

## Islamophobia, the First Crusade and the Expansion of Christendom to Islamic World

Hussain Othman

University Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia

---

**Abstract:** The impact of the First Crusade proclaimed by Pope Urban II in 1095 during his sermon at Clermont, France goes beyond the historic fall of Jerusalem from Muslim hand to the Western Christians. It was the beginning of a systematic and thoughtful description of Islam and Muslim as the great enemy of Western Christendom. Islam was portrayed as a heretic belief and anti-Christ movement. The Muslims were compared with the barbaric people, merciless and coldblooded. The demonization of Islam and Muslims had successfully instigated Western Christians to take part in the expedition of the First Crusade and marched towards the Islamic World in the Near East. Muslims had lost their second Holy Land, the Quds or Jerusalem, to the First Crusaders and part of their lands were colonised. The establishment of the Kingdom of Jerusalem by the First Crusaders was a historic moment not only for the victory of wars and the possession of Muslim cities, lands and territories but more importantly the personal victory of the Papal to expand Western Christendom to the Islamic World. Through the description of the First Crusade, mostly from the Western sources, this paper is intended to show that it was the Pope who systematically sown the seeds of Islamophobia among Western Christians so that they will realise his vision of expanding his Imperial Christendom to the Islamic World.

---

**Key words:** Islamophobia • First Crusade • Pope Urban II • Christendom • Islamic World

---

### INTRODUCTION

The term “crusade” was almost unknown during late eleventh century when Christian’s military expedition from Europe first reached Islamic world in the near east and ignited the religious wars on behalf of Western Christendom. Urban II, the Pope who first called for this expedition did not used this term or invented it during his sermon at Clermont in 1095. Rather he urged the Christians Europe to take a military journey or pilgrimage and most of the contemporaries termed as *iter* (journey) or *expeditio*, *passagium*, *peregrinatio* (pilgrimage). Other various terms used by western writers are *bellum sacrum* or *guerre sainte* (holy war), *passagium generate* (a passage or general passage), *expeditio cruris* (expedition of the Cross) or *negotium Jhesu Christi* (the business of Jesus Christ). These terms according to Housley describe two main understanding on the crusade, first as the journey and second as the enterprise [1]. Collectively, the crusaders in late eleventh century were known as *milites Dei* or *Christi*, the Army of God or the Army of Christ.

Later in twelfth to thirteenth century a more specific terminology was developed to describe the crusaders who took the vow for the crusades and were then required to attach a cloth cross to their clothing and were expected to wear that distinctive emblem continuously until the vow had been fulfilled. The word *crucesignatus* (one signed with the cross) was used to refer to the crusader and the French term *croisade* (the way of the cross) came to be adopted. Among the early Arab chroniclers the term “*Hurub al-Ifranj*” or “*al-Firanj*” (wars of the Franks) was used to describe the crusade. The term “*Hurub al-Salibiyya*” or “the wars of the cross” is a later term translated from the word “the crusades” [2-4].

In its early and original form, the Crusades are the holy wars designed and promoted by the Roman Catholic Papacy since the late eleventh century to liberate the Holy Land of Jerusalem from the Muslim’s rule. This was true in regard with the first three crusades which marched to the Holy Land but later crusades were then targeted to other parts of Muslim territories including Egypt and Syria. Targeted enemies were also varied according to the interest of the papal and in some occasions Christians

who deemed as the enemies of the Holy Roman Catholic Church or specifically the Pope himself were also targeted. The variety of crusading purposes brought Western scholars to understand the crusade differently. For traditionalist scholars, the crusade is limited only to the holy wars for the liberation of the Holy Land. Other group scholars whom described by Professor Giles Constable as pluralists, popularists and generalists understood crusade in a wider perspectives and not only limited to the purpose of liberating the Holy Land.[5]

**Demonization of the Muslims:** Pope Urban II is the central figure in the making of the history of the First Crusade which later followed by many of his successors. Against this background it was an appeal of military aid from Byzantium Emperor Alexius I Comnenus in March 1095 to Urban II during which the pope was at the ecclesiastical council in Piacenza, Italy, "The crusade was his personal response to an appeal which had reached him from the Greeks eight months before. In March 1095 he had been presiding over a council at Piacenza, when there had arrived an embassy from Constantinople to ask for aid against the Turks" [6]. The Emperor was asking for a small group of troops to resist the Muslim threat next to his border. In the next two years Alexius was stunned by the tide of hordes of Latin Christian army marched through Constantinople towards the Holy Land [7].

In 1095, during his famous sermon at Clermont (a southern French town), Pope Urban II called upon the Christians of Europe to stand up and march towards Jerusalem to liberate the Holy Land from the Muslims.

"Urban declared that Christianity was in dire peril, threatened by invasion and appalling oppression. The Holy City of Jerusalem was now in the hands of Muslims - 'a people...alien to God', bent upon ritual torture and unspeakable desecration. He called upon Latin Europe to rise up against this supposedly savage foe as 'soldiers of Christ', reclaiming the Holy Land and releasing eastern Christians from 'servitude'" [8].

He was then carried the message throughout France, "he preached the crusade at Limoges at Christmas, at Angers and Le Mans in February 1096 and at a council held at Nîmes in July ... at Le Mans in February... at Tours in March".[9] By the time Urban left France his message was clearly echoed and responded by thousands of enthusiastic knights who took the cross at their will. They were not only highly excited to join the expedition

for the religious duty to liberate the Holy Land but also because of the hatred on the Muslims. The hatred was incited through the description of Muslims by Urban. This message of hatred was purposely inculcated among Western Christians so that they will have more and better reasons to take the cross and join the long journey to the Holy Land. Urban described the Muslim as "subhuman savages, bent upon the barbaric abuse of Christendom", the slaughters of the Christian pilgrims to the Holy Land,

"The cruelty of these impious men goes even to the length that, thinking the wretches have eaten gold or silver, they either put scammony in their drink and force them to vomit or void their vitals, or - and this is unspeakable - they stretch asunder the coverings of all the intestines after ripping open their stomachs with a blade and reveal with horrible mutilation whatever nature keeps secret." [10].

Urban's horrific description of the Muslim is totally misleading and far from the actual attitude of Muslims towards others and their religions. A history of more than 400 hundred years before Urban has proven this. Jerusalem was captured by Umar al-Khattab, second Caliph of Islam in February 638. Since then the Holy City was peacefully ruled by the Muslims based on the principles of religious tolerance. People of all beliefs including Jews, Christians and Muslims were living peacefully next to each other. Foundation of respect and tolerance among each other's belief was laid by Umar during his arrival in Jerusalem. Amin Maalof describes the moment of the arrival of Umar in Jerusalem,

"Umar had entered Jerusalem astride his famous white camel and the Greek patriarch of the holy city came forward to meet him. The caliph first assured him that the lives and property of the city's inhabitants would be respected and then asked the patriarch to take him to visit the Christian holy places. The time of Muslim prayer arrived while they were in the church of Qiyama, the Holy Sepulchre and 'Umar asked his host if he could unroll his prayer mat. The patriarch invited 'Umar to do so right where he stood but the caliph answered: 'If I do, the Muslims will want to appropriate this site, saying, 'Umar prayed here.' Then, carrying his prayer mat, he went and knelt outside. He was right, for it was on that very spot that the mosque that bore his name was constructed." [11].

Although Urban's wild accusations on the Muslims are baseless and having no concrete evidence, his sermon echoed through his visits to other parts of European Christendom and attracted vast majority of Latin Christians including the princes and the noblemen to take the cross and follow his path.

"His itinerary after Piacenza demonstrates that he set out, as he put it, to 'stimulate the minds' of the nobles and knights in his homeland, France. His year-long journey, processing crowned through country towns, which had never, or had hardly ever, seen a king in living memory, accompanied by an impressive entourage, including cardinals and senior officials of the Roman Church and a flock of French archbishops and bishops, was deliberately theatrical. Everywhere he went he dedicated cathedrals, churches and altars. He presided over councils at Clermont (November 1095), Marmoutier near Tours (March 1096) and Nimes (July 1096), at which his already impressive entourage was greatly augmented. He first preached the crusade on 27 November in the open air, in a field outside the town of Clermont. It fell a little flat because the number of important laymen in his audience was relatively small, but that had not been his intention, for it seems that he had instructed bishops to bring with them to the council the leading nobles in their dioceses. He also preached the Cross at Limoges, Angers, Le Mans, Tours and Nimes and probably elsewhere besides and he presided over Cross-taking ceremonies at Tours and possibly Le Mans. He made a detour to celebrate the feast of the Assumption at the great Marian shrine of Le Puy, the bishop of which, Adhemar of Monteil, was to be his representative on the crusade and he celebrated the feasts of St Giles and St Hilary at St Gilles and Poitiers respectively." [12].

Christianity as a religion was for so long known as a religion for loving and caring. Killing, murdering and what more declaring a war on others are basically almost unknown from the Holy Text and early Christian doctrine. Fifth Commandment clearly prohibited of the killing of human being, 'Thou shall not kill'. "There was no precedent for these massive hosts of arms-bearing pilgrims taking the cross and making their way eastwards across hundreds of miles of unfamiliar terrain...to liberate the holiest of Christianity's many shrines".[13] It took hundreds of years for Christian clergies to justify holy war and it was initially based on the foundation laid by Saint

Augustine of Hippo (354-430 CE). Even then his work was hardly laid a clear foundation to declare and advocate the sanctification of war [14]. Later Christian theologians and canon lawyers simplified Augustine theories in which explained that a war could be waged under three circumstances; for a just cause, proclaim by a legitimate authority and with the right intention. First, the war must have a just cause and normally such a cause could only be past or present aggression or injurious action by another. Second, it must rest on a legitimate authority or known as the authority of the prince. Third, the army of God as they were called ought to have right intention and pure motives.[15] The debates on these three foundations of proclaiming a Holy War continue even after hundreds years of the First Crusade and despite the defeats of Latin Christians in later crusades and the rise of religious mistrust on holy wars whether they are really God's will or human made conviction.

"St Augustine's definition of just violence, that it avenged injuries, presupposed a less passive attitude on the part of the just than was later to be acceptable, especially in the notion of vengeance, which haunted canon lawyers until c. 1200, after which it seems gradually to have been dropped and in a wide interpretation of the injuries to be avenged, which could include any violation of righteousness, God's laws or Christian doctrine. As late as the middle of the thirteenth century the great canon lawyer Hostiensis (d. 1271) seems to have believed that Christendom had an intrinsic right to extend its sovereignty over any society which did not recognize the rule of the Roman Church or Roman Empire." [16].

Prior to March 1095 and long before Pope Urban II received the request from Byzantium Emperor asking for military aids to face the Muslims' threat, Pope Gregory VII (1073-1085) was already on his way to bring Roman Catholic papacy into secular and worldly affairs beyond the Churchly limitation including the potential use of violence. He was championing the reformation movement for the Church to rejuvenate western Christendom. As an advisor to Gregory, Urban highly supported the cause and soon after his succession to the papacy he had every reason to design a great plan for the reformation and the call for the First Crusade is among the great plan of his papacy. The military aids appeal from Greek Christian Emperor Alexius I Comnenus came just on the right time [17]. The fact that Byzantium Emperor sent the messenger

and requested for the military aids from the papacy apparently showed that in Latin Christian of Europe the pope is the most powerful political figure and highly capable to direct his command over great kings and noblemen of Europe. The impact of pope's calls for the crusades and the participation of great kings and noblemen since the First Crusade had everything to explain this fact.

One may curious why after more than 400 years of Jerusalem under the Muslim rule it was suddenly become highly important as a focal point for Urban II's preaching of the First Crusade. The background of which the First Crusade was delivered is very much related to the papal politics. During this time the Roman Catholic Church was facing with the anti-pope movement and political rival with Henry IV who took control over Rome and most of provinces in Italy. Pope Gregory VII was having tough challenge to overcome his political rival and to develop a grand political plan of establishing the Papal Monarchy. Initially the pope failed to achieve his goal and died in exile in southern Italy but his grand plan was clearly apprehended by his successor Urban II. Urban was then executed the plan through the sermon at Clermont and as history evidently showed he successfully gained the supports from almost all over western Christendom and among princes and noblemen [18]. Obviously, the four-hundred-year history of the occupation of Jerusalem by the Muslims was revitalised again with the embellishment of the religious credentials through the repentance of sins and promises of direct pass to Heaven. It is the grand design of Papal Monarch to achieve a true meaning of Christendom.

"To understand the relationship between conventional crusading and Christendom at large we must take into account the political philosophy which dominated Western European thought at the time. Christendom had many meanings, but in political terms it was seen not merely as a society of Christian but as a universal state, the Christian Republic, transcendental in that it existed at the same time in heaven and on earth. Providing the political context in which men and women could fully develop their potential for loving God and their neighbours, it was the only true sovereign state. Earthly kingdoms had no real political validity, being at best temporal conveniences which could be considered to be its provinces. The Christian Republic - 'the kingdom of Christ and the Church' to the leaders of the First Crusade - had its possessions and its citizens. Any

asset, such as territory once governed by Christians but now in the hands of outsiders, could be restored to its rule. Any threat to its subjects, whether from without or within, must be resisted. A crusade was its army, fighting in its defence or for the recovery of property lost by it. St Bernard could argue that the cause of King Louis VII of France, setting out for the East, was of importance not only to him 'but to the whole Church of God, because now your cause is one with that of all the world'. A century later Eudes of Chateauroux made the same point in one of his sermons: But someone says, 'The Muslims have not hurt me at all. Why should I take the Cross against them?' But if he thought well about it he would understand that the Muslims do great injury to every Christian." [19].

**The March of the First Crusade:** Urban's call for crusade was well responded by Latin Christians both from the noblemen and the poor of the masses at large. It was the role of the bishops who brought down his message to their own dioceses. Those who missed to attend the pope's original sermon will have their opportunity to listen from these bishops. Seduced by Urban's promises that those who took the cross and fight for the Christ in this Holy War would be granted with the repentance of their sins and the protection from the church, tens of thousands of men, women and children marched out of the West to wage war against the Muslims in the First Crusade.

Peter the Hermit, a poor Christian preacher is among the first who inspired by the sermon and almost immediately answered the call. Within six months after the sermon he has successfully gathered almost 15,000 Christian believers largely made up of poor people to march towards Jerusalem. Alongside other small contingents from Germany they made up of around 20,000 armies making ill-disciplined progress towards Constantinople in spring 1096. "Along the way, some of these 'crusaders' concluded that they might as well combat the 'enemies of Christ' closer to home and thus carried out terrible massacres of Rhineland Jews" [20]. Crossing the Bosphorus strait and into the Muslims territory they faced with Kilij Arslan, a young seventeen year old Turk Muslim ruler with his army.

The People Crusaders as they were known are made of several hundred knights, most of them without their armour, marched at the head of the procession, followed by a disordered throng of foot-soldiers.

“They had been marching for less than an hour when the sultan heard their approaching clamour. The sun, rising at his back, shone directly into the eyes of the Franj. Holding his breath, he signalled his emirs to get ready. The fateful moment had arrived. A barely perceptible gesture, a few orders whispered here and there and the Turkish archers were slowly bending their bows: a thousand arrows suddenly shot forth with a single protracted whistle. Most of the knights fell within the first few minutes. Then the foot-soldiers were decimated in their turn” [21].

Kilij Arslan and his army scored a jubilant victory annihilated the People Crusaders although their leader Peter the Hermit saved by his luck of leaving to Constantinople to get the food and help from the Byzantium Emperor soon before the battle.

People’s Crusade might not successfully achieve its main target but these crusaders had indeed made their historical presence as the first European people to involve in holocaust, killing massive numbers of Jews, “In what has been called 'the first holocaust', most of these armies had begun their marches by persecuting European Jews” [22]. The outbreaks of the killing took place in France which broke out among Christians gathering to take cross in Rouen. It was soon widespread in Germany,

“It is possible that persecution was widespread in France, although the details of it are lost, apart from two references to an anti-Jewish riot which broke out among men gathering to take the cross in Rouen. Much more evidence is available about events in the Rhineland. Between 25 and 29 May the Jewish community at Mainz was annihilated. The movements of the crusaders, at no point very clear, now become impossible to trace with certainty. Some marched north to Cologne, where the Jews had already been dispersed into neighbouring settlements. Throughout June and into early July they were hunted out and destroyed. Another band of crusaders seems to have marched south-west to Trier and then to Metz, where the massacres continued. During May a separate crusading army, probably Peter the Hermit's, forced almost the whole community at Regensburg to undergo baptism.”[23]

The People’s Crusade was seen as unsystematic, instigated only by the desire to get repentance and to escape from deprivation and miserable lives in Europe. This expedition was never accepted as the “genuine” First

Crusade. It was the expedition led by noblemen and princes which properly took their journey under the authorisation of the Holy Roman Catholic Church and the Pope that commonly accepted as the “genuine” First Crusade. This was since the beginning understood well by Urban when he took his sermon at Clermont in 1095. Among the noblemen and princes, the attraction of worldly life, the wealth, the fighting for power and thrones, the lust for women and adultery are the common scenes. Fortunately, there are some who were touch with the religious consciousness and got attracted to the call for the holy war. Some of them were experiencing religious call and feeling of a born again Christian and are ready to leave their sinful past for the rewards offered by the Pope. The story of Fulk Nerra, a brutal and cruel warlord ruler of Anjou in west-central France between 987-1040 inspired many of noblemen. For many years living in violence, brutal killing in battles and bloodsheds he was then experienced a religious consciousness and looking towards repentance. Out of the fear for the Hell he was then dedicated himself to three pilgrimages to Jerusalem. On his last journey he was reported to have been led naked to the Holy Sepulchre begged Christ for forgiveness of his sins. Many of rulers and noblemen in early eleventh-century of Latin Christian were preoccupied with the idea of Apocalyptic and the Last Judgement as experienced by Fulk Nerra [24]. These men are in dire need of salvation than ever before and the sermon of Urban II at Clermont proposed that a crusader engaged in this war as a means of grace for the remission of all his sins; and the phrase *remissio peccatorum* [25].

During Urban II campaign, a number of princes and noblemen had taken their cross and making vow for the crusade including Count Raymond of Toulouse, Bohemond of Taranto and his nephew Tancred of Hauteville, Godfrey of Bouillon and his brother Baldwin of Boulogne. These are the five princes who played important roles in the crusade expedition to the Holy Land leading three main Frankish armies in the front. Count Raymond of Toulouse was a secular lord of south-eastern France and he was the first among the princes to commit to the crusade. A wealthy and influential figure in his mid-fifties admired by the Pope due to his strong support of papacy reformation and his ally with Adhemar of Le Puy, the soon to be the Papal Legate (Pope’s official representative) for the First Crusade. Bohemond of Taranto was a forty-year-old southern Italian Norman, the son of the Norman adventurer who conquered southern Italy during the eleventh century. Adequately trained in military education and having experience of fighting in

battlefield together with his father. Tancred of Hauteville is Bohemond's nephew. A young man with little experience in warfare but said to have skill in Arabic language. Godfrey of Bouillon, son of the count Boulogne was not in favour with the papacy and he was said to take the cross purposely to establish his new life in the Holy Land. He was joined by his brother Baldwin of Boulogne. The First Crusaders were also joined by another two contingents from northern France led by three leading nobles Robert, duke of Normandy, Stephen, count of Blois and Robert II, count of Flanders [26].

After a long journey from Europe each contingent met at Constantinople, the capital city of Byzantium Empire. The Emperor Alexius I invited each of the princes to have an audience with him so that he can get their oath and promise that whatever cities and countries seized by the crusaders be hand it over to the Byzantines. Although some of the princes hesitated and try to avoid meeting with the Emperor they were all finally agreed to some extent especially Raymond, count of Toulouse who agreed only not to threaten Alexius power and possession [27].

Beginning in February 1097 armies of the First Crusade were crossing Bosphorus strait and setting up the camp at the shore of Asia Minor and months later their number reached around 75,000 including 7,500 fully armed, mounted knights and further 35,000 lightly equipped infantry. The first city targeted is Nicaea, the capital city of Seljuk Sultan Kilij Arslan. On the other hand, Kilij Arslan was said to be intoxicated by his success of defeating the People Crusade led by Peter the Hermit the year before. Information that the new and fresh groups of crusaders were arriving in Constantinople was ignored and he is said to concern more on his mission to wage wars against other Turkish princes in order to establish his superiority within the region [28, 29].

The crusaders reached Nicaea on 6 May 1097 only to find the thirty-foot-high fortifications, nearly three miles in circumference blocking their advancement. The news shocked Kilij Arslan and he took his army and return to Nicaea in the hope of defending the city from plundering. A surprise rear attack was planned and launched but to no avail. Later with the assistance from Emperor Alexius I who ordered his best knight name Taticius and his army, the crusaders successfully sieged the fortifications of Nicaea in 18 June 1097. Kilij Arslan sent a farewell message to his men defending the fort and left Nicaea never to see it again. While in his retreat Kilij Arslan called all Turks to come to his aid for riposte and

proclaimed jihad towards crusaders. New troops and volunteers were recruited and to his call many Turks answered. New alliance was also made with Danishmend, another Turkish warlord. The battle was fought at Dorylaeum while the crusaders encamped at an abandoned Byzantine military camp. Highly determined and motivated after their success at Nicaea, the crusaders were able to driven out Kilij Arslan army and his allies to their defeat. Ibn al-Qalanisi reported, "The Franj cut the Turkish army to pieces. They killed, pillaged and took many prisoners, who were sold into slavery." [30].

Now the route towards Jerusalem slowly opened for the crusaders. Their next target is Antioch, former Byzantium city under the Seljuk control since 1085. It was an uneasy march. Three months of marching throughout the summer of 1097 took them many tolls with starvation, dehydration and diseases. The city was greatly desired by Byzantium Emperor for it was a gate to conquer and control Asia Minor, apart from being their colony prior to 1085. In the eyes of Byzantium Emperor the crusaders are his mercenary armies to free Antioch and he is expected that the city will be returned to him after it was fully occupied. Later, his expectation is discovered to be wrong.

Having reached outside Antioch walls, the crusaders were "daunted by the sheer scale of its defences. One Frank wrote in a letter to Europe that at first sight the city seemed 'fortified with incredible strength and almost impregnable.'" [31]. The city's Seljuk governor Yaghi Siyan strengthen his defence inside the city and sending messages to other Muslim sultans including the Caliph in Baghdad asking for military aid. Attempts had been made to break into the fortification and besiege the city from every direction but the crusaders were facing with strong retaliation from inside. The news of the approaching of military aid from other Muslim armies outside Antioch forced the crusaders to double their efforts. Through inside contact with an Armenian commander who betrayed the city and opening the route through one of the city towers the crusaders managed to enter and occupied the city. Once inside, the crusaders hysterically relished themselves with killing and slaughtering the Muslims, Christian Greeks, Syrians and Armenians. "One Latin contemporary noted that 'they were sparing no Muslim on the grounds of age or sex, the ground was covered with blood and corpses and some of these were Christian Greeks, Syrians and Armenians.'" [32]. Yaghi Siyan, his family members and son were also murdered and decapitated.

The besieged and captured of Antioch was also reported in a comparatively great detail in Muslim resources as compared to Latin Christian resources. Some events were also differed particularly in regards with the attitude of Muslim ruler of Antioch Yaghi Siyan on indigenous Christians. Ibn al-Athir recorded how the Franks took Antioch,<sup>1</sup>

“They reached the lands of Qilij Arslan ibn Sulayman ibn Qutlumish, namely Konya and other cities. Having arrived there, they were met by Qilij Arslan with his hosts, who resisted them. They put him to flight in Rajab 490 after a battle <sup>2</sup> and then traversed his lands into those of the son of the Armenian which they marched through before emerging at Antioch and putting it under siege.

When the ruler Yaghi Siyan heard of their coming, he feared the Christians in the city. He sent out the Muslim inhabitants by themselves and ordered them to dig the moat. Then the next day he sent out the Christians also to dig the moat, unaccompanied by any Muslim. They laboured on it until the evening but when they wished to enter the city he prevented them and said, 'You can give me Antioch until I see how things will be with us and the Franks.' They asked, 'Who will look after our sons and our wives?' 'I will look after them in your place,' he replied. So they held back and took up residence in the Frankish camp. The Franks besieged the city for nine months. Yaghi Siyan displayed such courage, excellent counsel, resolution and careful planning as had never been seen from anyone else. Most of the Franks perished. Had they remained in the numbers they set out with, they would have overwhelmed the lands of Islam. Yaghi Siyan protected the families of those Christians of Antioch, whom he had expelled and restrained the hands that would do them harm.

After their siege of Antioch had lasted long, the Franks made contact with one of the men garrisoning the towers, who was an armourer, known as Ruzbah and offered him money and grants of land. He was in charge of a tower next to the valley, which was built with a

window overlooking the valley. After they had made an arrangement with this cursed armourer, they came to the window, which they opened and through which they entered. A large number climbed up on ropes. When they numbered more than five hundred, they blew the trumpet. That was at dawn. The defenders were already tired from many sleepless nights on guard. Yaghi Siyan awoke and asked what was happening. He was told, 'That trumpet is from the citadel. No doubt it has already been taken.' However, it was not from the citadel but merely from that tower. He was seized with fear, opened the city gate and left in headlong flight with thirty retainers. His deputy as governor of the city came and asked after him. He was told that he had fled, so he himself fled by another gate. That was a boon for the Franks. Had he held firm for a while, they would have perished. The Franks entered the city through the gate and sacked it, killing the Muslims that were there. This was in Jumada I. <sup>3</sup>

When the next day dawned, Yaghi Siyan came to his senses again. He had been like one distraught. He looked at himself after he had covered several leagues and said to those with him, 'Where am I?' 'Four leagues from Antioch,' he was told. He then regretted his flight to safety and his failure to fight until he either drove them from the city or was himself killed. He started to lament and bewail having abandoned his wife, his children and the Muslim population. Because of the violence of what afflicted him he fell from his horse in a faint. When he fell to the ground, his followers went to remount him but he could not hold on, for he was close to death. They therefore left him and rode away. An Armenian, who was cutting firewood and came across him when he was at his last gasp, killed him, cut off his head and took it to the Franks at Antioch.” [33].

On the other side of the story, Latin Christian source blamed Yaghi Siyan for his brutal acts on non-Muslims of Antioch, the indigenous Christian,

“For his part, Yaghi Siyan ordered the public victimisation of Antioch's indigenous Christian population. The Greek patriarch, who had long resided peacefully within the city, was now dangled

<sup>1</sup> For the translation of *Al-Kāmil fī'l-tārīkh* of Ibn al-Athīr, the author consulted with D. S. Richards, 2006, the Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr for the Crusading Period from al-Kāmil fī'l-tārīkh, United Kingdom: Ashgate. Richards's translation is based on manuscript source: Ms. Pococke 346: Bodleian Ms. Pococke 346, 195 folios, completed Tuesday 7 Rajab 691/24 June 1292, covering the years 502-71/1108-76.

<sup>2</sup> According to Richards this is the battle of Dorylaeum, fought in end of Rajab [3 July 1097]. See further D. S. Richards, *The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr for the Crusading Period from al-Kāmil fī'l-tārīkh*, United Kingdom: Ashgate, 2006, Part 1, p. 14.

<sup>3</sup> It was between April-May 1098, see further Richards, 2006, Part 1, p. 15.

by his ankles from the battlements and beaten with iron rods. One Latin recalled that 'many Greeks, Syrians and Armenians, who lived in the city, were slaughtered by the maddened Turks. With the Franks looking on, they threw outside the walls the heads of those killed with their catapults and slings. This especially grieved our people.' [34].

The besieged of Antioch took about eight months and the crusaders finally managed to storm through inside and fully control the city and fortification but only to find themselves besieged by Kerbogha and his army, a general sent by the Caliph in Baghdad. In spite of standing with a great number of armies, Kerbogha was finally defeated and the second besieged of Antioch was ended. Some of the crusaders believed that the relic of Holy Lance discovered by Peter Bartholomew, a peasant visionary played the greatest role for the crusaders triumph over Kerbogha. The discovery of the Lance was seen as a great transformation in crusaders morale since most of them believed that it was the one prophesied in an apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter. Among the leaders of the First Crusade Raymond of St. Gilles was the one who had shown a great devotion to the Lance and took the responsibility for its custody and gain some donation upon it. Other leaders had shown their scepticism over Peter's claim as a well-known Holy Lance was already in safe custody in Constantinople, "Robert of Normandy, Robert of Flanders, Tancred and Bohemond were all very sceptical, believing that Peter had simply brought a piece of iron with him into the cathedral." [35] Obviously, Raymond had a profitable custodian business showered with donation from the believers and admirers of Peter's Lance including from Adhemar of Le puy, the Papal Legate. On the other hand, the fate was not with Peter since he has to face with scepticism and even hostility from many leaders. Later, in order to prove his claim Peter offered himself to walk through an inferno. He was badly burnt and died after twelve days of fatal injuries. "His demise shattered belief in his prophecies and left the efficacy of the Holy Lance in grave doubt." [36].

**The Fall of Jerusalem:** The long battle, exhaustion and the celebration of victory at Antioch had slightly delayed the crusaders towards their major target, Jerusalem. Although along this time some attacks and skirmishes on surrounding area of Muslim territories were also launched. It takes them ten months to get out from disillusionment and move on towards the Holy City.

Since its capture in 638 during the time of Caliph Umar, Jerusalem was under the Islamic control and peacefully ruled by many Muslim rulers. Christians and Jews were living side by side with their Muslim neighbours. Outside Christians and Jewish pilgrims were also welcomed to perform their holy pilgrimage (John France, 2005: 48). Now the city is at the edge of tumbling as the crusaders emerged out of the desert. The world of Islam was also in the midst of conflicts and division between Fatimids and Sunni rulers of Seljuk. After the defeat of Kerbogha at Antioch, Fatimids vizier al-Afdal seized Jerusalem from the Seljuk in August 1098. Ibn al-Athir narrated the story,

"Jerusalem had been held by Taj al-Dawla Tutush who assigned it to Emir Suqman ibn Artuq the Turkoman. When the Franks defeated the Turks at Antioch and made slaughter amongst them, the power of the Turks weakened and they lost cohesion. When the Egyptians saw their weakness, they marched to Jerusalem, led by al-Afdal ibn Badr al-Jamali. There they besieged Suqman and Ilghazi, the sons of Artuq and also their cousin Savanj and their nephew Yaquti. They set up forty and more trebuchets against the town and demolished parts of its wall. The inhabitants fought back and the fighting and the siege lasted somewhat over forty days, until the Egyptians took the city on terms. Al-Afdal treated Suqman, Ilghazi and their followers well, gave them generous gifts and sent them on their way to Damascus. Subsequently they crossed the Euphrates. Suqman took up residence in Edessa but Ilghazi moved to Iraq. The Egyptians appointed as deputy in Jerusalem a man called Iftikhar al-Dawla, who remained there until this present time, when the Franks attacked after they had besieged Acre but with no success." [37].

The crusaders long expedition finally arrived at Jerusalem on 7 June 1099 and camped outside the city in the preparation for their final assault [38]. Knowing the Franks were already in front of his gate, waiting impatiently to knock down the fortress and taking over the city, Iftikhar al-Daulah had nothing else to do except to strengthen his defence and garrison. He knew it for well that these armies of Franks were no ordinary men - who can easily be defeated and turning back even with his ferocious attacks - for most of them were taken the cross and under their oath not only with the Pope but also with



the God to whom they put their trust and hope of repentance. They had suffered so many hardships, starvation, thirst and even death of many of their fellow comrades during the journey and battles fought along the line of expedition.

The people of Jerusalem, Muslims, Jews, Syrian Coptic and Armenians were also working together to their best ability to save their city from the barbaric assaults of the crusaders. Noblemen, the rich, the poor and the peasants, men and women, young and old and the children, some of whom braved themselves to offer their hands to protect their city and land from invaders. Some of whom were incapable took their shelter inside Mosque, Church and Synagogue praying to One God to protect the city and the people. Crusaders are so determined, the Holy City should be theirs or they will be cursed for not giving themselves to its cause. Ibn al-Athir further narrated,

“After their arrival they erected forty trebuchets or more and they constructed two towers, one on Mount Zion side but the Muslims burnt that one and killed all inside. After they had completely destroyed it by fire, their help was then called for, as the city defences had been overwhelmed on the other side. The Franks did indeed take the city from the north in the forenoon of Friday, seven days remaining of Sha'ban [15 July 1099].” [39].

The aftermath of the assault and invasion was so fearful and bloody. Both Muslim and Christian records reported the mass killing and slaughtering of Jerusalemites most of whom are Muslims. Ibn al-Athir reported the aftermath of the invasion,

“The inhabitants became prey for the sword. For a week the Franks continued to slaughter the Muslims...In the Aqsa Mosque the Franks killed more than 70,000, a large number of them being imams, ulema, righteous men and ascetics, Muslims who had left their native lands and come to live a holy life in this august spot. The Franks took forty or more silver candlesticks from the Dome of the Rock, each of which weighed 3,600 dirhams and also a silver candelabrum weighing forty Syrian rotls. They removed 150 small candlesticks of silver and twenty or so of gold. The booty they took was beyond counting.” [40].

Ibn al-Athir's estimation was far beyond the number recorded in Latin resources. It was said that only 10,000 Muslims were massacred and even some were released. “Modern historians long regarded this figure to be an exaggeration, but generally accepted that Latin estimates in excess of 10,000 might be accurate” [41]. Although the Muslim sources were seen by Western historians as an exaggerated in terms of the number of Muslim slaughtered during the raid, Latin resources do not denied the brutal acts of the crusaders. Asbridge describes;

“Soon after midday on 15 July 1099 the First Crusaders achieved their long-cherished dream - Jerusalem's conquest. Surging through the streets in blood-hungry, ravening packs, they overran the Holy City. What little Muslim resistance remained melted away before them, but most Franks were in no mood to take prisoners. Instead, three years of strife, privation and yearning coalesced to fuel a rampaging torrent of barbaric and indiscriminate slaughter. One crusader joyfully reported: ‘With the fall of Jerusalem and its towers one could see marvellous works. Some of the pagans were mercifully beheaded, others pierced by arrows plunged from towers and yet others, tortured for a long time, were burned to death in searing flames. Piles of heads, hands and feet lay in the houses and streets and men and knights were running to and fro over corpses’.” [42].

House of worship is no more a safest haven for Muslims as they understood during their lifetime in Jerusalem. Those fled into Haram al-Sharif and Aqsa Mosque were chased and brutally slaughtered. Asbridge further describes;

“Many Muslims fled towards the Haram as-Sharif, where some rallied, putting up futile resistance. A Latin eyewitness described how ‘all the defenders retreated along the walls and through the city and our men went after them, killing them and cutting them down as far as the [Aqsa mosque], where there was such a massacre that our men were wading up to their ankles in enemy blood’. Tancred gave his banner to a group huddled on the roof of the Aqsa, designating them as his captives, but even they were later slain in cold blood by other Franks. So gruesome was the carnage that, according to one Latin, ‘even the soldiers who were carrying out the

killing could hardly bear the vapours rising from the warm blood'. Other crusaders ranged through the city at will, slaughtering men, women and children, both Muslims and Jews, all the while engaging in rapacious looting" [43].

The massacre took place for at least two days with the corpses piled up and left decayed inside the city. The smell of blood and corpses haunted the people for months to come,

"But the Frankish massacre was not simply a feral outburst of bottled rage; it was a prolonged, callous campaign of killing that lasted at least two days and it left the city awash with blood and littered with corpses. In the midsummer heat the stench soon became intolerable and the dead were dragged out beyond the city walls, 'piled up in mounds as big as houses' and burned. Even six months later a Latin visiting Palestine for the first time commented that the Holy City still reeked of death and decay." [44].

Jerusalem was a city of multi-culturalism, multi-religious and multi-tolerance for more than 400 years under the guardian of Islamic rulers. But now the days had gone and the new ruler born out of the papal decree of the Holy War is on the throne. After the massacre of its inhabitants, the religious landmarks of the Holy City representing the multi-religious tolerance and co-existence were sacked. Maalof describes,

"Among the monuments sacked by the invaders was the mosque of 'Umar, erected to the memory of the second successor of the Prophet, the caliph 'Umar Ibn al-Khattab, who had taken Jerusalem from the Rum in February 638. The Arabs would later frequently invoke this event, to highlight the difference between their conduct and that of the Franj. 'Umar had entered Jerusalem astride his famous white camel and the Greek patriarch of the holy city came forward to meet him. The caliph first assured him that the lives and property of the city's inhabitants would be respected and then asked the patriarch to take him to visit the Christian holy places. The time of Muslim prayer arrived while they were in the church of Qiyama, the Holy Sepulchre and 'Umar asked his host if he could unroll his prayer mat. The patriarch invited 'Umar to do so right where he stood but the caliph answered: 'If I do, the

Muslims will want to appropriate this site, saying "Umar prayed here." 'Then, carrying his prayer mat, he went and knelt outside. He was right, for it was on that very spot that the mosque that bore his name was constructed. The Frankish commanders, alas, lacked 'Umar's magnanimity. They celebrated their triumph with an ineffable orgy of killing and then savagely ravaged the city they claimed to venerate.

Not even their coreligionists were spared. One of the first measures taken by the Franj was to expel from the Church of the Holy Sepulchre all the priests of Oriental rites—Greeks, Georgians, Armenians, Copts and Syrians—who used to officiate jointly, in accordance with an old tradition respected by all previous conquerors. Dumbfounded by this degree of fanaticism, the dignitaries of the Oriental Christian communities decided to resist. They refused to tell the occupiers where they had hidden the True Cross, on which Christ died. In the minds of these men, religious devotion to the relic was compounded by patriotic pride. Indeed, were they not fellow citizens of the Nazarene? But the invaders were not impressed. They arrested the priests who had been entrusted with custody of the Cross and tortured them to make them reveal the secret. Thus did the Franj manage to forcibly deprive the Christians of the Holy City wherein lay their most precious relics." [45].

The Muslim world was shaken with the news of the fall of Jerusalem and they mourned on the death of men, the enslavement of women and children and the plundering of property and the most revered house of worship, the al-Aqsa mosque. The Muslim Caliph in Baghdad was informed on the news. Ibn al-Athir narrated,

"In Ramadan [of 492 Hijriyyah] <sup>4</sup> men came to Baghdad from Syria seeking assistance, accompanied by the Cadi Abu Sa'd al-Harawi. They recounted in the Diwan a narrative which brought tears to the eye and pained the heart. They demonstrated in the mosque on Friday and cried out for help, weeping and reducing others to tears. A tale was told of the killing of men, the enslavement of women and children and the plundering of property that had fallen upon the Muslims in that revered, august place. Because of the severity of their suffering they did not observe their fast. The caliph ordered the following to be sent on a mission, the Cadi Abu Muhammad al-Damghani, Abu Bakr al-Shashi, Abu'l-Qasim al-Zanjani, Abu'l-Wafa ibn 'Aqil, Abu

<sup>4</sup> The date is between 22 July-20 August 1099 according to Richards, 2006, Part 1, p. 22.

Sa'd al-Hulwani and Abu'l-Husayn ibn Sammak. They set out for Hulwan but news came to them of the death of Majd al-Mulk al-Balasani, as we shall relate, so they returned without achieving any aim or any goal. The rulers were all at variance, as we shall relate and so the Franks conquered the lands.” [46].

Almost nothing can be done by al-Mustazhir, the Abbasid Caliph in Baghdad for this Islamic dynasty was far away from its golden age of power and might. The Caliph had lost all his real power, “Baghdad was half destroyed and the empire had disintegrated. All that remained was the myth of an era of unity, grandeur and prosperity that would haunt the dreams of the Arabs for ever. Although the 'Abbasids were to rule in name for another four centuries, they no longer actually governed. They were no more than hostages in the hands of their Turkish or Persian soldiers, who were able to make or break sovereigns at will, often resorting to murder in the process. To escape that fate, most of the caliphs renounced any political activity.” [47].

In addition to that, the deep divisions in Islamic world between Sunnis and Shi'is weaken the solidarity of the Muslims to face the catastrophes of crusaders invasion. The Sunni Muslims were in allegiance to the Baghdad caliphate, while the Shi'is to the Fatimid caliphate in Cairo. The Fatimid was seen as more lenient towards the Franks and in some events they were also having alliance with Byzantium Empire and supporting the crusaders to overthrow the Seljuk Sunnis in Nicaea and Antioch. “The vizier al-Afdal warmly congratulated the Basileus upon the fall of Nicaea and three months before the invaders took Antioch, an Egyptian delegation bearing gifts visited the camp of the Franj to wish them a speedy victory and to propose an alliance with them” [48]. Latin Christendom enjoyed the expansion of its Holy Imperialism in Islamic World throughout 1099 to 1187. It was the unity of Muslims in years to come that haunted the next generation of crusaders. The rise of Seljuk Zangid sultanates and Saladin (Salehuddin al-Ayubi), the great Muslim warrior echoed the spirit of jihad and unity among Muslims.

**The Expansion of Christendom to Islamic World:** Although the main theme of Pope Urban II's sermon of the first Crusade is the liberation of the Holy City of Jerusalem from “infidels” and its restoration into Christian hands, the political goals underpinning the papal ambitious plan were far beyond. It is the expansion of Latin Christendom under the banner of the Holy War [49].

During that time, the pope power was threaten by Europe secular rulers such as Henry IV who unleashed anti-pope attack and movement. In the midst of the conflict between heaven and earth, religious and secular, the call for the crusade on Muslims was timely unified most of the backbones of Europe's ruling class [50].

The participation of five princes and noblemen representing almost entire Europe's ruling class strengthen the iron fist of the Pope among the ruling class and sent a clear message to those determined to oppose the Church of Roman Catholic. The conquest of Holy City by the First Crusaders accomplished the first political goals of the papal to expand and establish the global Christendom,

“A universal state, the Christian Republic, transcendental in that it existed at the same time in heaven and on earth...Providing the political context in which men and women could fully develop their potential for loving God and their neighbours, it was the only true sovereign state. Earthly kingdoms had no real political validity, being at best temporal conveniences which could be considered to be its provinces [51].

The crusade now is clearly becoming a finest tool for holy imperialism. Antioch and Edessa are two great Syrian cities conquered during the First Crusade. Other cities including Tripoli, Acre and Jaffa were then conquered until Latin Christendom was officially established in Islamic World of the Near East with four major settlements, the Kingdom of Jerusalem, the principality of Antioch and the counties of Edessa and Tripoli. These settlements often described as the 'crusader states' and created out of the holy imperialism justified under the sermon of Pope Urban II and papal jurisdiction. Pope Urban II died before the news of the victorious expedition of the First Crusade and the conquest of Jerusalem reached Rome. His legacy of holy imperialism was taken forward by his successor Paschal II and the next popes to come. “At its core, the crusading movement, for centuries to come, would be dominated by the need to defend these isolated territories, this island of western Christendom in the East” [52].

The challenge faced by the popes in “post-Urbanism” is to ensure the continuity of crusading spirit not only to protect and sustain the holy Latin Christendom in Islamic World but also to look for further expansion in other vicinities and beyond. The advent of holy imperialism is now clearly visualised through the

First Crusade and will be more intense in the next crusades sanctioned by the popes. "A century later Eudes of Chateauroux made the same point in one of his sermons: But someone says, 'The Muslims have not hurt me at all. Why should I take the Cross against them?' But if he thought well about it he would understand that the Muslims do great injury to every Christian." [53].

In occupied crusader states of Near East, one important move taken by the crusaders to sustain their presence in the new holy imperial in Islamic World and to ensure the sustainability of the future crusades was the establishment of religious military orders. This move is not only important from the perspectives of future strategic affairs of the occupied crusader states but also for the political survival of the Holy Imperial. Kings, princes and noblemen who took the cross will only serve the crusade during a specific expedition. Once the expedition concluded they will have to return to their courts to look after their kingdoms, territories and the people. The peasants who took the cross will have to return to their villages, families and farms. Even the bishops, clergies and churchmen will have to return to serve their dioceses, minsters and churches. But for these knights who dedicated themselves to religious military orders will have to give their body and soul to the path of the crusades. It is an act of devotion which soon enabled their orders to be acknowledged as spiritual orders.

"The most striking contrast between members of the military orders and members of conventional religious communities lay, of course, in the fact that the knights and sergeants in these orders not only carried arms, but put them to use as part of their religious vocation. Canon law long before the First Crusade, as we have seen, had strictly forbidden clerics, monks and canons-regular to carry weapons at all, much less to fight with them. 'He who cares to involve himself with the worldly militia', wrote Pope Leo the Great (440-61), 'is not free from the devil's snares.' Yet the Templars and Hospitallers were undeniably religious orders, approved and privileged by the papacy, whose members dedicated themselves to warfare against the opponents of Christendom." [54].

But their dedication towards fighting and warfare, taking up the swords, killing, murdering, slaughtering, plundering the enemy territories for the sake of Christendom and the defence of the Holy Land apparently

gave the impression that in the field they are indeed the religious military orders. "Like monks, they made vows of poverty, chastity and obedience, but, rather than dedicate themselves to lives of sheltered devotion in isolated communities, they took up sword, shield and armour to fight for Christendom and the defence of the Holy Land." [55]. Unlike traditional monks, they were not bound by a vow of stability to remain in a specific community. Instead, they were mobile and free to move around the Latin Christendom in Islamic World or even abroad in performing their religious military duties [56].

The establishment of religious military orders in many ways confused the Christians including the church. It was unknown to Christian's religious organization before the First Crusade.

"The appearance of the Knights Hospitallers and Knights Templars in the Latin East during the second decade of the twelfth century, however, presented ecclesiastical authorities and canon lawyers in particular, with a knotty conceptual problem. The military orders were a new and previously unheard-of kind of religious organization. They were hybrid groups that simply did not fit into any established category within the church's legal structure. They were not exactly monks, nor were they canons-regular, nor were they clerics, yet in some respects their way of life resembled elements of each of these conventional religious groups." [57].

However, for the interest of the Christendom in the Near East the church authorities including the popes finally approved the existence of these religious military orders and supported them with generous bundle of ecclesiastical privileges,

"Popes early on granted them papal protection for their houses and persons. In addition they received immunity from payment of tithes on lands that they cultivated, as well as the right to collect tithes on lands they possessed and worked with their own labour, together with exemption from most types of episcopal control, including immunity from the effects of excommunication or interdict pronounced by bishops, the right to maintain their own churches and cemeteries, the *privilegium fori*, or right to be tried exclusively in ecclesiastical courts and much else besides." [58].

The first religious military order established after the formation of crusader states in the Islamic World is the Knights of Templar in about 1119. It was started with a small band of knights led by Hugh of Payns, a French nobleman, dedicated themselves to the task of safeguarding the routes to the Holy Land and protecting the Christian pilgrims. Their charitable works were soon recognised by Latin patriarch as a spiritual order and were given quarters by the King of Jerusalem in al-Aqsa Mosque. Latin crusaders strongly believed that the mosque was built on the site of the Temple of Solomon and following that and in honour of their new site they named the order as the Order of the Temple of Solomon, or the Templars.

This order was later formally recognised and endorsed by Latin Church in January 1129 at a major ecclesiastical council held at Troyes (Champagne, France). This endorsement and later with the papal support and further commendation from Bernard of Clairvaux - a great Christian luminaries during the preaching of Second Crusade - has made Templars as one of the most powerful religious military orders during the Holy Wars beginning with the Second Crusade. In 1130 Bernard in his treatise entitled *In Praise of the New Knighthood* praised the virtues of Templars' way of life and declared that the order to be "most worthy of total admiration", lauding its brethren as 'true knights of Christ fight[ing] the battles of their Lord', assured of glorious martyrdom should they die." [59]. With Papal support and Bernard's admiration, this order was apparently garnered acceptance for a revolutionary offshoot of crusade ideology. In many ways this was the ultimate distillation and expression of Christian holy war for the installation and protection of Holy Imperial of Christendom in Islamic World.

Second religious military order established by Latin crusaders is Hospitallers which emerged out of an institution dedicated to the care of pilgrims and the sick. An institution known as The Hospital of St John was built in memory of St John the Baptist. It grew in power and importance not only for the medical functions and charitable purposes but also as a religious military order. Although it was recognised as an order by the pope in 1113, far earlier than the Templars, its martial elements do not emerged until mid-twelfth century under the guidance of its master, Raymond of Le Puy (1120-1160). Only then it was known as a second religious military order [60].

The establishment of religious military orders is obviously a direct result of the crusading expeditions and the creation of Christendom Holy Imperial territories in

Islamic World. The First Crusade gave birth to the Christendom Holy Imperial territories and following that is the establishment of Templars and Hospitallers as religious military protectors. The Third Crusade gave birth to another religious military order known as Teutonic Order. It was started as a field hospital set up by German crusaders during the Third Crusade outside Acre around 1190. Nine years after that this movement was recognised and confirm as a new religious military order by Pope Innocent III and enjoyed close association with the Hohenstaufen dynasty and Germany [61].

The combination of these three strong, highly disciplined and financially supported religious military orders are the backbones of the Christendom Holy Imperial. Each of these orders embraced their mission through vows, though different in rituals or languages but certainly common in its aims and purpose to serve the Holy Imperial. Each of these orders wore a mantle, though different in colours but emblazoned with the same shape of cross. "By this point it had become customary for Templars to wear a white mantle emblazoned with a red cross, while the Hospitallers bore a white cross on a black background. Teutonic Knights, by contrast, adopted a white mantle with a black cross." [62]. They are the knights of Holy Imperial, ready to strike the enemies under the name of Holy War and the Church of Latin Christendom. Without these religious military orders, Holy Imperial of Christendom in Islamic World is weak, vulnerable and could be perished with the constant threats from the Muslims.

By 1200 the presence of these religious military orders was associated with the construction of great fortresses and castles in many strategic places in the Islamic World to defend their interest in surrounding areas. A vast amount of money and energy was devoted by these three major religious military order either to modifying and extending existing castles and fortresses or to designing and building from the scratch. Financial supports for the construction of these castles gained from the charitable donations not only from the Kingdom of Jerusalem but also from the nobles of Christian Europe. The orders were also acquiring great swathes of land in Europe and elsewhere in the Islamic World from which they had generated a handsome amount of money. The support and recognition received from the papal preserved their independence from local ecclesiastical and political jurisdiction through which they were exempted from paying the tithes. In addition to that, recognition from the papal had also upgraded their spiritual and religious status enabled them to garner the support from

ordinary Latin Christians and to recruit new members and thus supply the manpower for the construction of the castles [63].

The Templars had built a number of castles and one of the most important is Pilgrims' Castle which constructed in 1218 capable of holding 4,000 men. Today the ruin of the castle serves as an Israeli military base. Another important castle of the Templars built in early thirteenth century is the major inland castle of Safad in northern Galilee. Still standing this day as a legacy of the crusading periods and the impression of the Holy Imperial supremacy is the castle of Krak des Chevaliers (in Arabic - Hisn al-Akrad) once belong to the Hospitallers. The castle is situated on the southern edge of the Ansariyah Mountains, overlooking Bouqia valley. It was in possession of Hospitallers since 1114 and capable of housing a garrison of 2,000 men. The fortress of Montfort is a castle belongs to Teutonic order and it was designed and built by the order from the scratch [64]. These buildings became the great strongholds for crusaders in years to come and were also one of the most obvious living monument and evidence of the existence of Holy Imperial in Islamic World.

From the perspectives of the Muslims living in the Near east or its vicinities, these religious military orders are the real threat for their existence and religious belief because the knights are taking the cross for their entire life, taking vows to fight the "infidels", to protect the Christendom and to convert by the swords. Muslims had a very bad experience during the fall of Jerusalem to the First Crusaders. Thousands of them were massacred and taken into prisoners and slavery. Now, after the crusader states were established in Islamic World and Jerusalem became the city of Latin Christian Kingdom, these religious military orders are the forefront of the military threat to the existence of Muslims surrounding and the fate of Muslim territories occupied during the First Crusade. After their establishment, they have launched assaults on Muslim territories and stood in front lines of the Second and the following crusades, killing thousands of the Muslims not only the army but also innocent populace of the plundered cities including women and children. They are really the killing machine built out of the spirit of the crusades to wipe out the "infidels", to whom Muslims were always referred.

The emergence of religious military orders was seen by Muslims at that time as an advent of Holy Imperialism in their territories in form of extended military threat and it will constantly presence as long as the crusader states

exist. Thus, the Muslim army responded accordingly and most of the time these knights of religious military orders will not be spared after they have been defeated and captured. Ibn Athir reported how the Templars and Hospitallers, as war criminals, were sentenced to death after they have been defeated during the siege of Tiberia by Salah al-Din,

"After Salah al-Din had achieved the defeat of the Franks, he remained where he was for the remainder of the day. On the Sunday morning <sup>5</sup> he returned to Tiberias and camped around it. The chatelaine sent requesting terms for herself, her children, her followers and her possessions. He granted this and she left with everything. He kept his word to her and she left in security. Then he gave orders for the king and all the company of notable prisoners to be sent to Damascus. He also ordered the Templars and the Hospitallers who had been taken to be gathered together for execution. He learnt that those who held one of these prisoners would not let him go because of the ransom they hoped for. Therefore for every prisoner in these two categories Salah al-Din offered fifty Egyptian dinars. Immediately 200 prisoners were brought to him and he ordered their heads to be struck off. He singled these out for execution because they were the fiercest fighters of all the Franks. He wished to rid the Muslims of their wickedness. He wrote to his lieutenant in Damascus, instructing him to kill those of them who had entered the city, whether they were his or anyone else's. This was carried out. About two years later I passed by the site of the battle and saw the ground covered with their bones, visible from afar, some of them heaped up and others scattered about and this was apart from those that torrents had swept away or wild beasts in those thickets and hollows had taken." [65].

Another important concern of the Muslims at that time on the presence of these religious military orders is the threat on their house of worship which is the centre of their belief and the religious life. Some good Muslims might well accepted the fate of thousands of Muslims massacred during the siege of Jerusalem by the First Crusaders as a martyr, a reward granted the person a direct entrance into the Paradise. But no good Muslims would ever accept during his lifetime that the House of God, their third Holiest Mosque in Islam, the Mosque of

<sup>5</sup> The date is 5 July 1187 according to Richards, 2006, Part 2, p. 324.

Al-Aqsa being plundered and taken away from their possession. Thus, the act of confiscating and converting Al-Aqsa Mosque into a church and a residence for the Templars symbolizes a religious contempt upon Islam and Muslims. Usamah, a chronicler of Mu'in al-Din Unur who visited the Jerusalem during the crusaders occupation reported that al-Aqsa Mosque was occupied by the Templars and they had set up a small church inside [66]. Ibn al-Athir reported that the Templars had built dwellings west of the Aqsa Mosque and had erected there all that they needed, storerooms, a privy and such like. The mosque was full with filth and impurities. Only after Salahuddin al-Ayubi regained the Jerusalem al-Aqsa Mosque was cleansed of filth and impurities and the cross taken down from the dome and the inside was restored into its original [67].

While in Jerusalem, Usamah was also visited al-Aqsa Mosque and ask the permission from the Templars to pray inside. While performing the prayer directed to Mecca he was harassed by one of the Latin Christians who was at that time inside the mosque. He wrote,

“One day I entered, said Allahu akbar and was about to begin my prayer, when a man, a Franj, threw himself upon me, grabbed me and turned me toward the east, saying, 'Thus do we pray.' The Templars rushed forward and led him away. I then set myself to prayer once more, but this same man, seizing upon a moment of inattention, threw himself upon me yet again, turned my face to the east and repeated once more, 'Thus do we pray.' Once again the Templars intervened, led him away and apologized to me, saying, 'He is a foreigner. He has just arrived from the land of the Franj and he has never seen anyone pray without turning to face east.' I answered that I had prayed enough and left, stunned by the behaviour of this demon who had been so enraged at seeing me pray while facing the direction of Mecca.” [68].

This event shows the lack of religious tolerance in the Holy Kingdom of Jerusalem under the ruling power of the First Crusaders which is directly symbolises the lack of religious tolerance in the Holy Imperial of Christendom. In a way the event expresses the fact that in the advent of Holy Imperialism there can only be one single religion in the Christendom east, the Roman Catholic Christianity. Other religions including Christianity of other sects were not allowed to be practiced peacefully. This fact was apparently revealed through some crusading brutal acts since pre-crusading, the People's Crusade. The first ever

crusade – even before the official First Crusade – in 1096 led by Peter the Hermit, plundering the land of European Jews, killing and murdering the Jews as they were seen as “enemies of Christ” in the neighbourhood [69]. It was also well known that Eastern Christians were brutally massacred and their church was plundered during the sieged of Jerusalem in the First Crusade, Maalof describes, “Not even their coreligionists were spared. One of the first measures taken by the Franj was to expel from the Church of the Holy Sepulchre all the priests of Oriental rites—Greeks, Georgians, Armenians, Copts and Syrians—who used to officiate jointly, in accordance with an old tradition respected by all previous conquerors.” [70]. Even years after the First Crusade, Eastern Christians were treated badly and alongside with Muslims and Jews they were considered as second class citizen of Western Christendom in the Islamic World. Neighbouring vicinities ruled by Eastern Christians were also targeted as in the case of Reynald of Chatillon who plundered Cyprus in 1156. Maalof describes the devastating attack led by Reynald,

“The island's cultivated fields were systematically ravaged, from north to south; all the livestock was slaughtered; the palace, churches and convents were pillaged and everything that was not carried off was demolished or burned. Women were raped, old men and children slaughtered; rich men were taken as hostages, poor ones beheaded. Before setting off loaded with booty, Reynald ordered all the Greek priests and monks assembled; he then had their noses cut off before sending them, thus mutilated, to Constantinople.” [71].

**Concluding Remarks:** The victory celebrated by Latin Christians during the First Crusade is the accomplishment of the crusading mission or armed pilgrimage to regain the Holy Land through the initiation of the seeds of hatred and demonization of Muslims by Pope Urban II. It was the beginning of a systematic attack on Islam and Muslims and generated a widespread Islamophobia among Western Christians. Some of the high ranking leaders of First Crusade among the princes extended their celebration through the possession of four occupied territories; Kingdom of Jerusalem, Principality of Antioch, counties of Tripoli and Edessa. The establishment of Kingdom of Jerusalem and its territories marked the expansion of Christian states to the Islamic World and created the on-going conflicts between Muslims and Christians until today. The rest of the crusaders, after

performing their pilgrimage in the Holy City went back to Europe bringing along the memories of the crusading to be told to their family and people upon the victory to inflict the great damage to the Muslims in the Near East. On the other hand, the victory celebrated by the pope and the papacy is beyond the vision of each and every First Crusader, it is the celebration on the establishment of their Holy Imperial of Christendom in Islamic World of the Near east, "...a universal state, the Christian Republic, transcendental in that it existed at the same time in heaven and on earth...Providing the political context in which men and women could fully develop their potential for loving God and their neighbours, it was the only true sovereign state." [72]. This victory in reality is the pope's personal victory since he is really the "chief author of the crusade" and the owner of the crusade, "The pope was, as a contemporary put it, the 'chief author of the expedition' and he regarded it as his own." [73].

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

This article is based upon research conducted at Prince Alwaleed bin Talal Centre of Islamic Studies, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom and supported in part by the Fundamental Research Grant Scheme (FRGS) 1/2011, under project Vote 0834, University Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia and Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia. Any opinion, finding, conclusions or recommendations expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of any of the supporting institutions.

#### **REFERENCES**

1. Housley, Norman, 2006. *Contesting the Crusades*, UK: Blackwell Publishing, pp: 7.
2. Asbridge, Thomas. 2010. *The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land*, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 40.
3. Moosa Matti, 2008. *The Crusades: Conflict between Christendom and Islam*, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, pp: 11.
4. Riley-Smith Jonathan, 2002. *What Were the Crusades?*, third edition, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp: 2.
5. Housley Norman, 2006. *Contesting the Crusades*, UK: Blackwell Publishing, pp: 2.
6. Riley-Smith Jonathan, 2009. *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, London: Continuum, pp: 13.
7. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. *The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land*, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 34.
8. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. *The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land*, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 33.
9. Riley-Smith Jonathan, 2009. *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, London: Continuum, pp: 13.
10. Asbridge, Thomas. 2010. *The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land*, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 37.
11. Maalof, Amin. 1984. *The Crusades Through Arab Eyes*, translated by Jon Rothschild, London: Al-Saqi Books, pp: 51.
12. Riley-Smith Jonathan, 2002. *What Were the Crusades?*, third edition, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp: 13.
13. Housley Norman, 2006. *Contesting the Crusades*, UK: Blackwell Publishing, pp: 24.
14. France, John. 2005. *The Crusades and the Expansion of Catholic Christendom, 1000-1714*, New York, Routledge, pp: 43.
15. Riley-Smith, Jonathan. 2002. *What Were the Crusades?*, third edition, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp: 6.
16. Riley-Smith Jonathan, 2002. *What Were the Crusades?*, third edition, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp: 9.
17. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. *The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land*, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 10.
18. France, John. 2005. *The Crusades and the Expansion of Catholic Christendom, 1000-1714*, New York, Routledge, pp: 44.
19. Riley-Smith Jonathan, 2002. *What Were the Crusades?*, third edition, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp: 24.
20. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. *The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land*, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 41.
21. Maalof Amin, 1984. *The Crusades Through Arab Eyes*, translated by Jon Rothschild, London: Al-Saqi Books, pp: 8.
22. Riley-Smith Jonathan, 2009. *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, London: Continuum, pp: 50.
23. Riley-Smith Jonathan, 2009. *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, London: Continuum, pp: 50.
24. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. *The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land*, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 5.
25. Riley-Smith Jonathan, 2002. *What Were the Crusades?*, third edition, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp: 56.
26. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. *The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land*, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 43-46.
27. Hindley Geoffrey, 2003. *The Crusades: A History of Armed Pilgrimage and Holy War*, London: Constable and Robinson, pp: 31-33.



28. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 53.
29. Maalof Amin, 1984. The Crusades Through Arab Eyes, translated by Jon Rothschild, London: Al-Saqi Books, pp: 9.
30. Maalof Amin, 1984. The Crusades Through Arab Eyes, translated by Jon Rothschild, London: Al-Saqi Books, pp: 14-17.
31. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 64.
32. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 73.
33. Ibn al-Athīr, ʿIzz al-Dīn Abī al-Hassan ʿAlī al-Syaibānī, 1864. *Kitāb al-Kāmil fī'l-Tārīkh*, Leiden: Matbaʿ Brill, 10: 191-192.
34. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 67-68.
35. Riley-Smith, Jonathan. 2009. The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading, London: Continuum, pp: 96.
36. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 74-87.
37. Ibn al-Athīr, ʿIzz al-Dīn Abī al-Hassan ʿAlī al-Syaibānī, 1864. *Kitāb al-Kāmil fī'l-Tārīkh*, Leiden: Matbaʿ Brill, 10: 197.
38. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 89-90.
39. Ibn al-Athīr, ʿIzz al-Dīn Abī al-Hassan ʿAlī al-Syaibānī, 1864. *Kitāb al-Kāmil fī'l-Tārīkh*, Leiden: Matbaʿ Brill, 10: 197.
40. Ibn al-Athīr, ʿIzz al-Dīn Abī al-Hassan ʿAlī al-Syaibānī, 1864. *Kitāb al-Kāmil fī'l-Tārīkh*, Leiden: Matbaʿ Brill, 10: 197-198.
41. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 101.
42. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 101.
43. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 101.
44. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 102.
45. Maalof Amin, 1984. The Crusades Through Arab Eyes, translated by Jon Rothschild, London: Al-Saqi Books, pp: 51.
46. Ibn al-Athīr, ʿIzz al-Dīn Abī al-Hassan ʿAlī al-Syaibānī, 1864. *Kitāb al-Kāmil fī'l-Tārīkh*, Leiden: Matbaʿ Brill, 10: 198.
47. Maalof Amin, 1984. The Crusades Through Arab Eyes, translated by Jon Rothschild, London: Al-Saqi Books, pp: 54.
48. Maalof Amin, 1984. The Crusades Through Arab Eyes, translated by Jon Rothschild, London: Al-Saqi Books, pp: 44.
49. Riley-Smith Jonathan, 2009. The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading, London: Continuum, pp: 15.
50. Hindley Geoffrey, 2003. The Crusades: A History of Armed Pilgrimage and Holy War, London: Constable and Robinson, pp: 9.
51. Riley-Smith Jonathan, 2002. What Were the Crusades?, third edition, New York: Palcrave Macmillan, pp: 24.
52. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 115.
53. Riley-Smith Jonathan, 2002. What Were the Crusades?, third edition, New York: Palcrave Macmillan, pp: 24.
54. Brundage James, A., 2003. Crusades, clerics and violence: Reflection and a canonical, in Marcus Bull and Norman Housley (eds.), The Experience of Crusading, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, 1: 154.
55. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 168.
56. Brundage James, A., 2003. Crusades, clerics and violence: Reflection and a canonical, in Marcus Bull and Norman Housley (eds.), The Experience of Crusading, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, 1: 153-154.
57. Brundage James, A., 2003. Crusades, clerics and violence: Reflection and a canonical, in Marcus Bull and Norman Housley (eds.), The Experience of Crusading, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, 1: 153-154.
58. Brundage James, A., 2003. Crusades, clerics and violence: Reflection and a canonical, in Marcus Bull and Norman Housley (eds.), The Experience of Crusading, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, 1: 154.
59. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 168.
60. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 169.
61. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 541-542.
62. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 542.
63. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land, London: Simon & Schuster, p. 542.

64. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 544-545.
65. Ibn al-Athīr, ʿIzz al-Dīn Abī al-Hassan ʿAlī al-Syaibānī, 1851. *Kitāb al-Kāmil fī'l-Tārīkh*, Leiden: Matbaʿ Brill, 11: 355.
66. Maalof Amin, 1984. The Crusades Through Arab Eyes, translated by Jon Rothschild, London: Al-Saqi Books, pp: 127-128.
67. Ibn al-Athīr, ʿIzz al-Dīn Abī al-Hassan Alī al-Syaibānī, 1851. *Kitāb al-Kāmil fī'l-Tārīkh*, Leiden: Matbaʿ Brill, 11: 361-366.
68. Maalof Amin, 1984. The Crusades Through Arab Eyes, translated by Jon Rothschild, London: Al-Saqi Books, pp: 128.
69. Asbridge Thomas, 2010. The Crusades, the War for the Holy Land, London: Simon & Schuster, pp: 41.
70. Maalof Amin, 1984. The Crusades Through Arab Eyes, translated by Jon Rothschild, London: Al-Saqi Books, pp: 51.
71. Maalof Amin, 1984. The Crusades Through Arab Eyes, translated by Jon Rothschild, London: Al-Saqi Books, pp: 157.
72. Riley-Smith Jonathan, 2002. What Were the Crusades?, third edition, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp: 24.
73. Riley-Smith Jonathan, 2002. What Were the Crusades?, third edition, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp: 28.