
 Italy, 12, 17–18, 21, 40–41, 43, 45, 50–51, 53, 55, 58, 60, 66, 71, 77–78, 80–82, 86–88, 90, 93, 106, 116, 129, 150, 157, 170, 174, 178–180, 182, 197  
  
 Japan, 6–7  
 Jean de Brienne, 157, 171, 173, 178–179, 182  
 Jerusalem, xii, 13–14, 48, 61–62, 73–75, 84, 87, 89–90, 92, 95–109, 113–116, 118, 121, 124–127, 129, 133–136, 138–141, 144–153, 155, 157, 164, 167–168, 170–173, 177–183, 185, 189–193, 195–199, 200  
 Jesus Christ, 4, 6, 14, 23, 67, 73–74, 86–87, 89–90, 95, 101, 114, 117, 128, 131, 174  
 Jew(s)/Judaism, 3–6, 11, 13–15, 40, 42, 49, 62, 66–68, 75, 90, 92, 99, 116, 124, 130–131, 145, 183, 187, 199–200  
   *Talmud*, 3–4, 65–66, 183–184  
 Johannes II Komnenos, 125, 161  
 John of Damascus, 68, 205  
 Joinville, J. de, 183–184, 186–187, 189–190, 205  
 Jordan, 11, 95, 113, 147  
   River, 62, 146  
 Joscelin de Courtenay, 107, 124  
 Joscelin II, 124–127  
 Judah, 4, 14, 84 *see also*: Israel  
 Julius Caesar, 19–20, 30, 57

- Kedar, B. Z., 115–116, 205  
Keegan, J., 1, 205  
Killebrew, A. E., 11, 205  
Knights Hospitallers, 131, 133–134, 150, 181, 197  
Knights Templar, 122, 130–131, 133–136, 144, 181, 195, 197–198  
Könyves Kálmán, 90–91, 93  
  
Laroui, A., 49, 205  
Lebanon, 10–12, 15, 101, 104, 107–108, 113–114, 137, 147  
Leo II (king of Armenia), 178  
Leo III (emperor), 44  
Leopold V, 152–153, 156  
Leopold VI, 168, 170–172  
Lewis, B., 65–66, 205  
Littell, J., 5, 205  
Livonian Knights, 128–130, 181  
Louis de Blois, 156, 165  
Louis IV (d'outre-mer), 147  
Louis VII (le jeune), 122, 124, 129  
Louis VIII (the Lion), 169, 174, 189  
Louis IX (Saint), 131, 183–187, 189–190  
  
Maalouf, A., 137, 144, 205  
Marcellinus, 25, 33, 36  
Matilda of Tuscany (Canossa), 78, 80–82, 87–88  
Mediterranean, 10–12, 20, 30, 60, 77, 129, 146, 180, 185–186, 190–191, 198  
Mesopotamia, 10–11, 69  
Middle Ages, 5, 14–15, 33–34, 40, 61, 68, 83, 101–102, 121, 130  
Middle East, 8–10, 15, 23, 27, 47, 49, 68–69, 72, 75, 85, 113, 186  
Migne, J.-P., 130, 205–206  
Mijolla, A. de, 26, 206  
Mitscherlich, A., 62, 206  
Mitscherlich, M., 62, 206  
Molinier, A., 95–96, 206  
Mongol(s), 6–10, 33–34, 70, 182, 186, 189, 192  
Mongolia, 8, 10  
  
Moors, 16, 27, 30, 32, 42, 61–62, 68, 71, 108, 112, 123, 128  
Morris, C., 157, 206  
mourning, 2, 15, 23, 59, 61–63, 81, 167, 175, 178, 180, 198, 200  
Muhammad, 42, 68, 70, 138  
Musa bin Nusair, 47–49  
Muslim(s), xi–xii, 9, 15–16, 23, 27, 29–32, 34, 42, 45–49, 56, 61–62, 65–72, 75–76, 84–85, 94, 99–100, 102, 104–105, 107, 109–112, 115–116, 118–119, 122, 125, 128–129, 137–144, 148, 153–154, 167, 171, 182, 184, 186–187, 192, 196–197, 199–200  
*see also*: Islam  
  
narcissism, 5–6, 29, 41, 190  
Nazi, 4–6, 136  
Niederland, W. G., 16, 207  
Noble, P. S., 165, 206  
North Africa, 12–13, 15, 26–27, 29–30, 36, 47, 49, 68–69, 189–190  
  
Odo, Count of Paris, 51, 58  
Oedipal theme(s), 73, 79, 112, 114, 177  
Oliver of Cologne, 168, 170–172  
Olster, D. M., 23–24, 206  
Orthodox Church, 22, 54, 66, 71, 86, 92, 94, 113, 127, 131, 155, 160, 164  
Otto of Brunswick, 156, 160  
Otto I (the Great), 43–44, 53–55, 57  
Otto IV, 59, 172  
Otto von Freising, 54, 127  
  
pagan, xii, 3, 5, 26, 54, 66, 109–110, 127–132, 186  
Palestine, 9, 23, 62, 71, 77, 89, 103, 136, 139, 147, 199  
Partner, P., 62, 206  
Patai, R., 49, 62, 140, 206  
Persia/Persian(s), xii, 4–5, 9, 13, 23–24, 31, 35–36, 66, 68–72,

- 75–76, 100, 103, 109, 112,  
118–119, 182, 186, 192, 199
- Peter the Hermit *see*: Pierre  
l'hermite
- Peters, E., 180, 207
- Philipp of Swabia, 155–156, 160
- Philippe II (Auguste), 59, 93,  
150–152, 156, 172
- Philippe IV (le Bel), 135
- Phillips, J. P., 155, 159, 206
- Phoenicia/Phoenician(s), 10,  
12–15
- Pierre l'hermite, 90–92, 98, 124
- pilgrimage/pilgrims, xii, 74, 88–92,  
95, 106, 122, 133–134, 140–141,  
145, 153, 179, 196
- Polain, M.-L., 95–96, 206
- Pope
- Alexander II, 78
  - Anacletus II (anti-pope), 122
  - Calixtus II, 135
  - Celestine III, 128–129, 153, 156
  - Clement III (anti-pope), 78,  
81–82
  - Clement V, 135
  - Damasus I, 46
  - Eugene III, 122–123, 128
  - Gregory VII, 78–83, 114
  - Gregory VIII, 150
  - Gregory IX, 177–181, 183
  - Gregory X, 195–196
  - Honorius II, 122
  - Honorius III, 168, 170–171,  
173–174, 177–179, 181–182
  - Innocent II, 122–123
  - Innocent III, 130, 156, 158–160,  
166, 168–170, 172, 174, 178
  - Johannes (John) XII, 44, 53–54
  - Johannes XIX, 55
  - Leo I, 23
  - Leo III, 44
  - Leo IX, 54
  - Martin IV, 196
  - Nicholas IV, 196
  - Paschal II, 118, 134
  - Urban II, 78, 83, 86–89, 95, 122
  - Victor III, 83
- Prawer, J., 114, 207
- Procopius of Caesarea, 25, 207
- projection, xii, 2, 6, 26–27, 61, 86,  
154
- Prussia/Prussian(s), 109, 128–129,  
130, 172, 181
- Publius Vergilius Maro (Virgil), 37,  
41
- Punic Wars, 12–13
- racism, 1–3, 6–7
- Raoul de Caen, 101, 207
- Raymond d'Aguilers, 95, 98–99,  
102, 108, 207
- Raymond de Saint-Gilles of  
Toulouse, 88, 93–98, 101–102,  
105–108, 117
- Reynauld de Chastillon, 144–147
- Rhine river/valley, 17, 20–21, 30,  
33–35, 44, 58–59, 62, 90, 92, 122,  
124
- Richard I (*Coeur-de-Lion*), 111,  
149–153, 156
- Robert of Normandy, 93, 102
- Robinson, G. R., 117–119, 207
- Robinson, J. H., 117–119, 207
- Roger II, 115, 127
- Rollo, 57–58
- Roman Catholicism, 5–6, 26, 30, 46,  
54, 66, 71, 74, 78–79, 81, 87, 90,  
92, 97–98, 113, 116, 121–122,  
127, 130, 134, 155, 159–160,  
167–169, 173, 178
- Romans, 3, 12–13, 16–22, 24–26,  
30–37, 39–41, 43–45, 55, 57, 60,  
65, 68, 82, 117, 145–146
- Roncevaux Pass, 61, 108–112
- Russia/Russian(s), 4, 8–9, 127–128,  
131
- Saif ad-Din Qutuz, 9, 185–186
- Saint Jerome, 19, 46
- Saint Peter, 23, 74, 79, 156

- Salah ed-din Yusuf ibn Ayyub  
(Saladin), 48, 104, 134–135,  
144–150
- Sanchez, L. A., 3, 202
- Sepharad, 13–15
- Siberry, E., 84, 207
- Spain, xii, 12, 14–16, 19, 22, 24, 26,  
30, 32, 42, 44, 48–49, 58, 60–62,  
68–69, 72, 84, 109–112, 123, 128,  
179, 190
- Spicer, A., 89, 207
- splitting, 26–27, 68, 71–72, 86
- Stein, H. F., 16, 207
- Stevenson, W. H., 24, 207
- Strickland, D. H., 71, 112, 187, 207
- Suetonius, Gaius Tranquillus, 17, 207
- Syria/Syrian(s), 10–12, 42, 47–48,  
71–72, 77, 94, 102, 106, 114,  
117–118, 121, 133, 138–139, 147,  
151–152, 167–168, 171–173, 181,  
189, 191–192, 198
- Tacitus, Cornelius, 16, 21, 207
- Tancred, 93–94, 97–102, 105–107,  
114
- Tariq ibn Ziyad, 15, 47–49
- Terman, D., 5–6, 207
- Teutones, 6, 18–19, 35
- Teutonic Knights, 109–110, 129–132,  
180–181, 197
- Theophanes the Confessor, 23–24,  
44, 208
- Theophylaktos Simokattes, 23–24,  
208
- Thibault III of Champagne, 156–157
- Throop, P. A., 175, 208
- Tigris, 10, 69
- Tripoli, 101, 104, 107–108, 114, 121,  
125, 136, 145, 147, 191–192, 196
- Troy/Trojan(s), 19, 37, 41
- Tsar Kaloyan, 165–166
- Tubb, J. N., 11, 208
- Turk(s), xii, 30, 34, 66, 68, 70–71, 85,  
100, 105, 109, 112, 117–119, 121,  
150, 164
- Kipchak, 102, 186
- Oghuz, 30–31, 72, 75
- Ottoman, 31, 62, 72, 102
- Seljuk, 31, 70, 72, 75–77, 82, 91,  
93–94, 96–97, 100, 103,  
105–107, 115, 118, 121,  
124–125, 129, 139, 168,  
172–173, 192
- Turkic states/tribes, 7–9, 30–31, 33,  
69, 76–77, 121
- Tyerman, C., 83–85, 208
- Tyre, 10, 12, 103–104, 113, 136, 149
- Umayyads, 15, 42, 47–48, 68–71
- Vallvé Bernejo, J., 15, 208
- Vandals, 25–26, 33, 164
- Villehardouin, G. de, 157, 165–167,  
208
- Virgin Mary, 23, 73, 90, 122, 131,  
174
- Visigoths, 15, 24–26, 40
- Vryonis, S., 164, 208
- Waite, R. G. L., 6, 208
- Waller, J., 2, 208
- William of Tyre, 99, 105, 126,  
145–146, 208–209
- William I (the Conqueror), 58, 93
- Walter the Penniless *see*: Gaultier  
sans-avoir
- Yaghi-Siyan, 94, 96
- Yerushalmi, Y. H., 15, 49, 62, 200,  
208–209
- Yolande Isabelle, 178–180, 182
- Zosimus, 33, 36

