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ABSTRACT

In a world that has become so powerfully gripped by a possible escalation of a ‘clash of civilizations’ that could spiral out of control, interest in the history of Christian-Muslim encounters and violence is on the rise. The aim of this chapter is to provide some historical depth to a debate that often tends to be shallow in its appreciation of a complex legacy of interaction between different people. It will commence with an overview of the recent debate that emerged in response to the ideas of Samuel P. Huntington. It will then consider the historical implications of the crusades in the way they have come to colour contemporary West-Muslim relations. Finally, the chapter will consider a number of naval battles between the Knights Hospitallers of St. John the Baptist and the Ottoman Empire as a case study in early modern Christian-Muslim interaction. This relationship will be looked at from the religious angle, but other factors that informed this conflict, such as status and masculinity, will also be considered.

INTRODUCTION

Fascination with a ‘clash of civilizations’ between Christians and Muslims has gripped people’s imagination and there is growing interest in the history of Christian-Muslim encounters and violence. For all the talk about secularism and a decline in religion, issues of faith are as capable today, as ever, to stir deep and widespread passionate reactions. This chapter will commence with an analysis of the contemporary idea of a ‘clash of civilizations’ and with an overview of current European-Mediterranean relations. The chapter will then move backwards in time to consider the impact which the Crusades of the Middle Ages had on Christian-Muslim relations. It will analyse how a particular understanding of the Crusades moulds modern discourses about Christian-Muslim relations. The third and main part of this chapter deals with the early modern Mediterranean. The main focus is on the Hospitaller Knights of St. John and the Ottoman Turks. The 16th and 17th centuries, sandwiched between the Middle Ages and the post-1789 era, tend to be dismissed as a time of petty squabbles between marauding corsairs, some donning the cross, and others the crescent. This chapter focuses precisely on this period to highlight the extensive social, economic and religious encounters and exchanges that took place between Christians and Muslims in the Mediterranean.

A CLASH OF CIVILIZATIONS?

A series of Danish newspaper cartoons that appeared in the year 2005 depicting the Prophet Mohammed, as well as Pope Benedict XVI’s lecture in Germany in September 2006, aroused passionate and at times violent reactions among Muslims, which made many think back on Samuel P. Huntington’s article and book about civilizations and the ways they clash. The term a ‘Clash of Civilizations’ was first used by Bernard Lewis in an article he wrote in *The Atlantic* in 1990, in which he outlined the grievances which the Arab / Islamic world had toward the West / Christianity. Huntington elaborated the term in an article he published in 1993. In his vision, the Third World War would see the Judeo-Christian West ranged against a Confucian-Islamic alliance. Under the generic labels of ‘West’ and ‘Islam’ he set down a pattern of thinking which followed strict black and white contours, and which was found to be exceptionally convenient following the 11 September 2001 terrorist attack upon the World Trade Centre in New York City. This latest act seemed to be the logical culmination of the Confucian-Islamic connection designed to promote acquisition by its members of the weapons and weap-
ons technology to counter the military powers of the West. In reality, however, the attack upon the US was not done through ballistic missiles or chemical weapons, but by the carefully planned suicide attack of a small group of deranged militants who used American civilian planes.

The main criticism hurled at Huntington is that of oversimplification. His eight-civilizations division was too categorical and it implied an exaggerated level of civilizational isolation and homogeneity. According to him a civilization is the “highest cultural grouping of people and the broadest level of cultural identity people have.” But the concept of civilization is a complex and imprecise one, used along with or instead of other notions such as culture, race and nation. Sweeping statements about civilizations can only therefore lead to imprecise readings of past and current events. Huntington considers the ‘West’, primarily North America and Western Europe as a whole, disregarding the fundamental differences not only between the two but also within Europe itself. Even ‘Islam’ cannot be taken as one homogenous group. There are, for instance, noticeable differences between Muslims in the Middle East and Muslims in North Africa (the latter’s belief in saints brings them quite close to South European Catholics in fact). There is then, particularly in North Africa, the traditional dichotomy between the Muslims of the cities and the Berbers of the desert, a dichotomy forever immortalized by Ibn Khaldun. The Persian Gulf War (1990-91) brought traditionally anti-American Syria to join the US in its war against Iraq. Once aggression had occurred, the United States and other Western governments became involved for geopolitical reasons that transcended cultural differences. West-Islam co-operation over Kuwait was not the first of its kind. Fernand Braudel observed that in the 17th-century Mediterranean, ‘Men passed to and fro, indifferent to frontiers, states and creeds...’ Around 1548, Jean de la Valette, an official of the Catholic military-religious Order of St. John, agitated for the transfer of their headquarters from Malta to Tripoli in North Africa. Among other reasons he gave for such a move, he argued that he felt confident enough that the Catholic Order and the Muslim Berbers of North Africa could co-operate in their opposition to the Muslim Ottoman Turks.

Points of convergence such as those outlined above have a tendency to be ignored. After all, the Crusades of the Middle Ages are enough of a potent example to anyone who sees the possibility of a ‘West’ vs. ‘Islam’ conflict. In popular mentality and in some official discourses in the Arab World, Israel is regarded as a Crusader state and as such it should be wiped out just like the medieval crusader states were. According to Mehmet Ali Agca, who tried to kill Pope John Paul II on 13 May 1981, the Pope was the ‘supreme commander of the Crusades’. Although Huntington makes it clear that he sees Western intervention in other civilizations as a dangerous source of instability, his ideas are often taken to imply the contrary. Paul Johnson, on the other hand, was very blunt when he put forward his argument that the ‘civilized nations’ ought to take it upon themselves to recolonize Third World Countries ‘where the most basic conditions of civilized life had broken down’. This evocation of 19th-century imperialist language found immediate resonance among US policy-makers and the media. Works like
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Huntington’s and Johnson’s serve to heighten discourses of the familiar (Europe, the West, ‘us’) and the strange (the Orient, the East, ‘them’). The phenomenon of Islamic fundamentalism is a sign of bewilderment and guilt that the border with the ‘other’ has been crossed. The ‘other’, in this case, is modernity, which has become inseparable from the West and by implication evil, as well as attractive. Just like Communism, Islamic Fundamentalism is bred in a situation of lack of democracy, huge social inequalities, poverty and deprivation. This was why in 1948, Ernest Bevin (post-war British Foreign Secretary), underlined how the real danger seemed to lie in the moral and material exhaustion of Western Europe, which made it ripe for communist infiltration. That was why Marshall Aid was an all-encompassing programme of political, economic and social regeneration and integration. Similarly the challenge of achieving stability in the Mediterranean has to address security not in a vacuum, but in conjunction with the socio-economic base of that challenge, and with an awareness of the historical heritage of the region.

Over time, a situation of ‘centre and periphery’ has developed in the relationship between Europe and the Mediterranean. It is a relationship of inequality existing in geographical space and in historic time. The theories of Andre Gunder Frank and Immanuel Wallerstein – emphasizing the expanding control and exploitation of the material resources of the periphery by the core – can be seen in operation in the control of Europe over the gas pipelines on the southern shores of the Mediterranean which fuel the energy needs of Europe. The idea of the Mediterranean as the periphery of Europe leads to the implication that ‘Europe’ and ‘Mediterranean’ are two mutually exclusive categories. This is a discourse that harks back to the Pirenne thesis and debate. According to Henri Pirenne, the cultural and economic unity of the two shores of the Mediterranean was broken in the 7th and 8th centuries with the Muslim invasions. For centuries after the Mediterranean Sea witnessed incessant battles between cross and crescent. In the post-1989 era, the return to such a conflict seems to preoccupy many leading analysts. Between the 16th and the 17th centuries, first the economic, then the political hearts of Europe shifted from the Mediterranean to North-Western Europe. The Mediterranean became important only in terms of its validity to European plans. Thus, in the days of European colonial empires, the Mediterranean was the highway of Europe to the East. In the post-1989 era it is turning into the first line of resistance against Islamic fundamentalism and against illegal immigrants from less developed countries.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), the Western European Union (WEU) and the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) have been seeking to establish and develop bilateral relations with a select group of Mediterranean non-member states, rather than adopt a comprehensive approach or collective security plan for the whole Mediterranean region. Such a strategy contrasts sharply with the better-organized approach of these same organizations to Eastern Europe, which shows that their commitment to Mediterranean security is at best a limited one. The failed attempts at forging a trans-Mediterranean international institution, such
as the ‘Conference on Security and Cooperation in the Mediterranean’ (CSCM)\textsuperscript{27}, contradict notions of Mediterranean unity. It is clear that the three subregions of the Mediterranean, that is, Southern Europe, North Africa, and the Levant (not to mention the individual countries) all follow independent and sometimes conflicting aims\textsuperscript{28}. The 19th-century Eastern Question and NATO membership of Greece and Turkey were primarily concerned with keeping Russia out of the Mediterranean. In a similar fashion, it is now being perceived that NATO’s main strategy is to keep Islamic Fundamentalism out of the Mediterranean.

**Perceptions of the Crusades**

The French historian Joseph François Michaud said: “The history of the Middle Ages has no more imposing spectacle than the wars undertaken for the conquest of the Holy Land”\textsuperscript{29}. The Crusades certainly had an overarching impact on the development of European and Mediterranean medieval societies. Their legacy has reverberated throughout the ages since, and discourses about the crusades continue to be heard in the contemporary world. As already outlined above, the crusades come up with incredible regularity in the Arab / Muslim world. The response of Iran’s Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei to Pope Benedict XVI’s speech was to remark that this was “the latest chain of the crusade against Islam started by America’s Bush”\textsuperscript{30}. In the Western hemisphere, interest in the crusades is evident during occasions such as when a briefing by the Council for the Advancement of Arab-British Understanding (CAABU), given in the year 2000 in the British House of Commons, was entitled ‘The Crusades Then and Now’\textsuperscript{31}. A main thrust of this presentation was that the crusades fundamentally affect contemporary Muslims’ perceptions of the West. Three years earlier the same House of Commons had set up a commission to investigate Islamophobia and the situation of Muslims in the United Kingdom\textsuperscript{32}.

The crusades were launched in support of a cause which can be portrayed with equal force as the most noble and the most ignoble. To contemporaries a crusade was an expedition on behalf of Christ, which had been authorised by the Pope, and whose participants took vows and enjoyed the privileges of protection at home and indulgences. At the basis of any crusade lay the premise that one was fighting to recover Christian property or to resist aggression. Death met as a crusader was equated with martyrdom so that immediate entry into paradise was to be expected. Essentially, anyone who took the necessary vow could be a crusader. By taking such a vow, one became subject to ecclesiastical authority, with all the duties and privileges that this brought with it (such as exemption from secular law courts). This vow also implied that a person would put his/her normal occupation aside for a while to go crusading\textsuperscript{33}.

In the 19th and 20th centuries, images and perceptions of the crusades proliferated in Europe. In the 19th century, many commentators were critical of the crusades, but they also espoused a rather rosy-coloured image of Christian chivalry engaged with an exotic Muslim foe. The Victorians were much attracted by the ideas and precepts of medieval
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chivalry. In both England and France crusading pedigree was proudly displayed in heraldic devices. In music, art, and literature, crusading themes kept re-emerging – Sir Walter Scott, for instance, wrote a number of novels about the crusades (e.g. *Ivanhoe*, 1819, *The Talisman*, 1825). In the 20th century, crusading language found resonance in the great wars that afflicted it. Some accounts of the First World War, brushing aside the harsh realities of trench warfare, saw the war as ‘a noble crusade fought in defence of liberty, to prevent Prussian militarism dominating Europe and to free the Holy Places from Muslim domination’. Crusading imagery also re-emerged during the Second World War, when General David D. Eisenhower published his account of the campaign under the title *Crusade in Europe*.

According to Jonathan Riley-Smith, the obsession with the crusades in the Arab/Muslim world originated when the Ottoman Sultan Abdulhamid II (ruled 1876-1909) publicized his conviction that the European powers had embarked on a new crusade against him and his empire. It was a theme first picked up by pan-Arabism and later by pan-Islamism, with the latter steadily overtaking the former. The Lebanese author Amin Maalouf laments the fact that the crusades had the effect of making the Muslim world turn in upon itself and miss out on world-wide developments, leading to a dichotomy between Islam and modernism. This is because progress came to be seen as the embodiment of ‘the other’. Political and religious leaders of the Arab world constantly refer to Saladin, the fall of Jerusalem and its recapture. President Nasser of Egypt was often compared to Saladin and the Suez expedition of 1956 by the French and English was also portrayed as a crusade. Moreover, pamphlets in Libya in the 1980s depicted the Americans as crusaders. Against such modern perceptions of the crusades, it is useful to analyse what Arab chroniclers who were contemporaries of the crusades observed. In their writings the terminology changes from ‘Saracen dogs’ to ‘Christian pigs’; from the urge to acquire the Holy Sepulchre to maintaining control of the Holy Rock from where Mohammed rose to Heaven; from the ‘pious Geoffrey’ to the ‘pious Saladin’. Just as Joinville recounted how King St Louis wept whenever he thought of God’s power and benevolence, so Maqrizi described the Sultan of Egypt, Malik al-Salih in the same terms. The chronicler Abu Shama II reported Saladin’s appeal to raise an anti-Crusade movement. He quoted Saladin as reproaching the Arabs for their lack of unity when compared to the great solidarity shown among the infidels. Saladin described the Franks as giving their utmost, sacrificing everything and sharing everything between themselves, all in the name of their faith in God. Heeding Saladin’s appeal, the Arabs and Muslims managed to reverse the conquests of the crusaders. The Emir Faisal was, in fact, prompt to remind this to the French representative at Versailles after the First World War, when France was trying to stake its claim to Syria dating back to the crusades.

That the term ‘crusades’ should feature so much in today’s world is a result of the particular spin that 19th- and 20th-centuries Europeans and Sultan Abdulmahid II gave it. There is a strong trend among Arab and Muslim scholars to evaluate and reinterpret the crusading phenomenon in the light of recent experiences such as colonialism, Arab
nationalism, the establishment of the state of Israel, the liberation of Palestine and the rise of Islamic fundamentalism. The single greatest grudge that the Arab world holds against the West is that it helped to create and still sustains the state of Israel. On the other hand, it is also very probably the case that hatred of Israel is what galvanises the Arab world and gives it some sense of cohesion, without which it is quite likely that Arab countries would be at each other’s throat. If, according to Akbar Ahmed, the West does not recognise this heritage, understanding between West and East will be hampered. The use of the term crusade by Osama bin Laden and his followers is therefore pregnant with political and religious significance. They are expressing both a historical vision, as well as an article of faith that have helped to provide moral justification for the actions of both Arab nationalists and radical Islamist.

HOSPITALLERS AND OTTOMANS IN THE EARLY MODERN MEDITERRANEAN (C.1565–C.1700)

The Knights Hospitallers of St John the Baptist and the Ottoman Empire represented, in theory, if not always in fact, the essence of religious militancy. The Hospitallers had originated a few years before the First Crusade as a hospice dedicated to the care of the sick, poor and pilgrims that went to Jerusalem. The socio-political situation of the Levant over the next two centuries caused the evolution of the Hospitallers into an institution that merged without any effort the double mission of servus pauperum and miles Christi. Their subsequent stay on the islands of Cyprus and Rhodes led to them becoming formidable sea-faring warriors and by the early 16th century they could be described as one of the most formidable foes which the Ottomans had to face. The Ottoman Turks had risen as warriors in the Anatolian marches of the decaying Byzantine Empire, and as Ottoman sultans they always remained gazi (Holy War) sultans, but they extended the concept of gazi to bring the whole Islamic world under their protection. The claims to universal empire by the Ottomans had their foundation in the will of God, but they were also based on the concept of the justice of conquest. God had imposed on Muslims the duty to propagate Islam by force of arms, and the Koran adjured believers ‘not [to] think that those who were slain in the cause of Allah are dead. They are alive and well provided for by Allah;…’ Much of the early modern Mediterranean was under Ottoman control, though this was continually contested by the Christian powers in the west, especially by Habsburg Spain. The final colossal battle of the 16th century occurred at Lepanto in 1571, where an alliance of Christian navies defeated the Ottoman one. One of the most potent depictions of this battle is that of Giorgio Vasari (1511–1574), in which he shows Christ, St Peter and other saints helping the Christian fleet, while demons try in vain to help the Turks. It is a powerful reminder of how faith underpinned the beliefs and actions of early modern people. After Lepanto, Spain had to focus its energies on the low countries in revolt and its colonial possessions, whereas the Ottomans had to deal with a reinvigorated Safavid Empire to their East. Both sides were therefore engaged in conflicts with their co-religionists. The result of this was that Christian-Muslim conflict in the Mediterranean was ‘down-
sized', allowing the two sides to adjust to a *modus vivendi* and occasionally even find points of convergence.

A number of early modern texts are utilised here to gain as contemporary a view as possible of this situation, in terms of the encounters between Hospitallers and Ottomans. These sources consist mainly of the diary of Francisco Balbi di Correggio about the 1565 Siege of Malta, the diary of the 17th-century Spanish adventurer Alonso de Contreras, and a series of printed accounts of naval encounters between the navies of the Hospitallers and the Ottomans. Balbi and Contreras left a written record of what the life of early modern adventurers was like. Their works allow us to obtain an intimate glimpse of a life dominated by war and religion, where the boundary between these two was often blurred.

Balbi was a 16th-century Italian-Spanish who left the most extensive first-hand account of the 1565 Ottoman siege of Hospitaller Malta. He was not a member of the Order but he served in the Spanish corps throughout the siege. Balbi, being a Christian, spared no literary effort to show that the Christians were better than the Muslims, however, throughout his work one can read the subtle recognition by a soldier of the others’ military abilities. At the beginning of his account, he outlined the many good qualities that the leader of the Hospitallers, Grand Master Jean de la Valette, possessed. He went on to say that it took “… a man of his wisdom and courage to be able to resist the onslaught of Suleiman …”, thereby recognizing that only someone who was equally portent could match the great and fearsome Sultan Suleiman the Great. Most of the time Balbi referred to the Ottomans as either the ‘Turks’ or the ‘enemy’, avoiding pejorative terms such as ‘barbarians’. However, after the fall of the Fortress of St. Elmo, when the Ottomans massacred most of the remaining defenders, and threw into the sea the mutilated bodies of the dead Christians, he could not desist from calling them “Turkish barbarians”. At the same time, Balbi also recorded how one Ottoman commander accused the other of cruelty in his treatment of the Christian captives, and how the other replied that there was to be no quarter. What Balbi fails to mention is that La Valette, upon seeing the floating corpses, first wept, and then responded with equal savagery by having some of the Turkish prisoners beheaded, and their heads shot, instead of cannonballs, into the enemy camp. Thinking, perhaps, that such a vindictive act was less excusable than that of a Pasha, since it emanated from a Christian knight, Balbi thought it best to leave it out of his account. One could almost say that in these bloody acts, Christians and Muslims found a point of convergence – there was a sullen recognition by both sides that even more than before, the context was now one of ‘an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth’.

The second character to be considered here is that of Contreras. He was a 17th-century Spaniard from Madrid, who travelled throughout the Mediterranean and the Caribbean, served the Order on many occasions, and was finally received as a Hospitaller brother servant-at-arms in the Priory of Castille. He wrote a diary of his life, which commenced with his setting off to serve the King of Spain at the age of fourteen in 1595. Besides being involved in a number of duels and fights with all sorts of people,
Contreras was actively engaged throughout all his life against the two main foes of his native Spain – the Ottoman Turks and Muslims in the Mediterranean, and the Protestant English in the Atlantic. His first proper military engagement was on board the Spanish galleys that sailed from Naples and Sicily to lead an attack on the western coast of Greece, then part of the Ottoman Empire. During one of these early expeditions, when he was not even eighteen years old, he narrates how he managed to single-handedly capture a gargantuan Turk:

> I poked him with my sword and said in Arabic to him, ‘Lie down on the ground.’
> This gargantuan Turk looked at me and started to laugh. At that time, though I was equipped with a sword and shield, I had a face as smooth as a girl’s.

It is telling that both the Turk and Contreras shared a common notion of manliness, and the lack of it, as denoted by facial hair. In early modern times beards were an essential denominator of masculinity. The growth of facial hair denoted that a boy had effectively passed from the feminine realm of women and children, to that of men and adults. Contreras was therefore perfectly capable of understanding the Turk’s mocking of him because his face was still “smooth as a girl’s.” It emerges that in early modern times, Mediterranean men, whether they donned the cross or the crescent, shared a similar understanding of the role of the body in forging one’s manliness.

In Contreras’ diary, as in Balbi’s account, there are references to moments of sheer savagery, committed by both Christians and Muslims alike, such as when a skirmish with some Moors at Cape Bonandrea in North Africa led to some brutal acts being committed by both sides. From Contreras’s diary, however, there also emerges an example of how the religious beliefs of Christians and Muslims could converge. He described a cave on the island of Lampedusa in the central Mediterranean which contained an altar of the Blessed Virgin, as well as the tomb of a Turkish marabout (a West African Muslim spiritual leader) who was considered by Muslims to be a saint. In this cave, visiting Christians and Muslims would both leave offerings at their respective shrines – food, clothes, money, and so on. The reason for these offerings was that the cave was used by escaping galley slaves – of both faiths – as a safe haven until they could be rescued by their own people. If anyone else besides the escaping slaves – and excepting the Hospitallers – dared to remove these items, it was believed that their galley would be precluded from leaving the harbour. This story indicates how beneath the wider labels of ‘Christianity’ and ‘Islam’, there were sub-practices peculiar to certain regions and people. It also shows how geographical conditions (e.g. Lampedusa’s location) and human factors (the need to provide for escaping slaves) led Christians and Muslims to find a common solution to their shared problem, one that was underpinned by religion and war.

The conflation of religion and violence led to the development of tracts that dealt with naval encounters between Christians and Muslims. These printed accounts – described as either a *Relazione* (a report) or an *Avviso* (a notice) – tended to be short pamphlets that gave a day-by-day and a blow-by-blow account of a particular naval encounter. It
was a genre well known in early modern Europe through which states and individuals sought to glorify themselves. The medium of the printing press was therefore harnessed by the Order of St John to spread the fame of its warriors and their actions. Such tracts served to show the continued relevance of a religious-military order dedicated to defending a Christian Europe from its Muslim foes. They were also meant to capture the imagination of prospective candidates aspiring to join the Order who would be lured by the promise of adventure, glory, and the salvation of their soul through the ultimate Christian sacrifice – the laying down of one's life in defence of others and in the name of God. Since Christians wrote these texts, it is necessary to be aware of the inevitable bias against the Muslim side. At the same time, such bias may not be totally unwelcome. After all, objectivity is hardly ever an achievable goal and subjectivity brings us closer to what contemporaries thought and felt. Though Muslims were naturally demonised in such writings, they were not always dismissed as barbarians. The Christian gentlemen who wrote or inspired such texts could at times fraternise with the gentlemen on the other side, even if they were Muslim. The unwritten code of chivalry was like a common meeting ground for both Christians and Muslims, and for some it may have felt like a religion all of its own. Therefore, these tracts allow one to look at Christian-Muslim war from the religious angle, but they also highlight the importance of status and masculinity in informing conflict.

Such expeditions served three purposes. Firstly, they served an economic purpose, not only through the capture of booty and slaves, but also by diminishing the potential of attacks on Christian lands and vessels. Secondly, they served a religious purpose, in that war was waged to glorify God. Finally, it was also a way of keeping the knights themselves busy at sea, rather than idle at land. These tracts were generally penned by an anonymous author, in praise of the Captains and Knights that partook in such battles. The qualities of these men were highlighted – nobility of birth, Christian charity, proficiency in the use of arms, and a readiness to give everything and sacrifice everything for the Order and for God. The wearing of the red habit with the white eight-pointed cross of the Order was a badge of excellence and distinction in Europe, and a symbol that instilled fear and resentment among Muslims. Manly excellence was also linked to nationality – hailing from France or Italy, in particular, was seen as a guarantee of one's naval aptitude. The language used was vivid, active and gripping, and it sought to place the reader in the midst of the action and to show the great valour of the knights. Many of these tracts, by finishing with the words LAUS DEO (Praise be to God) gave the whole text (and the battle described therein) the character of a prayer. Through the placement of prayer at the heart of the narrative and action, these tracts could almost be describing a pilgrimage. Before a battle commenced, knights and soldiers prepared themselves through confession, prayer and the invocation of God and the saints to their cause. After all, at the end of their pilgrimage-battle, death could be waiting, and one had to be on guard and ready. Moreover, when the galleys returned victorious to Malta, street processions were held to praise God and the Virgin Mary for the victories obtained, thereby bringing the pilgrimage-battle to a fitting end. A final
but crucial element to be considered here is the attitude towards their Muslim enemies, called generically the ‘Turks’. Although the title of ‘barbarians’ was at times attributed to the latter, there often was a subtle hint that Christian valour was met by Muslim valour. The good military qualities of the Turks – their soldiers, their artillery and their leaders were recognised and taken into account. After all, if the courage of the knights was to shine properly, it could only do so when opposing equally courageous warriors. The stubbornness of the Turks was also admired, although it could easily turn into irrational obstinacy, and that was deemed to be unmanly.

**Conclusion**

This chapter provides an overview of the history of Christian-Muslim interaction (both conflict and convergence) in the Mediterranean from the Middle Ages to modern times. It was concerned with showing how the concept of ‘clash of civilizations’ oversimplifies and glosses over a more complex social and historical palimpsest. The case was also made for giving due consideration to the Crusades as a central organising principle that underlines contemporary Christian-Muslim relations. In early modern times, then, encounters and violence between Hospitallers and Ottomans serve as a case study into the multi-faceted nature of relations between faiths or civilizations. Both Hospitallers and Ottomans were religious warriors, committed to fight each other, even unto death. Moreover, they shared a certain understanding of what constituted military valour and manliness. Christian-Muslim interaction has, inevitably, been underwritten by religious concepts and beliefs. However, it has been argued here that other factors, such as politics, status and masculinity also informed these exchanges, both amicable and hostile. By taking these elements into account, alongside religion, a fuller understanding of Christian-Muslim relations in the past can be achieved. On the other hand, it is important to recognise that if peace is to have a chance in the contemporary world, faith has to form an important part of the equation in solving Christian-Muslim issues.
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