SOME FACTORS INFLUENCING THE GROWTH OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY EFFORTS TOWARD THE MUSLIMS IN THE THIRTEENTH AND FOURTEENTH CENTURIES

By

James C. Waltz

AN ABSTRACT

Submitted to the College of Science and Arts
Michigan State University of Agriculture and
Applied Science in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of History

1960

Contact between different civilizations is an important portion of history. In the Middle Ages, such contact involved the relations between Christians and Muslims. Often, however, only the military aspects of that contact—the whirlwind Arab expansion and the Christian crusades—are considered. The present study considers another facet of Christian-Muslim contact, that of Christian missions toward the Muslims in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and particularly seeks to ascertain some of the factors which gave rise to these Christian missions.

Both Islam and Christianity are missionary religions, that is, both regard the spreading of their truth and the conversion of unbelievers a sacred duty. A vital Muslim missionary activity followed in the wake of the Arab conquests, and Muslims treated conquered Christians kindly in the hope of soon converting them to Islam. The success of Muslim missions may have stimulated the Christian missionary interest.

After recovering from the shock of the Islamic advance, Western Europe in the eleventh and twelfth centuries launched a military counterattack against the Muslim forces. Eventually the Christians regained control of Spain, Sicily, and the Holy Land, and in the wake of these reconquests established close relations with Muslims. In the course of closer relations, the Christians learned more about Muslim faith and practice, and began to consider how Muslims might be converted to Christianity.

A further stimulus to missionary activity was the work of St. Francis and St. Dominic in the first quarter of the thirteenth century.

Both men were interested in revitalizing Christian faith among Christians and in spreading it among non-Christians. The Dominican and Franciscan orders continued the missionary emphasis of their founders by sending many men into most of the then known world.

Opposition to the crusades was also a factor favoring missionary activity. Such opposition came from several quarters: from those who opposed all war, those who opposed the use of force against infidels, those who objected to crusade abuses (such as the direction of crusades against Christians, e.g. Frederick II), and from those who wanted to replace the crusades with missions.

Moreover there developed in Western Europe a sizable body of propaganda favoring missionary activity. The most significant of the propagandists was Ramon Lull, who wrote voluminously about missionary activity, urged several popes to organize the Church for mission work, and worked as a missionary among the Muslims. Some of the propagandists favored missionary work in conjunction with a crusade, while others were ready to renounce all use of force in missionary efforts.

The papacy, while favoring missionary activity as a general policy, was frequently more interested in conquering the Muslims than converting them. However some popes, such as Gregory IX, gave considerable leadership to missionary work.

Unfortunately other factors hindered Christian missions, such as a lack of zeal among many Christians, the unplanned and overoptimistic nature of the work, and the strength and spread of Islam. By the end of the fourteenth century Christian missions had almost disappeared from Muslim lands, and Christian-Muslim contact took new forms.

SOME FACTORS INFLUENCING THE GROWTH OF CHRISTIAN MISSION BY EFFORTS TOWARD THE MUSLIMS IN THE THIRTEENTH AND FOURTEENTH CENTURIES

By

James C. Maltz

A THESIS

Submitted to the College of Science and Arts
Michigan State University of Agriculture and
Applied Science in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of History

1960

Approved

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Mr. Richard E. Sullivan has combined careful criticism of this work with useful suggestions and helpful encouragement, and has thus contributed to the development of both the author and the paper.

INTRODUCTION

The Christian Church in the West entered into vigorous missionary activity among the Muslims in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. It is the purpose of the present study to ascertain some of the factors contributing to the rise and the decline of that missionary activity. Such an inquiry involves a consideration of the historical background out of which the missions arose, an examination of the contemporary literature concerning missionary work, a delineation of the major personalities involved in the work, a study of papal policy regarding missions, and a sketch of the actual missionary work and the methods used.

It is assumed in the present study that Christianity is a missionary religion, that is, one in which the spreading of the truth and the conversion of unbelievers is regarded as a sacred duty. It is further assumed that the significance of religion in the medieval world makes the history of Christian missionary efforts in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries an integral and important part of the history both of areas where Christianity was the dominant religion and of areas where missionaries sought to make Christianity dominant. Too often medieval Christian-Muslim relations are discussed only in terms of the military contacts of the Arab expansion and the Christian reconquest, particularly the portion of the Christian reconquest known as the crusades. The present study provides a corrective to such a limited view by focusing attention upon some non-military Christian-Muslim contacts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

CHRISTIAN-MUSLIM RELATIONS TO THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

The Christian missionary effort of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries grew out of a long period of interaction between Muslims and Christians. Some explanation of the nature of the relationship between the adherents of the two religions is therefore necessary in order to understand the ideas and practices of those who undertook missionary work during these centuries.

The Christians first encountered Islam as a militant movement which overran kingdoms and empires with astonishing rapidity. In 622, Muhammad, who claimed to have a new revelation from God, fled from his home town of Mecca to nearby Medina, where he and his new revelation were favorably received. When he died ten years later, this new revelation, now known as the religion of Islam, was solidly established in a small portion of Arabia. Within a century of Muhammad's death, the forces of Islam had gained religious and political control of lands from the frontiers of India to the Pyrenees, and in so doing had engulfed many formerly Christian areas, particularly North Africa, Spain, and the Near East.

The smashing Arab victories represented a stunning defeat for the Christian world. However, it was not a defeat that necessarily engendered religious hostility, as some interpreters have suggested on the basis of the fact that since the Arabs were inspired by a new religion, then their expansion must have been the result of religious fanaticism. Although fighting for the faith was a factor in the Arab expansion, hope of booty and a desire for lands more fertile than the Arabian

desert were also strong motivations; hence the goal was not the conversion of other peoples to Islam but rather the subjection of other peoples to Allah, His prophet Muhammad, and Muhammad's followers, the Arabs.[1] The fact that many people who were so subjected were also converted to Islam does not permit one to assume that conversion was the goal of the Arab armies. To clarify this matter, Arnold writes: "These stupendous conquests which laid the foundations of the Arab empire, were certainly not the outcome of a holy war, waged for the propagation of Islam, but they were followed by such a vast defection from the Christian faith that this result has often been supposed to have been their aim."[2] So it is clear that subjection, not conversion, was the goal sought by the Muslim armies.

But such conversion did occur, so much so that Arnold can call it a vast defection. And if the Muslim armies did not effect this wholesale conversion, it is necessary to ascertain what did. One factor was the nature of the faith itself. The core of Islam is its unqualified monotheism: "There is no God but Allah." The Muslim must bear witness that Allah is the only God and Muhammad is His prophet, pray toward Mecca five times daily, give alms to the poor, fast during the day throughout the sacred month of Ramadan, and sometime during his life

---

[1]Thomas W. Arnold, The Preaching of Islam: A History of the Propagation of the Muslim Faith, 2nd ed. (Lahore, c. 1950), p.5, n.1. He cites Goldziher, Vorlesungen uber den Islam (1910), p. 25, as follows:

Was Muhammad zunachst in seinem arabischen Umkreise getan, das hinterlasst er als Testament fur die Zukunft seiner Gemeinde: Bekampfung der Unglaubigen, die Ausbreitung nicht so sehr des Glaubens als seiner Machtsphare, die die Machtsphare Allahs ist. Es ist dabei den Kampfern des Islams zunachst nicht so sehr um Bekehrung als um Unterwerfung der Unglaubigen zu tun.

[2]Arnold, p. 46.

make a pilgrimage to Mecca. This was a far simpler system of observances than that of Christianity, and made conversion very easy. One needed only to confess that Allah is God, and he was a Muslim. The Quranic regulations for business, social and family life were quite similar to those of Judaism and Christianity; thus a new convert needed to make few changes in his life. Furthermore Islam claimed to be the latest and most authentic revelation of the God of Christianity and Judaism, and hence both appealed to and made room for followers of those faiths.

Another factor contributing to conversion to Islam was the missionary nature of the Muslim faith, which is indicated in such passages of the Quran as this: "Say to those who have been given the Book and to the ignorant, Do you accept Islam? Then, if they accept Islam, are they guided aright: but if they turn away, then thy duty is only preaching; and God's eye is on his servants."[3] Islam had no special group of religious professionals to do missionary work; instead each Muslim was to be a missionary. The missionary obligation was formalized in the doctrine of jihad, which literally means "the using, or exerting, one's utmost power, efforts, endeavour, or ability, in contending with an object of disapprobation."[4] Later Muslim thinkers developed the idea that the sword might be a means of exerting one's utmost power against unbelievers and in the spreading of the

---

[3]Arnold, p. 4, citing the Quran, sura 3, verse 19. On pp. 3-6 he cites several Quranic passages regarding the Muslim missionary obligation and the necessity of performing this obligation peacefully.

[4]Arnold, p. 441. In an appendix, pp. 440-46, he analyzes the use of the verb jahada (from which jihad comes) in the Quran, citing numerous Quranic passages as illustrations.

faith. Certainly there were coerced conversions to Islam, but these were exceptions; most conversions to Islam were peaceful. And as the ultimate objective of Islam was the conversion of all people, the exertion of Muslims in missionary efforts was a permanent policy.[5]

Conversion to Islam was also facilitated by the nature of Muslim rule. Religion was the structural principle of Islamic society; and the Quran was the basis not only of the Islamic faith, but also of the civil and social regulations of the country.[6] Consequently, non-Muslims or dhimmis were second-class citizens. Muslim rulers usually treated dhimmis tolerantly, because Muhammad had commanded that respect be shown to "people of the Book," that is, people who had a written Scripture. Hitti, describing conditions under Muslim rule, says that "Christian communities were left unmolested in the exercise of their faith and under their own ecclesiastical laws and native judges."[7] For the privilege of keeping their own religion, and for the benefits of the protection given by Muslim armies, the dhimmis paid a special tax, the jizyah.[8] The dhimmi's faith, says Pirenne, "...was not attacked; it was simply ignored; and this was the most effective means of detaching him from it and leading him to Allah, who would not only restore his human dignity, but would open to him the gates of the Musulman State. It was because his religion compelled the conscientious Musulman to treat the infidel as a subject

---

[5] Majid Khadduri, War and Peace in the Law of Islam, 2nd ed. (Baltimore, 1955), p. 64.

[6] G.E. von Grunebaum, "The Beginnings of Culture Consciousness in Islam," American Anthropologist, LVII (April, 1955), 39; Khadduri, p. 63.

[7] Philip K. Hitti, History of the Arabs from the Earliest Times to the Present, 6th ed. (London, 1956), p. 510.

[8] Arnold, pp. 59-60.

that the infidel came to him, and in coming to him broke with his country and his people."[9]

The advancing Muslim armies deprived the West of much Christian territory and for a time in the eighth century threatened to overrun both Western Europe and the Byzantine Empire. However, determined Christian resistance at Constantinople and in France coupled with rivalries among the Muslim leaders checked the Islamic expansion, so that after 750 the only significant Muslim military activity in Western Europe was, apart from sporadic coastal raids, the conquest of Sicily in the late ninth century.

With its borders somewhat stabilized, Western Europe turned its energies toward the solution of the problems posed by the Muslim advance. In the political sphere, the solution was the establishment of the Holy Roman Empire, which united much of Europe under one temporal ruler. In the religious sphere the tenth century Cluniac reform stimulated Christian faith and devotion and produced religious leaders such as Pope Gregory VII, who led the Roman Church to new heights of power, both in spiritual and temporal affairs.

As Western Europe revived, the desire to win back the Muslim-controlled lands and to re-establish commerce with the Orient grew stronger.[10] Leadership was assumed by the Italian city-states, expecially Genoa and Pisa who succeeded in clearing the seas around Italy of Muslims and recaptured Sardinia. The Italian cities, however, did not establish

---

[9]Henri Pirenne, Mohammed and Charlemagne, tr. Bernard Miall, 10th ed. (London, 1954), p. 152.

[10]Pirenne, p. 166.

any significant relationship with the Muslims. Much more significant was the Norman conquest of Sicily in the eleventh century. The invading Normans were not religiously motivated, and were so few in number that religious toleration was their only feasible policy.[11] Thus the conditions of surrender were that the Muslims would keep full and equal rights and liberties.[12] Such was usually the case, although Ibn Jubayr, who traveled to Sicily in 1184, found that many of King William's retinue had to practice their Muslim religion in secret for fear of royal reprisals, that the king sometimes used force to make sheiks renounce their faith, and that Muslims were prohibited from holding their Friday religious services which included prayer for the Muslim ruler. However Broadhurst says that "...conversion to Christianity was not encouraged, and indeed the Arab troops which composed so large a part of the Sicilian infantry were deemed to be more trustworthy when unconverted."[13] There was little interference with Muslims in the practice of their religion, thus Christians could learn more about Muslims and Islam.

Interaction between Christians and Muslims reached its height in the early thirteenth century with the accession of Frederick II to the Sicilian throne. He welcomed Greek, Jew, and Arab into his

---

[11] Charles H. Haskins, The Normans in European History (Boston and New York, 1915), p. 225.

[12] Robert Briffault, The Making of Humanity, 2nd ed. (London, 1928), pp. 211-12.

[13] The Travels of Ibn Jubayr, tr. R.J.C. Broadhurst (London, 1952), pp. 339, 348, 385, n. 156.

Christian kingdom and heartily encouraged intellectual activity. One form of this intellectual activity was disinterested research into matters of religious faith, conducted primarily by Muslim thinkers who were outside the main stream of Islam.[14] Many Western Europeans felt that Frederick, although nominally a Christian, was actually indifferent to all religions rather than being tolerant of the non-Christian faiths. The intellectual activity during Frederick's reign contributed to better understanding of Islam by Christians, and also to a more tolerant Christian attitude toward Muslims. But this tolerant attitude developed very slowly, as is indicated by the fact that Frederick found it necessary to command that no Christian prevent his Muslim slaves from being baptized.[15] Apparently Christians were more concerned with the economic advantages of Muslim slaves than with the opportunity of converting such slaves to Christianity.

The Crusades made the Holy Land another area of Christian-Muslim contact. From the beginning the crusading movement represented an attempt to unite Western Europeans under a religious banner for a military assault on the Muslims. In his initial appeal at Clermont in 1095, Pope Urban II asked the nobles to cease fighting other

---

[14] Emile Gebhart, Mystics and Heretics in Italy at the End of the Middle Ages, tr. Edward M. Hulme (London, 1922), pp. 147, 152. How far outside the main stream of Islam such Muslim thinkers sometimes went is indicated by the fact that Ibn Tofail, one of Frederick's Muslim favorites and a teacher of Averroes, professed complete indifference in religious matters.

[15] Berthold Altaner, Die Dominikanermissionen des 13 Jahrhunderts (Habelschwerdt, 1924), pp. 113-14.

Christians and to join together to fight the Muslims.[16] In so doing he shifted the ground of a favorite eleventh century discussion topic—whether the use of armed force was consonant with Christianity—by affirming that war against the Muslims was God's will.[17] Urban hoped that the Christians of East and West could unite in a great venture to recapture the Holy Land, but the Byzantines expected the crusaders to aid in recapturing former Byzantine lands in Asia Minor.[18] This difference of purpose increased rather than lessened the tension between the two areas, and finally led to the direction of a crusade against Constantinople in 1204. Such hostility between the Christians did not enhance Christianity in Muslim eyes, while the behavior of the Christians both in war and peace rendered the Christian-Muslim contacts almost valueless.

As some of the crusaders stayed in Palestine to settle on land which had been wrested from the Muslims, there developed colonies of Western Europeans loosely grouped into the County of Edessa, the Principality of Antioch, the County of Tripoli and the Kingdom of Jerusalem. These settlers, never many, had some opportunities to know and be known by the Muslims, indeed the mere survival of the westerners often depended on peaceful relationships with the Muslim

---

16 For a listing of the various appeals used by Urban, see Dana C. Munro, "The Speech of Pope Urban II at Clermont, 1095," American Historical Review, XI (1906), 231-42. For various eyewitness accounts of the speech itself, see August C. Krey, The First Crusade: the Accounts of Eyewitnesses and Participants (Princeton, 1921), pp. 24-43.

17 Palmer A. Throop, Criticism of the Crusade: a Study of Public Opinion and Crusade Propaganda (Amsterdam, 1940), pp. 27-28.

18 William B. Stevenson, "The First Crusade," in Cambridge Medieval History, eds. J.R. Tanner, C.W. Previté-Orton, Z.N. Brooke (Cambridge, Eng., 1926), V, 270-71.

natives. The Frankish lords held some natives in serfdom, and had little contact with them, but apparently treated these serfs well, for Ibn Jubayr was very upset by the fact that the natives under Islamic rule wanted to be under Frankish rule, as taxes were lower and general treatment better.[19] However the Christian lords denied baptism to their Saracen slaves, a practice which distressed Jacques de Vitry, who felt that many of these slaves would come to Christianity if they were not prevented by their masters.[20] In the towns, the Franks were always in the minority, and in time and through intermarriage became nearly indistinguishable from the natives, often adopting the luxuries, manners and dress of the East. Adventurers and criminals often became bandits, and thus unpalatable to Christian and Muslim alike, while the merchants were generally interested in profit rather than propagation of the faith.[21]

In general, therefore, Europeans who remained in the Holy Land tended to accept and accommodate to the local culture. Thus the Arab-Syrian Usamah remarks in his memoirs that "Everyone who is a fresh immigrant from the Frankish lands is ruder in character than those who have become acclimatized and have held long association with the Moslems." And Usamah could speak from experience, for he relates in another place how a newly arrived Frank pushed him around when he was praying toward Mecca. He also witnessed the breaking of safe-conduct pledges by Frankish rulers, as well as receiving kind

---

[19] Travels, pp. 316-17.

[20] Jacques de Vitry, Epistola, 1217, ed. R. Röhricht, Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XIV (1894), 111-12.

[21] Charles Lethbridge Kingsford, "The Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1099-1291," in Cambridge Medieval History, V, 312.

treatment from them. Another Frank, he recalls, showed a Muslim a picture of Mary and the baby Jesus, and said "'This is God as a child.'" The effect upon one who did not believe in the Incarnation and whose religion prohibited any pictorial representation of God can well be imagined.[22] But some Franks, who were willing to learn from the Muslims, gained not only new knowledge of such things as medicine and the arts but also new respect for the Muslims. Indeed some became so enamored of Islam that they were converted to it. Many others became so tolerant or indifferent that they did not seek to convert Muslims, but became satisfied with a peaceful coexistence. There were, of course, some conversions from Islam to Christianity, but the local Christian leaders doubted whether such conversions were genuine.[23] Matthew Paris tells of some Saracens who had become converted by witnessing Louis IX's great patience and strong faith while a captive of the Saracens, by thinking about his coming to them from his love of God, and by being instructed in the Christian teachings by friars in the Holy Land.[24] Unfortunately few crusaders were like St. Louis, and Latourette is correct in saying that "...the Crusades probably accentuated the bitterness between Moslems and Christians and led the former more than ever to identify Christianity with military and imperialistic ambitions."[25]

---

[22] An Arab-Syrian Gentleman and Warrior in the Period of the Crusades: Memoirs of Usamah Ibn-Munqidh, tr. Philip K. Hitti (New York, 1929), pp. 60-61, 94-96, 150, 163-64.

[23] Dana C. Munro, The Kingdom of the Crusaders (New York, 1935), pp. 119-26, 191.

[24] Matthew Paris, English History, tr. J.A. Giles (London, 1852), III, 63-64.

[25] Kenneth S. Latourette, A History of the Expansion of Christianity (New York and London, 1938), II, 318.

But the most prolonged and hence the most significant contact between Christians and Muslims occurred in Spain, which the Muslims had entered in 711. Here many Christians lived under Muslim control and became desirous of overthrowing that control at the first opportunity. The Christian reconquest, like the original Muslim invasion, was for political control rather than religious conversion. Under Muslim control, many Christians became Muslims, and there was much intermarriage between persons of the two faiths, for, as Altamira says, "...in those days neither side showed any acute feeling of religious intolerance."[26] It may indeed be the case that the tolerance later shown by the Christians was derived from their experiences with Muslim tolerance; at least Thompson and Johnson are of this opinion, for they hold that "the civilization of Islam in Spain profoundly affected the life of the small Christian states to the south of the Pyrenees, and fostered in them the attitude of religious tolerance."[27]

Certainly the Christian reconquest of Spain was marked by religious toleration.[28] As cities were recaptured, the local Muslims were usually allowed to remain in them and enjoy their own religion, laws, and property under the rule of their own local magistrates. Sometimes Muslims were segregated into separate quarters in the cities, or a

---

[26] Rafael Altamira, A History of Spanish Civilization, tr. P. Volker (New York, 1930), pp. 48-54.

[27] James Westfall Thompson and Edgar Nathaniel Johnson, An Introduction to Medieval Europe (New York, 1937), p. 183.

[28] Briffault, p. 207.

small town would be given entirely to them.[29] Of course Dominicans and Franciscans were empowered to enter all places where Jews and Moors dwelt, to assemble them to listen to sermons, while the royal officials were directed to compel the attendance of those who would not come."[30] and monasteries were founded in reconquered territories to aid in conversion.[31]

Religious tolerance toward Muslims and Jews was also expressed in Spanish Christian laws and literature. For example, King Alfonso X (1252-82) wrote into his laws his desire that "by good words and appropriate preaching should the Christians seek to convert the Moors and make them believe our faith . . . , not by force or through rewards [Koran: 'Let there be no compulsion in religion.'], for if it were the will of our Lord to lead them to it and to make them believe it by force, he would reward them if wished to [Koran: 'But if the Lord had pleased, verily all who are in the earth would have believed together.']; but He is not rewarded by the service that men do out of fear, but by that which is done freely and without any recompense."[32] Castro inserts the Quranic sentences in this passage to show the similarity between Alfonso's ideas and Quranic teaching. Alfonso further claimed that the hard life of the tornadizos (Spanish Muslims who became Christians) discouraged other Muslims from becoming Christians.

---

[29] Roger B. Merriman, The Rise of the Spanish Empire in the Old World and the New (New York, 1918), I, 197-98.

[30] Henry Charles Lea, A History of the Inquisition in Spain (New York, 1906), I, 63.

[31] Latourette, II, 314.

[32] Américo Castro, The Structure of Spanish History, tr. Edmund L. King (Princeton, 1954), p. 223, cited from Alfonso's Las siete partidas, vii, 25, II.

For example, owners would not free Muslim slaves who became baptized, although the Church insisted that they do so.[33] Many would have become Christians, Alfonso felt, "if it were not for the abuse and dishonor that they see the others receive who turn Christian and are called turncoats and many other evil and insulting names."[34] In a further effort to aid missionary work, Alfonso translated the sacred books of Muslims and Jews into Castilian to show to the non-Christians their errors. At almost the same time, Alfonso's nephew, Don Juan Manuel, was writing "there is war between the Christians and the Moors, and there will be, until the Christians have got back the lands which the Moors took from them by force; for neither because of the law nor because of the sect that they hold to, would there be war between them; for Jesus Christ never commanded us to kill or to reward people in order that they should embrace his law; for he has no desire for forced service but only for that which is done readily and freely."[35] This passage indicates that the Spanish Reconquest was considered a mere political operation with almost no religious overtones, and the Muslim was a political rival to be conquered rather than a religious enemy to be exterminated.[36] So, Addison states, "peaceful persuasion was the order of the day, and for a brief period it intervened between the indifference of the past and the cruel bigotry of a later age."[37]

---

[33] Lea, I, 57-58.

[34] Castro, p. 89, from Las siete partidas, vii, 25, III.

[35] Castro, p. 221, from Don Juan Manuel, Libro de los Estados, p. 294.

[36] Castro, p. 225.

[37] James T. Addison, The Christian Approach to the Moslem (New York, 1942), p. 54.

But the papacy and the Church in general voiced disapproval of the Spanish policy of religious toleration. Thus after the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa in 1212, 70,000 persons offered money to Alfonso IX if he would let them become his vassals while keeping their Muslim faith. However the two archbishops with Alfonso would not permit him to accept the offer, so the 70,000 were massacred. The Lateran Council of 1216 commanded that Muslims in Spain be made to wear a distinctive garment or badge, but both Gregory IX in 1233 and Innocent IV in 1250 found that this was not being done. In 1266 Clement IV ordered James I of Aragon, who was tolerant toward Muslims under his rule and maintained friendly relations with Muslim rulers of other lands, to expel all his Muslim vassals from his dominions. And in 1278 Nicholas III scolded Alfonso X for entering into truces with Muslim princes.[38] Finally, with the general Council of Vienne in 1311-12 and the Spanish Council of Valladolid in 1322, the Church succeeded in developing intolerance among its Spanish members. Lea harshly criticizes the Church for fostering intolerance rather than tolerance, as the latter policy would, in his opinion, have facilitated the conversion of many Spanish Muslims to Christianity.[39]

In Spain, Muslim culture reached its height and transmitted much knowledge to the West. Especially important in this transmission was a shifting population of Mozarabes (literally, "would-be Arabs," from the fact that they spoke Arabic as well as their own language) who

---

[38] E. Allison Peers, Ramon Lull: a Biography (London, 1929), p. 246.

[39] Lea, I, 57-73.

passed continually from Andalusia to Catalonia and Languedoc. Moreover, Muslims had dwelt in Provence for almost two hundred years when it was united to the Spanish March by the marriage of Count Raymond Berengar of Barcelona to Douce of Provence.[40] Thus southern France as well as Spain benefited from Muslim culture. Bennett says "...the Provencal civilisation thought less in terms of force and more in terms of the mind than any other contemporary society."[41] Possibly it was the Muslim influence which led Provencal thought away from force.

Through the numerous contacts with Muslims in Sicily, the Holy Land, Spain, and Provence, Western Europe slowly gained a more accurate knowledge of the Muslims and their religion. Even at the time of the First Crusade, the West knew little about Islam.[42] This ignorance was exploited through propaganda, such as the Epistola Spuria of the Byzantine Emperor Alexius I and expanded accounts of reported Muslim atrocities, with the goal of inciting more people to join the crusading forces. It was variously reported that the Muslims revered Muhammad as a god, that they worshiped idols, that they treated Christians with horrible cruelty, and that they were very immoral.

The increased contact with Muslims in the period of the crusades wrought a change in Western Europe's propaganda against Islam. Emphasis was placed upon errors in the Islamic faith rather than upon Muslim behavior. Thus Peter the Venerable, abbot of Cluny, traveled through

---

[40] Briffault, p. 209; Castro, p. 321.

[41] R.F. Bennett, The Early Dominicans (Cambridge, Eng., 1937), p. 16.

[42] Dana C. Munro, "The Western Attitude toward Islam during the Period of the Crusades," Speculum, VI (1931), 329-43. These three paragraphs on the changing Western attitude are based on Munro's article.

Spain in 1141 and was so impressed by the Saracens that he sought to discover what the Quran taught so that its teaching might be refuted. For this purpose he translated the Quran, and produced a life of Muhammad and a dialogue concerning the main points of the Muslim religion. His translation of the Quran, although somewhat inaccurate, was the only one in the West until the end of the seventeenth century. Oliver the Scholastic wrote in his Historia Damiatina about 1220 that since the Muslims denied Christ's passion and death, the unity of His divine and human natures, and the Trinity, they should be called heretics rather than infidels and be dealt with accordingly. Jacques de Vitry, writing from the Holy Land in 1221, gave an account of the Muslim opinions of the Virgin Mary and John the Baptist.

As missionaries became active among the Muslims, they made more accurate information about Islam available; such writers as Humbert of Romans, William of Tripoli, Burchard of Mount Zion and Ricoldus gave valuable accounts of Muslim practice. Increased knowledge of Islam stimulated the production of polemics against the Muslim faith. Both polemicists and missionary writers emphasized the similarities as well as the differences of the rival faiths, and implied that the conversion of Muslims to Christianity was quite possible. However belief in the possibility of converting the Muslims was definitely a minority opinion, even during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

While a better knowledge of Islam was spreading, dissatisfaction with the crusades as a means of dealing with the Muslims was growing, because of the failure of the crusades to achieve any significant victory against the Muslims in the East, the success of Frederick II's

diplomatic approach to the Egyptian sultan in 1229, and the increasing preoccupation with domestic social and political concerns.[43] At the same time, the disparity between the apostolic tradition and current church practice was becoming evident. Throop holds that "the decay of the crusades is inseparably bound up with this revision of Christian values which brought a new monasticism, a new peace movement, and a new ardor for the spread of Christianity."[44] This "new ardor" was further stimulated by a greater tolerance of and increased respect for the Muslims and their faith. However other Christians hindered missionary efforts by refusing baptism to Muslim slaves and serfs, as Frederick II's edict and Jacques de Vitry's letter make clear; by treating Muslim converts to Christianity unkindly, as Alfonso notes; and by behaving in such a manner that Muslims soon lost all respect for the Christians and their religion, as happened especially in the Holy Land. Those who favored peaceful missionary activity were a minority, but fortunately had the excellent leadership of two of the most significant men of the later Middle Ages: St. Francis and St. Dominic. The contribution these two men made to peaceful missions in the later Middle Ages is examined in the next chapter.

---

[43] E.J. Passant, "The Effects of the Crusades upon Western Europe," in Cambridge Medieval History, V, 323.

[44] Throop, p. 288.

CHAPTER II

FRANCIS, DOMINIC AND THE MENDICANT ORDERS

The thirteenth century renewal of peaceful missionary effort was inaugurated by two men: St. Dominic and St. Francis. Dominic was born to a noble Castilian family in 1170, and entered the service of the Church at an early age. In 1205 he went to southern France in the service of his bishop, Diego of Osma, who was so interested in missionary work that he once sought, unsuccessfully, to relinquish his bishopric to go as a missionary to the Cumans.[1] Diego's missionary zeal probably influenced young Dominic to some extent.

In southern France Dominic discovered that both clergy and laity were extremely ignorant of their Christian faith while the heretical Cathari could discuss religious issues clearly and competently. Distressed by his discovery, Dominic decided to emphasize theological education which would enable Christians to refute and possibly convert the heretics. Dominic and his followers practiced a vital prayer life and a strict asceticism in conjunction with their studies, thus opposing the Cathari with superior lives as well as superior arguments.[2]

At the time of the Fourth Lateran Council, Dominic went to Rome to subordinate his band of followers to the Church, and while there experienced at St Peter's Cathedral a vision which led him to form a universal preaching order from his small group of followers.

---

[1] Bennett, pp. 36, 108.

[2] Bennett, pp. 13-14, 24. See also Bede Jarrett, Life of St. Dominic (Westminster, Md., 1947), pp. 31-32, 44-45.

Dominic wanted to spread the faith not only among the heretics in southern France but also among Muslims and heathens in distant lands. Indeed he himself grew a beard in the hope of visiting the Tartars, but died in 1221 before he could make the journey.[3]

Francis was born in 1182 to a successful merchant family of Assisi, and spent his youthful days in revelry and relative unconcern for religion. But he became dissatisfied with this type of life, and also became convinced that God wanted him to live as Jesus Christ had lived—in poverty, preaching the Gospel, and ministering to the poor and sick. Impressed by the response of his hearers to the Gospel, Francis came to believe that Muslims would also be easily converted upon hearing the simple Gospel. In this faith he embarked for Syria in 1212, but a shipwreck halted him. Again in 1214-15 he sought to go abroad, this time to Morocco, but became ill and stopped in Spain. The failure of this second missionary journey was a severe trial to Francis, who wondered if God really wanted him and his followers to devote themselves to missionary activities. He consulted his good friends, St. Clara and Brother Sylvester, about this and they said, "The Lord wills that you go forth and preach."[4] So in 1219, Francis and twelve of his friends went with the crusaders to Egypt, where Francis obtained an opportunity to preach to the sultan. The sultan was impressed by Francis' zeal and devotion, but was not persuaded to

---

[3]Altaner, p. 3; Bennett, p. 108.

[4]Raphael L. Huber, A Documented History of the Franciscan Order: 1182-1517 (Milwaukee, 1944), p. 25.

embrace Christianity even thou h Francis offered to walk through fire to demonstrate the power of God.[5] Although Francis' preaching effort was unsuccessful, he did obtain permission to preach in the sultan's lands and, after a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, spent a year in Syria before returning to Italy in 1221.

Francis definitely intended his followers to be missionaries, and wanted them to be concerned primarily with the salvation of others. Therefore he broke with the stabilitas loci, the continuous living in one place, practiced by former monastic orders. His ideas were not new; both the Premonstratensians and the Cistercians had been doing missionary work in the preceding century. But Francis was now going beyond these orders by urging a universal dissemination of the Gospel. Therefore explicit instructions for missionary work were given in the First Rule of the Franciscan order:

> Section 16. Of Those Who Go Among the Saracens and Other Infidels
>
> Therefore, whoever of the brothers may wish, by divine inspiration, to go among the Saracens and other infidels, let them go with the permission of their minister and servant. But let the minister give them leave and not refuse them, if he sees they are fit to be sent; he will be held to render an account to the Lord if in this way or in other things he acts indiscreetly. The brothers, however, who go may conduct themselves in two ways spiritually among them. One way is not to make disputes or contentions; but let them be 'subject to every human creature for God's sake,' (I Peter 2:13) yet confessing themselves to be Christian. The other way is that when they see it is pleasing to God, they announce the Word of God, that they may believe in Almighty God . . . and that they should be baptized and be made Christians, because, 'unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' (John 3:5)[6]

---

[5] Paul Sabatier, Life of St. Francis of Assisi, tr. Louise S. Houghton (New York, 1894), p. 171.

[6] Huber, p. 616. Cited from First Rule (Regula non Bullata) of the Friars Minor, tr. Paschal Robinson in The Writings of St. Francis (Philadelphia, 1906).

Francis clearly believed that the mere proclamation of the Gospel would cause Muslims and other infidels to embrace Christianity; no intellectual explanation or theological disputation would be necessary. Dominic, however, wanted Christians to be able to present the faith intelligently, and therefore stressed learning. Indeed, the Dominicans replaced manual labor with intellectual work as one of the essential duties of the religious life.[7]

After his return from the East until his death in 1226, Francis faced two main problems concerning his order. The first of these problems involved the relationship of the Franciscan order to the Church. Francis wanted his followers to be a spirit-led body responsible to God for their actions, while the Pope wanted the order to be an official church organization subject to papal control. With many misgivings, Francis submitted to the pope. This submission opened the way for the second problem: how closely should the order follow Francis' teachings? Even during Francis' lifetime some of his followers sought to modify his strict rules with regard to poverty and other forms of conduct. Soon after his death the order split over this question of how to follow the founder's teachings. One group, the Conventuals, wanted to interpret and modify Francis' instructions; the other group, the Spirituals or Observants, wanted to observe to the letter what Francis had taught.[8] The Spirituals retained more of Francis' missionary zeal than did the Conventuals, partly because of their closer adherence to Francis' teachings and

---

[7] A.G. Little, "The Mendicant Orders," in Cambridge Medieval History, VI (1929), 738-40.

[8] Huber, p. 228.

partly because of their espousal of mysticism.[9] Thirteenth century mysticism blended religious illumination with reforming energy and emphasized that love between God and man should be productive of good works. As the Spirituals enthusiastically sought to realize Francis' twofold ideal of adoration toward God and missionary activity toward men, they found the mystical emphasis helpful. A special favorite of the Spirituals was the mystic Joachim of Flore, who had written at the turn of the century predicting the coming of a new age of the Holy Spirit, in which the clergy would be religious, the Gospel would be spiritually understood, and a new monastic order would convert the world.[10] Well might the Spirituals think these words in Joachim's Concordia were meant for them: "One day the preachers will go to the infidels to bear them the good tidings, and these new converts will serve as a defence to the apostles against the wicked Christians of the old community."[11] It was imperative that preaching and missionary work be done immediately, for according to Joachim the year 1260 would usher in the new age. Furthermore, Joachim considered crusades against the divine will, and his followers "constituted a body of men within the Church opposed to the crusades on religious grounds."[12] Thus Joachim's teachings stimulated the missionary inclinations of the

---

[9]Lemmens reports that Raymond Gaufredi, a fourteenth century Franciscan Master-General, sent the leaders of the Spirituals into the Orient because he wanted to use their zeal in the mission work there. Leonhard Lemmens, Geschichte der Franziskanermissionen (Münster in Westfalen, 1929), p. 83.

[10]Evelyn Underhill, Jacopone da Todi, Poet and Mystic, 1228-1306: A Spiritual Biography (London and Toronto, 1919), p. 169, n. 1.

[11]Gebhart, p. 188.

[12]Throop, p. 174.

Spirituals both by stressing the spreading of the Gospel and by opposing the crusades. However Joachim's influence upon the Spirituals was disastrously diminished by the fact that 1260 brought no new age.

The test of theories and ideas is the effective practice of them. A brief look at the various missionary efforts toward the Muslims in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries will provide some knowledge of how effective the ideas and theories of Francis and Dominic were.

In 1217 or 1218 the Franciscans organized the province of Antiochae or Ultramaris, which included the three custodies of Syria, Cyprus, and Rumania. Benedict of Arezzo, the third provincial general of Antiochae, introduced the Franciscan order into Constantinople and began the Vicariate of the Orient in 1221.[13] Some Dominicans came to the Holy Land in 1225, and in 1228 it was made an independent Dominican province.[14] In 1255 Humbert of Romans, then Master-General of the Dominican order, requested volunteer missionaries for the Holy Land, Greece and other non-Christian lands. Early in 1256 he reported that many had responded to his plea, but later in the same year his encyclical describing the Dominican missionary success in various countries said nothing of conversions of Muslims in the Holy Land.[15] By 1277 the Franciscans had convents at Tripoli, Acre, Tyre and Sidon, while the Dominicans had convents in Tripoli, Acre and Nicosia.[16] With the fall of Tripoli

---

[13] Huber, pp. 706, 714-15, 750-62. Vicariates were formed where provinces could not be erected because of the impermanent nature of the missions or the lack of sufficient convents for proper canonical organization.

[14] Altaner, pp. 20-21.

[15] Throop, p. 168.

[16] Leonhard Lemmens, Die Franziskaner im Hl. Lande (Münster in Westfalen, 1925), I, 21; Altaner, p. 21.

in 1239 and here in 1291, and the houses except that at Nicosia were destroyed. The Dominicans erected two more houses on Cyprus at Famagusta and Limisso during 1300, but it was not until 1335 that mission work in the Holy Land was revived under the protection of the kings of Aragon.[17]

The Franciscan Chapter of Pentecost in 1219 sent six brothers to Morocco, five of whom were martyred on January 16, 1220.[18] In June, 1225, Pope Honorius III appointed two Dominicans to go to Morocco, and results were so encouraging that Honorius sent more missionaries in October of the same year, and named one of them bishop of Morocco. On February 20, 1226, the pope empowered Archbishop Rodrigo of Toledo to send approved men of both orders to Morocco, and to consecrate two of them as bishops.[19] But on October 10, 1227, seven Franciscans were martyred at Ceuta.[20] In 1229, however, Ferdinand of Castile and Mamoun, the king of Morocco, signed a treaty which promised the latter the aid of Castilian soldiers in return for permitting Christians to observe their religion, build churches, and baptize Saracens in Morocco. Mamoun's tolerant policy soon provoked a revolt against him, which suggests that many Moroccans were yet very hostile to Christianity. In 1235 Morocco became a province of the Franciscan order, but there is almost no record of missionary activity there after that date.[21]

---

[17] Lemmens, Franziskanermissionen, pp. 61-63.

[18] Ibid., p. 11.

[19] Altaner, pp. 98-100.

[20] Leonhard Lemmens, Die Heidenmissionen des Spätmittelalters (Münster in Westfalen, 1919), p. 98.

[21] Lemmens, Franziskanermissionen, pp. 10-11.

Two Franciscans were sent by the 1219 Chapter of Pentecost to Tunis, but the Christian merchants there quickly sent the missionaries home, fearing that Christian propaganda would incite a hostile movement against all Europeans in Tunis. However later Franciscans won a nephew of the Tunisian prince to Christianity. The new convert wanted to be baptized at Rome, but while passing through Sicily was captured by Frederick II and prevented from reaching Rome. In 1256 Pope Alexander IV gave the Spanish Dominican province control of the mission work in Tunis. And in 1270 Louis IX diverted his crusading expedition to Tunis in the mistaken belief that the Muslim prince of Tunis was about to be baptized and might need protection from his Muslim subjects. The treaty which followed Louis' ill-fated expedition gave the priests and monks the right to build houses and chapels, to preach and to conduct religious services. However, these privileges could be exercised only in the fondaci, the portions of the city reserved for Christian merchants.[22]

In Spain the Christian princes established the Church as the reconquest progressed; so the orders emphasized language training to prepare missionaries for the work of converting newly conquered Muslims to Christianity. The leader of this emphasis on language schools was Raymond of Peñafort, Master-General of the Dominicans from 1238-40 and reportedly converter of more than 10,000 Muslims.[23] At his urging

---

[22] Altaner, pp. 99, 108-11.

[23] Lemmens, Heidenmissionen, p. 95. Cited from Mortier, Histoire des Maitres Généraux de l'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs (Paris, 1903), I, 320.

the Dominicans established a language school at Toledo in 1250. In the same year the Provincial Chapter of Toulouse chose eight friars to learn Arabic for the purpose of serving in the mission field.[24] King Alfonso IV established another language school at Seville in 1254, and the Dominicans formed a third school at Barcelona in 1259. In 1257 the members of the Provincial Chapter of Saragossa were required to study Arabic.[25] In 1276 a college of missionary studies, including language, culture, geography, and theology, was established on Majorca by James II of Aragon.[26] Yet another language school was started at Xativa in 1291.[27] The effect these schools had upon missionary work is unfortunately unrecorded.

In Libya, the Franciscan Conrad Ascoli reportedly won more than 6400 persons to Christianity through preaching and miracles. Some missionaries worked among the merchants in the fondaci of the Egyptian port cities, but when these missionaries ventured to preach Christ to the Muslims they were insulted and sometimes stoned.[28]

From this brief historical sketch, it is clear that much of the missionary work was organized from the top down, and bore little

---

[24] Bennett, p. 60.

[25] Altaner, pp. 89-94.

[26] Huber, pp. 778-80.

[27] Altaner, p. 94.

[28] Clemens, Heidenmissionen, p. 101. The statement about Ascoli is cited from Luke Wadding, Annales Minorum, 1289, number 27.

relation to actual conversions.[29] Again there were Christians who hindered the missionary efforts of other Christians, as, for example, the Christian merchants in Tunis. Much attention was given to preparation for an intelligent presentation of the faith in the language of the Muslims. Martyrdoms were plentiful, especially among the Franciscans, but conversions were few, except in those instances where Christians held political control through treaty or conquest.[30]

---

[29] The Dominican Chapters-General of 1325 and 1327 excepted the province of Jerusalem from the requirement that no house with less than its full complement of friars could send representatives to the provincial chapters, which suggests that houses in the Jerusalem province were frequently undermanned. Georgina R. Galbraith, The Constitution of the Dominican Order: 1216 to 1360 (Manchester, Eng., 1925), p. 47.

[30] Lemmens considers that the Dominican stress upon the intellect led Dominicans to weigh carefully such problems as possible martyrdom, while the Franciscan emphasis upon love impelled Franciscans toward martyrdom as the perfection of love. Heidenmissionen, pp. 106-7.

CHAPTER III

RAMON LULL: MISSIONARY TO THE MUSLIMS

The peaceful missionary movement toward Islam focuses most sharply in the person of Ramon Lull, whose life covers more than half of the one hundred fifty years with which this paper is concerned. Lull was born between 1231 and 1235 (1232, says Peers) and died either in late 1315 or early 1316. His father aided James I of Aragon in the taking of Majorca from the Moors in 1230, and was rewarded by a royal grant of extensive lands on the island. The elder Lull apparently already possessed considerable land in Barcelona and other parts of Catalonia; thus the infant Ramon was born to a prosperous family and had a very bright future. His parents arranged for his full religious and secular education, and apparently through his father's influence Ramon obtained a position in the court of James I. For some time he was the companion of James' two sons, and became tutor, seneschal, and eventually majordomo of the younger one, James II. In the king's service, Ramon traveled frequently, and thus gained new experiences and made helpful contacts with other royal courts. Although Ramon married, he continued to participate fully in the dissolute and profligate life of a courtier.[1]

But in 1263, while composing a vulgar love song, he was confronted by a vision of Christ upon the cross. This occurred four more times before Ramon decided to change completely his life and put the

---

[1] This chapter on Lull is based on E. Allison Peers, Ramon Lull: a Biography (London, 1929).

crucified Christ foreknown in His existence. He describes the experience in his Desconort in these words:

> But Jesus Christ, of His great clemency,
> Five times upon the Cross appear'd to me,
> That I might think upon Him lovingly,
> And cause His Name proclaim'd abroad to be
> Through all the world.[2]

A few months later, he was in the church in Palma on the Feast of St. Francis, when a bishop was preaching concerning the completeness of Francis' surrender to God. As Ramon listened, he became convinced that he too must renounce his earthly possessions and devote himself to the love of God and the conversion of the Saracens.

Ramon saw, however, that mission work among the Saracens involved some formidable problems. It would be necessary to present a carefully reasoned Christian faith to the Muslims, who had thought much about religious questions. Moreover this presentation would have to be in their language to be effective. So Ramon purchased a Moorish slave to help him learn Arabic, and, using the library of the local Dominican convent, spent the next nine years in studying philosophy, theology, natural science, and especially the Arabic language. He probably also spent some time in disputes about the faith with the Jews and Saracens in Palma. But even more important, he began writing, and his Book of Contemplation (written in Arabic and then translated into Catalan), and the Book of the Gentile and the Three Wise Men both come from this period.

---

[2] Peers, p. 21. Cited from Lull's Desconort, II.

At this time, Ramon favored peaceful missions exclusively. He wrote in the Book of Contemplation as follows:

> Many knights do I see who go to the Holy Land thinking to conquer it by force of arms. But, when I look at the end thereof, all of them are spent without attaining that which they desire. Therefore, it appears to me, O Lord, that the conquest of that sacred land will not be achieved . . . save by love and prayer and the shedding of tears as well as blood. . . . Let the knights become religious, let them be adorned with the sign of the Cross and filled with the grace of the Holy Spirit, and let them go among the infidels to preach truth concerning Thy Passion.[3]

Ramon felt that if Christians and Saracens were at peace, ". . . they could dispute with each other peacefully concerning the faith, and then it would be possible for the Christians to direct and enlighten the Saracens in the way of truth, through the grace of the Holy Spirit and the true reasons that are signified in the perfection of Thy attributes."[4] While recognizing that some infidels reject argument, he affirms there are more who love arguments and proofs, so the faithful should go to such for the purpose of "'disputing with them and bringing them to see the truth by long demonstrations continuously made with true and necessary reasons . . . .'"[5] To help the faithful in this endeavor, Lull uses much space to describe the stumbling blocks which unbelievers find in Christianity: the doctrines of the Trinity, Christ's deity, the Incarnation, and the Virgin Birth. He further claims that "'many Jews would become Christians if they had the

---

[3] Peers, pp. 30-31. Cited from Libre de Contemplacio, chapter 112.

[4] Peers, p. 73. Cited from the Catalan text in Obres de Ramon Lull (Comissio Editora Lulliana), (Palma, 1906 ff.), V, chapter 204, p. 317.

[5] Peers, p. 73. Cited from Obres, VII, chapter 278, p. 87.

wherewithal to live, and likewise many Saracens, if the Christians did them not dishonour.'" To organize this missionary work, Lull recommends that the pope assign cardinals to each province of infidels, set aside yearly a sum of money to finance the missionary work of these cardinals, and provide for the teaching of languages to missionaries.[6]

Most of Lull's chief thoughts concerning missions are in the Book of Contemplation, but he did not stop there. In the Book of the Gentile and the Three Wise Men, a Christian, a Muslim, and a Jew expound the contents of their respective faiths. In the course of the discussion, Lull particularly attacks Muslim materialism, especially as expressed in the Islamic conception of paradise. The Gentile, who had hoped to embrace one of the faiths, is unable to decide among the three.

Upon completion of these works, Ramon spent about four months in retirement and contemplation upon Majorca's Mount Randa, spiritually preparing himself for his future labors, and then plunged into six months of writing at the monastery of La Real, where he wrote what he considered his most significant work, the Ars Magna. Lull claimed to have discovered a logical method (the words Ars Magna mean for him the "great method") which in his opinion completed the ordinary methodology of the scholastics. The scholastic method started with sensible observations and stopped at corporeal things. There is however, claimed Lull, another order of knowledge independent of sense knowledge. This second order of knowledge, which has for its object suprasensible realities, is the divine knowledge of general

---

[6] Pears, pp. 65-75.

principles, which Lull identifies with the attributes of the divine essence. In De Wulf's words:

> The _Ars magna_ is a combination of these general principles: it sets out general tables of ideas (termini), which only need to be combined according to a special method in order to attain to knowledge. At first these tables related to God and contingent being, each figure consisting of a certain number of heads of ideas, the divine attributes, and predicates expressing relations between contingent things. These heads of ideas were to be combined according to 'topical' terms furnished by a 'tabula instrumentalis.' Combinations of letters symbolized the combinations of ideas, and Lully presented them in the form of synoptic and geometric tables.[7]

Lull intended the _Ars magna_ to be a missionary handbook, which would educate missionaries in the ways of reasoning and of answering questions, but there is no evidence that it ever changed the mind of a Muslim.[8]

In 1274-75, Prince James had Ramon's books examined by a master in theology, supposedly the Franciscan Bertran Berenguer, who not only approved but even admired these books. This commendation, echoed by Prince James, encouraged Ramon to write more. But of greater significance for Ramon's work was Prince James' accession to the throne of Majorca, Cerdagne, Roussillon, and Montpellier upon the death of James the Conqueror in 1276. One of the new King's first acts was the founding of a missionary college, which Ramon had long desired, at Miramar in Majorca. Thirteen friars were to live here and devote themselves especially to the study of Arabic, while

---

[7] Maurice De Wulf, _A History of Mediaeval Philosophy_, tr. Ernest C. Messenger (London, 1926), II, 153-54.

[8] Peers, pp. 110-11; Addison, p. 43.

being maintained at the king's expense. However, Miramar is not known to have sent out any missionaries, and in 1295 some unknown disaster caused it to be abandoned.

In 1277, Ramon went to Rome to encourage the pope to found other monasteries such as Miramar where foreign languages could be studied by prospective missionaries. But John XXI died before Ramon arrived, and he did not wait for the election of Nicholas III. During the next five years Ramon traveled widely, although it is impossible to say certainly where he went. Eventually he returned to Perpignan, and stayed there with James II for some time. In 1283 he attended a Chapter-General of Dominicans at Montpellier, and urged them to interest themselves in preaching to the infidel, but the Dominicans were indifferent to his plea. He spent two years in Montpellier, writing the Ars de contrariis, Blanquerna, Art of Contemplation, Book of the Lover and the Beloved, and other books.

Blanquerna, a romance by Lull, stresses the need for more persons to go as missionaries:

> How many boast that, if occasion came,
> Right gladly they would die by sword or flame!
> But oh! how few will go on God's Crusade,
> For when they think on Death they are dismayed![9]

As pope, Blanquerna not only sends envoys who learn languages, preach, and convert the heathen in other lands, but also receives and sometimes converts envoys from other lands. Blanquerna also orders the world by dividing it into twelve parts, pacifying warmakers with presents, and

---

[9]Peers, p. 173. Cited from Peers' own translation of Blanquerna (London, 1926), p. 300.

compelling unbelieving subjects of Christian princes to learn Latin and the Scriptures. In this book Ramon shows that he is now willing to use force as well as argument as a means of conversion.[10]

Again in 1285, Ramon went to Rome and again the pope died as Ramon was traveling. He left Rome to attend another Chapter-General of Dominicans at Bologna, and then returned to Rome and an audience with the newly elected Honorius IV, who established the study of Arabic and other languages at the University of Paris, and may have been influenced in this and in his general missionary outlook by Lull. While in Rome, Ramon wrote the Book of the Tartar and the Christian, which tells of a Tartar who desires to learn of the future life. The Tartar has fruitless talks with a Jew, a Saracen, and a Christian, but then meets Blanquerna, who explains the Christian faith to him in such a way that the Tartar becomes completely converted. After this conversion, the Tartar goes to the pope and expresses his desire to help other heathen learn of the Christian faith, and as he leaves two bystanders express Lull's ideas by calling for more such messengers and for a great prince to lead a new crusade. In 1286 Ramon wrote The Dispute between a Believer and an Unbeliever, in which the two parties dispute concerning the existence and nature of God, the Trinity, Incarnation, Resurrection, creation, and the sacraments.[11]

Ramon left Rome in 1286 and went to the University of Paris, where he lectured on his Art. During this stay he probably attended

---

[10] Peers, pp. 174-75.

[11] Peers, pp. 197-205.

the Dominican Chapter-General held in Paris in 1286, again with no success for his appeal to found missionary colleges and send many trained missionaries to the field. Ramon also had an audience with Philip IV concerning the support of missionary work, but he obtained little from the French king except good wishes. While in Paris, Ramon also wrote Felix, or the Book of Marvels, in which he says: "After this manner . . . might the Roman faith increase; for, if the Tartars and the inhabitants of Liconia, and the other heathen, are converted, the Saracens will be destroyed; so that, by the way of martyrdom, and through the greatness of charity, the whole world will be converted to Christianity."[12]

From Paris Ramon went to lecture on his Art in Montpellier in 1287, and here first attended a Chapter-General of Franciscans. The following year he went to Rome to see the new pope Nicholas IV, who was too busy with the Sicilian question to give much attention to Ramon's plans. As Ramon returned to Montpellier, he attended another Franciscan Chapter-General at Rieti, and made a favorable acquaintance with the newly elected General, Ramon Gaufredi, who gave him letters of commendation to the provinces of Rome, Apulia, and Sicily. While lecturing at Montpellier, Ramon also wrote the Art of Loving the Good, Book of Saint Mary, Book of Antichrist, and Questions which were asked by a certain Friar Minor.

Late in 1290 Ramon returned to Rome and presented the pope a tract on the conquering of the Holy Land. But Nicholas IV's plans

---

[12]Peers, p. 217. Cited from Felix, book viii, chapter 46.

for a crusade failed and he died in 1292. So Ramon, despairing of the possibility of accomplishing anything further by his counsel, went to Genoa where he prepared to sail as a missionary. He was actually on the ship when he became so ill that he had to be left in port. His illness was of a psychosomatic nature: his fear of the dangers involved in going to the Muslims had made him ill. Such a fear indicated to Ramon a lack of faith in God, and recognition of such a lack of faith produced a spiritual crisis in Ramon's life. During this crisis Ramon had a vision which showed him that he could be saved if he joined the Dominican order, but that his Art and its value could be preserved only if he joined the Franciscans. Ramon eventually decided in favor of the latter order.

But the problem yet remained: what of his missionary work? Once again Ramon boarded a ship for Africa, and once again became violently ill. But this time he remained aboard the ship, and in a very short time his illness had vanished, as had his doubts concerning his missionary calling. He arrived in Tunis, where he gathered learned Moors together and disputed with them about the Christian faith with such success that someone in the audience persuaded the caliph to imprison Ramon. Some desired his death, but the city council decreed banishment, so he was taken to a ship. While this ship was still in the harbor he escaped and sought to renew his work, but seeing the crowd attack a merchant who resembled him, Ramon decided to postpone his efforts until a more favorable time.

He returned to Naples, where he wrote, lectured on his Art, and preached to the Moors in the city. Here he wrote the Book of the Five

Wise Men. In this book four Christian sages (Latin, Greek, Nestorian, and Jacobite) discuss the danger of Asia's turning to Islam or Buddhism rather than to Christianity. During this discussion a Saracen asks them to demonstrate the truth of their religions in an intellectually satisfying manner. Only the speech of the Latin sage is presented, and he, after making clear that religion is not demonstrable in the same way as a mathematical theorem, contrasts the faith of each of his companions with his own.[13]

Soon after Celestine V was elected pope in 1294, Lull presented him with two books: The Flowers of Love and Intelligence and the Petition of Ramon for the Conversion of the Heathen. In the latter work he proposed that a tithe of the Church's wealth be assigned to crusades and missionary work until the Holy Land is conquered and the world won for Christ; that a cardinal be chosen to spend his life selecting the best preachers in Christendom and training them for missionary service; that language colleges be established to aid in training these missionaries; that the schismatics, who are the most effective missionaries to Muslims and Tartars, be recalled to the true fold; that a crusade to conquer the Holy Land by force of arms be inaugurated; and that Muslim and schismatic sages be invited to Rome to learn what Christians really believe. Ramon was concerned that the Mongols might embrace Islam or Judaism, and felt that the time to do missionary work among them was now, for now it was not

---

[13] Peers, pp. 248-50.

difficult to convert them by disputation as they had only a rudimentary religion and allowed Christian missionaries free access to their lands. But, he said, haste was necessary, "for, if the Tartars set up a religion, as Mahomet did, either Saracens or Jews will be able to convert them to their religion, and all Christendom will be in dire peril."[14] He wanted organized missions under effective church control. What Lull was proposing was essentially a laymen's missionary crusade.[15] This complete plan for church missionary action had no practical effect because Celestine V surrendered the papacy soon afterwards.

Lull then attempted to obtain support for his missionary plans from Boniface VIII. Boniface, however, was occupied with the Sicilian question, disturbances in Italy, strife in Rome, and the quarrel with Philip IV, and had little time for missionary considerations. Ramon's persistent appeals won him little except enemies, and he expressed his disillusionment and bitter disappointment in his Desconort (Disconsolateness), a verse-work written in 1295, in which he gives a history of his life and thwarted efforts. In the Desconort, Lull enters into a dialogue with an imaginary hermit (who seems to be a representation of Lull's doubts or lower self) on the question of whether reasonable arguments and the Art are really useful to conversion. Although the hermit at length accedes to Ramon's views, the way in which he does

---

[14] Peers, p. 253.

[15] Robert E. Speer, Some Great Leaders in the World Movement (New York, 1911), pp. 45, 50.

so strongly suggests that conversion is not the work of reason but the work of God alone.[16]

Some little time before writing the Desconort, Ramon professed as a Franciscan tertiary, probably at the Franciscan Chapter-General at Assisi in 1295. From Assisi he returned to Rome, where he composed his Tree of Science, Book of the Articles of the Faith, and Book of Proverbs. From Rome he went to Montpellier to visit James II, and then to Paris where he may have had another unfruitful visit with Philip IV, and where he did more writing and lecturing.

In 1299 Ramon attempted, in the Dictat (Writing) of Ramon, to persuade the king of Aragon to summon Jews and Saracens to argue about their faiths with Franciscans and Dominicans. The result of these arguments, Ramon believed, would be the conversion of the infidels. He also obtained royal permission to preach in all synagogues and mosques of the dominion. In 1300 he wrote the Book of the Being of God and the Book of the Knowledge of God, both of which he intended for use in disputes with unbelievers.

In Majorca, he heard a rumor that the Tartars had conquered the kingdom of Syria. This seemed to offer a golden opportunity for missionary work, since he thought conversion of the Tartars would make conversion of the Muslims easier, so he sailed in 1301 for the Holy Land. But in Cyprus he learned that the rumor was false, so he returned to Majorca, and later visited Montpellier and Genoa. During this time he wrote the Dispute between Faith and Understanding,

---

[16] Peers, pp. 253-65.

the Book of the Ascent and Descent of the Intellect, and the Ars Magna Praedicationis. In 1305 he produced his Liber de Fine, in which he restated his views on disputations with unbelievers, and also drew his picture of a proposed crusade. Apparently he hoped to receive fulfillment of some of his desires through the new pope, Clement V. But the pope, who was involved in Philip IV's plans for the suppression of the Templars and the condemnation of the acts of Boniface VIII, had no time for Ramon's plans.

In 1307 Ramon made another missionary journey to Bugia, where the political situation was extremely disturbed because there had recently been war with the neighboring kingdom of Tunis. In addition a Muslim religious reformer had been attacking Muslim orthodoxy, and religious tempers were inflamed. Ramon began his preaching by publicly denouncing Islam in the marketplace, which led to his capture by a mob. He was brought before the chief judge, who arranged for a public debate between Ramon and learned men of the city. Ramon's performance in the debate caused the chief judge to imprison him. But during his imprisonment he was allowed to debate with learned Muslims, and from these debates came the idea for his Disputation of Ramon the Christian and Hamar the Saracen. In this work the Saracen argues that neither Trinity nor Incarnation is compatible with the idea of God, and if an Incarnation were necessary, God would have taken the nature of the angels rather than that of man. Ramon replies by proving the Trinity and Incarnation with the same seven conditions by which Hamar disproved them, naming eleven Divine "qualities," co-essential dignities of the Godhead, and

using the ten commandments, seven sacraments, seven virtues, seven deadly sins, and nine ordinances of the Church as further defenses of his position. Peers' analysis is that "Ramon's strongest points are a most potent comparison between the Allah of Islam and the Holy Trinity of the Catholic faith, and contrasts between the practices of the rival faiths and the lives of their founders."[17]

The king of Bugia expelled Ramon to Christian territory, and a shipwreck brought the missionary to Pisa. Here he endeavored to found a new military order and start a new crusade. The response was so heartening that Ramon journeyed toward Avignon to see the pope, but on his way he stopped at Montpellier where he did some more writing. Clement V, however, was still too busy with other matters to give Ramon any encouragement. So Ramon went to Paris to lecture for two years, and there engaged in a spirited battle against the prevalent Averroism.

In 1311, Ramon attended the Council of Vienne, to which he proposed the establishment of language schools, the uniting of all Christian knights into one crusading military order, and the composition of learned works refuting the errors of Averroism. The Council accepted his first proposition and even enlarged it by founding not three but five central colleges for language instruction, and effected his second by commanding the Knights of St. John to prepare plans for an armed crusade.

---

[17]Peers, pp. 330-32.

Back in Majorca, Ramon wrote some forty books and pamphlets. Then in 1313 he went to Messina in Sicily, where he produced thirty more works. He probably held discussions with the king, the archbishop, and others concerning the best methods for converting the Jews and Saracens on the island. But in 1314 he left again for Bugia. From Bugia he went to Tunis for a while, where he apparently had peaceful disputes and preaching tours. In fact he is reported to have converted five of the most influential men in the city. Perhaps because of this, perhaps because he felt he had done all he could do, he left Tunis and went once more to Bugia. Here he began proclaiming the truth of the Christian faith in the city streets, and was stoned to death by a furious mob in late 1315 or early 1316.

Living and working as he did with Muslims and Muslim literature, it is probable that Lull was somewhat influenced by Muslim thought and life, particularly by Sufi mysticism. Castro affirms that ". . . Sufism made a positive effort to becloud the frontiers that separated the different religious confessions. Some Sufists went so far as to argue that 'with the knowledge of divine unity an element of union was given to humanity, whereas the different religious laws were the cause of the separation.' These ideas are plainly present in the works of Raymond Lully, where they are in perfect harmony with the exalted illuminism of his lyric soul."[18] He adds that "Lully felt no scruple in declaring his Moslem interpretation precisely because

---

[18] Castro, p. 224.

he had made his own the Islamic idea of tolerance . . . ."[19] Hitti says that Ibn Arabi, the "greatest speculative genius of Islamic Sufism," held that the mystic had but one guide, the inner light, and would find God in all religions. And "the influence of the illuministic school, whose greatest Spanish representative Ibn Arabi was, is manifest . . . in the so-called Augustinian scholastics such as Duns Scotus, Roger Bacon, and Raymond Lull."[20] Peers cites others who claim considerable Arabic influence upon Lull, and concludes: "the truth is probably that Lull frequently followed Moslem literature in matters of detail, but that it had little or no influence upon his intellectual formation and only a subsidiary influence upon his work anywhere."

Clearly there is agreement that Lull was influenced by Muslim thought, although Peers finds the amount of this influence negligible. It is equally clear, as Peers points out, that Lull held a theological position akin to that of Thomas Aquinas.[21] Lull's basic premise was that everything in the Christian faith is rational and can therefore be rationally demonstrated, and his books are largely efforts at such rational demonstration.[22] Conversions in his books, however, are the result of mystical intuition rather than rational conviction. Lull's work greatly influenced late medieval missionary operations.

---

[19]Castro, p. 310.

[20]Hitti, p. 587.

[21]Peers, p. 398, 405.

[22]De Wulf, II, 153.

CHAPTER IV

PROPOSALS FOR WORKING MISSIONS

Although Ramon Lull wrote voluminously about missionary work, he was not the only one doing so. Increasing knowledge of the faith of Islam, coupled with increasing awareness of the impermanent results of crusades, led many in the late Middle Ages to become increasingly interested in converting the Muslims. Some, like Lull, wanted to do this in conjunction with a crusade, or at least the threat of one. Thus Oliver the Scholastic of Cologne wrote to the sultan of Egypt in 1221, urging him to allow Christian preachers to spread the faith publicly in his land, and threatening him with the Church's use of the material sword if he refused. It is doubtful that the threat frightened the sultan, who had seen the Christians defeated in Egypt shortly before this, but it is clear that Oliver thought the threat of another crusade would be an incentive to conversion efforts.[1]

Jacques de Vitry, writing from the Holy Land in 1217, reported that although it was lawful for Muslims to become baptized Christians hindered them, fearing that the Muslims would not work for Christians after baptism. Because of discord among the Muslims, he felt that many of them "if they heard, and had the help of Christians, would be converted to the Lord." Since he was unable to preach among the

---

[1]Throop, pp. 125-26. Cited from Oliverius Scholasticus Coloniensis, Epistola, September, 1222, ed. R. Röhricht, Westdeutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kunst, X (1891), 195 ff. Both Munro, Kingdom of the Crusaders, p. 192, and Addison, p. 38, give the date as 1221, so the date of 1222, given in Throop, may be one of many typographical errors in the Criticism of the Crusade.

Muslims, he said that "... when I could, I preached through letters, which I sent to them in the Saracen script, and showed them their errors and the truth of our law." But he believed that fear of a crusade was a definite aid to conversion, and told how many Muslims sought baptism when they heard of the coming of King Andrew of Hungary with his crusading army.[2] In England, about 1250, Adam Marsh also urged that missionary work be done along with Henry III's crusade.[3]

Even the most authoritative theological voice of the Church, Thomas Aquinas, favored the missionary effort. He wrote his Summa Contra Gentiles in 1259-64 in response to Raymond of Peñafort's request for a book which would dispel the errors of unbelievers. Thomas saw that the crux of the problem of communication with these unbelievers, as well as the basic point of contact with them, was the use of Aristotle by both Muslims and Christians, and took the position that nothing which is philosophically demonstrable can be contradicted by anything in Christian revelation. This provides a unity of truth, and enables him to say that Aristotle spoke well as a philosopher. In seeking to proceed against the individual errors of unbelievers, Thomas faced two problems: a lack of knowledge concerning these errors and the denial by many of these unbelievers of the authority of Scripture. He says: "We must, therefore, have

---

[2] Jacques de Vitry, Epistola, 1217, ed. R. Röhricht, Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XIV (1894), 111-12, 116-17, 118-22.

[3] Throop, p. 132. Cited from Adam Marsh, Epistolae, ed. J.S. Brewer, Monumenta Franciscana (Rolls Series, IV: London, 1858), I, 416.

recourse to the natural reason, to which all men are forced to give their assent. However, it is true, in divine matters the natural reason has its failings. Now while we are investigating some given truth, we shall also show what errors are set aside by it; and we shall likewise show how the truth that we come to know by demonstration is in accord with the Christian religion."[4] So in the first three books of this work—on God, Creation and the Nature of Man, and Providence (the relations between God and man)—he deals with these matters in the light of the knowledge which natural reason can attain. In the final book, on Salvation, he deals with those things which are divinely revealed, and shows how these are not opposed to the results of natural reason and are not prey to the attacks of unbelievers. Such an approach, like Lull's Ars magna, is an approach to the highly intellectual Muslim, and requires a well-educated Christian to expound it.

Thomas also furnished the theological basis for peaceful missions by declaring in his Summa Theologica that:

> Among unbelievers there are some who have never received the faith, such as the heathens and the Jews: and these are by no means to be compelled to the faith, in order that they may believe, because to believe depends on the will: nevertheless they should be compelled by the faithful, if it be possible to do so, so that they do not hinder the faith by their blasphemies, or by their evil persuasions, or even by their open persecutions. It is for this reason that Christ's faithful often wage war with unbelievers, not indeed for the purpose of forcing them to believe, because even if they were to conquer them, and take them prisoners, they should still leave them free to believe, if they will, but in order to prevent them from hindering the faith of Christ.

---

[4] Thomas Aquinas, On the Truth of the Catholic Faith, tr. The American Fathers (Garden City, New York, 1955-57), book I, chapter 2, sections 3 and 4.

> On the other hand, there are unbelievers who at some time have accepted the faith, and professed it, such as heretics and all apostates: such should be submitted even to bodily compulsion, that they may fulfill what they have promised, and hold what they, at one time, received.[5]

Powicke claims that this distinction between heretic and infidel furnished the grounds for the expansion of missions in the late Middle Ages. The heretic had no rights, for he had broken his oath to the society in which he lived and hence might be legitimately forced to believe, but the infidel, who had never believed, could not be so forced. Consequently the only legitimate way to lead an infidel to the Christian faith was through some form of peaceful missionary effort. However the infidel could, as Thomas clearly states, be subjected to force "in order to prevent them from hindering the faith of Christ."[6] It is doubtful whether many persons of that period could clearly distinguish in actual practice between force used to prevent someone from hindering the faith and force used to convert him to the faith.[7]

Yet another significant aspect of the Thomistic position is its relation to Muslim thought. Khadduri states that "St. Thomas Aquinas, who was acquainted with Muslim writings, formulated his theory of

---

[5] Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica, tr. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (New York, 1947), vol. II, part II, number ii, question 10, article 8.

[6] F. M. Powicke, The Christian Life in the Middle Ages and other Essays (Oxford, 1935), p. 42.

[7] Throop, p. 139.

just war along lines similar to the Islamic doctrine of the jihad."[8] It seems certain that Thomas, who was educated in Naples, where many Muslim scholars lived under Frederick II's protection, had considerable acquaintance with Muslim thought both then and in his later years. Thus Muslim thought may have contributed to Thomas' distinctions regarding the rights and the treatment to be accorded to infidels.[9]

Another missionary-minded work was Pierre Dubois' De Recuperatione Terrae Sanctae (On the Recovery of the Holy Land), written in 1306. Dubois differed from most later advocates of a crusade by planning for the conversion as well as the conquest of the Holy Land. A "foundation" consisting of property received by bequest or by confiscation from the military orders would provide funds to train boys and girls in foreign languages, the Bible and the articles of faith, and in "human and veterinary surgery." The boys would go to the Holy Land as church or government workers. They ". . . must know how to respond so reasonably to the objections of the barbarians that they destroy their erroneous opinions; they must be able to convince them with incontrovertible arguments and draw them to the truth of the Christian faith."[10] The girls would marry Christian or Saracen lords in the Holy Land, teach them to adhere to the Roman faith and usage, raise

---

[8] Khadduri, p. 58.

[9] Briffault, p. 217. See also M. Anwar-ul-Haq, "Influence of Muslim Political Theorists on Medieval European Political Thought," Islamic Culture, XXXII (1958), 186-89.

[10] Pierre Dubois, The Recovery of the Holy Land, tr. Walther I. Brandt (New York, 1956), chapter xxvi, p. 116.

their children as Christians, and possibly attract other converts. Boys with special aptitude would go to the papal curia, and when the pope sent legates to another land he would "send with the legate two or more persons highly skilled in every branch of knowledge. They would outdo the experts of that country in disputing, advising, discussing, and in every other way, so that there would be no one who could withstand the wisdom of the Roman Church. Those in the East who depend on reason would praise and fear the wisdom of the Romans."[11]

It is clear that Pierre knew that the Muslims were intelligent and reasoning persons, and he saw that the best way to convert reasoners was by giving them better reasons than the ones they had. He also rightly saw that the best way to present these better reasons was in the language of the hearer. Language training and skill in reasonable presentation of the Christian message are still considered vital parts of missionary work.

A further indication of the strength of the proponents of peaceful missions is Humbert of Romans' listing of them in his Opus Tripartitum (1274) as the most significant force opposing a crusade. Humbert indicates that the supporters of peaceful missions opposed the crusade on the basis of God's example of love, for he says a familiar argument is: "When we conquer and kill them [Muslims] we send them to hell, which is contrary to Christian charity." Humbert, who as Master-General of the Dominicans had promoted missionary work, might be expected to

---

[11] Dubois, chapters xxvii-xxix, pp. 117-20.

favor the peaceful missionary approach, but he replied that since Muslims went to hell when killed it was better to kill them quickly so their sins would be fewer. The advocates of peaceful missionary activity certainly had not converted Humbert to their cause.[12]

Even in vernacular literature there was some support of the missionary effort. Guiraut Riquier, writing during the pontificate of Gregory X, felt that if both lay and ecclesiastical powers would end their quarrels the Muslims might be conquered by either arms or sermons.[13] Ramon de Cornet, writing in 1332, shared this view; he saw preaching as a necessary part of the crusade but did not think that it alone was sufficient.[14] Nor did Guillaume Durant the Younger, who, in urging a new expedition to the Holy Land, urged that mission work among both schismatics and Muslims be undertaken in connection with the expedition. He may have been influenced by Ramon Lull, possibly at the Council of Vienne.[15]

But there were also those who, following the lead of Francis and Dominic, were willing to see the crusade completely replaced by peaceful missionary work as a method of dealing with the Muslims. As early as 1189 Ralph Niger wrote: "It were far better that we strike

---

[12] Throop, pp. 136, 169-70.

[13] Throop, p. 140. Cited from Guiraut Riquier, "Karitatz et amors e fes," in C.A.F. Mahn, Die Werke der Troubadours, IV, 38.

[14] Throop, p. 140. Cited from Ramon de Cornet, "Per tot lo mon," in Deux manuscrits provençaux du XIVe siecle, eds. J.B. Noulet, C. Chabaneau (Montpellier and Paris, 1888), p. 155, n. xli.

[15] Aziz S. Atiya, The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages (London, 1938), p. 70. Cited from Guillaume Durant le Jeune, Informatio brevis de modo in futuro.

with the sword of the word and bring the Saracens voluntarily to the faith; God is not pleased with a forced service. Whoever seeks to propagate the faith by violence, transgresses by that very fact the discipline proper to the faith."[16]

In the wake of the Albigensian crusade there came a storm of protest from the poets of Provence. They aimed most of their criticism at the pope for attacking their land rather than the Holy Land; but Guillaume le Clerc strikes a somewhat different note in his satire Le Besant de Dieu (c. 1226) when he says: "Rome should not, I think, if one of her sons has fallen into error and wishes to rectify it, send upon him an elder brother to destroy him. Rather should she summon, talk gently, and admonish him than waste his country."[17] Although this statement does not directly concern peaceful missions to the Muslims, it does indicate the existence of a religious feeling which is unfriendly to the idea of using force rather than persuasion to destroy heresy. Throop cites Huon de Saint Quentin, Moniot, and Gautier de Coincy as other representatives of this feeling in Old French literature.[18] This same feeling is shown by Guillem Raspols, who in or around 1265 composed a tenzone in which he accused God of many things, one of them the useless waste of blood on a crusade: "My fine Lord, you will have spoken a good word and can well remedy

---

[16] George B. Flahiff, "Deus non Vult: A Critic of the Third Crusade," Mediaeval Studies, II (1947), 171.

[17] Throop, pp. 32, 43. Cited from Guillaume le Clerc, Le Besant de Dieu, ed. E. Martin (Halle, 1869), verses 2485-90, pp. 71-72.

[18] Throop, p. 67.

this damage if you give to each Saracen the will to recognize his error. Then no one would have to go to battle, since everyone would know his own folly. For we suffer for their ugly sin and it is easy for you to dispense with this carnage."[19]

Chief among those who opposed the crusades and favored peaceful missionary work was Roger Bacon, the English Franciscan. In his Opus Majus, written in 1268, Bacon maintained that a knowledge of languages was necessary for the conversion of unbelievers, and that:

> . . . the Greeks and the Ruthени and many other schismatics likewise grow hardened in error because the truth is not preached to them in their tongue; and the Saracens likewise and the Pagans and the Tartars, and the other unbelievers throughout the whole world. Nor does war avail against them, since the Church is sometimes brought to confusion in the wars of Christians, as often happens beyond sea and especially in the last army, namely, that of the king of France, as all the world knows; and if Christians do conquer other lands, there is no one to defend the lands occupied. Nor are unbelievers converted in this way, but they are slain and sent to hell. The survivors of the wars and their sons are angered more and more against the Christian faith because of those wars, and are infinitely removed from the faith of Christ, and are inflamed to do Christians all possible evils. Hence the Saracens for this reason in many parts of the world cannot be converted . . . . Moreover, the faith did not enter into this world by force of arms but through the simplicity of preaching, as is clear. And we have frequently heard and we are certain that many, although they were imperfectly acquainted with languages and had weak interpreters, yet made great progress by preaching and converted countless numbers to the Christian faith.[20]

Bacon, although not overly optimistic about the prospects of converting the Saracens, proceeds to indicate in more detail his methods for

---

[19] Throop, p. 140. Cited from Guillem Daspols, "Deinhos, aujas, c'aver saber e sens," ed. F. Meyer, Bibliotheque de l'École des Chartes, XXX (1869), 239.

[20] The Opus Majus of Roger Bacon, tr. Robert B. Burke (Philadelphia, 1928), Vol. I, part 3, chapter xiii, pp. 111-12.

converting unbelievers: "I said above . . . in regard to the conversion of unbelievers, that persuasion of the truth as alone contained in the Christian religion is a twofold matter, since we may appeal to miracles which are beyond us and beyond unbelievers, a method in regard to which no man can presume; or we may employ a method familiar to them and to us, which lies within our power and which they cannot deny, because the approach is along the paths of human reason and along those of philosophy."[21] Bacon recognizes that it is fruitless to quote the Scriptures or other learned authorities, as the unbelievers do not recognize these as significant. Therefore, the common ground for discussion between believer and unbeliever must be that provided by philosophy. This discussion is intended for the learned persons who can receive wisdom and be persuaded by reason "So that when these men become enlightened, the persuasion through them of the multitude is much easier."[22]

Further, Bacon states that God as creator and first cause is accepted by all sects, and the wisdom of the first cause argument is apparent to all. In affirming this, he is able to strike another blow for peaceful rather than warlike missions:

> And when Christians confer with Pagans, like the Peruani and the other adjoining nations, the latter are easily convinced and perceive that they are in error. The proof of this is found in the fact that they would become Christians very gladly if the Church were willing to permit them to retain their liberty and enjoy their possessions in peace. But the Christian princes who

---

[21] Ibid., Vol. II, part 7, fourth part, chapter i, pp. 792-93.

[22] Ibid., pp. 793-94.

> labor for their conversion, and especially the brothers of the Teutonic order, desire to reduce them to slavery . . . . For this reason they offer opposition: hence they are resisting oppression, not the arguments of a superior religion.[23]

Muslims, however, because they have some very learned men among them, are not easily convinced by Christian arguments. But because philosophy is more in conformity with Christianity than with Islam, and because Muhammad himself says that Christ is the greatest prophet of God, it should be easy, says Bacon, to convince the Muslims of the superiority of Christianity. There can be only one supreme religion, and by a series of arguments similar to these already cited, Bacon proves to his satisfaction that Christianity is that supreme religion, sanguinely asserting that ". . . the unbelieving philosophers are ignorant of many things at present concerning divine matters, and if these were suitably set before them and proved by the principles of the complete philosophy, that is, by the virtuosity of reason, which has its origin in the philosophy of the unbelievers, although completed by the faith of Christ, they would receive it without contradiction and would rejoice in regard to the truth set before them . . . ."[24] Such an argument rests on Bacon's assumption that speculative philosophy has moral philosophy as its aim, and that while the unbelievers are better in speculative philosophy than the Christians, the moral philosophy of the Christians excels that of the unbelievers.

---

[23] Ibid., pp. 796-97 ff.

[24] Ibid., Vol. I, part 2, chapter xix, p. 73.

Bacon, who had studied in Paris under Thomas Aquinas' teacher, Albertus Magnus, emphasized like Thomas and Ramon Lull the use of reason in a missionary approach to the Muslims and other infidels. However Bacon seems to have had far less influence than the other two, which may be due in part to his complete disavowal of the use of force.

In Spain in 1278 there appeared another significant evidence of peaceful missionary zeal — the Pugio fidei . . . adversus Mauros et Judaeos, by Ramon Marti (or Martini). Marti had studied oriental languages as part of his training in the Dominican order, and also had read extensively in Jewish and Arabic philosophy. He is concerned with three main types of enemies of the Christian faith: the epicureans, who deny God's existence and hold happiness the highest good; the naturalists, who deny the immortality of the soul while admitting the existence of God; and the philosophers, who deny God's creation and omniscience and the resurrection of the body. Against the first group, he proves the existence of God by showing: the need of a first cause, the need of a prime mover, the necessity of harmony in the world, the part God plays in the origin of the soul, and the evidence for God one finds in contemplating creation. To show that happiness is not the highest good, he cites Scripture, the Fathers, the classics, and Muslim philosophers like Algazel, Avicenna and Averroes. And concerning the immortality of the soul, he urges the moral utility of the belief, the incompleteness of God's justice in this world, the idea that the soul is only perfected apart from the body, that the soul does not weaken as the body does, and that the soul is incorruptible.

In the remaining parts of his work he discusses the coming of the Redeemer and the fulfilling of Messianic prophecies, and deals with the Trinity, original sin, redemption and the sacraments. Although his arguments are very like those of Thomas Aquinas, his doctrine, in Pelayo's words, ". . . is expounded with a certain originality and with profound knowledge of Semitic philosophy . . . . Ramon Marti demonstrates practically the proof that one could hold the orthodox philosophy of those same Arabic peripatetics, who were the chief text of the Averroist impiety."[25] According to Peers, the Pugio fidei "was a powerful weapon of conversion and a spur to determined proselytizing."[26] Marti also wrote another missionary handbook, the Explanatio simboli apostolorum.[27] Other polemic works of this late medieval period in Spain were the Biblia parva of Pedro Pascual and the Disputa of Pedro Alfonso.[28]

In Italy also there was some expression of these peaceful missionary feelings. Dante's stress on world peace was not directly

---

[25] Menéndez Pelayo, Historia de los Heterodoxos Españoles (Buenos Aires, 1951), Vol. III, libro iii, capítulo 4, parte vi, pp. 227-32.

> La doctrina, como se ha visto, es la misma de Santo Tomás, pero expuesta con cierta originalidad y con profundo conocimiento de la filosofía semítica . . . . Ramón Martí demostró prácticamente el provecho que podía sacar la filosofía ortodoxa de aquellos mismos peripatéticos árabes, que eran el gran texto de la impiedad averroísta. (p. 230)

[26] Peers, p. 297.

[27] Bennett, p. 60.

[28] Jorge Rubió Balaguer, "Literatura Catalana," in Historia General de las Literaturas Hispánicas, eds. Díaz-Plaja and P. Guimerá (Barcelona, 1949), I, 650.

aimed at promoting peaceful conversion, but peace would obviously aid that work. Boccaccio in his Decameron tells the story, adapted from the Novellino or Cento Novelle Antiche of Frederick II's court, of a rich Jew from whom Saladin wanted to borrow some money cheaply.[29] To do this, he asks the Jew which of the three laws, Jewish, Muslim, or Christian, is true, hoping thereby to trap him. The Jew, however, replies with the story of a man who had a ring which passed to the heir from generation to generation. This man had three sons, so he had two other rings made exactly like the first and gave them on his death to the three sons, with the result that none knew which was the true ring. The Jew concludes: "And so say I to you, my lord, of the three Laws to the three peoples given of God the Father, whereof you question me; each people deemeth itself to have his inheritance, His true Law and His commandments; but of which in very deed hath them, even as of the rings, the question yet pendeth."[30] Such a tolerant attitude could certainly favor a peaceful missionary approach.

In England in 1370, William Langland expressed peaceful missionary ideas in his Vision of Piers Plowman. He depicts in one passage the sudden conversion of the Jews when they see the Paschal full moon (which is symbolic of the events of Jesus' crucifixion), and the

---

[29] Gebhart, p. 149.

[30] The Decameron of Giovanni Boccaccio, tr. John Payne (New York, 1931), first day, third story, pp. 28-30.

subsequent conversion of the Muslims upon their seeing the conversion of the Jews.[31] Elsewhere the hope is stated that prelates and priests will gradually teach Saracens and Jews to believe in Christ and the Holy Spirit, even as they already believe in God, and thus be saved from their sins. Moreover, the pope should promote Christianity by peaceful measures as did Muhammad by his rule and religion.[32]

Other pertinent writing on peaceful missions came from those who were on the mission field. Matthew Paris records the letter of a Dominican named Philip, who wrote of the attention being given to the study of Arabic and other languages in the Holy Land.[33] The writings of the missionaries to the Mongols also stimulated interest in missionary work by speaking hopefully of the possibility of converting the Mongols and then with their help converting the Muslims. Roger Bacon, for instance, was influenced by the journal of William of Rubruck, who went to the Great Khan's court in the mid-thirteenth century.[34] Salimbene in 1285 was aware of a rumor of the impending conversion of the Tartars and Saracens, and Coulton adds that "these

---

[31] The Vision of William Concerning Piers the Plowman, ed. Walter W. Skeat (London, 1924), B-text III, lines 325-27; C-text IV, lines 481-85.

[32] Ibid., B-text XV, lines 594-602; C-text XVIII, lines 233-323. See also B-text XV, lines 383-90; C-text XVIII, lines 124-86; and notes pertaining to these various passages.

[33] Matthew Paris, I, 57.

[34] Opus Majus, Vol. II, part 7, fourth part, chapter i, pp. 796-97.

reports of a wholesale and miraculous conversion of Tartars or other infidels were frequently circulated by 'truthful travellers' in the thirteenth century."[35]

In 1273 William of Tripoli, a missionary in the Holy Land, wrote De Statu Saracenorum in response to Gregory X's desire for information concerning a proposed crusade. William did not want a crusade; his whole tract is devoted to the idea that missionaries rather than soldiers should be sent for the recovery of the Holy Land. Conversion of the Saracens would settle the matter of unbelievers in the Christian sacred places, and the historical and theological connection of the two faiths offers an excellent basis for such conversion. He mentions a prophecy, current among the Saracens of the time, to the effect that the Saracens would be divided into three parts: one part to die by the sword, another part to perish in flight through the desert, and the third part to accept the Christian faith. Throop adds that William, "firm in his conviction that the Saracens would flock to the Christian faith if they heard the word of God . . . ends his tract with these confident words: 'And thus solely by the word of God, without philosophical argument and without military weapons, they will seek as simple sheep the baptism of Christ and will enter into the flock of God. He says and writes this who by God's will has baptized more than a thousand.'"[36]

---

[35] G.G. Coulton, From St. Francis to Dante (London, 1906), p. 224.

[36] Throop, pp. 120-22. Cited from William of Tripoli, De Statu Saracenorum, in L. Fretz, Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge (Berlin, 1903), pp. 597-98.

Another missionary writer was Ricoldo of Monte Croce, who had gone to the East to learn more of the Muslim faith, so he could better refute it. He settled in Baghdad, where he wrote at the end of the thirteenth century his Confutatio Alcorani, De Lege Saracenorum, and Opera perfectionibus Saracenorum. He intended these three works to serve as the basis of theological discussions with schismatics, Jews, and Muslims, and hoped in the use of these works and discussions to convert the world to Catholicism by argument and reason. Ricoldo also preached to Muslims in Arabic, and became personally acquainted with authoritative persons in Baghdad.[37]

By holding that coercion of heretics or infidels is proper only to temporal rulers and not the Church, Marsilius of Padua gave some support to the peaceful missionary idea. His Defensor Pacis, written in 1324, is intended to uphold the power of the state as greater than that of the Church, and in accordance with this aim he writes as follows: "According to the truth, therefore and the clear intention of the Apostle Paul and the saints . . . it is not commanded that anyone, even an infidel, let alone a believer, be compelled in this world through pain or punishment to observe the commands of the evangelic law, especially by a priest . . . ."[38] Marsilius spends some time in defending this position. First of all, the infidel is sinning against divine law, not human law, and so must be judged by a

---

[37] Atiya, pp. 158-59; Altaner, pp. 82-83.

[38] Marsilius of Padua, The Defender of Peace, tr. Alan Gewirth (New York, 1956), Vol. II, disc. 2, chapter ix, section 7, pp. 167-68.

judge of divine law. Secondly, the only judge of divine law who has coercive power is Christ; a priest has judge's powers only in the sense of knowing what is heresy or infidelity. Thirdly, Christ's judgment is in a future world, not in this one. Lastly, therefore, the only basis for punishing an infidel in this world is for the breaking of a human law, and breaking of human law is punishable by the state, not by the Church. Thus ". . . the pastor, bishop or priest, must teach and exhort him in the present life, must censure and rebuke the sinner and frighten him by a judgement or prediction of future glory or eternal damnation; but he must not coerce . . . ." Neither may the king coerce unless the legislating power of the state—the whole body of citizens—per its him to do so.[39]

Clearly the peaceful missionary movement enjoyed support from various walks of life. Philosophers, theologians, active missionaries, greater and lesser poets, travelers, and political theorists were writing in favor of peaceful missionary activity. But these writers were also among the best educated men of their time, and the multitudes may not have shared their ideas. Moreover, there was no machinery available for the rapid, widespread dissemination of ideas in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, hence it is probable that the writings in this chapter reached relatively few of the people of Western Europe. Thus, while a considerable body of writing favored peaceful missionary activity in this period, it does not necessarily follow that large numbers of Western Europeans did.

---

[39] Ibid., chapter x, pp. 173-81.

CHAPTER V

THE PAPACY AND MISSIONS

An examination of peaceful missionary activity in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries would be incomplete without a consideration of the work of the papacy. During the centuries following the fall of the Roman Empire, the popes had sought to restore the ideal of Christendom as a single community united under a visible head by establishing papal supremacy throughout the Western Church and by attaining a position free from and superior to the empire.[1] Indeed the papal goal was to make theocracy a political reality.[2] By the end of Gregory VII's pontificate in 1085 papal supremacy over the Western Church had been established. The resolution of the investiture struggle in the early twelfth century helped to make the Church more independent of the Empire (that is, the new Holy Roman Empire). The crusades aided the papal quest for temporal superiority by giving the Church the power to guard property for absent crusaders, to obtain through heavy taxation money for the crusades, and to guarantee the future for the crusader both in heaven and on earth. And since the crusades united Europe in quest of a common goal, the papacy, which led this unified quest, became the leading force in Europe. Consequently during the pontificate of Innocent III (1198-1216) it appeared that the papacy had attained its theocratic ideal.

---

[1] L. Elliott Binns, The History of the Decline and Fall of the Medieval Papacy (London, 1934), pp. 1-37.

[2] Throop, p. 42.

Recognizing the value of the crusades in the maintenance of papal supremacy over both church and empire, Innocent III and his successors constantly sought to organize new crusades. One need only mention the fourth (1204), fifth (1219), sixth (1229), and seventh (1248) crusades to recognize that the crusade appeal was still powerful. But a closer look reveals that the popes did not have effective control over these efforts; thus the fourth crusade attacked Christian Constantinople rather than the Holy Land, while the sixth crusade was led by the then excommunicated Frederick II.

It is safe to say that the idea of the crusade was a dominant factor in thirteenth century papal policy. But there were also moves of a missionary nature toward non-Christians, especially Muslims. Alexander III (1159-81) had exchanged letters with the Muslim sultans on economic, political, and theological issues.[3] Honorius III (1216-27) wrote in 1221 to all the metropolitans of Europe, asking each of them to choose at least two men, preferably Cistercians, who were good, learned, and ready to face martyrdom if necessary. The chosen men were to be sent to the pope, so he might send them forth to the ends of the earth. Honorius also appointed two Dominicans to start mission work in Morocco; these had the authority to preach, baptize Saracens, and reconcile apostates.[4]

---

[3] Altaner, p. 72.

[4] Altaner, pp. 1, 98-99; Lemmens, Heidenmissionen, pp. 2, 98. See also the contents of these letters in Regesta Pontificum Romanorum, ed. Augustus Potthast (Graz, 1957), I, numbers 6599, 7490.

Gregory IX (1227-41) was especially interested in the propagation of the faith, and attempted to effect a reunion with the Greek Church in the hope of presenting a united Christendom to the non-Christian world. Like Honorius, Gregory was interested in Morocco, and personally consecrated Aquellus the first bishop of that land. The unfortunate Moroccan martyrdoms, however, convinced Gregory that successful missionary work demanded the conversion or at least the active goodwill of the Muslim lords. Accordingly in 1233 he sent some Franciscans with letters to the courts of sultans in Africa and Asia, in which he stressed the Trinity and the deity of Christ and the hope that these sultans would accept Christianity.[5] Gregory also worked for the spread of Christianity in Livonia and Prussia, aided in the conversion of the Cumans by establishing a bishopric and granting privileges to the missionary friars, and sought to convert the Muslims whom Frederick II had settled at Lucera.[6]

After Celestine IV's seventeen-day reign in 1241, and a period of almost two years during which there was no pope, Innocent IV (1243-54) began his pontificate. In the wake of recent Mongol invasions, Russia and Hungary had appealed to the popes for help, and Innocent reasoned that the most effective way to stop these cruel invasions was to convert the Mongols and render them fearful of offending God.[7] In addition he

---

[5] Lemmens, Franziskanermissionen, pp. 11-12; Potthast, 9093, 9207, 9265; Altaner, p. 102; Atiya, p. 238, n. 2.

[6] Horace K. Mann, The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages (London, 1925), XIII, 417-20; Altaner, pp. 113-14; Lemmens, Franziskanermissionen, p. 10.

[7] Lemmens, Franziskanermissionen, pp. 21-22.

hoped that a Christian Mongol empire would assist the Christian West in crushing the Muslims. With such ideas in mind, Innocent dispatched two Franciscans, Lorenzo of Portugal and John of Plano Carpini, to invite the Great Khan and all the Mongols to become Christians. Lorenzo quit long before reaching his destination, but John arrived at the imperial court in 1246, witnessed the coronation of Guyuk, and returned with the latter's noncommittal answer in 1247. Meanwhile the pope had sent another ambassador, Anselm, who with four or five other Dominican brothers delivered papal invitations to embrace Christianity to five sultans.[8] The sultan of Egypt replied that he and his people knew Christ better and honored Him more than the pope did, while the sultan of Morocco said he wanted no fellowship with Trinitarians and other such atheists.[9] Anselm and his company eventually reached the camp of Baiju, the Great Khan's lieutenant in Western Asia. Baiju sent back with the papal ambassadors two envoys, whom Innocent IV met several times to inquire about the possibilities of Mongol conversion and cooperation with the West. To a request of the sultan of Damascus for Christian military aid against Egypt, Innocent replied that he would give aid if the sultan accepted Christianity, but the sultan refused to do so.[10] Innocent also urged the Provincial of France to send missionaries to the Cumans.[11] Old

---

[8] Altaner, pp. 79-80.

[9] Leclercq, Les missionnaires, pp. 11-12.

[10] Altaner, p. 75.

[11] Hahn, XIV, 180-201; Atiya, pp. 230-41.

on June 22, 1248, he wrote to the chancellor of the University of Paris: "We have arranged that certain youths versed both in Arabic and other languages of the oriental countries be sent to Paris to study, so that after learning from the sacred page the way of the Lord's commandments they can, when their education is completed, teach others the way of salvation in the lands beyond the sea."[12] Another act designed to further mission work was Innocent's approval of the statutes of the Societas fere ritmatim propter Christum (Society of Pilgrims or Wanderers for Christ), which were designed to organize the missionary efforts in the mendicant orders.[13] In 1254, Innocent requested the sultan of Iconium to permit Dominicans to work in that land for the salvation of souls.[14] But Innocent also sought to enforce the strictures of the Fourth Lateran Council regarding the wearing of distinctive dress by Muslims, and he ordered James I of Aragon to allow no Saracens except slaves to reside in the recently reconquered Balearics.[15]

Alexander IV (1254-61), at the urging of Raymond of Peñafort, gave renewed vigor to the mission work in Morocco and Tunis.[16] Urban IV (1261-64) and Clement IV (1265-68) preached the crusade. Clement

---

[12] Dubois, Recovery, chapter xxvi, pp. 114-15, n. 11. Cited from Chartularium universitatis Parisiensis, I, 212.

[13] Huber, p. 702.

[14] Altaner, p. 81.

[15] Lea, I, 68, 69.

[16] F. Pandonnet, "Preachers, Order of," in The Catholic Encyclopedia (New York, 1911), XII, 368.

was anxious for the conversion of the Mongols, but was also anxious for James I to show Christian zeal by expelling all Muslims from the Aragon domains.[17] Gregory X (1271-76) was presented with a seemingly great missionary opportunity in the Great Khan's request for missionaries. This request was conveyed to the pope by Niccolo and Maffeo Polo, and is described by Marco Polo in the Prologue to his Travels in the following words:

> His object . . . was to make a request to his Holiness that he would send to him a hundred men of learning, thoroughly acquainted with the principles of the Christian religion, as well as with the seven arts, and qualified to prove to the learned of his dominions by just and fair argument, that the faith professed by Christians is superior to, and founded upon more evident truth than, any other; that the gods of the Tartars and the idols worshipped in their houses were only evil spirits, and that they and the people of the East in general were under an error in reverencing them as divinities, and that if they would prove this, he and all under him would become Christians and the Church's liegemen.[18]

The Great Khan, however, was probably more interested in the advanced technology which these Westerners possessed, and the possibilities of Christianity as a force for holding together his empire, than in the Christian faith as a strictly religious matter.[19] Gregory X sent two men with the Polos, but the party had gotten only as far as Armenia when, upon learning of warfare ahead of them, the two would-be missionaries became fearful of danger and returned to the Holy Land.

---

[17] Mann, XV, 130-85; Lea, I, 70.

[18] The Travels of Marco Polo, ed. Manuel Komroff from Marsden's translation (New York, 1926), Prologue, chapter 2, also Book II, chapter 6.

[19] Leonardo Olschki, Marco Polo's Precursors (Baltimore, 1943), pp. 88-92.

Innocent V, Hadrian V, and John XXI together spent less than a year on the papal throne. Nicholas III (1277-80) ordered his legate to make preparations toward the establishment of a bishopric among the Cumans at Milcov, as the bishopric Gregory IX had founded had been destroyed in the Mongol invasions.[20] Nicholas also commanded the Provincial of the Hungarian Franciscans to send more missionaries to the Cumans. However Nicholas was primarily interested in a crusade, and for this reason reprimanded Alfonso X for entering into truces with Muslims. The embassies which the Mongols sent to the West during these years to seek alliances against the Muslims were coolly received and evasively answered by both popes and kings. A party of Franciscans which Nicholas sent to the Great Khan apparently never reached their destination.[21] His successors, Martin IV (1281-85) and Honorius IV (1285-87) raised money for crusades and spent it in other projects. Honorius, however, sent clergy who had command of eastern languages to Paris, to study theology in preparation for foreign missionary work.[22] Nicholas IV (1288-92) sent John of Monte Corvino and some fellow Franciscans to the Great Khan with letters which show a very diplomatic attitude toward the schismatic churches as well as toward the Khan. During Nicholas' pontificate, diplomatic embassies were exchanged with Arghun Khan, and missionaries sent to Persia.[23]

---

[20] Tennens, Heidenmissionen, pp. 20, 53.

[21] Cathay and the Way Thither: Being a Collection of Medieval Notices of China, ed. and tr. Henry Yule (London, 1866), I, 166, n. 2; Mann XVII, 41.

[22] Mann, XVI, 156 ff., 438-39.

[23] Atiya, pp. 249-50; Peters, p. 226; Mann, XVII, 41, 69.

Celestine V (1294), pope for only five months, received Raymon Lull's comprehensive missionary plan, but did nothing to further mission work. Boniface VIII (1294-1303) was engaged during his pontificate with Philip IV of France, and Benedict XI (1303-04) was also unable to attend to missions. But Clement V (1305-14) responded to an appeal for help from John of Monte Corvino by making him Archbishop and Patriarch of the East and sending him seven suffragan bishops, of whom only three arrived in Peking.[24] The Council of Vienne, which was held during Clement's pontificate, established five schools for education in oriental languages. John XXII (1316-34) sent many missionaries, generally Franciscans and Dominicans, throughout the East. Moreover, he organized the eastern missions, creating bishoprics and archbishoprics in Persia, Armenia, Georgia, and Kipchak (southern Russia), and allotting the northern half of Asia to the care of the Franciscans and the southern portion to the Dominicans. Benedict XII (1334-42) sent John of Marignolli with others to the East, in response to an embassy from the Great Khan.[25] Clement VI (1342-52) apparently did nothing for missions, but during the pontificate of Innocent VI (1352-62) John of Marignolli returned with the Khan's letter requesting more missionaries. The pope asked the Franciscan Chapter-General for action on this request, but received none. Urban V (1362-70) sent some missionaries to the East, but there is no evidence that they ever reached Peking.[26]

---

[24] Mann, XVII, 97; Atiya, p. 251.

[25] Atiya, pp. 254-55; Mann, XVII, 98; Leemens, Heidenmissionen, pp. 42-43.

[26] Mann, XVII, 102-04.

Clearly the papal missionary method was to seek quick conversion of the Muslim people through conversion of their leaders, and to establish church control by the hasty erection of bishoprics. The papal correspondence indicates that the popes, like Francis and Lull, expected the Muslims to be easily converted. When this did not happen, the popes were nonplused and were unable to devise a satisfactory missionary program. The popes also failed to discern that the professed desire for union with Rome on the part of schismatics and Mongols was really a device to induce the popes to give military aid against enemies. When such aid failed to materialize, the desire for union disappeared.[27]

From the foregoing sketch of papal activity connected with missions in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, it is clear that the popes were more interested in mission work in the Far East and among the Tartars than in mission work among the Muslims nearer them. Such an emphasis fits perfectly with the papal emphasis upon the crusade; the popes saw the Muslims as enemies to be exterminated rather than as heathen to be converted, and to maintain crusading enthusiasm it was necessary to continue to impress upon Western Europe the idea that the Muslims were enemies. Atiya finds three main aims in the papal policy of the later Middle Ages: the popes hoped to convert the Mongols and bring Peking and Persia within the fold of the Roman Catholic Church; the popes hoped that conversion of the Mongols would eliminate the danger the Mongols posed to Western

---

[27] Altaner, pp. 230-33.

Europe; and the popes hoped to obtain united action between the Europeans and the Mongols to crush the Muslim Mamluk empire.[28] Allied with these aims were the spasmodic attempts at reunion of Eastern and Western Christianity, and with the various schismatic groups in the East, in the hopes that a united Christian front could be presented against Islam. This passion for unity also helps to explain the papal dislike of the tolerance shown to Muslims in Spain and Sicily. The best way to have religious unity was to eliminate the dissenting elements, which the popes sought to do by repeated pressures upon the tolerant Spanish rulers and Frederick II, and by crusades against the latter and other dissenters, such as the Cathari. As Throop says, from the papal point of view "nothing was more imperative than religious unity."[29] But, as Throop makes clear in his book, the papal pressure upon Europe for this religious unity produced further disunity.

The popes, however, did not justify their actions solely on the basis of expediency; canon law was also a major factor in their thinking. Walter Ullmann has treated this subject in considerable detail, and in so doing has shed some light on the legalistic bases for the papal approach to missions. First it is to be noted that the crusades were not, in the eyes of the canonists, the ideal way of affirming papal power. Ullmann says: "But we should not for a moment assume that the crusades served as a model for the setting up of a papal world

---

[28] Atiya, pp. 233-34.

[29] Throop, p. 47.

monarchy: the employment of brute force was a feature that did not gain much favour with the canonists. They preferred subtler methods, some of which would nowadays be termed the method of infiltration. That is not to say that the canonists did not justify the crusades ex post, but that they at least never promoted the employment of force as the ordinary and regular method for the extension of papal power."[30] One of the chief methods of "infiltration," of course, was missions. Thus the canonists, among them Pope Innocent IV, held that missionaries and other papal representatives must be allowed to enter and move freely in non-Christian countries, and refusal to allow free entry was punishable, since every rational creature is to praise God, and hindrance of missionaries prevents them from helping others praise God. If the pope was unable to give the punishment, he could use the secular arm to do so. But such power only referred to the lawful commands of the pope to non-Christians; it did not include or imply the right to compel non-Christians to embrace the Christian faith. By the same logic, entrance to Christian countries was denied to non-Christian emissaries, especially Muslims, who were in error and might hinder people from praising the true God.[31]

The pope was the lawful protector of Christians wherever they were found, and therefore had the right to interfere directly with the internal affairs and legislation of non-Christian countries. Beyond such rights, Innocent IV saw the pope as a quasi-emperor, exercising

---

[30] Walter Ullmann, Medieval Papalism: The Political Theories of the Medieval Canonists (London, 1949), p. 121.

[31] Ullmann, pp. 124-25.

the emperor's functions when the emperor was unable to do so; therefore the pope had the right to attempt to regain all lands formerly held by the Roman Empire, such as the Holy Land. Here was the juristic basis for the crusades.[32]

The next question was whether the pope could conquer non-Christian lands which had never been under Christian rule. Innocent IV held that this could not be done, and that possession of certain lands by infidels is acceptable unless their acts make such possession sinful. But Hostiensis, another canonist of the period, said that as Christ had had dominion over all, so should His vicar.[33] According to Ullmann, "something in the way of a compromise between these two theories was achieved by later canonists. It was agreed that force should not be employed to subjugate these pagan countries to Christian rule, but that they should be won over by the efforts of missionary activity, that is, by peaceful penetration."[34] However, if the right of entry was refused, then force could be used.

The canonistic arguments, like papal activities, treated missions as a means to some other end, rather than as an end in itself. Popes in the earlier Middle Ages had considered missions one of the chief ends of papal activity; in the thirteenth century the outlook has changed. Hence it is startling to find a king, Louis IX, concerned with the salvation of the souls of the Mongols and the Muslims and sending

---

[32] Ullmann, pp. 126-28.

[33] Ullmann, pp. 129-31.

[34] Ullmann, p. 131, 132, n. 1.

missions to them for the purpose of converting them to the Christian faith, while the popes were concerned with military alliances and crusades.[35] Much of the change is attributable to the fact that the Church was now an accepted societal institution, rather than, as in an earlier period (before 1000), one which was fighting for its existence. Consequently the Church was concerned with its maintenance more than with its message. In addition the popes, having attained a degree of temporal supremacy, fell prey to the many problems of a temporal sovereign, and frequently had too little time to give to spiritual concerns.

---

[35] John of Joinville, The Life of St. Louis, tr. René Hague (New York, 1955), chapters xxix, xlv, pp. 133-35, 491-92. For missions in the earlier Middle Ages, see Richard E. Sullivan, "The Papacy and Missionary Activity in the Early Middle Ages," Mediaeval Studies, XVII (1955), 46-106.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

From the preceding pages it is evident that there were many factors working to stimulate missionary activity toward the Muslims in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Several of these factors were in the historical situation of the time. Internal dissension and Christian resistance had halted the Muslim empire's expansion during the eighth century and Western Europe, during the succeeding centuries, had time in which to recover from the Islamic disruptions. By the eleventh century recovery was sufficiently advanced for Western Europe to be in a military counter-attack against Islam. During the twelfth century, the stimulus of contact with Islam encouraged the development of trade, the increase of learning, and the growth of tolerance in Western Europe, all of which were important in mission work. The missionaries operated from bases in the *fondaci*, the European merchant quarters, in the port cities of Africa and the Near East, while missionaries to the Mongols east of the Black Sea were aided by contact with Genoese merchants.[1] The emphasis on the intellectual exposition of the Christian faith, which is evidenced in the work of St. Dominic and the missionary propagandists as well as the papal letters to Muslim cultures, was a natural outgrowth of increased learning. And the rise and spread of tolerance among the people of Western Europe

---

[1] Remling, *Heidenmissionen*, pp. 51-52. Elsewhere (p. 99) Remling says: "Die Macht der Christen wuchs mit der Ausdehnung des Handels." Altaner, in speaking of mission work in Tunis, affirms that: "Die Handel war hier wie auch sonst immer der Schrittmacher der Missionen." Altaner, p. 105.

helped to decrease interest in crusades and increase interest in missions as a means of dealing with the Muslims. It is interesting to speculate on the significance of the Muslim contribution to the Christian missionary interest. Dominic and Lull, both Spaniards, were well acquainted with Muslims. Francis' father was well-traveled in southern France where Muslim influence was strong, and Francis was considerably influenced by the troubadours who were in turn influenced by the Muslims. Joachim of Flore and Thomas Aquinas grew up in Muslim-influenced southern Italy; the latter attended the University of Naples where Muslims were on the faculty. Roger Bacon and Marsilius of Padua were so well acquainted with the work of the Muslim philosopher Averroes that both were accused of being Averroists. Such considerations are merely circumstantial, however, and cannot be adduced as definite proof that Christian missions were fostered by Muslim thought and influence.

Another Muslim-tinged factor in missionary work was later medieval mysticism. The significance of visions in the lives of Dominic, Francis, and Ramon Lull has been noted. Mysticism was a keynote of Francis' life, while Lull has frequently received more consideration as a mystic than as a philosopher. As mysticism stressed the union of the individual with God, it helped to blur distinctions between religions and led the believer to feel confident that he can lead another to the same mystical experience.

But it was necessary for individual persons to utilize the various factors in actual missionary work. Because they sought to do so, Francis and Dominic are among the favorite heroes of church history. Some popes, notably Gregory IX, Innocent IV, and John XXII, aided the

missionary effort by sending letters to non-Christian rulers, maintaining an organizational structure to facilitate missionary operations, and stimulating zeal for mission work. And of course there are the numerous individuals who did particular service in particular lands. It is very important to note that the leaders in the peaceful missionary work—Francis, Dominic, and Ramon Lull—were convinced that they were led by God into this activity, and that the leading of God was their primary motivation.

Many of the factors which aided missionary work, however, also served to hinder it. Trade did not always aid mission work, as in the case of the two Franciscans who were ejected from Tunis by Christian merchants. The intellectual emphasis in Christianity, which viewed Islam as a hostile dogmatic system rather than a vital faith, frequently hindered the conversion of the Muslim to Christianity.[2] Religious tolerance sometimes became religious indifference and then deterred mission work. Mysticism often led missionaries and popes to be unrealistically optimistic concerning the prospects of converting the Muslims, and prevented the development of more concrete programs of missionary activity.

An important factor in missionary work is the method used by the missionary. Unfortunately, materials for the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries are too scanty to discuss missionary methodology in other than general terms.[3] However Bertold Spuler, in discussing "Iran and Islam,"

---

[2] Addison, The Christian Approach to the Moslem, pp. 287-90, discusses at length the hindrance of the intellectual approach.

[3] Lemmens, Heidenmissionen, p. 103.

provides a helpful framework for thinking about missionary methods in general terms. He begins by listing two chief missionary methods: "The foreign religion may succeed in convincing the leading personality or the principal group of the truth of its message," and "the second manner of conversion is by way of a mission to individuals or groups, which wins over the whole people not through the leading classes but through the socially inferior ones." He concludes that the conversion of Iran to Islam was not effected by either of these two methods, but by a different one, which added ". . . spirituality and a missionary ideal to the social, financial, and cultural inducements leading toward the change of religion. To these were added, last but not least, physical force, terror, and death, before the whole Iranian people embraced Islam."[4] The first method, Spuler notes, yields a large proportion of people who conform outwardly only. Method two requires greater exertion for the missionary religion and greater sacrifice (because of the necessity of repudiating much of the culture) for the converts, but insures that such converts will be firmly convinced adherents of the new faith. The third method involved, at least in Iran, control of government by the missionary religion.

The popes, by their many letters to the Muslim sultans and the Mongol Khans, were clearly utilizing the first of these approaches. Missionaries on the field also used method one, as the conversion of the Tunisian emir's nephew and the disputations of Ramon Lull with Muslim leaders show. But it is equally clear that this method of

---

[4] Bertold Spuler, "Iran und Islam," in The Centenary Anthropologist, XVI, Memoir 76 (April, 1954), pp. 47-48, 53.

approach was unsuccessful. The only really effective work among Muslims occurred in lands where Christians held political control through actual conquest, as in Spain, Sicily, and the Holy Land, or through treaties as in Morocco and Tunis.[5] Such a set of circumstances is outlined in Ryder's third method. It then becomes questionable whether one may refer to missionary efforts under such conditions as peaceful missionary efforts, since the efforts depend upon Christian political hegemony, which may have been gained by force, for success.

The ineffectiveness of appealing to Muslim leaders to change their religion is, however, only one explanation of the failure of missionary efforts toward the Muslims. Islam had a law which punished apostasy by death, and this law, rigidly enforced during the Middle Ages, considerably lessened the possibility of converting Muslims to Christianity.[6] The loss of the Kingdom of Jerusalem with the fall of Acre in 1291 deprived the eastern missionaries of their base of operations, while the Hundred Years' War in France and the strife between Pope John XXII and Emperor Louis IV diverted attention and energy away from the missionary enterprise.[7] But the overly optimistic belief in the ease with which the Muslims could be converted, and the consequent failure to establish a systematic missionary plan with permanent mission work in the non-Christian lands also contributed to failure. Moreover the popes, anxious to extend the area of the Church's power, erected

---

[5] Altaner, pp. 86, 229-30.

[6] Addison, pp. 25, 37.

[7] Altaner, p. 19; Huber, pp. 256-58.

bishoprics and the framework of hierarchical organization without regard for the actual number of Christians in the area. The result was the appearance of an organized missionary work which was in reality all but nonexistent, being instead spasmodic and haphazard, composed of few missionaries and almost no indigenous leadership.[8] A further hindrance was the missionaries' ignorance of the language of the lands in which they worked; the continued insistence upon the need for language schools is proof that linguistic ability was a problem.[9] During the fourteenth century many of the lesser Mongol khans were converted to Islam, and their lands thus became less accessible to Christian missionaries.[10] The Black Death of 1349, which killed between one-half and two-thirds of the Franciscans, was especially severe among missionaries. Clement VI stated on March 14, 1349, that only three Dominican priests were left in all of Persia.[11] Such wholesale losses of personnel caused the orders to admit new members carelessly, and these new members lacked missionary zeal and dedication.[12] With the overthrow of the Mongols by the Ming dynasty in 1368, any hope of great missionary successes came to an end. The great missionary effort had spent its force, and future generations would profit from its mistakes rather than its successes.

---

[8] Lemmens, Heidenmissionen, pp. 47-48.

[9] Altaner, pp. 232-36, 75-76.

[10] Atiya, p. 256; Tittle, article in Cambridge Medieval History, VI, 754; Lemmens, Franziskanermissionen, p. 34.

[11] Lemmens, Heidenmissionen, p. 48.

[12] Huber, pp. 256-58.

PRIMARY BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary source materials do not deal directly with the factors in the origin of Christian missionary activity toward the Muslims, but rather supply specific examples and illustrations of such factors. Matthew Paris's English History from the Year 1235 to 1273, tr. J.A. Giles, 3 vols. (London, 1852) contains scattered bits of information about Western Europe's knowledge of and attitudes toward Muslims. Another work which provides such information and especially affords an understanding of the influence of Joachim of Flore upon the Franciscans is Salimbene's Chronicle as translated and expanded by G.G. Coulton, From St. Francis to Dante (London, 1906). Knowledge of Christian-Muslim relations in Sicily and the Holy Land is gained from The Travels of Ibn Jubayr, tr. R.J.C. Broadhurst (London, 1952). Christian-Muslim relations in the Holy Land are also illuminated in Usamah ibn-Munqidh, Gentleman and Warrior in the Period of the Crusades: Memoirs of Usamah Ibn-Munqidh, tr. Philip K. Hitti (New York, 1929). A Christian view of the Holy Land conditions is given by Jacques de Vitry's letters, edited by R. Röhricht, "Briefe des Jacobus von Vitriaco," Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XIV (1894), 97-110.

Material on missions to the Mongols is extensive and indicative both of the general approach to missions and the methods used by missionaries. The travels of Odoric of Pordenone and John de Marignolli, along with some letters from missionaries of the time, are contained in Henry Yule's two copiously annotated volumes, Cathay and the Way Thither, Being a Collection of Mediaeval Notices of China (London, 1866).

Contemporaries of Marco Polo, ed. Manuel Komroff (New York, 1928) contains Odoric's account, along with the journals of John of Pian de Carpini and William of Rubruck. A comparison of Komroff's Odoric with Yule's reveals that the former has omitted many of the passages dealing with Odoric's religious work; thus his treatment of John and William is suspect. Fortunately a better edition of William's travels exists, the well-annotated The Journey of William of Ruoruck to the Eastern Parts, tr. and ed. William W. Rockhill (London, 1900). Komroff's edition of The Travels of Marco Polo (the Venetian), revised from Marsden's translation (New York, 1926), is in modern English and evidences sound scholarship; however Henry Yule's edition of Marco Polo is still definitive. The Life of St. Louis by John of Joinville, tr. René Hague from text edited by Natalis de Wailly (New York, 1955) gives insight into Louis IX's motives for sending William of Rubruck to the Mongol Great Khan.

Other primary sources are the writers who urged missionary activity. The Opus Majus of Roger Bacon, tr. Robert B. Burke, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1928) stresses the philosophical bases of missionary attack, and urges language training for missionaries. Pierre Dubois, The Recovery of the Holy Land, tr. Walther I. Brandt (New York, 1956) outlines a complete missionary scheme as a part of a plan to make the French king the greatest of all kings. Brandt's introductory notes are very useful, especially in explaining the operation of propaganda activity in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Marsilius of Padua: The Defender of Peace, tr. Alan Gewirth, 2 vols. (New York, 1956) is well done. Volume two is the translation, volume one is an exposition of medieval

political philosophy and contains an especially helpful treatment of the role of Averroism in the political thought of that time. Dante, Monarchy and Three Political Letters, tr. Donald Nicholl (New York, 1954) gives the great poet's ideas on ideal relations between church and state, and also discusses how universal peace may best be obtained. The Vision of William concerning Piers the Plowman in Three Parallel Texts together with Richard the Redeless by William Langland, ed. Walter W. Skeat, 2 vols. (London, 1924) places much emphasis (in Piers the Plowman) upon the need of converting the Muslims.

In general secondary works, the best treatment of late medieval missionary activity is Berthold Altaner, Die Dominikanermissionen des 13. Jahrhunderts (Habelschwerdt, 1924), in which a large section is devoted to Muslim missions. Altaner also discusses the missionary ideas of Dominic and the early Dominicans. In his conclusion, he deals with the Dominican relations with the Franciscans, and with the methods and results of Dominican missions. The original sources are used extensively, and the bibliography although uncritical is exhaustive. Also very useful is Bernhard Lemens, Die Heidenmissionen des Spät-mittelalters (Münster in Westf., 1919) which deals with both Franciscan and Dominican mission work. His treatment of missions to Muslim lands is unfortunately relegated to a seven-page appendix. Lemens too has thoroughly sifted the sources, and cites some Franciscan sources not used by Altaner. Lemens' Die Franziskaner im Vl. Lande, 1. Teil, Die Franziskaner auf dem Sion: 1335-1552 (Münster in Westf., 1925) deals only incidentally with missionary work. In Geschichte der Franziskanermissionen (Münster in Westf., 1929) Lemens includes

very brief summaries of his treatments in Golden Fleece. Neither Jessens nor Altaner probes into the factors assisting the inception of the missionary efforts. Kenneth Scott Latourette, A History of the Expansion of Christianity, Vol. II, The Thousand Years of Uncertainty (New York, 1938) relies almost entirely upon Jessens and Altaner for his treatment of later medieval missions. James T. Addison, The Christian Approach to the Moslem (New York, 1942) discusses briefly the history of missionary efforts toward Muslims, and emphasizes the theoretical aspects of such approaches. Raphael M. Huber, A Documented History of the Franciscan Order: 1182-1517 (Milwaukee, 1944) is a thoroughly documented work with some helpful information. Huber, however, is extremely biased against the Spirituals and thus fails to treat them at sufficient length. Georgina R. Galbraith, The Constitution of the Dominican Order: 1216 to 1360 (Manchester, Eng., 1925) deals with changes in the order's constitution and little else. R.F. Bennett, The Early Dominicans (Cambridge, Eng., 1937) helpfully discusses many aspects of the life of the early Dominicans, but his references to foreign missionary activity depend upon Altaner. These two books taken together do not, however, give the full picture of the Dominican order as Huber does for the Franciscans. A helpful but brief survey of the Dominicans is P. Mandonnet, "Preachers, Order of," in The Catholic Encyclopedia (New York, 1911), XII, pp. 354-70. The early work of both orders is briefly summarized in A.G. Little, "The Mendicant Orders," in Cambridge Medieval History, VI, pp. 727-62.

In biographies, Bede Jarrett, Life of St. Dominic (Westminster, Md., is competent but certainly not definitive. Paul Sabatier, Life of St.

Francis of Assisi, tr. Louise S. Houghton (New York, 1894) is the best biography of Francis. Horace K. Mann, The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages, Vols. XIII-XVII (London, 1925) uses sources well to give a brief yet accurate summary of the important events in each pontificate; however his treatment of papal motives and attitudes is somewhat superficial. On Ramon Lull, a brief, popular, and inaccurate work is Samuel M. Zwemer, Raymund Lull: First Missionary to the Moslems (New York and London, 1902). Robert E. Speer, Some Great Leaders in the World Movement (New York, 1911) bases his chapter on Lull upon a critical reading of Zwemer. The definitive account of Lull's life and work is E. Allison Peers, Ramon Lull: a Biography (London, 1929). Peers, whose field is literature, develops his portrait of Lull from Lull's writings, and in the process makes abundantly evident the main points and the development of Lull's missionary thinking.

As missions to Muslims were in part a reaction to the crusades, some works on the crusades contain much information about missionary activity. One of these is Palmer A. Throop, Criticism of the Crusade: A Study of Public Opinion (Amsterdam, 1940) which is concerned with the attempts of Gregory X (1271-76) to organize a crusade. Throop finds that the rise of missionary interest was one of the factors working against Gregory's efforts. A special feature of this book is Throop's examination of the poetry and literature of the period for indications of opposition to the crusades and often of genuine missionary interest. Unfortunately the printing has been atrociously done, and there are typographical errors on almost every page. The book contains no bibliography, but is thoroughly referenced through footnotes. Another

helpful work is Aziz S. Atiya, The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages (London, 1938). Many persons in the later Middle Ages were proposing missionary work, as well as crusades, and Atiya has much to say about both emphases. His extensive bibliography is invaluable, as are the many lists of rulers and other charts given in the appendix. Dana C. Munro, The Kingdom of the Crusaders (New York, 1935) discusses relations between crusaders and Muslims in the Holy Land. On the significance of the crusades for missionary work the following articles in volume V of the Cambridge Medieval History give the essential facts in brief compass: William B. Stevenson, "The First Crusade," pp. 265-99; Charles Lethbridge Kingsford, "The Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1099-1291," pp. 300-19; and E.J. Passant, "The Effects of the Crusades upon Western Europe," pp. 320-33.

On Christian-Muslim relations in Spain, Rafael Altamira, A History of Spanish Civilization, tr. P. Volker (New York, 1930) is a scholarly treatment with much emphasis on Muslim cultural contributions. Américo Castro, The Structure of Spanish History, tr. Edmund L. King (Princeton, 1954) gives a full treatment of the philosophical and literary influence of the Muslims upon Spain. Roger B. Merriman, The Rise of the Spanish Empire in the Old World and the New, Vol. I, The Middle Ages (New York, 1918), contains nothing not in either Altamira or Castro. Henry Charles Lea, A History of the Inquisition in Spain, Vol. I (New York, 1906) traces the rise and fall of Christian tolerance toward Muslims in Spain, but exhibits undue hostility toward the Church.

Concerning Islam and its spread, the best work is Thomas Walker Arnold, The Preaching of Islam: A History of the Propagation of the

Muslim Faith, 2nd ed. (Lahore, 1950) which deals extensively with the Quran and the nature of Islam. Arnold was among the first to show that Islam spread peaceably rather than by the use of the sword. A modern treatment of Islam, especially helpful for its penetration into Muslim doctrines, is Majid Khadduri, War and Peace in the Law of Islam, 2nd ed. (Baltimore, 1955). Philip K. Hitti, History of the Arabs from the Earliest Times to the Present, 6th ed. (London, 1956) is the standard history of the Arab people.

For medieval mysticism and Joachism, Emile Gebhart, Mystics and Heretics in Italy at the End of the Middle Ages, tr. Edward M. Hulme (London, 1922) is a scholarly, useful account. Evelyn Underhill, Jacopone da Todi, Poet and Mystic 1228-1306: A Spiritual Biography (London and Toronto, 1919) illuminates both the nature of medieval mysticism and the work of the Spiritual Franciscans.

Among more specialized studies, Walter Ullmann, Medieval Papalism: The Political Theories of the Medieval Canonists (London, 1949) is most valuable for its studied exposition of papal policies as influenced by canon law. Leonardo Olschki, Marco Polo's Precursors (Baltimore, 1943) indicates the Mongol reasons for seeming to be interested in Roman Christianity—reasons of which the popes were unaware. Charles H. Haskins, The Normans in European History (Boston and New York, 1915) supplies information concerning the Norman religious policy in southern Italy and Sicily.

A useful general work is Henri Pirenne, Mohammed and Charlemagne, tr. Bernard Miall from the 10th French edition (London, 1954) in which Pirenne describes how Western Europe was disrupted by the Muslim

expansion and how Western Europe recovered from this disruption. Pirenne reasons that the Muslim capture of the Western Mediterranean, by practically eliminating Western European sea trade, forced Western Europe to develop an economic, social, and cultural system apart from contact with the cultured East. The "Pirenne thesis" also dominates his A History of Europe from the Invasions to the XVI Century, tr. Bernard Miall (New York, 1939) which, although interesting and accurate, lacks annotations which would render it more valuable. Maurice De Wulf, A History of Medieval Philosophy, tr. Ernest C. Messenger from the 5th French edition, 2 vols. (London, 1926) is a succinct summary of the important contributions of various medieval philosophers. Robert Briffault, The Making of Humanity, 2nd ed. (London, 1928) is hostile to the Church and attributes many of the intellectual and religious developments of the Middle Ages to Muslim influence. However the book has almost no references, and Briffault himself is a privately educated surgeon rather than a trained historian, thus his work must be used with extreme caution.

To view the missionary work of the later Middle Ages in the light of earlier missionary efforts, the following articles by Richard E. Sullivan are especially valuable: "Early Medieval Missionary Activity: A Comparative Study of Eastern and Western Methods," Church History, XXIII (1954), 17-35, which is what the title indicates; "The Papacy and Missionary Activity in the Early Middle Ages," Medieval Studies, XVII (1955), 46-106, a study of the work of various popes in furthering missionary activity; and "The Carolingian Missionary and the Pagan," Speculum, XXVIII (1953), 705-40, a study of Carolingian missionary methods.

For Islam, Gustave E. von Grunebaum, "The Response of Culture Consciousness in Islam," American Anthropologist, XLVII, memoir 81 (April, 1955), 31-57, sheds light upon the treatment of Christians in Muslim territory and offers some knowledge of the cultural situation into which the Christian missionaries came. Bertold Spuler, "Iran and Islam," American Anthropologist, LVI, memoir 76 (April, 1954), 47-56, gives a sound framework for studying missionary methods and makes plain that the Muslims were also missionaries. Ameer-ul-Haq, "Influence of Muslim Political Theorists on Medieval European Political Thought," Islamic Culture, XXXII (1958), 186-89, is based almost entirely upon Briffault and a cursory reading of Thomas Aquinas, and is nearly valueless.

Some articles on the crusades are also helpful for the background of the missionary activity. Dana C. Munro gives in broad outline "The Western Attitude Toward Islam during the Period of the Crusades," Speculum, VI (1931), 329-43. Helpful for understanding the basic rationale of the crusades is Munro's analysis of Urban's speech, "The Speech of Pope Urban II at Clermont, 1095," American Historical Review, XI (1906), 231-42. George B. Flahiff reports on Ralph Niger, an early opponent of the crusades, in "Deus Non Vult: A Critic of the Third Crusade," Mediaeval Studies, IX (1947), 162-88. Criticism of the crusades is also examined by Palmer A. Throop, "Criticism of Papal Crusade Policy in Old French and Provencal," Speculum, XIII (1938), 379-412, but this material is also incorporated in his book, Criticism of the Crusade.