

BLASCO VALLÈS, Almudena, e COSTA, Ricardo da (coord.). *Mirabilia 10*

A Idade Média e as Cruzadas

La Edad Media y las Cruzadas – The Middle Ages and the Crusades

Jan-Jun 2010/ISSN 1676-5818



Love of God or Hatred of Your Enemy? The Emotional Voices of the Crusades

O amor de Deus ou o ódio ao seu inimigo? As vozes emocionais das Cruzadas

Sophia MENACHE¹

Abstract: The present paper attempts to investigate three cornerstones of the history of the early crusades from a wider range of emotions while focusing on [1] the call to the crusade and the conquest of Jerusalem, [2] the fall of Edessa and, subsequently, the Second Crusade and its outcomes, and [3] the Christian defeat at the Horns of Hattin. Less than a century before the crusades, different groups in Christian society had been the target of the same pejorative emotions that were later used to denounce and reproach the Moslems. These terms should therefore be seen and analyzed, not to produce a superficial moral reading of the vilification of the Moslems, but as an essential part of the thesaurus in which Christian society analyzed itself. In fact, the use of the same Augustinian emotional index transforms negative attitudes toward the Moslems into an act of inverted inclusion of the Moslems within the Christian sphere; in other words, using illusionary inclusion in order to exclude. This inverted inclusion means that within its inner discourse, Christian society defeated the Moslems symbolically, independently of the real outcome on the battlefield. The transformation of the crusaders from Westerners into Easterners in Fulcher's eschatology (note 45) is a conscious practice of erasing the "other" by expropriating its identity. This was not, however, an act of including the Easterner into the crusaders' *weltanschauung*, but a symbolic denial that further served to exclude the Easterners altogether.

Resumo: O presente artigo pretende investigar três pedras angulares da história das primeiras cruzadas a partir do início de uma ampla gama de emoções, enfocando: **1.** a chamada para a cruzada e a conquista de Jerusalém, **2.** a queda de Edessa e, posteriormente, a Segunda Cruzada e seus resultados, e **3.** a derrota cristã nos Cornos de Hattin. Menos de um século antes das cruzadas, diferentes grupos da sociedade cristã já tinham sido alvo das mesmas emoções pejorativas que, posteriormente, foram utilizadas para denunciar e reprovar os muçulmanos. Esses termos devem ser vistos e analisados, não para produzir uma leitura superficial do aviltamento moral dos muçulmanos, mas como uma parte essencial do léxico com o qual a sociedade cristã analisou a si própria. Na verdade, o uso do mesmo *index* emocional agostiniano transformou atitudes negativas contra os muçulmanos em um ato de inclusão

¹ Professora Titular do Departamento de *História Geral* da Universidade de Haifa (www.haifa.ac.il). *E-mail:* smenache@univ.haifa.ac.il

invertida dos muçulmanos dentro da esfera cristã. Em outras palavras, a *inclusão ilusória* foi usada para excluir. Esta inclusão invertida significa que, simbolicamente, em seu discurso interior, a sociedade cristã derrotou os muçulmanos, independentemente do resultado real no campo de batalha. A transformação dos cruzados ocidentais em orientais na escatologia de Fulcher (nota 45) foi uma prática consciente de apagar o “outro”, expropriando-o de sua identidade. Contudo, isto não foi um ato de inclusão dos orientais em cruzados *Weltanschauung*, mas uma negação simbólica que também serviu para excluí-los completamente.

Keywords: Crusades – Moslems – Papacy – Emotions.

Palavras-chave: Cruzadas – Muçulmanos – Papado – Emoções.

Jonathan Riley Smith elaborated about thirty years ago on the problematic relationship in Christian thought between the love of God and “love your neighbor,” on the one hand, and the crusades, with all their acts of violence perpetrated against the Moslems, on the other hand.² Riley Smith’s pioneer study hints at the wide spectrum of emotions that the crusades aroused among their contemporaries. However, as Barbara J. Rosenweing complained: “As a medievalist, I have cause to be worried about emotions in history. I do not worry about the emotions themselves: people in the past, as now, expressed joy, sorrow, anger, fear, and many other feelings... What medievalists – indeed, all historians who want to get their history right – must worry about is how *historians* [sic] have treated emotions in history.”³

Rosenweing’s words assess the disregard of emotions and/or the biased approach that characterizes medieval historiography. Though in recent years, a new interest in emotions, especially in the Early Middle Ages, is clearly detectable,⁴ much work remains to be done. In this regard, the crusades and the Latin States *Outremer* offer a precious source of research on a rich spectrum of emotions, which in many aspects still remains *terra incognita*. The pioneer work of Riley Smith elucidated one aspect – love of God – in the

² Jonathan Riley-Smith, “Crusading as an Act of Love”, *History* 65 (1980), p. 191, p. 177-192.

³ Barbara H. Rosenweing “Worrying about Emotions in History”, *The American Historical Review* 107-3 (2002), pars 1.

⁴ See, for instance, Mary Garrison, “The Study of Emotions in Early Medieval History: Some Starting Points”, *Early Medieval Europe* 10-2 (2001), p. 243-250; Catherine Cubitt, “The History of the Emotions: A Debate”, *ibid.*, p. 225-227; Barbara H. Rosenwein, “Writing Without Fear About Early Medieval Emotions”, *ibid.*, p. 229-230.

multifarious emotional baggage that the Christian enterprise overseas aroused among contemporaries.

The present paper attempts to investigate three cornerstones of the history of the early crusades from a wider range of emotions while focusing on [1] the call to the crusade and the conquest of Jerusalem,⁵ [2] the fall of Edessa and, subsequently, the Second Crusade and its outcomes, and [3] the Christian defeat at the Horns of Hattin. The spectrum of feelings associated with the crusades may expose the degree of reception of the papal/ecclesiastical message among the chroniclers and medieval audiences at large. For the purposes of analysis, we follow here the social-constructionist view, according to which emotions and their display are formed and shaped by the society in which they operate.⁶

We further assume that emotions are managed not only by a specific society in a definite place and time, but also by individuals who seek to express their feelings. In this regard, what may be seen as official representations of emotions – as they appear in contemporary narrative sources – were in fact effective shapers of individual representations.⁷ Some emotions, however, functioned as both collective and individual shapers or are intermingled expressions of both social needs/desires and individual feelings.

The almost obligatory starting point for any research on the emotional aspects of the crusades is Pope Urban II, the main designer of the Christian enterprise overseas. In his letter to the faithful in Flanders (December 1095), written shortly after the council at Clermont, the pope mentioned the main factors that legitimized, even dictated the massive departure of the faithful eastwards:

We believe that you, brethren, learned long ago from many reports the deplorable news that the barbarians in their frenzy have invaded and ravaged the churches of God in the eastern regions. Worse still, they have seized the Holy City of Christ, embellished by his passion and resurrection, and – it is

⁵ Reference to liberation or conquest throughout this article is quite indiscriminate and tries to follow the western use of these terms. See, Penny J. Cole, “Christian, Muslims, and the 'Liberation' of the Holy Land,” *The Catholic Historical Review* 84 (1998), p. 1-10.

⁶ Ron Mallon and Stephen P. Stich, “The Odd Couple: The Compatibility of Social Construction and Evolutionary Psychology,” *Philosophy of Science* 67 (2000), p. 133-154.

⁷ William M. Reddy, “Emotional Liberty: Politics and History in the Anthropology of Emotions,” *Cultural Anthropology* 14 (1999), p. 256-288.

blasphemy to say it – they have sold her and her churches into abominable slavery.⁸

The feelings of anger, injury, and insult arising from the violence and the many atrocities committed by the Infidel to the most precious shrines of the Christian faith were emphasized in papal correspondence time and again. Crusader preachers further elaborated on the papal themes and fostered in medieval audiences a variety of negative feelings, beginning with horror and sorrow, and in view of the enemy's cruelty, the search for vengeance.⁹

According to some medievalists, violence, which in the crusader context acquires crucial importance, should be evaluated as a medium through which power was expressed, understood, and manipulated.¹⁰ Richard W. Kaeuper further claims that violence acted as a political and a legal agency, a focus of fantasy, the ultimate guarantor of honor, status, and hierarchy, and even as an enticement to justice.¹¹ Anger, as well, played a crucial role in medieval society in general and throughout the *bellum sacrum* in particular, and it appears very often as an integral part of the war, no less important than weapons and armors.¹²

In another letter to the religious congregation of Vallombrosa (7 October 1096), Pope Urban II exposed the means and goals of the Christian enterprise overseas: “we were stimulating the minds of knights to go on this expedition, since they might be able to restrain the savagery of the Saracens by their arms and restore the Christians to their former freedom”.¹³ The Christian attack on the Moslems was therefore presented as a just reprisal for their desecration of shrines most holy to the Christian faith; indeed, the Moslems' acts of sacrilege, their despoliation and vandalism against the Christians' ancestral rights to the

⁸ *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Innsbruck, 1901), p. 136-137; trans. Riley Smith, Louise and Jonathan, *The Crusades: Idea and Reality 1095-1271* (London, 1981), p. 38.

⁹ Jonathan Riley Smith, “Christian Violence and the Crusades”, in *Religious Violence between Christians and Jews: Medieval Roots, Modern Perspectives*, ed. Anna Sapir Abulafia (New York, 2002), p. 16-17.

¹⁰ Gerd Althoff, “Empörung, Tränen, Zerknirschung: 'Emotionen' in der öffentlichen Kommunikation des Mittelalters”, *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 30 (1996), p. 60-79.

¹¹ Richard W. Kaeuper, “Introduction”, in *Violence in Medieval Society*, ed. Richard W. Kaeuper (Woodbridge, 2000), p. xiii.

¹² Nancy Sherman, *Stoic Warriors: The Ancient Philosophy behind the Military Mind* (Oxford, 2005), p. 65.

¹³ W. Wiederhold, “Papsturkunden in Florenz,” in *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (Göttingen, 1901), p. 313-314; trans. Riley Smith, Louise and Jonathan, *The Crusades: Idea and Reality 1095-1271*, p. 39.

Holy Land – which, by that time, had become the *Patrimonium Christi* – actually rendered the crusades a Just War.¹⁴

According to classical jurisprudence, justice was “a steady and enduring will to render unto everyone his right”.¹⁵ Though one may doubt whether the average eleventh-century Christian knew about Ulpian or his erudite Roman colleagues, the ecclesiastical message undoubtedly succeeded to create a sense of righteousness and morality on the Christian side that justified taking appropriate and also unprecedented measures against a repulsive enemy.¹⁶

Urban further took care to remind his contemporaries of the crucial damage that the Christian enterprise would inflict on the enemy’s pride, not only in the Holy Land but far and wide, where Christian lands would be released from Moslem rule. Thus, referring to the capture of Tarragona in the Iberian Peninsula, the pope argued: “For you know what a great defense it would be for Christ’s people and what a terrible blow it would be to the Saracens if, by the goodness of God, the position of that famous city were restored”.¹⁷ The search for vengeance thus appears to have been a most appealing component in the papal message, one that was especially attractive to medieval knights.¹⁸

These feelings returned to the German heritage of the cult of war and the bravery of soldiers on the battlefield, which by the end of the eleventh century received renewed impetus from the consolidation of knighthood as a well-defined social class.¹⁹ The question still remains, however, whether the anger, vengeance, or retaliation that the pope attempted to foster, did in fact

¹⁴ There is a rich bibliography on the idea of Just War and Holy War. See, for example, James A. Brundage, “Holy War and the Medieval Lawyers”, in *The Holy War*, ed. Thomas F. Murphy (Ohio, 1976), p. 99-140; H. E. J. Cowdrey, “The Genesis of the Crusades: The Spring of Western Ideas of Holy War”, *ibid.*, p. 9-32; Sophia Menache and Daniel Gutwein, “Just War, Crusade and *Jihad*: Conflicting Propaganda Strategies During the Gulf Crisis (1990-1991)”, *Revue belge de philologie et d’histoire* 80 (2002), p. 385-400.

¹⁵ Ulpian, *Regulae*, book 1 in *Digest*, trans. Alan Watson, 4 vols. (Philadelphia, 1985).

¹⁶ On the Moslems’ image at this stage, see, S. Loutchitskaja, “*Barbarae nationes*: Les peuples musulmans dans les chroniques de la première croisade”, in *Autour de la Première Croisade*, ed. Michel Balard (Paris, 1996), pp. 99-108; M. Bennet, “The First Crusaders’ Image of Muslims: The Influence of Vernacular Poetry”, *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 22 (1986), p. 101-122.

¹⁷ P. Kehr, *Papsturkunden in Spanien. I Katalonien* (Berlin, 1926), p. 287-288; trans. Riley Smith, Louise and Jonathan, *The Crusades: Idea and Reality 1095-1271*, p. 40.

¹⁸ Jonathan Riley Smith, *The Crusades: A Short History* (London, 1987), p. 14-16.

¹⁹ J. Dunbabin, “From Clerk to Knight: Changing Orders”, in *The Ideals and Practice of Medieval Knighthood*, eds. C. Harper-Hill and R. Harvey (Woodbridge, 1988), vol. 2, p. 26-39; Richard Mortimer, “Knights and Knighthood in Germany in the Central Middle Ages”, *ibid.*, p. 86-103.

permeate the narrative sources, thus providing an echo to the papal call and further justifying the atrocities that the Christians perpetrated against the Infidel *Outremer*.

The different versions of Urban's speech at Clermont – as they appear in the chronicles written about ten years later, i.e., after the First Crusade had materialized – may clarify the process of the transmission of the papal message and the kind of emotions it aroused.²⁰ The very fact that the original version of the pope's speech did not remain – a fact that Joshua Prawer accurately called “one of the paradoxes of history”²¹ – allows us to transfer at least some part of the initiative for the crusades from Urban II to the chroniclers; each of whom in his own way and according to his own experience recovered what he remembered about the ecclesiastical assembly in Clermont or about the message that he wanted to attribute to Pope Urban.

Fulcher of Chartres – who probably was at Clermont and participated in the First Crusade as chaplain of Stephen of Blois²² – emphasized the search for vengeance implied in the papal call:

For the Turks, a Persian people, have attacked them [Eastern Christians].

...They have seized more and more of the land of the Christians, have already defeated them in seven times as many battles, killed or captured many people, have destroyed churches, and have devastated the kingdom of God... I, not I, but God exhorts you as heralds of Christ... to hasten to exterminate this vile race from our lands and to aid the Christian inhabitants in time.²³

The pious identification with the suffering of their brothers overseas should therefore justify retaliation against their infamous enemies, who had slaughtered and captured many among the Eastern Christians while destroying the houses of God. A vindictive God looking for vengeance and the recovery of Christian lands by the force of arms thus replaced the evangelical, loving

²⁰ On the various versions of the papal speech, see, Dana Carleton Munro, “The Speech of Pope Urban II at Clermont, 1095”, *American Historical Review* 11 (1906), p. 231-242; Herbert E. J. Cowdrey, “Pope Urban II's Preaching of the First Crusade”, *History* 55 (1970), p. 177-188.

²¹ Joshua Prawer, *A History of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, 2 vols. (Jerusalem, 1963), vol. 1, p. 82.

²² On Fulcher and his writing, see, Fulcher of Chartres, *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem (1095-1127)*, trans. Frances Rita Ryan (Knoxville, 1967), p. 3-56.

²³ Fulcherii Carnotensis *Historia Iherosolymitana*, l. 1, III: 3-4, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1913), p. 132-133; trans. Frances Rita Ryan, *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem*, p. 66.

God.²⁴ One should note in this regard that anger often appears in medieval literature as a temporary emotion that may be satisfied and, hence, annulled when vengeance is achieved.

Only when the last stage did not crystallize, then could anger turn into hatred of a more stable nature. Contemporary reports further differentiate between hatred as an emotion, and revenge, which was depicted as an action achieved by material weapons.²⁵

A fourteenth-century preacher's handbook clearly establishes that "for many people today cannot take their revenge with material weapons and therefore retain hatred through hardened anger (*iram induratam*) in their hearts".²⁶ The history of the crusades, however, does not corroborate clear emotional demarcations: though vengeance was achieved and, at least on the first stages, the Moslems were defeated on the battlefield, anger and hatred together left their mark on the Christian approach to Moslems and Islam throughout the whole crusader period and beyond.

Robert the Monk – who was also at Clermont²⁷ – conjured up the satanic image of the Moslems in the message he ascribed to Pope Urban:

The race of Persians, a foreign people and a people rejected by God... has invaded the land of those Christians, depopulated them by slaughter and plunder and arson, kidnapped some of the Christians and carried them off to their own lands and put others to a wretched death, and has either overthrown the churches of God or turned them over to the rituals of their own religion.

They throw down the altars after soiling them with their own filth, circumcise Christians, and pour the resulting blood either on the altars or into the baptismal vessels. When they feel like inflicting a truly painful death on some they pierce their navels, pull out the end of their intestines, tie them to a pole and whip them around it until, all their bowels pulled out, they fall lifeless to the ground...

²⁴ On the appeal to the crowds in the Middle Ages, especially, in the crusader context, see, Gary Dickson, "Medieval Christian Crowds and the Origins of Crowd Psychology", *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 95 (2000), p. 61-67.

²⁵ Guy Halsall, "Violence and Society in the Early Medieval West: An Introductory Essay", in *Violence and Society in the Early Medieval West* (Rochester, 1998), p. 7-18.

²⁶ *Fasciculus morum: A Fourteenth-Century Preacher's Handbook* 2. 3, ed. and trans. Siegfried Wenzel (Philadelphia, 1989), p. 118-121.

²⁷ On the few biographical facts known about Robert and his writing, see, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade: Historia Ierosolimitana*, trans. Carol Sweetenham (Aldershot, 2005), p. 1-4, 48-67.

When Pope Urban had eloquently spoken these words and many other things of the same kind, all present were so moved that they united as one and shouted ‘God wills it! God wills it! (Deus vult)...’²⁸

By ascribing to the Moslems the forced conversion of Christians, coupled with what contemporaries saw as the barbarous practice of circumcision, Urban II – in the version of Robert the monk – actually appealed to the most primitive and powerful fears among contemporary audiences, that of castration.²⁹ Besides, the detailed description of the painful torture of Christians condemned to death,³⁰ together with the desecration of churches, brought about the desired goal; i.e., the immediate emotive response of the congregation, who saw in the papal call the voice and will of an almighty God.³¹

Guibert of Nogent further elaborated on the satanic image of the Moslems, while adding macabre details of his own in a letter allegedly written by the Emperor of Constantinople to Robert I, Count of Flanders (1071-1093). The detailed account and the fact that it was attributed to the highest Christian ruler of the time secured its impact on contemporary audiences:

After Christianity was driven out, the churches which the pagans held had been turned into stables for horses, mules, and other animals... they carried out all kinds of filthy activity in them, so that they had become not cathedrals, but brothels and theaters... They took virgins and made them public prostitutes...

Mothers were violated in the presence of their daughters, raped over and over again by different men, while their daughters were compelled, not only to watch, but to sing obscene songs and to dance... Finally reverence for all that

²⁸ Robert of Rheims, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, c. 1-2. *RHC OCC*, vol. 3, p. 727-730; trans. Carol Sweetenham, p. 79-81.

²⁹ On circumcision and Christian approach to it, see, Ivan G. Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood: Jewish Acculturation in Medieval Europe* (New Haven, 1996), p. 76-78; David Nirenberg, *Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1996), p. 147-148; S. J. D. Cohen, “Between Judaism and Christianity: The Semicircumcision of Christians according to Bernard Gui, his Sources and R. Eliezer of Metz”, *Harvard Theological Review* 94-3 (2001), p. 285-321; Richard Schenk, “Covenant Initiation: Thomas Aquinas and Robert Kilwardby on the Sacrament of Circumcision”, in *Ordo sapientiae et amoris: Image et message de Saint Thomas d’Aquin*, ed. Carlos-Josaphat Pinto de Oliveira (Fribourg, 1993), p. 555-593.

³⁰ The martyrdom of Christians, including priests, at the time of mass became a very common *topos* in Robert's writing; see, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, l. 1, c. 10, 12, trans. Carol Sweetenham, p. 86-87.

³¹ Rachel Dressler, “*Deus hoc vult*: Ideology, Identity and Sculptural Rhetoric at the Time of the Crusades”, *Medieval Encounters: Jewish, Christian and Muslim Culture in Confluence and Dialogue* 1 (1995), p. 188-218.

was called Christian was handed over to the brothel... Their lust overflowed to the point that the execrable and profoundly intolerable crime of sodomy, which they committed against men of middle or low station, they also committed against a certain bishop, killing him...³²

Huizinga had already emphasized the love and search of medieval audiences for macabre spectacles, a tendency whose roots go back to the Early Middle Ages.³³ Gerd Althoff further claims that the extravagance of medieval representations of emotions was not due to any primitive lack of restraint but to the basic public and theatrical nature of communication at the time.³⁴ The testimonies quoted above portrayed for the ordinary eleventh-century person a very good image of the enemy, while translating abstract terms – such as Infidel – into every-day practice. The Moslems' felony covered not only the most abominable crimes against the Christian faith but was actually in open contravention to most basic behaviour norms of humankind. The papal call for the crusade was therefore received in a most propitious arena, that of emotions. It appealed to the most basic emotions of Christian society, and the narrative sources testify its impact on contemporary audiences.

The conquest of Jerusalem by the crusaders (15 July 1099) further provides a strange mixture of the holy and the profane, with praying and fasting, litanies and processions accompanying the massive slaughtering of Moslems. The many sources reporting the Christians' tremendous victory offer a clear picture of the turmoil of emotions that seized the faithful as a whole, without distinction of gender, age, or social status. After referring to the fears (*timor*) among the crusaders who had besieged Jerusalem, Raymond d'Aguilers noted the extreme change of mood that followed the conquest of the city:

...Before we made this assault on the city, the bishops and priests persuaded all, by exhorting and preaching, to honor the Lord by marching around Jerusalem in a great procession, and to prepare for battle by prayer, fasting, and almsgiving.

[After the Christians entered the Holy City,] our men followed killing and slaying even to the Temple of Solomon, where the slaughter was so great that our men waded in blood up to their ankles... But this time the pilgrims entered the city, where the enemy gathered in force. The battle raged

³² Guibert de Nogent, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, trans. Robert Levine, *The Deeds of God through the Franks* (Woodbridge, 1997), l. 1, p. 36-37.

³³ See H. Huizinga, *The Waning of the Middle Ages*, trans. F. Hopman (1924, Harmondsworth, 1982), p. 9-29. See, also, Philippe Aries, "Huizinga et les themes macabre", in *Bijdragen en mededelingen Betreffende de geschiedenis der Nederlanden* (Gravenhage, 1973), p. 246-257.

³⁴ Gerd Althoff, "Ira Regis: Prolegomena to a History of Royal Anger", in *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, ed. Barbara H. Rosenwein (Ithaca, 1998), p. 74.

throughout the day, so that the Temple was covered with their blood. When the pagans had been overcome, our men seized great numbers, both men and women, either killing them or keeping them captive, as they wished... Later, all of our people went to the Sepulchre of our Lord, rejoicing and weeping for joy, and they rendered up the offering that they owed...³⁵

The anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* – who probably participated in the First Crusade at the side of Bohemond – gives a similar account: “No one has ever seen or heard of such a slaughter of pagans, for they were burned on pyres like pyramids, and no-one save God alone knows how many there were”.³⁶ One may note, in this regard, the success of contemporary ecclesiastics in giving a new meaning to the Christian love of God, while the divine command of loving your enemy (*Matthew* 5: 43-48) disappears as though it had never been and the love of God justifies and even legitimizes the massacre of Moslems that followed the conquest of Jerusalem.

Prayers and abstention, processions and liturgies, before and after the slaughtering of the Infidel appear as manifestations of gratitude to a vindictive God, Who had bestowed the Christians with an irrefutable, just victory; the cruel – one may even say, savage ways of approaching the Infidel, moreover, were not accompanied by any signs of remorse.³⁷ Contemporary reports of the conquest of Jerusalem clearly reflect the twofold approach to anger in medieval sources. Medieval theologians criticized anger that was out of control; as such, it was unreasonable, sinful, and more suitable to animals than to human beings.

According to contemporary chroniclers, however, the crusader conquest of Jerusalem was not such case. The liberation of Jerusalem from Moslem sacrilege, with all the atrocities it implied in actual practice, was depicted in the category of a reasonable, just, useful anger that was directed at extirpating sin

³⁵ Raimundi de Aguilers, *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Jerusalem*, c. XX, *R. H. C. Occ.*, II-4, p. 299-300; trans. A. C. Krey, *The First Crusade* (London, 1921), p. 256-257.

³⁶ *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, XXXIX, ed. and trans. Rosalind Hill (London, 1962), p. 92. See, also, P. Partner, “Holy War, Crusade and Jihad: An Attempt to Define Some Problems”, in *Autour de la Première Croisade*, p. 333-343; Benjamin Z. Kedar, “Croisade et Jihad vus par l'ennemi: une etude des perceptions mutuelles des motivations”, *ibid.*, p. 345-355.

³⁷ On parallel phenomena in Moslem literature, see, Zouhair Ghazzal, “From Anger on Behalf of God to 'Forbearance' in Islamic Medieval Literature”, in *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, p. 203-230.

or punishing evil doers; it pertained, therefore, to that kind of anger possessing a moral dimension.³⁸

Petrus Tudebodus, who was also an eyewitness of the conquest of Jerusalem, placed emphasis on the crusaders' joy (*exultantes, gaudenter*) as they approached the holy city, while he contrasted those *Christi milites* to *illis paganis*. In this context, Petrus refers to the exchange of visual and oral insults between the Moslem inhabitants of Jerusalem and the crusaders assaulting the city, an exchange that from the Moslem side was accompanied by invectives against the most precious values of the Christian faith.³⁹

William of Tyre, who gives a similar report, emphasizes the feelings of *ira* that embraced the faithful in face of the Moslems' acts of sacrilege committed to their face.⁴⁰ He also stresses the devotion and piety that were expressed among the crusaders in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre following the conquest of the city.⁴¹ Albert of Aachen, as well, describes the slaughtering of thousands of Moslems in most brutal ways, while the crusaders (whom he refers to as *peregrini*) did not differentiate among their victims.⁴² Indeed, in a letter to Pope Paschal II, Godfrey of Bouillon, Raymond of St. Gilles, and Daimbert estimated that about 100,000 Saracens had been killed during the conquest of Jerusalem.⁴³

The crusaders' conquest of the holy city thus served as a fruitful arena to express conflicting feelings, which had been fermenting for years, at least since the call of Clermont. At a first stage, hatred, aversion, despair, fears, and, above all, anger were integral to the Christian enterprise. "Hatred" was a conventional term in medieval secular jurisprudence that described a lasting

³⁸ On both kinds of anger, see, Lester K. Little, "Anger in Monastic Curses", *ibid.*, p. 12-13; Richard E. Barton, "'Zealous Anger' and the Renegotiation of Aristocratic Relationships in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century France", *ibid.*, p. 155.

³⁹ Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere*, eds. J. H. and L. L. Hill (Paris, 1977), p. 134.

⁴⁰ *Willelmi Tyrensis Archiepiscopi Chronicon*, l. 8, c. 11, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, 2 vols. (Turnholt, 1986), vol. 1, p. 401.

⁴¹ "Intueri erat amenissimum et spirituali plenum iocunditate quanta devotione, quanto pii fervore desiderii ad loca sancta fidelis accederet populus, quanta mentis exultatione et spirituali gaudio dominice dispensationis deosculabantur memoriam: ubique lacrimae, ubique suspiria, non qualia meror et anxietas solet extorquere sed qualia fervens devotio..." *Ibid.*, l. 8, c. 22, p. 413-414.

⁴² Alberti Aquensis *Historia Hierosolymitana*, c. 21-22, R. H. C. Occ., vol. 2-5, p. 477-479.

⁴³ *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and Other Source Materials*, ed. Edward Peters (1971, Philadelphia, 1998), p. 295.

public relationship between two adversaries; “anger,” conversely, often described a short-term, thus repairable rage between members of a kin group.

In moral literature, the opposite of hatred was usually love, while anger was balanced with patience.⁴⁴ Still, it is rather doubtful if such differentiations were respected in the narrative sources. Those who victoriously entered the Holy City further regarded the conquest of Jerusalem as a fair compensation for former sufferings thus justifying their unlimited joy and hope. As well expressed by Fulcher of Chartres:

Oh day so ardently desired! Oh time of times the most memorable! Oh deed before all other deeds! Desired indeed because in the inner longing of the heart it had always been hoped by all believers in the Catholic faith that the place in which the Creator of all creatures, God made man, in His manifold pity for mankind, had by His birth, death, and resurrection, conferred the gift of redemption would be restored to its pristine dignity by those believing and trusting in Him.

They desired that this place, so long contaminated by the superstition of the pagan inhabitants, should be cleansed from their contagion... And this same work which the Lord chose to accomplish through His people, His dearly beloved children and family, chose, I believe, for this task, shall resound and continue memorable in the tongues of all nations until the end of time.⁴⁵

The mass euphoria that followed the conquest of Jerusalem was not a short-lived phenomenon, and Fulcher provides a faithful reflection of the sense of mission – or mission accomplished – that characterized the first settlers in the crusader kingdom about twenty years later:

Consider, I pray, and reflect how in our time God has transformed the Occident into the Orient. For we who were Occidentals have now become Orientals. He who was a Roman or a Frank has in this land been made into a Galilean, or a Palestinean... We have already forgotten the places of our birth... Words of different languages have become common property known to each nationality, and mutual faith unites those who are ignorant of their descent...

He who was born a stranger is now as one born here; he who was born an alien has become as a native. Our relatives and parents join us from time to time, sacrificing, even though reluctantly, all that they formerly possessed...

⁴⁴ Daniel Lord Smail, “Hatred as a Social Institution in Late Medieval Society”, *Speculum* 76 (2001), p. 90-91.

⁴⁵ Fulcherii Carnotensis *Historia Iherosolymitana*, l. I, 29: 3-4; trans. Frances Rita Ryan, *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem*, p. 123.

You see, therefore, that this is a great miracle, and one which the whole world ought to admire...⁴⁶

Divine intervention did not therefore come to an end with the First Crusade and the liberation of Jerusalem. It was part and parcel of the crusader enterprise thereafter and, as such, it created a new kind of solidarity among all the Christians living in the Holy Land. The words of the apostle thus received a new meaning: “Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all” (*Colossians* 3: 11). The Christian faith provided the strongest bond among those who fixed their residence in the Holy Land. The holiness of the land further strengthened the bonds among its new inhabitants, who became Galileans and Palestinians and, as such, who had forgotten their European roots.

A survey of contemporary sources further reveals the twofold nature of feelings: love and hatred (*amor*⁴⁷ and *odium*), desire and aversion (*desiderium* and *fuga*), sadness and joy (*dolor* and *delectatio*), hope and despair (*spes* and *desperatio*), fear and daring (*timor* and *audacia*), and anger (*ira*), the only passion that, according to Thomas Aquinas, has no contrary.⁴⁸ All these emotions appear very often in close association, and their dissociation becomes quite difficult, if not impossible, and appears to be rather artificial to the spirit of contemporary sources.⁴⁹

The sense of mission, which was a direct outcome of the first victories, began to decay even to collapse, with the first reversals on the battlefield. By the mid-twelfth century new feelings, most of them of a negative, pessimistic nature, gradually came to the fore. Indeed, disappointment, frustration, and sometimes despair were the outcomes of the fall of Edessa (25 December 1144) the following Christian defeats during the Second Crusade and its aftermath (1147-1148).⁵⁰

⁴⁶ Fulcherii Carnotensis *Historia Iberosolymitana*, l. III, 37: 2-8; trans. Frances Rita Ryan, *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem*, p. 271-272.

⁴⁷ In the framework of this paper, we will avoid reference to this particular emotion, which was convincingly researched by Jonathan Riley Smith (see note 1).

⁴⁸ Aquinas, *Summa Tebologiae*, ed. and trans. by the Dominican Fathers (London, 964-80), 1a. 2ae. 23.

⁴⁹ On the classical approaches to the basic feelings in humankind, see, Susan James, *Passion and Action: The Emotions in Seventeenth-Century Philosophy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), p. 5-6.

⁵⁰ On the historical context, see, John G. Rowe, “The Origins of the Second Crusade: Pope Eugenius III, Bernard of Clairvaux and Louis VII of France”, in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*, ed. M. Gervers (New York, 1992), p. 79-90; Jonathan Phillips, “Papacy Empire

William of Tyre describes in detail the turmoil of emotions in the papal curia that brought about the call for a new crusade. He further laid emphasis on the enlistment of the Cistercian monk, Bernard de Clairvaux, to the new Christian enterprise overseas with an unprecedented impetus. Bernard, indeed, brought about a positive response to the new crusade not only among the masses but among the political elite of the time, as well.⁵¹ On the other hand, the essay written by the Cistercian monk to his former pupil, Pope Eugene III (1148-1149), faithfully reflects the sense of frustration shared by many contemporaries in light of the continuous Christian defeats overseas:

The sons of the Church and those who are counted as Christians have been overthrown in the desert, slain by the sword or consumed by hunger... [F]ear and sorrow and confusion are in the inner chambers of their kings. How confused are the feet of those who preach peace, of those who bring glad tidings of good things!

We have said “Peace” and there is no peace; we have promised good things and you see there is disorder, so that it looks as though we have gone into this business rashly without stopping to think... But perhaps our contemporaries say, “How can we know that what you say is truly inspired by the Lord? What proof can you give us to make us believe in you?” I have no answer to their questions; they must spare my embarrassment...⁵²

The confusion and mortification alluded to by St. Bernard was a direct result of the disappointment of contemporaries following the Second Crusade, whose undertaking had been so vehemently preached by the Cistercian monk a few years earlier. We find here the first seeds of the doubts and even suspicions that became a crucial element in the criticism of the crusade throughout the thirteenth century; namely, whether the movement as a whole was inspired by God or, rather, by the greed and ambitions of human beings the popes at their head, who were not immune to error and miscalculation.⁵³

As the situation in the battlefield did not improve and the fall of Edessa turned into an incontrovertible fact, the search for vengeance became more acute and pressing. The pursuit of revenge further turned into a pattern

and the Second Crusade”, in *The Second Crusade: Scope and Consequences*, ed. Jonathan Phillips and Martin Hoch (Manchester, 2001), p. 15-31; Martin Hoch, “The Price of Failure: The Second Crusade as a Turning-Point in the History of the Latin East?”, *ibid.*, p. 180-200.

⁵¹ *Willelmi Tyrensis Archiepiscopi Chronicon*, l. 16, c. 18, vol. 2, p. 739-741.

⁵² Bernard de Clairvaux, *De consideratione*, in *Sancti Bernardi Opera*, ed. J. Leclercq et al. (Rome, 1963), vol. 3, p. 410-413; trans. Riley Smith, Louise and Jonathan, *The Crusades: Idea and Reality 1095-1271*, p. 62-63.

⁵³ On the growing criticism of the crusades, see, Elizabeth Siberry, *Criticism of Crusading 1095-1274* (Oxford, 1985), passim, and the bibliography included.

shared not only by human beings – the crusaders – but also by Jesus Christ Himself, Who in the zenith of His passion allegedly anticipated the coming of the crusaders to the Holy Land. In a scene added by Graindor to *La Chanson d'Antioche* (c. 1180), Jesus indeed tried to comfort the thief at his side by declaring:

Friend... the people are not yet born
 Who will come to avenge me with their steel lances.
 So they will come to kill the faithless pagans
 Who have always refused my commandments.
 Holy Christianity will be honoured by them
 And my land conquered and my country freed.
 A thousand years from today they will be baptized and raised
 And will cause the Holy Sepulchre to be regained and adored.
 And they will serve me as though they were my offspring;
 They will all be my sons, I promise them that.
 In heavenly paradise shall their heritage be...⁵⁴

The prophetic tone of these words aimed at strengthening the confidence of the crusaders, by transmuting divine reward from this world to the next. From the 1140's onward, the motives of divine retribution in the world to come, which were so dear to the early Christians,⁵⁵ were therefore reinforced as a kind of psychological compensation for the many dilemmas and difficulties that faced the crusaders in the Holy Land.

The attempt to deny any legitimacy of Moslem rule over Jerusalem did not diminish over the years. Though a more moderate image of the “pagans” emerged toward the end of the twelfth century,⁵⁶ Peter of Blois still referred to the Moslems as those “who blaspheme against Christ, pollute the sanctuary of the Lord and in their pride and miscreance abase the glory of our Redeemer”.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ *La chanson d'Antioche*, ed. S. Duparc-Quioc (Paris, 1976), I, p. 25-28; trans. Louise and Jonathan Riley Smith, *The Crusades: Idea and Reality 1095-1271*, p. 72.

⁵⁵ R. Bultot, *Valeurs chrétiennes: La doctrine du mépris du monde au XIe siècle* (Louvain, 1964), p. 11-57; Melvin Storm, “*A culpa et a poena: Christ's Pardon and the Pardoner's*”, *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 83-4 (1982), p. 439-442.

⁵⁶ R. C. Schwinges, *Kreuzzugsideologie und Toleranz* (Stuttgart, 1977), p. 102-108.

⁵⁷ Peter of Blois, *Epistolae*, in *P. L.* 207, col. 1064. Trans. Jonathan Riley Smith, “Crusading as an Act of Love”, p. 177.

The Christian setback at the Horns of Hattin (3 July 1187),⁵⁸ moreover, served as a catalyst for a renewed turmoil of emotions, either caused or justified by the unprecedented scope of the defeat and its awful consequences. It further brought about an extraordinary flow of a sense of guilt, which in essence was hardly new, but which the irrefutable defeat had turned into an unquestionable truth: the sins of the crusaders and of the inhabitants in the Latin East as a whole did bring about God's anger and were therefore responsible for the victory of the Infidel. This interpretation is fully developed by Patriarch Eraclius in a letter written to Pope Urban III about two months after the Christian defeat at the Horns of Hattin (5-20 September 1187):

The enormity of our lamentation and sorrow, Reverend Father, we are scarcely able to convey to your piety's ears. It has fallen to us to see in our days the oppression of our people, the doleful and lamentable desolation of the holy church of Jerusalem and that which is holy given unto dogs (Matthew 7: 6). Truly, Holy Father, the anger of the Lord has come upon us and His terrors have put us to confusion (Psalm 88: 16)...

He has given over our king and the whole Christian army into the hand of pagans... Nor are these things enough to satiate the barbarity of the enemies of the cross of Christ. Indeed, striving to blot out the Christian name from under heaven... Alas, alas, O Reverend Father, that the Holy Land, the inheritance of the Crucified, should be given into the hands of pagans. Alas, alas that the Lord has thrown away His inheritance and has not spared it, withholding His mercy behind his anger...⁵⁹

The disaster in the battlefield thus became an outcome and faithful reflection of the fury of the vindictive God Who had accompanied the crusaders from their very beginnings, though by the end of the twelfth century His victims were not Moslems any longer but Christians. Thence the imperative to find the reason that might justify such rigorous punishment. It was easily found in a well-known *topos* in medieval literature, *peccatis nostris exigentibus*; i.e., the many sins of the faithful provided the cause and reason of divine punishment.

A letter written to the prior of the Hospitallers in Italy refers to the fact that “as a consequence of our sins many of our men were killed, and the Christians were defeated”.⁶⁰ An old French continuation to the chronicle of William of

⁵⁸ On the battle, its course, and consequences, see, Benjamin Z. Kedar, “The Battle of Hattin Revisited”, in *The Horns of Hattin*, ed. B. Z. Kedar (Jerusalem, 1992), p. 190-207; W. J. Hamblin, “Saladin and Muslim Military Theory”, *ibid.*, p. 190-207.

⁵⁹ Translated by Peter W. Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem and the Third Crusade: Sources in Translation* (Aldershot, 1998), p. 162-163.

⁶⁰ Peter W. Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem and the Third Crusade*, p. 161.

Tyre returns to the same *topos*, while also mentioning one of its many victims, the vicar of God on earth, Pope Urban III, who had died of grief:

After this division [of the count of Tripoli] had been defeated the anger of God was so great against the Christian host because of their sins that Saladin vanquished them quickly... The disaster befell Christendom at a place called the Horns of Hattin... The news of it struck the hearts of those faithful to Jesus Christ. Pope Urban who was at Ferrara died of grief when he heard the news...⁶¹

Pope Urban III's distress did not remain an isolated phenomenon. On the contrary. Pope Gregory VIII (*Audita tremendi*, November 1187) depicted in ominous colors the emotional reactions to the defeat at Hattin among the members of the papal curia:

On hearing with what severe and terrible judgment the land of Jerusalem has been smitten by the divine hand, we and our brothers have been confounded by such great horror and affected by such great sorrow that we could not easily decide what to do or say; over this situation the psalmist laments and says, "Oh God, the heathens are come into thy inheritance..."

We ought not to be so downhearted that we fall into want of faith and believe that God, angered by his people in such a way as to allow himself to become infuriated by the manifold actions of a host of common sinners, will not through his mercy be quickly placated by penance, that he will not console us and that after weeping and tears he will not bring rejoicing.

For anyone of sane mind who does not weep at such a cause for weeping... would seem to have forgotten not only his Christian faith... but even his very humanity, since every sensible man can surmise the details which we have left out, from the very magnitude of the peril, with those savage barbarians thirsting after Christian blood and using all their force to profane the Holy Places and banish the worship of God from the land.⁶²

The turmoil of emotions embraced not only the pope and the cardinals but the whole of Christendom, further stirred by the atrocities committed anew by the Infidel in the most holy shrines of the Christian faith. Hattin became in the papal document the most faithful reflection of God's anger against Christians: their sins and malevolence brought not only about the loss of Christian lands but also about the capture of the Cross, which by the end of

⁶¹ *The Old French Continuation of William of Tyre, 1184-97*, 42, *ibid.* p. 47.

⁶² *Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris*, ed. A. Chroust, M. G. H., SRG, n.s. (Berlin, 1928), vol. 5, p. 6-10; trans. Riley Smith, Louise and Jonathan, *The Crusades: Idea and Reality 1095-1271*, p. 64-65.

the twelfth-century has been abandoned to the contaminated hands of the Infidel.⁶³

Acknowledgment of God's infinite justice vis-à-vis a deliberate attempt to foster a widespread sense of *mea culpa* was not an ephemeral strategy of the papal curia. An appeal to similar emotions appears in a letter written by Conrad of Montferrat to Baldwin, Archbishop Canterbury, almost two years after Hattin (1189):

The holy city of Jerusalem, despoiled of its worshippers, is to be mourned and lamented. As a consequence of their sins, its inhabitants have been placed under tribute to Saladin, and, having paid the capitation tax, are driven far from the kingdom. The walls of Jerusalem are bereft of their hermit occupants. God has stood back as if from the defilement of our evil, and Mohammed has taken over; where Christ was prayed to day and night at the appointed hours, now Mohammed is praised with uplifted voice.⁶⁴

The widespread manipulation of the well-known formula “because of our sins” may raise questions as to the genuine value of this expression to express authentic feelings. As well pointed out by Mary Garrison, the very utilization of what she calls “prefabricated units of expression” – quotations, allusions, proverbs, or clichés – may have been deliberate precisely because of their communicative power.⁶⁵ Peter Dronke has further demonstrated that a distinctive use of a *topos* can itself constitute individuality within a tradition.⁶⁶ The widespread use of the cliché “because of our sins” cannot by itself deny or diminish the sense of anguish and despair that embraced twelfth-century Christians.

Faced with the difficult question of how the Christ refrained from bestowing victory on the Cross and the Christian armies and, instead, actually chose the Infidel (whose barbarous essence and terrible crimes were by then well-known), contemporaries could only reply with a sense of *mea culpa*, which had been preached continuously by the Church preachers for generations.⁶⁷

⁶³ On Gregory's crusading policy and the preaching of the crusade at this stage, see, Penny J. Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095-1270* (Cambridge, 1991), p. 62-79.

⁶⁴ Ralph of Diceto, *Opera Historica*, ed. W. Stubbs in *Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I, R. S.*, 2 vols. (London, 1865), vol. 2, p. 60-62. Trans. Peter W. Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem and the Third Crusade*, p. 168-169.

⁶⁵ Mary Garrison, “The Study of Emotions in Early Medieval History”, p. 245-246.

⁶⁶ Peter Dronke, *Poetic Individuality in the Middle Ages: New Departures in Poetry 1000-1150* (Oxford, 1970), p. 11-12.

⁶⁷ E. F. Vodola, “*Fides et culpa*: The Use of Roman Law in Ecclesiastical Ideology”, in *Authority and Power: Studies on Medieval Law and Government Presented to Walter Ullman on his Seventieth Birthday*, eds. Brian Tierney and Peter Linehan (Cambridge, 1980), p. 83-97; J. C.

Moreover, the ubiquity of the *topos* in ecclesiastical correspondence and in narrative sources, as well, may testify to its roots in the climate of opinion prevailing in medieval Christendom.

This short review hints at the broad spectrum of emotions that were closely connected with the crusades and the Christian epos in the Latin East and reveals some of the ways by which contemporaries tried to understand and explain the historical process. No clear difference of approach is discernible among the different sources, a situation that allows the conclusion that the papal message was widely accepted by contemporary authors. Medieval chroniclers used all the rich spectrum of words at their disposal without making clear differentiations among anger, hatred, violence, and revenge, terms which were distinctively employed in contemporary jurisprudence manuals and in theological treatises alike. Thus, reference to the words themselves can only limit the field of research, while historical contextualization allows a better analytical and theoretical perspective of the intricate emotional spectrum that was inherent in medieval Christendom.

A process of continuous emotional adjustment to changing circumstances is also clearly discernible, while the thesaurus of emotional expressions changed and revitalized itself according to new exigencies. Still, the hatred of Moslems and Islam remained constant throughout the crusader period, notwithstanding the meeting with the enemy and the complete victory over it in the first stages. This hatred, moreover, was actually a condition *sine qua non* of the crusades and, therefore, was continuously fostered by ecclesiastical propaganda. On the other hand, the historical process left its mark on the changing emotions among the crusaders, while the anger and hatred of the Moslems at a first stage was strengthened if not replaced by the increasing search for revenge and the subsequent search for their own sins as justification for the repeated defeats.

Contextualization of the negative emotional vocabulary that was used to delineate and describe Christian-Moslem relations proves, though, to be misleading. In fact, medieval sources described the Moslems with the same spectrum of negative emotions that were used to reproach different groups within Christendom itself – the heretical sects provide a clear example of this approach. The crusades, moreover, took place shortly after Christian society had allegedly settled its internal differences in the form of the *Tregua Dei*; the ideal of knighthood further crystallized across the same spectrum of values

Payen, *Le motif du repentir dans la littérature française médiévale: des origines à 1230* (Genève, 1968), passim.

and emotions that delineated the discourse in which the Moslems were discussed.

Less than a century before the crusades, different groups in Christian society had been the target of the same pejorative emotions that were later used to denounce and reproach the Moslems. These terms should therefore be seen and analyzed, not to produce a superficial moral reading of the vilification of the Moslems, but as an essential part of the thesaurus in which Christian society analyzed itself. In fact, the use of the same Augustinian emotional index transforms negative attitudes toward the Moslems into an act of inverted inclusion of the Moslems within the Christian sphere;⁶⁸ in other words, using illusionary inclusion in order to exclude.

This inverted inclusion means that within its inner discourse, Christian society defeated the Moslems symbolically, independently of the real outcome on the battlefield. The transformation of the crusaders from Westerners into Easterners in Fulcher's eschatology (note 45) is a conscious practice of erasing the "other" by expropriating its identity. This was not, however, an act of including the Easterner into the crusaders' *weltanschauung*, but a symbolic denial that further served to exclude the Easterners altogether.

The inverted inclusion of the Moslems thus became the last step on the long march of both inclusion and, at the same time, erasing the Infidel, for it was Christianity that defined the cultural boundaries of the West. In this way, in an almost embryonic "Orientalistic" fashion, crusader society had subordinated the East; indeed, turned it into a part of the West. The emotional discourse thus proves to be a political narrative, and in this fashion it should be read.

⁶⁸ See, for instance, the use of Augustine's arguments by Jacques de Vitry, bishop of Acre, to justify violence against infidels (c. 1216-1225), Jacques de Vitry, *Sermones Vulgares*, in *Analecta novissima* (Paris, 1888), vol. 2, p. 419-420.